

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS

FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING

September 6, 1990

Law School, Room 116

3:30 - 5:30 p.m.

**Members Present:** Administrative: Chancellor Gerald Bepko, J. Herman Blake, Richard Peterson, Dean William Plater. Deans: Constance Baker, John Barlow, Barbara Fischler, H. William Gilmore, P. Nicholas Kellum, R. Bruce Renda. Faculty: C. D. Aliprantis, James Baldwin, Patricia Blake, David Bodenhamer, Walter Buchanan, Varoujan Chalian, Elaine Cooney, Theodore Cutshall, Ann Dunipace, William Engle, Paul Galanti, Jean Gnat, Dolores Hoyt, Norman Hudson, Jerome Kaplan, Henry Karlson, Linda Kasper, Juanita Keck, Michael Kubek, Bruce Long, Lynda Means, Dana McDonald, Patrick McGeever, Richard Meiss, Bernard Morrel, B. Keith Moore, Jerold Paar, Catherine Palmer, John Rafert, Edward Robbins, Bruce Roth, Carl Rothe, Neal Rothman, Phyllis Scherle, Edmund Schilling, Lee Schwecke, Kent Sharp, Jan Shipps, Aristotle Siakotos, Hitwant Sidhu, Donald Tharp, Jay Tischfield, Ann Tomey, Marion Wagner, Kathleen Warfel, Kathryn Wilson, Donald Wong, Charles Yokomoto, Susan Zunt.

**Alternates Present:** Deans: Gary Lowe for Sheldon Siegel, Rita Fordyce for William Voos, Hugh Wolf for Donald Warren, Marvin Ebbert for James Weigand, Georgia Miller for Jack Wentworth. Faculty: Julia Tyler for Frances Brahmi.

**Ex Officio Member Present:** Henry Besch, Richard Fredland, Gerald Powers, Maxine Tutterrow, President, IUPUI Staff Council, Jeffery Vessely.

**Members Absent:** Deans: A James Barnes, Trevor Brown, Walter Daly, Norman Lefstein. Faculty: Darrell Bailey, Jonas Bjork, H Glenn Bohlen, Thomas Broadie, Dewey Conces, William Crabtree, Ronald Dehnke, Dornith Doherty, Andrew Evan, Martin Farlow, Naomi Fineberg, Janice Froehlich, Philip Gibbs, Michael Gleeson, Richard Hamburger, Dean Hawley, Florence Juillerat, Richard Kovacs, Richard Lawlor, Chris Miller, Robert Pascuzzi, John Pless, Sherry Queener, Michael Ryan, Thomas Ryan, Scott Shapario, Gregory Sutton, Vernon Vix.

**Visitors:** Erwin Boschmann, Dean of the Faculties Office, David Bostwick, Engineering and Technology, Bette Joe Davis, Scott Evenbeck, Carol Nathan, Jane Partenheimer, Sagamore, Jeannette Rowe, Staff Council, Gene Tempel.

**AGENDA ITEM I - Approval of Minutes: April 5, 1990 and May 3, 1990**

**BEPKO:** Our first item of business is the approval of the minutes for April 5 and May 3. Do I hear a motion to approve?

**CHALIAN:** I make a motion that the minutes be approved as circulated. [Seconded]

**BEPKO:** The minutes are approved as circulated.

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

**BEPKO:** Welcome to the new year which is filled with promise and enthusiasm for the growth and success of our academic programs. We begin the new year with a tradition but one which we are going to revise slightly. We have two memorial resolutions that ordinarily would be the first item of business and they would be read in full text. But, based on a number of recommendations and the recommendation of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council, we are going to dispense with the reading of these memorial resolutions. We call your attention to them in the packet of materials that was distributed for today's meeting and urge that you look at them and urge that you remember the many contributions of Joe G. White of the School of Dentistry and David H. Jung of the School of Medicine. To mark the moment, our approval of these memorial resolutions, and our agreement that they should be distributed to the persons indicated in the resolutions and to all appropriate persons who would be interested in these memorial resolutions, to mark all of that, I will ask that we stand and observe a moment of silence. Thank you.

There are a few items that I would like to take up before we have a presentation which will be part of the Presiding Officer's Business. This will be a presentation on the Undergraduate Education Center which a number of you have asked about. Anticipating some other questions and also to make some announcements, I would like to cover several points.

First, we have had considerable discussion about titles within campus administration over the past few years. As you know, there have been a number of changes in the way positions have been titled. About two years ago the Vice President for Bloomington and the Vice President for Indianapolis were given the additional title in lieu of a pay increase; the additional title being Chancellor of the respective campuses; the Vice President title to reflect the systemwide responsibilities that each office contains and the Chancellor title to reflect the role on the specific campus. Flowing from that, there were appointments of Vice Chancellors both at Indianapolis, Bloomington, and a number of other campuses. In fact, Bloomington increased its number of vice chancellors to four this past year and other campuses have followed suit with three or

four vice chancellors. Many of the campuses have vice chancellor titles for persons who do administrative business management, facilities management and budget work. We have two persons on this campus who have distinguished themselves, we think, by their service in the administrative field both in terms of general administration, administrative affairs, and in terms of budgetary affairs and fiscal affairs. One is Bob Martin who has been Director of Administrative Affairs and the other is Dave Robbins who has been Director of Budgetary and Fiscal Affairs. They have been directors and they have a number of directors who report to them. Each has a very large portfolio. In the case of Bob Martin, a couple of thousand employees report to him through a series of other directors. Given that the other campuses have moved in the direction of making those persons or persons who did that type of work -- vice chancellors -- given that they have the broadest responsibilities, the broadest portfolios of any of these persons throughout the University system, broader even than the persons with comparable responsibilities on the Bloomington campus and with consultation with a number of persons, including the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council, other faculty members, and deans, we have concluded that we should retitle their positions from director to Vice Chancellor. In the case of Bob Martin, he will be Vice Chancellor in Administrative Affairs. In the case of Dave Robbins, he will be Vice Chancellor in Budgetary and Fiscal Affairs. We think that these are merely title changes, not changes in activities. This is an expansion of the number of people who will be involved but simply a recognition of the breadth of responsibility that each person has and the ordering of those responsibilities in accord with an organizational chart that makes more sense and is more consistent with what is done on the other campuses.

Secondly, there has been a question raised about the dean's search in the School of Engineering and Technology. We announced some time ago that Bruce Renda has indicated that he would like to return to full time teaching as of July 1, 1991 and wished to retire from the deanship after a long and distinguished career as Dean of Engineering and Technology. We announced that we would be forming a search committee. We should have done that by now, because there is less than one year until the date when we had thought that Bruce would be resuming full time academic work, but, in the interim, some issues were raised by faculty members of the school. The particular issues have to do with how Engineering and Technology relate to each other and whether there should be some reorganization of Engineering and Technology. The most commonly offered suggestion from members of the faculty was that consideration be given to dividing Engineering and Technology and having a separate school of Engineering and a separate school of Technology as you find on the West Lafayette campus. In order to address that issue, we formed a blue ribbon committee of faculty members with one outsider and that was Art Hansen, former President of Purdue University. That committee met and has made recommendations about

the conditions for both Engineering and Technology. A variety of things have been recommended most of which we have been eager to implement. The one thing that we have not yet resolved is whether there should be this separation of Engineering and Technology. There was a division among the faculty. There has been some division everywhere that the issue has been raised, and we are not yet prepared to make that decision. The Purdue administration in West Lafayette has asked us to wait until it conducts a review of the Purdue schools on this campus. That is a periodic review that is conducted for all Purdue schools, whether in West Lafayette or here in Indianapolis. That review is going to take place early next month. Shortly thereafter we will have a resolution of the remaining issues that were addressed by the Art Hansen Task Force and we will move on to a search and screen effort. Whatever that effort may be, we will move on to it. We won't know, though, until all of the structural decisions are made. We have briefed the faculty of the School of Engineering and Technology on all of this but wanted the Faculty Council to know the status of this matter, and that is why I reported it.

We have also a project underway that you should be aware of. For the past year, or maybe a little less, we have been discussing with the Faculty Council Executive Committee the implementation of a plan for reviews of academic campus administrators. The only person whose office is subject to a mandated periodic review is the Vice President and Chancellor of this campus and the Bloomington campus. On the Indianapolis campus, though, we have not had a regular institutionalized review procedure for other academic officers. We had proposed sometime ago to begin a procedure, that would flow out of the review of my office, which is taking place during the fall term of this academic year. That procedure would include, not only the other officers in the campus administration, but also deans of schools. We are simultaneously discussing this issue with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council, a special committee that was appointed in cooperation with the Dean of the Faculties, my office, and with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council, and with the deans of the schools to develop a plan for a procedure that would be comparable to the one that is used in Bloomington for academic reviews. We hope to have a report on that in the not too distant future -- a report that would include a recommendation that a particular procedure be used for all of these offices and that we institutionalize a collegial procedure for giving feedback to academic officers about issues and performance: will it give faculty members an opportunity to make views known in a regular institutionalized procedure.

Also, we will be coming to you a little later in the fall term with a report on the appropriation request for Indiana University. We are not going to do that at this meeting, but at one of our subsequent meetings we will make that presentation. But, for the moment, I would like to call your attention, in case you haven't heard about it until now, to the fact that the presidents of all

seven universities in the state including all of the public universities -- Purdue, IU, Ball State, Indiana State, University of Southern Indiana, Vincennes, and Ivy Tech -- last Friday had a series of news conferences around the state at which they launched an initiative that proposes to add over the next four years a significant amount of new funding to higher education in Indiana. The point being that the state has earlier turned its attention to primary/secondary education. Now the state should turn its attention to higher education. Indiana should invest in its higher education institutions so that the expenditures on higher education in Indiana more nearly approximate the type of expenditures that are made by our competitor states. The specific proposal is to add three percent to the budgets of each the public universities/post secondary institutions per year over the next four years in addition to the cost of living adjustments and in addition to the amounts that would be otherwise given for enrollment adjustments to reflect increased enrollments. If that was done, that is the position of the seven institutions, then Indiana would be caught up and could go back to the normal type of funding for higher education. Unfortunately, right in the middle of this we have had some very gloomy news about state finances. That will not deter the seven presidents or the rest of us from making a case. But, it may not be the best year in which to make this kind of proposal. That won't change anything as far as we are concerned. The quest will still be to focus the attention of the state on higher education and to get catch up funding for all higher education, but particularly for this campus.

Some questions have been raised over the summer about child care on campus. As you know, we have an excellent child care program already underway but the problem is that it is too small. We have had repeated requests, particularly from employees in the hospitals, to try to provide a broader, more accessible child care both for employees and also for students of the university. We are exploring some possibilities along those lines. We are talking to some private companies about the possibility of using University land under a lease and licensing contract which would permit the child care companies to build large facilities that would be available to a lot larger audience than our current child care facility is and would be available at very competitive prices. That would also include some of the features that our current child care facility includes, such as the educational programs that are conducted there. When I say educational programs I mean the internships that are conducted by the School of Education using our current child care facility. In the course of these inquiries, which are in the preliminary stages right now, we have not made any decisions about the existing child care facility. For all we know, there may be two types of child care at some time in the future. One is our existing child care facility, which is operated by the University, and second is a child care facility that is operated in partnership with a private company. We haven't made any decisions and we want to assure people that we are going to look

very carefully at what the private companies propose before making any decisions about either going into this kind of venture or certainly before we would curtail any of the existing child care facilities that are now enjoyed by a relatively small but very enthusiastic group of faculty and staff. We don't want anyone to think that decisions have been made. They haven't. We are looking into this only as a way of trying to provide more child care services for more people who wish to work and have their careers or their studies on this campus.

Finally, we have had questions about the Family Leave Policy that was adopted by the Faculty Council here at IUPUI during the middle of the academic year last year and then was adopted by the University Faculty Council in February. I would like to give you an update on that. The matter was referred to Vice President John Hackett and the new head of Human Resources, who is new to the University, Margaret Mitchell. They were asked to study implementation of the family leave policy. The work that they did during the spring term consisted of going to all campuses interviewing faculty members, administrators, and others about implementation issues. Over the summer the proposal was considered for a time that each campus be given an opportunity to have its own family leave arrangements. The Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses, I think, however, must have the same policy. We have so many faculty members who go back and forth, so many faculty members who hold appointments on both campuses, that it would be awkward, at best, to try to conceive having different policies for each of those two campuses. Based on that, we have been asked ourselves to take up these implementation issues, which we are going to do with dispatch. A memo has gone out to the Council of Deans asking the deans of the respective academic units to consult with their faculty consultative groups to determine views on the series of implementation issues that are going to be necessary to resolve. We would like your advice and your counsel and we will work with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council on these same issues. To give you an idea of what those issues are and what the implementation considerations will be, let me list the ones that are currently on the table.

First, the question is whether the faculty policy should be implemented or whether the faculty policy should wait until a comparable policy is available for all staff. Secondly, whether the policy can be implemented during this academic year or whether there should be an effort to prepare for the implementation, even for faculty, until the beginning of the next academic year so the responsibility centers can do the budget planning that may be needed in order to take account of the costs that will be associated with implementation.

Third, There is a request that has been made by the Board of Trustees to have more information about specific costs of each feature of the Family Leave Policy. We are working now to develop

a better sense of the costs as reported by the responsibility centers and as gathered at the campus level and reported to the Vice President for Finance. Also, we have been asked to raise, and have ourselves raised some questions about implementation procedures as to whether family leave is in all cases a matter of right and can be automatically invoked by an employee -- staff member or faculty member -- or whether in some of the cases, pregnancy is probably something that will have to be automatic, but in other cases whether there will be some University faculty committee, in the schools or otherwise, to review requests for family leave; whether there will be some mechanism for determining the nature of a hardship, the degree of illness of a member of the family, in order to activate the family leave rights of the faculty. Also, there are questions raised about things like waiting periods. I think this issue relates particularly to staff but it may also relate to faculty members. Should there be a waiting period before a person can avail herself or himself of family leave benefits? This again, relates not only to pregnancy, but also to persons who may ask for family leave to care for someone in the home or for a relative. Questions were raised about how long a period a person should be in the employ of the University before that kind of family leave benefit should be conferred. Similarly, on the following end, what kind of commitments should be made by a faculty member or a staff member at the conclusion of family leave? The case was envisioned where a person might come to work for the University and a week later ask for family leave to take care of a relative and then when the family leave expired say that the illness is serious enough so that the employee doesn't think that they would like to come back to work in any event. The suggestion has been made that we consider issues like that so we can implement the policy at the first reasonable opportunity. That is all going forward right now, and we will have reports back to you regularly both through our appearances and through the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council.

Finally, we have a presentation that I am pleased to be able to introduce. As you know, Herman Blake has been Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education for a little over a year. In that time he has done remarkable work not only in drawing together the various units that have served our undergraduate student population, but also in developing a new vision for the way we serve our undergraduate students and the way we especially serve groups that have historically been under represented in the University, both ethnic minorities and other groups. I am pleased to be able to introduce Herman today as he makes a report on a new organizational structure that has been developed in consultation with our Council on Undergraduate Learning and a variety of other people on campus. It is called the Undergraduate Education Center, and Herman will begin the discussion but Scott Evenbeck will join him as well.

**BLAKE:** Thank you, Mr. Chancellor and good afternoon. We are pleased to have this opportunity to share with you some brief

perspectives on the new unit, the Undergraduate Education Center. Our purpose here is to give you some information about the development of the Center and, after brief remarks, respond to your questions.

The Undergraduate Education Center is a further development of efforts to improve the effectiveness of our services to a substantial number of IUPUI students who have yet to be admitted to one of the degree-granting units on campus. It combines three formally separate units -- the Adult Education Coordinating Center, the University Access Center, and the University Division. It builds on the efforts of these three units but also includes new developments designed to increase the effectiveness of our work.

Although very recent and rapid in its development, the Undergraduate Education Center is a logical development of changes which have been underway at Indiana University for sometime. From the office of President Ehrlich all the way through to the office of the IUPUI administration, we have seen an unequivocal commitment to move Indiana University to an even more significant level of achievement in the education of our students--particularly those comprising of the New Majority.

The exigencies facing IUPUI in terms of the expansion of our faculty ranks, and the pressing needs for additional academic space in central facilities made this a most propitious time to unify the Adult Education Coordinating Center, the University Access Center, and the University Division into one unit. While somewhat different in mission, each of the previous units also had considerable duplication and overlap in their functioning. We, therefore, felt that if the units were to occupy the same space in a facility, further from the center of campus, this would be the best time to both increase their efficiency by merger and extend their impact by augmented activities.

Under the guidance and direction of the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education, the staffs of these three units were moved into two floors of the annex of the Union Building several weeks ago and the new unit was inaugurated. Therefore, at IUPUI we no longer have an Adult Education Coordinating Center, the University Access Center, or the University Division. We are in the process of dropping these titles from IUPUI publications. While we realize there will be a period of transition to the new terminology, we also recognize the formation of the new unit. We are presently beginning an effort to review the policies of the former units toward an improved and systematic set of policies which will end some of the confusion about roles and responsibilities in regard to various categories of students.

In addition to new leadership in new facilities, we are also making a deliberate effort to strengthen the links between the Under-



graduate Education Center and the regular academic programs at IUPUI. We have also articulated a mission and philosophy statement to guide all of us in our work with students.

**EVENBECK:** The Undergraduate Education Center of Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis is a counseling, advising, and supporting services program which operates in support of the academic programs of the degree-granting units of the University.

The mission of the Undergraduate Education Center is to serve lower division students in their quest for higher education by providing access, guidance, and academic support as appropriate. It assists students in the acquisition of appropriate skills, attitudes and values which will permit them to take full advantage of the liberal and professional education offered at IUPUI; it counsels and advises students in the selection of courses, majors, and academic units; it transfers those students into the degree granting units of the University as soon as possible after their matriculation.

Toward the fulfillment of this mission, the staff of the Undergraduate Education Center have adopted a philosophy which specifies the values and principles which guide them in their response to student needs. Some, but not all, of these values and principles are:

1. Every student, regardless of previous circumstance, has the potential to achieve educational excellence.
2. Every student is a unique and special person, possessing qualities which contribute to the richly diverse university community.
3. Every student is expected to exert their maximum energies toward the achievement of educational excellence.
4. A liberal education from IUPUI is one of the most valuable avenues toward the achievement of the qualities of a worthwhile citizen.
5. Undergraduate Education Center staff will maintain high standards of professional conduct in their response to students.
6. Success in the achievement of the mission of the Undergraduate Education Center will be best when it involves cooperative approaches to education and community-building strategies within the University.

When fully developed, we anticipate five basic components in the Undergraduate Education Center: (1) Administrative, (2) Academic Counseling/Advising, (3) Supportive Services; (4) Academic; and (5) Assessment and Evaluation. While analytically distinct, we expect the five components to interact creatively to meet student needs within the context of the mission and philosophy of the Center.

To expedite discussion, we would like to conclude with a brief

articulation of what we mean by an academic component in the Undergraduate Education Center.

Although the schools of Education, Liberal Arts, and Sciences offer courses through the Undergraduate Education Center, fundamental the Center does not offer an academic program and there are no expectations that course offerings will become a regular part of the center's responsibility. Recognizing, however, that the educational program is the only reason for a student enrolling in the University, the Undergraduate Education Center strives to insure that all students are enrolled in the array of programs and courses that best meets their needs.

With the support and approval of the School of Education, we are beginning a pilot program for a limited number of courses in study skills. Our Undergraduate Education Center Senior Counselors will also serve as adjunct faculty in the School of Education. These courses are taught by UEC staff as part of their responsibilities, with peer mentors assigned to each of the sections as assistance to the Senior Counselors. This pilot program is designed to see if we can improve the effectiveness of these remedial courses and the UEC, by building a stronger bridge between an advising and academic program.

The courses in Writing, Writing E 010, and Mathematics, M 010 and M 020, which are taught through the Center are wholly the responsibility of the appropriate departments of the Schools of Liberal Arts and Science. The faculty are responsible only to the departments who assess their qualifications and maintain quality control over the course offerings.

As we increase our ability to identify the student qualities which enhance academic success, we will simultaneously investigate the ways in which we can place groups of Center students in entry-level courses where their performance and activities can be closely monitored. We are presently working toward a pilot effort in Chemistry which may serve as a prototype for a more broadly-based program.

The point here is that, while the Undergraduate Education Center will not offer an academic program or specific courses, we will work on a closer and much more systematic link between our advising efforts, and specific courses where our students are closely supervised and monitored by faculty, counselors, and peer mentors. The goal is to make the educational experience of our students much more of a coherent whole, and get students to focus more on the acquisition of a good education and learning experience rather than on the accumulation of credits.

At its best, such an effort will require some limited resource allocation to faculty, as well as joint meetings between relevant faculty and UEC staff to discuss progress and problems. Over the

next few months Dr. Anthony San Pietro will be working with the Center as a Special Advisor to our academic efforts.

**BLAKE:** This is an ambitious enterprise--much more ambitious than what has previously existed at IUPUI. It is both exciting and humbling. Exciting because the opportunity to create a new future for students is an extra-ordinary opportunity, yet humbling because the challenge is so great. There are so many things we must do and think about in creating the new, while continuing to serve students out of some former contexts. We fully expect to make mistakes, but hopefully our errors will be indications of the significance of the challenges we choose to undertake.

There are many aspects of our work that we could share with you, but we thought we would at least give you these few ideas to stimulate your thoughts and perhaps respond to your questions. We have a much longer and comprehensive essay which is in its last revision and we would be pleased to share it with you in another week or so. We have a summary of the mission and purpose statement which we would like to distribute to you today.

**WILSON:** Did you say that University Access students, when that part was first formed, that those students did not meet Indiana University requirements, how many of those students are there?

**BLAKE:** I don't know the exact number that were admitted this year but we stopped admissions after a point at which we felt we could no longer handle the volume that was coming in. I can't give you the exact numbers. You may know those, Scott, or you may not.

**EVENBECK:** There are 3,300 enrolled in the Access Center.

**BLAKE:** Thank you.

**WILSON:** Why are you admitting students that don't even require a minimal criteria? Faculty, as far as we know, have never voted to change our admission requirements. We are supposed to remain outside.

**BLAKE:** I am following a policy that was here when I arrived. That is to say that we had to provide an opportunity for students who had no other place to go in terms of dealing with deficits. We are taking this particular pilot approach that we made mention of to deal with those deficits.

**WILSON:** Why were faculty never asked if they wanted to do this? This is not something that is mandated and we are required to do.

**BLAKE:** I would beg to differ with you on what you mean by qualification. We could debate that all afternoon and would be willing to do so around a variety of context. We are finding that the vast majority of these students come from some of the best schools in the state and some of the evidence seems to indicate

that, while they may not do well on some of the standardized tests, it is not because they are unable to learn. We are developing strategies to improve that. To push it a bit further, there are some other issues that one might raise about those students who meet the so called qualifications and requirements. We do not have a community college system in the state and we have an obligation as the only public institution in this area to make a response to these students. We are doing, I think, a very commendable and impressive job in beginning to move those students to a higher level of performance.

**SIDHU:** Is this new unit considered an academic unit or non-academic unit as far as the University is concerned? If it is going to be considered as an academic unit, it would raise the question as to how their academic policies will be handled?

**BEPKO:** Before Dr. Blake answers Professor Sidhu, I think there should be a footnote to the earlier conversation about this.

**PLATER:** There has been a faculty committee that has been setting policies for the University Education Center and its predecessor units. Last year Professor Morrel made a presentation to the Faculty Council on the committee structure that has been followed to set policies and to determine the way in which we would admit students. I don't know if Bernie wants to comment on the presentation he made last year, but there is a series of interlocking committees all of which report ultimately to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Faculty Council which sets the general policies that are then implemented by a series of administrative committees that work with the individual specific units. This year, because we are in the process of combining the three separate pre-existing units into a single unit, we have not yet developed the overall committee structure but, as in the past, the Academic Affairs Committee of the Faculty Council will set the policies that determine the way in which students are admitted to these units.

**WILSON:** I beg to differ with you. We voted on the admission standards, that is, this faculty voted as did the University Faculty Council, a couple of years ago, to be that students admitted to this University must be in the upper half of their high school class or have a total of 750 on their SATs. These students don't meet that and I don't think anybody ever voted, in any faculty body with the powers to vote on those things, to change those rules.

**VESSELY:** It is not in affect yet.

**PLATER:** The policies that you are talking about don't go into effect until 1992. The policies which we voted on across the University do allow for the kinds of exceptions that Vice Chancellor Blake has described here. I think that it might be useful at some point to review the assumptions and philosophy of

the study that has been taken under the guidance of the Academic Affairs Committee to begin to develop a rationale for serving these students. Herman or Scott may speak more knowledgeably than I can about the numbers, size and proportion of the University Education Center, but there is an intent to limit the number of students whom we might call "high risk" students to an ever decreasing number but to always have a commitment to serve those students who, based upon their placement tests and individual counseling and other factors, merit our taking a chance on and allowing them to enroll in the University in prescribed courses to demonstrate their abilities to succeed at the college level. The courses that we are talking about are the ones that Scott described, the 001 level courses. Many of them are pre-college level work and don't apply toward degrees. Again, that is a policy set by the faculties in separate schools. But, I think that the Academic Affairs Committee and the committees that are working with them have begun to work through, very systematically, the issues that you are concerned about. It is not something that we are prepared to do overnight because we need to provide some opportunity for widely accessible public higher education in this Indianapolis region and we are doing that in part through the agreement with Ivy Tech. Again, that was reported to the Faculty Council last spring. That agreement would provide a partial answer to the responsibility of higher education and the state of Indiana for students who are not well prepared.

**KECK:** It is my understanding that the University Division is also incorporated. Is not University Division an area where students who are academically talented could choose to be placed when they did not know what kind of major they wanted to pursue. I had a personal experience with a negative impact on an academically talented student who simply didn't know what major she wanted and chose University Division and now the family believes that the daughter is being viewed by the University as having a real deficit to be made up. Why is the University Division associated with students who are academically disadvantaged when the students in University Division may well be academically talented?

**PLATER:** I think the general philosophy is that these are programs that handle, advise, counsel, and work with students who are not yet admitted to degree programs. They should be treated through one comprehensive program but we do not have to treat every student exactly the same because, as you have pointed out, students enter the University with very different expectations, aspirations, and levels of preparedness. But we need one set of coherent policies and way of dealing with students who are not yet admitted to degree programs.

**KECK:** It makes a real negative statement to academically talented students who don't know what they want to do yet. It tends to suggest perhaps they need to seek another university. The apparent opinion is that we think that they are not academically prepared. We are not prepared for eighteen year olds who are choosing IUPUI

as their first choice as an institution. The other institutions throughout the state have university divisions, or, as IU calls it, "Exploratory").

**BEPKO:** University Division.

**KECK:** They are not associated with something like Access Center which was designed for students who are as yet perhaps academically disadvantaged.

**BEPKO:** I think there was another hope as a part of the whole movement to encourage more students to earn degrees. The hope was that we would have more students admitted directly into the schools, and the University Division wouldn't be as large as it had been in the past because schools would be willing to take academically superior students at an earlier stage.

**BLAKE:** I think there is another point that you have missed. If you look at the mission and purpose document that we presented to you, we point out that we counsel and advise students in the selection of academic programs, courses, and majors and the like. Also, that we transfer those students to degree granting units as soon as possible. I think you are making some unfortunate assumptions when you claim that associating people from different kinds of backgrounds is detrimental to students who are academically talented and who are not yet certain of their major. These students can benefit from our counseling and other services. The well-prepared students who know what they want as a major are the ones who don't belong in our unit and have the capacity to move quickly into degree granting units. We want them there and we will urge them to move there. That is our responsibility as an advising and counseling unit. If the student doesn't know his or her capacities or abilities, and once we learn and understand them, we will move that student and urge that student to go to the places where they will be best served. Toward that end, we have engaged Dr. San Pietro to help us think through and work these things out in the most effective way possible. Our goal is to serve students regardless of previous circumstance of life and we do that.

**KECK:** It is not my assumption but the students' assumption that she is being viewed as somehow deficient because she didn't have what she wants and was originally assigned to the Access Center. She is a member of three Honor Societies and has an SAT score of 1050.

**BEPKO:** That sounds like a mistake, because I don't think that a student with that kind of credentials would have been referred to the program that includes the Access Center. Within the Undergraduate Education Center there are different programs designed for different students, and a student who has that kind of credentials would not be assigned to Access Center courses. That is an individual aberrational case. The case may be something that we

can address individually but that type of case is not contemplated by the policies that are reflected in the Undergraduate Education Center.

**BLAKE:** Professor Aliprantis, in fact, in the past it has been inappropriate and ineffective advising and counseling of students, and placement of students, that led to the situation you describe. One of the reasons why we have taken the approach that we are taking is to end that practice.

**SIDHU:** Will this be considered as an academic unit or not? If it is not going to be considered as an academic unit, as a counseling unit what has to happen, the University Division does not have enough counselors, it does not have enough staff, how are you are going to meet that deficiency if you are to combine the different units?

**BLAKE:** It is an advising and counseling unit, it is not an academic unit and does not offer academic programs. In terms of the number of personnel in relationship to the demand by students, certainly that is very great. We are attempting to increase our effectiveness through developing other kinds of programs which will have peer mentors and students helping to develop learning communications among students in effective ways under the guidance of our professional staff. We simply do not have the resources -- and even if we had the resources we think it would be an inappropriate allocation of resources -- to try to put in the number of advisors and counselors that might be justified by the number of students that come in. We think there are other ways we can meet the demand of students and allocate those resources toward getting those students into academic units.

**WILSON:** Do you have some way to track the progress of these academically disadvantaged students?

**BLAKE:** We started about six weeks ago to track the whole program. We have not charted anybody's progress yet. We do indeed intend to build a complete assessment and evaluation component within this so that we can have a good understanding of how to identify those qualities which lead to outstanding performance and those qualities which do not. We intend also -- as we develop new approach to admissions -- to do much more preadmissions counseling so we can advise students who are clearly not the kinds of students who can do well in our programs to not enroll here. We are working on developing a clear articulation with Ivy Tech to also begin to meet some of these needs. We are in the process of trying to correct what have become errors. In doing that, we are building toward these new efforts. Now, with respect to charting students, we are beginning to do that now. We will be doing more and more of that with each semester. We will be able to give you some sense of how that is working over the next year, but we have just started and we don't have any track record.

**BEPKO:** There is a major initiative underway that Herman Blake has been at the center of to improve our assessment activities overall. We have invited some people who have developed substantial national reputations in assessment to come and be consultants and visiting scholars. I think that in time we will have an assessment program that applies to all aspects of our undergraduate programming that will, I hope, put us into the national forefront.

**YOKOMOTO:** Are there guidelines that apply to the Undergraduate Education Center? How long can a student stay in the undergraduate program? We have students who for maybe three years were with one program and now are in the Undergraduate Education Center.

**BEPKO:** Correct me if I am wrong, but for the first time we are directly addressing that kind of issue, and students are being counseled out of the University who have not made progress toward the completion of a degree. A number of the comments that have been made refer to problems that we ourselves have observed and that caused us to want to move into a new format that would give us an opportunity to address these things. We hope that the future will bring programming that will eliminate many of the things that you have raised as problems.

**KARLSON:** My understanding is that certain undergraduate schools have University Division course prerequisites for admission. For example, the Business School requires that you complete certain courses before you can be admitted to the Business School, and these are University Division courses and can only be taken at the University Division. So, that a student who is intending to attend the Business School would in effect be required to stay in the University Division unless they want to apply to a school that they had no intent of graduating from until they have completed those prerequisites for admissions into the School of Business. Would that be correct? If that is correct, then it calls for the question, very seriously of combining in the University Division those who are outstanding students attempting to make prerequisites for admission to their schools and those who are there because of learning deficiencies that really mean they are not capable of presently being admitted to the University. I think that this might have the impact of stigmatizing in the minds of the students the way that they are being treated. That might address one of the concerns which we heard earlier. In effect, you are combining apples and oranges.

**BEPKO:** I think it is clear that they should not be combined in the classrooms where the achievement levels are likely to be significantly different, where the students who were not able to achieve at a high enough level would detract from the education of those who were able to achieve at a higher level. And mingling might do more than that. It might cause higher achieving students to think less of the institution. I am not sure that is what is happening



here. I think that what you may see, is that all are getting counseled in the same unit which means that occasionally, those people may walk down the same hall, and if you say that we should seal off students on the basis of how high they achieve at entry, I am not sure that you will get universal agreement on that.

**KARLSON:** It is not just that, but the type of counseling needed by these two totally different student populations is so different that our attempt to use the same group of counselors for both is inappropriate.

**BLAKE:** I have had a lot of experience in this and have done rather well in dealing in one administrative unit with students from a wide range of backgrounds and abilities. The issue is to recognize the unique qualities of the students. If you pay close attention to the statement of mission purpose and philosophy which we are developing there, you will see that we are working specifically toward making sure that we do not look at any student by any other characteristics except the characteristics of that student.

**KARLSON:** Now I can speak as a parent whose family is engaged in education at IUPUI and say that you are not meeting your goal.

**BEPKO:** I am not sure what you mean by that, but it may be something that would be better taken up in the various groups that will helping to give shape to these programs.

**LOWE:** I have two points. The first is to support what Dr. Blake has just said. I have advised a wide range of students in a wide range of higher education institutions and I don't recall students with scarlet As on their person identifying them as somehow less deserving. Regardless of whether they are academically sound or unsound, I think it is a fallacious assumption to project such a stigma.

My second point is this. It seems to me that the anecdotal instances of mistakes brought up here are in some ways proof of why such a center might indeed be needed since it seems we have specialized in advising in terms of breaking out different groups. Therefore, we have potentially stigmatized different groups. By creating something like the Undergraduate Education Center, if we ourselves understand what seems to be clearly spelled out in this proposal, we will provide a strong and comprehensive service. It will take some time to develop, but as indicated by these "mistakes" noted in this discussion we need just such a center to remove some of this so-called stigmas. It seems to me that the Undergraduate Education Center is potentially an attempt to undercut some of these very things that we seem to be so concerned about in the earlier discussion rather than perpetuating them.

**BEPKO:** I think that is the spirit in which the various groups that have contributed to the development of this Center have approached

their work. I think it is very important that we hear faculty concerns, both in this forum and a variety of others, that we ought to make information available so that everyone understands what is happening, understands the reasoning which led to the development of these programs and (b) helps us to address what I think has been a very serious problem, that we haven't done very well with in the past. It is something that we think is a significant improvement in how we deal with the responsibilities that we have been given by the State of Indiana.

**WILSON:** Has the State of Indiana given us the responsibility to educate anybody no matter what their qualifications? That is, we should educate them whether they have a third grade, fifth grade, or a ninth grade reading level because we have to give them a chance. I am really concerned that when we have 3,300 students mixed among the rest of the student population that we are compromising the quality that we are trying to build here. It is not a question of being mean to these people. It is simply a question of differentiating between people who are qualified to go to college in some way and those who are not.

**BEPKO:** One thing that I want to clarify is I don't know that there are 3,300 students who have a third grade reading level, or anything like that. I don't know that there are any students who fit in that category. We have a wide variety of students who have come to us without meeting the Indiana University proposed admission standards that are effective as of 1992. They have a variety of talents, some of them are good in some areas, some of them are not so good in other areas. It is incorrect to lump that whole group into a category of inferiority. I don't think that is a fair characterization of the group. The State of Indiana hasn't told us exactly what to do. We have to, as an academic community, decide what is the best position for us to have in this community. It is, however, clear to us that the leadership of the state is most concerned about the very students that we are talking about today. They are not as concerned about other aspects of higher education. If we fail to respond to the things that the leadership of our state is most concerned about, I think it would be a mistake on our part. Now, if we can't do a good job, if we can't do everything that we would like to do, we will have to make decisions along the way that will be informed by the judgments of everybody in this room and more. That will, I think, shape the institution in the appropriate way. No one wants to arrogate those decisions to any small group. I do think that we have to take this seriously. It is a national issue that we cannot ignore.

**BUCHANAN:** In the discussion regarding, Ivy Tech is there any plans in the future where Ivy Tech would have the job of getting specific students up to our admission standards or are we both going to do this? It seems to me that it might be more efficient to let Ivy Tech do remedial work.

**PLATER:** We are talking about a wide range of cooperative ventures

including pilot admissions so that as a student applies for post-secondary education, the counselors can help direct that student to the institution that will best meet their needs as well as their level of preparedness. One of the things that we have to do is insure that there are courses available at Ivy Tech that will, in fact, prepare students to succeed at the University level. We are working through that process now. There are, in fact, courses being offered on the Ivy Tech campus this fall semester by IUPUI to help initiate this process. We think this will be a very promising way to achieve some of the objectives that have been outlined here. There won't always be a perfect match between the two institutions, but we can do a far better job than we have in the past.

**BEPKO:** I think we could probably talk on and on about this but the forum for a continued discussion might be a different one than this. If you are interested, we would like to hear more from you and we would like to have dialogue...

**BLAKE:** I would like to follow up on that. I am sorry to interrupt you. One of the points that I wanted to make is that Professor San Pietro will be setting up regular sessions in the Undergraduate Education Center at which we will invite faculty to come and bring their concerns and share them with us and talk with us as well as our leading staff about ways in which we approach these concerns. We meant what we said when we said we want to strengthen the links to the academic program. Our purpose is to see that the students make more efficient use of the University rather than less. We may make mistakes and we may not share the same points of view, but we will provide the opportunity for a continued dialogue on a weekly basis with us so that we can hear your concerns and respond to them because ultimately it is in your classrooms, laboratories and offices that the real work of the University gets done and we don't intend to get in the way but to enhance the situation.

**BEPKO:** We have delayed something that ordinarily comes earlier in the meeting and I would like to move to that. A new leader of the Faculty Council, Secretary Dick Peterson is here to give his first Executive Committee Report. We have delayed him too long. I think that Dick is going to follow in the tradition of excellence that we have had at Faculty Council leadership. I am pleased to introduce Dick Peterson.

**AGENDA ITEM III - Executive Committee Report - Richard Peterson,  
Secretary**

**PETERSON:** Thank you very much. I would also like to thank those of you who were on the Council last year for electing me. You have changed my life significantly already. I don't think I can occupy the same footprint as my predecessor nor can I probably distribute

the same kind of humor that John Chalian gave you last year when he sat in Jeff's position. But, I will try to do the job that is required of me and I know now firsthand that it is already turning out to be a pretty big job. I will be calling on you to help me and assist me in various things.

I have a few items on the agenda today that I would like to bring before you. I will try to bring them pretty much as a list except for the first and second ones. The first thing that I would like to mention is that we have already had a change in the way in which your minutes are being distributed. You are not getting bound copies of minutes at this point. You are getting stapled copies of minutes. That already has saved us a significant amount of Faculty Council budget money. We also think that it would be just as efficient to go to a lighter weight paper which will save us an even greater amount of money and maybe some shelf space for you. If I hear no objections, we will try to stick with a comparable color of paper and save the Faculty Council office some significant money. I have heard some comments from faculty and have taken some steps to approach that. If I hear no major objections, we will go ahead and do a little cheaper reproduction but still get you all the information.

The second item that I want to bring up is that we have received a letter, and I guess it is an ongoing letter, from the Association of American Publishers relating to resale of complimentary examination copies of textbooks. The thing they want to encourage is the return of these books if you are not going to use them rather than selling them back to bookstores or wherever. There are a number of examples of this that they gave. But, the real reason they are giving for this is in your best interest also. They feel that through these sales, you as faculty members and authors, are losing up to \$10 million per year in royalties which should come back to you. I think this is an important issue we should consider. I am bring this to you for information at this point but secondly, if you would desire to do something about this, I would entertain a motion at a subsequent meeting to form some kind of resolution by this Council, if this is your wish. If you have a desire to take any action, let me know and I will distribute materials relating to this issue and we can consider it at a future meeting.

There are several other topics which we have been discussing at the level of the Executive Committee and other levels in subcommittees, etc. I want to bring those to your attention. The issue of the Dismissal Policy which was brought up two years ago has again been resurrected in a meeting earlier this afternoon. We will be again entering a discourse related to a Dismissal Policy which will be fair to faculty and to administration in the case where there is incompetence on the part of a faculty member.

We also are continuing to work on a manual for members of Faculty

Boards of Review so they can more appropriately serve the goals and needs of the faculty. Hopefully, this manual will be coming to you for information and/or approval sometime during this fall.

The next issue is there has been a voice of concern related to the environment raised to the Executive Committee in relationship to recycling and other potential health issues on campus. We are at this point investigating what is being done on campus, what committees, what administrative groups are talking about recycling and would like to study this issue and bring additional information to you. I would also appreciate any information from you which would give us some idea of what is currently being done. So, if you know what is being done and you have some idea as to what is being done or some ideas of what might be done in this area, let us know and we will try to encourage this by mechanisms that will be usable

The last issue that I want to bring up is there is, as part of the enhancement of our University budget, a request on the part of the Board of Trustees to bring the faculty compensation level up within the University. We have heard this for a number of years and I am sure you think this is just another story. They have specifically requested us as a University to come up with a plan where faculty would be involved in developing a plan to increase the compensation level of faculty over the next five years to the average of peer institutions. We are working on and there are committees which are being formed on this campus to consider this. The committees in Bloomington are a little bit further along at this point. The Trustees are going to be wanting reports in the near future on this as to what our response to this is as we plan for the new budget biennium. Thank you.

BEPKO: Thank you, Dick.

#### AGENDA ITEM IV - Question-and-Answer Period

BEPKO: We have had some questions and answers already but we have a designated period. I tried to answer a few questions in advance but if there any other questions, I would be happy to answer them.

ALIPRANTIS: Could you tell me what the status of the progress report about the TIAA/CREF fringe benefits for the 10-month employees?

BEPKO: I think that the University Faculty Council committee is still studying this. It is not with the administration. I think what it boils down to is that there is some reluctance elsewhere. The Indianapolis campus voted to adopt that policy but the University administration concluded that as a compensation matter it should be University wide and, correct if I am wrong, but it is in the University Faculty Council process right now.

**PETERSON:** Jeff Vessely might know more about that but he just walked out of the room.

**BEPKO:** That probably is not why he walked out.

**KAPLAN:** Several students are concerned about the child care at the 38th Street campus. We are so far away that it makes it hard to use the facilities on the main campus.

**BEPKO:** I am sympathetic to that, but I think child care is needed everywhere. To date we have put all of our efforts into bringing the academic programs from 38th Street down to the West Michigan campus so that we could all share in the same facilities here. I hear what you are saying, and we should be making every effort to provide child care wherever we can.

**WILSON:** There has been some monies allocated by Indiana University to improve writing on this campus and to develop portfolio projects. My question is, now that this money has been given out in a lump sum, what kinds of plans are there to carry on in terms of programs that have been started up. The reason I ask is that if I go to my dean or my chairman and ask them if I can have the money to keep my writing program going, the first question he has to ask is if it will bring in any money. He doesn't have any extra money to give me to do that. There isn't enough money for that. That kind of program is not going to bring in any more money. How do you see carrying on this type of program?

**PLATER:** The money that you are talking about is project money, or "seed" money to develop projects. It is not intended to sustain the programs. In part, it is not known whether every project would succeed and it has to be implemented, in your own example, within the unit. There is no single source of money to continually replenish this work. Were the campus to try to fund successful experiments, the money would come from the same source that you would go to anyway; that is, the academic units that generate the revenue would have to supply the money one way or the other.

**WILSON:** Quality improvement doesn't mean money in the forefront. So, there is no way of funding this for a long term or even over a short term after this year. There was one person in my school who ran into something like this that cost \$6,000 to run. The money doesn't exist.

**PLATER:** I think part of the assumption is that the schools are the best place to evaluate those kinds of decisions and make the choices as to where resources will be allocated. There never has been any money other than what we can reallocate. We aren't in the business of generating totally new dollars. We haven't created a new source of funds by Responsibility Center Budgeting. What we have done is try to put the decision making back closer to the

level where choices can be best evaluated. You can use those resources in this case to improve quality and we hope in the long run that this decision will improve the revenue stream.

**BEPKO:** One other point related to that is we may have a shortage of funding for a variety of important projects. We regret that. We work our hardest to obtain those resources so that we can fund the programs that we all know should be going forward. But, that shortage of funding shouldn't be blamed on Responsibility Center Budgeting. I don't think that is the cause of the problem. The cause of the problem is a shortage of funding.

**WILSON:** I realize that but the Responsibility Center Budgeting idea doesn't cause this. There still is a problem nevertheless.

**BEPKO:** Your dean is right behind you.

**STOCUM:** That applies to the University as a whole. To begin with, Responsibility Center Budgeting does a lot that it intends to do if you start out adequately funded. If you start from a down position -- underfunded, Responsibility Center Budgeting does have a lot of problems. It is going to take a while for us to bootstrap ourselves out of this situation. I am not blaming Responsibility Center Budgeting. I am talking about the University as a whole. We are starting from a down position.

**BEPKO:** We probably should have a session here on Responsibility Center Budgeting. We have talked about it a few times and I think that it would be helpful to provide background on what it actually does and doesn't do. It is not a normative mechanism. It doesn't say what we ought to do with our money. It is a management tool, for the most part, that gives us a clearer picture about where costs are and where our revenue is. It doesn't force us to do anything one way or the other. We have the same amount of money and all it does is give us a different picture to use in evaluating how to make choices among all the competing claims.

**YOKOMOTO:** Last year during discussion on the salaries and merit raises plans, on the one-half of one percent of the base funds that come out of new money. I thought I heard the term "President's Initiatives." Are those one and the same when we use the words initiatives or are those different initiatives?

**PLATER:** I don't know that they have ever been referred to officially as the "President's Initiatives". On this campus the Council on Undergraduate Education has talked about a number of the issues in parallel with the University-wide discussions, and we have used the same terms, "capstone experience," "threshold experience," "writing" and computer competency," etc., and have developed plans to try to implement some of these same goals. In fact, the budget process is related to that planning to the extent that the campus plan tries to implement the same University wide

academic agenda. Progress has been made on implementing some of the initiatives during the year. They tend to be take the form of additional faculty lines as opposed to separate programs that would be called "the threshold experience." We have set aside some money for writing as seed projects but not to fund them on a permanent basis. Permanent funding comes through the additional faculty lines that are within the academic units.

**BEPKO:** That reallocation fund that you are talking about, the one-half to one percent of new funding for the campus, was applied, for the most part, to new faculty positions, in accordance with discussions that we had with the IUPUI Faculty Council Budgetary Affairs Committee. We just reported back to the Budgetary Affairs Committee at a meeting last week on the specific allocations that were made with the reallocation fund. It was almost all for new faculty positions. There was a little bit of library money but almost all was for new faculty positions; largely in the arts and sciences and engineering.

**SIDHU:** I think it would be a good idea, some of us may not know anything about Responsibility Center Budgeting. I think we should have discussion on the item in one form or another so we can get education and if there are some issues we can talk about, that might help all of us.

**BEPKO:** We will plan a session on that during the year.

**PLATER:** Just as a followup, we should have a discussion about the implementation of Responsibility Center Budgeting on our own campus. Those of you who keep your minutes of the Faculty Council meeting might wish to refer back a year ago to a very good, comprehensive overview that Ed Whalen presented to this Council. I think he presented, as clearly as anyone can, the theory, philosophy and intent of the Responsibility Center Budgeting system. That might be a good background piece for you to refer to. When we talk about what we are doing on this campus though, we should bring you up-to-date on the ways in which the system is taking shape here.

**ALIPRANTIS:** Also, we were compared to University of Southern California. That was way off as for budgets.

**BEPKO:** The big difference is that they are private and we are public. That is the major difference. But, in size and the number of programs and the type of programs, we are very similar to USC. I think you believe they have more money than they do. We visited USC and, while some of their programs may be better funded, some of them are not as well funded, and the overall budget picture, in terms of total dollars in a variety of dimensions, is not really much different than IUPUI. The big difference is public and private. Their sources of revenue are different than ours. But, you have more of a first hand experience, Roko. Roko was a



visiting professor at the University of Southern California this last year.

ALIPRANTIS: They have more revenue coming all the time. When they have a problem they come up with ways to get the money.

BEPKO: I dare say that in their Faculty Senate meetings that have the same problems. Faculty members have programs and they can't get funding...

**AGENDA ITEM V - Unfinished Business**

[There was no Unfinished Business]

**AGENDA ITEM VI - New Business**

ALIPRANTIS: I have one item of new business. I informed my dean that I was on sabbatical and every time the Faculty Council minutes came out I was marked absent.

**AGENDA ITEM VII - Adjournment**

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

BARBARA A. FISCHLER  
UNIVERSITY LIBRARY  
LY 133  
IUPUI

LMS

**RECEIVED**

**OCT 22 1990**

**DIRECTOR'S OFFICE**

## INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS

Faculty Council Meeting  
 October 4, 1990  
 Madame Walker Urban Life Center  
 3:00 - 5:00 p.m.

**Members Present:** Administrative Members: Chancellor Gerald L. Bepko, Richard Peterson, William Plater. Academic Deans: Constance Baker, John Barlow, Barbara Fischler, H. William Gilmore, P. Nicholas Kellum, Norman Lefstein, R. Bruce Renda, David Stocum, William Voos. Faculty: C. D. Aliprantis, Darrell Bailey, James Baldwin, Patricia Blake, David Bodenhamer, Walter Buchanan, Elaine Cooney, William Crabtree, Theodore Cutshall, Dornith Doherty, William Engle, Janice Froehlich, Paul Galanti, Michael Gleeson, Jean Gnat, Dolores Hoyt, Norman Hudson, Jerome Kaplan, Henry Karlson, Linda Kasper, Michael Kubek, Lynda Means, Dana McDonald, Patrick McGeever, Richard Meiss, Catherine Palmer, John Pless, Bruce Roth, Carl Rothe, Neal Rothman, Phyllis Scherle, Edmund Schilling, Lee Schwecke, Kent Sharp, Jan Shipps, Aristotle Siakotos, Hitwant Sidhu, Jay Tischfield, Ann Tomey, Marion Wagner, Kathleen Warfel, Kathryn Wilson, Donald Wong, Charles Yokomoto.

**Alternates Present:** Administrative Members: Scott Evenbeck for J. Herman Blake. Academic Deans: James Carter for Walter Daly, J. Marvin Ebbert for James Weigand. Faculty: Joann Switzer for Frances Brahmi, Rosemarie Jones for B. Keith Moore, Glen Sagraves for Susan Zunt.

**Ex Officio Members Present:** Henry Besch, Erwin Boschmann, Jeffery Vessely.

**Ex Officio Member Absent:** Gerald Powers.

**Visitor Present:** Amy Morris, Sagamore

**Members Absent:** Academic Deans: A. James Barnes, Trevor Brown, Jack Wentworth. Faculty: Jonas Bjork, H. Glenn Bohlen, Thomas Broadie, Varoujan Chalian, Dewey Conces, Ronald Dehnke, Ann Dunipace, Andrew Evan, Martin Frlow, Naomi Fineberg, Philip Gibbs, Richard Hamburger, Dean Hawley, Florence Juillerat, Juanita Keck, Richard Lawlor, Bruce Long, Chris Miller, Bernard Morrel, Jerold Paar, Robert Pascuzzi, Sherry Queener, John Rafert, Edward Robbins, Michael Ryan, Thomas Ryan, Scott Shapiro, Gregory Sutton, Donald Tharp, Vernon Vix,

LMS

ERIC L. PUMROY  
 ARCHIVES  
 LY  
 IUPUI

**AGENDA ITEM I - Approval of Minutes: September 6, 1990**

**BEPKO:** The first item on our agenda today is the approval of the minutes of September 6. As far as I know the minutes have not been distributed.

**PETERSON:** We distributed them today but they have not had a chance to look at them.

**BEPKO:** They have been distributed but there hasn't been sufficient time for people to review them so we will not have approval of the minutes today.

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

**BEPKO:** I have two brief items to take up. The first one is a two-part item. The first part is to thank Dr. Henry Besch for having supplied some of the refreshments for this afternoon's reception. Thank you very much, Henry on behalf of everyone here.

Secondly, I would like, as part of recognizing Henry for his generosity, to ask him if he would say a word about the Faculty Club. The University Faculty Club is now in its third year of operation. There are openings for members, and we certainly encourage you to use the Faculty Club for lunches or other activities. Henry will say a word about that.

**BESCH:** Thank you very much, Jerry. It is a time when we are asking people to renew their membership in the University Faculty Club. We have been fortunate in not having to ask to loudly because people have been renewing their memberships very graciously. We haven't billed for this year's renewal yet but that is coming soon. We would certainly welcome new members to join about 250 of those who are members of the Faculty Club. To just remind you, there is a fixed-price lunch everyday. The Club has recently been approved for its liquor license, which is to say that you can buy wine if you happen to be inclined to do that. The fixed-price lunch has two hot entrees and it is always very good for \$10. You can't beat it with a stick. So, we invite you to come to the University Faculty Club and to use the club at hours other than lunch. It is available to all members. We recently had the club's first annual tennis tournament. This Saturday we will have its first annual Harvest Moon Ball. We expect the Harvest Moon Ball to grow beyond what it is the first time. Come and enjoy and if you haven't joined, join. If you have joined, be expected to ask to rejoin soon. Thank you.

**BEPKO:** Thank you, Henry. I have one other announcement. The University has been looking into child care issues and expanding

child care. I mentioned this at the last Faculty Council meeting. There has been considerable interest in the subject. You should know that shortly, in a variety of ways, all members of the University family will be asked to give us their views on this effort that we are making to expand child care services. So, you may be aware that at some point you will have an additional opportunity, apart from the Faculty Council, to suggest to us how we can best provide the maximum child care services for the University community.

One last point. The subject of athletic events on campus has been raised again, particularly events on weekends that cause streets to be closed for periods of time. We have made an effort to accommodate these athletic events because we think it is a part of our being a good corporate citizen to host some of these events and to allow the streets to be used at different times, on the weekends especially. It has helped us, I think, in engendering community support for some of our projects. I think that the best example is the new University library for which we were able to raise over \$18 million in a period of a little over 18 months. So, we are concerned that we remain a good corporate citizen and partner with the community in some of these events, but we also have been very careful to try to arrange these events so there was no disruption of academic programs. We have had a few instances reported to us where there has been something more than the minor inconvenience that we ask your indulgence in. We are working now to create even better systems for notification, for handling traffic, and for handling the needs of the academic community while these sporting events are taking place. We will keep you posted on that but we have asked our Vice Chancellor for Administrative Affairs to review the whole pattern of activity and especially those leading up to some events that will take place in the future. We would like to make sure that a plan and a pattern of activity are refined to the maximum extent.

The important parts of our meeting, though, begin with, other than Henry Besch's announcement about the Faculty Club, the leader of the Faculty Council, Richard Peterson, giving the Executive Committee Report.

**AGENDA ITEM III - Executive Committee Report - Richard Peterson, Secretary**

**PETERSON:** I have a number of issues that I want to discuss with you today, at least bring to you today in some kind of an announcement form. If there is discussion on any of these items, we can either do that after I am done or raise your hand and try to get my attention during the time that I am presenting this information.

The first announcement is related to Honorary Degrees. An

announcement about the composition of the University Honorary Degrees Committee and a request for honorary degree nominations will be coming out soon. The new chairman of the Honorary Degrees Committee is Wilmer Fife. Although the candidates for these honors can be submitted directly to the committee, Shirley Nusbaum can help in putting together the nomination packet and in the evaluation of the components of the file to make sure of its completeness and its appropriateness. This should make for the best presentation of the candidate to the committee for their consideration. At this point, you can be thinking about whom you might wish to nominate for this year's honorary degrees and contact Shirley to see if you might do this in the best way possible.

Some new plans for early retirement are on the docket. We were going to have these plans available to bring over here today but we did not get them distributed. Chancellor Bepko was going to distribute some of them today. He had agreed to bring those over and discuss them here. A committee was working this summer on some of these newly-proposed early retirement plans. These plans are primarily being considered to be replacements for the 18/20 plan for individuals who were hired after January 1, 1989, when, as you know, the 18/20 rule was eliminated then. There are three options in the packet that will be distributed to you. These plans were developed in consultation with the Nyhart Company, Indianapolis actvories, a committee of faculty and others who worked with the administration on this. Although they were primarily developed for newcomers to the University, there are options, if they are approved, that the rest of us, who are currently on the 18/20 plan, might be able to use as parts of these or in combination with the current 18/20 plan.

Two changes in the 18/20 plan are being suggested in these proposals. Those two are related to an early retirement under the 18/20 plan, at the age of 60. The second part, would be the option to work for the University while you are on the 18/20 retirement plan as a part-time individual. Please look over the plans as you receive them. Hopefully, we will have them available for you today. (These documents were delivered during the meeting and made available.) Discuss them with the greatest number of faculty that you possibly can and groups within your schools to see if they meet their needs. Other campus committees are currently looking at these plans and are considering and discussing them to see if they do meet some of the needs that we have for early retirement. The committees that have currently been assigned to this are the Fringe Benefits Committee and the Budgetary Affairs Committee. Those people have been and will be looking at this. If you have any comments to these individual committees about the plans, let them know. Also, the individual who is primarily responsible as a faculty member for the development of these new plans was Chris Lohmann from Bloomington. Any individual comments that you may have or questions about these

plans could be addressed to him. We would like to have a vote of support or non-support from this Council on these plans, hopefully, at our next meeting. That is why I wanted to have them distributed today and have them discussed. Look at them, get your comments back to me and to the Executive Committee and to the other committees that are looking at this.

There also has been some discussion about the yearly salary letter. The yearly salary letters have been coming out much later than I think most of us would like. Chancellor Bepko and others are currently working on plans to expedite the process of sending out these letters. They aren't at a stage where they can be presented yet, but I can assure you that they are looking at this in a very serious way to try to get a much more expeditious plan that will allow us to distribute these at an earlier date.

The question of TIAA/CREF for summer teaching also has long been a topic of concern. This issue concerns the whole University and the implications must, be considered by the University Faculty Council before they can be implemented on the campuses. We would hope that this issue could be brought to the floor of the University Faculty Council in the near future so that it could either be approved and implemented or dropped from our list of agenda items that we would be considering.

A task force on Faculty Compensation, the five-year compensation plan, has been set up on campus here. A group that is co-chaired by Dana McDonald and David Robbins are looking at this. If you have any input or comments for this committee, please feel free to contact either of these individuals.

We discussed the sale of complimentary books in this meeting last month. We have had a response on this from the bookstore and it is the policy of the bookstore not to buy complimentary copies of books that are marked as such. We have also heard from faculty who say that many of the books which they receive are not marked when they receive them. I think it would be appropriate that I write a letter to the individuals who have written to us to tell them that complimentary books should be marked if they expect us to be able to adhere to this policy. If I don't hear from any of you relating to this, I will respond to this group and tell them that it should be made a policy that books would be marked if they don't wish them to be sold back to the bookstore. If I hear from you, we will discuss it further.

An Environmental Concerns Committee has been set up. They will be discussing various items related to the area of recycling, and environmental affairs as these relate to this campus. David McSwane and Richard Strong are the co-chairs of this committee. If you have comments or suggestions, please contact one of them.

A paper on the new majority should have been distributed by the

President. I have not seen the copy that came to my office in the newsprint form, but I have draft copies of it. It is in the IU Newspaper. I don't know where those copies are distributed across campus. I think the President is interested in having your comments on this and I would encourage you to look at that article put, it into the context of this campus, and respond to those of us who are on the Executive Committee, Chancellor Gerald Bepko, or President Thomas Ehrlich relating to this issue.

I have one correction in the committees that were sent out and that relates to the Tenure Committee. The list of people for the Tenure Committee is incorrect. We need to correct that and it will come out as part of the minutes. Mary Kimball, John Ottesmann and Susan Zunt should not be listed on the Tenure Committee for this year. That was an old list when those people were on there. Gabrielle Bersier should be listed with a term ending in 1991 instead of 1992, since she is replacing myself. Paul Galanti, Law School, and B. Keith Moore, Dentistry, should be listed with terms expiring in 1992. Please note these corrections.

One last item needs to be addressed, and this may have to be discussed in a future meeting, concerning our student government and our Constitution calls for student leaders on some of the committees. Those are to come from the student government and we have no student government, which complicates our Constitutional issue. Henry Karlson may want to comment on this. We have some suggestions but the people we have as suggested representatives may not have come from student government since we have no effective student government in operation at this point. It complicates things in the feedback to develop a new student government with the Student Affairs Committee, as an example, when you can't get representatives from the student government. Do you have any comments on that, Henry?

**KARLSON:** Now that I have been asked, I always have a comment. That is part of my function. The Constitution and Bylaws are quite explicit that student government be represented. We have no student government; therefore, the students should have no representation. In order to change that, we would have to amend our Constitution and Bylaws.

**PLATER:** Technically, the student government still exists. It has dissolved itself into a committee of the whole. I think for purposes of nominating students to serve on Faculty Council committees, they can reconvene them-selves as student government to take care of the business of providing nominations for student government purposes. For your information, you should know that David Benz is the President Pro Tem of student government and is serving as a representative of student government for University functions on behalf of this campus, although, in many of the gatherings and meetings that take place, we will also call upon

representatives from the student councils of the schools to express the views and interests of students on this campus.

PETERSON: I think the best way to handle this for the time being is for Henry Karlson and I to discuss this with the administration and see if we can't resolve this and bring it to you as an item next time if there are any complications that remain on this issue. That concludes the business that I have. If you have any comments on anything I have talked about today, any questions, you may ask them at this time.

MCDONALD: You just referred to the task force that has been set up to consider the matter of improved faculty compensation and asked for comments to the committee. I am not sure that, except for campus leaders and deans and two or three committees, the Faculty Council knows the details about this initiative. They have possibly read something in the Bloomington paper. They haven't read anything, I don't believe, from IUPUI papers, nor have they been given any background. I was wondering if you or the Chancellor would give them such background on that.

BEPKO: At the meeting of the Trustees in June in Kokomo, a couple of members of the Board of Trustees said that they thought they had heard enough about low salaries at Indiana University. In particular, they were focusing on the Bloomington campus because they stated in this expression of frustration that they were tired of hearing that Indiana University was last in the Big Ten. They thought that the University should adopt a program for bringing Indiana University from last in the Big Ten to above the median or fourth in the Big Ten. I think that everyone in the University administration was delighted that the Trustees were of a mind to make such a strong statement about low salaries. But, it became immediately apparent that it was not going to be easy to translate that expression of concern into a program. For one thing, I think the Trustees did, in their initial expression, contemplate only the Bloomington campus. They said, "We want to be fourth in the Big Ten and therefore let's develop a plan to see how we can get there" and did not contemplate the other seven campuses. We quickly pointed out to them that there would have to be an overall plan that would elevate all campuses to the median or above for their peer institutions. That meant that the campuses had to undertake a process of identifying peer institutions. For Bloomington it was easy because the Big Ten was the ready reference that everyone was pleased to use. But, for other campuses, it was not so easy. It is particularly difficult for IUPUI because we have no counterpart. We are peerless in the truest sense of that word. So, we have been at work, through a number of committees, in an effort to try to develop for this campus and for the other six campuses a list of peer institutions or peer campuses that generally reflect the kinds of activities that we have on this campus and that we can use as a comparison group for salary purposes for determining how much lower salaries



are than they ought to be. We have developed a tentative list which has been distributed to the committees. One of those committees is the Budgetary Affairs Committee. We have asked for comments and we are at a point now where we need final comments because we will have to submit the list of peer campuses. I can tell you that the list of peer campuses that we have prepared shows that we are well below the median in terms of salaries and it would take us a considerable while and a considerable investment on the part of the state to bring us up to above the median. We are not going to be satisfied with the median. Dana has been quick to point this out. We should not be satisfied with coming to the median of our peer group if Bloomington is going above the median in the Big Ten. So, we want to be at the 60th percentile or above. In order to reach that, we would have to have a significant infusion of new funding above and beyond the cost of living increases -- real growth in salaries. That will be presented back to the Trustees, I believe, either at their November meeting or at their December meeting here in Indianapolis. Actually, the final approval of a plan will be in February, but they are informally going to look at this in either November or December and give their reactions to what the University administration is going to present. If it is approved in February by the Trustees, then it will become a policy of the University to, over a period of four years, reach at least the 60th percentile in relationship to our peer groups.

There have been a variety of concerns expressed about this effort. Of those concerns, the most obvious is, where the money is to come from. We might be able to raise our salaries to the 60th percentile if we didn't have secretaries, computers, graduate fellowships, or scholarship funds for undergraduate students, and, I think, the faculty members who have reviewed these matters have quite rightly pointed out that we should not be talking only about salaries. We should be talking about a broader range of benefits, a broader range of quality or benefits supported by funding in the University rather than just picking out salary as one measure of our overall health or illness. There has been a presentation on that point made informally to the Trustees. Actually, there have been several presentations, and I think the trustees are mindful of that concern. In order to attract and retain faculty, you don't just raise salaries; you include lots of other things that will require support from the state. That ought to be our overall goal. The compensation comparisons are going to go forward. It is not just salaries but the whole compensation package that will be considered by the Trustees at their February meeting.

PETERSON: Are there any other comments? Does that answer your question? Do you think that is expressing it well enough?

MCDONALD: Yes.

#### AGENDA ITEM IV - Question-and-Answer Period

BEPKO: We have a question-and-answer period now, in general. If Dick Peterson or any of us can answer any questions, please feel free.

ALIPRANTIS: Can you say something about why the summer salaries were changed? Remember, we discussed it the other day. Why were the summer salaries for the School of Science changed?

BEPKO: I think this is still something that is under discussion. I will let Bill explain it.

PLATER: The main change that took place was to allow for faculty, who have grants during the summer, to increase the percentage of time that would be allowable, up to almost a third of the time, as opposed to the limit that heretofore has been in place of 20 percent. So through a combination of teaching and grants, it would be possible for a faculty member to have a summer appointment that totalled, I don't remember the exact percentage, I think it is 32.5 percent, which is allowable under federal regulations. The IUPUI policy up to this time had been to limit summer appointments to 20 percent regardless of whether you have an outside grant.

ALIPRANTIS: In the School of Science a five hour teaching load is full time. With the new guidelines, it is not. Is that correct?

PLATER: We have always tried to have some consistency across schools. The guidelines that we issued increased the possibility of appointments up to 32.5 percent. We described full time load for teaching as being either two three credit hour courses or a total of six credit hours to be the equivalent of 20 percent.

ALIPRANTIS: But that is a change, isn't that correct?

PLATER: I am not sure about that but I will take your word for it that it is a change but I am not aware...

ALIPRANTIS: With the new regulations, people may have to teach more than six hours for a full summer teaching load. For instance, in mathematics, it is more likely that people have to teach eight hours for a full summer teaching load. The five hour full time summer teaching load for the School of Science was negotiated with the then Executive Dean Ed Moore twelve years ago.

PLATER: Our intent was to get away from having 17 individually negotiated arrangements for summer teaching, and to have some consistency across the schools. This was a reasonable compromise it seemed, on the basis of most common practices across the

schools. I think there are reasons for making exceptions that can be handled either on an individual basis or, I think, we are willing to do whatever is necessary to ensure the integrity of the academic programs. There are some schools that have requested and had some exceptions made to the policy. If the School of Science, through Dean Stocum, wishes to propose that, we would be very happy to consider it. But, to allow for greater flexibility for faculty who are engaged either in research or a combination of teaching and research is why we tried to establish this campus wide policy to increase the amount of summer time that could be allowed.

**ALIPRANTIS:** Could you send a memo?

**PLATER:** I recommend that you take it up with your dean and let Dean Stocum make whatever requests he wishes on behalf of the School of Science.

**STOCUM:** I have already made that request. Didn't I send you a memo some time ago arguing our case?

**PLATER:** We will take it up in due course, David.

**BEPKO:** I think that there is more discussion required of this to deal with the specific case. Maybe it would be better to have that discussion without asking everyone else to be part of it. I think we can work this out.

Let me mention one other thing before we leave the question and answer session. The early retirement proposals are being run off and will be over here before our meeting is over today, I hope, so that everyone who is here ought to have a copy. But, even if you don't receive it here, we will have it in the mail to everyone on the Faculty Council, which includes a number of people who are not here, so that it can be discussed at the meeting next month.

**MCDONALD:** Another topic that hasn't been laid to rest is the proposed change in the fringe benefit for extended family leave. I know that some people are hoping for some action and this group has not been told where that one lies completed either.

**BEPKO:** We did make a report at the September meeting. I can update that a little bit although not a lot has gone on since then. As we reported in September, after the adoption of the University Faculty Council resolution, the President asked Vice President Hackett to study implementation of the family leave policy. Vice President Hackett asked the new Human Resources Director, Margaret Mitchell, to go to all eight campuses to interview faculty, deans, and others about implementation. She did that during the spring term and came back with a very mixed report. Some of the smaller campuses expressed the view, through

their own faculty bodies, that they were not ready to adopt a family leave policy. They thought there were some troublesome aspects, some costs that hadn't been considered. They were worried about those costs. The result was that John Hackett suggested that it might be a good idea to have each campus do whatever it wanted to do and have non-uniform fringe benefits. That is inconsistent with the long standing University policy of having all faculty treated the same. So, that idea was not pursued. In particular, Bloomington and Indianapolis thought that those two campuses should be identical because we have so many faculty who go back and forth, and it would create a very anomalous condition if there were different arrangements based on whether a person is reporting immediately to Bloomington or Indianapolis. So, we thought that we would take the matter to the campuses for discussion. We distributed materials to the Council of Deans in September within a matter of days after it was brought to us by Vice President Hackett. We asked a series of questions about implementation. We brought the issue to the Council with the idea that our purpose was to discuss implementation and to find out the answers to some questions. Those questions included, as I pointed out in September, whether there should be a faculty policy adopted now or whether there should be a faculty and staff policy adopted at the same time? In other words, there is recognition that the staff will be troubled and there will be personnel problems if we adopt a broad family leave policy for faculty and do nothing for staff. So, the question was raised: Should we go ahead with the faculty policy now or should we wait until there is a staff policy to go along with it? In our group of campus administrators, the views were mixed. Some thought that the policy should go ahead immediately. In Liberal Arts and Science in particular the faculty groups in those schools which have been consulted, we asked that they be consulted by the deans; the governing organizations in Liberal Arts and Science thought we should go ahead with the faculty family leave policy and look at the University study and arrange for a staff family leave policy at some later date. Other schools, however, were concerned that there would be morale problems and favored having a University-wide family leave policy go into place at the same time -- both for faculty and staff. It may not be an identical policy but one that at least extends some family leave benefits to staff. There were other questions such as "Should whatever we do, decide to go ahead with a family leave policy just for faculty, or whether it will be faculty and staff both, either way, should we go ahead now, this year, January 1st, for example, or should the family leave policy be implemented effective at the beginning of the next budget year -- July 1, 1991?" There was to unanimity views, as reported by the deans of the faculty groups, that this should be implemented in July of 1991 because there are budget implications and we are already into a budget year. They did not think it was wise to begin the policy this year, not knowing if there would be funds available in the budgets to pay the costs of

the plan. That is true even if it was a faculty only policy because I think it should be recognized that not every school has all of their faculty working in a mode that was contemplated by the planners of this faculty family leave policy. The premise of the family leave policy was that a faculty member would be teaching two or three courses per semester and that, if the faculty member took leave, the school could hire a part-time teacher or graduate student to teach the two or three courses that were being offered and that that could be paid for out of the amount that the faculty member's compensation was reduced during the family leave. However, many of our units employ clinical faculty who would have to be replaced by substitutes that would cost as much on a temporary basis, (or even more than) the faculty member who is going on leave. So, there would be costs in some units, maybe more in some than others, but there would be costs even associated with a faculty only family leave policy and therefore a majority of the units thought that this should be postponed until at least July 1, 1991

There were also very helpful comments provided on implementation issues such as: should there be a waiting period before somebody is entitled to family leave? Should there be a requirement that, after a family leave, the faculty member or other employee of the University return to full-time service for a period of time with the analogy being the sabbatical leave policy we have? And a variety of other things like that. Our Council provided very helpful information on those issues.

In Bloomington, the same issues were taken to the Council and the faculty groups in those schools, represented in the Council of Deans in Bloomington, said they thought that there should be a staff family leave policy at the same time that the faculty family leave policy is implemented and that the faculty family leave policy should not go into effect until we have a plan for staff. They also recommended unanimously, it is my understanding, that not only those two plans should go ahead at the same time but that they would probably have to begin in 1991 at the earliest.

There is one other point that I should mention and that is that the School of Medicine faculty groups met. Kathleen Warfel, who is on that faculty group, the elected faculty body in the School of Medicine, may be able to report in more detail on what happened. It was our understanding the the School of Medicine group voted by a substantial margin to reject the idea of a family leave policy on the grounds that the faculty members who have had needs in this area have been adequately accommodated on an informal basis and that formalizing this process could be more costly, ironically, although this may be slightly inconsistent with saying that it would cost more, but it could ironically result in a reduction of leave opportunities. This is because the benefits that have been provided for faculty members of

Medicine who had family considerations that have caused them to want to take leave have been more generous than the ones that are stated in the family leave policy adopted by the University Faculty Council. In other words, when somebody has a real problem, others have covered and a faculty member has received full pay rather than 70 percent of full pay minus the fringe benefits -- the TIAA/CREF which is in the UFC policy. That was the basis for the vote in the School of Medicine faculty group, which is something that has to be taken into account because it is a group that represents a very large number of faculty. Kathleen, is that an accurate summary?

WARFEL: Yes. I think that is fair. There are a couple of points that I would like to make. One of them is that the real problem has to do with the partial leave part of the policy, where a faculty member gets partial leave when they are generally excused from classroom teaching for longer than two months with a salary deduction. That reduction is used instead to hire replacement teachers. In the School of Medicine, this really doesn't fit clinical positions. If you give a brain surgeon a 15-week leave of absence, it is hard to go out and hire another one for 15 weeks. I think the question that the Faculty Steering Committee in the School of Medicine was answering was "Do you think that this Family Leave Policy suits us? Would we want to rigorously enforce it within our school?" I think that is the question that was pretty strongly answered, "No!". I don't think that should be taken to mean the School of Medicine faculty doesn't recognize the benefit to the general academic faculty. I don't think the School of Medicine faculty wants to exhaust it, obviously. We are just simply saying it doesn't really fit our situation, although it may be of great value to the University in general.

BEPKO: Well, it does complicate matters though even if it was the view of the faculty of the School of Medicine that Medicine should be left out. It would create a situation that is a little different than we have ever had before.

WARFEL: It wasn't so much that we thought we should be legally excluded. It was just that we didn't feel that we would make much use of it. I mean, to make use of it somebody would have to apply for it.

BEPKO: In other words, the School of Medicine would not mind if this policy was adopted and bound, the School of Medicine and the School of Medicine faculty had a right, under this policy, to invoke the family leave policy. But, it was only that the Medicine faculty leadership thought it was something that the School of Medicine faculty would not utilize.

WARFEL: I can't answer that. It was my feeling that at the discussion during the meeting was that people felt this really

didn't make sense for us. The question that we were asked wasn't, "Do you think this makes sense for the University?" It was more like, "Do you think that this makes sense for the School of Medicine?"

ROTHE: Are you speaking to a clinical faculty...

WARFEL: The Faculty Steering Committee is representative of the whole school.

ROTHE: Did they poll the faculty?

WARFEL: No. They talked to 12 people.

McGEEVER: I am wondering what the status is of a concept that I have heard kicked around with the fringe benefits in general. That is the notion of a kind of a cafeteria where faculty, up to some limit, would pick out those benefits of which they wished to avail themselves because the interchangeability of benefits between schools and between people in different situations might be dealt with in that fashion. I have heard that idea kicked around and I was wondering if it is still current?

BEPKO: I think that it is still something that is within the range of possibilities. The issue of a cafeteria style fringe benefit package was raised in connection with the family leave policy discussions. It was the view of the Faculty Council that we would be better to go ahead with the family leave policy now and wait until later to look at that other potential namely, the cafeteria model. But, we have to recognize that in a cafeteria or optional fringe benefit package, there would be some additional costs because there would be the adverse selection principle at work. When you pick the kinds of benefits you want, you usually are picking them because you are in a higher risk group with respect to those options, so, overall, it has been the experience of other big organizations that it does cost a little more. You may get a little less for your money that way than you would otherwise but you have more choice. That still is a possibility for the future but it is not something that is on the table right now. Let me finish this discussion, though, and tell you the last part.

After those Deans' Council meetings it was clear that there was enough concern about staff benefits that we concluded that we had to do an immediate study and model of a staff benefit family leave that could be used in assessing costs. This is viewed as an implementation activity which is responsive to the University Faculty resolution. We will be taking the specifics back to the Council of Deans so that we can engage in discussions about budget planning for 1991. That is what the next step will be and we will be having these materials distributed to the schools in advance of the November meeting of the Council of Deans. The

agenda, we hope then, will be to discuss what budget arrangements will have to be made in order to implement (a) a faculty family leave policy, (b) a faculty and staff family leave policy. We will work from there.

SIDHU: Sir, is there any possibility that we can get the minutes of the University Faculty Council for those who are interested in those. Last year I tried and the Bloomington office told us that IUPUI would have to meet the costs of those minutes before we can get them. We feel that we are absolutely unaware of what is happening. It is very important that we know what decisions are made at the University Faculty Council. Some of the members would be interested in knowing if those minutes are still available, we would like to have those if any arrangements can be made. I questioned Professor Vessely last year also. He tried and I tried directly but we were told that, unless your IUPUI campus meets the cost of it, we cannot provide them.

BEPKO: I don't know. Jeff, did you look into this? I think we can accommodate this with no difficulty.

VESSELY: There was a two-step process. The first one was that in the summer we sent a letter to all faculty on the mailing list that said "If you want the minutes, fill out this form and mail it back in." Then we had maybe 50 people who did that and 500 people who forgot to do it or for one reason or another didn't do it. So, they weren't going to get the minutes and they called individually. The minutes were only distributed twice last year. So, if you get about half of everything that you normally think you should get in the mail, if you received one set of minutes, you are about even. There were three months or three meetings worth in one packet and three in another. We didn't produce them on a regular basis. At one time they were going to be placed on one of the electronic mail systems and I didn't ask, but I think Jim Patterson had asked if the chancellors could pull them off there and distribute them to the mailing list on campus. Chancellor Cohen in South Bend said he wouldn't do that. He didn't think that was something that the campuses should do so then it ended up in some other discussions. So, quite frankly, I don't know whose responsibility it is. There are some minutes that have been distributed to some of us and not to others that haven't been distributed yet anyway. Dick Peterson could probably tell you the current status.

FISCHLER: They are always available in the library. We have them in the archives.

BEPKO: Are they on line, Barbara?

FISCHLER: I don't know if they are on line or not. I don't have the capability of putting it on or having someone type it in. But, certainly the archives would have and we can put them on reserve.



**PETERSON:** The minutes of the University Faculty Council meetings from last year are on line. They are available through VAX NOTES. I will publish in the minutes of this meeting, how to access these, if you have a VAX account here or in Bloomington. It is available under both of those auspices. I also do think that we should have a wider distribution of those minutes. That is not a topic that Myrtle and I have discussed yet this year, but I want to look at that carefully so we have a wider distribution of those minutes. As a minimum, I think those minutes should go to all committee members and all IUPUI Faculty Council members and all other committee members and Faculty Council members on other campuses. Then anybody else who wants to have them. We should also distribute a summary of those minutes to absolutely everybody who is on the campus so that they know what was discussed and how to access that information from the University computing system so that everyone does have access. That will be done. I will discuss this with Myrtle and hopefully make that information obvious to anyone who wants to receive it.

**SIDHU:** I don't even mind paying for them out of my own pocket if they are going to charge for it. But, we should have the privilege of getting those minutes in one way or another.

**PETERSON:** I agree 100 percent and if you have put in a request to get the minutes on a routine basis, you should be getting those because that indicates that you have an interest in University Faculty Council affairs.

**BESCH:** I believe that we are in the ten-minute question and answer period. I have one final question for the Vice President. That is, whether it is true that IUPUI and the Center for Philanthropic Studies has any good news to report to the Faculty Council?

**BEPKO:** I think there is good news. I think you probably saw in the newspaper that the Center on Philanthropy announced plans for the next several years--activities that are much broader and I think much richer in terms of the academic, intellectual contributions that the Center will make. Many of you here in the room are involved, I know. In support of the activities of the Center it was announced that the Center has received grants in the amount of \$15.1 million to support these activities over the next four years. A good portion of that came from Lilly Endowment and a very substantial grant was made by a group of anonymous donors. \$15.1 million is one of the largest single investments through grants that we have had at the University. I should say that the funding for these activities should be available for projects throughout the University. I think the impact of these grants will be felt not only by the people who are immediately associated with the Center but will permeate and radiate out through the University.

**AGENDA ITEM V - Introduction of New Members**

**BEPKO:** Now we have the annual introduction of new members of the Faculty Council. I don't remember whether we started with the smallest or the largest school last year but our agenda suggests we start with the largest this year and that is the School of Medicine. We have Dean James Carter from the School of Medicine to introduce Medical School faculty.

**CARTER:** Thank you, Chancellor Bepko. I take it I am to introduce the newly elected members, not our total representative body from the School of Medicine. I will mention first those who, it is my understanding, are here with us this afternoon and I will then list the other members who have been newly-elected.

Dr. William A. Engle who is an associate professor of pediatrics.

Dr. Janice C. Froehlich who has a joint appointment as assistant professor in the department of medicine as well as the department of physiology and biophysics. Dr. Froehlich also has served in this body on the Budgetary Affairs Committee.

Linda M. Kasper who is an associate professor of medical technology in the Division of Allied Health Sciences. She has been a long time member of the Fringe Benefits Committee of this body.

Dr. Michael J. Kubek who is associate professor of anatomy and of neurobiology.

Dana M. McDonald is head librarian of the School of Medicine library. She is also a member of the Budgetary Affairs Committee of this body, as well as a past member of the Executive Committee and the Staff Relations Committee.

Dr. Richard A. Meiss, who also has a joint appointment in our school. He is a professor of obstetrics and gynecology and the department of physiology and biophysics.

Dr. Kathleen A. Warfel is a professor of pathology. She is a member of the Faculty Affairs Committee of this body, the Library Affairs Committee, and the University Faculty Council.

Dr. Donald Wong also has a joint appointment in our school as assistant professor in the department of anatomy, as well as in the department of otolaryngology and head and neck surgery.

Would you like for me to also read the members whom I think are not here who were newly elected?

**BEPKO:** Sure.

**CARTER:** Dr. Naomi Fineberg is an associate professor in the department of medicine. She has been a member of the Academic Affairs Committee of this body.

Dr. Philip S. Gibbs is a professor of anesthesiology as well as professor of respiratory therapy in the Division of Allied Health Sciences.

Dr. Dean Hawley is an associate professor of pathology.

Dr. Richard J. Kovacs is an assistant professor of medicine.

Dr. Richard J. Lawlor is an assistant professor of clinical psychology.

Dr. Gregory Sutton is an associate professor of obstetrics and gynecology. Dr. Sutton, I might mentioned also, is president of our faculty.

Dr. Vernon Vix, is a professor of radiology and medicine.

**BEPKO:** Let's welcome the new members from the School of Medicine. It has been known that on occasion, because of other commitments, a person who has already been introduced has had to leave this meeting. If that happens today, you should know that there are copies of the early retirement plan on the table at the back.

Next we have the School of Dentistry, Dean Gilmore.

**GILMORE:** Chancellor Bepko, our lone new member is a reappointment and has served as no stranger, Dr. B. Keith Moore, department of dental materials. He has served on virtually on every standing committee of the Council. He apologizes because he is having surgery this afternoon. It is not serious surgery although it is serious to him, of course. It is tendonitis of the elbow. It is not a tennis injury. He is a great member of the Council and expressed concern that he couldn't be here today.

**BEPKO:** Thank you, Bill. Next from the School of Science, Dean David Stocum.

**STOCUM:** The School of Science has two new representatives to the Faculty Council. Chamolambos Aliprantis, better known as "Roko." Roko received his Ph.D. from Cal Tech and his research area is in mathematics. He has been acting chairman of mathematics department in the School of Science during 1988-89, and in 1989-90 he was at Cal Tech on a sabbatical leave where he was finishing a couple of textbooks. He also has been appointed as the managing editor of a brand new international journal called "Economic Theory." He tells me that he played water polo in his youth and now that he is in his old age he is restricting it to

playing volleyball.

Our second member, Neal Rothman, is also in the department of mathematics. He received his Ph.D. from Louisiana State University and his current research interests are in mathematics. Neal spent a year as a program director in the mathematical sciences section of the National Science Foundation. He then came to IUPUI where he was chairman of mathematical sciences from 1982-1986. I am happy to say that Neal and I were neighbors when we both lived in Champagne, Illinois, and were working at the University of Illinois and we are neighbors again. His office is right down the hall from mine. Both Roko and Neal are very fine mathematicians and they are also excellent teachers of mathematics. We are very pleased to have them in the School of Science.

**BEPKO:** Let's welcome the School of Science representatives. Next is Dean Connie Baker from the School of Nursing.

**BAKER:** Chancellor Bepko, I am pleased to introduce Patricia Blake, associate professor in the School of Nursing. She has served on several committees of this body, including the Budgetary Affairs Committee and the Faculty Affairs Committee. She has been at IUPUI since 1969 and has been tenured for the past ten years.

**BEPKO:** Next is Dean John Barlow from the School of Liberal Arts.

**BARLOW:** The School of Liberal Arts has three newly elected representatives this year. Patrick McGeever, political science, studied at St. Louis University and the University of Pennsylvania. You may have seen him on Channel 13 commenting on the news. Phyllis Scherle of the English department, studied at Southern Illinois University, does a lot of advising in the English department and serves on the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Faculty Council. She is secretary for that group. Jan Shipps who is in the department of American Studies. She is a specialist in the study of Mormonism and she has been on the Faculty Council quite a few times before.

**BEPKO:** Next is Dean Bruce Renda for Engineering and Technology.

**REND:** The School of Engineering and Technology has four newly elected members to introduce. We have eight departments and 16 disciplines, but all of these four members are electrical engineers. I am pleased to introduce Kent Sharp who is a professor of electrical engineering technology. He earned his degrees from Rose Hulman and the University of Colorado. He worked at Bell Laboratories before he joined our faculty 24 years ago. He has served on many committees of the Council; was Executive Committee member as well as University Faculty Council member from 1981-83; and was Secretary of IUPUI Faculty Council

from 1981-83. He recently got married. We don't know how that affects his personal life, but at least now his socks match. Professor Walter Buchanan, who is in the electrical engineering technology department, received an IU B.A. degree in Slavic languages and a J.D. from the Indiana University School of Law. He was an officer in the U.S. Navy and worked for Naval Avionics before he joined us six years ago. He has served on the Metropolitan Affairs Committee of this Council. Elaine Cooney, an assistant professor of the electrical engineering technology department, received her degrees from the General Motors Institute from the West Lafayette campus. She worked at Delco Electronics for a number of years before she joined us four years ago. She has served on a number of committees of our school and is very active in bringing young women into engineering and science. Charles Yokomoto is a professor of electrical engineering who has all of his degrees from Purdue. Charlie joined our faculty 21 years ago and has been very active in the IUPUI Faculty Council, as most of you know. He has served on the Academic Affairs Committee, the Athletics Affairs Committee (1985-91), the University Handbook Committee, the Executive Committee (1982-84), and the Faculty Affairs Committee (1982-90).

**BEPKO:** Next is Dean Lefstein from the School of Law, who is just about finished with the task of cleaning up the mess in the Law School that he was recruited to clean up a couple of years ago.

**LEFSTEIN:** I am pleased to introduce Professor Paul Galanti, the Law School's representative on the Faculty Council. Paul is a 1963 graduate of the University of Chicago Law School, where he was managing editor of the University of Chicago Law Review. He practiced law in Chicago with a very prominent law firm. He teaches in the Law School subjects very important to all of you, such as anti-trust law, business associations, and trade regulation. Paul has been very active in a number of IUPUI committees. This past year he served with the Tenure Committee and the Sabbatical Leaves Committee, among others. He is an avid runner. During this past year, he had a photograph published in Road and Track Magazine.

**BEPKO:** Hugh Wolf was to be here from the School of Education but at the last minute found that he could not be here and asked me to introduce a person who is not new to the Faculty Council. He is a person who has served long and well as a member of the Faculty Council but was newly-reappointed this year and that is Edward Robbins. Next, from the University Library, is Barbara Fischler.

**FISCHLER:** Thank you. We have two new representatives this year. The first, James Baldwin, our head of acquisitions. Jim is very active on the Academic Affairs Committee and has served on the Metropolitan Affairs Committee. I had trouble getting extracurricular activities out of him, but he did allow me to say

that he is still interested in domestic cats. Our other representative is Jean Gnat who is an at large representative. Jean is the head of the Science/Engineering Library and has taken on an extra activity as the acting head of public services of the University Library. Jean is very well known in this particular organization and many others. She has been on the Budgetary Affairs Committee two different times, successively from 1980-1985. She took one year off and came back. She has been on the Constitution and Bylaws Committee, the Executive Committee, the Faculty Council (1978-1983) and (1979-1992), the Library Affairs Committee, the Nominating Committee, and the University Faculty Council. She didn't give any extracurricular activities, but I would announce that, as of this morning, she became a grandmother again.

**BEPKO:** The School of Public and Environmental Affairs, in part at least, focuses on public administration and in public administration there is a concept of delegation of authority from persons elected to other persons in government. Dean James Barnes has delegated the responsibility of introducing a new faculty member to Mark Rosentraub, who is the Associate Dean for Indianapolis, and Mark Rosentraub has delegated that responsibility, in turn, to Michael Gleeson who will introduce himself.

**GLEESON:** That's me.

**BEPKO:** You have the floor if you would like to say any more about yourself, Michael. We are glad you are here. Welcome. From Physical Education we have Dean Kellum. Nick, you might explain to Hitwant how he can use his new computer to access the UFC minutes.

**KELLUM:** I'll probably have to pay for that. I would like to introduce two members of our faculty who are newly elected, one for the first time and one who was reelected to the Faculty Council. First of all is Professor Edmund Schilling, who is an associate professor of physical education and also is an associate professor, part-time, in the School of Education where he supervises student teachers, and teaches courses in physical education. Ed has been a member of the Athletic Affairs Committee in the past and he is our unit representative for the next two years. He is a former basketball player at Butler University. An at-large member of this Council from the School of Physical Education is Dr. Hitwant Sidhu who is no stranger to this body. He has been a regular member of the Council and has also been a regular member of many committees of this body, including a two-year term as a member of the Executive Committee.

**BEPKO:** Next is the Indiana University School of Music, which now operating at IUPUI. Bill Plater will introduce a new member from the School of Music.

**PLATER:** I am very pleased to introduce Darrell Bailey for two reasons. First, because the fact that he is now a member of the Council, signals the change that Chancellor Bepko just mentioned. The internationally renowned IU School of Music now operates programs on this campus and Darrell is the representative of the School of Music for IUPUI. Darrell is a new colleague and has already made a great impact. First on our academic programs, which he is reorganizing and leading to new heights of excellence both in traditional areas; he's opening a new computer music laboratory which I think is being installed this semester and will be available for instruction beginning in the spring. Also, he has instilled new life into our student activities and under his leadership has brought fine musical performances to many of the occasions that we, as faculty, enjoy for receptions and other gatherings. Darrell, if you would stand. I would also say that it is a real pleasure to be able to introduce the entire faculty of a school at one of these meetings.

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

**BESCH:** There is only one unit smaller than a one faculty member unit, that is none. There are four members of this body who are not a member of any unit, so that comes to zero. Two of the those persons are here, and one I would like to introduce is Jeffery Vessely who is newly elected to this body. There are two other people who are elected by, as a rule of this Council, to serve in this Council by virtue of the fact that they are elected to the Executive Committee, not by virtue that they are elected to this body.

**VESSELY:** I guess that means that I am supposed to introduce Henry.

**BEPKO:** I think Henry Besch is in that category. Henry Karlson is also in that category.

**BEPKO:** I would like to introduce Dick Peterson who serves in all kinds of capacities as the leader of this Faculty Council. He deserves an introduction, too, and a round of applause.

#### **AGENDA ITEM VI - Unfinished Business**

**CHUMLEY:** Make sure you have signed the attendance sheet before you leave. Thank you.

#### **AGENDA ITEM VII - New Business** [There was no new business]

**AGENDA ITEM VIII - Adjournment**

**BEPKO:** We are adjourned.



INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS

FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING

November 1, 1990

Law School, Room 116

3:30 - 5:30 p.m.

**Members Present:** Administrative: Chancellor Gerald L. Bepko, Vice Chancellor J. Herman Blake, Dean William Plater. Deans: Constance Baker, John Barlow, Barbara Fischler, Sheldon Siegel, David Stocum, William Voos, Hugh Wolf. Faculty: C. D. Aliprantis, Darrell Bailey, James Baldwin, Henry Besch, Jonas Bjork, Patricia Blake, Frances Brahmi, Walter Buchanan, Varoujan Chalian, Dewey Conces, Theodore Cutshall, Ronald Dehnke, William Engle, Naomi Fineberg, Paul Galanti, Michael Gleeson, Jean Gnat, Richard Hamburger, Dean Hawley, Dolores Hoyt, Norman Hudson, Jerome Kaplan, Henry Karlson, Linda Kasper, Juanita Keck, Richard Kovacs, Richard Lawlor, Bruce Long, Dana McDonald, Patrick McGeever, B. Keith Moore, Bernard Morrel, Jerold Paar, John Pless, John Rafert, Edward Robbins, Carl Rothe, Neal Rothman, Phyllis Scherle, Edmund Schilling, Lee Schwecke, Kent Sharp, Hitwant Sidhu, Donald Tharp, Vernon Vix, Marion Wagner, Kathleen Warfel, Kathryn Wilson, Charles Yokomoto.

**Alternates Present:** Deans: Doris Merritt for Walter Daly, J. M. Ebbert for James Weigand. Faculty: Marvin Needler for Elaine Cooney, Kimberly Quaid for Jay Tischfield, Thomas Kippenbrock for Ann Tomey.

**Members Absent:** Faculty: David Bodenhamer, H Glenn Bohlen, Thomas Broadie, William Crabtree, Dornith Doherty, Ann Dunipace, Andrew Evan, Martin Farlow, Janice Froehlich, Philip Gibbs, Florence Juillerat, Richard Kovacs, Michael Kubek, Lynda Means, Richard Meiss, Chris Miller, Catherine Palmer, Robert Pascuzzi, Sherry Queener, Bruce Roth, Michael Ryan, Thomas Ryan, Scott Shapiro, Jan Shipps, Aristotle Siakotos, Gregory Sutton, Jeffery Vessely, Donald Wong, Susan Zunt.

**Visitors Present:** Erwin Boschmann, Paul Carlin, Daryl Dean (The Nyhart Co.), Jack Hudson (Director, Insurance and Retirement Program), Chris Lohmann (Co-chair UFC Fringe Benefits Committee), Robert Martin, David Robbins.

**AGENDA ITEM I - Memorial Resolution: Francis Sondag, School of Medicine**

**BEPKO:** Our first item of business is a memorial resolution for Francis Sondag from the School of Medicine. The memorial resolution is attached to today's agenda. I hope you will look at it and with your permission we will send it to the appropriate persons, survivors of the deceased faculty member. Also, consistent with our tradition, I would like to ask you to rise and observe a moment of silence. Thank you.

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

**BEPKO:** We have three items of business from my office, the first of which is to make a comment. As you see in front of you that today was the day of regular pilgrimage to West Lafayette to meet with President Steve Beering and other officers at Purdue University in West Lafayette. As you also know, we have a dress code in the campus administration that calls for the wearing of ties like this whenever any of us venture forth north of Lebanon. So, you will see that we are attired

consistently with our campus policy.

More importantly, though, we have a couple of items to bring to you. First, is a report on some visiting faculty and consultants that we have at IUPUI. Bill Plater will bring us up to date on that.

**PLATER:** As a part of the One University Planning process, each of the campuses of Indiana University was asked to begin thinking about issues related to a phenomenon that has become known around the country as "assessment." There was a committee, or an intercampus Council on Assessment formed with representatives of each of the campuses to talk about what is happening on their respective campuses to coordinate plans and, generally, to promote the idea of sharing information. On our own campus, we have asked the Council on Undergraduate Learning to assume primary responsibility for relating issues of assessment to the development of undergraduate programs and to our emphasis on improving the overall quality of undergraduate education. Assessment is not limited to undergraduate programs, but that is where much of the focus of our activity has been.

We also created a committee that works with the Council on Undergraduate Learning and with the Academic Affairs Committee that is called, I think, simply the IUPUI Assessment Committee. It has representatives from most of the schools on campus, though not all. Each school was invited to have a representative as a member of this group. Again, the purpose of this committee has been to promote discussions of assessment of how assessment might have an impact on improving the overall quality of our programs, how we might use assessment in planning and developing the campus. We have, in fact, thought of assessment in three primary areas of activity. One is at the department/school level where assessment takes on meaning according to the nature of the faculty and the type of program that is offered. Each of the schools or departments that has been considering assessment has approached it in very different ways. The campus has not tried to suggest that there is a single model that everyone should be following on assessment activities, but that they should take it up where it is appropriate and develop a plan that would meet the school's own expectations, in accord with its five-year development plan.

The second major area of concern or activity has been student assessment. Although that has many possibilities for our campus, we have been mostly worried about issues of assessment relating to new students as they come in to the University. In particular, placement of students into courses in mathematics, writing, reading, and other areas. We have talked about this in the context of our plans for the development of the Undergraduate Education Center and cooperative ventures with IVTC. Having a program that will allow students who are interested in post-secondary education, but who may not qualify for admission to IUPUI, requires that we have a very good, well-developed method of assessing the abilities of students and be able to place them appropriately both in courses and in other programs that we might jointly develop with IVTC.

The third area of concern has been that of academic planning. This most particularly relates to the use of data about ourselves, about our own institution, to help us do a better job in measuring our success, in meeting the goals that we have set for ourselves, and in developing plans for the future.

While these conversations have been going on in many different arenas, within departments, within the intercampus assessment council, and within our own campus committee, we have thought it would be helpful to have some outside advice and counsel -- people who have been thinking about assessment in broader ways -- to come here talk with us, and give us the benefit of whatever insights or advice they may have. We have drawn most heavily on Trudy Banta, who is very well known nationally and has been working in the area of assessment for, I think, at least ten years. She is the director of the program at the University of Tennessee which has become very well

known as a successful model for assessment because they have been using it at the University for a number of years. They have had an opportunity to define their programs and to develop tools for assessing everything from individual student progress to overall programs and for addressing the concerns of the state. Tennessee is one of those states that has a mandate or a requirement that institutions present evidence, quantitative information, about progress toward meeting academic objectives. She has been successful in persuading the state to change some of its original goals and expectations. We thought her experience would be particularly helpful to us. In the course of her visit and in meeting with the departments and the various faculty committees and other administrative groups, she became aware of the importance and need for the development of our institutional data facility and recommended that we invite a man named Peter Ewell, who is the senior associate director of the National Center for Educational Management Statistics based in Colorado, to come and talk with us about our capacity to gather and use institutional data, primarily in the area of academic planning. Both Trudy Banta and Peter Ewell were here last month and spent two full days with us meeting with a variety of departments, school groups, committees, and administrative officers. They are preparing a series of recommendations and reports that will be of use to us as we think about how we might reorganize or better use the information sources that we have, and use this information in our academic planning process.

Although it is possible that Peter Ewell might return for visits during the year at our invitation, we viewed his visit as essentially a one time visit. On the other hand, Trudy Banta will return again in a few weeks, and probably once a month through the rest of this year, to talk with us about how we can use assessment to achieve our academic purposes. We wanted you to be aware of who these consultants were and why they were here and to ask that the Council, through the Academic Affairs Committee and other means, join with us in thinking about the ways in which we take stock of how successful we have been in achieving our academic objectives.

One goal that we have is to develop a plan for both an office or program of institutional data research and secondly a support service that would provide help or assistance to schools or individual departments that are interested in assessment activities. During the late fall semester and early in the spring semester, the Assessment Committee will be working on a plan which ultimately we will present both to the Council of Deans (the academic deans) and to this Council for your information and further advice. There is not a plan or a structure yet, but as soon as there is, we will present it early in the formative stages for your suggestions and comments. I would be happy to answer any questions you may have about assessment.

We have made arrangements with Change magazine to distribute a copy of an article that appeared in Change in the last month talking about assessing assessment after a five or ten year period of this national phenomenon. We thought it was such a well written article that we think we should distribute it to the faculty. Change magazine was sufficiently intrigued with the idea that they have waived their ordinary copyright fee because we are going to give it to the whole faculty, and they won't charge us for it. It will be distributed later this month.

**BEPKO:** Thanks, Bill. If there are no questions, I would like to call upon Vice Chancellor Herman Blake to introduce a new member of our University family.

**BLAKE:** Good afternoon. As you know, during the last academic year John Krivacs, who for many years had served as Director of Admissions at IUPUI, retired and we began a search for a new Director of Admissions. A number of members of the faculty served on that search committee, including several persons who are present in this room. I would like, first of all, to express my thanks and appreciation to the faculty who served on the Admissions Committee because I think their work was outstanding and as a result I think we have made an excellent appointment. I have the privilege this afternoon of introducing to you Dr. Alan Crist, who for 16 years has served

in the Admissions Office of the University of Wisconsin at Madison, rising up higher and higher in the ranks in that office, who had taken on broader responsibilities and eventually became second in command of the office as Associate Director of Admissions. We have been able to complete the search by appointing Dr. Crist as Director of Admissions. Dr. Crist has both his bachelors as well as doctoral degrees from the University of Wisconsin at Madison and brings to us the kind of intellectual skills, professional understanding and intuitive insights into the admissions process that will allow him to develop a whole approach to admissions that will reflect the changes that have been going on at IUPUI and the wishes and needs that have been frequently expressed.

Before asking him to make a few comments, I would like to just tell you a little bit about some aspect of that search process which leads us to the conviction that this is an outstanding appointment. The Search Committee reviewed nominations and applications and from those selected a short list of candidates who were brought to the campus for interviews. After those candidates were reviewed, the Search Committee recommended to us two candidates. We felt that this position was so important to the future of the campus that we did not want to make a decision only on the basis of how a candidate performed while they were on campus. Therefore, the chair of the Search Committee, Dr. Eugene Tempel, and myself, along with a consultant who was a specialist in admissions, spent one day on the campus of each of the two candidates to answer unanswered questions and to probe areas and issues that could not be probed in an interview on this campus. We did make those visits. We talked to faculty, high school admissions counselors, students, peers, subordinates, and those to whom these individuals reported at great length. When we went to the University of Wisconsin at Madison, we talked to everyone there at every level from the Chancellor on down. When we went in to talk with the Chancellor, she had but one major comment about Dr. Crist and that is, he is the one person in the Admissions Office who was responsible for making her plan, the Madison plan, come to life on that campus. Her regard for him was so high, we had to raise the question of why she would want him to leave the campus. In the discussion subsequently it was clear that other developments in the Admissions Office made it unlikely that Dr. Crist would rise to a higher level because his supervisor had a much longer period of time to go before stepping down. So, it was appropriate that he seek opportunities elsewhere. We had nothing but the strongest affirmation by people who were in sensitive positions to understand what we were seeking and what we needed. We are very pleased that we have been able to appoint Dr. Alan Crist as Director of Admissions here at IUPUI. He began his service last Monday morning and we are very pleased with him and I am pleased to present him to you today.

**CRIST:** Thank you very much, Herman. Only my mother has introduced me more eloquently than that and with more delight. I am really pleased. I only hope that I can live up to that wonderful introduction.

I am truly delighted to be here. This, I view as the best move that I could have made bar none in my professional opinion, that would advance me in my career in trying to serve students at an institution that I feel is going in the right direction to tie into the 21st century. I think that IUPUI is really committed to the kinds of things that I would like to see happen as far as providing access to the new majority, returning adult students, and minority students and to do the best that we can to develop our entire undergraduate student enrollment here. Since I have only been here four days I am not going to make any lengthy comments. I haven't discovered all of the areas in which we want to move. There are certainly many that I have already unearthed after scratching the surface a bit. I have had some contacts with some of you already this week and I hope we are at the beginning of what will be a long and very worthwhile and fulfilling relationship, as I work with you. I won't make any promises that I can't keep today, but what I will promise you is that I am going to come back after I have had a chance to assess better some of things that I have questions on and get a chance to talk to some of you privately and individually about your interest in the

Admissions Office and what is happening or isn't happening. I will promise to come back and provide you an update and report and respond to other questions that you might have. So, with that I would really like to again thank everyone for their confidence in me. I am truly having a great time and looking forward to a long and happy relationship. Thank you very much.

BEPKO: Thank you, Alan.

**AGENDA ITEM III - Executive Committee - Secretary Richard**

**Peterson**

BEPKO: Next we have Dick Peterson with the Executive Committee report.

PETERSON: I hope the time that I take today doesn't subtract from the other important issues but there are several items on my agenda that I would like to mention.

First of all, there are a couple of minor changes that I would like to make. One is our ability to access the VAX computers for University Faculty Council minutes and notes, that was a distributed was a rapidly written set of instructions and there was an erroneous change in it. There are two corrections that I want to make. First of all, the number under number 1, the number 8 on the menu, may not be true for all the computers and all the positions in the way that your menus are set up. So, delete the phrase "number 8 on your menu" from the instructions. Also, under number 3 on the instructions, when you are adding an entry to your VAX Notes there need to be two colons between prism and UFC. That will access last year's University Faculty Council information at this point.

We are currently trying to set up a menu similar to this for the 1990-1991 University Faculty Council business. That will be accessible by typing in UFC91 at that point where you type in UFC to get access to last year's notes. I will complete those instructions and make those corrections and they will be available in subsequent distributions of agendas.

There are several items of unfinished business which were not put into the agenda that was distributed for today's meeting. One item of unfinished business would be Family Leave. The Family Leave is being worked on. We have no significant progress to report on the Family Leave Policy. The TIAA/CREF for Summer Employees is partially being handled by the early retirement plans. We are working with an interface on those two items. Some discussion of that will take place today more than likely when we are discussing the Early Retirement Plan. The last item of unfinished business would be the annual salary letter. We still do not have the details in the changes of the annual salary letter worked out. We are working anxiously with that to try and coordinate it better so that everyone can receive those in a more timely and coordinated fashion.

The next item is that we are getting ready to make final provisions on a document for considering reviews of administrators on this campus. That has been sent to the Council of Deans and has been modified by the administration. It has been sent back to the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee is currently dealing with it. We will be discussing, over the next week, some additional modifications of that review plan and hopefully will be able to bring that for your attention in the near future.

I want to announce that we have two student representatives on the Student Affairs Committee who have been appointed to that committee. They are Vicki Fried and the other one is Natalie Cochran.

We have an item of business that the Executive Committee wants to bring to you. Gerald Powers

is unable, because of scheduling problems, to meet his responsibilities to this Council and to the Executive Committee and, thus, he has resigned from both of those bodies. The Executive Committee would suggest that we take the next highest individual from the election and ask that individual if he or she would be willing to serve in that capacity. If you have no objections, we will go ahead with that plan. Do you have any problems with the next highest person in the voting rank? [None expressed] If there are no problems with that, the post will be filled by Dolores Hoyt who is the next highest vote getter from the last election.

I also want to announce that we have a resignation from the University Faculty Council from this campus. Professor Edwin Casebeer is not able to fulfill his responsibilities because of scheduling problems. It is within the purview of the Executive Committee to decide what mechanism would be used to replace that individual. We will report on that at the next meeting.

The last item that I would briefly like to bring up here is related to street closings on campus. I don't want to make an issue out of it at this point, but I would like information from you if indeed you have information that can be given to me. There have been times when street closings have been taking place when it has caused significant inconvenience to certain programs. I would like additional feedback on that if there is any to be given to me. The administration has attempted to resolve some of these problems by getting notification at a proper time so that all academic units can be contacted, alternative routes can be determined, and people can be directed to those alternative routes to get to academic programs. If significant problems remain in that area, we may have to take some further action. That completes my report.

**QUESTION:** Do you want these reports in writing?

**PETERSON:** The best way to give them to me is probably in writing and we will present those to the Executive Committee. Address correspondence relating to this to me and send copies of it to the administration.

#### **AGENDA ITEM IV - Question-and-Answer Period**

**BEPKO:** The next item is the scheduled question and answer period. We had no questions in advance of the meeting. Are there any questions or comments now?

**WILSON:** Can you give us an update on what is being done about general education curriculum? I have only heard rumors about what types of things the committees are working on.

**BEPKO:** There was a meeting last week on the subject of general education. It included faculty members from all campuses. It was chaired by Ken Gros Louis from Bloomington but it was conducted under the auspices of the President's Council on Arts and Sciences which is chaired by Bill Plater. Bill was actively involved in the development of this program. I think it might be good for Bill to comment on what the next steps are. Certainly nothing will be done though until there is a broad consensus, if that is developed. All faculty members will play a part in any judgments that are made about general education.

**PLATER:** I think from the University prospective the substantive points about what might make up the general education core have been circulated in the planning papers during the past two years. That formed a basis for the separate campus discussions. As far as I know, there has been no plan to have anything adopted as a University core that would also not be agreed upon by each of the campuses. On our own campus, our planning has been coordinated through the Council on Undergraduate Learning with the expectation that, through discussion and a development of a

common philosophy, each school would be asked to consider ways of implementing those goals that represented the philosophy, either in the form of particular courses or sets of requirements. The substantive point that I want to make here is that, as far as we are concerned through the Council on Undergraduate Learning, it will be up to each school to develop its plan for general education or for a core. But that we hope there will be great deal of consistency across the campus by reaching an agreement first on principles, on philosophy.

The meeting that the Chancellor alluded to concluded the day with each campus retreating to have a discussion based on the conversation that had taken place earlier in the day. Each campus has been asked to make a report to the whole University that will be published in the IU Newspaper some time after January 15, when those reports are due. On our campus the Council on Undergraduate Learning will review the report before it is submitted. The preliminary report is being drafted by a subcommittee consisting of David Stocum, John Barlow, and Bernie Morrel. They will bring their report to the Council in November or December for discussion.

**WILSON:** What you are saying is that what people are developing now is core philosophy instead of core curriculum?

**PLATER:** I think so, with the expectation that a curriculum would be developed within each school that reflects that philosophy and set of goals we have share in common. There is some expectation and hope that this will also extend across all of the campuses. For example, we had talked about writing competency as a shared goal that would be a part of general education. It turns out, there is a fairly high degree of consistency across all the campuses of Indiana University in requiring, in most cases but not all, two writing courses. There is a committee or a group made up of the representatives of writing programs that has been meeting to talk about the issues that we share as a University regardless of the campus -- issues relating to the assessment of students when they enter the University, placement, the development of appropriate courses, what kind of competency should be expected of a graduate of Indiana University who holds a baccalaureate degree, and ways of developing programs across the curriculum so that writing is a part of the expectations of many courses, that kind of thing.

**BEPKO:** Are there any other questions or comments? Does that answer your question, Kathryn?

**WILSON:** Yes.

**KARLSON:** I would like to ask a question. On October 13, again New York Street was closed. There was no prior notification given to anyone nor any alternative routes made available, and it severely disrupted a program of minority education that was taking place at the Law School because New York Street is the only access from the west and we have a large minority population to the west that had no way to get to the Law School other than abandon their cars a great distance and walk. I would just like to know who is responsible for the notification and providing of alternative routes that didn't do it?

**BEPKO:** I can't tell you right now who may or may not have done something that they were supposed to do in this case. I am not familiar with the specific case. All I can say is that we have, mindful of the concerns that I talked about in the last meeting of the Faculty Council, started a review of all of this. It is resulting in an accelerated and enhanced notification system by which we will notify all relevant persons, in particular, Henry, because we know of your interest, by personal letter, of every event that may take place on campus that could in any way interfere with the flow of traffic or pedestrians on the campus. We will make that same service available for anyone else who is interested in having that, and we will make absolutely certain that the schools are notified as well. I think the schools have been notified in the past but that notification system could be

breaking down. It is good that you have raised this issue because it will give us an opportunity to review the notification system and make certain that everyone has not only notification of the existence and the scheduling of an event, but will also be informed about alternative access, ingress and egress opportunities for the day that the event takes place.

**BALDWIN:** Do we ever have the right to say no?

**BEPKO:** Absolutely. We can't say no to the use of the city streets although it may be that we can. I am not as certain about that as I am certain about the fact that we can say "no" to the use of our facilities and will say "no" to the request for use of our facilities if events cannot be scheduled with a minimum of disruption of regular activities. It has been our goal all along, and I thought we were achieving it until the events of this fall term were brought to our attention, to accommodate the interests of the community as I talked about in our last meeting in having events in the downtown area that utilize the increasingly beautiful campus atmosphere and at the same time those events should not intrude in any significant way on campus activities, particularly academic activities. If we cannot do that, if there is a conflict between the athletic programs or whatever other events may be scheduled here that involve closing streets or other disruption, if we cannot accommodate that with the regular activities, then we simply will not have the outside activities on campus. We have our first and primary allegiance to our academic activities and we will not tolerate any disruption and will not even tolerate any significant inconvenience to people who are here for academic purposes. We think, though, that we can accommodate those different purposes and are eager to try to do that because we think that our good corporate citizenship, our outreach to the community, has created an atmosphere which makes it much easier for us to ask for support both from the government and from the private sector of Indianapolis. I think the best example of how the community views us, because of the overall cooperative attitude that they see at IUPUI, is the fund raising we did for the campus library. We raised \$18.5 million in 18 months, an extraordinary feat of fund raising which is something which I think would not have been possible were it not for the overall partnership that exists between us and the larger community. So, we can't be abrupt and give the impression that we are not interested in being a good corporate citizen. At the same time, we will not tolerate the kind of disruption that I think may have taken place in one instance this year. We have announced that this review of the campus programs is taking place and would be pleased to hear from people who have had experiences similar to the ones that Henry has had. We would be pleased also to hear about specifics because that is the only way we are going to be able to tell if we can accommodate these different uses of our campus community.

**ROTHER:** What reason can justify closing streets?

**BEPKO:** The closing of the thoroughfare is not technically our doing. That is an interesting question. Maybe none, but the city of Indianapolis makes those judgments and not the administration of the University. I think that it may be that you can have the kind of events that have been scheduled here. That one was a Corporate Challenge that was held on campus. The other one, I am not sure about. I think there were two events that caused problems.

**KARLSON:** There were five.

**BEPKO:** Well, there may be five events. I didn't know that all five caused problems. It may be that you can't have the kind of foot race that the sponsors of these events wish to have on any public street. That is something that the city will have to make a decision about. Wherever you have it, you are going to cause some inconvenience. Our hope has been that the events that included the campus, and not all of these events do, would be conducted in a way that would allow everyone on the weekend who is going to any of our buildings to have access. If New York



Street is closed for a period, then all building users should be able to get on to campus with notification in advance, by other means, park in a way that would permit them to walk without too much extra distance to the building that you were going to without any blocking. Maybe it is not possible and if it isn't then we simply will not cooperate with the events that are being scheduled.

**WAGNER:** I have a request. The concern that some of my people have had on Saturday is that access to the only handicapped parking we have is totally closed. I think something in the meantime could be done to see that faculty and students in wheelchairs be allowed access to the handicapped parking lots. It is a great concern of many of the students.

**BEPKO:** I couldn't agree more with that. In fact, I am shocked that that is true. I don't understand why that is true. There is someone sitting right behind you who will take careful note of that. I think at this point we could guarantee that that will never happen again. It is absolutely unacceptable to have the handicapped parking places closed off. I don't know the details but we would like to find out the details and make sure that the policies that we have articulated, the policies that I have described both here and in the last meeting of the Faculty Council, are given effect.

**PETERSON:** I had another comment on this issue and hopefully this will be a brief comment and not elicit too much additional discussion. I was told in my investigation of this that at times the streets are closed without any notification at all to us and at other times they are closed at very short notice so it is impossible to get that information out to the important people. I think we need to set up some criteria by which a notification system is produced so that if people notify us on Thursday afternoon that there is going to be an event on Friday and we have no way to accommodate that, we need to say no.

**BEPKO:** If the event involves the use of our facilities, then we certainly should know about it before then. If somebody asks to use our facilities on that short notice and we don't have an opportunity to give adequate warning, we should say no. With respect to the streets, I am not as sure. We may have some legal right to refuse to allow those streets to be closed but I am not sure of that.

**KARLSON:** I called the Mayor's office and asked that exact question and they told me they would not close the streets unless the University requested. Even if we do not have the legal power to prevent it, I believe any administration in the United States today that wishes to be re-elected must have some view of the importance of education. If the administrator for the city of Indianapolis thinks that jogging is more important than higher education, then I believe this Council should go on record to the contrary.

**BEPKO:** I don't think anyone has said that jogging is more important than academic programs in the city or elsewhere.

**GALANTI:** I would like to go on record as saying I don't think the city administration is in favor of jogging over education. As someone who participates in most of the running events that are held downtown, I find an attitude that, if I have to wait for 25 seconds to cross New York Street, that this is interfering with educational programs, I find that attitude (1) to be somewhat offensive, and (2) to be totally irrational. I have no more trouble crossing the street the day of the races than I do anytime at 5:00 in the afternoon when there is a lot of traffic. I hope the University does not feel that it is necessary to stop participating or allowing participation or the use of our facilities in these events if there are some minor problems. Handicapped parking is a different matter. I think everyone would agree on that. But, if it is a matter of a little trouble crossing New York Street, I don't think the University is going to be well served by telling the city that we are not going to

participate or that we are not going to allow the use of our facilities. That would be very short sighted on our part.

**KARLSON:** I would like to reply. I have taught classes on Saturday for the last 13 years. We started off after a few years with one jogging event. Then it was two. Now it is five. The inconvenience, as noted to me by my students, is far from just a few minutes. For example, they closed New York Street for two and one-half hours and all cars in our parking lot were trapped because they did not bother to tell us of any alternative route out. That is one event.

In the other event, Paul, you are very fortunate that you live east because if you are coming in from the west, New York Street is the main artery to this campus. Many minority parents who were trying to get here with their children found that street closed to their access with no alternative being told to them. They had to park their cars and walk long distances.

**BEPKO:** I think we have reached the point where the details are going to consume us. You know the policy and I think the policy is good and clear. We have undoubtedly run into some problems in implementing that policy. We do have to know how much inconvenience this has caused. It is not a clear black and white issue. We do have to have notification systems that are effective and if the city says that they would not hold an event out here or use the city streets unless they had our permission to do so, then we will use that authority in a way that is consistent with this overall policy of making absolutely certain that academic programs are not disrupted or significantly inconvenienced by athletic events. That has been our policy all along. We would appreciate your help in giving us information, that will help us to have a better implementation of our policy than we have had up until now. I think we have used the ten minutes unless there are any other questions.

#### **AGENDA ITEM V - Committee Reports**

**BEPKO:** We have some committee reports that are listed on the agenda as Item V. They relate to Item 7 - a report on early retirement. With the permission of the leadership of the Faculty Council, we would like to move those committee reports down to Item 7 and take up Item 6 first which is a report of a task force on faculty compensation and support. Here to brief you on that...

**ALIPRANTIS:** I have some gentlemen here who have to leave by 5:00 and we have several things to discuss.

**PETERSON:** The request to go a little earlier on the agenda was made by Dave Robbins also because he wants to get out early. So we have a conflict of a number of people who need to leave early.

**BEPKO:** There are more guests to discuss Item 5 and 7 than number 6 so let's honor the request of our other guests to have that item taken up first. This is a discussion of the Early Retirement plans that are on the table for discussion. We have with us Roko Aliprantis who is chair of our IUPUI Faculty Council Fringe Benefits Committee and also co-chair of the University Faculty Council Fringe Benefits Committee. We have a special guest Chris Lohmann who is co-chair of the UFC Fringe Benefits Committee. Chris, are you also chair of the BFC Fringe Benefits Committee?

**LOHMANN:** Yes, I am.

**ALIPRANTIS:** We have two amendments. One for the pension plans and one for the summer TIAA/CREF for the ten-month faculty. What we want to do is to call on Daryl Dean to define the terminal base salary for the 10-month employees. Before we vote, I would like to open the floor for discussion. [The IUPUI Fringe Benefits Committee Resolution is as follows:]

The Committee recommended the following resolution to be adopted by the IUPUI Faculty Council:

1. That Terminal Base Salary (TBS) (the average of the five highest years of salary) shall be uniformly defined as 12/10 of salary for all 10-month appointees, and that this definition be used both in the 18-20 plan and in FERP.
2. Beginning with the summer of 1991, TIAA/CREF benefits shall be paid on salaries received for teaching regularly scheduled summer session courses. Faculty on grant supported summer research appointments may include TIAA/CREF benefit charge if their grants permit.

**HUDSON:** I will just briefly say that last spring Margaret Mitchell, myself, and some others went around to each campus to solicit input from chancellors, and faculty, special staff on what we were looking for in an early retirement program. We got lots of input, much of which was contradictory. For example, a plan that is very generous and the forethought of income for the retiree costs us money. One that can encourage the right to stay and one that wants to leave. It was hard to deal with. In working with Chris Lohmann from the UFC Fringe Benefits Committee, Dick Hines, and with Nyhart, Inc., we came up with the model you have now. What we would like to do is have Daryl Dean, President of Nyhart, Inc., discuss these with you so you will understand what the concepts are and understand the plans.

**DEAN:** The presentation that I have is probably important enough that you hear it whether or not you vote for or against the TBS base salary. Unless everybody here raises their hand and says they have gotten this report, they fully understand and have no questions, then I can leave. Alternatively, I would like to walk through the models and tell you the facts about them and then, at the end of that, as you think of all the combinations of the pieces, I will take questions as to how they fit together and any specific questions you might have. Is that alright, Doctor, or did you want to call for a vote on this issue first?

**ALIPRANTIS:** No. Would you briefly explain the major difference to the people?

**DEAN:** We gathered information from outside sources, from various university studies, from the Faculty Council, the administration, and industry in general, and came up with five primary goals for the early retirement plan. Those goals are that:

1. The benefits be adequate.
2. The benefits be equitable. That means that people who serve longer and earn more money get a bigger benefit than people who served shorter and earned less money.
3. The benefits be more available than the current 18/20 plan is. That means a more liberalized eligibility.
4. The benefits be more flexible for the various campuses and schools to be able to use them to fit their needs as well as faculty and administrations to use them to fit their needs.
5. They must be cost efficient and that, generally to the administration, means that it cost less than the 18/20 plan.

If you have this report in front of you, on page two is the outline of the first model. If you don't have one and you want one, I have some extras. Page two describes what is labeled "Phased Early Retirement Plan One." This one has the most liberal eligibility and the least benefits. It is not an entitlement. It is an opportunity to negotiate a phased retirement with the University. It comes about after reaching age 55 and having 15 years of service at Indiana University. At that time, a person can go to the department, to the school, or to the campus administrators and say, "I would like to start my phased retirement and I would like to phase it out over x numbers of years." Those number of years are any number that you want to negotiate that fits the school's need up to age 70. So, in the extreme, it could start at age 55 and run all the way to age 70 -- a 15-year negotiated arrangement. It could be at 75 percent of normal work schedule; 50 percent or 25 percent or any combination of those going from year to year with a modest subsidized pay schedule. For example, as it says, if you work 75 percent of normal schedule, you would earn 80 percent of normal pay; 50 percent would earn 60 percent of normal pay and 25 percent schedule would earn 40 percent of normal pay. When a person enters this program there is a beginning time and an ending time agreed to with the University and that ending time is the moment at which you fully retire or move on to other employment if that is your purpose.

During the period of this phased retirement, other benefits, including health and life insurance, would continue as though you are a full-time employee. TIAA/CREF contributions would continue based on your actual reduced pay.

The last point of significance here is that for those of you who are eligible for 18/20 any year of participation in Phased Early Retirement Plan One or Phased Early Retirement Plan Two eliminates one year of eligibility under 18/20. So, the plans can be merged. They can be fitted together to suit your needs but they cannot be stacked end to end.

The second model is on page five. It also is a Phased Early Retirement model that is an entitlement. That means when you become eligible for this by reason of age and years of service you can go to the University or the department and say, "I am taking Phased Early Retirement Two and I would like to start next year." The eligibility is more strict than Phased Early Retirement Plan One. To go along with that, the benefits are larger. The eligibility is reaching age 60 and completing 15 years of service at Indiana University. This phased program anticipates and will contain a specific five year phase out. One of two schedules, the first one would be phased down to 75 percent in the first year, then 50 percent, then 50 percent, and then 25 percent, and 25 percent. The alternative would be 75-75-50-50-25. Each of them carries with it a subsidized pay schedule that carries a greater subsidy than Phased Early Retirement One. For example, a 75 percent work schedule carries with it a full pay; a 50 percent work schedule carries an 80 percent pay; and a 25 percent work schedule carries a 60 percent pay. As with Phased Early Retirement Plan One, this program would continue you as an employee full time for purposes of life and health insurance and would continue contributions to TIAA/CREF based on the reduced pay schedule that you are actually receiving. Also, as in Phase One, any year participation under this program reduces participation eligibility under the 18/20 plan year for year.

On page eight we have the third model. The third model is a full early retirement plan. Keep in mind there are employees at the University, and faculty who have been hired since January 1, 1989 who have no early retirement plan now. This is designed primarily for them but it may also be useful for people in the 18/20 plan. This benefit is an entitlement meaning once you have reached the age and service eligibility you may take it. The age is 60 and the age and service eligibility are  $\text{age} + \text{service} = 84$ . That ties in somewhat with the 18/20 plan in that the 18/20 plan says age 64 and 20 years of service. Those just happen to add up to 84. But, in this case, a person who is age 60 can take this program after 24 years of service. The benefit is a defined benefit, defined as a stated percentage of terminal base salary. Currently terminal base salary is a

term used in the 18/20 plan that says the last five years of your earnings averaged. As part of this proposal, it is anticipated terminal base salary would be changed to the highest five years regardless of whether that is the last five or not. That may affect some people. In fact, part of the proposal is that the terminal base salary be changed to the highest five years for the 18/20 plan as well as for this plan. The percentage of pay that would be paid is 60 percent for a person with 20 years of service plus an additional one percent for people who have years more than 20 then. One percent for each additional year. An example would be, a person retires at age 60 with 24 years of service. That would be the first eligibility date which would have 64 percent of terminal base salary paid. A person retiring at age 65 with 35 years of service, which happens to be the standard measure that the AARP uses for their minimum measurement under this program, 65 with 35 years of service would gather you 75 percent of terminal base salary payable for five years or until death or to reaching age 70 whichever comes first. During the period of this benefit you are not actually on the payroll of IU. You are on a retirement plan. Consequently, TIAA/CREF and Social Security contributions would not be continued. However, life and health insurance would be continued on the active employee plan until age 65 and then transferred to the retiree's plan. Those of you who are in 18/20 and are nearing retirement can see, as you look out into the future what your benefit is going to be, this program is somewhat less than most people will be getting under 18/20 now. That is because the TIAA/CREF investments in the past have been so good, especially in the past ten years. The 18/20 plan is based on the TIAA/CREF balance projected five years forward. If those balances don't bare so well in the next ten years and you come up for retirement, it could be that the 18/20 plan benefit would be less than this. This then is available as an alternative. So, for those of you in the 18/20 plan this becomes a floor below which, if the 18/20 benefits go, you can take this one.

On page 11 is what I like to call the fourth model and it suggests changes to the 18/20 plan, which are significant. Historically, the 18/20 plan has pretty much operated as golden handcuffs. They had the handcuffs and when they unlocked them you get the gold. For that was tight eligibility -- 20 years of service, age 64. Some people have said, "I'm not 64 but I would love to take it." We are recommending that eligibility be loosened to age 60 and age plus service total 84, with the same eligibility as the full early retirement plan would apply. This would mean somebody at age 60 with 24 years at IU could take 18/20. The penalty, of course is, if you call it a penalty for the availability, that when you take the 18/20 plan at 60 it is a lesser benefit than if you waited until age 64, which is true of most retirement plans, the sooner you take it, the less you receive. But, as I said initially, opening up the availability and the tradeoff against a smaller benefit is what all of this program is focused on. As far as I can see, this has been something the faculty councils of the various campuses and the University Faculty Council have been wanting for a number of years. So, it sounds to me like that is something you would want.

The second part of it is the gainful employment rules. In the beginning the gainful employment rules said you won't have any outside gainful employment of significance. That was modified in 1988 to say you won't have any outside gainful employment from the State of Indiana or any of its divisions, schools or subsidiaries. That has proven to be a detriment both to the University in certain instances and to the retiree in certain instances. Both could benefit by the knowledge in service that a retiree has to offer, this rule stands in the way of its happening. So, the recommendation here is a general one rather than specific that says, in those instances, where it is beneficial to both the retiree and the University, the gainful employment rule should be loosened and should be basically eliminated so that a person could fulfill some service for the University for pay and not forfeit the benefits. If any of you know some people who have been in that situation, you know exactly what I am talking about.

Lastly, on page 12, we have estimated the cost of this program. The easiest way to say this is that the top line under TBS1 (terminal base salary I) is the current situation. The University's costs

for the 18/20 plan this year are 5.9 percent of the payroll of the people who are eligible. By 30 years from now, if these programs are adopted on terminal base salary I, if that is the way that it goes, the range of cost would be the bottom line -- somewhere between 2.2 and 3.6 percent or approximately a midpoint of 2.9 percent. That is about half of the cost of the 18/20 plan. The tradeoff is for availability unlocking the handcuffs and trading those for silver, I guess. So, you have unlocked silver handcuffs instead of locked golden handcuffs. The terminal base salary II, as it shows on this page, is 12/10 of the terminal base salary I for 10-month pay people. I think this is the issue Professor Aliprantis is presenting for your vote today. It is not a part of the recommendation of this Task Force. They could not agree on that. What they and I did agree on was to put the cost numbers into this report so that they are available for anybody who wishes to consider them and apparently you wish to consider them. I say that it is not part of the recommendation because the Task Force could not agree but here are the numbers. I would welcome any questions that you have.

**WARFEL:** I have a question about the different kinds of plans, particularly number two. I don't understand exactly what 50 percent for the time means. Is that class time? Is this all of a professor's time? Who decides how much someone has been working, much less what 50 percent will be?

**DEAN:** Let me answer that in a larger sense because there may be several questions similar to this. We have presented concepts here, the general details the administrative details of which, need to be refined. The answer to that is not yet clearly defined but we are interested in your ideas as to how it could work. We know there are problems with people who teach half-time and do research half time. We know there are problems with people who work full time on the administrative staff and there are no half time positions available. We are willing to try to work that out. I think that it is going to have a lot to do with each position and what the school and the individual need out of this arrangement, but some guidelines are going to have to be put down; they have not been yet.

**WARFEL:** Space is a related issue.

**DEAN:** Space is a related issue. All of the other things that a person can negotiate with the school to get in return for time off or to make this thing work is what is going to have to happen. But, space, I think, is also an issue.

**BLAKE:** What happens if someone has been a 12-month appointee and has changed to a 10-month appointee when you talk about the five highest years of salary?

**DEAN:** Under current situations it would be the last five years. Under the proposal it would be the highest five years regardless of when it happened or whether they were a 10-pay or a 12-pay.

**HAMBURGER:** Is the 12/10 rule applicable for those who teach summer school and for those who do not?

**DEAN:** The 12/10 rule is a proposal being made by your Faculty Council and I would let them describe it, but I think it is for those who are on 10-pay period whether they taught summer school or not because TIAA/CREF contributions are not paid on summer school teaching salaries. Is that a correct statement?

**ALIPRANTIS:** Yes. The proposal is for everybody who is a 10-month appointment teaching or not teaching.

**HAMBURGER:** Mathematics is not my strong suit, but if someone doesn't teach in the summer and

takes Phased Early Retirement Plan II and has 75 percent of normal work and 100 percent of normal pay, they are getting pay raises.

**DEAN:** As an hourly rate, that is correct. But then, so is the person who fully retires. He is getting a pay raise in the sense that he is performing no service and getting something.

**HAMBURGER:** He is getting something for nothing.

**DEAN:** Are you referring to the 12/10 issue? I think the 12/10 issue is with regard to full early retirement and the 18/20 plan not the phased retirement.

**GNAT:** My question is regarding 12 month employees, it seems sort of inequitable to increase the salary of the 10-month people when they retire.

**DEAN:** I am not doing that. If at all possible, I would like to separate the discussion...

**ALIPRANTIS:** The problem is a lot of schools who do not have enough courses for the summer for everyone to teach.

**GNAT:** I don't understand that.

**BESCH:** I wonder if it is possible to have TIAA taken out of summer salaries. Why could you not do that? That way both sides would be satisfied. Can we take TIAA monies out of summer salaries?

**DEAN:** Are you saying to pay TIAA/CREF contributions on summer salaries and take it from there? I guess if the University decides to do that, it can do that.

**ALIPRANTIS:** You are talking about the second time?

**DEAN:** That is an alternative.

**BESCH:** Take it first. Why take 12/10 when you could take an equitable amount from people who work in the summer. If you work in the summer, you get paid. If you don't, then you don't. That is being fair. I only get paid for those months in which I work. So, why don't we make it so that the contributions can be paid when you work? If you don't work, then you don't get paid. It could be paid the same way in the summer as it is any other time of the year that you work. We voted to do the same thing for the Purdue people at IUPUI and that should take care of it. I don't know why we have to do that plus this.

**ALIPRANTIS:** You are missing the point. The point is that the 10-month employees are not paid during the summer.

**BESCH:** Not unless they teach. They get paid for teaching.

**STOCUM:** If I were a 10-month employee and I had no grant and I was not teaching in the summer, I would be laughing all the way to the bank?

**ALIPRANTIS:** But, wait a second. Look at your salary. As an administrator you will receive a pension that will be 60% of your salary while a faculty member on a ten-month appointment will receive a pension that will be 50% of his/her salary.

**HAMBURGER:** If we go to this under 18/20 and raise the total base salary for 10-month employees which was part of this proposal to change the whole thing, his comment about laughing all the way to the bank is quite true.

**BEPKO:** Can I offer a suggestion on how we might address the different issues that are involved? I think that it is the intention of the persons who are offering the rather tentative program to have at least the kind of vote of approval that would instruct our University Faculty Council representatives on how to approach this when it comes before the UFC and I think it is going to be taken up by the UFC before too long. So that there is one item that may deserve some show of support or a vote and that is the overall early retirement program that is presented today and was distributed in this handout earlier. The second and third items are in the one page sheet that Roko has distributed. The first of these has to do with the terminal base salary. That is the issue that is being discussed right now. The second has to do with the payment of TIAA/CREF on summer school salaries. Would it be fair to take them up in that order?

**ALIPRANTIS:** Yes.

**BEPKO:** The first item, then, if we could confine ourselves to it, will be the early retirement package.

**HAMBURGER:** The early retirement package proposal would change the 18/20. Will the change in the specific modified gainful employment rule be to meet the needs of campus officials who make the decisions?

**DEAN:** There would have to be some guidelines established. That is one of those administrative processes I would say under certain circumstances it would be automatic and under other circumstances it would have to be the decision of the person who wants to hire them back.

**MCDONALD:** The Budgetary Affairs Committee has had several sessions on this and I would very much like our work to be recorded here today. Richard Rogers is here to address on behalf of the Budgetary Affairs Committee.

**ROGERS:** The Budgetary Affairs Committee only dealt with Chancellor Bepko's statement on whether or not we endorse the concept and philosophy of having early retirement programs at IUPUI. We didn't. We recognize that there are a number of issues that have to be resolved and so we would mention that we think that there is substantial financial savings possible to the University taken as a whole on a substituting early retirement program. Naturally, we observed that the statistics indicate that 30 percent of our employees will probably adopt early retirement programs. That will save the University substantial monies based upon the projections and the cost figures. Again, we tried to approach this fairly from a financial point of view. One of the critical variables we think is necessary to maintain flexibility. In other words, we feel that our faculty has to have the ability to choose any one of these early retirement programs or more importantly not choose them. We are not giving up our current 18/20 benefits. So, if somebody elects to stay at IU or IUPUI until they are 64 years old, they don't give up anything. We think it is important that this part of the program be maintained. Finally, to think that on an advisory basis, there are probably going to be some hidden costs which have not been spoken of by the gentleman. As you realize, when somebody reaches the age of 55 or 60, some of these people with their grant money generate capabilities. Many, in fact, start to have a negotiating position because of programs that allow somebody to force the University to retire them early; they can use that as a negotiating tool. We, therefore, suggest that the administration may want to examine more closely some of the hidden costs that may be involved with these programs because of the additional power and control that may be transferred to the faculty. That is strictly advisory.



In conclusion, we support the retention of all three early retirement programs. However, we put the administration on notice if any of these plans are too biased in terms of their savings to the 18/20. In other words, the idea is to develop these things. People will not elect the early 55 year old program if it is simply too much of a give up on the part of the faculty employee to the retiring process. That is the last thing you want to be able to notify them. That concludes the general recommendation of the Budgetary Affairs Committee.

**LOHMANN:** I just have a question about that report. When you say that your committee recommended option of the three parts of the early retirement, are you specifically not recommending the revision to 18/20 or are you...

**ROGERS:** No. We did not discuss the revision to 18/20 in that form. We only looked at the three programs. There is a learning process taking place as these things are developed. Regarding the 18/20, I think we would like to hold judgment if we could possibly do that and look at the numbers more carefully.

**MOORE:** I would like to make a motion that this Faculty Council go on record as supporting the three new retirement programs as well as the changes recommended in the eligibility for the existing 18/20 program.

**THARP:** I second that.

**BEPKO:** Is there any further discussion? Are you ready for the question? All in favor, say "Aye." Is there anybody who is opposed? [none] The motion carries. Roko, you had two other motions.

**ALIPRANTIS:** We wanted to make sure that the TBS (Terminal Base Salary) is defined in an equitable manner. The TBS must include summer compensation from teaching and/or grant compensation.

**ROGERS:** Would you like our committee to look at the question?

**KECK:** Is it the five highest years of salary?

**ALIPRANTIS:** (THE TAPE CUT OFF FROM THIS POINT UNTIL THE NEXT CONVERSATION WHICH IS PROFESSOR SHARP.)

**SHARP:** I move that we send this to the Budgetary Affairs Committee.

**BEPKO:** There was no second to Kent Sharp's motion and now Dick Hamburger had made a motion on #2. Is that seconded? [This was seconded] Is there any discussion on #2? All in favor, say "Aye." Any opposed? [one] Item #1 is still remaining.

**SCHERLE:** Would a motion be in order to approve number one? I so move.

**ALIPRANTIS:** This is a motion from the committee and therefore does not need a second.

**BEPKO:** It is coming from a committee. The only reason we entertain Dick's motion is that Item #1 has already been resolved. We will take your suggestion as a motion to approve this and take that up now. Is there any discussion about item #1?

**WILSON:** It seems that the fair thing to do on number one is to modify it a bit. Is it true that you can have only the years in which you get actual summer salary? Those definitely should be

counted to get 12/10 in those years in which you teach. The only thing I don't understand is, can you take any of those five years that are highest and then you can just go back to a year when you got 12/10 of your salary or do you have to take only the last five years?

**BEPKO:** The highest five years.

**WILSON:** So, then you should be able to go back to any years you teach and take those years in which you actually got the 12/10. I don't see why people who actually don't work or do anything for the University in those two months should get benefits from that because that is...

**BEPKO:** We have to bring this to closure. Is that in a form of a motion to amend this motion to say that, in accord with the comment that Chris Lohmann made, that instead of it being automatically 12/10 that it be the five highest years including summer school teaching compensation or research compensation through the University?

**ALIPRANTIS:** Exactly.

**BEPKO:** Does everyone understand the motion to amend?

**LAWLOR:** Does that mean within any 12/10 manipulation...

**BEPKO:** TBS would be equal to your highest five years compensation including 10-month, summer teaching and research payments made through the University. The motion has been made and seconded and this is a motion to amend this motion. Are you ready for the vote? If so, all in favor say "Aye". Any opposed? [Some opposed] Now we have to vote on the motion itself as amended. All in favor, say "Aye." Any opposed? [some opposed] The motion is adopted as amended. Does that complete the business of your committee, Roko?

**ALIPRANTIS:** Yes.

**BEPKO:** Thanks to the people here especially Chris Lohmann.

#### **AGENDA ITEM VI - Task Force on Faculty Compensation and Support - Update**

**BEPKO:** There is a faculty compensation study going on. This is our effort to comply with the Trustees' request which was described at the last meeting, so you can read in the minutes what we are doing. We are moving forward, identifying peer institutions and we will be reporting both to you and the University administration. The Trustees will hear about this at some point. It may be that they will get a briefing on this matter this weekend in Ft. Wayne but it will be heard probably at the retreat in February as a final matter. This is an effort to show the difference between our salaries and the salaries of our peer institutions and the gap between them and what we need to get from the state to make up that gap so that we can be in the 60th percentile of our peer institutions. Dave Robbins, Dana McDonald and Richard Rogers were here to talk about this but given the time, unless you would like to make couple of comments...

**ROGERS1:** We will be back and continue to update you on this.

**BEPKO:** Dick, would it be fair to place this on the agenda for the December meeting at the front of the agenda?

**PETERSON:** We certainly can do that and also in the meantime I would suggest that, if you have any comments about these peer institutions, or if you want any further information about what is being done at the level of the task force, contact either Dave Robbins or Dana McDonald and they will be more than willing to update you on that. Thank you for coming.

**BEPKO:** There is a list of the peer institutions on the table as you leave.

**AGENDA ITEM VII - Unfinished Business**

[Due to lack of time there was no unfinished business]

**AGENDA ITEM VIII - New Business**

[Due to lack of time there was no new business]

**AGENDA ITEM IX - Adjournment**

**BEPKO:** We are adjourned.

**INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS**

**FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING**

**December 6, 1990**

**Law School, Room 116**

**3:00 - 4:00 p.m.**

**Members Present:** Administrative: Chancellor Gerald Bepko. Dean William Plater. Deans: John Barlow, Walter Daly, Barbara Fischler, H. William Gilmore, P. Nicholas Kellum, Norman Lefstein, Sheldon Siegel. Faculty: C. D. Aliprantis, Darrell Bailey, James Baldwin, Patricia Blake, Thomas Broadie, Walter Buchanan, Elaine Cooney, William Crabtree, Theodore Cutshall, Ronald Dehnke, Dornith Doherty, Ann Dunipace, William Engle, Paul Galanti, Jean Gnat, Richard Hamburger, Dean Hawley, Dolores Hoyt, Norman Hudson, Florence Juillerat, Henry Karlson, Linda Kasper, Juanita Keck, Michael Kubek, Richard Lawlor, Dana McDonald, Richard Meiss, B. Keith Moore, Bernard Morrel, Jerold Paar, Catherine Palmer, John Pless, John Rafert, Edward Robbins, Bruce Roth, Carl Rothe, Neal Rothman, Phyllis Scherle, Edmund Schilling, Scott Shapiro, P. Kent Sharp, Hitwant Sidhu, Vernon Vix, Marion Wagner, Kathleen Warfel, Kathryn Wilson, Donald Wong, Charles Yokomoto, Susan Zunt. Ex Officio Members Present: Henry Besch, Richard Fredland, Maxine Tutterow.

**Alternates Present:** Administrative: Scott Evenbeck for J. Herman Blake. Deans: Shirley Ross for Constance Baker, Hugh Wolf for Donald Warren, J. M. Ebbert for James Weigand, Georgia Miller for Jack Wentworth.

**Members Absent:** Deans: A. James Brown, Trevor Brown, R. Bruce Renda, David Stocum, William Voos. Faculty: Jonas Bjork, David Bodenhamer, H. Glenn Bohlen, Varoujan Chalian, Dewey Conces, Andrew Evan, Martin Farlow, Naomi Fineberg, Janice Froehlich, Philip Gibbs, Michael Gleeson, Jerome Kaplan, Richard Kovacs, Bruce Long, Patrick McGeever, Lynda Means, Chris Miller, Robert Pascuzzi, Sherry Queener, Michael Ryan, Thomas Ryan, Lee Schwecke, Aristotle Siakotos, Gregory Sutton, Donald Tharp, Jay Tischfield, Ann Tomey. Ex Officio: Jeffery Vessely.

**Visitors:** Erv Boschmann, Kay Carl, Carol Cecere, Mark Grove, Robert Martin, David Robbins, John Snyder, Gene Tempel.

**AGENDA ITEM I - Call to Order**

**BEPKO:** Thank you, Neal, for calling our attention to the fact that the beginning of the meeting time had already passed.

**AGENDA ITEM II - Approval of Minutes: October 4, 1990**

**BEPKO:** We have an item on the agenda for the approval of the minutes of the October 4th meeting. Is there a motion to approve these minutes? [Motion made and seconded] All in favor, say "Aye." Any opposed? [None] The minutes will be approved as distributed.

**AGENDA ITEM III - Presiding Officer's Business - Chancellor Gerald L. Bepko**

**BEPKO:** We have a brief introduction that Bill Plater will make.

**PLATER:** Although I think many of you have had an opportunity to meet Mark Grove, the new Registrar for IUPUI, we thought in light of the fact that he is enforcing deadlines for turning in grades and other such matters, you might like to meet him face to face. Mark is here in the back of the room. Mark, if you would stand. We wanted to have this opportunity for you to see Mark and say hello to him. He is joining us after serving one year as the registrar at Central Connecticut State University. Before that, he had been the registrar at Indiana University at South Bend for seven years from 1982-1989. Mark is very well known to people who work in Administrative Affairs and in the business of the registrar's work around the University. We were very pleased to have him return to our campus, where he brings not only a great knowledge of Indiana University but the experience that he has gained in working in another state and another environment. I think some of you are aware of the new initiatives begun under Mark's leadership during the fall semester including some improvements in the use of computers for efficiency and scheduling. He has just undertaken a review of our classroom space to see if we can make the classrooms more responsive and adaptative to the needs of the faculty who are teaching in them. We are delighted to have Mark join us and I hope you will join with me in welcoming him officially to our IUPUI community.

**BEPKO:** Thanks, Bill.

#### **AGENDA ITEM IV - Executive Committee Report - Richard Peterson, Secretary**

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

**PETERSON:** I have several, hopefully, very short items that I want to bring to you today. The first item is a report from the Executive Committee related to introductions in our fall meeting of this group. The Executive Committee has made a motion and voted not to have the introductions of faculty at that meeting. They feel it is not useful time spent in this meeting. Subsequently, we will not make introductions at that time, unless somebody has major objections to that protocol.

The next item is that our March 7th, meeting as scheduled. It comes during spring break if my numbers are correct. So, what we want to do is to move that meeting, if there is no problem with this subsequent date, to March 14, one week later. Hopefully, that will fit into everyone's schedule. Again, if there are major problems with that date, let me know and we will take some other course of action.

You have received a number of pieces of paper though the mail related to FACET nominations. You will be receiving yet another piece of paper, hopefully within a day or two, related to submission of your nominations for the FACET group to Dean Erv Boschmann's office. The Executive Committee and Dean Boschmann will all work together to try to get those nominations. We can place as many as ten nominations into the University level for this particular honor and the session that is given for these people.

The policy that we looked at earlier in the fall for early retirement has been continuing to get consideration at various levels of the University. It was discussed at University Faculty Council level. I think there was a general consensus that this was a reasonable way to go. I think there are still some questions at that level. All of the eight units through the University have not fully considered it at this point. Hopefully, at our February meeting we will come to a consensus on the early retirement policies. That is just a report and update on early retirement.

There has been a bit of fallout from our Student Rights and Responsibilities document that was approved last year. The fallout is the non-discrimination clause, particularly as it relates to ROTC in their discrimination against people who have various sexual preferences. This has caused quite a bit of flack at various units. We have not considered this issue at the level of this Council or at any of our committees as far as I know. If anyone has concerns and wants to feed into this, I would certainly be willing to put this to a committee for their consideration. Perhaps the Student Affairs Committee should look at this to see if we have any general concerns from this campus.

The last item on my agenda is really in the wrong place, but I have included it in my agenda because I had neglected to put it on originally and I didn't want to clutter the rest of the agenda because we have another major item on it today related to the review of deans. The item that I want to present to you is a report from the Task Force on Faculty Compensation. We have a very short report from that Task Force, and we will probably get additional information as time goes along. Dave Robbins will give us this report along with a handout.

**ROBBINS:** Thank you very much. We will be very brief. The Task Force has been meeting and it is very active. They are working on identifying our peer group. There are copies of this document on the table. We also have been studying the idea of confirming the level of funding that would be required to meet the objectives as established by the Trustees and the other areas of support which are particularly of great importance to the campus and to all involved. We have also begun to examine, review, and identify certain strategies that might be used to satisfy some of these objectives. The committee will be meeting again early in January, and we will be available to meet with this group, or any group, to bring them up to date on what is going on.

**PETERSON:** Thank you very much. Are there any comments on that Task Force?

**WILSON:** I have a question. I would like to know what criteria you used to establish other universities as peer groups?

**ROBBINS:** There were several schools were identified and included and then taken out. Criteria included the urban nature of the campuses and the size of the schools was compared and institutions that have similar school programs to IUPUI. There are, obviously, a lot of schools that could have been brought into it, others that were not. We also tried to look geographically, although we do have an east coast and a west coast school but for the most part, many of them are the midwestern region of the United States.

**PETERSON:** Are there any other questions or comments for Dave? He and Dana McDonald are co-chairing this Task Force that is looking into this from our campus level. If you have any further comments or want any further information on this, please feel free to contact them at any time. That completes my report.

#### **AGENDA ITEM V - Review of Administrators - Action Item**

**BEPKO:** Dick, do you want to present the action item on behalf of the Executive Committee?

**PETERSON:** I'll take the stand again under these conditions. We do have the action item that is on the agenda for today and that is to look at the document that has been presented to you on review of administrators, particularly the review of deans. Those of you who were here last spring will remember that Chancellor Bepko appointed a task force consisting of Richard Fredland, Jeffery Vessely, and myself to begin working on this. During the summer, the three of us met to consider a draft policy that was given to us by the Chancellor's office. That draft policy was essentially the

University Faculty Council policy and how it works at that level. We revised that policy as a subcommittee and then presented it to the IUPUI Faculty Council Executive Committee. It was then given to the Chancellor's office and the deans. They had additional comments on it. It was again brought back to the Executive Committee and to the subcommittee. The chancellors and deans again looked at that revised document. I believe I have all the steps approximately correct on that. Today we are presenting a document to you for discussion. We feel that it has gone through a number of hands up to this point. If you feel that it is an adequate document at this point, we would like to have an approval of it. However, if you do have significant problems with it, areas that you think need to have some additional work, we would encourage that discussion here and we will delay the official approval of this document until a future meeting. But, if you do find that it is adequate, I would encourage that we take action as soon as possible so that we can go on with the reviews of the deans as stated in this document. I see many of you reading anxiously now. I hope you have had a little time to give it some consideration. I bring it to you for comments.

**MCDONALD:** I have a question. The first paragraph, the sixth line from the bottom: *...school associate deans who are the directors of IUPUI responsibility centers are to be reviewed by their respective deans through procedures developed in consultation with the Chancellor...* Can you tell me a responsibility center of which we speak?

**BEPKO:** Business, SPEA, Education.

**MCDONALD:** So, they are system schools.

**BEPKO:** When there is a dean in Bloomington and an associate dean here who is head of a responsibility center, I think this language applies.

**MCDONALD:** Thank you.

**PETERSON:** There has been concern on the part of Bloomington that there may not be a review of these kinds of people and that is why we put this specific wording in here so we would have that kind of review.

**ALIPRANTIS:** I have some serious questions about the process. Our system here is to be evaluating and being evaluated. At this time, is it correct that no dean is being evaluated?

**PETERSON:** Not on an official level like this.

**BEPKO:** Not under this procedure.

**ALIPRANTIS:** In other words, I am being evaluated so they can give me my raise, who evaluates the deans of the schools? Is it the Chancellor or someone else? Someone has to decide their raise. So, in other words, we are being evaluated to see how good we are and how we perform and, according to the outcome of that, we get good grades. I presume that the same thing holds true for the deans. Is it correct that every dean will be evaluated after five years? Don't you think it is too much time to evaluate them every five years?

**BEPKO:** I think you are confusing annual reviews with this periodic, or formal and more extensive, review. What is contemplated here is much grander than the review that anyone would expect to take place every year. It is an opportunity to stop every five years and reflect giving the incumbent in the office an opportunity to think about things that he or she has done, giving a wide range of people an opportunity to help the incumbent improve in the position, and deciding what the

incumbent would like to do. We could not do this every year, Roko, for everyone on the list. As you can see, it is not just the deans, it is a list of administrators that is much larger and longer than just deans. Everyone at the University who is eligible for an increase in salary has a review by someone else each year and it is certainly done for deans.

**PETERSON:** This is an opportunity for faculty also to get involved in the assessment of what is happening in their schools. The majority of the faculty that are on this committee will be from the school in the majority of instances, unless it is an extremely small unit.

**ALIPRANTIS:** This does not exist right now?

**PETERSON:** No, not on this campus. It does exist on the University level and it does exist in Bloomington. They do a very similar type of process that is being proposed here. We have not had this process.

**SIDHU:** How will the results be used for or against the performance of the the dean? Will there be a reward for doing a good job?

**BEPKO:** I hope so.

**SIDHU:** For those who fall below expectations, are they going to be asked to improve or some action to be taken?

**BEPKO:** To answer your first question, we will try to use this wisely. I hope it does serve a purpose. Of course, one can't predict in advance exactly what will happen or how much time it will take. If it is taking too much time and we think it is not producing enough benefits, I suppose we could adjust and try within the framework of this document to spend less time on it. But, I think it is a very good opportunity for the incumbents in all of these administrative positions to have an opportunity get feedback at periods of time so that they can decide how to do their jobs better and find out what people across the range of their responsibilities think about their activities. It is a very healthy thing, and I think that is the way we are approaching it. It will support and reinforce more effective leadership.

**FREDLAND:** I would just like to add that on page four of the document, in the middle of the paragraph, it specifies that a report shall be written and shall be disposed of in several different ways depending on the level. So, it is not as if this process can evaporate at the end of the review process.

**BEPKO:** It is clear in the document that there are reporting requirements as well.

**BLAKE:** On page four, following the F comment, it talks about the administrators having access to survey results and to other materials so a person can respond. Further down it states, "...removing the names of respondents..." Is that true of all documents that names will be taken off before it is shown to the administrative person? I am more concerned about non-tenured faculty than I am tenured faculty.

**PETERSON:** I can respond to that to a certain extent from the perspective of the committee. Dick Fredland, who chairs that committee, may have some additional comments on it. We perceive this as being two different kinds of feedback to the committee. One, signed letters going to the committee which then could be available to the administrator and the signed document could be available to the administrator under those conditions. The other condition would be surveys. In every case. Those surveys would be done in such a way that there would be an anonymous



feedback so that the name of that individual who responded to the survey would not go in. We need to have a double check type of a thing along with surveys so that we make sure that there aren't double or multiple copies being sent in from one individual and that we have a reasonable representation from the constituencies. Do you have other comment on that, Dick?

**BEPKO:** There may be a limit to which we can restrict information because the person under review has rights. What is in the file, in general, should be made available to the person under review.

**ROTHMAN:** You have between 25 and 35 administrators that have to be done which means five committees a year. That is an awful lot of work.

**BEPKO:** It will take us a while to catch up with this scheduling.

**ROTHMAN:** But, still on the average over the long haul you will be doing approximately five a year.

**BEPKO:** There will be practical problems of that kind, and I think that we just have to watch how this unfolds and make sure we don't consume too much time and energy in the process.

**ROBBINS:** Is there any thought being given to how this might be phased in? Obviously, those who have spent at least five years in their current position would be eligible for this the first year. Assuming there are more than could reasonably be reviewed that first year, is there any thought to what that first five might be? For example, if you were going to take one-fifth of them each year where would you begin?

**BEPKO:** We haven't decided yet, but I think longevity would be one of the important factors.

**ROTHMAN:** Have you considered doing a trial and just do one to see what it costs first? Because this is going to take away from the faculty's research, teaching, and a few other things. It is an effort that they are going to have to put out and give up something else.

**BEPKO:** I am not sure how long they will take. I think that if Bloomington has some experience with this; I don't think it has consumed an inordinate amount of time. Are there any other comments or questions? This calls for a vote. All in favor, say "Aye." Any opposed? [None] Thank you.

#### **AGENDA ITEM VI - Question and Answer Period - 10 Minutes**

**BEPKO:** We now have our ten-minute question-and-answer period. If you have any more questions about the document, you can ask them now.

**COONEY:** I was wondering about the status of the child care center and the research being done about that.

**BEPKO:** I will mention that again in the second part of our meeting today, but a study is underway which will involve inviting a sampling of faculty and staff, I believe, to respond to a questionnaire. This will give us more information about the needs and attitudes toward child care. Meanwhile, we have really not proceeded very far with what we have announced as a new initiative in an effort to try to create more child care and more dependent care for the campus. We have suggested that we are interested in making an additional subsidy to whoever may be interested in providing additional child care in the form of land that can be used. We have no predisposition as of this

time about who may be the one who actually provides the child care. It could be a for-profit entity, it could be a non-profit entity, or it could be the University. But, we are exploring and as soon as we get the results of the survey that we are conducting, we will continue to explore every possibility that we think is viable to try to increase the dependent care available to the University family. We think what is available now is not sufficient to meet the demands of the University community.

**WILSON:** I was curious to know how many students are actually enrolled on this campus this semester. I keep reading different figures in different documents.

**BEPKO:** I keep reading different figures too. I think the reason is that sometimes the figures are only for Indianapolis and not for IUPUI, meaning both Indianapolis and Columbus. Sometimes people use the figures from last year to report on enrollment this year. I think we ought to ask the Registrar to give us the exact figure.

**GROVE:** The official enrollment figure for the University, represented as being IUPUI and Columbus, is 27,518 students. Approximately 1,300 are at Columbus. Approximately 26,200 are registered at this campus.

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

**BALDWIN:** In the IU Newspaper of November 16 there was a report of a Board of Trustees meeting about the Trustees being concerned about the University's identity. [Showing Marsh Supermarket grocery bag] Is that part of it? Marsh is plugging the One University. What is this for?

**BEPKO:** I think that Marsh supermarkets, as a public service gesture, carry different messages for not-for-profit institutions. They offered to do this for Indiana University to promote higher education. That is why you see Indiana University and its eight front doors on the paper shopping bags that Marsh distributes. The session that was held at the Trustees' meeting was not an announcement of policy but simply a discussion by a couple of persons in the University Relations Office. Marcia Busch Jones was the one who made the presentation, I believe. She works for Doug Wilson, Vice President for External Affairs. The purpose of the presentation was to show how many images Indiana University and all of its campuses project to the community and how difficult it is for the community to sort out all of these different identifiers that are used. They had a list of all of the different seals and symbols that are used on letterheads, for example, and it fills a number of pages. I don't think there was any suggestion that there be action taken immediately. The point was that this is something to talk about, consider, and it is possible that the University could move itself toward having a more common identity across the eight campuses. But, as we always say, we have no identity problems at IUPUI.

**ALIPRANTIS:** Is there a way the Executive Committee could think about a logo for IUPUI? All of us use different stationery.

**BEPKO:** This happens with some regularity and I am not sure we can solve the entire problem. I know on a number of occasions in the recent past I have seen colleagues from the faculty here on television and all you see is Professor, Indiana University. I don't think I have seen Professor, Purdue University. I think this creates some local difficulties for us, but I think it is lot better than it was some years ago. We have made the news media here mindful of the identity issue, and more and more often IUPUI will be included in the tag line. Even if it says Indiana University, it will say IUPUI as well, which is probably the correct thing to say. With respect to the question of stationery, (Gene Tempel won't like this) but some thought has been given to this; Gene has been

the one who has been singled out as the person who probably ought to head up the project eventually. Maybe he can give us a summary of what has been done so far.

**TEMPEL:** Could we wait until after my annual review, Jerry? [laughter] There is an effort being made at the University level to look at the letterhead. We at the External Affairs Coordinating Council have attempted to deal with this issue but we have held up our work waiting for the University level committee to determine how it might approach this problem. We are mindful of the problem and we are trying to do something about it, but we can't move until we get some of that settled. We are doing a few things to deal with the problem. For example, we have visited the Chronicle of Higher Education and, if you will watch the Chronicle of Higher Education, I think you will see reported when there something going on at this campus they will be using the campus identifier. It is a matter of getting out and explaining to people and these media what this place is and why it has two university names in it. Once you get that done, I think they can handle it. So, we are trying to make an effort to do it at that level, and we certainly will try to deal with the letterhead question as soon as we can come up with some University identifier. One of the things that has been discussed is to do away with a lot of the other symbols and go to some kind of shared and distinctive type designed face that would be recognizable across the system, because every time they try to solve the problem and come up with a similar logo it causes problems here at Indianapolis and Ft. Wayne by having two universities in one place. It is a complex problem. We are working on it. If you would like to have some input, you can write me about it. Your dean is coming to see me about the letterhead problem, he has already told me that he has some concerns about it and, frankly, there is more interest in identifying the campus now and we are trying to figure out how we can do that.

**SIDHU:** Sir, I think we are losing the battle all the time. When we had the National Sports Festival, there was only Indiana University's stadium, etc. When the publicity goes from the Vice Chancellor's office to the media, I do not know who the responsible person is, that becomes the Indiana University Natatorium. I think we have agreed that this is going to be IUPUI. Either you appoint a committee to implement that or the Executive Committee should take the responsibility. I think we should take this more seriously, feeding the information to the media. We used to have our own Indiana University telephone directory. That disappeared. Slowly and slowly it looks like steps have been taken in that direction. How we don't know. We are not only fearful we are becoming the afraid.

**TEMPEL:** I would like to have those problems referred to my office because that is the very thing we have been working on. I would say, for example, if a news release goes out identifying Indiana University Natatorium, it always says "at IUPUI." I read a national publication over the weekend which has a story in it about the Natatorium and three times it referred to it as the IUPUI Natatorium. More and more the identity is coming together. There was a series of stories last year that came out of the School of Dentistry which identified it as the IU School of Dentistry at IUPUI. There are identifications now of the Medical Center at IUPUI. All of those things are helping us identify this as one place where a lot of good things happen. If we try to force the IUPUI on everything, we are going to lose the identification of the professional schools and some of the other more established units here. We are trying to be very careful about how we word this.

**BEPKO:** I think added to that is, while, Hitwant, you may see this moving in a direction that concerns you, I see it moving in the other direction.

**TEMPEL:** We are happy to discuss those issues. We have a meeting every month of the External Affairs Coordinating Council. Those issues can be brought to that Council for discussion.

**PETERSON:** I was just reminded of something. We have a new appointment that has been made

and I think Jerry would like to make an announcement on that appointment. It is an appointment that the Executive Committee had some input into as we met in session.

**BEPKO:** This is a part of the question-and-answer period and I will take that as a question. I am pleased to announce that Catherine Palmer is now the Grand Marshal of the University and she will share that honor with a faculty member from Bloomington. It is the first time that a faculty member from Indianapolis has been Grand Marshal. Congratulations!

**PALMER:** And the first woman.

**BEPKO:** That is right. This is the first time a woman has been Grand Marshal.

**PETERSON:** The individual from Bloomington is Joe Waldman, School of Business.

#### **AGENDA ITEM VII - Unfinished Business**

**PETERSON:** There are three items that still remain on our agenda. Two of them are listed. One of them is the TIAA/CREF for Summer Employees which is a continued festering sore under our skin and keeps being brought up. It is something that we are concerned about at the University level. Bloomington is concerned about it, and we are certainly concerned about it here. We are waiting for the appropriate actions in that area. I have a feeling that within a relatively short period of time we are going to be able to take some action in this area.

Family Leave Policy is another one of those policies that has been approved by councils and has not yet been implemented. But, again, that is being worked on several levels of the University.

There is one other item that is supposed to appear under these carryover items, and that is something related to getting our appointment letters each year. Jerry Bepko is working on that. I don't know if he has any further progress on that but there has been a lack of coordination, I guess is the best way to put it, in when and how we get our yearly notification of new salary letters.

**BEPKO:** We would like to have those letters distributed as soon as possible after the budget is set. We would like to have that done in a way that is as personal and supportive as possible. We are working with the deans to involve a better system.

**ROBBINS:** I just want to observe how much I appreciate the fact that we are now seeing these actions that the Faculty Council has taken but has not received final disposition carried over. I chaired a committee about three years ago which recommended this be a part of the process of our Faculty Council so the Council could keep apprised of what was happening to the action that it had taken which required some action beyond this body. It is most helpful. It gives us an idea whether anything is happening and whether we ought to do anything about it. I think otherwise it keeps us apprised of what we have done and where it is going in a way that hasn't occurred before. I just want to recognize that I for one am most appreciative that that is now being done.

**ROTHMAN:** Could I ask one further question on the TIAA/CREF item? How come the research office did not accept asking for money from the Medical Science Foundation when we were asking for research money? They could always turn it back and not use it. This year it was sent back and told "No, you can't ask for it."

**BEPKO:** That was earlier in the year.

**ROTHMAN:** It was last week.

**PLATER:** We have asked for a change to the response. We have asked that when a proposal is submitted, that the proposal carry a note that says "pending approval" when requesting TIAA/CREF summer benefits.

**ROTHMAN:** We have no objections to that.

**BEPKO:** We had a call on that. We wanted to get back to the people who had made the request to tell you that we are going to put that into the grant applications. We can't make it final because it is a Trustees' policy that we are talking about.

**ALIPRANTIS:** I have heard several things about the Engineering school. Could you say something about the Engineering school? Are they going to split it? Is there anything official?

**BEPKO:** The decision was made that, for the time being anyway, the two programs would be better served by remaining as part of the School of Engineering and Technology. We are about to appoint a search and screen committee to search for a replacement for Bruce Renda. The target is to recruit for July 1, 1991. Bruce Renda has agreed to serve for an indeterminate time, but we hope for a short period after that time, if we have not made an appointment by that date. The chair of the search committee will be Tom Lenz from the School of Business. We will distribute a copy of the appointment letter. It includes persons who were recommended from the faculty of the school. A majority of the committee will be composed of faculty of the school.

**BESCH:** I have a question which I have been puzzling about, since I have learned about a memo coming from Chris Keeley about one week ago saying that, as of the month of November, there are two new policies that we need to be aware of. Both of them, I think for me, would have had negative impact if they had been in place in the last year. I can't understand the motivation for them. The question is, why do we no longer ask people who quit to give two weeks' notice? Secondly, why do we give full terminal pay to people who walk in one day and quit the next?

**BEPKO:** I am beginning to see what a good idea it is to ask vice chancellors to attend these meetings. The Vice Chancellor for Administrative Affairs happens to be here and is probably the best person to answer this question. My answer, Henry, if I gave it, would be I haven't the faintest idea. Bob, are you there?

**MARTIN:** We have asked that same thing, Henry. Part of that came out of union negotiations. The question has come up in the last two weeks. I have asked Chris to prepare a document explaining that.

#### **AGENDA ITEM VIII - Adjournment**

**BEPKO:** Dick Peterson has suggested we have a five minute break before the next part of the program. Therefore, we are adjourned.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS

FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING

January 10, 1991

Law School, Room 116

3:30 - 5:30 p.m.

**Members Present:** Administrative: Chancellor Gerald L. Bepko, Dean William Plater. Deans: Walter Daly, P. Nicholas Kellum, Angela McBride, R. Bruce Renda, Sheldon Siegel, William Voos. Elected Faculty: C. D. Aliprantis, James Baldwin, Patricia Blake, David Bodenhamer, Frances Brahmi, Elaine Cooney, William Crabtree, Theodore Cutshall, Ann Dunipace, Paul Galanti, Michael Gleeson, Dean Hawley, Dolores Hoyt, Norman Hudson, Jerome Kaplan, Henry Karlson, Linda Kasper, Juanita Keck, Michael Kubek, Dana McDonald, Patrick McGeever, Lynda Means, B Keith Moore, Jerold Paar, John Pless, Edward Robbins, Phyllis Scherle, Edmund Schilling, Lee Schwecke, Scott Shapiro, P Kent Sharp, Hitwant Sidhu, Marion Wagner, Kathleen Warfel, Kathryn Wilson, Charles Yokomoto, Susan Zunt.

**Ex Officio Members Present:** Henry Besch, Maxine Tutterrow, Jeffrey Vessely.

**Alternates Present:** Administrative: Scott Evenbeck for J. Herman Blake. Deans: Miriam Langsam for John Barlow, Shirley Yegerlehner for Barbara Fischler, Hugh Wolf for Donald Warren, J. Marvin Ebbert for James Weigand, Georgia Miller for Jack Wentworth. Elected Faculty: Norris Richmond for Varoujan Chalian, Lynn Carson for Jean Gnat, J. Chorpensing for Florence Juillerat, Linda Cox for Bruce Long.

**Members Absent:** Deans: A James Barnes, Trevor Brown, H. William Gilmore, Norman Lefstein. Elected Faculty: Darrell Bailey, Jonas Bjork, H. Glenn Bohlen, Thomas Broadie, Walter Buchanan, Dewey Conces, Ronald Dehnke, Dornith Doherty, William Engle, Andrew Evan, Martin Farlow, Naomi Fineberg, Janice Froehlich, Philip Gibbs, Richard Hamburger, Richard Kovacs, Richard Lawlor, Richard Meiss, Chris Miller, Bernard Morrel, Catherine Palmer, Robert Pascuzzi, Sherry Queener, John Rafert, Bruce Roth, Neal Rothman, Michael Ryan, Thomas Ryan, Jan Shipps, Aristotle Siakotos, Gregory Sutton, Donald Tharp, Jay Tischfield, Ann Tomey, Vernon Vix, Donald Wong.

**Visitors Present:** Steven M. Boyle (IUPUI Staff Council), Erwin Boschmann (Dean of the Faculties Office), Mark Grove (Registrar), William Spencer (Chancellor's Office), Gene Tempel (Vice Chancellor for External Affairs).

**AGENDA ITEM I - Call to Order**

**BEPKO:** Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen.

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

**BEPKO:** The Presiding Officer's Business which is listed as the second item on the agenda, after the call to order (which is now completed), we would like to defer until the question and answer period. We are having some things run off that are to be dropped off here at 3:30 and they are not here yet. So, in order to have those available at the time of the discussion, we will drop Item #2 down to Item #7 and move immediately to the Executive Committee Report which is being presented by the acting head of the Faculty Council Richard Fredland.

### **AGENDA ITEM III - Executive Committee Report - Richard Fredland**

**FREDLAND:** Thank you. I just have two brief matters. First, in compliance with University policy already underway is the review of the Chancellor of this campus, Vice President Bepko. The chairman of that committee is Jeff Vessely and if any of you have any matters to take up regarding that, you are invited to contact Jeff.

Also in the matter of review of administrators, you will recall that at the December meeting we adopted a policy on reviewing administrators. We wanted to propose for your acceptance today, and hopefully your agreement, a couple of editorial changes in that policy to make more clear what we adopted and what we intended to have in that language. I have written on the board the language. If you should happen to have in your possession the document that we adopted in December, in the middle of the first paragraph we have a sentence that talks about who is included. This language has been added to explicitly include those individuals who are associate deans of systemwide schools and who do not report to this campus but who report on other campuses. There are four such schools: Education, SPEA, Journalism, and Business. It was included in our language in December. It was our intention in December and this explicitly states it. We also have deleted at one other point in the second paragraph the term "IUPUI" and talk about reflecting the highest goals and aspirations of the academic community not simply IUPUI. We would like to propose that we accept these editorial changes as non-substantive and we were not even proposing to vote on it.

### **AGENDA ITEM IV - Election of Faculty Boards of Review - Nominating Committee**

**BEPKO:** We will move to the next agenda item which is the election of faculty boards of review. Is the Nominating Committee ready with its report?

**HOYT:** We are distributing the ballots for the faculty boards of review election. We are electing three boards and you are to elect five on each board. I would like to thank in advance all the people who are willing to put their names on the slate. We appreciate it greatly.

**BEPKO:** Dolores, while we are conducting the election, would you like to report on the number of at-large and unit representatives to be elected?

**HOYT:** The magic number "N" will be figured in the fall which means that there are 39 eligible unit representatives and a like amount of at-large representatives. The ballot for both the at-large representatives and the University Faculty Council representatives will be mailed at the end of January. I want to remind people to sign their ballots before they return them. In the first slate that we had of at-large candidates, there were 31 ballots which had to be discarded because we couldn't find anything that resembled a signature. It seemed a shame to void those but that is what the instructions said. We can't count your ballot unless you have signed either the ballot or the envelope in which they are returned.

**BEPKO:** Does that also complete the report on the number of at-large and unit representatives?

**HOYT:** Yes. There are 39 eligible unit representatives and a like number of at-large representatives to be elected.

**BEPKO:** I think we should take note that not only is that the shortest discussion of "N" that has ever taken place in this Council, but it is also the first time that we have ever talked about "N" where there have been no frivolous comments made.

**HOYT:** I want to apologize for the mixup on the at-large ballots which were sent out earlier. I know there were a lot of people confused on that. I just wanted you to know that if people sent in the forms with names on them, we transferred those names to the correct ballot and your vote was counted.

**AGENDA ITEM V - Martin Luther King, Jr. Celebration  
Eugene Tempel**

**BEPKO:** That takes us to Item V. Gene Tempel is going to give us some information about the Martin Luther King, Jr. Day celebration.

**TEMPEL:** Thank you, Jerry. I will leave these yellow sheets on the table and you can pick one up after the meeting. I wanted to remind you that Monday, January 21 is the annual campus celebration of Martin Luther King, Jr. Day. There are three events that I want to call to your attention which are being hosted on this campus.

First is the annual Chancellor's Breakfast at 7:30 a.m. All of you are invited to attend that breakfast. You should have received an invitation and with a simple RSVP to the Chancellor's Office if you can attend that. We have invited a number of campus groups as well as community groups to attend. This event is important to us because the Chancellor will again issue a statement of our commitment to Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity, and non-discrimination. Also this year he will issue a statement regarding the minority scholarships. I hope you will be able to be with us.

The students have scheduled two events -- One is from 2:30 - 4:00 p.m. when Dr. James Renick from George Mason University will conduct a symposium along with others with a panel discussion on Giving Life to a Vision. Then, the students have the 20th Annual Martin Luther King, Jr., Dinner at the Westin Hotel. Dr. Na'im Akbar, clinical psychologist from Florida State University in Tallahassee, will be with us for that. I hope you will be able to support these events and encourage others to attend the events as well.

**BEPKO:** Thanks, Gene. Are there any questions about the Martin Luther King Day Celebrations?

**ROBBINS:** Where is the learning symposium going to be held?

**TEMPEL:** It will be in the Lecture Hall, Room 101. All of that information is on the sheet which I will leave on the table.

**AGENDA ITEM VI - Question-and-Answer Period - 10 Minutes**

**BEPKO:** We will move to the Question-and-Answer Period which I would like to use for making a few comments about something which has come up within the last couple of weeks. We have distributed a letter along with a three-page enclosure from Pat Bauer, who is a state representative from South Bend and chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, to our President, Thomas Ehrlich. The letter is written in anticipation of our appropriation request presentation which is scheduled for late this month. It asks for information to be provided at that presentation. The request for information is the attachment with the letter. There are nine different points stated in this request for information.



I will highlight a couple of the things that are in this request and then focus on Item #7 for a few minutes. The first request is very routine. We don't think it has any special meaning but it could. That is, to provide fee schedules for the University.

The second asks for the number and percentage of students that are residents and non-residents. I think the purpose of that question is obvious. There has been a concern in many states about the perceived increase in non-resident students at some public universities. I don't think that at Indiana we have that difficulty because at Indianapolis we have a very small percentage of non-resident students. In Bloomington, I think the undergraduate non-resident student population is lower this year than it has been in any year for a number of years.

The third question asks about courses that are offered for which no credit hours are granted toward degree programs. We assume that this refers to remedial courses that all public universities offer and we do here at Indianapolis. Some of those remedial courses do count toward some degree programs but, in most cases, they do not. We are led to believe by things that have been said by the Commission for Higher Education in the recent past that item #3 in Pat Bauer's list of questions refers to this continuing interest in remedial education. We are not sure exactly why they are interested in this or why they related it to budget except that they could assume that, as we have heard from time to time, that if education has been paid for once in the high schools, then they shouldn't be paid for again in the universities. But, it probably is more likely that this question relates to the following question, #4.

Question #4 has to do with the time it takes to complete a baccalaureate degree. The argument that has been made in the Commission this year is that remedial courses at the beginning, plus additional requirements during the course of baccalaureate programs, have contributed to a condition in which students don't complete baccalaureate degrees any longer in four years, but it is more like five or five and one-half years before they finish. This length of time for the completion of baccalaureate degrees is of concern to the Commission and, I suppose now, because the House Ways and Means Committee has picked up these two questions, is also of interest to the legislature.

Question #5 has to do with faculty compensation, but it has to do with more than that. If you will look at the last page of this handout, you will see the form that has been provided for giving information on faculty compensation. Although, it is not an easy form to read and it is not easy to see exactly what information the Ways and Means Committee desires, we have, from discussing this with people who should know, come to the conclusion that they are not only interested in compensation but also in issues concerning the amount of faculty time that is devoted to pure instruction as opposed to research in aid of instruction. Also, there are issues generally of faculty productivity. I should mention, in connection with this item, these data that we are obliged to provide and that will be and have actually already been provided to the Commission for Higher Education, come from University records that are based on individual effort reports that are filled out by everyone of us. We have been concerned in the past, and now have had our concern heightened, that these individual effort reports are not filled out with uniform interest or with uniform vocabulary. It may be that in different units we are taking different approaches to completing these individual effort reports. In relatively short order we are going to be providing more definitive information about how we think these individual effort reports should be completed. In this way we can make sure that there is uniformity across the campus, at least, in responding to these individual effort reports. This will insure that these, compiled based on those individual reports, will be more descriptive of our actual efforts.

Item #6 has to do with the number of courses taught by teaching assistants, research assistants, or graduate students. The purpose and our response to that should be obvious.

Item #7 is the blockbuster question. Although I think it was important to go over the preliminary questions before getting to this one so that you can see the whole range of inquiries that we have been presented with. (#7 is the reason for distributing this letter.) Number seven asks, "what areas and initiatives would we recommend to absorb a two percent cut in the base budget for 1991-93." I think this a reflection of a national phenomenon. There are 28 states as of this time that are going to end this fiscal year with a deficit even though they have constitutional provisions that prohibit a deficit. We think that this is a result of two factors. First, the economy has caused state revenues to decline below projections. That is certainly true in Indiana. While personal income taxes are right on budget, corporate income and sales tax collections have fallen well below the expected targets and that has caused a significant revenue shortfall. When that revenue shortfall is projected out to the end of the year, I think it will produce about a \$100 million deficit for the state budget.

In addition, there are extra costs that are being imposed on the states by Congress. The one that is most notable is Medicaid. More Medicaid costs are being shifted to the states and the states have no alternatives but to absorb those costs. That creates an automatic increase in state expenditures without a correlated increase in revenues. That has contributed to the deficits of all of these states. In addition, there are things like court-ordered prison improvements that will cost the states and will not be again correlated with revenue increases. The result in Indiana is (some speculate) that, if spending levels are not decreased, if revenues are not increased, if revenues are simply extrapolated based on the trends that now exist, over the next two years there will be somewhere between an \$800 million and one billion dollar deficit in the state budget. That is the reason why the Ways and Means Committee has asked all state agencies, including the public universities, to think about what a two percent reduction would mean and be prepared to talk about that at the time of the budget discussions in this session in the General Assembly.

A couple of words about the response of the University at this very early stage. There has not been a lot of time to think about this, or to make further inquiries, but in the interest of alerting faculty at the earliest possible time, to the possibility that this type of budget cutting may come to pass, we thought we would present to you today what we know about the inquiry and what our position is going to be. Our first assumption is that this two percent reduction is not in our total base budget but it is in the appropriation that we receive to support our total activities. And, as you know our total budget is composed of not only appropriations from the state, but also tuition income, income to support research, and a variety of other types of income so that our general fund may consist only of 30 to 40 percent appropriation. So, the two percent reduction will come not from the total base, but from the appropriation. In addition, there has been no indication, as of now, that we will not be able to make up some of the reduced appropriation through increased tuition. Of course, in some schools, particularly at the graduate level, there has never been any question about what our tuition rates are. That has been left completely to the Trustees of Indiana University. The state legislature and Governor's office have never been particularly worried about that. I suppose that there is an extreme which would cause them to worry but we have never come close to that. However, at the undergraduate level they have taken an interest in the tuition rates and have worried that our tuition rates are too high. It depends on how you look at this as to what conclusion you will reach. We think that over the years the state has failed to provide the support that is necessary and, as a result of their failure to provide support, the percentage of the total expenditure that we make for undergraduate education, the percentage that is based on student fees, has become larger and larger. Right now it is too large and that is because the state hasn't paid enough for this education. The state looks at this and says we (the universities) have raised our tuition rates too fast and that is the reason why there has been a higher and higher percentage of the cost of education being paid for by the students. We think we are right and we will maintain that position but, nevertheless, there is this tension. To date we have not heard anything that suggests that there will not be some flexibility in setting tuition and will permit us to

recover some of the two percent that would be cut from the appropriation.

In addition, it is our preliminary reaction that there should be no dramatic changes or layoffs. If any person's job is affected because of any cuts that are made later on, every effort would be made, in fact, I am not sure we could guarantee it, but we come very close to guaranteeing that any person affected by this would be transferred to another part of the University in order to make sure that there is no personal suffering or minimum personal suffering. In addition, we are still committed to maintaining good salary increases, at least cost of living increases, for the first year of the biennium, 1991-92. So even if these cuts are made, our commitment will be to not have personal suffering and to do everything possible to make sure that the amount available for faculty and staff increases is equal to the cost of living increases that we expect.

In addition, after having talked to a number of groups about this in the last few days, including the Budgetary Affairs Committee of the Faculty Council, we are inclined to make some other preliminary conclusions. We don't think that we should make across-the-board cuts that involve a little cutting here and a little pinching there and a little squeezing somewhere else. Whatever we do should show some broadly supported priorities about expenditures within the universities and that we shouldn't give that impression, because I don't think it would be a correct one if we did give it, that we can absorb cuts of this kind without substantial pain and without substantial erosion of programs within the University. The fear we have is that if we do make some kind of uniform retrenchment and try to snip a little here and cut a little there, that we will give the impression that there was no real loss associated with this kind of a cut. It would confirm some of the views that are held in the political community that universities are fat and that they can absorb this kind of reduction without any real difficulty. That is an impression we don't want to convey because, in fact, it is not true. At IUPUI, in particular, any kind of cuts, any kind of reduction in our appropriation will cause real injury to the academic programs. When we talk about what things should be examined to offer to the House Ways and Means Committee as likely candidates for sacrifice in the event that these cuts are necessary, we should protect the core academic programs at all costs. These academic programs should remain inviolate and that includes the teaching and research mission of the University. Those should be the last things that are affected by any kind of budget reductions. The first things to review would be peripheral activities, service functions that are not central to the core academic mission of the University.

We hope that this is only a precautionary gesture at this early stage of the budget making process. Although we might note parenthetically that the budget making process is usually a little further along by this time; the state, the Governor usually would have submitted a budget by this time and there has not been one submitted yet to date. At this early moment in the budget making process we hope that this is only a gesture more in an excess of caution and that by the time the budgets are actually made there will not be a necessity for any cuts. We don't know that and we have to begin the process of thinking about these things right now and invite your comments and the participation of all faculty and all employees of the University in helping us to develop some very broadly supported consensus based decisions about the best things to sacrifice if it is necessary to make these sacrifices. In that connection, though, there will be something of importance taking place tonight and that is the Governor's State of the State message. I am sure that he will refer to budgets in this message because I think probably the state budget making for 1991 will be, if not the key issue, then certainly one of two or three key issues in front of the General Assembly. I am sure he will address it because it is so important. I would be happy to begin our question and answer session and take a couple of extra minutes beyond the ten minutes that ordinarily is allowed because included in the question and answers would be this rather gloomy news about the state's budget.

**WILSON:** Would these be considered to be the service portion of the University?

**BEPKO:** We are not yet in a position to talk about things we had in mind. I am afraid if I said some things before we were ready to even talk about them it might cause problems in the operations of those areas. I guess I can mention one that we have already talked about with the Budgetary Affairs Committee. I want to say by way of a cautionary note, before even mentioning this one area, that no decisions have been made. We are not going to do anything as of this time. We are only thinking and talking and looking for your views on what would be the best areas to consider sacrifices in. There is nothing that is decided and we are only at the most preliminary stage. But, if I were to suggest one thing that we do now by way of service that we might look at as a potential for sacrifice is the Student Health Service which is subsidized through the General Fund of the University. We have talked in the past about making that a pay-as-you-go operation. It may be that there are academic units that are served by that service, that we don't know about at this point. It may be related to essential academic activities, in which case we wouldn't be able to consider it. But that is the sort of thing that you might begin to look at in responding to the House Ways and Means Committee. We are asking, however, schools and the Budgetary Affairs Committee and others to think about this and we will have a considerable discussion, and we hope considerable development of consensus, before anything is decided.

**FREDLAND:** Within \$10.00 how much is two percent?

**BEPKO:** Two percent of appropriation is about \$2.7 million.

**ROBBINS:** What percentage of increase would it take to recover that two percent loss in the base budget?

**BEPKO:** Undergraduate fees -- I think it would be a couple of percentage points above the cost of living increase that has already been projected. So, instead of a 5.5 percent increase in undergraduate tuition would be approximately eight percent. I think that is the case but it is hard to do those calculations on the spur of the moment. However, I would add that we can't simply do that. There has to be more thought given. We can't simply say that we will pass along the total cost of this to undergraduate students in the form of a higher tuition rate. I think that we have to have soundly based academic policies, policies that are based on our academic planning and that will lead us to make whatever adjustments we make either in the programs or in the tuition rates.

**BALDWIN:** When is this form due and will we see the answers to particularly #7?

**BEPKO:** Yes. You will see the responses and there will be a good deal more discussion, we hope, with representative groups before they are submitted. We think that the President's Office is going to try to have something prepared. Whether it will be definitive or not, I don't know, but something prepared prior to the meeting of the House Ways and Means Committee on either the 29th or 30th of January. So, we have a couple of weeks time.

**SIDHU:** As far as the House Ways and Means Committee is concerned, if any faculty has to make a sacrifice, say we are expecting five percent and we recommend that they should pay only three percent, will that be announced as far as deficiencies in the budget are concerned?

**BEPKO:** I should preface my response by saying that we are not sure yet what this question means in terms of budget increases. Our assumption up until now is that, while we may reduce our appropriation by two percent, that we will still be talking about increases in the base budget for things like salaries and enrollment adjustments to provide us the formula funding for the increases in enrollments during this biennium, for plant expansion to pay for the heat and light in new buildings, and for fee replacement to help us pay the bond holders on the bonds that pay for the new buildings. If that is true, then there will be some, we hope, funding for salary increases. I

don't know how much that will be. Our initial reaction is that we should do everything possible to continue our progress in elevating faculty and staff salaries, that the most important thing we do is performed by the faculty and staff. If we allow a year to go by when we are given lower than cost of living increases or no increases we will even further damage the conditions that we operate in. Because the faculty and staff are the most important ingredients of the University we simply have to continue to do everything humanly possible to raise salaries. In other words, I don't think it would be a good idea at this time to say, "Well, if we have to cut two percent, then we will just cut salary increases or even reduce salaries." I don't think that is an acceptable alternative at this time.

**MCDONALD:** Is the fringe benefits package touchable or not?

**BEPKO:** That is an interesting question. The Trustees, of course, feel very strongly about the retirement program. It is the most valuable and possibly available fringe benefit program. I am reluctant to say any more except that we have had informal discussions. (This doesn't involve the University administration. It is just talking about these things with Dick Peterson and others on campus) that we should look at our total fringe benefits package in thinking about new fringe benefits that we would like to have. It is absolutely clear that we have a desperate need for additional child care. It is also clear that there is a strong need for a family leave program. There may be some disagreements in some schools about that but broadly among faculty members I think there is the view that we need to have a family leave program of some kind. We also have some issues that are on the bottom of the agenda page that are continuing which will cost something. To address this we have talked about the idea of saying that total fringe benefits are high enough now. (There is something like \$.32 or \$.33 per dollar) and that we should stop there. If we create new fringe benefits, we should reallocate among the existing fringe benefits. The first and most obvious place that you look is our retirement program because what we have right now, in my personal view, is an extremely well-funded retirement program. For those of us who started before January 1, 1989, we are getting 14.7 percent or 14.8 percent of our annual salary paid into TIAA/CREF. A very very good retirement program. So good that those of us who have 18/20 benefits, if we have been at the University for any length of time, are retiring at or very near full salary which is a very good retirement benefit. When coupled with social security, it becomes extremely good. While we have that very very good benefit in one area, we have starvation in other fringe benefit areas. It would take very little to extend that line of reasoning and say, while we have this very good benefit in one area, we have starvation in other academic areas. But, I would personally be reluctant to take that second step. I would be willing to say we should talk about how good our retirement program is when we are talking about what other fringe benefits we may want to fund. I would be very reluctant to say we ought to take money out of our retirement program to balance the state's budget, in general.

**COONEY:** Has any consideration been given to offering a flexible benefit package something like a smorgasbord?

**BEPKO:** There has been thought given to that but it is something that takes a long time to sort out. There are some problems with that. There is adverse selection involved. That is, in some plans it has been more costly because people who want certain types of benefits are those who are the highest risks for that kind of benefit. It costs more to insure for that kind of plan. Some institutions have done it successfully but to date we have not moved forward on that. The only reason I mentioned what I did about our own informal conversations was to address Dana's question about our retirement benefits. I think that the issue of a smorgasbord plan is something that probably ought to be for another day. We are praying for good news from somewhere but in the last few days we haven't had any.

**KARLSON:** I want to address a different topic. This year the Law School was once again required to send its bulletin to Bloomington for publication. It was sent in more than adequate time. It got back more than late -- not until the middle of October. This has severely hurt our recruiting capabilities, particularly since we had already planned to end our recruiting March 1 as opposed to a later date that we had used previously and that was in the bulletin. I would like to make two inquiries. First, is the Law School unique in this requirement? Secondly, if the Law School is not unique in this requirement, have other schools on this campus also met this inefficiency in Bloomington in their recruiting activities and the damage to their recruiting? Third, why do we have to send it to Bloomington to begin with?

**BEPKO:** Those are good questions. Gene Tempel won't like me for asking him to add to my response on this. I will give him a moment to collect his thoughts. I don't think that this is the first time that has happened, Henry. It is something that deserves attention. The Law School, in particular, and I know this firsthand, has had that kind of problem in other years. I think that it is true that quite a number, in fact all of the bulletins do go to Bloomington for publication. That is in keeping with a policy that has been in existence for as long as anyone knows. There is one office that reviews all bulletins from a legal standpoint and from an overall university standpoint. So, every bulletin goes to Bloomington. With respect to the timing as to whether others have had that problem, I think we should know about that because I know it has been a problem on occasion here for the Law School. If it is a problem for more than just the Law School, I think we ought to raise this, especially if it interferes with student recruitment. Gene, can you add to that?

**TEMPEL:** As far as I know, the bulletins are the only documents from the campus required to go to Bloomington for printing. Our office would certainly be interested in negotiating on that point with Bloomington. I think Bill Plater would be very interested in seeing that production done up here instead of in Bloomington. The money to support your bulletins is in a budget down there but we supply money from the campus to add to that. So, we can negotiate on that point. This is the first time I have heard that bulletins are coming back late. If bulletins are coming back late, we ought to know about that. We will certainly take up the issue with the Publications Office in Bloomington. We probably can negotiate immediately to get involved in the process to make sure we are keeping on schedule.

**KARLSON:** I would point out that we received our bulletin in mid October which is very very late to start addressing them and sending them out. We were severely behind other law schools because of this. This has hurt our recruitment.

**BEPKO:** Paul Galanti used to manage this process.

**GALANTI:** Yes. Matter of fact, I used to write the Law School bulletin by myself. The problem that I recall was that the Publications Office in Bloomington would have a publication schedule. The bulletin was supposed to be there on such and such a date. If it missed that date, it threw off their entire production schedule. I am not quite sure why. So, therefore, it got put back on the bottom on the pile. So, this is an area where I thought that there could be improvement. I don't see why if something comes in a day late from the Law School why the Nursing School bulletin would be substituted for the Law School's bulletin and then the Law School would slot in after the Nursing School. I thought they were inflexible in handling their production schedules. This might be an area where, through reasonable conversation and instruction, this could be improved.

**BEPKO:** I think we should look into the issue of timing of publications. We will do that and report back.

**TEMPEL:** If other schools have had a problem with this, let us know and we will take the whole set of problems there at one time.

**BEPKO:** The issue has been made more complicated by the fact that the budget for the bulletins is a Bloomington budget. If the budget was up here, we might have been able to short circuit the process. I think they would be happy to say, "Okay, you can print them yourselves." But, then you would have to find money to do it. There is about \$75,000 in that budget, isn't there Gene?

**TEMPEL:** There is more than that.

**BEPKO:** I think that is a good point to look into. Incidentally, the printing may not be the area that is most responsible for the requirement. My recollection is, when I worked with it some years ago, is that the reason for sending them to Bloomington was there had to be one coordinated point to review all bulletin material. They read everything. It has to be consistent with the University's policies in every area, and they also have to look at it from the legal standpoint because the bulletin is, to some extent, the contract between the University and students. That may take some time even if we were to print our own bulletins here.

**KARLSON:** My understanding is that at least this year it was sent in well within the time limits for publication and yet, due to total gross inefficiency, we didn't get it back.

**BEPKO:** We will quote you, Henry, when we discuss that.

**KARLSON:** I would like to know who is accountable for it. The marvelous thing about a bureaucracy is that you are allowed to be inefficient and that is because you are not identified. I think the person who delayed us for this period should be identified.

**BEPKO:** Gene, remember that. Total and gross inefficiency and we want to know who is accountable.

**CUTSHALL:** It was my understanding that originally the groundbreaking ceremonies for SET III was supposed to be in January, but I now understand that it has been postponed until February. Would you care to comment on why that has been postponed?

**TEMPEL:** I am not on the committee. We tried to do is set the groundbreaking date as near as possible to the date the activity would take place. Originally, we were told the contract might be let in December and activities start right after the first of January. So, we were prepared to go with an early January groundbreaking date. It now looks as if it will be the end of February or the first of March before they start. We are very conscientious to set the groundbreaking very near the start of construction because we dug a hole in the ground for SET II and it was there for a long time. Legislators began asking us why it was so important to have funding so quickly if we weren't going to go ahead with construction. So, we were concerned not to do anything until we were sure the construction would begin. The February, date seems to be more nearly in line with the start of construction.

**BEPKO:** The weather might be better in February too.

**WAGNER:** I wonder when we are going to have groundbreaking for the traffic signals?

**BEPKO:** There already has been groundbreaking as I understand it. The foundations are there and we are only waiting for the lightposts themselves. We drove past there yesterday and saw students running in front of cars. Bob Martin, who is Vice Chancellor for Administrative Affairs,

was in the car and I said to him, "Bob, where are those lights?" He said, "I just talked to the city and they said that the foundations are in and the posts are in the mail." So, I said, "Call the city and tell them that you were driving down Michigan with Bepko, Plater, Tempel and others in the car and a student ran in front of our car. We almost hit him. All of the administrators in the campus administration blew their tops and started screaming about the city's liability and responsibilities and instructed him to call immediately and ask them when they are going to be in." I haven't seen him since yesterday. He may still be on the phone on hold.

**WAGNER:** Where do they get the electricity for those lights?

**BEPKO:** I think that is already installed. Nothing would surprise me anymore.

**VESSELY:** You can call them back today and tell them that a student did get hit yesterday on Michigan just east of Mary Cable Building. It happened about 1:00 yesterday. I called and no one had any followup information. We asked Chief Mulvey to check on it. I have not heard anything since then.

**BEPKO:** We didn't hear about it at all. Was it a serious accident?

**VESSELY:** It was a backlog of traffic. The question came up at our parking meeting yesterday and someone stated that someone had been hit.

**BEPKO:** We will call Bob Martin and have him call again tomorrow with that new bit of information. Henry's comment about bureaucracy is as applicable to the city in this case. I would like to comment briefly on the carryover items some of which I mentioned already.

On the TIAA/CREF for summer employees, we are prepared to implement it on the campus but this, as we have explained from the very beginning, is something that is considered a fringe benefit. The policy of the University is to have those fringe benefits allocated on a systemwide basis. This issue, although voted upon in the IUPUI Faculty Council and the Bloomington Faculty Council, still is in the University Faculty Council Fringe Benefits Committee. The University Faculty Council will have to recommend it before it will be recommended to the Trustees.

**ALIPRANTIS:** The IUPUI Fringe Benefits Committee had a meeting about a week ago. As far as we know the Board of Trustees did not make any decision on this matter.

**BEPKO:** At any rate, I wanted to describe where this was in terms of the decision making process. It is in the University Faculty Council right now with the additional comments that Roko made. Roko, maybe I could talk to you after the meeting for a minute about that.

The Family Leave Policy is still under study based on the difficulty of determining costs -- costs in the units that have clinical faculty, who work in their regular teaching responsibilities 40-or-45 hour work week and could not be replaced by the part-time or graduate assistant faculty that were envisioned in the family leave policy. Also, there is the issue of determining the cost of staff family leave benefits.

Also, there is the faculty salary letter matter. I don't think there is a problem here. We are having some continuing discussions about how best to manage this arrangement, keeping in mind our purpose is to give the earliest notification to every faculty member of what salary increases are being recommended and to make it the most personal and direct kind of communication possible. By the end of the year, we will have a system for coordinating campus administration with the schools that will achieve that objective.



The Early Retirement policies which were presented here in November are now pending in the University Faculty Council. I think the Trustees were inclined to look at this at their February retreat meeting in Bloomington but the University Faculty Council meeting will not take place in time for the UFC to have its recommendation to the Trustees by its February meeting. So, I suppose this will be held over until April. I think that the reaction so far has been uniformly favorable to the early retirement proposals based on the commitment that the Trustees made at the time of the changes in the 18/20 policy that there would, in fact, be an early retirement program. Are there any other questions or comments?

HOYT: I would like to give you the election results.

Faculty Board of Review #1

James Baldwin  
Monte Juillerat  
Gerald Powers  
Gerald Preusz  
Susan Zunt

Faculty Board of Review #2

Jacqueline Blackwell  
Carol Deets  
Miriam Langsam  
Richard Pflanze  
Kathryn Wilson

Faculty Board of Review #3

Arthur Brill  
Lisa Ikemoto  
Juanita Keck  
Neal Rothman  
Rosalie Vermette

I would like to have permission to destroy the ballots.

**BEPKO:** Is there a motion? [So moved and seconded] All in favor, say "Aye."

The motion carries. The ballots will be destroyed. If there is no other business, I would like to mention one thing in closing. I would like to introduce a new member of the Faculty Council. The newly-appointed interim dean of the School of Nursing is Angela McBride. Angela is an outstanding nursing educator and scholar. She has not only established a formidable position for herself in the world of nursing education but as a researcher. She has also served as president of Sigma Theta Tau the international honor society for nursing -- the Phi Beta Kappa of Nursing. She has held several administrative positions and has shown great skills in those positions, most recently as Executive Associate dean for research in the School. She has also shown in the short time that she has been interim dean that she has an equally strong aptitude for and an ability to be the dean of the School of Nursing. We are pleased to welcome Angela to her first Faculty Council meeting as interim dean.

**AGENDA ITEM VIII - Adjournment**

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

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

**Members Present:** Administrative: Chancellor Gerald L. Bepko, Dean William Plater. Deans: John Barlow, Barbara Fischler, P Nicholas Kellum, Sheldon Siegel, William Voos. Faculty: C D Aliprantis, Darrell Bailey, James Baldwin, Patricia Blake, Walter Buchanan, Varoujan Chalian, Elaine Cooney, William Crabtree, Theodore Cutshall, Ronald Dehnke, William Engle, Naomi Fineberg, Paul Galanti, Michael Gleeson, Jean Gnat, Dean Hawley, Dolores Hoyt, Norman Hudson, Jerome Kaplan, Henry Karlson, Jerome Kaplan, Linda Kasper, Juanita Keck, Michael Kubek, Richard Lawlor, Dana McDonald, Patrick McGeever, Lynda Means, Richard Meiss, B Keith Moore, Jerold Paar, Catherine Palmer, John Pless, John Rafert, Edward Robbins, Carl Rothe, Neal Rothman, Phyllis Scherle, Lee Schwecke, Scott Shapiro, P Kent Sharp, Aristotle Siakotos, Hitwant Sidhu, Donald Tharp, Jay Tischfield, Ann Tomey, Vernon Vix, Kathleen Warfel, Kathryn Wilson, Charles Yokomoto, Susan Zunt. Ex Officio Members: Henry Besch, Richard Fredland, Maxine Tutterrow, Jeffery Vessely.

**Alternates Present:** Deans: Shirley Ross for Angela McBride, James E. Carter for Walter Daly, Hugh Wolf for Donald Warren. Faculty: Janet Chorpensing for Florence Juillerat.

**Members Absent:** Administrative: J. Herman Blake. Deans: A. James Brown, Trevor Brown, H. William Gilmore, Norman Lefstein, R Bruce Renda, David Stocum, James Weigand, Jack Wentworth. Faculty: Jonas Bjork, David Bodenhamer, H Glenn Bohlen, Francis Brahmi, Thomas Broadie, Dewey Conces, Dornith Doherty, Ann Dunipace, Andrew Evan, Martin Farlow, Janice Froehlich, Philip Gibbs, Richard Hamburger, Richard Kovacs, Bruce Long, Chris Miller, Richard Meiss, Bernard Morrel, Robert Pascuzzi, Sherry Queener, Bruce Roth, Michael Ryan, Thomas Ryan, Edmund Schilling, Jan Shipps, Gregory Sutton, Marion Wagner, Donald Wong.

**Visitors:** Margaret Mitchell, Norris L. Richmond (Dental School), John Morgan (IUPUI Staff Council), Erwin Boschmann (Faculty Development), Eugene Tempel (External Affairs), William Spencer (Vice President's Office), Wendell McBurney (Research and Sponsored Programs), Mark Grove (Registrar).

#### **AGENDA ITEM I - Call to Order**

**BEPKO:** The first order of business is the approval of the December 6 minutes of the Faculty Council which have been distributed. Do we have a motion?

**UNKNOWN:** I move for approval of the minutes.

**BEPKO:** Does anyone want to second that? [It was seconded] All in favor, say "Aye." Are there any opposed? [None] It carries. The minutes are approved.

I would like to propose a change in the agenda and the order of taking up matters that are on our agenda. I would like to move the Presiding Officer's Business to the Question-and-Answer Period. We have some persons whose schedules would be accommodated by that change. In particular, the person who is going to talk about the TIAA/CREF Options that are available has a plane to catch so that his report will be part of the Executive Committee Report. We would like to move to that Executive Committee Report and unless there are any objections we will assume that we take it by consent that we are going to change the order of the agenda and move to the Executive

Committee Report.

#### **AGENDA ITEM IV - Executive Committee Report - Richard Peterson, Secretary**

**PETERSON:** I have two items on the Executive Committee Report. The first one is a presentation by Margaret Mitchell, whom I am sure you all know; she is backed up by Steve Miller who is our new University Treasurer. You might want to introduce Steve and have him stand just so we can get to know him, if you have not met him up to this point. He works in Bloomington as well as all eight campuses.

Margaret Mitchell is going to present to you some information from the task force that has been considering some alternative CREF options that might be available very shortly to us. This committee is in the process of finalizing a report. We wanted to give you an update on this. She will bring you up-to-date on this item. Thank you.

**MITCHELL:** Thanks Dick. I think all of you know that in the early part of this academic year John Hackett appointed a University wide Task Force to discuss the CREF options. I will back up a little bit sooner than that. In March, 1990, TIAA/CREF, the University's carrier for our defined contribution plan for our faculty and professional staff, gave the University some opportunities for two types of programs that fit within our College Retirement Equity Fund -- CREF. That was opportunities to transfer to or for participants to contribute to either the Social Choice or Bond Fund CREF made available. The University made the decision to allow those two types of choices for our participants.

The other piece was in terms of cashability and transferability for CREF, not TIAA, not the portion that you put in your TIAA, but only the portion that you put into your CREF, college retirement equity fund. Those options are University decisions. Each university has the option of either accepting cashability or transferability or not accepting it. John Hackett, in the early part of this academic year, put together a task force to make some recommendations to the administration regarding that. Transferability dealt with allowing you, as participants, having the opportunity to move your defined contributions in your retirement plan from CREF to other types of vendors that are a lot more risky. Probably, if you are lucky, you have chances for better returns on your investment. Cashability, was defined as some type of cashout, either at the time of termination from Indiana University or upon retirement, not to be prior to the age of 55. The committee spent the majority of the past semester trying to make recommendations regarding these two options. The committee, at times, appeared to be very large and cumbersome only because on most occasions we only had half of the committee attending. The committee was made up of faculty members and professional staff members from different campuses. A good many of the people who were on the committee were part of IUPUI, and there were others from the South Bend, Kokomo and Bloomington campuses.

Representing the University Faculty Council Fringe Benefits Committee was Chris Lohmann who will be presenting recommendations to the Fringe Benefits Committee. The assumption of the Fringe Benefits Committee is going to present their recommendations. I am saying all of this right now that nothing is finalized. There is nothing going to be announced about what the University is planning on doing. We are still in the recommendation stages. The two pieces that the committee has recommended are, first, in terms of transferability that the University recognized (this is the committee recommendation) that CREF contribution plan is in fact a retirement plan for its participants. They made the decision to recommend that only between four and five vendors, in terms of transferability, will be given as options. The decision in terms of who those vendors will be and the criteria for making the decision regarding those vendors has not been made.

The other piece was cashability. Again, recognizing that TIAA/CREF, our defined contribution plan itself was a retirement plan for participants, the committee recommended that only a certain portion of CREF monies that have been contributed in your name would be available for cashout at or after the age of 55 upon termination from Indiana University or upon retirement. One question is: Is the 50 percent available one time only? Or, can you get a total of number of withdrawals? None of those operational types of issues have been addressed right now. We still have work to do in order to deal with those. The only thing that I can really and truly say to you is that the committee, as well as the University, is committed to having your input. We don't want to surprise you with, "This is what we have decided and let's move on from there." We are interested in finding out what all of you are interested in doing. I am here to also let you know that, in terms of the process, the University Faculty Council will be reviewing the recommendations of the task force with each of the University Fringe Benefits representatives. The function ends with the University Fringe Benefits representatives, which is Dr. Aliprantis here at IUPUI who will be working with his committee on the University campus Fringe Benefits Committee. They will be letting all of you know what they are doing. On each of the campuses the same thing will hold true. So, we are going to get the feedback that we need in order to make the decision. We are committed to making sure that we do hear from all of you. I am also here to see if I can answer any questions.

One of the other things that I do want to point out is that we have asked TIAA/CREF representatives to come to each of the campuses and let you see just what TIAA/CREF has to offer as to the types of variable programs that they have in terms of CREF options. Many of the people on the committee were not familiar with those. They didn't know that there were many ways of cashing out, not in lump sums, but in increments over certain periods of time, the amounts of money that has been contributed to TIAA/CREF after you have retired from the University. We have scheduled this for early spring. Probably early in April or May, someone will come to this campus to discuss with groups, as well as with people individually and to counsel them regarding their TIAA/CREF options. Does anyone have any specific questions? I might not have answers but I certainly will take them back and get back to Professor Peterson with some answers.

**TISCHFIELD:** I would like to pose the question in a slightly different way. Over the years, what benefit has accrued to the University by having TIAA/CREF as a sole carrier?

**MITCHELL:** None whatsoever. Historically, the University had the Carnegie Foundation for its retirement plan. TIAA grew out of the Carnegie Foundation. One of our leading faculty members from the School of Business was at one time president of TIAA/CREF, Indiana University does have a relationship with TIAA/CREF. It doesn't get anything out of it. It has been viewed for many years as being one of the finest vehicles for faculty retirement programs.

**TISCHFIELD:** That wasn't meant to be a comment on the suitability or quality of TIAA/CREF. It occurs to me that with any vendor for our plan do not certain benefits accrue. What then is the benefit by having a larger plan versus having the power of investing capital as they wish? And, I was just wondering what the University, in choosing one vendor, got out of it, and the answer was nothing.

**MITCHELL:** Absolutely nothing. The assumptions are that the participants are beneficiaries. The University doesn't get anything out of it.

**PETERSON:** I have also asked Roko Aliprantis, as the chair of our Fringe Benefits Committee, to look at this committee and provide us with comments and other things. I would like to call on him so that he can get on the floor as early as possible.

**ALIPRANTIS:** The IUPUI Fringe Benefits Committee met and discussed the CREF Option Com-

mittee's report on the transferability and cashability options. After a long discussion, our Committee approved, in principle, the recommendations of the CREF Option Committee and passed a resolution that is presented to the IUPUI Faculty Council for approval. This resolution inserts a paragraph in the CREF Options Committee's recommendation. The proposed resolution is being distributed right now for your consideration.

#### RECOMMENDATION OF CREF OPTIONS COMMITTEE

##### Transferability Option

The University should select a number (five or less) of alternative vendors to TIAA/CREF. Thus, the TIAA/CREF Retirement Plan would become the "Indiana University Retirement Plan." Each vendor would be able to receive contributions directly from the University of transfers from any of the other vendors, at the direction of the participant.

##### [PROPOSED AMENDMENT FROM IUPUI FRINGE BENEFITS COMMITTEE]

The foregoing language does not preclude the University from agreeing to implement additional or different transferability alternatives proposed by individual faculty members that could demonstrably advance their individual retirement objectives.

Participants will be solely responsible for their decisions regarding fund selection and performance.

##### Cashability Option

Participants who have reached their fifty-fifth (55) birthday, and who have terminated employment with Indiana University, may elect to receive up to one-half (50%) of their CREF accumulation in cash, in lieu of monthly income. (This option shall also be available to any alternative vendor to CREF.) No restrictions will be placed on any funds so removed from the Plan. No in-service (to active employees) distributions will be available.

The participant (and spouse) shall be required to sign a "hold-harmless" agreement stating that the University is not responsible for any misuse or poor judgment of the funds removed from the retirement plan.

The IUPUI Fringe Benefits Committee points out that the details of the implementation of this proposal must be worked out before any such a program takes place. Several important questions need clarification.

1. Can an employee direct funds to more than one vendor? Or, is the employee limited to only one vendor?
2. Does the cashability option have to be decided at the point of retirement? Can an employee begin retirement with an annuity and later request a cash option?
3. Is it a correct assumption that the cashability option can be exercised only one time per individual?

**MITCHELL:** This was the intent of the committee. It was 50 percent of a certain amount of money. It is not 50 percent of what you have today. Okay, I am 55 and I was leaving IU and I was asking for 50 percent of the CREF today and the 50 percent that was left would accrue but then at another time I could not request another 50 percent of that.

**ALIPRANTIS:** How would you start the annuity? Can one get 50 percent of what is left of an annuity already started?

**MITCHELL:** That question I don't have the answer to.

**ALIPRANTIS:** This and several other points need clarification.

**MITCHELL:** What I would hope we could do is that when Chris Lohmann talks with you, you will then bring up those issues. TIAA/CREF representatives are not going to make decisions for us but they certainly can clarify some of the basic concepts behind the intent of opening up the options.

**ALIPRANTIS:** The resolution coming from our Fringe Benefits Committee urges the adoption of the recommendation of the task force with this friendly amendment together with several recommendations which I understand will be discussed during the implementation process.

**MITCHELL:** We will take those back to the task force.

**ALIPRANTIS:** The friendly amendment would provide one more vendor in the following sense. If someone comes from industry with the feeling that his/her pension plan is better than our plan, that person should have the option of transferring the new money into his/her original pension plan. That is the intention of this amendment.

**MITCHELL:** I understand. Again, I am not making any commitment that we are going to do this.

**ALIPRANTIS:** This is what we would like. We have passed it out to the members of the Faculty Council for discussion.

**PETERSON:** We do have a motion on the floor with a vote to basically approve of this with an friendly amendment. Before further discussion, I think I would like to entertain a second to that motion.

**ALIPRANTIS:** It is coming from a committee and doesn't need a second.

**PETERSON:** That is right. Go ahead with additional discussion.

**UNKNOWN:** This is a comment on the report as a whole. The spirit of the report and the statement of the Plan section appears to be very much opposed to the spirit of the two other options on the second page. It doesn't look like a very consistent report.

**MITCHELL:** The philosophy of the report is what the committee agreed on and the recommendations are also what the committee agreed on.

**COMMENT:** They still are inconsistent. The first page seems to be very conservative and the second page says, "here are five options in one case and another option" which are not really consistent with page one.

**MITCHELL:** If you saw where it came from in the beginning, in terms of 100 percent cashability and the sky is the limit on the number of vendors. They made recommendations to limit to four or five vendors.

**ROTHER:** On the cashability policy option, if you retire, is that included?

**MITCHELL:** I don't understand.

**ROTHERS:** If you are 55 years of age and if you retire from IU...

**MITCHELL:** At age 55?

**ROTHERS:** Or more. Why isn't that in there?

**MITCHELL:** Retirement to you and what the committee meant by retirement are two different things. If we talk about retirement in terms of TIAA/CREF, we would have been talking about getting an annuity. Is that what you are talking about? Or retiring from Indiana University? You would not have to begin your annuity.

**UNKNOWN:** What if you were ready to begin your annuity but you wanted to take half of it in cash and the rest of it in annuities? Could you do that?

**MITCHELL:** Yes, the committee's recommendation was prior to beginning your annuity you could request 50 percent cashout.

**UNKNOWN:** Retirement is considered termination. I think we all look at the word "termination" and think that it is quitting to go someplace else. I am saying that it also means in terms of retirement.

**MITCHELL:** You can't first begin your annuity and then go back in and request your cashout. Does that deal with what your issue is?

**ROTHERS:** Basically. My concern is that there is a lot of loose ends in this major committee report. The other is the transferability, is that connected to TIAA?

**MITCHELL:** No.

**ROTHERS:** Then why does it have in that second line "TIAA"?

**MITCHELL:** The truth of the matter is, within the next couple of months, the committee expects TIAA is going to present those kinds of options in an entirely different way. Say you have \$100,000 in TIAA/CREF with \$80,000 in TIAA and \$20,000 in CREF. You can take, basically, all of the money in your CREF because all the money that you have in TIAA and CREF will be added in terms of a determination of how much money you can take out of CREF. You can't, at this point, transfer money from TIAA into CREF. You can't do that.

**ROTHERS:** Then why have that statement?

**MITCHELL:** Because in terms of the calculation of the amount of money that you can cashout of CREF, the calculations will be based on the total amount of money that you have both in TIAA and CREF. That is why it is there. Again I say, these are recommendations that will be given to the Vice President for Finance and Administration. The operational piece, which could be pages long, to discuss how this is going to happen hasn't been developed yet. All that you have right now is the piece that was voted on in November by the committee.

**ROTHERS:** It seems to me that if we have the option of taking a major part of our retirement funds that the University put in for retirement and if you have not given us criteria for what these other vendors are, this means that the vast majority of that money can go into one of these and be very



risky,

**MITCHELL:** As I said before, we have to determine the criteria for the vendors. We have yet to decide to send money directly to the other vendors, or having it accrue, first in TIAA and then having the participants transfer it to another vendor. We have a long way to go. What we want to find out from people like you is, do you want this? Is this in the spirit of what TIAA last year gave us the option to do?

**ROBBINS:** I make the observation which I think is somewhat contrary to the report that you have been making that the document, by and large, is very paternalistic. It takes the view that, particularly under the cashability option, all of your funds are in TIAA and half of it is CREF is going to be annuitized which means that it has that kind of built in protection that someone else has assumed for us that that amount of money will be available for retirement and that is only half of the CREF that we, as faculty members are otherwise able to manage ourselves and not put ourselves too much at risk. I would suggest that there ought to be more competence in the individual's knowledge of this plan to make the best judgments in their own behalf.

**MITCHELL:** The committee was made up of faculty members exactly how you described from the very beginning. Then they moved themselves to the point of almost going to complete opposite of being paternalistic.

**ROBBINS:** My argument is to try to persuade them to be less paternalistic and to take a look at the most flexible view that the present option permits, which is complete cashability. Even if we were to assume that we need someone to watch after us and protect most of what we do with our retirement investment, I want to make it clear that I don't buy that assumption, but even if we did it, one of the problems with this is that it fails to take in assumptions and facts that only the individual could know about. For example, other kinds of income at retirement, things about an estate plan, a variety of factors that could, in effect, turn out to be the last thing that even the most paternalistic agency or individual would want from the faculty member. I think that the alternative of putting faith in the faculty member to make the best choice, given all of the factors that are available to them, is the one that we ought to support. So, my argument is that we ought to adopt the position that permits maximum utility of the options that are now available to us in the CREF system which were not there before in terms of both transferability and cashability.

**UNKNOWN:** The "hold-harmless" agreement which is listed under cashability, does that also refer to funds that have been transferred to the University approved vendor?

**MITCHELL:** Yes. Again, I say it doesn't say that but what we are trying to deal with is concepts first and then operationalizing. I guess you are not quite comfortable with our procedures. What I brought to you today was a packet of information that talks about how we are going to operationalize concepts that you may not have even brought into this.

**UNKNOWN:** I was just merely asking for a point of clarification.

**MITCHELL:** The truth of the matter is right now I can't clarify...

**UNKNOWN:** I was just wondering what the words here mean. If the University approves XYZ Company as a vendor and an employee elects to transfer to XYZ approved company, the University is now held harmless from XYZ Company turning out to having invested everything in Kuwaiti oil wells?

**MILLER:** I think the spirit of that "hold-harmless" is, if that retirement, you decide you want to

take 50 percent of your cash and you want to take it and invest it anything else and suppose you buy 100,000 lottery tickets with it, what we are saying is you can't come back to the University a year later and say, "Gee! I blew all of my money. What else have you got for me?" That is not to be confused with, aside from CREF that you move your money to, within the retirement plan, that is a different story. We are talking about if you take cash out of the plan when you retire and then it is your responsibility and we are not responsible for what you do with it. Is that right, Margaret?

**MITCHELL:** Yes.

**PETERSON:** I would like to have a point of order. I think we could sit here and discuss this item a lot more and I know you have a lot of questions on this. I would like to allow you that opportunity, unfortunately, we do have other items on our schedule which are extremely important including the budget crisis which we are up against this year. I would like to, at this point, try to close the discussion and see if you want to go ahead and discuss this further at a later time. We will have other options, according to Margaret Mitchell, to discuss this and deal with it. We can vote on the principle if you like at this time, we can go ahead and table the motion if we have such a motion that comes before us at this point or whatever your pleasure is.

**FREDLAND:** I am not exactly clear what we are voting on for what body and representing whom. Is this the campus speaking to faculty of this campus speaking to the administration appointed CREF options committee? Who is speaking to whom in this vote?

**BEPKO:** The motion was made by the Fringe Benefits Committee of this Council so I think what the vote would be is a vote on the motion made by the Fringe Benefits Committee. We will have to ask Roko to restate the motion.

**ALIPRANTIS:** We would like to have some clarifications plus we would like to vote on this. Our people thought this was a good amendment.

**BEPKO:** Margaret, you didn't bring this here asking for a vote, did you?

**MITCHELL:** No.

**ALIPRANTIS:** We basically agree but we would like to see more.

**ROTHE:** It seems to me, in that case, this vote is out of order. There is nothing to amend.

**PETERSON:** The committee made the motion as a result of looking over the document as I provided to them earlier. The committee has an independent ability to make motions to bring before this Council, but we are not ready to approve of anything officially because an official document hasn't really been provided to us. This is a committee report and we are bringing this to you for information purposes to know where this is so this wouldn't come up some three months from now as a policy and then you wouldn't have had any information on it whatsoever.

**BEPKO:** Would it be fair to conclude this in the following way? That, if you have comments to make this document clearer or to change it in some way in terms of its basic policy, those comments should be directed to Margaret Mitchell or Steve Miller. That this document will not be adopted by the University until it has been brought back to this body again which will give the Fringe Benefits Committee an opportunity to make its motion at a time when the document and the policy proposal is mature.

**PETERSON:** We have a motion on the floor.

**BEPKO:** There has been a motion to table.

**PETERSON:** There has been a motion to table this. Is there a second on the motion? [seconded] All in favor of that motion, say "Aye." Opposed? We will table the motion for now and hope for additional discussion on this item as this policy is further refined and brought back and brought back to us.

**ALIPRANTIS:** Everybody should read this. It is a very important item for all of us. All of us want something different. I ask all of you to let me know your feelings on this.

**PETERSON:** The next item on the Executive Committee Report is an item that I have taken on myself to allow Jerome Kaplan a couple of minutes to make an announcement about a potential service opportunity that you may want to be involved in. We will give him a couple of minutes to do this and minimize any discussion on this item.

**KAPLAN:** I believe we have the opportunity of starting a college level program at the medium security prison at Plainfield, called the Youth Center (males ages 20-30, current population 861 - to be shortly increased by 600.) The education program at the Youth Center presently only goes up to the High School level. Any college level courses must be taken by correspondence. This is in contrast to the four-year college program run by Ball State at the Pendelton prison.

I have been volunteer teaching, mostly physics and math, at the Youth Center for six months. The course structure has been informal and with no credit given to the participants. Recently, I have been told that I will have private funding to start a college program. Because of crowded teaching facilities and fund restraints we will initiate the program with one college level course and clearly it won't be physics. Given one course, what should it be? Here is where I need your suggestions. I will also ask for course suggestions from the inmates. The inmates will also be involved in defining the program objectives in our funding request. The start date for the program is next Fall. Once the "course" is decided upon I will need a very good and dedicated teacher who will be paid.

Please call 274-6902 or write to me at KB 141 if you have any thoughts or suggestions. This is just a beginning and I hope in time to have a much enlarged program. If anyone has any questions, I will be glad to answer them.

**PETERSON:** Thank you for that announcement, Jerry. It seems like a reasonable public service opportunity which I felt this worthy of a few minutes of your time. If you have any comments, please contact Jerry.

#### **AGENDA ITEM V - Library Report - James G. Neal, Dean of University Library**

**BEPKO:** We have next on the agenda a library report by the Dean of Indiana University Libraries, Jim Neal. He has an extraordinarily good sense of timing because he just walked in the room. If his presentation is as good as his sense of timing, this is going to be thrilling. Jim, we are happy to have you here. Thank you for coming.

**NEAL:** Let me just pass this document out. Thank you, Jerry. I welcome this opportunity to speak with the IUPUI Faculty Council about a very important issue that we are facing in the Indiana University libraries as well as among the research libraries of North America. We are facing some unprecedented challenges in our ability to develop collections in support of our students and our faculty. We have a goal of providing comprehensive access to research information but the growth, the proliferation, if you will, in the amount of information that is available and the costs of that information are making it very difficult for us to achieve our goals and, therefore, to support

the needs of the faculty and students at Indiana University.

The sheet that is being passed out to you [see IUPUI document 91-01 attached] is a summary of some ideas, some facts and some strategies about the current situation that we face. What I thought we might do here this afternoon is just walk through some of these ideas to try to characterize it within the Indiana University context. Then, to talk on the back of the page about some strategies we are looking at here at this University as well as among the major research libraries in the country.

As Dean of University Libraries, I work very closely with all of the library directors across the IU system. The library directors on this campus, Sara Hook-Shelton, Jim Bailey, Barbara Fischler, and Dana McDonald, and I, have talked about this issue as critical to our ability to support the research and teaching needs of the faculty at IUPUI. It is ironic, in this electronic age, that as we look at the production of print information when we have the expectations that gradually there be a transformation from the print to the electronic formats, we continue to see a massive increase on an annual basis in the production of published information, currently, at a five to eight percent rate internationally. This is extraordinary. It is coming at the same time that we are seeing growing bodies of information being produced only in electronic formats. This is being fueled by the massive increase in scholarly information that is being produced, but also by some rapid political, social, and economic changes taking place in key parts of the world - eastern Europe, Africa, Latin America, and East Asia. The information explosions in those parts of the world are particularly challenging as Eastern Europe, as glasnost meets capitalism, not only is the amount of information available but the cost of that information is extraordinary as well.

From 1971-1988 we can document an inflation rate for scholarly materials of about 250 percent. That is way above the cost of other materials that we need to acquire to run our universities. During the past year, we have had extraordinarily difficult financial situations. Domestic price increases are averaging somewhere between 12 and 14 percent while materials from Europe are averaging somewhere between 25 and 40 percent. We all know that materials that we purchase from Western Europe, in particular, are not foreign language materials. Many of the core journals and many of our disciplines are, in fact, published in Western Europe. It is always extraordinary to me that American university faculty who produce important scholarly information very often pay Western European publishers to include articles about that research through page charges, and then the libraries on their campus buy it back and put it on the shelves in the library for the faculty and students to use. This is an extraordinary situation and now with the prices increases that we are experiencing we are focusing our attention increasingly on it.

The main reason for this rapid increase in price is primarily the condition of the American dollar. But not only the American dollar. There have been some significant increases in postage rates, plus the general expansion in the size of journals and also the increase in the price of the production of those journals. We have been trying to monitor the research library community very carefully on explained costs versus unexplained costs. We are finding that increasingly some of the West European publishers are moving beyond our ability to explain the price increases that they are charging, particularly, the American market where we are paying differential prices than universities and individuals throughout the rest of the world.

The acquisitions budgets in research libraries simply have not kept up. At IU Bloomington, for example, this year we received a ten percent increase in our materials budget. By all standards that is an excellent increase. It is comparatively high among the research libraries in North America for 1990-91. But, one matches that against the type of inflation rates that we are facing it is clear that we are not going to be able to keep up and that we are going to have to make some cuts somewhere in what we are doing.

It is also true that academic and society publishers, particularly in the United States, that used to have responsibility for a large portion of the scholarly information that we produced and shared increasingly have turned that responsibility over to commercial publishers, and increasingly have turned it over to west European commercial publishers.

Research libraries as a whole are spending an expanding percentage of their acquisitions budget on journals at the expense of monograph support. At IU Bloomington, for example, over the past 20 years, serials as a percentage of our total acquisitions budget has increased from 27 to 62 percent. That means we have two-thirds of our budget immediately, when we start each academic fiscal year, committed to ongoing purchases. It means that we have fewer dollars available for discretionary funding to purchase monographic material and, as a result, some disciplines suffer as a result of this trend.

Research libraries in North America are increasingly purchasing a declining percentage of the world production of new research information. This is particularly troubling because one of the things that we have sold in the research libraries of North America is our ability to at least have one copy available to purchase and then to loan among the research libraries. But, increasingly, we find that we are not even purchasing a large percentage of the world production of information. It is not available in North American research libraries for our scholars and students to use.

We do know that electronic production, storage and distribution of research information will be of growing importance. This means that all of our campuses at IU need to continue to invest in information technology and telecommunication systems, and that the centrality of the library in a lot of this information technology planning is clear. I think you clearly made a commitment to that at IUPUI in the type of facility you are developing as part of your new library.

These are scary facts. As we talk to our colleagues around the country at professional conferences and over various EMail systems, we know that the situation that we are experiencing here at Indiana University today is shared among the research libraries. We are collectively and individually looking at a variety of strategies. Obviously, one of the solutions and the solution that we have traditionally turned to is to ask our institutions to ask our campuses to provide us with more funding, to put more money into library acquisitions. But, clearly, with inflation rates running close to 40 percent, there are limits as to what universities and campuses can do. We, as a result, are carefully reviewing our commitments, our journals, our programs of purchase, and we are in fact now in the process of making selective cancellations at all the campuses of Indiana University, as well as at all the major research universities in the country. We are expanding, as a result, our dependence on resource sharing. This has been a very important part of our ability to support teaching and research at our universities, but it is becoming even more important. Since we have brought up the Online catalog at Indiana University, we have seen a massive increase in the sharing of materials, books, photocopies, and other materials among the campuses of the University.

Last year, for example, we had over 155,000 interlibrary loan transactions at Indiana University. That was a ten percent increase over the previous year and for the first six months of this year it has increased another ten percent. Our projection, as the data base expands, and as we are forced to cut materials and limit our purchases of new materials, is that this is probably going to increase about 100 percent in the next five years. Therefore, the increasing importance of our ability to communicate electronically with other libraries, to develop new ways to deliver information whether that means using telefaxsimile or simply a van that might run between campuses of IU. This is a very important set of developments that we need to monitor very carefully. We need to talk in our university settings about what all this means to the future of scholarly communication. We need expanded discussion and we need expanded education. We are forging much more active working relationships in the research libraries with publishers, with government agencies, and with

a number of research professional organizations. The Association of Research Libraries, of which Indiana University is a member, has just set up an office of scientific and academic publishing, the purpose of which is to very carefully monitor the situation. Interest in network information is a recognition that we have limitations on the campus and the University level and we need to work much more carefully together to develop a national scholarly communication network.

There are many fundamental issues that we can cite that explain this phenomenon of rapid growth in scholarly information. Surely, one of those issues is the scholarly reward system in the American university and its impact on scholarly publishing. Clearly our promotion and tenure systems are factors in the activities of our faculty in producing and publishing scholarly information. This is not unique to the United States. We are receiving reports now from Chinese and Japanese universities that, before they can even be hired as a tenure track faculty member at those universities, they must have at least five research publications in English language journals. This is fueling not only the growth and the size of journals but the number of journals that we see being produced around the country. There is expanded use of electronic publication and distribution of research information as a replacement for the traditional journal. I serve on the editorial boards of several research journals and I receive manuscripts to review electronically over Email. I send my comments back electronically. Eventually, those manuscripts get printed on pieces of paper and put on the shelves in our libraries. I think we need to begin to question why we share research information in a preliminary way electronically, but then we feel moved to put this on paper and to put it increasingly in smaller buildings, tighter buildings in libraries throughout the country.

We need to assess the concept of intellectual property rights. Obviously one of the limitations we face in sharing information among research libraries is the copyright laws of the United States, which limit our ability to photocopy and distribute information. Intellectual property rights are something which are carefully protected, as you would suspect by the commercial publishers. I think they are just waiting for some cooperative activity on the part of the research libraries in this country so that can bring us into court and begin to question some of the cooperative strategies that we are developing.

We need to take some legal actions to get on top of some of the monopolistic practices of some of these publishers. One faculty member at the University of Wisconsin recently published in a physics journal an analysis of the cost per word in major research journals in physics. He demonstrated that some publishers were charging much more per word than other publishers. As a result of that article, he was sued in the courts of five countries in the world by the producer of that journal. Obviously, the publishers are much more well armed, legally and financially, to cope with the situation than are the universities in this country. I should add that that court suit has been thrown out in three countries and still is active in two.

We need much more rigorous evaluation on the relationship between new journal creation and user demand. Why does every community college, college, and university in this country feel the urge to constantly be bringing out new journals every year? We can't buy these new journals in research libraries and we are not quite sure who is supporting them. It is something that I think that, as an academic community, we have to question, not only why we have all these new journals but also in what format we are producing and what format we are distributing that information. Some have suggested that all research that is federally funded should be published only in academic or scholarly journals and not in commercial publications. That is an interesting concept but obviously flies in the face of some of the intellectual property rights and legal questions that we are facing. I think my most important concern and one of my reasons for being here today is not only to raise awareness and consciousness about the difficulties we are facing in research libraries, but we need to promote a much more active dialogue among the libraries, among the librarians, the faculty, the research community nationally, and the publishers. We are not going

to solve this problem unless we sit down together and try to project what the future of scholastic communication will be.

We are facing a very difficult situation at Indiana University. The Bloomington campus, for example, is facing a budgetary shortfall in the current fiscal year of \$335,000 in its materials budget. That represents the difference in cost between what we had in our budget to pay for our commitments and what the costs are as we receive bills from monographic and other publishers. We project that next year a minimum inflation rate of 15 percent and obviously that very much depends on the situation in the Middle East and the status of the American dollar. But, if we were to project, for example, a flat materials budget, for the acquisition program of the library next year that means that we are even 15 percent further behind than we are today. Obviously, routine strategies for dealing with this simply won't work. We are asking the entire scholarly community at IU, as well as across the United States, to begin to tackle this issue in a very systematic and substantive way. Scholarly communication in the year 2000 will simply not be the same as it is today in 1991. I think we have to help shape that scholarly environment. Librarians cannot shape that environment. It is the teaching and research faculty of this country who sit on the editorial boards who produce the scholarly information and who use the scholarly information who really need to provide that leadership. Thank you.

**BEPKO:** Thank you, Jim. I would like to say that, as you can see, I think that Jim is providing excellent leadership for Indiana University libraries and in particular we are very happy about the way he has supported the libraries here in Indianapolis. I know there are a number of people from our libraries here, but in particular Jim has been very helpful to Barbara Fischler and her colleagues - Dolores Hoyt, Jean Gnat, and others - in the development of our new campus library and we appreciate that very much, Jim. Thank you for being here. We do have a very big issue yet to take up and that is the legislative budget. We have with us a person who is as close to that as anyone at Indiana University. Don Weaver is the Director of State Government Relations for IU and in that role oversees all of our relationships with the General Assembly. He has been at the State House today and is here to give us a thumbnail sketch of where the University budgets stand and maybe a word or two about how bad it really is.

**WEAVER:** The mood at the State House is TLC at this point and that doesn't stand for Tender Loving Care. It really stands for Tenseness, a certain amount of Loneliness, and a lot of Confrontation. That is not, in my brief experience of about 10 years, too unusual, but it is unusual to be that way in February. It is usually that way in April. It is very confrontational at this point and it hasn't been a lot of fun. Jerry mentioned where the budget stands. I am not going to get into a lot of numbers because they probably have changed since I left the State House anyhow.

I would like to bring you up-to-date a little bit. As most of you I think probably know or I hope you know the seven university presidents joined forces back in the spring to try to persuade, both from a grassroots levels and also from a legislative level working with legislators, the awareness of the need for higher education in the State of Indiana. We have been told on many many cases and many places throughout the state, that if you want to become an issue and if you want to receive more funding, you have to have grassroots support. So, we have been working on that. We began a program back in the spring and that reminds me of a little saying that I heard somebody make years ago concerning the online registration system that they were trying to put in at IU. He said "Our hearts were young and gay in the month of May, but we will always remember the month of September." That was kind of the way we were as we moved along and built momentum during the summer, and then all of a sudden everything came out from under us when we started getting downturns of the economy and the economic forecasts the state was putting out. Because of that, as you might know, the State Budget Agency did put out a recommendation on a budget, not in December as they usually do, but in early January. Basically, that recom-

mendation on the budget, affecting Indiana University and all of higher education, was to straight-line the 1990-91 budget, which means to take your 1990-91 budget and straightline it with some minor base adjustments. I am not going to get into those base adjustments unless you really want me to, although one does affect IUPUI campus dramatically. They did this by cutting appropriation amounts and assuming a 4.1 percent tuition increase at each one of the campuses. Basically, the appropriations were being straightlined and the expenditure budgets were being straightlined, or the assumption of the expansion budgets were being straightlined, assuming a 4.1 fee increase.

An interesting note on that is that the Budget Committee, which usually makes a recommendation to the legislature or to the Ways and Means Committee and they will build from that, did not really make a recommendation. The Budget Committee never voted on that proposal and never recommended to Ways and Means. That was purely a State Budget Agency recommendation or, if you want to use the term, "the Governor's recommendation." So, there we had not a recommendation from the state agency or any kind of legislative body in front of us to deal with, but it certainly was a recommendation that we didn't care for. We did our best to deal with that. One of the things that I will say that we dealt with and the way in which we dealt with it was to bring all seven presidents to the State House for a general meeting with their legislators and tried to talk to them about their feelings and the impact that that recommendation would have on higher education in the State of Indiana. The only reason I bring that up is that because of that action, which is the first time in my memory and I think in a lot of people's memory, that we were that obvious in our refusal to kind of go into the findings of the woodwork someplace. It got the eye of the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee. In the best of my analysis, and I don't say that I am 100 percent right, he is the only one, other than probably some of the Governor's staff members, who really took exception to that move. It wasn't meant to be confrontational and to do a runaround of the Ways and Means, but he viewed it that way. So, he has more or less declared war on higher education and in his own view in viewing that. I might say that our meeting at the State House was held for a reason. We could have had it anyplace. We thought we needed the presence in the State House to really get the attention of people that we were serious about fighting for what we thought we needed and for our share of what was available. Subsequent to that, the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee has put forth or filed his budget bill. His budget bill is essentially the same thing that the state budget agency recommended with a very important change as far as Indiana University was concerned. Going back into one of those basic adjustment items that I mentioned to you earlier, one of those is called "enrollment adjustment for enrollment growth or change." That basically is funding new students. That is retroactive funding because that is really funding for students that occurred on your campus two years ago. We feel that that money is something that has been obligated to us and owed to us. It is not a given on whether they should give that. That has been part of the agreement that they would give us additional funding.

What the State Budget Agency in fact had done with that is they have taken that total and said, "Okay, we will give you one-eighth of it the first year and three-eighths of it the second year so the second year of the base you are really getting half. What it means is that, for the biennium, you get about one-third of the funding that you really deserve. The chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee accepted that, but he put another kind of wrinkle in it. He accepted the amount of dollars that they provided, I should put it that way. But, he said "I don't think we should fund enrollment change funding for non-resident students." So, we will not be funding non-residence students. We will also not fund something that is called those students which occur because of what he calls a "pump handle effect." A pump handle effect is what occurs to a campus when their enrollments go up and down. Because what happens with the enrollment change funding is when you get new students you get half of the average costs of the State of Indiana for a student. When you lose that student, you lose one-sixth of it. So, if it goes up one-half and only goes down one-sixth, you lose it. If your enrollment goes up and down, you keep gaining that difference. So,



he said, "That's not fair. We shouldn't do that and we are going to take it out." So, making those adjustments really affected some of our campuses fairly dramatically. That is where we stand. Where we will go from here, I am not quite certain. We obviously are lobbying in part for total funding. This is another thing that has got the concern of the chairman of House Ways and Means Committee because he says the universities are not willing to admit there is a problem with the economy. They are not willing to take their cuts like all the rest of the state agencies. And, there has been issued to the state agencies, depending on the size of their budgets, cuts of between one and five percent. They have been asked to come in with their proposals and their hearings at those lesser levels.

Our feeling is that we don't want to be oblivious to what is happening in the state of Indiana and the President is certainly concerned about that. The feeling is that if we accept what they are saying now, we just go off and say, "Okay, we will accept our two percent cut or these adjustments the way you have made it. We are never going to get anymore than that." In fact we might get less because there are other state agencies and other needs in the state that are being pressed very hard and we feel that we have to continue to press as hard as we possibly can. We are not going to lay off the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee. We are going to keep pressing and we are still trying to build the grassroots for it. One of the things that I will mention to you right now is that just recently we have asked our campuses, in different localities around the state (when I say our campuses, I should say all the campuses of higher education, including all of the sites for IV Tech), to try to inform their leadership and their business leaders in their community of what is happening and what is happening to higher education and ask them to call their representatives who are on Ways and Means. We have only targeted Ways and Means representatives right now. I think that Dick Peterson has a handout (see IUPUI Circular 91-01 attached) that he will give you pointing out some of the concerns and listing the local members of Ways and Means. I am telling you to do with that as you feel you would like to do. If you think that is not something that is for you and you don't want to get into the political process, that is your business. This isn't meant to be confrontational at all with these people. I have been told by a lot of legislators, if they get five or six calls or if they get 10 or 15 letters on an issue, that is a lot. There are obviously some very hot issues where they get more than that. Generally, that is a lot of contacts. We are asking you or asking the business leaders in the state to please call their legislators and say "Higher education is important to me. It is important to the future of the state of Indiana." We maintain that higher education is not part of the problem of the budget of the state of Indiana, but it is a part of the solution of the state of Indiana. We really believe that. With the layoffs, this sort of thing is never going to be needed more. I think Vice President Bepko said it best by saying that with layoffs in some of the white collar areas, there has never been more need than there is now for higher education. At the very time they had that meeting, we were cutting back the funding on even trying to get new students. So, that is basically the picture on the budget.

I will entertain some questions. I am not sure I can answer them by any means but I will entertain them. I would like to point out to you a few other things. One is that Indiana University has approximately between 175 and 200 bills which we now try to follow through the legislature. It is not a one item deal. There are probably that many bills that affect us a lot which we can't do anything about. There are some environmental bills, unemployment workmen's compensation -- those kinds of bills that certainly affect us but that we probably can't do a lot about. We are not a big player in that process. But, we will try to make our feelings known and keep abreast of this. Then there are probably another 60 bills which really impact the universities directly and primarily the universities. Of course, we take a great deal more interest in those kinds of bills and try to actually work those and get some resolution to them. In many cases we try to support them and in many cases we try to defeat them in all honesty. To give you a sense of what kind of bills, I am not going to go into these, I am just going to give you a quick rundown on what kinds of bills we

might deal with. Certainly not all sixty. We have two tax credit bills, one to eliminate the tax credit given to a taxpayer if he gives to an educational foundation if that money is not being used for educational purposes. Then there are two other bills, one in the Senate and one in the House, which increase the tax credit from \$100, \$125, \$200, or \$250 depending on whether you are single or married. We have a bill to require the universities to have everyone of their teachers, instructors, faculty members take an English language proficiency exam. We have both oral and written. That probably will not go anywhere, but it is something that is introduced just to get people's attention.

**BEPKO:** That has been in the legislature before.

**WEAVER:** It has been in the legislature before.

**BEPKO:** How many bills altogether have been introduced? Maybe 500 bills every session? There are only a very small percentage of that actually enacted.

**WEAVER:** How many are introduced?

**BEPKO:** Yes.

**WEAVER:** About 2,000.

**BEPKO:** Maybe 100 are enacted.

**WEAVER:** There is another one that is interesting that prohibits alcohol on campuses for underage students. What it says is that if the universities don't prohibit that or discourage it in a proper manner, they can be fined \$5,000 a day from their appropriation base for I think a maximum of 30 days or something for each incident that they let occur. We were asked what the physical impact on that would be and we came up with a figure that would be \$16 million because we would have to hire a supervisor or a chaperon for every twenty students just to keep up with it. One of the more serious, by the way though, is a bill to give the Commission for Higher Education the power to approve the numbers of credits which are required for degrees at our universities. That got our attention quickly. There is a bill on smoking in classrooms. There is a private enterprise bill which has been up several times before. The one that got my attention was a university lobbyist bill which removes the exemption for university lobbyists. There are a lot of recycling bills. There is the standard bill to create a commission to study the separation of IUPUI campus. That is being filed again. Another would reimburse state employees and their children for educational costs, which is a good idea if they will do it. That gives you samples of some of the kinds of bills that we get involved in and look at. With that I am going to be quiet. I am sure you are anxious to go. If you have any questions, I will be happy to try to answer them.

**MCGEEVER:** You mentioned about the State Budget Agency proposal that there was something in there that would impact seriously IUPUI. What was it?

**WEAVER:** What I was talking about was the thing that I came back to later, which was the base adjustment. It is not the pump handle effect so much as just not getting your full appropriation for the enrollment change money is a big impact on IUPUI. You have had good growth over the last couple of years and you won't get paid for it.

**BEPKO:** There is also a reduction in the appropriation as well, which is equal to 4.1 percent of the tuition that we have collected this year. Don said that there would be a level, or as he described it, a straightline budget. It would only be so if we raised tuition by 4.1 percent.

**WEAVER:** I am sorry, Jerry, but there is another impact to that, too. I forgot to tell you something. In that budget bill there is also a fee cap of five percent. Really, if you want any more money, you have got nine tenths of one percent to raise and that is all you can get. That is for in-state students. IUPUI, of course, is predominantly in-state students.

**SCHWECKE:** Is there any support for reducing power of the HEC and their control of budget curriculum?

**WEAVER:** I don't know. The Higher Education Commission has some very key supporters in the legislature and some of their real detractors, people who really did not like the HEC, were people who have been in the minority party. Those people are now in the majority party in the House, but one of the biggest detractors of the HEC power is the one that introduced the bill to give them the power to limit the number of hours or to control the number of hours for a degree. One of the members of the Ways and Means, his suggestion has always been that we don't limit the powers of the Higher Education Commission, just cut their budget down to about \$200,000 so they can't hire anybody to keep them out of trouble. His solution, too, was to the Higher Education funding problem was to just close one of the universities and give their money to the other universities.

**BEPKO:** Are there any other questions? The response of the University to this has been measured because we don't know yet what will happen but prudence does dictate, as we said in our last meeting, some plans for the worst case possible. We are engaged in that right now with the academic units. I think that the general policies of the University will be to say in times of financial difficulty that we must focus on faculty and staff compensation first. The faculty and staff matter most and that will be probably the first priority in dealing with any kind of reallocations. Secondly, there will not be across the board reductions. There should be some attention paid to our academic priorities - the planning agenda and the core missions of the University and not just a distribution of the burden throughout all of the different parts of our operations. Also, there are some suggestions that we try to increase retention of students. The President made this point at the Trustees' meeting this past weekend, that one way of adding income for the University without diluting quality or requiring any, in many cases without any additional costs, is to see that more of our students are successful and complete their degree programs. So, our retention rates, particularly in undergraduate programs, are certainly improvable and this is one of the areas that I think we will hear more about. So far, not really much has been decided except that these general policies will probably emerge and I think that we are probably going to have to know more about the budget before we can talk in any meaningful way about the salary increases that could be available. The one figure that has been used in the documents that we have distributed to the Budgetary Affairs Committee and others is that compensation for all personnel, faculty and staff, be determined on the basis of how much salary a person is paid so that persons who earn more money would have a lower percentage increase than those persons who made less money. The arbitrary cutoff point that was selected was \$30,000. It was suggested in the first planning document that we looked at, that we implement a policy that would create a pool of salary increase funding for those persons who were paid \$30,000 or less which was equal to about five percent of the total base for that group of employees. For those persons who were above \$30,000, a pool of money be created that was equal to about 2.5 percent of the total salary base. That doesn't mean that everyone above or below is going to be paid the same amount. It doesn't mean anything at this point because it is not a policy, it is just something that was offered for discussion. That is the sort of thing that we are going to be looking at. We hope that we will be able to achieve that. If Don is correct, there still is hope that we will be able to avoid having cuts or that we will be given maintenance increases in the University's budgets or that we will get the enrollment adjustment funding which we have earned by increased enrollments we have had for the past two years, then there may not be as much of a problem. But, we are planning on at least taking a count of the contingency that we will have none of that new funding and we will have

actual cuts and in that case we will have to struggle and we will have to reallocate and we will have to make some very tough decisions in order to reach that kind of salary increase for continuing personnel. That will be the first priority. I would be happy to entertain questions or discussion.

We do have one other item, but maybe it would be better to postpone it. We made a report on the compensation study at the Trustees' meeting on Monday. We thought we would make the same report today. It might take seven minutes or so. Should we take it up today or should we postpone it until the next meeting? [It was agreed to take it up today.]

[Chancellor Bepko showed some overheads which are attached as IUPUI Circular 91-06) As you know, the Trustees of the University asked the campuses to develop a plan on how they could bring average salaries up to the 60th percentile among peer institutions. We formed a committee that has been hard at work for the past couple of months to determine, first, peer institutions, and you have seen those, and look at peer institutions' salaries to see how much our peer institutions' colleagues are paid. This is a list of the peer institutions and the average salaries that we have given you already. I put it up for purposes of reminding you of what our peer institutions are and showing you what our salary ranges are for IUPUI at the top for full professors, associate professors, and assistant professors. This includes all faculty on campus including the Medical School but not physician faculty. Physician faculty are excluded from these studies at most universities and we have held constant to that assumption.

When you look at our peer institutions and look where we stand in terms of faculty salaries adjusted for inflation, you can see that, out of 15 peer institutions, we are ninth in the full professor range, twelfth for associate professors, and eighth for assistant professors. So, we have some catching to do to get to the 60th percentile. We have some catching up to do even to get to the median but for the 60th percentile we have even more to do.

To get to that level, we have made some computations and we assume that if the peer institutions continue to raise their salaries at precisely the same percentage that they have over the last five years and if we raise our salaries at precisely the same percentage that we have over the last five years, in the 1994-95 fiscal year, we would need \$3 million to catch up. That is in base funds, with that \$3 million in our base budget. That would bring us to the 60th percentile of our peer institutions, adjusted for the cost of living in our area.

In addition to that, we have assumed that this biennium is not going to be a good one for us after what you heard from Don Weaver. We think that we are going to have to make an adjustment, called a "lag adjustment" that will take into account the poor performance that we are likely to have in 1991-93. We have assumed, arbitrarily, based on what I told you a few minutes ago about the first assumption about salary increases, that faculty salary increases in this first year of the biennium will probably be three percent. That is an arbitrary assumption because it could be a lot higher and it could conceivably be lower; but we assume, based on what we know at the time we prepared these figures, that three percent is a reasonable adjustment. The second year of the biennium may be better because in most of the proposals that Don Weaver described to you we will get more enrollment adjustment funding. We will get a tiny little piece the first year and maybe a little more in the second year and we could conceivably do better in the second year. But, if we assume that our peer institutions are going to move a little faster than we do in the first year and have 4.5 percent average increases for both years, we will lose some in the first year, make up a little in the second year, and we assume that we will probably lose \$950,000 in base salary increases as compared with our peer institutions. So that we will have a \$3 million debt to start with and we will have another million to make up. How are we going to make this up? We are going to make it up through private support, private support we expect to grow on this campus. We have a number of campaigns that are about to begin. They may be delayed a little bit because

of the economy but we have every expectation that before 1994-95 we will create for the campus 10 chairs and 15 professorships across the whole campus that would be available in some form to increase faculty salaries. Of course, the professorships are add ons and they would automatically increase faculty salaries. The chairs are a little different. They are funded at \$1 million at least each, and they may be used to recruit new faculty and they may not add to the existing salary base quite the same way as a professorship would. But, we assume that from those ten chairs we will add \$350,000 to our existing salary base. From the professorships we will add another \$300,000. In addition to that, we will go to the state and, under the new Fund for Teaching Excellence, ask for the matching money that is to be provided for any new endowment funds to support faculty activities which have been created after July 1, 1990. That, in other words, should match the \$650,000 that we will get from these new chairs or professorships for a total of \$1.3 million, we hope.

Secondly, we have resource management. We think that through better resource management we are going to be able to reallocate for faculty salaries as we have done over the past four or five years. The best way I can demonstrate that to you is to show you that we have done better than almost anywhere else at Indiana University in terms of average faculty salary increases over this five year period. These are the average increases over a period from 1986-87 through this year. On the average, we are above every other Indiana University campus. Our averages have been seven percent for full professors and associate professors and even more for assistant professors.

We did a comparison of what percentage our peer institutions, all 15 peer institutions, have increased their salaries by over this same period of time. We computed salary averages and determined that, over this period, from 1985-86 to 1989-90, peer institutions raised their salaries for all ranks at 6.61 percent per year and, for all ranks at IUPUI, we averaged 7.11 percent. That means that we have been doing one-half percent better than our peer institutions over this period of time. We have done that with no money from the state. That has been done through reallocations and through economies and through some revenue that we have generated. We assume that we are going to be able to do the same thing again. Actually, we may have to do a lot more of this in 1991-93 because if the worst case comes to pass, we are going to have to make up a lot. We assume that by 1993-95 we will back on an even keel and will beat our peer institutions at the business of reallocating by about one-half of one percent and that comes out to about \$900,000 for the two years, about \$450,000 per year for the 1993-95 biennium.

Looking at the total projections of the total amount needed, I said that we needed \$3 million to close the gap to put us at the 60th percentile. In addition, for 1991-93 we are going to have a lag factor of almost \$1 million. So that our total gap, trying to meet this gap by 1994-95, is going to be almost \$4 million, \$3.95 million. We think we can get \$1.3 million from private support and we think we can get \$900,000 out of better resource management for the whole campus which leaves us with a request for the 1993-95 biennium of \$1.75 million to make up the total gap. We think if we come with this kind of proposal in 1993, that it will be the most powerful proposal that we can make. We already have the strong support of the Indiana University Board of Trustees to go to the General Assembly at the appropriate time that is suggested here to ask that they cooperate with us to match what we are doing on our own to bring us to the 60th percentile among peer institutions. That is our plan. We think that it is a realistic one and I hope that it succeeds. Are there any questions, comments? We didn't have our question-and-answer period today.

**MCDONALD:** Are all the chancellors as optimistic as you are? That is, we just hear that it is kind of tough here but we are going to do real fine if we can just get through one bad year which is terrible oversimplification of what I think I hear you saying.

**BEPKO:** We believe that it will do us no good to be disabled by the bad news. We have to keep planning for the goals that we want to achieve and we are not going to be deterred by anything. The only thing we can do is to continue to make realistic plans to bring ourselves to the 60th percentile and that is what we have done. We know that the times are not good. We have tried to take that into account in our planning, but we hope that it is a temporary setback and that by 1993 we will be back to the point where we can ask for this kind of support. We think we ought to plan that way. If it turns out that we don't have the state's support or if the state's finances are as bad as they are now when we come to 1993, then we think we will have to revise our plans. But, we are not going to stop shooting for the 60th percentile. We will prevail. Dick has something to pass on.

**PETERSON:** I have one more comment on one other item that you picked up today. That refers to the proposed changes in the academic handbook. This has been an item of discussion over the last year to year and one-half at this level, at the University Faculty Council level, and at a number of committee levels. Over the most recent past, Henry Karlson has chaired a committee which produced the changes that you see in front of you today. These changes will be brought to the University Faculty Council here next Tuesday for additional discussion and potential approval at that time. What I am asking you to do is to look these over. I can't ask for this to be approved or disapproved at this point. That has not been what is asked for at the University Faculty Council level, but it will be discussed at that level and therefore we need to know if there some major problems with this, whether it needs to go back to committee or whatever. Kathleen Warfel and her committee, the Faculty Affairs Committee, will be meeting on Monday and discussing this item. She is one appropriate person to bring this to the University Faculty Council if you have difficulties. I am, of course, another or any of the other representatives of this campus that go to University Faculty Council meetings would also be appropriate individuals to discuss this with. If there are problems, if there are significant reasons why we should not go ahead with this, we would like to know of those. If it is pretty straightforward, we will probably go ahead and approve this at the University Faculty Council level next week.

**MCGEEVER:** Just a question about the Handbook committee. Is this just the first installment of their work or is this it?

**PETERSON:** The recommendation has been made on the part of the Handbook Committee that a permanent Handbook Committee be appointed. That will be another point for discussion at the University Faculty Council level.

**ROTHMAN:** The last paragraph in #2 seems unreasonable. If you are bringing someone up early for tenure why would you fire him at the same time because you don't want him to leave early? It doesn't make sense.

**PETERSON:** As I said when we introduced this we are not really prepared to discuss this in great detail but this is certainly a comment that we will take to the next level. I am not going to try to defend what is in here or be prepared to comment a lot but we will take that to the University Faculty Council as a question. Please look this over and get to your University Faculty Council representatives if you have further questions on this document.

#### **AGENDA ITEM VI - Adjournment**

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

INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS

Faculty Council Meeting

March 14, 1991

Law School, Room 116

3:30 - 5:30 p.m.

**Members Present:** Administrative: Gerald L. Bepko, William Plater. Deans: John Barlow, P. Nicholas Kellum, R. Bruce Renda, William Voos. Elected Faculty: C D Aliprantis, James Baldwin, H Glenn Bohlen, Frances Brahmi, Walter Buchanan, Varoujan Chalian, Elaine Cooney, William Crabtree, Theodore Cutshall, Dornith Doherty, Ann Dunipace, Michael Gleeson, Jean Gnat, Dolores Hoyt, Norman Hudson, Henry Karlson, Linda Kasper, Michael Kubek, Richard Lawlor, Dana McDonald, B Keith Moore, Bernard Morrel, Jerold Paar, John Pless, Edward Robbins, Bruce Roth, Carl Rothe, Neal Rothman, Phyllis Scherle, Edmund Schilling, Scott Shapiro, P Kent Sharp, Jan Shipps, Hitwant Sidhu, Vernon Vix, Kathleen Warfel, Kathryn Wilson, Donald Wong, Charles Yokomoto, Susan Zunt. Ex Officio Members: Richard Fredland, Jeffery Vessely.

**Alternates Present:** Deans: Doris Merritt for Walter Daly, Bill Orme for Barbara Fischler, Hugh Wolf for Donald Warren, J. M. Ebbert for James Weigand. Elected Faculty: Eleanor Donnelly for Patricia Blake, Thomas Majcher for Lynda Means, Beverly Ross for Lee Schwecke, Thomas Kippenbrock for Ann Tomey.

**Members Absent:** Administrative: J Herman Blake. Deans: A James Brown, Trevor Brown, H William Gilmore, Norman Lefstein, Angela McBride, Sheldon Siegel, David Stocum, Jack Wentworth. Elected Faculty: Darrell Bailey, Jonas Bjork, David Bodenhamer, Thomas Broadie, Dewey Conces, Ronald Dehnke, William Engle, Andrew Evan, Martin Farlow, Naomi Fineberg, Janice Froehlich, Paul Galanti, Philip Gibbs, Richard Hamburger, Dean Hawley, Florence Juillerat, Jerome Kaplan, Juanita Keck, Bruce Long, Patrick McGeever, Richard Meiss, Chris Miller, Sherry Queener, John Rafert, Michael Ryan, Thomas Ryan, Aristotle Siakotos, Gregory Sutton, Donald Tharp, Jay Tischfield, Marion Wagner. Ex Officio Members: Henry Besch, Maxine Tutterrow.

**Visitors Present:** JoAnn Switzer (Medicine), John Morgan (IUPUI Staff Council), Norris L. Richmond (Dentistry), Erwin Boschmann (Associate Dean of the Faculties), Bill Spencer (Assistant to Chancellor), Gene Tempel (Vice Chancellor for External Affairs).

**AGENDA ITEM I - Call to Order**

**BEPKO:** I don't know whether it is my sense of the size of the room today or whether it is the attendance, but it looks like we are still somewhat on spring break this week. So, thank you for being here. We would like to ask your indulgence as we begin the meeting today to change the agenda. We would like to move Item VII, a discussion of the Revised Proposed Early Retirement Plans, to the first item of business because Chris Lohmann, who is the chair of the Fringe Benefits Committee of the University Faculty Council, is here but he is scheduled to leave for Chicago as soon as he can get away from this meeting. We would like to accommodate his schedule and ask that this item be taken up first. If we hear no objections, we will assume that you agree that item should be taken first. I would then like to introduce Chris Lohmann to explain the status of and report on the Early Retirement Plans.

## **AGENDA ITEM II - Revised Proposed Early Retirement Plans**

**LOHMANN:** Thank you very much. Actually, I am here not so much in my capacity as the chair of the Fringe Benefits Committee as a member of the Task Force that put this early retirement plan together. Let's start out by saying that perhaps some of you may think it unseemly for any Faculty Council to discuss early retirement benefits at a time when we don't even know whether we are going to teach our courses next year or have adequate support for our graduate students, or get a salary increase, given all the dark clouds of the legislative appropriation of funds.

I do want to remind ourselves though that this particular early retirement plan should not be seen as an increment for faculty privileges and benefits. It is really part of a retrenchment process that began in the fall of 1988 when the Board of Trustees decided to revise and curtail the 18/20 Plan. This is essentially the second shoe that is dropping. The first shoe dropped in October of 1988 and now comes the second shoe. You may remember that part of the first shoe was that TIAA/CREF benefits for all eligible employees as of January 1, 1989 were going to be reduced from a 15 percent contribution to a 12 percent contribution. This new retirement plan is also a considerable reduction over the 18/20 Plan that most of us, I assume, are still grandfathered into. But, as the new faculty and eligible employees replace us old folks, eventually there will be a very substantial saving. In fact, if we calculate a three percent savings both on the TIAA/CREF contributions from 15 to 12 percent, plus the estimated savings of this plan over the 18/20 Plan, eventually, on the basis of a \$250 million annual TIAA/CREF eligible payroll, the University will save \$15 million. That is a reduction of about six percent on that \$250 million. Nobody here should say that we are talking about a big new benefit in this part of the retrenchment program. I think the state legislators ought to know this, and we ought to be aware of it because it could become a controversial matter. So much by way of a preamble.

As for the process that we are involved in with this document, you may recall that we already did a round of discussion on a proposed early retirement plan that looked somewhat like this at an earlier stage. There were discussions of that earlier report from the task force on all of the campuses that have led up to the discussion now. It was discussed here and then all of that information came back to the task force. We took that into consideration, and then we made some revisions in that first plan and the revised document is what you have here. I would go on the assumption that you saw that earlier draft, that you discussed that earlier draft, and that you are reasonably familiar with the earlier draft and that I don't have to start from ground zero. I will simply go quickly through the changes between this document and what you saw earlier. If that is agreeable to you, let me proceed.

If you look at this document, the first thing you will see is something called the Phased Early Retirement Plan on your page two. You may recall that in the earlier document we had a Phased Early Retirement Plan I and a Phased Early Retirement Plan II. Now, in this document, all we have is a Phased Early Retirement Plan. This Phased Early Retirement Plan is very close to what used to be PERP II. The reason you only have one rather than the original two is fairly simple. When we listened to the various voices on the various campuses in this long discussion process that had taken place, what we heard were essentially two things. From the Board of Trustees we heard, "PERP II as an entitlement is too expensive." You may remember that the major distinction between I and II was that PERP II was an entitlement. If you met the criteria, you got it. It was as simple as that. This new version is no longer an entitlement. It has to be negotiated on a one-on-one basis. The person entering into it and the University have to agree to it on a one-on-one basis. It may be given to one person and it may be denied to another person. It is simply part of the negotiation process. This entitlement feature simply didn't fly. It didn't fly with the Board of Trustees and it also didn't fly with many departmental chairs and academic deans. They said "What are we going to do if this is an entitlement and we have a lot of people who are on some



kind of lower-than-a-100 percent appointment, yet we can't carve up laboratories and we can't carve up classrooms, we can't carve up office space." We can only do this on a one-on-one basis. If it happens to all work out, fine. Therefore, strip this thing of the entitlement and we will go along with it. That is what we did. We stripped the entitlement out of PERP II. As soon as we did that, PERP I and PERP II really began to collapse. There wasn't any point in having PERP I anymore. So, what you have now is what used to be PERP II, but the entitlement has been stripped out. Otherwise it is the same plan.

Let's go on to the Full Early Retirement Plan on page 5. That is much the same as the one that you saw before. There is very little change here with one exception. You may recall that on the first discussion around there was still uncertainty about how to define the terminal base salaries which is very important feature in this plan because that is the basis on which the 60 percent plus and so many percent per service year are figured as your retirement benefit. So, TBS is an important feature here. On the earlier round we did not get that agreement -- how to define TBS. We have now reached an agreement. We have listened to a lot of folks on the various campuses and what everybody seems to be able to agree to is that TBS, we will see this year in the third paragraph under "Benefits", is defined as the average of the five years of highest earnings, with earnings defined as income on which TIAA/CREF contributions have been made. So, this means that your summer earnings, if we add to that, that TIAA/CREF benefits are to be paid on summer earnings, then your TBS is figured on your ten month salary plus whatever salary you may have had in the summer that TIAA/CREF had been paid on. That becomes the basis on which you figure TBS. You may remember there were other possible versions. Some said "administrators and faculty ought to be exactly the same. Therefore, all faculty, regardless of whether they taught or did contract research in the summer or not, ought to be given a 12/10 that ought to be TBS. Other people said "No, that is too expensive. Let's strip away two months from the administrators." So there were various models here. This seemed to be the model that most people were able to agree on.

Let's skip on to the 18/20 Plan. There are again a couple of small changes from the last time you saw this. We initially proposed a minimum age reduced from the present 64 years down to 60. This ran into a fair amount of opposition primarily on the part of the Board of Trustees but also a lot of academic deans who felt that if we provide so generous an early retirement benefit as provided under 18/20, to people at such an early age as 60, what we are really instituting is a subsidized raiding plan so, that when you are age 60 you cash in on your 18/20 and you go off to the University of Illinois and take a full-time position. People didn't think that was a good idea. On the other hand, there are a lot of faculty who feel 64 is really not an early retirement age. They felt this should be moved down. We sort of met in the middle at age 62 which also happens to be, of course, the age at which you can draw Social Security benefits. At that point your income from 18/20 would be supplemented by your Social Security benefits.

You may also recall that there was still no agreement in the last discussion on how to deal with the gainful employment rule. Right now you know that under 18/20 it is not possible to earn any income from any state agency including IU. The University has shot itself in the foot with that rule because a lot of retired faculty members might do some very good things like teach workshops, conduct a seminar, or whatever it may be. That can't be done now. We simply have eliminated everybody who is on 18/20. We decided that you can earn income from an Indiana state agency or from IU up to 20 percent of TBS. The reason why we picked the 20 percent figure was not just totally arbitrary but we understand that under current rules, when you are on full-time appointment with the University, say in the department of mathematics, you can take on overload of teaching in the School of Continuing Studies and you can make up to 20 percent income in addition to your full-time salary without incurring any penalties. So, we went by that model and said, "All right, if you can do that when you are on active status, why can't you do it when you are on early retirement status?" That is when we put in the 20 percent limit. As far as non-state providers of

income are concerned, the sky is the limit. You can do anything you want.

On page 8 we simply repeat once more that we also are proposing the payment of TIAA/CREF benefits on summer teaching and to have that definition of the TBS apply to the 18/20 Plan.

These are really some fairly minor changes. What is going to happen from now on with this plan is that I believe that your campus maybe the last that is having this discussion. It is already on the agenda of the University Faculty Council. So, your discussion here and your vote here will be very helpful for the discussion at the University Faculty Council. Since this is a University-wide fringe benefit, the really definitive vote will have to take place there. So, your vote here will be helpful, but it is not like you are the final legislators here. You are giving advice and your advice is very much appreciated. You might keep that in the back of your mind as you discuss matters because, in some ways, your discussion is as important as some kind of final vote you may pass. I am ready to answer any questions.

**ROBBINS:** On the change in the terminal base salary to the five highest years and the addition of paying contributions on summer salaries, would those summer salaries go into that computation beginning at the point when the contributions began to be paid or could those who may have worked summers prior to the adoption of this, but for whom contributions were not paid, count that summer income in those five highest years? For example, if this were adopted and next year someone who had been working summers the past five years retired and those were their highest salary, could those salaries be included in that computation of terminal base salary?

**LOHMANN:** I think that our thinking was generally that the computation would begin when the TIAA/CREF begins. There is clearly in some way an unfairness for those who worked in the summer before TIAA/CREF was implemented. I think that is a question that perhaps they want to take up at the University Faculty Council again and see what the pros and the cons are. I don't have any very strong feelings one way or the other. I think our assumption was that you have got to begin somewhere so let's begin when this begins. On the other hand, let me point out the other argument. It may very well be that the Trustees consider this recommendation from the Task Force and from the various faculty councils. They won't necessarily going to accept this whole thing. They may very well pick their way through this and say, "Okay, we accept PERP and we accept FERP, but we don't accept TIAA/CREF for the summer." The Trustees finally have the say on that. If the Trustees were to say, "Okay, we will figure TBS on the highest salary including the summer, but you are not going to get TIAA/CREF on the summer" then obviously it would be done.

**ROTHMAN:** Is this a program in general that is to encourage retirement or is a program to attract faculty? If it is a program to attract faculty, you won't attract senior faculty. I am not eligible so I don't care. But, what is it all about?

**LOHMANN:** It seems that any kind of a program like this cuts a lot of different ways. There is not one answer to that question. It could be attractive in hiring young faculty. Some people say young people don't even look at retirement programs. They are much more interested in health insurance or up front salary or something else, but they are not interested in retirement programs. On the other hand, it certainly could help, and 18/20 has helped, to retain people here who are moving toward eligibility and who are weighing things saying "If I go away, I forego all of these benefits. So, maybe I would like to keep these benefits so maybe I should stay here." You are right. It certainly will not help in recruiting senior faculty who will not have the number of service years by the time they reach retirement age. But, there are lots of other people at the University whom it might serve. It could be a recruitment tool, it could be a retention tool, and we think it makes simply good sense in the modern world to provide retirement possibilities at an age earlier than between 65 and 70. I think we are a bit behind the times. The statistics show that people do

retire at earlier ages. We want to provide a plan that makes that possible.

**VESSELY:** To just follow up on something that Professor Robbins said about eligibility. Is everyone who is in the grandfathering area, will the option still be available to select either the old early retirement or the new early retirement program?

**LOHMANN:** Yes. That certainly is an option. I think that is also one of the reasons why the Trustees have already said that they don't favor reducing the retirement age for 18/20 down to 60 because they feel that if anybody is really eager to retire early at age 60 and is eligible for 18/20, they ought to move into this because there are a lot of savings for the University for anybody who moves from 18/20 to this plan. This is kind of an inducement for people. They will consider what is more important, retiring at age 60 or getting a better benefit?

**ROBBINS:** It isn't absolutely certain that the 18/20 Plan will provide everyone a higher benefit than they might get under the Full Early Retirement Plan (FERP). It is possible that circumstances would be such that the projected TIAA/CREF retirement five years out would be less than the 60 percent plus provided by the FERP.

**LOHMANN:** It is very unlikely, but I guess it could happen. But, it is very unlikely.

**ROBBINS:** There is nothing like 18/20 for a fairly substantial benefit. This is clearly a reduced version.

**LOHMANN:** Although, as we compare it to other retirement plans, this is still quite good compared to other universities.

**BEPKO:** Is there any viewpoint from our campus Fringe Benefits Committee, Roko?

**ALIPRANTIS:** We do think that this is the best that we can get and we approve it. We give you a free hand to negotiate it. We would like to see also a fringe benefit for the ten-month employees.

**PETERSON:** The one issue that is not addressed in here is when that summer contribution begins to be made for TIAA/CREF on the summer employees. We are getting so late in the year that, by the time that it gets through the University Faculty Council and gets to the Board of Trustees, there probably won't be time to address that for this upcoming summer.

**LOHMANN:** I think this upcoming summer is totally out of the question.

**PETERSON:** The thought was that this would be for the following summer.

**LOHMANN:** Yes.

**BEPKO:** Are there any other comments or questions? Would you like to vote for approval of this document so that it can be of assistance to our representatives on the University Faculty Council? [So moved and seconded] The motion has been made and seconded. All in favor, say "Aye." The vote is unanimous in favor of this document. Thank you, Professor Lohmann. Have a good trip.

### **AGENDA ITEM III - Memorial Resolution: Grant Van Huysen, School of Medicine**

**BEPKO:** We have a memorial resolution for Grant Van Huysen for the School of Medicine. We have a new policy of not reading the memorial resolutions. But, with your concurrence, we will

note that the memorial resolution was approved and received and will be communicated to those persons who are indicated in the resolution as recipients.

#### **AGENDA ITEM IV - Approval of November, 1990 and January, 1991 Minutes**

**BEPKO:** We need approval of minutes for two different meetings. Do we have a motion on those minutes? [So moved and seconded]. All in favor, say "Aye." Are there any opposed? [none] The minutes will be approved as distributed.

#### **AGENDA ITEM V - Presiding Officer's Business - Chancellor Gerald Bepko**

**BEPKO:** We have one item under Presiding Officer's Business that is a carryover item that has been on our agenda for some time. Actually, it has been removed now but we are going to report on it anyway. It is the faculty salary letter issue. Bill Plater will bring us up-to-date on that issue.

**PLATER:** We are very pleased to report that this is the first carryover item that we have been able to remove from the agenda. At the suggestion of the Executive Committee and members of the Council we have been trying to develop a system to improve the timely notice of salary increases for faculty. After a series of discussions with the administrative officers who have to prepare the letters and implement all of the bureaucracy that goes with making certain that the salary notices are exactly right, as well as with the deans who are ultimately responsible for recommending the salaries and verifying that all of the information is correct, we decided the best way to do this is through a two-step process. As a consequence, beginning this year, we will ask that all of the deans notify individual faculty of the salary increases that have been recommended for them to the Board of Trustees within two weeks of the time that the recommendations have been submitted to the campus office. This will insure an early and timely notice for the faculty of what the probable salary increases are to be. Once the Board of Trustees has acted upon the recommendations, the Chancellor will then send a letter directly to the individual faculty member confirming, or stating, what the salary is as approved by the Board of Trustees. The letter from the Chancellor will ask that, if there is a discrepancy in the two letters, the faculty member immediately notify the department chair or the dean to determine what the source of the problem is. This procedure is based on our experience and over continuing assumption that almost always the salary recommended by the dean will be the same as that approved by the Board of Trustees. But, it is possible that either an error could occur or that something would change in between the recommendation stage and the approval stage. In any case, we believe this will insure as early notice as possible and at the same time provide the verification that faculty have asked for, once the Board of Trustees has acted.

**BEPKO:** If the Trustees approve a higher salary than the dean recommended, we will give you the option of whether to call it to anyone's attention or not. Are there any questions?

**ZUNT** Is there an estimate about what that date might be, two weeks after the recommendation from the dean? Would it be sometime in July?

**PLATER:** It should be much earlier than that. We can't set a specific time because it varies from year to year. In one year of the biennium, the salary determinations always come much later because the state legislature has to approve the budget. This year, for example, we probably won't have recommendations into our offices until late May and it could, therefore, be early June before faculty receive their first notice. In the second year of the biennium it is almost certain that it would be six weeks earlier than that.

**CUTSHALL:** The question that I would have then is that, I assume that the salary letters you do send out from your office to the faculty member do not pass through the dean's office first.

**PLATER:** That is our intent to do so that the...

**CUTSHALL:** When would that come out relative to when you get your departmental/school notification?

**PLATER:** It would be as soon as possible after the Board of Trustees act. Again, that will vary somewhat, but it shouldn't take very long after the Trustees' action to have the letters out. I can't make promises on behalf of another office that will actually have to do it, but I think it would be reasonable to have about a two week lag time.

**BEPKO:** The Trustees' meeting is already scheduled for June 18, 19, and 20th. That is the session in which it is contemplated that they would approve the budget. The letters will be out before the first of July. If there are no other comments, we have the Executive Committee Report.

#### **AGENDA ITEM VI - Executive Committee Report - Richard Peterson, Secretary**

**PETERSON:** I have very little to report today. I did want to reemphasize the two major things that are coming up at the University Faculty Council next time. That is the proposal that we have already discussed here to modify the early retirement proposal and the proposed changes in the Academic Handbook. I think it is very important that we are represented from this level on both of those items. Please get to your University Faculty Council representatives if you have any more comments on either of these items. That is the extent of the Executive Committee Report.

#### **AGENDA ITEM VII - Proposed Changes in the Academic Handbook**

**BEPKO:** We have one item that is left of those two. That is the Proposed Changes in the Academic Handbook and Kathleen Warfel is going to lead our discussion of those changes which are in your agenda packet.

**WARFEL:** I brought a one-sheet handout to help us get through this discussion. If you didn't pick one up when you came in, there should be some more on the table.

The handbook that we are talking about is the All University Academic Handbook that is currently in a three-ring red binder. We are not talking about the IUPUI Handbook. The proposed changes are printed for you in the material that was distributed. The Indiana University Academic Handbook is in need of being updated. Last year the Agenda Committee for the UFC appointed a Handbook Committee which had representatives from Bloomington, with Charles Yokomoto and Henry Karlson for IUPUI (Henry Karlson was the chair of this committee), and representation from some of the other campuses. After a lot of work, that group reported back to the Agenda Committee with the nine suggestions that you see. These were discussed, to some extent, at last month's University Faculty Council meeting and they are now being presented for discussion at all the campuses. We are going to take the feedback from these discussions, work on the proposed changes, and then hope to present them for approval.

The IUPUI Faculty Affairs Committee has reviewed the proposed changes in detail and written comments regarding both major and minor points. We bring today this list of major concerns and ask for the advice of the IUPUI Faculty Council. I think it would be easier if we went through these

one through nine. Some of them will be much easier to discuss than others.

Proposed Change #1: This is a change on page one of the Handbook in the Introductory Remarks. There was a sentence saying that statements and policies in the Handbook do not create a contract and do not create any legal rights. The feeling is that that sets rather a bad tone for the Handbook overall and the recommendation is to strike that sentence. There has been general agreement so far in favor of doing that. Does anyone want to make a comment about proposed change #1?

**WILSON:** I have just an overall question. Does this document pertain to Purdue people on this campus?

**PLATER:** Yes. But, depending on the changes that take place here, we would have to modify the regulations that we have followed in addressing the Purdue Promotion and Tenure cases. One of the results of the proposed changes is to bring us closer to what we have observed for Purdue members. But, if there were to be a change in the tenure process, that would also have to be modified for Purdue faculty.

**WILSON:** (Could not understand)

**PLATER:** Yes. As far as the tenure provisions are concerned.

**BEPKO:** I think the last paragraph of recommendation #1 answers the question. The answer is yes, it does apply but in the event of differences between this document and the original documents cited herein, I would think that would refer to the Purdue procedures. The wording in the original document shall control or "obtain" is the word they use here, but I think that means control. So, the answer I guess is yes but if Purdue documents that control promotion and tenure for Purdue are different, then they supersede this but only to the extent that they supersede. Kathleen, do you want to approve these one at a time as we go through them?

**WARFEL:** Whatever you wish to do.

**PETERSON:** I think that might be a good thing to do.

**BEPKO:** Should we vote on #1? All in favor, say "Aye." Are there any opposed? [none]

**WARFEL:** Proposed change #2 is in the section about the Probationary Period for Tenure. First of all, there is a different way of presenting the concept that the total probationary period for tenure doesn't exceed seven years. Then there are two paragraphs added. One of them addresses the fact that you can't get tenure just because people forget about you. That if you are overlooked, it is not automatic tenure. But, as soon as you are found you have to go through the tenure process.

The last paragraph added states that faculty going up for tenure early would have to leave the university if unsuccessful; there would be no second chance. This does not accurately reflect current practices, nor does it appear to be a necessary change because of abuse of the system. The committee's suggestion is that this last paragraph should not be added. Is there any discussion on proposed change #2?

**VESSELY:** Kathy, can we get a reaction from Dean Plater in regard to whether that is accurate that it is not consistent with current practice or whether or not there is abuse or not?

**PLATER:** I don't think there is abuse. The current practice, through a fairly recent change, has been to allow early consideration of candidates for tenure at, essentially, their own request. There

is a clear understanding that one possible outcome of that review might be a notice of non-reappointment . That is what we have tried to state in the current policies that we have developed for consideration of earlier than normal tenure. There is not a rule that says that it has to be automatically tenure or non-reappointment.

**FREDLAND:** What then happens if someone is denied tenure after three years? Do they get reviewed again in three years? Is that the automatic assumption?

**PLATER:** It wouldn't change the probationary period. A person would still have to be reviewed at the end of the probationary period. It would be possible for a person who is being considered for earlier than normal tenure to withdraw his/her candidacy along the way and return to the normal probationary period that has been established. A candidate might put him/herself up for early tenure and with an unfavorable school review might withdraw candidacy at that point. As far as the tenure clock is concerned, there would be no change.

**PETERSON:** That withdrawal could presumably happen as far up as the Chancellor's office. Is that right?

**PLATER:** That is correct.

**SIDHU:** My question is just for clarification. This discretion will become an instrument for those of you who are going to discuss it again. I am just wanting to be clear that we are not approving these changes or disapproving them. Is that correct?

**WARFEL:** That is how I am interpreting what we are doing.

**SIDHU:** We are not taking any decisive action whether we approve or disapprove. This is for discussion during this meeting and it will be discussed at another level before it goes to University Faculty Council?

**SHIPPS:** It says ACTION ITEM on the agenda.

**SIDHU:** That is what I want to get a clarification on. It says ACTION ITEM. Are we approving or disapproving by vote the recommendations that this committee has made?

**WARFEL:** I think it is very important that we understand what it is we are asking your vote today. My understanding is that when you say, yes, you are in favor of "it", the "it" is our comment not the proposed change in its entirety.

**BEPKO:** Hitwant's question is what is the significance of the vote that we might take on any one of these particular recommendations as modified by the recommendations that you are making here, Kathy. I think that the answer to that is this would be informative for our representatives on the University Faculty Council when these issues are taken up there.

**ALIPRANTIS:** I would like to make a comment about this item and about early tenure. I would like to feel free to say that someone who deserves to get promotion in two years or one year should get it. There should not be the fear that in case you don't make it during an early tenure decision, then you are fired. If we adopt the policy that if you don't make it, you are out, then this will show the growth of IUPUI.

**HOYT:** I just had two points of clarification. One is that, by removing that paragraph we are saying that you can go up for early tenure and actually be unsuccessful and withdraw before the

decision and still stay appointed? You may also not be recommended but if you aren't successful, it can then again come up for tenure at the time at which it is set?

**PETERSON:** There is one circumstance where this gets a bit complicated. That is, if you come with three years of credit toward tenure and you are given an initial three year contract, you go up for review for tenure after the end of your first year. Then if you are not recommended for tenure, you still have an additional year on the contract.

**HOYT:** That is not early tenure. That is specified time. That is not what I am saying. I just want to clarify that if you went up for early tenure and then got discouraged, if you didn't receive it, then you were in fact terminated.

**WARFEL:** We believe that by not adding this paragraph things can go on as they have been. In some schools people try early and if they are unsuccessful they try again.

**HOYT:** The other thing is that when it says here "the total probationary period may not exceed seven years...", that means that it does not include those years that may be for whatever reason the clock stopped such as taking a leave without pay to pursue some special research opportunity, etc.

**WARFEL:** This is just clock running time.

**HOYT:** It isn't really too clear anywhere in this particular paragraph. Maybe it refers to it someplace else but there is nothing specifically stating it. It just sounds like it is that the total probationary period should not exceed seven years and there are no exceptions.

**WARFEL:** That was brought up at the University Faculty Council when these changes were discussed. I didn't include it as a major item today but it has been brought up already. There has been some comment made about the fact that there are exceptions. Ways to stop the clock might be put in there. That has been talked about in other forums but I didn't include it as a major item.

**HOYT:** I think that if we vote for that line, it is important that it somehow it be addressed that we are going to document it.

**KARLSON:** (Turned tape at this point) a family leave policy. That is understood that this was not to be in conflict with this. What we were worried about is the term of the probationary period and whether or not you could give more than seven years. First, that violates the AAUP guidelines. In fact, we are already in violation of the AAUP guidelines in some cases. I won't go into those circumstances. A total probationary period in excess of seven years would violate the AAUP guidelines.

**BEPKO:** Last fall we discussed an interim policy that we adopted for persons who were called up in the reserve because of the Gulf crisis. The tenure clock would stop in that case too if the absence from the University was long enough.

**BALDWIN:** I would like to ask a question about the next to the last paragraph which you don't have any recommendations about. It seems to me, looking at that in the worst of all possible cases, that a chair or a dean could actually do a pocket veto on somebody by not moving things along. I always liked this idea here. I don't know how often this accidental tenure happens, but it does enable people in charge of such matters to realize that they have to keep in charge of such matters. That is something that will affect the University at the end if they don't do their job. The penalty now falls on the individual faculty member, not on the administrators. I can just see



somebody with an internal grievance in an area not moving documents along or giving people bad advice.

**PETERSON:** That is dealt with in the last sentence. "In such a case, the review leading to a tenure or termination decision should be conducted at the earliest possible time." So, he would be considered whenever this did come to light. The person presumably would still be given at least a twelve-month warning period after having been with the University his number of years.

**BALDWIN:** That's the terminal year.

**PETERSON:** He is entitled to the additional twelve months after he is given that warning that he will not get tenure no matter when that is. That violates the seven-year rule to a certain extent given on the previous page. That is one of those exceptions that we have to accept when a person has been here more than three years or whatever it is, they have to be given a year termination.

**BALDWIN:** So that may be the next year?

**PETERSON:** Or sometime in the sequence. It may not have gone through regularly but they may put the documents through in January and try to get him through before all of the deadlines come up.

**YOKOMOTO:** I think there is a little bit of confusion as to what we would do proposed change #2 was left out. Kathleen said it would revert back to current practices, but on the committee we were quite clear that current practices was one attempt toward tenure. You have to really clarify this. Have there been people who have come up for tenure, went through the process, were turned down and, assuming they did file a grievance with the board of review, were given an extension toward tenure? We had Dean Anya Royce on the committee and Dorothy Frapwell with the University Counsel and we thought we were merely putting into words what is current practice. Henry, is that your recollection?

**KARLSON:** I recall the discussion. I stated that we had had a policy on this campus allowing early tenure requests but originally that required permission of the Dean of Faculties.

**PLATER:** Before it could be submitted.

**KARLSON:** Before it could be submitted. It was sort of a minor review and we thought it was not strong enough and you would never submit it so we never had that problem. But that was my understanding and I was told that I was wrong, that that was not the University policy by the individuals whose names you stated.

**WARFEL:** The School of Education members were the ones in Faculty Affairs who talked about what things were like in the School of Education.

**SHIPPS:** My question has to do with the first of these two paragraphs about you can't get tenure by inadvertence. Is that retrospective?

**KARLSON:** That is the current position of the University too. The University has never stated that you could have tenure by inadvertence. This was to clarify that issue.

**SIDHU:** Charlie, at the University Faculty Council meeting it was pointed out that on other campuses there have been some cases where the person has gone for early tenure and those are

withdrawn. So, by reading that paragraph, that possibility would be taken away from them.

**KARLSON:** It was understood that they could withdraw at any time in the proceedings. But if they did not withdraw and went totally through the proceedings, that was their one bite. That was the understanding that we had been told that the present University policy had been for some duration.

**PLATER:** It is not the University policy. It is the practice of the Bloomington campus.

**BEPKO:** We actually wrestled with this a couple of years ago and then established a principle that, while there should be no automatic jeopardy, that when you do ask for your tenure application to be sent to the Trustees, I think that is what we are talking about when you ask for it to be taken all of the way even though it may be early, then you run the risk that one of the possible results is a decision that you should not be tenured and that you will be given notice of non-reappointment. That is not necessarily what will happen. You could apply early, not be recommended for tenure and still be left in the same probationary period to come back again another time. I think the reason for acknowledging that there was some jeopardy is to avoid what could happen if you encourage people in the other direction -- that every probationary appointee would ask for tenure every year. If there was no risk whatsoever, you might have more people applying than would be good for us as an institution.

**GNAT:** Can a unit say that if you go up for early tenure and don't make it that you are out?

**PLATER:** Yes, but ordinarily this notice would be through the notice of non-reappointment process. After the third year of the probationary period there is an annual reappointment process regardless of initial appointment. That would still be an option regardless of the language here.

**ROTHMAN:** What I was thinking of was the entirely different situation of where the faculty wanted to keep the faculty member. They were afraid of losing him. Just to show the confidence of the faculty in the individual. I wasn't thinking about a person nominating themselves.

**KARLSON:** The language here is self-nominated. A faculty can request to be rated.

**SHIPPS:** Does it ever happen that somebody gets a job offer somewhere else and they come back and say, "Give me tenure and I'll stay"? Does that ever happen?

**BEPKO:** That is how this got started a couple of years ago, or at least that was one of the considerations. Someone on the tenure track was interested in another position. It hadn't actually been offered yet, I don't think. The question was whether there could be a recommendation for early tenure. The policy, as we understood it at the time, was that the Dean of Faculties had to give a preliminary review in any case such as that. It was my understanding at that time a few years ago, that the only reason for letting an early tenure review go forward was special circumstances, defined as a job offer from another institution that involved tenure. After some advice from the schools, and some soul searching we thought that it was better to allow units to recommend early tenure and not say the only situation would be where there was another job offer involved. It could be a recommendation for early tenure but there would be that one potential jeopardy that, if the file was reviewed and it was the fourth year of the probationary process and the review concluded that this person would not make tenure, even after six years, then he would have had that one review and that would be all that he would get. He would get a notice of non-reappointment because the file of the individual would be at that stage thought to be insufficient for early tenure. That wouldn't be the only possible result, however, it could be that the review would result in, not a recommendation of tenure, but in a continuation of the probationary appointment. That is our understanding of what the practice is today in Indianapolis.

appointment. That is our understanding of what the practice is today in Indianapolis.

HOYT: I am not in favor of the wording, but my concern is that, if it is left out, then what does the document say what happens? Is it left up to each campus and then the President then interprets that any way that he feels fit at that point? Is he covering all campuses? I prefer what you were saying to let people know about the dangers involved and that could be false but it is not making it absolute. But, taking it out seems to me, that the way it is now is, if you can find out from the right person, you can find out what the practice is. Heaven help you if you don't ask the right person and got the correct advice that you should have gotten. It is just that it is out of line and someone down the line interprets it totally differently, things may be in motion that you can't stop.

BEPKO: I think that right now, Dolores, if you have a question about this you would ask through the normal channels. If you go to the Dean of the Faculties, you would get the right advice. If you didn't do that, if you ask only people you happen to know, or didn't seek advice through that channel, then you might not get the right advice. But, if you do ask through the regular channels, you would get consistent and correct advice on the practices of the campus. I don't think that should be a problem.

HOYT: I have been in several meetings where I feel like I have heard two different things and this is with the same people involved. Maybe I am not listening correctly and misinterpreting. I have heard so many times and it has been grated into my mind that you have one chance to go up for tenure. Then, if you don't make it you are out whether it is early or not.

BEPKO: Apparently, that is your library policy. As Jean said, that is not the University's policy. Whatever governs your particular academic unit is what you are referring to. I suppose that within an academic unit, like your unit, there may be a more restrictive approach. I think the important question that you raise, though, is what is the consequence of this vote. I think if the vote is to recommend that this be taken out, this would be part of the instruction and information that would be given to our representatives at the University Faculty Council. On the other hand, we may wish to suggest substituted language.

ALIPRANTIS: I presume that when somebody asks for an early promotion, that the departmental committee would say to the person, "Wait, this is the case." The idea that everyone can try for an early tenure should not be encouraged unless there is some merit to this case. This should be controlled at the departmental level. Otherwise, I agree with you.

PALMER: I don't think any of us disagree that this paragraph should be taken out. I think what people are quibbling about is having something else put in. I move that we take a vote on whether to take this out or not. [motion seconded]

VESSELY: On that point, the paragraph mainly said something happens. Without that paragraph, what happens now is what is going to happen. As far as the paranoia about what the President is thinking, if there is non-reappointment, there is non-reappointment. The President is not going to say, "I think you are a good person and you should be reappointed, but arbitrarily I am going to say no." It is either reappointment or non-reappointment. That is the jeopardy. I thought we only had three or four lawyers in this room, but I am finding out that we have 20 or 30. We could write language for this forever. What happens is that you either get reappointed or you don't and if there is not a non-reappointment clause in there, then you are going to have an opportunity as we have seen in practice at least in Indianapolis to go at this again. We could write some things and be more or less paranoid depending on who wrote them.

**BEPKO:** Henry, you are the chairman of this committee.

**KARLSON:** The first information that we were given was that the standard procedure of Indiana University was that tenure was only to be given one chance. In fact, we were told by the people from other campuses who were present that that was the procedure at their campuses. Again, I have indicated that I thought the procedures were different here but that was disagreed with. The question though is whether or not tenure should be different on each campus. I don't believe it should be. I don't care what the rule is but whatever the rule happens to be, I think the people at Bloomington or the people at our other satellite campuses have the same interest. So, if we are going to have a rule, let us put into the Academic Handbook and not let it turn back so that at one school you can ask for early tenure and not get non-reappointment and at another school you can't without risking non-reappointment and at a third school they flip a coin. So, if you take this paragraph out, I merely ask that you recommend what it could be replaced with and not leave it at the flip of a coin or the will of the gods or all of the above.

**BEPKO:** I think that is the right approach. Maybe the issue of what is the existing policy, whether it is policy that applies in Bloomington and not in Indianapolis or whether it applies everywhere else and not in Indianapolis, should be set aside and a policy that is best for the whole University ought to be adopted.

**FREDLAND:** I would like to move that we strike the last sentence of that paragraph and retain the first sentence. I think that is pretty much the sentiment of what we are saying.

**KARLSON:** Again, the consequences of that act are going to differ from campus to campus and school to school. An academic handbook should be sufficiently precise to let a faculty person know these risks at the very least because this is going to be one of the primary sources of those who determine their rights and risks. You tell them they have a right **(COULD NOT UNDERSTAND)** if you belong to School A your head gets cut off, if you belong to School B, you get a second chance, and if you are on campus C, God knows what happens because they haven't decided yet.

**FREDLAND:** If the wording stated the consequences, would that make you happy?

**KARLSON:** I don't care what result you put in there so long as you are uniform for all campuses.

**SIDHU:** Henry, even if you are uniform all over, the main thing is that tenure is campus specific. I think there should be general consensus and the consensus is that the last paragraph should be removed.

**KARLSON:** I agree. I would like to have this language substituted that an adverse determination on a request for early retirement tenure will not necessarily lead to the determination of a person's position.

**BEPKO:** Would it be a good idea, and maybe I am anticipating the sense of the Council, to express satisfaction with the policy contained in the second sentence and ask the University Faculty Council representatives to take into account the concern that Henry's mentioned and that others have mentioned that there be a University wide policy of some kind, but not this one?

**BALDWIN:** I just have a suggestion. Could there be worked into this rule that if one is going up for early tenure and one submits the documentation, that if there is ever a negative vote at any level, that it stops at that point? Normally, if somebody is wise, they would pull it at that point anyway if it is early tenure. If it were codified that it had to be pulled at that point, unless the person wanted to take it to a Board of Review.

PETERSON: I think it is important to have something like that in there because our current practices say that we can withdraw it but what if you are not notified that it is negative? You would never have the opportunity to withdraw it. If that is built in, then we have no problem.

FREDLAND: I call for the question.

PETERSON: The motion from Faculty Affairs Committee was that we strike that paragraph and I think that should be the question.

BEPKO: I would like to ask you to approve the proposed change #2 but without the last paragraph. All in favor, say "Aye." Any opposed? Should there be anything other than the discussion that has already taken place to aid our University Faculty Council representatives in discussing what should be put into the handbook, assuming that the rest of the University Faculty Council will agree that this last paragraph is objectionable. It may be that the rest of the University Faculty Council will think that this is current practice on all of the other campuses. Maybe we are the ones who are out of step and the UFC will approve it even over our objections. There may be a need for guidance for our UFC representatives. Will it be sufficient to communicate to them the discussion that has taken place here or should there be some further motion?

WARFEL: Proposed change #3 is still on the general topic of tenure. It is the section entitled "Procedures for Faculty." This section doesn't say that much about procedure actually. We felt that it would be improved greatly by spelling out the importance of faculty peer review in the tenure decision making at departmental, school, and campus levels and should mandate in its language the participation of elected faculty members in the peer review process. It was suggested that the section on procedure have a statement about any future changes in tenure procedure being approved by the Faculty Council. The third concern about the procedure section is one that has been strongly debated in the several times that I have been through this. There are strong opinions on both sides of the issue of having additional information sought and received in the making of the tenure decision. This is the added paragraph, the three lines in the last paragraph about additional information being sought or received. We have no consensus on the suggestion concerning that.

ROTHMAN: I don't like the last paragraph at all. I would like that information be kept confidential and not shown to the individual.

KARLSON: The law would not allow that. If you are using it to deny a person employment, he has the right to see it. That is a matter of state law.

ROTHMAN: That is why you get a lot of nothings in these letters of recommendation.

KARLSON: That is also known as fairness and due process when they pass it in the legislature.

ROTHMAN: I will have to do it by telephone.

KARLSON: You would be violating these procedures and if it is determined then he will get automatic tenure from a court decision and you will pay large damages.

ROTHMAN: I'll join the union.

WARFEL: The comments that I have heard has been on these two spots. One group says that they don't think any additional information should be sought or added once the dossier is at a certain point. The other group says that everyone knows that additional information is, in fact,

sought and received and we ought to have something in the handbook, some policy of the University that says when it is sought and received. The candidate has to know about it and have a chance to comment on it.

**KARLSON:** I want to comment. Both of those positions were put forth very strongly on the committee as I recall. My original thought was that a file should be completed at the time it is submitted and that additional information should not be allowed after that point. Then the other position was in reality that that is not a practical set of circumstances. There might be very important additional information which should be considered by the committee. It was also pointed out that, as a matter of reality and practice, in fact such information is being requested in various schools and on various campuses. The next question was, of course, if you are going to do it or if it is being done, shouldn't the faculty member concerned have the ability to rebut what might be rumor or character assassination which he/she would have no possibility of being aware of? This was, in affect, a compromise recognizing what is being done but putting in place safeguards to guarantee that this supplemental information would be given to the faculty person concerned so that they would have an opportunity to deal with it.

**SIDHU:** Again, I may be taking a very negative point of view, but the only danger lies in this \_\_\_\_\_ that as far as the dossier is concerned, generally they should get it completed by the time it leaves the dean's office. If the dossier is completed and has been reviewed prior to leaving the dean's office, the information needed in the dossier is there. From there it moves on to the IUPUI committee, the Dean of the Faculties, the Chancellor, and the President. If it continues to stay open with the initial information, then the danger lies that the dossier keeps changing all the way until it goes to the Trustees. So, I feel that clarification can be sought, should be sought and we should have the opportunity to comment on that. As far as seeking additional information concerned, that will create some problems.

**VESSELY:** If this truly a peer review process and the peers are reviewing it along the way, if there is additional support -- from my sports background, if you need a pinch hitter or somebody to add that little extra clout before it goes on to the next level, it would seem to me that the faculty member would be in favor of that. If it is a peer process and it goes along with support all the way through the process, opening it up at some point and adding information that would suggest some dark secret from this person's past where they shouldn't get promoted and get tenure, is what I think that paragraph is trying to protect. It seems to me that one way to handle it would be language to say that everyone who has looked at this dossier thinks that this person deserves to be promoted or tenured why would we want to open it up to find an argument why we shouldn't promote that person or tenure that person.

**KARLSON:** This does not make it mandatory for them to do it. It merely permits it in those circumstances where they might think it is necessary. If everyone thinks that this person deserves tenure, no one is going to be seeking additional information.

**VESSELY:** It could be that everyone involved in that could be that a unit committee and the school committee says that but the dean doesn't think so.

**KARLSON:** Right now I would rather know why the dean doesn't think so than to have the dean suddenly mark "Denied" on it without any chance for the faculty member to respond.

**VESSELY:** Can't that happen whether or not that dossier has additional information added to it or not?

**KARLSON:** Quite often it is done on that basis. The dean says, "I am aware of this fact which isn't in the dossier. I just know this as the dean. I know this fact." That is, in affect, adding additional information to the dossier. How do you stop from the dean from acting on the basis of information known privately to him in his capacity as a human being? If he is going to act upon it, it has to become part of the dossier.

**BEPKO:** I think that to restrict what a dean or a department chair, or anyone else in the process, is going to be able to do, is going to be very difficult. It may involve legal problems in and of itself because you can't muzzle someone and prevent them from thinking or talking or communicating. I think Henry's point is well taken that this takes into account the possibility that there may be something that is interjected into the process. The best way of dealing with that is not to try to prohibit it, but to force it to be a part of the file and let the candidate know. That is what this section provides for.

**SHIPPS:** There is a very famous case among historians where a model dossier was concerned and a very negative book review in a prestigious journal came out the day before it was to be considered. Somebody brought it and it got into a big discussion about whether the person had the right to respond and say, "That's my big thing." This forces the person whose dossier is being considered to have the right to respond.

**BEPKO:** I think we have to move along anyway. Are you ready to vote on #3? All in favor say "aye." Any opposed? Let's move on to #4.

**WARFEL:** Section four has to do with annual review. The fact that there is supposed to be one, there is some clarification needed for the term "unit." But, basically we didn't see a major problem with proposed change #4.

**BEPKO:** Are there any comments on #4?

**PETERSON:** One of the only comments that I have heard about this is the definition of "unit" in some of these areas may not be as well defined as it should be. That will be something that will be taken into consideration at higher levels.

**KARLSON:** We tried to make this as broad as possible.

**BEPKO:** Are you ready to vote on #4? All in favor say "aye." Any opposed?

**ROTHER:** We need clarification. What are we voting on?

**KARLSON:** If you would like to know what we are attempting to clarify here was that the rules under which a person was going to be reviewed were to be determined by the faculty, not by a dean.

**BEPKO:** The vote was basically to reaffirm and approve what is in the agenda. Our review committee had no problem with it. Let's move on to #5.

**WARFEL:** Proposed change #5 has to do with geographic limitation of tenure. We saw no major problem with this change.

**BEPKO:** Are there any comments on #5? All in favor of #5, say "aye." Any opposed?

WARFEL: Proposed change #6 deals with a section entitled, "Criteria for Tenure." This section doesn't make clear what the criteria for tenure are except to say that they are similar to those for promotion but not identical to them. We felt that it would be a better section if it stated more exactly what the criteria for tenure are. There is a paragraph added about a document to be generated in the unit that will help people understand better what their unit is all about. The last paragraph added highlights the importance of recognizing and considering the diversity of missions in the University in making a tenure decision. We seem to be strongly in favor of the addition of that last paragraph.

ROTHE: In the first of those three changes the next to the last line says "each unit should provide each probationary..." It seems to me that that should be "shall." It seems to me that the faculty member shall know what the document...

BEPKO: Henry, do you have any reaction from the committee?

KARLSON: I think the term "shall" would be very appropriate. That would make it stronger and more mandatory because that was our intent. You notice also that once you have that at the time of your appointment, if the criteria change, you can elect to be considered under the criteria that existed at the time you were appointed.

MORREL: You are referring to the last sentence of the first paragraph, aren't you?

BEPKO: We have a sense that we should use "shall" instead of "should." Are there any other questions or comments?

ROTHMAN: My question regards what is coming up later in #8. Number eight and this one says different things. Number 8 states that with tenure you are automatically promoted. Here you are saying that can't combine the two. I am from a Purdue School and Purdue says that you get promoted then you get tenured. You don't get tenure without getting promoted.

WARFEL: The difference between tenure and promotion is involved in #6 but even more involved with #8 and so they...

MORREL: But here you are saying that they are going to be the same and in #8 you are saying that if you get tenured, you get promoted automatically.

WARFEL: What it says currently is that tenure will generally not be conferred unless the faculty member or librarian achieves or gives strong promise of achieving promotion in rank.

MORREL: But, number 8 says something different.

WARFEL: Yes, and we don't like it.

MORREL: You don't like it but I do.

WARFEL: You like the one direction it goes but not the other. Maybe you like it entirely.

MORREL: I like the idea that you only get tenured if you are promoted.

WARFEL: Yes. But, maybe not right at that minute.

MORREL: No. Right then and there.



BEPKO: I think we have to finish #6 given the time constraints. Are you ready to vote on #6? No. 6 would be as it is printed but with the changes that have been mentioned -- the two should come out and the two shall go in. Are you ready to vote? All in favor, say "aye." Any opposed? [a few] Let's move on to #7.

WARFEL: Proposed change #7 is again about annual reviews. This time for people who haven't been finally promoted rather than tenured. We saw no major problems with proposed change #7.

BEPKO: Are there any questions or comments?

PETERSON: I have a question related to the last phrase that was struck as to why that was struck. There have been some suggestions that that be retained.

KARLSON: Of the University?

PETERSON: No. "of all matters relevant to eligibility for promotion."

KARLSON: Because it was our understanding that those matters would have been given to them by the procedures if you take a look back at an earlier document, which we talked about here, in which the criteria for promotion and tenure was set out. So, that was redundant.

BEPKO: All in favor, say "aye." Any opposed? Let's move to number 8.

WARFEL: Proposed change #8 has to do with promotion in rank would absolutely link promotion and tenure. There was concern that tenure and promotion should not be so absolutely linked leaving the door open for rare exceptions.

BEPKO: The proposed change is to link promotion to associate and tenure, as it is in the Purdue system. The recommendation of the review committee is to not adopt that language; to not link tenure so absolutely to promotion from assistant to associate.

ROTHER: I would like to ask the committee a question. How can you possibly give someone tenure with a lifetime guarantee of employment and not at the same time say they are good enough for an associate professorship? Associate professorship, without further promotion, I understand, but to stay at assistant professorship or instructor for the remainder of their career seems unreasonable.

WARFEL: Part of the problem is that the tenure review has to be made after you complete five years and some people at that point may be showing strong promise for promotability but not being promotable at that given time. So, to link them absolutely would mean to force yourself to get rid of that person who showed strong promise.

ROTHER: That signal would be made at the end of the sixth year, right?

PETERSON: It begins at the end of the your fifth year in reality for tenure.

PLATER: The review takes place during a person's sixth year of the probationary period.

ROTHER: You have six years.

BEPKO: That is the policy for about 15 percent of the faculty on this campus already who are reviewed in the Purdue University process.

GNAT: It's automatic on the Bloomington campus.

KARLSON: On the Bloomington campus it is automatic.

VESSELY: I call for the question.

BEPKO: The question is the proposal of the review committee. They expressed the thought that tenure and promotion not be linked absolutely as they are in this language. That is what we would be voting on. Does everyone understand that? All in favor, say "Aye." Any opposed? [several] [A show of hands was taken -- 23 yes and 16 no.] The results of this vote will give to our representatives of the University Faculty Council an indication that the IUPUI Faculty Council is somewhat divided on the issue.

#### AGENDA ITEM VIII - Announcements

BEPKO: We have two announcements as we conclude the meeting. The first is an announcement by Jeff Vessely about a stunning success in intercollegiate athletics.

VESSELY: This is from my esteemed colleague, Hugh Wolf, who is the faculty athletic director. Hugh would like to offer the following resolution for our consideration:

Be it resolved that the IUPUI Faculty Council offer its congratulations to Coach Julie Wilhoit and the members of the IUPUI Women's Basketball Team who advanced to the Final Four of the NAIA national tournament held in Jackson, Tennessee earlier this week. Congratulations are also extended to Mary Murphy and Ann Zellers, who were named to the tournament All-Star Team and to Julie Rotramel, who received Honorable Mention All American honors. All three student athletes are enrolled in the School of Physical Education.

BEPKO: There is a motion and a second. All in favor say "aye." Any opposed? Dolores Hoyt has a report on elections to the University Faculty Council.

HOYT: The listing of the people who were elected as at-large representatives and University Faculty Council representatives are on the front table for you to pick up as you leave if you haven't already done so. These will be reflected in the minutes. The other thing is that I would like permission to destroy the ballots for both of those elections. [So moved and seconded]

#### University Faculty Council Election Results

##### Term Ending 1992

Walter Buchanan, Eng/Tech  
Wilmer Fife, Science  
Richard Fredland, Lib Arts  
B Keith Moore, Dentistry  
Richard Peterson, Medicine  
Kenneth Ryder, Medicine  
Jeffery Vessely, Phys Education

##### Term Ending 1993

Jean Gnat, Univ Lib  
Richard Hamburger, Medicine  
Linda Kasper, Medicine  
Bernard Morrel, Science  
Kathleen Warfel, Medicine

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

There was no unfinished business.

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

**BEPKO:** There is one other matter of new business.

**KARLSON:** I am speaking not as your Parliamentarian so I will step down. There is a matter that the ROTC Advisory Committee of the University. I wish to point out that on February 21 a group of students occupied the ROTC buildings and created two felonies. We have recently spent much time debating the creation of students rights and responsibilities. It appears that the Dean of Students at Bloomington does not desire to protect the rights of unpopular groups. The military has been discriminated against on the Bloomington campus. I won't go through the history but I will guarantee you that is nothing pleasant. In the course of this people were intimidated, property was stolen, property was destroyed, a private file of one of the students was taken in violation of both federal and state laws. This person might not get a scholarship because they did not get the file back in time to submit it. We are talking about serious activity, yet the Dean of Students, and I will give the name, in this case it was Associate Dean Richard McKay, did not even see fit to try to take the names of the students involved although he was aware of many of the criminal actions and he told them they could leave. A dean of students was unwilling to protect the rights of students to be safe from crime and unwilling to protect them against the disruption of a class which took place here which is the ultimate violation of academic freedom more popular by Nazis than what I hope the United States would be. That type of person should not be retained on this campus. I would request merely that we as a body recommend that the University appoint a committee to investigate these circumstances and to create procedures to insure that the rights of all students and faculty will be protected against violent mobs at the Bloomington campus. I move that as a resolution. [This resolution was seconded]

**FREDLAND:** It seems somewhat inappropriate that we resolve matters that have to do with the Bloomington campus.

**KARLSON:** We are recommending to the University Faculty Council that a committee be appointed and we can, of course, recommend. I think this engages and infringes upon the entire university because we are all going to be tarred with the same brush by law in such activity particularly when the rights of others are so blatantly violated. That is what I am really worried about.

**BEPKO:** What is your pleasure? Do you want to vote? All in favor of the motion, say "Aye." Opposed? [there were some opposed] The motion carries.

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

The meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

## INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS

Faculty Council Meeting  
 May 2, 1991  
 Law School, Room 116  
 3:00 - 5:00 p.m.

**Members Present:** **Administrative:** Chancellor Gerald Bepko, Dean William Plater. **Deans:** John Barlow, Barbara Fischler, R Bruce Renda, David Stocum, William Voos. **Faculty:** C D Aliprantis, Darrell Bailey, H Glenn Bohlen, Frances Brahmi, Thomas Broadie, Walter Buchanan, Elaine Cooney, William Crabtree, Theodore Cutshall, Andrew Evan, Paul Galanti, Jean Gnat, Richard Hamburger, Dean Hawley, Norman Hudson, Jerome Kaplan, Henry Karlson, Linda Kasper, Juanita Keck, Richard Kovacs, Michael Kubek, Richard Lawlor, Dana McDonald, Patrick McGeever, B Keith Moore, Catherine Palmer, John Pless, Sherry Queener, Edward Robbins, Carl Rothe, Phyllis Scherle, Edmund Schilling, Lee Schwecke, Kent Sharp, Aristotle Siakotos, Hitwant Sidhu, Kathleen Warfel, Kathryn Wilson, Donald Wong, Charles Yokomoto.

**Ex Officio Members Present:** Henry Besch, Richard Fredland, Maxine Tutterrow, President, IUPUI Staff Council.

**Alternates Present:** **Faculty:** Mary Stanley for James Baldwin, William McNeiss for Lynda Means, Nyla Heerema for Jay Tischfield, Creasie Hairston for Marion Wagner, LaForrest Garner for Susan Zunt.

**Members Absent:** **Administrative:** J Herman Blake. **Deans:** A James Brown, P Nicholas Kellum, Norman Lefstein, Sheldon Siegel, James Weigand, Jack Wentworth. **Faculty:** Jonas Bjork, Patricia Blake, David Bodenhamer, Varoujan Chalian, Dewey Conces, Ronald Dehnke, Dornith Doherty, Ann Dunipace, William Engle, Martin Farlow, Naomi Fineberg, Janice Froehlich, Philip Gibbs, Michael Gleeson, Dolores Hoyt, Florence Juillerat, Richard Kovacs, Bruce Long, Richard Meiss, Chris Miller, Bernard Morrel, Jerold Paar, Robert Pascuzzi, John Rafert, Bruce Roth, Neal Rothman, Michael Ryan, Thomas Ryan, Scott Shapiro, Jan Shipps, Gregory Sutton, Donald Tharp, Ann Tomey, Vernon Vix.

**VISITORS PRESENT:** Gene Tempel, Mark Grove.

**AGENDA ITEM I -** Memorial Resolutions: Joshua L. Edwards, M.D., School of Medicine, Clare M. Assue, M.D., School of Medicine, and Francis L. Sondag, School of Medicine

**BEPKO:** Let's come to order. We have a full agenda so we would like to get started. Our first agenda item is a set of three memorial resolutions for Joshua Edwards, School of Medicine, Clare M. Assue, School of Medicine, and Francis Sondag, School of Medicine. These resolutions are in the packet that was distributed. The authors of the resolutions are indicated. Consistent with our new policy, we will not read the resolutions but consider them adopted unless there is an expression to the contrary. We would like to have a moment of silence in observance and recognition of the death of our colleagues. Please rise and observe that moment. Thank you.

**AGENDA ITEM II - Approval of Minutes: February 7, 1991**

**BEPKO:** We have an item on approval of the minutes for the February meeting. Do we have a motion?

MCDONALD: So moved.

FISCHLER: I second.

BEPKO: All in favor say "Aye." Are there any opposed? The minutes are approved.

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

BEPKO: We have a couple of quick things under Item III. First, the standard Question-and-Answer session was omitted from the agenda. It doesn't actually have to be incorporated because it is a standard part of our business and we will take that up toward the end after other items have been taken care of.

Secondly, as you came in the door you may have picked up a copy of a letter dated May 1 on the North Central Association Accreditation of the campus for general University programs that is scheduled for November 9-11, 1992. This memo, available on the table, explains something of the preparation that is now underway for that North Central Accreditation visit. There is an organizational chart appended to the memo so that you can see the committees that are being launched to prepare us for that visit. Carol Nathan is the person who is going to oversee our preparation. She is here so if you having any questions, Carol will be happy to respond. This is an important matter for the campus. We think it will be an opportunity for us to translate some of the excellent planning that is going on, both on campus and in the schools, into a self-study document for the North Central Accrediting organization. That will give us a chance to assess how much progress we have made pursuant to our planning documents and to state our revised vision for the future of the campus. We look forward to your participation. If you have any questions now, Carol will be happy to answer them.

If not, I have one other item. For 1991-92 we have established a process of review for academic administrators. We have discussed that earlier this academic year and together we joined in approving for the Indianapolis campus this policy on reviewing academic administrators. Pursuant to that policy, at the last faculty council meeting each year we will announce to you who of those who are eligible will be reviewed in the following academic year, in this case it is 1991-92. For next year we will review seven persons; two vice chancellors, two other deans and directors of campus units, and three deans of degree granting units. The vice chancellors selected on the basis of seniority and their interest in having a review conducted are Executive Vice Chancellor and Dean of the Faculties William Plater and Vice Chancellor for Administrative Affairs Robert Martin. The two campus deans and directors who will be reviewed are Wendell McBurney, dean of Research and Sponsored Programs and Kris Froehlke, director of Computing Services. The three deans of degree granting units were selected on the basis of longevity. They will be P. Nicholas Kellum, dean of the School of Physical Education, who is the second most senior dean on the campus now. The most senior dean is Bruce Renda, who is here, but Bruce has already announced his retirement as dean and, indeed, the search for a new dean is well along. Bruce and we thought it would probably not be useful for a review to be conducted that might not even be finished by the time the new dean comes into place. So, we went to the second most senior person who is Nick Kellum. Next in seniority is Hugh Wolf who is Executive Associate Dean of the School of Education programs in Indianapolis. This is one of those merged school arrangements, so the School of Education based in Bloomington will also be involved with the review process; but we think of Hugh as being the dean of our Education programs and having a major role on the campus so his office will be the second. The third will be the Bloomington-based dean. One of the four that is now subject to the IUPUI procedure. In seniority, the longest serving dean is Jim Weigand who is dean of the School of Continuing Studies. Unless there are any questions about that, which can be

raised now or in the Question-and-Answer period, I would like to move to the Executive Committee Report from Dick Peterson.

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

**PETERSON:** I have a number of items on my report today. The first of those items is a report on the Academic Calendar from Bernard Morrel. You have received a copy of an academic calendar for 1992-93 and that is open for presentation and discussion.

**MORREL:** Thank you, Dick. You should have before you a copy of the academic calendar for 1992-93. There is good news and bad news to report about this calendar. The good news is that, as usual, it calls for 15 weeks of instruction each semester. It has the usual Thanksgiving Recess and no classes on Labor Day. It continues our tradition which you voted on last year and will first occur next year of having our spring break in sync with Bloomington's spring break.

Unfortunately, there is also some bad news. Two things that your attention should be called to are first, you will notice that the Commencement date is Sunday, May 9, and also final exams end that same day. That causes a tremendous problem for those administrative officers in each school who must decide which of our prospective candidates for graduation actually meet all the requirements. Unfortunately, there is nothing that can be done at this point in time. You might ask, "How did this error arise?" The way it did arise was that the All University Commencement Committee booked the facilities for May 9 without consulting our local administrators. In the past, they had consulted our local administrators and, for some reason this time, they did not. By the time it came to our attention, the following Sunday, May 16, was already booked by another organization. So, unfortunately, that is bad news for many people, but there is nothing that can be done about it at this point in time. I do understand that once this unfortunate event was discovered that a lively discussion took place and that it is unlikely that this mistake will be repeated any time soon.

One other feature of the calendar that some people have objected to involves the beginning and ending dates for the Second Summer Session. Originally, the administration proposed that the second summer session classes begin on Wednesday, June 30, and therefore that they would end on Wednesday, August 11. The reason for the delay between the end of first summer session and the beginning of the second summer session in their eyes was for administrative purposes to get the people registered and records cleaned up, etc. The calendar came from the administration to the Calendar Committee which changed the date that classes begin to Monday, June 28th. The feeling of that committee was that the people who taught in Summer II needed more time and the students, I suppose, as well to recover from the exertions of Summer II before fall classes begin. The matter was then referred to the Academic Affairs Committee, and when we took a voice mail vote on it the committee was evenly split with no particular preference for either date. So, I decided to bring the matter to you. I don't know how you want to consider the calendar, Dick, whether you want to consider it as a whole and just have discussion on the beginning and ending dates for Summer II or whether you would like to break them into two separate issues, voting on the bulk of the calendar first and then discussing and voting separately on the dates for the second summer session. The two proposed dates now are either Monday, June 28th, or Wednesday, June 30th, for the beginning dates of Summer Session II. I would be glad to answer any questions that you might have about the proposed calendar.

**MEISS:** This problem with final exams and commencement, you imply that both dates are immovable. Why is the date for final exams immovable also?

**BEPKO:** Mark Grove, the Registrar, is here. Maybe he can answer that question.

**GROVE:** The final exam period follows the end of the semester. We are locked into the calendar by Commencement being early this year. In order to allow enough time for registration at the beginning of the term, we can't start any earlier. Calendar guidelines also require equal number of meeting days for classes, so we can't have weekend classes such as Sunday run one less meeting as that is equivalent to missing an entire week of instruction. Or we start the semester on a Sunday to allow the same number of meetings.

We need to allow faculty enough time to review final exams and the academic units enough time to review the student's academic record to assure all degree requirements have been met. This means that exams offered Thursday or later would not allow enough time for that process.

**MEISS:** That's a practical matter. (could not understand) Will there not be diplomas?

**GROVE:** ...academic units need time to prepare their verified list of graduates. The other option is to delay Commencement, but the facility will not be available the third Sunday that year. We have moved Commencement to the third Sunday of the following year when it is available because the second Sunday is very early in May.

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

**PETERSON:** Why don't we try to resolve the issue of the start of the summer session and then vote on the whole thing?

**MORREL:** That is my report.

**BEPKO:** Bernie, we need a resolution of this now regarding whether it is June 28th or June 30th to start classes in the second summer session.

**MORREL:** I guess our resolution would be that the calendar be adopted as it stands.

**BEPKO:** I meant that we need to resolve an issue. Your committee would recommend that the calendar as printed on this paper be adopted.

**MORREL:** With the understanding that the committee was evenly split on the question of the summer II classes.

**PETERSON:** That is a motion from the committee. [motion seconded] All in favor, say "Aye." All opposed? [There were a few opposed.]

**BEPKO:** The ayes have it.

**PETERSON:** The motion carries. I have additional items on my report. The first thing that I would like to report is that the new early retirement plans that we have voted on in this Council and TIAA/CREF considerations for summer employees have gone forward to the University administration and have been considered at that level and apparently are being discussed this afternoon with the Board of Trustees. Unfortunately, what is being discussed with the Board of Trustees seems to be a stripped down version of this where the optional retirement program that was presented here, the Phased Early Retirement Program, would not be option. The Full Early Retirement program would be the only other option available, and there would be no alternatives to switch from one program to the other. That is what I understand is being brought to the Board of Trustees for discussion.

I also understand from Chris Lohmann that there is, at this time, no consideration being given to TIAA/CREF for summer employees at that level. That is being brought by University administration. If anybody knows any more about this, I would be more than happy for them to enter into this discussion but my talking with Chris Lohmann this noon indicated that those were the plans. They also incorporated into that an option under better financial circumstances to rediscuss these items. I know that is probably not all good news for you, particularly those of you who are on summer employment on a class by class or a quarter by quarter basis.

There has been some additional discussion of our Family Leave policy. That is one of our continuation items on the agenda. Our Fringe Benefits Committee has additionally discussed this, writing an additional report to Margaret Mitchell, and we are anxious to make further progress on that. But, again, with the financial condition that we currently have, there are some continuing problems with trying to address the Family Leave policy as approved by this body and the University Faculty Council.

One of the things that is traditionally done at this time of the year is to report on the actions of Boards of Review. I don't think that I have done this this year yet. There is only one Board to report any progress on and that was in a tenure case. Someone was denied tenure based on the review. He filed for a Board of Review to look at this. The Board of Review asked that he be independently reviewed by an outside committee which was set up by Chancellor Bepko. That committee was basically positive, at least reasonably positive about his case, but there are some continued questions about non-professional activities of this particular individual. That is being addressed now by another committee that has been set up by the Chancellor that is composed of individuals on this campus who will look at those issues of non-professional activities to see if there is any verification of those and if they are appropriate to bring as charges against this individual as part of his tenure consideration. That has been a long, dragged out case but hopefully sooner or later we will have resolution to that. I am sure that the Chancellor would be more than happy to get this off his venue.

**REND:** What are "non-professional activities?"

**PETERSON:** I don't have any details on that

**BEPKO:** I think it is unprofessional activities.

**PETERSON:** The University Faculty Council has considered Academic Handbook changes that we have addressed at this level and, for the most part, approved of those with some very minor comments and some minor additions. One addition that was made, and I think it is important for you to hear that here, is that Kathleen Warfel brought up the point that in no place did the University Academic Handbook specifically address the issue of peer review. We put in a small phrase supporting the principle of peer review. That issue will be additionally addressed by Faculty Affairs Committee of the University Council and other faculty councils through this next year to make sure that appropriate wording is put into the handbook related to this issue. I think it is extremely important that we get the appropriate wording in there.

The other issue which we have discussed at this level that has gone to the University Faculty Council level is some of the CREF Options that were available to us as University individuals if the University chose to have some of those options. One of two basic principles that we discussed was cashability, which means that at retirement or upon leaving the University one could withdraw his/her cash in the CREF division of TIAA/CREF. The other option was transferability, meaning that there would other plans available to us or that you could transfer your money into other plans. The cashability option was approved at University Faculty Council level. The transferability one was



not approved and it was primarily not approved, we feel, because of undefined costs that might be involved in transferring money that might be a burden on all of us. We are going to work on that additionally during this next year to make sure that the costs would be defined and that we would have this option available to us if it is considered appropriate at higher levels.

The last issue that I want to bring up today is something that has been distributed to you in your minutes and also there were additional copies of this on the table over as you came in. That has to do with the ROTC Discrimination Based on Sexual Orientation issue. This has been riding on the agenda of the Council since the New Student Rights and Responsibilities Handbook was produced last year. I believe it was finished last year. One of the issues is that ROTC does "presumably discriminate" against a group of individuals who have certain sexual orientations and the specific wording was put in there for sexual orientations rather than defining that further. The University Faculty Council committee on Educational Policies has brought some resolutions forward. I think we should at least consider these issues. There some emotional points involved here but we need to consider some of these issues. I want to bring those to you. It basically appears in two parts if you will look at this. There is one part that addresses non-discrimination and discriminating against people who have different sexual orientations. The second part gets down to the level of asking ROTC not to be on our campuses if they refuse to address this policy and change their policy. Henry Karlson has moved himself out of his parliamentary position. I think he wishes to speak on this issue.

**KARLSON:** I have several comments that I want to make. The first is when this provision was added there was not full debate on it at this Faculty Council dealing with sexual orientation. I have done some research on it. As a bit of background, I will state two facts. First, I have been on the ROTC Advisory Committee for both the University and for this campus. I have been on one or the other since its conception. Second, among other things, my specialty has been child abuse and neglect.

The term "sexual orientation" as used in this document is way too broad. Limited research will tell you that Pedophilia, which is child molesting, Necrophilia, which is sexual activity with corpses, and sadism, which is violent rape, are all sexual orientations. To say that we do not make decisions based upon a person's sexual orientation would be to say that grade schools which refuse to hire child molesters should not be allowed to recruit at Indiana University because they are discriminating on a basis of their sexual orientation. If you follow this policy, the Women's prison should hire men who believe in sadism and rape to be the prison guards because that is discriminating against them on the basis of their sexual orientation. Obviously, sexual orientation is the appropriate factor to take into consideration in determining whether or not the person should be hired positions. Obviously, we do not want someone whose sexual orientation is children in charge of our children. The question which is unresolved is whether or not sexual orientation can be limited in any manner in the state? There are two ways you might want to deal with the issue of sexual orientation. That is sexual orientation that relates to unlawful conduct. Well, keep in mind that federal law, under the supremacy clause preempts state law. If we apply that federal law, which is enacted by Congress, provides sodomy in the United States Army is a felony. Therefore, insofar as we are dealing with the sexual orientation as including conduct consistent with the orientation, we are dealing with commission of a felony in the military for homosexual sexual activity.

If the standard is that only sexual orientation or conduct that does not violate the law is protected by a code of student rights, clearly homosexual conduct and orientation is not a right of a student who seeks to serve in the United States military forces.

The second question is what is sexual orientation? What do we mean by sexual orientation? Let me explain what I mean. Does orientation mean an unexpressed or unexecuted desires? Does it include conduct? Technically, the term orientation would only include the first. Although, I have checked and the interpretation which has been given, at least on the Bloomington campus, includes conduct consistent with the orientation. So, if we assume, and then I ask what the legalities are? They said, "We don't care what the legalities are. We want the law changed." So, we apply both of those standards and I assume what we are saying if we vote in favor of this is that yes rapists should be put in charge of women's prisons. Yes, child molesters should be put in charge of children. And, anyone who chooses not to do such and to change the law to permit their sexual orientation and sexual freedom should be denied the ability to recruit at Indiana University. First, I think that is ridiculous. I think it is totally wrong. So, I checked a little more of its history. At one point there was a recommendation on the committee that we specifically deal with homosexuality and lesbianism as not appropriate grounds for discrimination and not use the term sexual orientation to define what we are referring to. That was specifically what was rejected by the committee, and they meant exactly what they said. If we affirm this as a campus, it would be an insult to the academic community.

**MCGEEVER:** I think Henry's comments are interesting but I am not sure that they really pertain so much to the issue directly before us, as to the policy that has already been adopted. That policy may have been unduly vague. We are not really considering that policy which has already been adopted.

**KARLSON:** Point of order. We are asked to reaffirm that policy in provision one. A reaffirmation is asking us to reconsider the policy. The first provision is reaffirming it. We should not vote to affirm this policy.

**MCGEEVER:** I think it would be more appropriate for you to move to get rid of the policy.

**KARLSON:** That is not the issue. The issue is whether or not to reaffirm it. I am speaking to that question -- Should we reaffirm it? The answer is no.

**FINEBERG:** I think it is something that perhaps needs to be brought up to University legal services because of regardless of what they thought they were doing and we think we were doing, it can be interpreted differently by someone five years from now. You are saying this says sexual orientation and is applicable only to homosexuality and therefore there is nothing wrong with it. I think that since this is a legal issue, that maybe the University really needs to seriously consider the wording.

**PETERSON:** I think that is Henry's point.

**FINEBERG:** I can see a potential problem down the line.

**PETERSON:** Do we have any more discussion on this issue or do you want to vote to affirm or not to affirm this particular point?

**ROBBINS:** What is the language of the military provision which apparently discriminates? Is it to be used as broad language or does it use more specific language?

**KARLSON:** I would like to define that if I may. There are two things involved. First, by a decision of Congress of the United States which has been reinforced by the military since they don't want to change, at least in the past they don't want to change, they do not recruit either homosexuals or lesbians. By military regulations if you are either a homosexual or a lesbian, you cannot serve on

active duty. You cannot be in the military. Secondly, conduct consistent with sexual orientation, homosexuality, sodomy is a specific felony as enacted by Congress in the uniform code of military justice. So, it is criminal conduct by the definition of the term as enacted by the legislature of the United States. It is also a criminal conduct in a number of states. In 1985 that issue was addressed by the United States Supreme Court in a case called *Hardwick* in which the United States Supreme Court said that yes, there is no constitutional right to carry on homosexual sodomy. In such illegality is found in any number of states in the United States. Obviously, the United States military is required to be able to move their personnel around to all of these states.

**ROBBINS:** Then, my further question is with that interpretation, why is it since that is what this resolution is attempting to deal with that language is not consistent with that language?

**PETERSON:** This language is consistent with the Student Rights and Responsibilities Handbook. It presumably incorporates into this wording the homosexuality issue.

**FREDLAND:** I just have a quick legal question at the risk of being billed for this. Does military justice take precedence over state law?

**KARLSON:** Is there a supremacy clause in the Constitution? The answer is yes.

**FINEBERG:** But, only for soldiers not for non-soldiers.

**KARLSON:** Yes. But if you are going into the military, you are going to be a soldier.

**SIDHU:** If that is the case, I don't think even though the rules apply in general sense, but we have to make a specific per diem but it would not apply to this section of the student body. What we are saying is that it is not allowed in the Army, is that correct?

**KARLSON:** I am saying that by an act of Congress it is not allowed. A reaffirmation is reaffirming our support of pedophilia, necrophilia, rape, etc. not whether or not the military should be banned as having an ROTC discriminates against people whose sexual orientation happens to be lesbism, homosexuality, or bisexuality. Again, I think particularly given the laws of our states, as determined by the United States Supreme Court it would be inappropriate for military to recruit people who they could not station outside the state of Indiana. On the merits itself, I think ROTC does an awful lot toward providing scholarships particularly minority students might not otherwise have an opportunity to attain a college degree. Also, I might add, the military is probably the best functioning agency in the world today in Affirmative Action in the sense of providing the benefits. I think it would be a horrendous damage to cut off minority scholarships.

**SIDHU:** Henry, can we pass a resolution then that it should be sent to a legal service as has been suggested?

**KARLSON:** The specific issue before us is this. I think we should just vote it down and not support this. Then we could make a separate recommendation that this entire program be reexamined in light of some of the comments.

**HAMBURGER:** Do we have minority scholarships? If we do, we are allowing a donor to put some conditions on their money and their course. The ROTC has put some conditions on their money and their course. It is no different than that.

**BARLOW:** There is one thing about this whole discussion that bothers me a lot regarding what Henry Karlson said. Many of these forms of behavior, like sadism, have little to do with sex. They

are forms of violence. They are not necessarily connected with sex.

**KARLSON:** Sadism is a type of orientation.

**BARLOW:** To say that rape is a form of sex I find a very disturbing view of human interaction. I think one of the biggest problems we have with rape in the world today is precisely that there are too many people, men usually, who think of it as a form of sex. It is not. That is probably true of a lot of the other exciting things. We don't have to pass special rules about heterosexual orientation to make sure that heterosexuals aren't going to be committing pedophilia and so on. I think behind what you are saying, I find a very disturbing view of men and women and the way in which we live.

**KARLSON:** Frankly, I am merely using the terms that are recognized and sadism is a recognized sexual orientation as is pedophilia, as is necrophilia, and as is homosexuality.

**BARLOW:** Who recognizes these? A bunch of men probably.

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

**MCGEEVER:** On this original question in which Henry raised the meaning of the words "sexual orientation", I think there is a way to endorse this resolution without also endorsing necrophilia, etc. That is simply to state that the sense of this body is that the term "sexual orientation" refers to heterosexuality vs. homosexuality or bisexuality. If people want to vote for this, I think that they can vote for it without making the assumptions that Henry does.

**KARLSON:** I am not making assumptions. I am stating from appropriate literature the definition of the words. Homosexuality, I guess you are assuming, is a sexual orientation then because someone has defined it as such. Clearly, mecafelis is a sexual orientation. Unfortunately, they have caused a lot of harm to children. As has been pointed out, if we reaffirm this, we are reaffirming in its broadest category (COULD NOT UNDERSTAND)

**MCGEEVER:** You have yet to cite one authoritative source.

**STOCUM:** I think a lot of these things -- necrophilia, etc. are probably common to heterosexuals and homosexuals. What I would like to know is if you think that the term "homosexual" belongs in the same category as necrophilia and all of that. It seems that they are all sexual disturbances. Or, whether the idea here is that the term "sexual orientation" could be deleted and replaced by homosexuality?

**SCHWECKE:** Homosexuality is not a psychiatric disorder. Pedophilia is.

**KARLSON:** I have to respond to that. The reason that it is not a psychiatric disorder is because of the vote taken by the American Psychiatric Association to change it from such. Following that, they tried to do the same for those who sexually abused children, pedophilia. The question is whether or not a sexual orientation, whether or not it is a disorder should be the basis of discrimination. You cannot deny that pedophilia is a sexual orientation. It is well recognized as such.

**STOCUM:** That doesn't answer my question.

**KARLSON:** I am not sure what your question is.

**STOCUM:** You don't have somebody strictly to define necrophilia who I believe fall in the distinct

categories.

**KARLSON:** Unfortunately, they do.

**BUCHANAN:** I think we are losing track, too, of what I consider the main issue. There is another test called the reasonable man test. Language is a constantly changing thing. If I asked a man on the street of what he/she meant by sexual orientation, he/she would probably think of homosexuality. To me the main issue here is not whether we approve of homosexuality. The issue is if we deny ROTC on this campus, I think we are denying minority students and people of lower income status the chance of financing their college education by that means.

**PETERSON:** I think there are two issues in this particular resolution. There is a part one and a part two issue. In order to try to bring this to some kind of resolution, I think the second issue specifically address what Walt has just mentioned. That is to eliminate ROTC from the campuses if the military does not change its policy.. That is the second issue. The first issue is more the discrimination issue. We can vote on those separately if you so wish to see how our votes might come out. I think we need to draw this to some kind of conclusion. I would like to bring forward something from this Council.

**HAMBURGER:** Can we vote on part two first?

**PETERSON:** That is fine with me. How many would vote in favor of part two which eventually results in the removal of ROTC from the campuses if the military does not change its policy?

**BESCH:** How long are they given?

**PETERSON:** They are given until 1995 to start the process of eliminating it from the campuses to be terminated in 1998-1999. They would not be allowed to continue to recruit students into the program. Of course, you have students in the program who would have to terminate from the program and that would be that 1998-99 year.

**BEPKO:** That would mean no more new students after 1995.

**ROBBINS:** The policy you are referring to is the specific one discrimination on the basis of homosexuality and the lesbiasm.

**KARLSON:** And bisexuality.

**PETERSON:** All of those in favor of this policy of eliminating ROTC please answer by saying "Aye." All of those opposed to this policy say "Aye." I think there is opposition to this policy. The second issue is the discrimination issue which is part one. We would like to have a vote on this also to see who is on which side of this issue.

**REDA:** Point of clarification. How did the chair rule the motion?

**PETERSON:** The chair ruled that we are opposed to part two. We would like to see ROTC continue despite their policy of discrimination.

**REDA:** Thank you.

**PETERSON:** Do you have a discussion on part one of this?

**MCGEEVER:** It is kind of pointless to vote on part one.

**SIDHU:** If we had the support for part two, then part one is the condition ROTC will continue. I think there is no reason to automatically approve that. We are not going to change any ROTC policies.

**PETERSON:** We voted not to change the policy.

**SIDHU:** Exactly, because that is automatically steps into that.

**PETERSON:** We can let it as a mute issue and not address the issue of sexual orientation at this time which is really what our major problem is.

**ROBBINS:** There may be one other issue here though. It could be that part of the vote and even my own was in part motivated by the concern about the elimination of the advantage that ROTC brings. That is, the scholarships, etc. That overrode the issue of whether or not they ought to continue to discriminate on the basis of homosexuality or lesbism or bisexual behavior. So, we could in fact, if that were the case, support item three under part two which calls for the University to make an effort to change the policy of discrimination without only leading to the elimination of the ROTC program. If that were the case, I think that would place some additional light on what the issues were here in terms of whether we were voting on the elimination of the discrimination. I think we could vote for the discrimination without voting for the elimination of the ROTC program.

**PETERSON:** Our vote did include, according to Henry Karlson, we voted on part two in total as we did take that vote at this point.

**ROBBINS:** My point was that that may have been a mistake.

**BESCH:** We voted in favor of it. We moved to rescind the vote and start over.

**KARLSON:** A person who voted against it needs to be the one to make the motion.

**FREDLAND:** It strikes me that we can still express our opinion on the general topic without giving any specifics. Since this does come to us from the Executive Committee as an agenda item, it strikes me as strange that we decide not to vote on it. It seems to me that we do have to vote on part one despite how we divided the issue. So, I would suggest we do need to vote on part one for procedural reasons.

**PETERSON:** That is the sense of what I had originally interpreted the Student Rights and Responsibilities document to mean. Obviously, there are other interpretations of that. I think that is indeed what was originally meant by this. We can modify this to say that and then vote on that issue related to that specific position.

**KUBEK:** Does part one refer to the University policy and part two refer to ROTC policy only or are we looking at two different issues? One pertaining to University and one pertaining to military? Where is the linkage here?

**PETERSON:** The linkage is that the University has approved of a policy that includes non-discrimination for sexual orientation. The military in part two discriminates, based on sexual orientations.

**KUBEK:** So, we could still have a University policy that applies to all other programs within the University except ROTC or are we looking at a total policy that has to apply to the entire University so we go to part two?

**BESCH:** It is important that we vote on part one or any part because someone has put it on the agenda. Since it is not necessary for us to vote yea or nay. I don't agree with Dick that we must vote.

**KARLSON:** I get a sense that there is an agreement that the term sexual orientation perhaps is too broad a possible definition. I believe it would be appropriate at this time for our body to either amend this (could not understand) since this comes out of the Faculty Council or to recommend to the Faculty Council that this issue be reopened to determine which sexual orientations the faculty of the University feels are inappropriate to be used as criteria. Because, obviously, what we are amending here has no impact upon the total University policy unless we recommend some action be taken.

**PETERSON:** I think that is a very meaningful suggestion. Do we have a motion to that affect?

**FREDLAND:** There is a motion on the floor because I made it.

**KARLSON:** It wasn't seconded.

**FREDLAND:** It was seconded.

**PETERSON:** The motion is then to vote on part one? Is that your motion?

**FINEBERG:** With the amendment in there?

**PETERSON:** Yes.

**HAMBURGER:** You keep saying that this has passed the University Faculty Council. Is that true? I don't think it has.

**PETERSON:** The Student Rights and Responsibilities Code of Ethics has passed the University Faculty Council.

**HAMBURGER:** Has the orientation in part one and part two passed?

**WARFEL:** No. The Code of Ethics has passed the University Faculty Council. They have not seen this.

**HAMBURGER:** This was deleted a year from the Code of Ethics.

**PETERSON:** It is in the current Student Code of Ethics.

**WARFEL:** The new code.

**HAMBURGER:** I may be wrong, I don't know whether it was approved and that is the question that I will ask. Did the University Faculty Council actually approve this? I don't they did. I know it was distributed and discussed and portions of it were sent back for rewrite.

**PETERSON:** That is a question that I certainly can't answer. I was not a member of the University Faculty Council at the time this was approved. I deny any knowledge of this.

**KECK:** I move that we table the motion until we find out if it has been voted on.

**PETERSON:** There is a motion to table. [Seconded] All in favor of that motion, say "Aye." All opposed? [a few] The motion to table is maintained.

**HAMBURGER:** Can we as a body define what we at IUPUI consider the words "sexual orientation" to mean and send forth a message to whatever the committee or any other committee is looking at this?

**PETERSON:** We can entertain that motion. If you want to make that motion. We really need to move on. We have a number of other items today and I really don't want to extend this discussion too much further. If we do have a rapid motion to define our meaning of sexual orientation, we will take that without any discussion, but otherwise I think we need to go forward with the rest of the agenda items.

**HAMBURGER:** Here is a motion to do that. I resolve that the IUPUI Faculty Council understand the term "sexual orientation" in this policy to be limited to homosexuality, heterosexuality, and bisexuality. [Seconded]

**PETERSON:** All in favor of this motion, say "Aye." All opposed? We have that on the floor.

#### AGENDA ITEM V - Election of Executive, Nominating, and Tenure Committee - Election Committee

**BEPKO:** Our next agenda item is the election of the Executive, Nominating and Tenure Committee. Kathleen Warfel will be conducting the election today.

**WARFEL:** Dolores Hoyt is chairman of the Nominating Committee this year but she had a conflict with today's meeting, so, I am doing her part today. I will distribute the ballots and if you are a visitor today and not a voting member of the Council, please do not take a ballot. There are three committees to be elected today. With the Executive Committee you should vote for four of the nominees. With the Nominating Committee you may vote for up to three of the nominees and the nominee with the highest number of votes will be chairman of the Nominating Committee not next year but the year after that. With the Tenure Committee you may vote for up to three of the nominees.

The results of the election were as follows:

Executive Committee: Walter Buchanan, Juanita Keck, Edward Robbins, Kathryn Wilson.

Nominating Committee: James McAteer, James Murphy, William Schneider. The person receiving the most votes was James McAteer so he will chair this committee in 1993.

Tenure Committee: Paul Galanti, LaForrest Garner, Kathleen Warfel.

**WARFEL:** I would like to ask permission to have the ballots destroyed.

**BEPKO:** All in favor say "Aye." Any opposed? Motion carries.



#### AGENDA ITEM VI - Athletic Advisory Committee Report - Dean Hugh Wolf

**BEPKO:** With the agreement of the body, maybe we can move something from one point on the agenda to another point. Hugh Wolf is here with members of the intercollegiate athletic program. Hugh is going to make his annual statement. Each year Hugh, as the chair of the faculty Athletic Advisory Committee, makes a report on IUPUI's intercollegiate athletics. A couple of the people he has with him today have exams and other things shortly. Hugh, would you make your report?

**WOLF:** Thank you all very much. Thanks to you for allowing me an opportunity each year to come and make this report. Actually, I do this in compliance with a resolution of the University Faculty Council which requires that the athletic committees on each of the campuses make reports to their faculty councils each year.

In the interest of time and recognizing that you have a lot of important items on your agenda I will not go through the entire report. I will see that it is filed with your Secretary and it will appear in the minutes. However, I do think you would be interested in a couple of items that the committee has dealt with this year.

First of all, we have reaffirmed our earlier support for the movement of the Intercollegiate Athletic Program at IUPUI from the NAIA, our present affiliation, to the NCAA affiliation.

Secondly, the committee has endorsed IUPUI's participation in a national study to determine the impact of intercollegiate athletics on academic development of student athletes. That study is being conducted by the National Consortium for Academics and Sports which is based at Northeastern University in Boston, Massachusetts. We will be the only NAIA school participating in that study. There are something like 40 or 50 NCAA schools but we will be the only NAIA school participating.

I also hope I will be forgiven for extending the agenda slightly in order to call attention to some pretty remarkable achievements that some of the student-athletes on our campus have accomplished this year. I certainly want to recognize George Adams, who is not here today. George successfully defended his state singles championship in tennis and will be competing for the second straight year in Kansas City in the national tournament. I want to recognize too for the sake of the minutes the women's volleyball team which won the state championship and advanced to the national tournament in Hawaii. I also want to call attention to the accomplishments of our women's softball team which finished last season with a record of 53 and 9 and participated for the eighth consecutive year in the national tournament.

Since we are not on television very often, I think it is important for you to have an opportunity to meet some of the student-athletes who represent you on a daily basis. This year I invited three. Unfortunately, one has already had to leave because she is taking a final examination in the School of Education. I will recognize her just the same. There was a lot of attention focused on the city of Indianapolis last month because of the Final Four NCAA basketball tournament which we hosted. I hope all of you recognized the fact that our women's basketball team also participated in a Final Four event, the NAIA National Championship in Jackson, Tennessee. So, I invited the coach and two of the players of that team, the first team in the history of our intercollegiate program to ever reach the Final Four of a national tournament, to come and be introduced today. I am going to ask Julie Wilhoit and Mary Murphy to come down front for a moment. The person who had to leave early was Julie Rotramel who during the course of the season became the all-time leading scorer in the history of IUPUI basketball. Julie is from Carlisle, Indiana, and graduated from Sullivan High School. She accumulated 1,809 points in her four-year career here at IUPUI. The two individuals standing before you are, first, Julie Wilhoit who has graciously taken time away from her full-time

job at the National Institute for Fitness and Sport to be here. Julie is in her fifth season as coach of the Lady Metros and has a career record of 64 wins and 32 losses and has led the women's team to two state championships and two national tournament participations. Julie is a graduate of Jacksonville High School, received a B.S. from Marion College, and earned a master's degree from IUPUI. In addition to its exploits on the court, I think we should be especially proud of the fact that Julie's team, the IUPUI Lady Metros, received the Fellowship of Christian Athletes Award for the sportsmanship it displayed throughout the tournament.

The other young lady is Mary (Muffy) Murphy. Mary is a sophomore majoring in Physical Education. She is a native of Indianapolis having graduated from Cardinal Ritter High School. Mary is also a star performer on our nationally recognized women's softball team. But the subject is basketball today and the reason I invited Muffy is so that I call attention to her truly extraordinary performance during the national tournament in Jackson, Tennessee. Mary set an all-time NAIA record by scoring ten three-point field goals in a single game. The next morning the headline in the Jackson, Tennessee, paper read "Cinderella is a Hoosier and her name is Muffy."

Thank you all very much.

#### AGENDA ITEM VII - Constitution and Bylaws Committee Report - Hitwant Sidhu

**BEPKO:** I don't think the Nominating Committee is ready to report yet so the next item is the Constitution and Bylaws Committee Report with Hitwant Sidhu.

**SIDHU:** I am nervous because Dean Renda caught the Secretary of the Council in an English mistake and therefore I may be even worse than that. Please forgive me and I apologize if I make mistakes.

The Constitution and Bylaws Committee has met three times during the academic year of 1990-91 in order to discuss some of the changes to be made in the Constitution and Bylaws of the IUPUI Faculty Council. We are presenting our recommendations to the Faculty Council in two parts. I shall proceed to discuss these recommendations which have been distributed to you on behalf of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee.

The sheet of paper which starts with "Substitute Article II" has the finalized recommendations to be incorporated in the Constitution and Bylaws if approved by the Council.

The first amendment deals with the IUPUI Faculty Council election at large. This item was sent by Dr. Juanita Keck and Dr. Richard G. Peterson, Secretary of the Council. Both have suggested making the wording more precise and clear. We recommend:

***Substitute Article II. Section 2, of the Bylaws of the IUPUI Faculty Council given below by the wording given in parenthesis.***

- b. A subcommittee consisting of three members of the Executive Committee, appointed by the Secretary of the Council with the concurrence of the Executive Committee, shall open and verify the returned ballots and insure that ballots are properly counted. In case of a tie, the entire Executive Committee shall vote by secret ballot to break the tie.)***

The change in the deadline for sending nominations was requested by Dolores Hoyt, Chairperson of the Nominating Committee, because the date for receiving the nominations and sending out the

ballots is presently the same (i.e., the end of January). She suggested that the nominations should reach the Nominating Committee earlier than the date selected for distributing the ballots for the election.

The third amendment deals with making the procedure of counting the ballot papers for the IUPUI Faculty Council and the University Faculty council elections uniform. It is recommended that:

***In Article II, Section D.5 of the Bylaws of the IUPUI Faculty Council, write Election - UFC: as a) and add the following b):***

- b. A subcommittee, consisting of three members of the Executive Committee appointed by the Secretary of the Council with the concurrence of the Executive Committee, shall open and verify the returned ballots and insure that ballots are properly counted. In case of a tie, the Executive Committee shall vote by secret ballot to break the tie.***

These are the amendments which we bring to you for your information only. The Constitution states:

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

I am proposing that the vote on these amendments should take place at one of the Council meetings during the academic year of 1991-92. If there are any questions, I shall be happy to answer them.

**GALANTI:** On D.4.a that proposed "Each academic unit may place in nomination two candidates elected by the faculty of that unit," are you contemplating that each unit will in fact conduct an election for these nominees?

**SIDHU:** Generally, that is the intention of that language. Some schools may not have the faculty organization. Originally it was the wish of the member who proposed that change that we should contact the chairperson or the person in charge of the faculty unit. We felt that in some cases it might be difficult. Therefore, the Nominating Committee is going to send the request for nominations to the deans. Wherever the units have their faculty organizations they would elect those two representatives. That is the intention.

**YOKOMOTO:** Concerning the first issue, letter (b) is the word "entire" supposed to be in there?

**SIDHU:** This was suggested by a member of the Committee. You can delete that word. We thought that the Executive Committee may not refer to less than three members. So, we can delete that word if you think there is no need for it.

**HAMBURGER:** I would like to ask Henry Karlson if the word "entire" means that everyone must be present?

**KARLSON:** They say by secret written ballot. It does not state that it takes place at a meeting. If I remember correctly, some of the discussion indicated that they were going to do it by ballot without a meeting.

**FINEBERG:** It still would require everyone to vote.

**KARLSON:** Submitting a blank ballot is a vote in that sense. So, a person can abstain and that is considered within the meaning of the term.

**PETERSON:** This may tie the hands and slow down the process. If some reason someone is out of the country for three weeks...

**HAMBURGER:** If they don't respond, that would negate the vote.

**SIDHU:** We can eliminate the word "entire" if you would like.

**FREDLAND:** So moved. (Seconded.)

**BEPKO:** It is the sense of the house on that issue. All in favor say "Aye." Any opposed?

**SIDHU:** So we will delete the word "entire." Before I discuss the second part, I would like to give you a little background on how this issue came up for discussion. I have to justify this change. On September 14, 1990, Dr. Richard Fredland sent a letter to the chairman of the IUPUI Constitution and Bylaws Committee requesting some changes in the operation of the Faculty Council. I will read a paragraph from that letter.

"I submit for your consideration a set of proposals with the explicit intention of revising the mode of operation of the Faculty Council meetings. The net effect is to make the elected Secretary the functioning executive of the body presiding, setting agenda, etc. The Vice President, namely the Chancellor, would be regularly on the agenda to report but not to manage the meeting. All other administrators would participate as the ex-officio members of the body."

The Constitution and Bylaws Committee met on November 15, 1990 to discuss that letter.

In principle they approved the suggestion, but because it was a major change, the committee decided that, in consultation with the Executive Committee, we should form a task force. Therefore, in consultation with the Executive Committee, a task force was appointed on December 12, 1990 and the task force was requested to report back to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee by the first of March, 1991. The members of that task force were: Richard Fredland, Chairperson, Kathleen Warfel, James Wallihan and Henry Karlson, and the nominee of the Chancellor was Dean William Plater. Because of the seriousness of the issue, the Task Force submitted as a matter of the seriousness of the issue took an extra month in submitting their report. The Task Force submitted its final report on April 9, 1991. The Chairman of the task force discussed the task force's recommendations in the Constitution and Bylaws Committee meeting held on April 18, 1991. These were the task force's recommendations. There were two reasons for making these recommendations: 1) they wanted to reduce the workload of the Secretary, and 2) they did not want to give the impression that they were eliminating the importance of the Chancellor. The Chancellor has stressed so many times that we work together as a family. That was the idea behind these recommendations. Therefore, the task force recommended that the Secretary's position should be changed into the position of the President. There should be another position of President-Elect. The President-elect will serve one year as president-elect and he or she will be promoted to the President's position in the second year.

The third recommendation was that there should be a Secretary who would take the minutes of the Council.

The fourth position would be of a Parliamentarian. In accepting those recommendations, we ran into a problem, and that was that our Secretary or would-be President has to serve on the University Faculty Council for a term of two years. To solve that problem and with concurrence of the chairperson of the task force, we are bringing this proposal and that proposal is in front of you.

In response to the report of the task force on faculty governance, we propose that the officers of the Faculty Council shall be President, a Vice-President, and a Parliamentarian. We are not giving the details of their duties at this time. We are coming to you for your approval only in principle and these are our suggestions.

The duties of the President shall include the present duties of the Faculty Council Secretary with the exception of reviewing, editing, and distributing the minutes of the Council. Again, there was a need for another person who would go between the faculty and the administration. Therefore, the President shall also serve as Ombudsman.

Second, the function of the Vice-President shall include presiding over the meetings of the IUPUI Faculty Council, reviewing, editing and distributing the minutes of the Council meetings, and other duties as delegated the President. He/she is not going to take the minutes himself or herself. The minutes will be taken as they are now but he/she would be doing the editing and distributing plus other duties assigned by the President.

The Parliamentarian's duties will remain the same as described in the Bylaws of the Council.

The following recommendation was taken from the task force's recommendations.

***"The agenda for the Council meeting shall be prescribed in such a way as to assure that both the Chancellor and the President of the Faculty Council have ample opportunity to present and discuss their business."***

They will not preside. They will mainly present information to the Council. We are proposing that the presiding officer should be an elected member and he/she should conduct the Faculty Council meetings.

If the above mentioned concepts are approved in principle, then the Constitution and Bylaws Committee will develop the exact language for amending the Constitution and Bylaws and will submit the amendments to the Council for approval at a later date. Those will come back to you in the same fashion as the other amendments. I will try my best to answer any questions if you have any. We are requesting to the Council for your approval but if you don't approve it in principle, then we will stop right here. We wanted the administration and the faculty to work together and come up with some solution. That was the reason we withdrew to take any action on it earlier.

**MCGEEVER:** Only by definition, the President is the person who presides. You have a President who doesn't preside. Why?

**SIDHU:** We are following the central government's example. In the Senate, the Vice President or the presiding officer is assumed to act as a neutral person. If you are presiding and also presenting the information, there is a possibility that you might unknowingly sway the opinions in one direction or the other. We are not saying that it is done intentionally but you can run the meeting the way you want to present the information. We do not want to change for the sake of change. We want them to present the materials independently. As far as the presiding officer is concerned, he/she should follow the rules and regulations so that the meeting should be conducted smoothly. Again, I want to say it very clearly. There is nothing against Chancellor Bepko. I think he is one of

us but those are the feelings expressed by some members again and again. The task force's recommendations were discussed in the Faculty Affairs Committee by Dr. Warfel and in principle, they also have agreed for this change. We tried to expand the base as much as possible because we do not want to give this impression that faculty are against administration. We have to work together. We have been working together and that is the way we want to keep it.

**ROTHERS:** How many years will be the President's term as Vice-President?

**SIDHU:** Both can run side by side -- President for two years and Vice-President for two years. In case the Vice President wants to run for the President's position, it has to be nominated by the Nominating Committee. We have not worked out the details and the duties of either office. At this time the thinking is that the terms of both will run side by side. If the Vice-President has time and his/her school allows the person to continue to serve for two more years, the Vice-President can run for the office of the President.

**WILSON:** Is the Secretary's workload really that bad that we need to proliferate higher administration?

**SIDHU:** With due respect to your suggestion, it has been the feeling of persons that the Secretary's position, by name, does not convey the meaning of the executive position of the Council and that is the only reason we are changing it to President.

**WILSON:** Why are we proliferating and making Vice-President something...

**SIDHU:** Because if we put the President in the same position, the President will be presiding over the meeting and the same thing can happen that the President will run the meeting the way he/she wants. We want to keep the president away from that responsibility and both chancellors and the president will have an equal opportunity for presenting the information to the Council. They will have the same status but we are saying that let the third person preside over the meeting.

**PETERSON:** I think the question that Kathryn is asking is are we trying to make another officer of the Council. We are trying to proliferate our officers of this Council. The real question was: Are the duties of the Secretary enough to have that broken into two offices? My suggestion would be yes, there are an awful lot of duties that you don't see that I have to do. I think that a full 50 to 60 percent of my week is occupied with the activities of this Council. You don't see that. It is one of the reasons that these minutes of these meetings have been delayed in getting distributed to you. I don't have time on my agenda get to them nor do I have time to bug other people about getting their comments back. A lot of meetings are expected of the Secretary at this point to attend to keep up-to-date on what is happening. I am supposed to be in Bloomington this afternoon attending the Board of Trustees meetings. I will be there all day tomorrow attending those meetings. Those are the kinds of things that one does as the Secretary and as the President would be doing. I think that it is essential that there be some redistribution of these activities to be effective.

**SIDHU:** Thank you, Dick. We are dividing those duties. We are seeking help from additional officers. The secretary is so much involved in so many activities he/she needs help from other officers.

**HAMBURGER:** The construction or a creation of a new position of that of a Vice-President, I still do not understand why the President should not preside over the meetings. This is not one of their major duties.

**KARLSON:** If I might express the considerations at one end of this, and that is that we visualize the President as representing the faculty. As such, making reports and in effect presenting the faculty position on issues that are brought before this Council. It is inappropriate for a person to both chair and act as an advocate at the same time. It is traditionally not done. This happens to be one circumstance in which we have been doing and it causes some confusion. Therefore, we thought that this would be an appropriate method to provide someone else, in effect, to run the assembly as presiding officer and at the same the president represent the faculty.

**HAMBURGER:** He is not an advocate in this room, however, is he? Or is an advocate of our belief in viewing and voting and what we have voted to others?

**KARLSON:** But, he is a reporting official which is different. He brings back reports, submits propositions for votes from other committees and that is really not the function of a chairperson. Unfortunately, we have been doing this for years and it does cause some confusion.

**HAMBURGER:** This will cause more, won't it?

**KARLSON:** Not really, because you will have a presiding officer who is not in effect a participant in the discussion, which is the traditional function of a presiding officer.

**SIDHU:** Dr. Hamburger, I have to be honest with you. That question was raised by a few members of the task force also. Henry happens to be a member of the task force as well a member of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee. That is the reason he is speaking on this issue and giving the justification for the change. What you have said is also the view of some of the other faculty member.

**ROTHER:** Am I right in assuming that the President can then run for Vice-President?

**SIDHU:** We have not worked out those details. I don't see any reason why the President cannot run for Vice-President next time.

**CUTSHALL:** Doesn't the Bloomington secretary serve for one year?

**SIDHU:** No,

**PETERSON:** No. that is not true. Their secretary serves for one year.

**SIDHU:** The first year they learn the procedural process and the next year they develop confidence, become strong and participate.

**FREDLAND:** I am trying to see if we can get beyond the rest of the afternoon on this issue. There are a couple of basic principles involved. One, Dick Peterson identified. The idea of dealing with paperwork should be separated from the person who is our elected faculty executive. Secondly, to identify that person who is our elected faculty executive in an executive kind of way, that will give the representation of the faculty and put in on par with the ability to present cases in this body with the administration. It would free up either the administration or the faculty representative from presiding over meetings so we could presumably be able to move through our debates and discussions with some kind of speed that we would have appreciated today that we have never appreciated. So, those are the principles at hand to provide an elected faculty executive and a person to deal with the minutes so the faculty executive can be an executive and not swamped with other responsibilities.

**SIDHU:** The question is whether you want to accept this proposal or not in principle only. We have not worked out the details. The details will come back to you at a later meeting.

**MCGEEVER:** Call for the question.

**BEPKO:** Could you elaborate on the duties of the Ombudsman?

**SIDHU:** We have not discussed those, sir. We will have to come to you and discuss with the secretary the duties of the Ombudsman.

**BEPKO:** What is the concept?

**SIDHU:** The concept, what we have been told is that if there is some kind of complaints, the Ombudsman will act between the faculty and the administration.

**BEPKO:** All in favor of the proposal say "Aye." Any opposed? Carried. Thank you, Hitwant.

#### AGENDA ITEM VIII - Unfinished Business

There was no unfinished business.

#### AGENDA ITEM IX - New Business

There was no new business.

#### AGENDA ITEM X - Adjournment

**BEPKO:** We are adjourned.