

INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY INDIANAPOLIS
FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING
SEPTEMBER 2, 1993
LAW SCHOOL, ROOM 116
3:30 - 5:30 P.M.

PRESENT: Administration: Chancellor Gerald L. Bepko, J. Herman Blake, Dean William Plater. Deans: John Barlow, P. Nicholas Kellum, Norman Lefstein, Angela McBride, Alfred Potvin, David Stocum, William Voos. Elected Faculty: C. D. Aliprantis, Biagio Azzarelli, Darrel Bailey, James Baldwin, Merrill Benson, Henry Besch, Patricia Blake, Frances Brahmi, David Burr, Edmund Byrne, Gayle Cox, Theodore Cutshall, Michael Dalsing, Joseph DiMicco, Naomi Fineberg, Richard Fredland, Michael Fritsch, Karen Gable, Paul Galanti, Gareth Gilkey, Michael Gleeson, Jean Gnat, Clifford Goodwin, M Jan Keffer, Raymond Koleski, Steven Leapman, James McAteer, Dana McDonald, Richard Meiss, Arthur Mirsky, Bart Ng, Byron Olson, Vimalkumar Patel, Richard Peterson, Rebecca Porter, Norris Richmond, Margaret Richwine, Edward Robbins, Carl Rothe, Lee Schwecke, Aristotle Siakotos, Jeffrey Springston, David Suzuki, Karen Teeguarden, Rosalie Vermette, Jeffery Vessely, Eric Wiebke, Patricia Wittberg, Charles Yokomoto, Susan Zunt. Ex Officio Members: Edgar Fleenor, Steven Mannheimer, Hitwant Sidhu, Kathleen Warfel.

ALTERNATES PRESENT: Deans: David Lewis for Barbara Fischler, J. M. Ebbert for James Weigand. Elected Faculty: Jean Hamilton for Norman Hudson, Richard Wyma for Eric Long, David Lewis for William Orme. Ex Officio Members: David Frisby for Maxine Tutterrow.

VISITORS: Robert Wolter (Sagamore Photographer), Jim Brown (Sagamore Reporter), Mark Grove (Registrar), Trudy Banta (Vice Chancellor's Office).

ABSENT: Deans: A James Barnes, Trevor Brown, Walter Daly, H William Gilmore, John Rau, Sheldon Siegel, Donald Warren, Charles Webb. Elected Faculty: Timothy Baldwin, David Canal, William Blomquist (for Paul Carlin), Michael Clark, Michael Cohen, Elaine Cooney, William Engle, Joe Garcia, Stuart Hart, Dolores Hoyt, Jerome Kaplan, Juanita Keck, Robert Keck, Joseph Koss, Diane Leland, Richard McCracken, Lynda Means, Daniel Peavy, Michael Sadove, Brian Sanders, Richard Schreiner, Jay Simon, Charles Slemenda, Robert Sutton, Karen West. Ex Officio Members: Barbara Cambridge, J Vannoy Faris, Janet Feldmann, Henry Karlson, B Keith Moore, John Pless, Helen Schwartz, Martin Spechler, Student Representative.

HENRY BESCH
PHARMACOLOGY & TOXICOLOGY/MEDICINE
MS A405
IUPUI

AGENDA ITEM I CALL TO ORDER

WARFEL: We will call this first meeting of this academic year of the Faculty Council to order. Those of you who managed to leave the campus and have something resembling a summer experience, I congratulate you and I welcome you back.

We have a few new faces and I extend a special welcome to the new members of the Faculty Council this year. The core of the Council is 80 elected faculty members, and the Council is the official voice for faculty governance on the campus. I think this year that we will have many important discussions and make several important decisions so I encourage all of you to jump into the fray and have an opinion.

I will, for the sake of the new people here, introduce the front table. Our parliamentarian, who is not with us today, is Henry Karlson from the School of Law. He is one of the officers of the Council. Dick Fredland is the President of the Faculty. Dean William Plater for those of you who haven't him before. Sitting next to Dean Plater is Chancellor Gerald Bepko. I am Kathleen Warfel and I am the Vice President of the Faculty and preside at this meeting. Bernice Chumley is the Secretary of the Faculty/Staff Council Office, and our sound technician is Beth Caster.

AGENDA ITEM II APPROVAL OF MINUTES: FEBRUARY 4, MARCH 4, APRIL 1, 1993

WARFEL: I will ask for approval of the minutes which have been distributed from the February, March, and April meetings of the Faculty Council. These were distributed over the summer. Does anyone wish to make corrections in them? Hearing none, we will take them as approved.

AGENDA ITEM III CHANCELLOR'S REPORT - GERALD L. BEPKO

BEPKO: I would also like to welcome everyone, especially so that I can say that it is a welcome to the 1993-94 academic year which is our 25th anniversary year. The official anniversary date is January 28, 1994. We will celebrate on that date the moment, hour, and the day 25 years ago in January of 1969 when a partnership between IU and Purdue was consummated and IUPUI was created. There will be a number of events during the year to celebrate the 25th anniversary. It will begin, of course, as of right now. Some events will be designated as 25th anniversary events starting almost immediately. The big kick-off for campuswide events will be the dedication of the Science/Engineering/and Technology buildings on November 2. We will have a ceremony which will be campuswide on January 28th to commemorate the exact day of the founding of IUPUI. The other half of the set of bookend's

framing the 25th anniversary events will be April 8, 1994, when we will have a dedication of the new library -- the crowning symbolic event for unifying IUPUI. At the same time, we will have a function for the whole campus that evening. It will be the annual dinner/dance, which the student organization presents. It will be open to the whole university community. We hope that you will get a sense of the excitement that we felt in thinking about the 25th anniversary and that it causes everyone in the university community to be very proud and to redouble their efforts to make the second 25 years even better than the first 25 years. Because of recent events, I think we will be able to have a good challenge to try to beat what we have done these last 25 years. The news from the State House, as you know, since we last met has not been very good. Despite that, I think institutions that have an understanding of their purpose and that are united in their commitment to serve their constituencies will succeed and we'll be able to match that first 25 years of growth and more. I think this is a time of unprecedented opportunity in higher education. The reputations in the past were slow to build and slow to erode. That is not true anymore. Reputations of institutions can disappear in a relatively short period of time. At the same time, reputations of institutions and the impact of an institution can be increased dramatically in a short period of time. That is what we project for IUPUI despite the state's funding problems.

As we begin the school year, probably the biggest news is the announcement that Tom Ehrlich made a week ago on Monday. I would like to say, in his behalf, and offer a perspective on his announcement, that he told it exactly as it was. These past 18 months or so have caused Tom Ehrlich to think more and more about his family. As you may know, he has had some relatively serious health problems in his immediate family. Ellen has had very serious surgery, his son, who is a practicing lawyer in Portland, Oregon, had very serious surgery within the last 14 months. His first grandchild was born very prematurely and spent the first two months of its life in the hospital in intensive care. All of this took place on the west coast. It was the beckon and call to Tom to move closer to his family. One major reason for his deciding not to continue at Indiana University is to be with his family and live in California. I think they still have a home in Palo Alto. That is one of the many possibilities that he will be exploring over the next 10 or 11 months.

The other reason I understand well, and I know a couple of you in the room have the same understanding. The three of us who are here and who are law teachers say to each other somewhat regularly that we came into the academic world, not to live lives that resemble the intensity of law practice at a much lower salary, but we came here to lead the lives of faculty members, to teach, to write, and to think about the important subjects in our fields. I have talked to Tom about that any number of times and, knowing him as a law teacher and a former law dean, that was much on his mind these last couple of years. It came to a head this summer when he was thinking

about wanting to be closer to his family in California. There are no ulterior motives or other reasons. Although I am sure that being closer to his family and having an opportunity to teach and write looked more attractive at times during this last year as he was forced to deal with somewhat difficult issues with the General Assembly and various other community aggravations. Nevertheless, I think that in his behalf I would like to say, and he would like for me to say, that these 11 months that he will remain as President, he is going to work as hard himself and try to encourage everyone else just as hard as he has these last six years. There will be no retreat from the policies that have been established. The commitment of the university holds constant, and I don't think there should be any fear of major changes in the immediate future.

At the same time as Tom announced his decision to leave Indiana University around August 1 of 1994, only a day later there was a change in the Indiana University Board of Trustees that you have probably read about. Bob McKinney has become the President of the Board of Trustees. There are two Vice Presidents -- Harry Gonso and P. A. Mack. This change is something that all Board members agreed to unanimously in their vote at the public meeting. It probably reflects interest on the part of the Trustees to be more involved and to have someone here from Indianapolis who would be closer to the heart and the soul of the university than a person who was practicing law in the northern part of the state. We don't think this signals any major change, although we are likely to see some more questions about productivity being raised by the Board and we are likely to see requests for some key indicators that all of us as members of an academic community can offer to the Board and to be able to show how well we are doing against some benchmarks to show that we are making progress always toward becoming a better and better university.

At the same time that these changes were taking place in the Indiana University structure, I want to alert you to some things that we have worked on in anticipation of there being discussions this year about the mission of all of the campuses in the public higher education system. Of course, expecting there that there will be some of the same continuing debate and controversy over the IUPUI mission, we have restructured the Board of Advisors on this campus. The Board is chaired by Harry Gonso who is a Trustee of Indiana University. Incidentally, Harry Gonso will be the chair of the search committee that has been formed to search for a new president over the next 11 months. This year we are going to restructure the Board and enlarge it by adding several new faces to the Board -- people in the community who we think can be very helpful in analyzing issues of higher education and in helping us translate our messages to the larger community. We will have an executive committee, which will be composed of Harry Gonso as the chairman of our Board of Advisors, Sara Barker, who is the United States District Judge, as the Vice Chair; Sam Jones, who is a community leader and head of the Urban League; Beurt SerVass, who is head of the City-County Council, and Tim McGinley, who is the new President of the Purdue

University Board of Trustees. This will constitute a committee that will work in between meetings of the Board on affairs of the institution here at Indianapolis.

In addition, there will be an Education Policies Committee, which will deal with the various issues that have been raised about academic performance, student performance, retention, the number of degrees awarded, whether our students are making the kind of progress they should, whether we are getting the kind of students that we need in order for them to benefit from higher educational programs, etc., including the campus mission issues. We will have a second committee -- a medical committee -- which will deal with all of the issues that have to do with our being simultaneously one of the largest health care consumers in the state of Indiana, one of the largest health care providers in the state of Indiana, and the state's only medical school.

Finally, we will have an External and Governmental Affairs Committee that will help us specifically deal with community issues. I put at the top of that list and re-emphasize the campus mission issue. We will have a governmental affairs committee and just for your information that is going to be chaired by the CEO of Indiana National Bank or NBD of Indiana, Tom Miller.

We are going to see more activity from our Board of Advisors. We will be getting more advice, thinking through with all of you and with the Board, some of the issues, crystallizing those issues so that they will be more powerfully presented to the community. Particularly, so that we can be successful in carving out the appropriate mission and adding all across the state, including state government, and all of the various constituencies that we represent, understand clearly what is the broad mission of IUPUI and that includes graduate education and research across the disciplines.

Throughout the year, we will also be talking about general education, and we hope that you will be involved in this. There are many of you who I see in the room, Ed Robbins, in particular, who have been involved in moving us forward toward a new statement and policy and application of general education for the campus. We hope all of you hear a lot more about that and that we hear from you about general education and about the ideas that are being discussed right now. This is a very important issue for public universities, and it is extremely important for IUPUI. In our progression it may be the next most important step toward the unity that we have all worked for over the years.

We can't begin the year without mentioning something about enrollments. The news is not altogether good, but not altogether bad either. Bill Plater will bring us up to speed on the fall term enrollments.

PLATER: The preliminary data for the fall enrollments as of the students census yesterday at the conclusion of the first week of classes indicates that we have enrolled at IUPUI 27,552 students including 1,405 students on the Columbus campus of IUPUI which means that there are 26,147 students here in Indianapolis. That is a very large number of students. It is still the third largest population in the state of Indiana that represents a slight decrease from this time a year ago. It is about a 2.8 percent decrease from last year. We also have a slight decrease in the number of credit hours being taught. The total number that we are officially teaching as of student census is something on the order of 252,000 credit hours which represents a little more than three percent less than what we were teaching at this time last year.

The analysis of why we are having a decrease after a number of years of slow, but steady increases is still pending review of data and conversations with students who applied but did not show up on our campus. There seemed to be four major factors, however, that we can point to at this time. The first is the state wide demographic pattern. We are just about at the low point of the number of traditional age students graduating from high school and, as a consequence, we, along with most other institutions, public and independent, have had a decrease in the number of applicants. That seems to be one of the most important factors. The second factor for IUPUI is that we have begun a deliberate process of changing our admissions pattern with both increased admissions requirements and deadlines for admissions. This appears to have had some impact on the number of students who enrolled this fall. Thirdly, as part of a many year process of revising the policies and procedures for the Undergraduate Education Center we have continued to see a number of students who were not retained due to poor academic performance. That probably accounts for a portion of this roughly 800 student decrease. The final factor is attributable to decisions being made by some schools as a part of their academic planning process to restrict admissions to a certain number of students that their programs can accommodate. In the highly popular areas this may have had an impact on particularly first year applications. As we have more analysis of the information and further conversation with students who have not come, we will report back to the Council on why we think we experienced a decrease this year. Although we don't have information from other institutions as of yet, informal conversations at other public institutions in Indiana suggest that there appears to be a general statewide decrease in the number of students at public institutions.

BEPKO: If there are any questions, we would be happy to address either now or at the time of the Question/Answer Period on the agenda. As I conclude, I have two more points about the 25th anniversary. First, we have planned the 25th anniversary celebrations with an eye toward costs and keeping those costs down. Most of the 25th anniversary events that you will see in bold type in the academic calendar that is distributed are events that schools and departments have planned already and are

financing out of regular budgeted expenditures. We will piggyback the 25th anniversary on those events. The campuswide events are going to be done at what we hope is a minimum of costs and we have been mindful of that from the very beginning. In a time of austerity we don't wish to have an ostentatious celebration. We hope to have a profound, meaningful celebration -- one that attracts the community's attentions to the extraordinary progress that has been made at IUPUI and causes us to think about the equally extraordinary potential of the future.

The other point about the 25th anniversary celebrations is that, according to the calendar, there is one being conducted as we speak -- the Integrated Technology Exposition. But, there is also one also that may be more relevant because you still have time to think about it that is coming up in only two days. There will be an IUPUI tailgate party this Saturday here on campus. You may be forewarned about the crowds that may gather especially towards the west end of the campus. This is to coincide with and lead into the WENS Sky Concert that takes place on Labor Day weekend every year with fireworks and music over the White River. We thought that we should start to do things on campus that were conducted on a grand scale. We are having our first tailgate party on campus and we expect 200,000 people. One person said, "Take that, Bloomington."

WARFEL: Are there any questions at this time?

AGENDA ITEM IV PRESIDENT'S REPORT - RICHARD FREDLAND

FREDLAND: I hope I will be slightly briefer. Some of you or all of you should have received in the mail within the last four or five days a small booklet surveying your assessment techniques. No description of what this was about came with it and we wanted to bring to your attention that what we are attempting to do with this, this is from a systemwide process -- it is not a campus specific thing, is to be able to demonstrate to the larger world that we are indeed doing assessment. Of course, beauty is in the eye of the beholder. Assessment is what you call it and, if you look at that survey, once you have opened your office door virtually everything else you do is assessment of one sort or another. Please take some time to fill it out, drop it back in the campus mail to the Public Opinion Laboratory. so that we will be able to demonstrate to those who are interested in what are we doing to measure the outputs of our activity which is really the nub of the question from the legislature and the Commission on Higher Education we will be able to tell them.

Before us today are a couple of very profound and significant issues. I want to get you into the mode of thinking about these things right now because we are going to spend some time today. We will vote on them next month. The matter of the

balanced case. If you haven't tuned into the balanced case, you will be tuned in by the end of today. We have language that has come before us today from our Faculty Affairs Committee which is different from language that has been passed by the University Faculty Council which came to it from Bloomington which has created a minor constitutional crisis in faculty governance in terms of this process. I happen to think that our language is superior to the Bloomington language if we are going to have any language at all. Once we decide on this we will have to figure out where we go from there. But, that is not your problem.

Also, we have before us in painful detail the Task Force on Faculty Appointments and Advancements (TFFAA). There is an implementation committee that consists of administrators and faculty that has been meeting through the summer. You will hear more about that also.

The question of stopping the tenure clock will be on the agenda in October as well for the first time.

Last year we completed our annual review of five administrators I believe none of which have been reported yet to this body. We will be eagerly awaiting those reports as they are finished as well as undertaking five new reviews this year -- Dean Barlow (School of Liberal Arts), Dean Brown (School of Journalism), Vice Chancellor Tempel, Paul Bippen (Director of the Columbus Center), and Michael Cozmanoff (Bursar) who just grabbed me by the scruff of the neck to say, "I didn't know that was going to happen this year." He is a particularly enthusiastic recruit. [laughter]

The concept of Responsibility Center Management is going to be looked at by the Budgetary Affairs Committee this year to see what it has done to and for us. That should be fun.

I was looking at my notes and not paying as careful attention as I should have but I think you said something about this, and I will if you didn't, that everybody at this front table has agreed that we will throttle anybody with a new initiative this year. [laughter] We have enough things going on that we do not necessarily need anything else and those that we have mentioned, and others that are already in the mill, will certainly keep us fully exercised, I think.

On the subject of coos and rumors of coos and revelations and resignations and elections of presidents of the board, I come at this from a political scientist perspective as opposed to a politician, a lawyer, a chancellor or anything else. I just wanted to say a couple of things. The search will be underway shortly for a new president of the university. I couldn't help but note as you were alluding to what has gone on in the Board of Advisors for IUPUI, this is not definitive observation but it is

just as impressionistic. There are only two educators on the Board of Advisors of this institution to the best of my knowledge. All of the rest of them come largely from the world of business. A substantial percentage as you might well suspect from the world of law. It is what we can do with under employed lawyers I find. [laughter] There was an editorial in a small town newspaper in this state, I am told, this week that what Indiana University needs is a CEO. I don't happen to be of that opinion. That may be the last time I have a chance to say that, I don't know. But, I think those of us on the faculty who might have a different opinion or a broader opinion of that may want to muster our thinking to be able to make that case as articulately as we are able to do that to the search committee. Which, incidentally, will be appointed by the Faculty Council Agenda Committee of which Kathy and I are among other members from this campus. This will be happening in the relatively near future.

A slightly different perspective on the election of the new president of the Board of Trustees again from a political point of view. It is fascinating from a political scientist's point of view to see one democrat unseat another democrat. When the members of the Board of Trustees who aren't elected by the alums are appointed by the Governor, you have to wonder what is going on there. It strikes me that there is an ideological difference that is consistent with what the Commission on Higher Education is looking at and that is more intense questions about, what indeed are you doing there on your campus? I perceive on the Board of Trustees a philosophical split about management that I think is not necessarily nifty when we are searching for a new president as well. That is another matter for another day. The new president of the Board of Trustees, you did not mention, is the owner of the local newspaper NUVO which I think is really nifty.

BEPKO: He doesn't like to be known as the owner. He is an investor.

FREDLAND: He is not the owner. Well, the primary investor. One other thing. The assault on higher education that is not unique to Indiana nor to this institution, I think makes us particularly vulnerable. I think we need to be very attentive to it. I think we are in the process of undergoing changes that I see happening from this perspective that is going to require some real leadership from faculty and administration and from the Board of Trustees. That makes it all the more critical when we select a new president.

On a different plane, I think that the temper of the times makes it very difficult for universities to be the ivory towers in the positive sense of that word. If we are, indeed, the "tellers of truth" which I like to think that we are paid to do, and maybe the last bastion of society that is paid to do that, perhaps. We cannot also be as attentive to our public relations images and concerns as we sometimes think we have to be. I am bothered that we find ourselves having to be unduly concerned, and

unduly is a big qualifier here, about what the public thinks about what we are doing. A lot of what we find to be academic truth is not necessarily very appealing to a large part of the public and I think we need to be very careful about what we say the truth is. The selling of Bloomington's mouths to Coca-Cola for \$1.5 million a year is just another indication of the kinds of things that we find ourselves doing to supplement the inadequate funding from the legislature. Our department is thinking of selling ads on the back of our bluebooks for next year. It is not an insignificant matter. What will Pepsi Cola do to our dental research on cavities, for example? There are enough without implications.

Chancellor Bepko mentioned general education. It will be before us this year. I personally am an enthusiastic supporter. I was talking to a colleague today and this person said, "I can't speak for my faculty. I don't know what they think." I said, "That has never stopped me." I have represented the faculty of this university as being in support of general education with great enthusiasm. It is going to require some pain and some effort this year. I have said to the people who have been involved with it that I think it to amorphous and needs to be more specific. That may or may not happen. I also think it needs to have some international dimension to it if we are going to have general education requirements that are going to be meaningful. So, I would encourage your attention to that, especially those of you who are in undergraduate programs.

On another matter, we have a spectacular new library. If you haven't visited the new library, go there right after this meeting. It is really a nifty place. Finally, we have a building on the campus which looks like it belongs to a university instead of to a prison compound. As a consequence of celebrating that, I came up with this notion. I have talked to a couple of people about this and they didn't think it was too zany. If every member of the faculty on this campus gave \$1.00 that would give us roughly \$1,350 with which to purchase a painting or a piece of sculpture for the library. If we can figure out a way to honestly collect a \$1.00 or more from each of you, that might be a way to give a sense of support to the library and a sense of feeling of community that we haven't often done. I am going to see what I can do about that.

In the absence of the library in the old business, there is supposed to arise a student center. I, on behalf of the faculty, have been eagerly awaiting the arrival of the students. I encourage your attention to this as well. It is having labor pains.

I think I have said everything that I wanted to say and that it is a joy to come to the end of last year noting that we have not had a new vice chancellor appointed. We begin the year with the same number of vice chancellors that we had last year. We look forward to a successful, challenging, and interesting year.

The agenda calls for a mention that we have a constitutional amendment to be voted on. It was approved by this body last spring. We did not have time to have it voted on by the faculty. I will call upon Vice President Warfel for the content of that amendment.

WARFEL: It actually consisted of three changes in the Constitution: (1) brought us in line with reality. We have recently been having only one full faculty meeting per year, although the Constitution mandated two; (2) It changed the number of voting faculty necessary to be present to have a quorum for a meeting of faculty of the whole from 50 to 100; and, (3) it added a section detailing how a referendum issue could be held. That should be coming out in the mail soon.

We had a couple of celestial comments about Dick's speech. Does anyone else want to say anything? [No comments]

AGENDA ITEM V STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

WARFEL: Under standing committee reports the agenda indicates that we are to have a report about Boards of Review.

BEPKO: We don't have the reports yet. A couple of the review processes are not yet completed, and it is our inclination to make the report only once for all of the reviews that we have done this past year. So, it will probably be in October, but it may even be November by the time we will make the final report which, if you will recall from last year, is going to be made in the form of a memorandum that will, in writing, outline all of the reports, all of the recommendations that were made by the review committees and the administration's responses to each of those. [Reporting on Administrative Reviews]

FREDLAND: We had one Board of Review. As you will recall, those of you who were on the Faculty Council, the huge snafu we had about what constituted a Board of Review. Fortunately, we only had one case. The Board of Review took a different task than usual and played the role of mediator between the multiple parties to this case. It has issued a substantial and thoughtful report. Only time will tell whether the mediation has worked.

AGENDA ITEM VI HEALTH CARE BENEFITS - EDWARD ROBBINS

WARFEL: The next agenda item is a report from Ed Robbins, chair of the IUPUI Faculty Council Fringe Benefits, on where health care benefits stands.

ROBBINS: I will simply go through the health care options that we anticipate having available on this campus, give you what information we have at this point about any changes in those plans, and what we know about the prospects for the premiums of those plans for next year. We will then ask for your support for a approach to setting the premiums for the one option for which the university sets premiums and that is the PCI Health Care Plan.

As most of you know, one of the changes that will affect a number of our participants is that the Maxicare HMO, in which about 1,300 of our faculty and staff on this campus have participated, is being discontinued as an option, but being replaced by the M-Plan HMO. Most people who continue in that plan will not discern any difference. In fact, those who were hired last year following the decision not to continue the Maxicare option, are already in the M-Plan HMO. As with the other HMOs, the premiums for these are set by the providers. The premiums for next year have not been firmly established -- there are still some negotiation going on between those providers and the university, namely Human Resources Management, who negotiates those premium arrangements with those external health care providers. What is happening at the present time is that they have asked the providers to re-think the proposed change in premiums to see whether or not we could come up with some better rates. Those negotiations will probably continue for another week or so, then it will be beyond the point when we can make changes and still get all the provisions in place in order to have the open enrollment that we typically have in the month of November.

In that plan the premiums for next year are likely to increase somewhere between 8 and 12 percent. That, along with what I'll report about the potential premiums for the other plans, I think is very good news. We have been anticipating and hearing a great deal about health care costs increasing at the rate of 20 or 25 percent a year. For a number of reasons we have seen a different kind of experience over this past year. A major part of it was related to the fact that a significant amount of health care was shifted from the providers to the employees. That certainly has made a difference. We are seeing some other kinds of changes in the way in which both practitioners and the participants are behaving and the net result of that is health care costs are not going to come very close to at least those outside estimates that we have heard about.

The second plan that will continue to be available on this campus is the UHC HMO. In that particular plan the proposals are to increase rates across the various options, (i.e., the employee/employer, employee/spouse/family), just a little less than six percent. So that is particularly good news. I would anticipate that these rates will not be any higher than this because the negotiations that are underway now is to get the providers to consider finding ways to lower them. So, again, that is good news.

There is one other outside possibility, I think it is a particular long shot, that there may be another option. That is the option that is the UHC point of service plan. This is different from the UHC HMO which is a closed system which in order to receive benefits from that you are required to receive those within the HMO context. The plan that they are attempting to put together that is a point of service provides an option for receiving services outside the network which means that, if you choose to use providers other than those that are included in the network, there will usually be a co-payment or other deductible that will apply that. It will cost more but at least it does not have the option. The guess now is that, that plan will likely not be in place in time to be included in next year's options. But, they will continue to work on that so that ideally there will be that option available in the near future.

The final option for the IUPUI campus is the PCI Health Care Plan. This is the typical indemnity plan in which we use the preferred care Indiana network and is the one which currently has the three deductible levels of \$300, \$500, and \$900 . Most of you, I think, have already heard that the Healthcare Commission has recommended that we not change the deductibles in that plan. We fully expect that, that will be the case. There is one change that we can anticipate that has been recommended again by the Healthcare Commission and that is the organ transplant provision which currently is provided by a network of hospitals in the state and out of the state, identified by the various transplant services that they are authorized to provide, to be replaced by organ transplants through the IU Hospital. Our analysis of that and the analysis that the Healthcare Commission is that, that will still provide more than an adequate option and alternatives for organ transplant for our participants and certainly we will do it at a better managed cost.

The procedure for setting premiums for the PCI option, and because it is done inhouse, is one that is based upon the best kind of evidence we have of cost experience over the most current time period, typically, the most recent 12 months for which there are costs records available. Over the 12-month period ending at the end of June the participant cost in the PCI program had increased about 9.8 percent, somewhat under 10 percent. I just heard that unofficially the costs for the month of July were in and they were down even a little more so that that kind of moving target that is used would result in even somewhat less of an annual increase over the past 12 months. When that is examined the cost of three deductibles, it turns out that it is distributed in such a way that at the highest level the increase seems to be something more like 5 percent with it increasing to something like 10 percent at the \$300 deductible level.

I suspect none of you have received it yet, but you will very soon receive the third edition of the health care bulletin. It explains the particular costs experience and, since it is cited there, I think the prospects are very good that when the Human

Resources Management staff takes their proposed premium rates for the PSI plan to the administration for their adoption, that it will not likely deviate very much.

There were some important ratios, particularly our action last year in which we specifically requested that any change that would result in cost shifting would be reflected in premiums and also that the 70/30 ratio of the university's contribution to the employee contribution would be maintained. In order for that to happen, then it clearly means that the premium increase ought to be based directly on what the best estimates of what the increased cost of the health care would be.

With those two principles in mind, the IUPUI Fringe Benefits Committee would present to you the following motion and ask for your support for it. That motion is:

1994 Premiums for the PCI Healthcare Plan should be determined on the basis of the most recent 12 months' cost experience available and distributed across the deductible levels consistent with that cost experience.

What that says otherwise is that we think that the healthcare costs ought to be limited to about the 5 percent range that is currently reflected in our cost experience.

WARFEL: Is that motion coming from your committee?

ROBBINS: It is and as a result it needs no second.

KOLESKI: Would you please be good enough to give us any kind of breakdown as to where costs for services and administration are going and what the utilization patterns and trends are in relation to our health insurance plans? Let me ask you a couple of things. First of all, the work that you and the people involved in your committee have been doing on our behalf is highly commendable. We are all better apprised of what is happening because of your efforts. But, I am troubled as to why costs are going up the way they are - ten to twenty-five percent per year and about three to four times as fast as the general cost of living rises. It is also very difficult to know about patient utilization patterns and trends. From what I have heard from others and from my own experiences, the direct services of the providers is excellent, the organization of the delivery of service seems to have some problems, and the paperwork that flows in the system is absolutely confounding. Is it possible that those who administer our health care system - within the university and the outside organizations - could periodically give us information as to the distribution of costs for services and administration of the system in relation to utilization patterns? Is it possible that, in relation to expenditures for pharmaceuticals and choosing and using physicians and other service providers, we might get suggestions from those who administer the

system as to how we might help ourselves and thus help the system control some of the costs? Each of us in this room is paying an increasing portion of the health care bill at IUPUI. It would seem to me that a better flow of information would help us understand where expenditures are going, why they are rising and what we might be able to do about them.

ROBBINS: I think most of the information that you are asking for is certainly available. Our PCI plan, for example, is administered by Accordia and they provide extensive and detailed information about how the costs of that plan are distributed across various providers, various services, various levels of the healthcare industry, that is, in doctors' visits, hospital visits, emergency room visits, etc. That information is available and I assume that we could get some kind of breakdown that would give us a sense of what the distributions are. I think it is the case that, our experience is driven by some of the changes that have been made in the healthcare plan, most specifically the changes that were made a year ago to add a co-payment to the use of the emergency room. The analysis of the use of the emergency room suggests that there is a higher level of use than you would otherwise expect and than is probably necessary. It became, under our previous plan, a kind of convenience with no particular financial liability for using that as opposing to going to a outpatient treatment center or waiting to get into your family doctor on Monday morning instead of going to the emergency room on Sunday evening.

The same thing was true of the change that was made to the drug plan. The notion that by adding a co-payment there, it was felt that it would motivate individuals to be more cautious about how they used the various options of getting prescriptions at the local Hook's Drugstore and paying a co-payment or using the Hooks' mail order and having to pay the co-payment there. So, making judgments about the cost of the prescription, the length of the prescription, and which of those two is the most economical, not only from their point of view, but from the institutional point of view, seems to have had an effect on usage.

Apparently the emergency room provision isn't working very well but the drug provision is. The use of the emergency room, as an option, still seems to be at about the same level it was before, even though a substantial co-payment has been added. The cost of drugs through the mail order have moderated somewhat significantly so that we have seen that the number of prescriptions and the cost of those prescriptions have declined. So, we have done those things and I suspect we will continue to look at those as we set rates. What we have not done and is what you are asking for, is to provide everybody some of the same information that those who are involved in these discussions have been getting.

KOLESKI: You just did a wonderful job of being a walking newsletter. It seems to me that it would be very helpful if all faculty members were getting that kind of information - and more - from those who administer the program in the simplified fashion in which you just presented it.

ROBBINS: I'll ask Dan Rives as he looks at the next newsletter to think about including some of that kind of information.

P. BLAKE: I have a question about the emergency room use. Is that general throughout the IU system or is it located on any specific campus?

ROBBINS: It is most prevalent on the IUB campus. It is probably influenced in major part by the nature of that campus. People tend to come in and out of there in terms of both the staff and spouses of students, etc., and are less likely to establish patient/doctor relationships where they have a primary care physician. So, it is predominantly a phenomenon of the Bloomington campus and the Bloomington hospital.

P. BLAKE: Is anybody looking at that?

ROBBINS: One of the things that I didn't report is what is being proposed and being developed for the other campuses. One of the options that is expected to come on line for the Bloomington campus is an HMO. That should have some real impact.

BYRNE: Ray covered most of what I was going to ask. Maybe just one follow-up. It is perhaps an assumption in what he said that I don't share because I don't know about it. I will put it this way. Why are you happy about the fact that the rate of increase in health care costs is only two, three, or four times greater than the rate of inflation, depending on which program you are referring to?

ROBBINS: I am happy because it is not five, six, seven, or eight times the rate of inflation.

BYRNE: The increase is something you are not personally responsible for, needless to say. Nobody really has much of a grip on that. But, does this mean that all we can do is be grateful for the rate, whatever it is?

ROBBINS: That is one way to look at it. I think that while it would be reassuring, if every facet of our economic lives were affected equally economically and raised at a constant rate of inflation, we know that doesn't happen even within those factors that are included in the consumer price index and those other things that impact inflation. I think one of the things that we could anticipate in any event, even if we

had the most efficient health care system is that the very nature of the health care system and the way it is changing -- the very rapid advance in technology and the treatments for medical problems that in the past we didn't have the capacity to treat - - will probably result in health care exceeding most other aspects of the economic index. I think to assume that everything is going to raise at the level of general inflation, misses the point about the costs that are associated with some aspects of it.

WARFEL: Would you repeat the motion, please?

ROBBINS: The motion is that *1994 Premiums for the PCI Healthcare Plan should be determined on the basis of the most recent 12 months' cost experience available and distributed across the deductible levels consistent with that cost experience.*

WARFEL: Is the Council prepared to vote at this time? All of those in favor, say "Aye." All of those opposed? [Passed with two abstention]

AGENDA ITEM VII QUESTION-AND-ANSWER PERIOD

WARFEL: Our next agenda item is the question and answer period which is usually allotted 10 minutes give or take a little.

BEPKO: We have two questions submitted in writing this time. Do you want me to take those first or do you want to wait until later?

WARFEL: Why don't you go first.

BEPKO: It may be that mentioning one of the things that is asked about I'll field questions that may be raised from the floor.

First, we had a question about salaries for faculty and the increases that were provided in faculty salary lines for 1993-94. We have preliminary data, I emphasize "preliminary" because this was the first run of data that we have been able to develop, and we always find some anomalies. There is a refinement process that takes some time that has not yet been done. With that caution, we have copies of a page that shows the percentage increases for assistant, associate, and full professor in each school and then a campuswide first average computation. You can pick those up or we can hand them out now. We wanted to make them available for you now in response to the question that I think came from the Executive Committee of the Council.

The other question that came to us had to do with what Dick Fredland mentioned in the jocular sense a few moments ago -- a publication called NUVO, which had an article in it yesterday that raised some questions in the minds of some about issues of academic freedom. I think the best way to reassure you that there has been no jeopardy whatsoever to academic freedom and that our commitment to academic freedom and the rights and opportunity for faculty to explore and publish whatever they, in their best judgment, see fit to explore and publish to make sure that there is no suggestion that that has been diminished in any way, I will explain these events in summary form and then I will be happy to answer any questions you have.

For about the last 25 or 30 years the Indiana University Business Research Center has had a contract with the state of Indiana to provide demographic projections. These demographic projections are published periodically and the Business Research Center is paid a fee by the state. The person who is responsible for that Business Research Center, you probably all know, is Morton Marcus. The Business Research Center hired a person, among others, to do demographic work several years ago while that person, I believe, was completing a Ph.D. That person has done a lot of the demographic work up through the spring of this year. The person who was doing that work disappointed the people in the Business Research Center. The employee disappointed the leadership of the Business Research Center in a variety of ways because of that person's conduct. There were some allegations made about misconduct and the head of the Business Research Center this spring gave warning memos to this person explaining what the problems were and outlining a series of steps that could be taken to correct the problems that existed. The employee quit at that point and that was the end of the relationship with the Business Research Center.

Shortly thereafter, the employee, pursuant to some previous relationships both personal and professional, collaborated with the chair of the department of sociology, Suzanne Steinmetz, to publish data that seemed, at first blush, very similar to, if not identical to, the projections that the Business Research Center had been under contract to publish for the state. A public announcement was made that a news conference would be held for a release date for these data. Of course, Morton Marcus found out this and was concerned at a couple of different levels, but most important of all was concerned about two things. First, that it appeared that the employee that had resigned under this cloud shortly before this was now using knowledge that had been developed and had gone around to another department of the university to do the same thing that he was originally under contract by way of his employment to do for the Business Research Center. Secondly, and more importantly, he was concerned that there could be some problems in the community. This was an event that took place while the legislature was in a special session and he was worried that if two different parts of the university were doing the same thing, one of which was under contract to the state of Indiana, that it could cause

embarrassment. Because of the possible embarrassment to the university, we asked the parties to come together so that we could talk about it and find out if indeed these were the same things that were being done by two different parts of the university and to see if there was some way of reconciling the differences of opinion that had been created by both these groups being on track to publish what we thought at the time was pretty much the same thing.

We had this meeting that was characterized in the NUVO article as an inquisition. That is not true. Everyone there, except the person who may have said this, although I am not even sure that it was said by Suzanne Steinmetz, but everyone else there agrees that it was not fairly characterized as an inquisition. It was an effort to see what the problem was, to see if there in fact was a duplication of effort, duplication of activities in two different divisions of the one university, to assess whether there was any potential for embarrassment to the university and to see if we couldn't work this out. We determined through the discussion that, in fact, there was a very substantial similarity in the two projects that were envisioned. There were some differences, having to do mostly with the fact that one group was looking at these data and would have some commentary that was based on the field of economics, which is the dominant discipline of the Business Research Center, and there was an emphasis in the other on sociology which obviously is the dominant field of emphasis in the department of sociology. After discussing these issues though, and concluding that these things, at least preliminarily (we didn't have these data in front of us; we didn't have the reports in front of us, they weren't available, but what was available at the time) quite a number if not all of the people present agreed that at least there was enough concern about this being a problem so that it would be better, in the interest of collegiality, and in the interests of the best tradition of Indiana University to urge Suzanne Steinmetz to make the contribution of a sociologist, of the people in sociology, in collaboration with Morton Marcus to wait until the Business Research Center data was available and then add the sociologist's interpretations and whatever perspectives were useful at that time in partnership with the Business Research Center. Suzanne Steinmetz, as was her right, said that she preferred not to do that. There was some reason for going ahead immediately with the publication of the data that had been gathered by this employee now working with her department. We said that if that was her decision, that was one that we would support. There was no effort made to suppress the report that she wanted to make. We thought the better way to go would be to do this in collaboration with the Business Research Center, but did not threaten, did not accuse her of immoral conduct or unethical behavior. We suggested that we weren't really sure what this amounted to. It was troublesome to us that an employee would leave one department under a cloud, go to another department and then do pretty much the same thing the employee was going to do in the first department and then beat the first department to the publication date, all of which could be embarrassing to the first department because they were under state

contract to produce these data.

It was a troublesome issue, but we weren't sure how to characterize it. It was troublesome enough so that we thought we should have this meeting and urge some collaboration. But, when there was a decision made by Suzanne Steinmetz not to want to collaborate, the matter was at a conclusion. No effort was made to, in any way, inhibit the opportunity that she had and the right she exercised to publish those data, which she did a couple of days later.

There was some follow-up activity which is still under way. For one thing, we think that it is important for us to take a look at the incident from a policy perspective. At this stage I think it is not something that will enhance the reputation of the university. We were concerned about that from the very beginning. I think we should have at least an opportunity to look, with the appropriate contributions of faculty, at the issue of policy. What policies might prevent this kind of issue from arising in quite the way it did this time, with no suggestion that there would be any suppression or censorship of any kind, but having a policy in place that could get people together or maybe anticipate this kind of problem before it reached controversy.

We did also want to look into the concerns that were raised about this employee. The concerns that were raised by Morton Marcus at the time the employee resigned from the Business Research Center were serious enough, we thought, to warrant the subsequent inquiry which is now completed. We have stated that, based on that further inquiry by our Affirmative Action Office, it would be in the best interest of Indiana University for this person not to be associated with the university.

Finally, we thought that this whole issue could create questions of how the university was using resources and we thought for the future, and for the policy development, we should know a little bit more about what costs were incurred in all of these areas and what resources were used to pay these costs. We have discussed this matter with the leadership of the Faculty Council who expressed some of the same concerns that one or two of you have expressed about the questions of academic freedom. It is my understanding that our discussions have comforted and satisfied Faculty Council leadership, both Dick and Kathleen, that there was not an issue of academic freedom at this point and not an issue of suppression. In order, though, to make sure that there is not any lingering concern in the minds of anyone, if you think it would be a good idea, I would be happy to take the various policy statements that are already in our organic documents on the subject of academic freedom, restate them with a special renewal of our commitment to academic freedom, and the absolute right of faculty to explore and to publish their findings.

Incidentally, we have a copy of a memo that was sent today from Suzanne Steinmetz to the NUVO publication saying that she is outraged at the article. She says that "the article contains significant misquotations, inaccuracies and out-of-context material. I respectfully request you either print a correction or a retraction of the article. It is not correct in many of the quotations attributed to me and others and is an inaccurate account of the events surrounding the production of our projections."

FREDLAND: I would like to send the same memo, even though I wasn't quoted as extensively. I would just like to say one additional thing if I may. Suzanne Steinmetz is the only person involved in this who is a faculty member of the university. The other people (principals) involved are not faculty members and so the interest of the Faculty Council in this was limited to the concern of academic freedom in her case and not any of the other matters involved.

BEPKO: Of the people in the School of Business, Morton Marcus is not a member of the tenured faculty, but there are other members of the faculty in the School of Business who are very concerned and approached us with this issue as a matter of their own faculty interests.

SAGAMORE REP: The demographics, were they similar or were there any inconsistencies in the reports? Is that perhaps one of the reasons why one is being pushed down...?

BEPKO: One is not being "pushed down." You said "one is being pushed down." None are being pushed down in any way.

SAGAMORE REP: But, the Business Center is the one under State contract to produce these demographic reports, so with that emphasis, is that maybe an additional reason why another hasn't been produced or published?

BEPKO: The Business Research Center's publication date is October 1, I think, or something like that. There are some people from the School of Business here and they may know more about the date when this is due to be published. That is not something that has been published as yet. We did not have in front of us either report, either the one from the department of sociology or the one of the Business Research Center. The only evidence we had in front of us were statements of the people who were involved, and from discussing it with them, we couldn't make a final determination of whether the publications were exactly the same or how much the same they were likely to be, but we did satisfy ourselves that there was enough potential for their being the same that we thought as a matter of good university policy the best thing to do would be to urge collaboration rather than competition in the publication of the reports. I have never seen the report that was done by the

department of sociology. I have not read it. The other is not available yet. So, we can't tell what the precise comparison revealed.

SAGAMORE REP: Is the publication date for the Sociology Department reports October 1 as well?

BEPKO: No. The sociology report was published without an addition, in early July of 1993.

WARFEL: I am sorry if there are other questions for today, but because we have other agenda items, we will save any other questions for the next meeting. If we have time at the end of the meeting, we will ask for further questions.

AGENDA ITEM VIII UNFINISHED BUSINESS

WARFEL: Our next item is unfinished business. The reviews of administrators was discussed earlier today, noting that the reports of reviews from last year are still coming forward and that five new reviews will be started this year. Did we want to say more about the implementation committees for TFFAA at this time?

PLATER: As you know, the Task Force on Faculty Appointments and Advancements issued its report last year and during the 1992-93 academic year the report was hopefully being discussed by each of the schools on campus as well as various committees of the Faculty Council.

The Faculty Council Executive Committee, along with the Faculty Affairs Committee, concluded that the complexity of the report required some special efforts to present the parts of the report for implementation. As a consequence, with the campus administration we agreed to form what we are calling an "implementation committee" made up of representatives of the Faculty Affairs Committee, the Promotion Committee, the Tenure Committee, and those members coincidentally include representatives from the Executive Committee and the original task force. This group has met one day for a full day to go through the entire report and review the best way to implement or consider the recommendations of the task force. It has a second meeting to review those steps and we will yet a third meeting I believe next week in anticipation of presenting to the Council and to the faculties of the schools a series of specific recommendations to implement the recommendations of the task force. I should say that it is not suggesting that the recommendations be implemented just as presented but we will present some modifications, variations for discussion and debate.

I think the time schedule for this was during the summer. It seemed possible optimistically to have this concluded by the end of the fall semester. I suspect that it will go into the spring as well. But, we would like to have as many of the recommendations considered and those that are to be implemented, be implemented in time for them to be available for faculty who might need this information for 1994-95, promotion, tenure considerations, reviews, etc.

You will receive a great deal of information probably within the next 3-6 weeks. We intend to ask that there be several public meetings outside of the Faculty Council meeting to discuss these issues. We will try to make both information and opportunities for discussion available before the Council is asked to vote on any specific recommendation.

FREDLAND: May I say one additional thing, please? A summary of the 33 recommendations are on line through the electronic mail system on the campus. So, if you don't have a copy and want to read them, you can do them that way or if you will call the Council Office (274-2215), we can provide the 4-5 page summary to you. We will not provide the 50-page original for you but there should be copies floating around from last year's Faculty Council.

PLATER: The issues which are included in this report are quite significant. They include matters of review of tenured faculty periodic review, procedures for dismissal of faculty for incompetence, a series of other matters of considerable important to us as faculty members. This whole series of documents and discussions warrants the attention and consideration of all faculty, but especially the Faculty Council.

PLATER: As we are reminded regularly, administrators are also faculty when it comes to consideration of this kind.

WARFEL: We will be paying a lot of attention to the TFFAA implementation at these Council meetings throughout the year. Let's turn our attention at this time to the Balanced Case issue which we will talk about today to get all of you up-to-date on what the Balanced Case issue is and where we stand. At next month's meeting we will ask you to make up your minds what IUPUI wants to do about it, if anything.

The Balanced Case issue starts on page 27 of the IU Academic Handbook where there is a section on the criteria for promotion. An essential paragraph on that page is where it is written down that teaching, research and creative work, and service are what we are all supposed to be doing and that, if one wishes to be promoted, one had better be excellent in one of those areas and satisfactory in the other two.

This has to do with the criteria for promotion, but because the criteria for tenure is so closely linked with the criteria for promotion, anything that is done to the paragraph on page 27 has strong implications for what happens when we come to tenure people. The University Faculty Council spent last year dealing with considering the Balanced Case issue. In 1992 the Bloomington Faculty Council received a report of the Bloomington Commission on Teaching and within that report there were several suggestions having to do with teaching. The Bloomington Faculty Council passed two resolutions and sent them on to the Agenda Committee of the University Faculty Council in the fall of last year. That Agenda Committee sent those two resolutions to the University Faculty Council Faculty Affairs Committee and to the campuses for consideration.

The University level Faculty Affairs Committee rejected proceeding further with one of the resolutions which had to do with funding teaching awards, but did march right ahead with the second resolution which recommended adoption of the Balanced Case resolution. At this point, I think we should probably look at the wording that was added. On page 27, the paragraph reads:

Teaching, research and creative work, and services which may be administrative, professional, or public are long-standing University promotion criteria. Promotion considerations must take into account, however, differences in mission between campuses, and between schools within some campuses, as well as the individual's contribution to the school/campus mission. The relative weight attached to the criteria above should and must vary accordingly. A candidate for promotion should normally excel in at least one of the above categories and be satisfactory in the others...

Actually, it used to say, "...normally a candidate for promotion should excel in one of the above categories and be at least satisfactory in the others... The very next sentence is what has been added to it.

...Alternatively, a candidate may present evidence of a balance of strengths that promises comparable benefits to the university over time.

The paragraph finishes with the original language:

"Promotion to any rank is a recognition of past achievement and a sign of confidence that the individual is capable of greater responsibilities and accomplishments.

The Agenda Committee received this language from the University level Faculty Affairs Committee and brought it to the University Faculty Council at the March meeting. At that March meeting there was pretty hot discussion -- pro and con -- about whether changing the criteria in this way was a good idea.

The IUPUI contingency felt that we had not considered it on this campus as a whole, although members of our Faculty Affairs Committee had been involved in discussions. The Faculty Affairs Committees had communicated, but certainly our Council hadn't considered this issue and hadn't had a chance to think about it. Therefore, at the March UFC meeting it was moved to refer to the campuses and to postpone a vote on this issue until the campuses, namely IUPUI, had a chance to think about it. That motion to refer failed by one vote. It failed 17 to 18. There had also been a motion to amend the language. That motion also failed. Then, the main question of whether or not to adopt the language as we saw in the spring was voted and passed 23 to 13.

In April, there was a memo sent out from the co-secretaries of the Faculty Council notifying the University community that even though this language had been passed and that for the 93-94 promotion and tenure consideration, this balanced case would be in place, so, be aware that it exists. This was very confusing because a few days later another memo went out saying "No, no, it is not in place after all. Ignore it. It is not policy yet. Yes, the UFC passed it, but it is on hold." It was placed on hold for a number of reasons: 1) because of IUPUI complaining that we hadn't had time to think about it, and 2) there was a faction in Bloomington that wanted some clarification of the language and the President decided to hold up on taking it to the Trustees. It has been passed by the Faculty Council, yet not really turned into active policy.

Since then, and in the meantime, our own IUPUI Faculty Affairs Committee has been asked to look at it carefully, to communicate with schools, and to make a recommendation to this body here. Our Faculty Affairs Committee has looked at it and their suggestion is that instead of inserting the sentence that was passed, we insert the sentence:

Alternatively, a candidate may present evidence of highly satisfactory performance in all three categories.

What are our options at this time? Well, our options as a Faculty Council could be to do nothing about the language as it was adopted in March, and not to worry about revising it. We could perhaps incorporate instructions in our own campus documents explaining what we consider to be the interpretation of this language for our campus. We could go back to the University Faculty Council this fall with a new resolution, perhaps substituting the Faculty Affairs Committee suggestion or something different.

What we need to do is talk about it and decide in October what we are going to do.

FREDLAND: At the moment, this language is before us. That is the proposal from our Faculty Affairs Committee.

SIDHU: The Executive Committee has already taken an action, and we need to pay attention to that. Each school's faculty organization has been requested to send their comments about the balanced case. We need to give them time for sending their responses. The consensus from the response should be brought back to Council for information.

WARFEL: Pat Blake is chair of the IUPUI Faculty Affairs Committee.

P. BLAKE: I sent out a notice before we left in the spring to all of the deans and I have received one response.

UNKNOWN: I have a question for clarification. I thought if the University Faculty Council, which has representatives from all of the campuses, voted on something that, that was it. What I don't understand is, whether this is a precedent or whether it is standard procedure for a campus which doesn't like what the all-campus council does, to moan about it and get them to change their minds. Can we actually do something that could make the all-university Faculty Council rescind the vote and say, "Well, we will do it over again?"

WARFEL: I think it is too late to have March's motion reconsidered. I think that there is always an option to come back with a new motion regarding an old issue. I don't think we can exactly ask them to undo what they have already done, but we could put a new suggestion before them. There have, unfortunately, been a few cases in the past, remembering the Family Leave Policy where the Faculty Council has passed something that has not gone forward.

UNKNOWN: So, technically we are amending what is already been approved?

WARFEL: If that is what we decide to do.

BESCH: I think, according to Roberts' Rules of Order, that in fact someone who voted for the amendment with the other wording could make a motion to bring back for reconsideration and that would be perfectly proper. Whether that would be of any use whatsoever.

WARFEL: In reading Roberts' Rules of Order it wasn't clear to me what the time limit on moving to reconsider was. I thought we had missed our window. I agree with your final point which is I am not sure what is the most effective way to do something, if we are going to do anything.

FREDLAND: I do not want to add any confusion to an otherwise crystal clear issue. It was partly my fault that what we got into this confusion. I took the responsibility for seeing that we had not had a voice in this policy that we had not really assented to. Because it came out of our Faculty Affairs Committee at virtually the same time it was passed at the University Faculty Council, I went to Tom Ehrlich and said, "Don't take it to the Board of Trustees right now." There was a lot of excitement, especially in Bloomington, to get this pushed through. There was less excitement on this campus. Before it was voted on at the UFC, nobody on this campus had really attended to it in a great deal of detail. From a constitutional point of view, yes, what you suggested is exactly what we are trying to do. We didn't like the outcome so we wanted to hold it off and see if we can rethink it. Henry put his finger on one of the options that we have available which is, if somebody who voted for it would ask them to reconsider, we could reconsider. Otherwise, we go with an amendment. When we vote next month on this issue, we either adopt this plan or we reject this plan and then we have to decide what we want to do with the other language. If we reject this language, we are going to have to figure how to handle it. This is not something that I have enjoyed and I wish it would go away. But the only thing I can do is to get to October and hope that we can deal with it then.

MANNHEIMER: I am a member of the University Faculty Council Faculty Affairs Committee and might even take credit for the word "comparable" which seemed to satisfy various strengths of the argument within that committee of the UFC. Presumably, the reason it passed at the UFC at large was that we felt the word "comparable" was the equivalent of the word "equivalent" in this statement.

The second point would be that the argument, again as it stands within our committee and later to the UFC as a whole, it pivoted on a metaphor of quantitative analysis wherein excellence was awarded the arbitrary figure of 5, satisfactory was awarded the arbitrary figure of 3. The argument was, as succinctly as I can put it, that in order to get tenured and get promoted one had, as a faculty member, to earn the score of 5 plus at least 3 and 3 for a grand total of 11. The argument was that a balanced case could conceivably grant tenure or promotion to a faculty member who had earned the score of 4, 4, and 3 adding up again to 11. As I read this, it seems like a candidate must just have evidence of highly satisfactory, which I assume to mean the grade of 4, in all three categories for a grand total of 12. Now, I am all for higher and higher standards for all faculty in all three categories of teaching, service, and research.

BESCH: Why don't we shoot for 5,5,5?

SIDHU: I don't think many of us can achieve 5,5,5. It is a struggle between teaching and research. You can show excellence in research very easily through published work, but to show excellence in teaching is very difficult if we have to use the same criteria for judging it which we use for judging the research. We need to discuss the question in detail and work out specific methods of judging excellence in teaching.

As far as the application of the decision is concerned, it should apply to all campuses of Indiana University because it is the decision of the University Faculty Council. How can we take the item back to the University Faculty Council? We will have to send our opinion to the University Faculty Council Faculty Affairs Committee and request them to reconsider their previous recommendation in light of our views. If they agree with our opinion, they will have to put it up for reconsideration by the UFC.

How can we take it back? You send an item back to the University Faculty Council Faculty Affairs Committee for reconsideration. If they reconsider, then take it back to the University Faculty Council. Because Henry Karlson is not here and the question is interpretation.

Second, what Henry [Besch] suggested was that the member who voted for it can raise the question that they would like to bring the item back.

WARFEL: One of the things that we will have to focus on is strategies we can adopt at this time. I wonder if we could also address the basic issue itself and that is would we have been in favor of changing the criteria for promotion at all in the first place? Some are nodding yes and some are nodding no.

BURR: I would like to know what the problem was we were trying to address concerning the language. I wasn't aware we had a problem.

WARFEL: This came to us originally from Bloomington's Commission on Teaching. I think the problem that it grew from was that people who were teachers at Bloomington were having trouble getting promoted and tenured.

BURR: If they were excellent teachers, they wouldn't have had trouble getting promoted. So, I see nothing wrong with the original way that these guidelines were stated. There is really no reason to change. Either change in language that is before us now would have the effect of creating a mediocre faculty, both in research, teaching and service. You can disagree with that but realistically the fact is that it would. I think it is very dangerous, and I don't think it was a problem to begin with.

WARFEL: You have reiterated what several people said at the University Faculty Council.

BURR: I think there is a problem to begin with. People talk as if there are three areas, but we will accept only one of these areas as the area of excellence. No one has said that.

UNKNOWN: I think part of the problem, from my perspective, is the definition of these words. I am not sure what excellence means. I have my own perspective but I think much of it has to do with what excellence, highly satisfactory versus adequacy, versus balance of strengths. Certainly, in terms of the teaching, if a faculty member couldn't get tenured with excellence in teaching, adequacy in research, and adequacy in service, how is that faculty member going to get tenure if he has a highly satisfactory, which I assume is better than adequacy, in research? That is, he/she is highly satisfactory job in service but it would seem to me that this criteria now says they can't just do adequacy in research, they must now be highly satisfactory, if highly satisfactory is better than adequate, which I assume it is. I think a lot of the problem is definition.

FREDLAND: I would just like to make two points. Let's go back to, is there a problem that we are trying to fix? It is very much a perceptual matter. It is a matter of interpretation. The Commission on Teaching in Bloomington, which evolved this language, it grew out of a long series of meetings the faculty were dissatisfied with some of the differentials and the reward structure in Bloomington. To those people who were never in the classroom, but were always in the laboratory, getting grants, producing papers, etc., and the others who were in the front line teaching and feeling that they were not being adequately rewarded. So, that is where the birth of the language occurred. You can argue whether it is a good idea or not, but that is the root of this and there was a perceived problem. It has been magnified by the attention by the Board of Trustees, by the legislature, etc. Questions put succinctly "Why aren't you in the classroom? Why are in the laboratory"

Our non-member visitor today has suggested that we might define what these things mean. What is 5? What is 4? So, it may be some additional language.

WARFEL: That was one of the options that I suggested. Remember that each campus is to have a document that more specifically talks about criteria for tenure. One of our options could be not to worry about the language at the University level, but to specify how we interpret it on this campus.

P BLAKE: I would like to make a couple of statements from the Faculty Affairs committee. First, we never considered numerical value. We did feel that "highly

satisfactory" was somewhere between "adequate" and "excellent". We also felt that each unit would interpret those terms as they do now. There are many people who are doing some research. They are doing good research, but they are not funded. They are not nationally recognized as such. More and more we found that the units were demanding that type of funded research for tenure. Yet, we felt that we were losing good teachers on that basis.

ROBBINS: I just wonder if anyone has the perspective that I do about all of this and that is that it makes no difference what the words are that are included in a document like the Faculty Handbook. All of my experience in the promotion and tenure process is that it is highly idiosyncratic. It is based almost entirely on the individuals who make up the committees. It is also subject to interpretations that are in the minds of the people on the committees and their own individual views are not affected by what happens to the language of the institutional handbook.

SIDHU: This is the problem we are facing today and I will give you a hypothetical example to illustrate this point. Suppose we have a candidate for promotion who is excellent in research but barely adequate in teaching and service, he/she will be promoted because he/she has met the University criteria which is very general. Another candidate, who may be very good in all three categories or very good in two areas and adequate in one, will not be promoted because he/she does not meet the present University criteria, but in reality he/she may be an all-round better teacher than the first candidate whose main strength is research. As such, we need an alternate provision so that second candidate may also get an opportunity for promotion.

WARFEL: We will discuss this again next month.

AGENDA ITEM IX NEW BUSINESS

WARFEL: Henry Besch is on the agenda for three minutes to talk about the Senior Academy.

BESCH: Thank you. Perhaps you have seen one of the first things to be circulated which contains the enhanced IUPUI logo for our 25th anniversary. It is on the front of an invitation to please plan to attend the inauguration of the IUPUI Senior Academy, which will be held Monday afternoon beginning at 2:00 p.m. on September 20, 1993 at the University Place Conference Center. Chancellor Emeritus Glenn W. Irwin will give a talk on the history of IUPUI. Chancellor Bepko will make inauguration remarks for the inauguration of this senior academy. There will be round table discussions. There will be a reception at 4:00. We wanted to be sure and remind you

of this new entity, the association of retired IUPUI faculty and staff -- who will, at last, have a place to remain with some of their colleagues.

WARFEL: Thank you, Henry. We believe that the Senior Academy may grow to be a very special part of our campus. A lot of retired faculty and staff continue to make valuable contributions.

FREDLAND: I failed to mention about our picture fund which now has \$63 in an envelope here at the front desk. The Campus Art Committee, chaired by Dean Voos from Herron School of Art, has agreed if we received money to spend it for us.

WARFEL: I would like to announce that Chancellor Bepko has said that he will be available to talk more about what we discussed during the question/answer period or to answer other questions which you have for him following the meeting today.

AGENDA ITEM X ADJOURNMENT

WARFEL: The meeting is adjourned.

INFORMATION:

THE TOTAL COLLECTED SO FAR FOR LIBRARY ART FUND IS \$137.00

INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY INDIANAPOLIS
FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING
OCTOBER 7, 1993
LAW SCHOOL, ROOM 116
3:30 - 5:30 P.M.

PRESENT: **ADMINISTRATION:** Dean William Plater. **DEANS:** John Barlow, Walter Daly, Angela McBride, Alfred Potvin, Sheldon Siegel, David Stocum. **ELECTED FACULTY:** C D Aliprantis, Patricia Blake, William Blomquist, David Burr, Edmund Byrne, David Canal, Michael Cohen, Gayle Cox, Theodore Cutshall, Michael Dalsing, Richard Fredland, Karen Gable, Paul Galanti, Joe Garcia, Gareth Gilkey, Michael Gleeson, Jean Gnat, Clifford Goodwin, Norman Hudson, Jerome Kaplan, M Jan Keffer, Raymond Koleski, Joseph Koss, Steven Leapman, Diane Leland, James McAteer, Dana McDonald, Richard Meiss, Arthur Mirsky, Bernard Morrel, Byron Olson, William Orme, Vimalkumar Patel, Daniel Peavy, Richard Peterson, Rebecca Porter, Norris Richmond, Edward Robbins, Carl Rothe, Brian Sanders, Richard Schreiner, Jay Simon, Charles Slemenda, Jeffrey Springston, Karen Teegarden, Jeffery Vessely, Karen West, Eric Wiebke, Patricia Wittberg, Charles Yokomoto.

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS PRESENT: Edgar Fleenor, Henry Karlson, John Pless, Hitwant Sidhu, Martin Spechler, Kathleen Warfel.

ALTERNATES PRESENT: **DEANS:** Shirley Yegerlehner for Barbara Fischler, Barbara Wilcox for Donald Warren. **ELECTED FACULTY:** David Lewis for James Baldwin, Julia Tyler for Frances Brahmi, Barbara Albee for Dolores Hoyt, Yuri Abramovich for Bart Ng, Subir Chakarbarti for Rosalie Vermette. **EX OFFICIO MEMBERS:**

ABSENT: **ADMINISTRATION:** Gerald L. Bepko, J. Herman Blake. **DEANS:** A. James Barnes, Trevor Brown, H. William Gilmore, P. Nicholas Kellum, John Rau, William Voos, Charles Webb, James Weigand. **ELECTED FACULTY:** Biagio Azzarelli, Darrell Bailey, Timothy Baldwin, Merrill Benson, Henry Besch, Michael Clark, Elaine Cooney, Joseph DiMicco, William Engle, Naomi Fineberg, Michael Fritsch, Joe Garcia, Stuart Hart, Juanita Keck, Robert Keck, Eric Long, Lynda Means, Michael Sadove, Lee Schwecke, Aristotle Siakotos, Robert Sutton, David Suzuki, Susan Zunt. **EX OFFICIO MEMBERS:** Barbara Cambridge, J Vannoy Faris, Steven Mannheimer, B Keith Moore, Helen Schwartz, William Schneider, Student Representative.

VISITORS: Trudy Banta (Planning and Institutional Improvement), Erwin Boschmann (Faculty Development), Linda Goodine (Herron School of Art), Scott Miley (Indianapolis Star), Carol Nathan (Associate Dean of the Faculties Office), Barbara Norton (School of Nursing), Shirley Nusbaum (Faculty Records), Mark Rosentraub (SPEA), James Wallihan (Labor Studies).

**AGENDA ITEM I MEMORIAL RESOLUTION: MOHAMMED ISHAQ, M.D.,
 SCHOOL OF MEDICINE**

WARFEL: This meeting of the Council will come to order. Our first agenda item is to enter a memorial resolution for Professor Mohammed Ishaq. Professor Ishaq was in the department of anatomy first at the University of Karachi which was a sister institution to our own Medical Center. He was then here in Indianapolis with us from 1970 until his retirement in 1985. We will not read the full memorial resolution, but I ask you to stand for a moment of silence.

AGENDA ITEM II APPROVAL OF MAY 6, 1993 MINUTES

WARFEL: We will not be approving the May minutes since they have not been distributed.

AGENDA ITEM III CHANCELLOR'S REPORT - GERALD L. BEPKO

WARFEL: Dean Plater will give the Chancellor's report today in the absence of Chancellor Bepko.

PLATER: I will be very brief. I wish to apologize for the Chancellor for not being here. The Commission for Higher Education is meeting at the same time as we are in Vincennes, Indiana. One of the issues on the agenda for discussion today is mission of the campuses of the public universities in Indiana. Under the circumstances of discussions we have been having as a campus about our mission and the importance of the definition of the mission of this campus, he felt that he had to be present to speak on behalf of IUPUI. He wishes to extend his apologies for not being here.

The other item which I wish to mention is in the way of sad news. Some of you knew Ed Moore very well. He was the Executive Dean and Dean of the Faculties on this campus. He has passed away this past week. If you had not heard this news, I thought the Council should be aware of it. A resolution will be introduced to the faculty at the appropriate time.

AGENDA ITEM IV PRESIDENT'S REPORT - RICHARD FREDLAND

FREDLAND: Thank you. In speaking of the death of colleagues, two other long-time colleagues of ours from the campus have also recently died. Patricia Boaz, long-time Professor of Chemistry recently died last week as well as my colleague in Political

Science, Robert Kirch. Resolutions will come in due time for both of them as well.

Since Jerry Bepko is not here I will take the liberty of at least announcing the fact that the review of administrators that was scheduled for last year has now been completed in all cases. He is required to provide a summary of that to us, not the reviews in detail, so, don't expect to see the full document. I presume by next meeting we will have that information. The reviews of this year have not yet gotten off the ground, but presumably they will be off the ground by the next time we gather.

The Commission on Higher Education is meeting today and looking at the mission of this campus. I distributed a work plan for the year some time ago that has made its way around. There are two elements on there that should attract your interest, especially if you are in undergraduate education. First, is increasing campus productivity. One way of looking at that is having administrators teach more. [laughter] The Task Force on Faculty Work, that met last year and dealt with some of these issues, will be re-convened this year in an effort to keep one step ahead of the Commission or at least in step with the Commission or something of the sort. Whatever will come from that, I can't predict at the moment.

Another one of their six items of work is enrolling 35,000 additional students in Indiana -- not at IUPUI. It is not that there isn't a need. It is a well documented need. One of the ways in which they plan to do this is by putting them in front of a television set -- what is referred to as "distance education." This is working through the Partnership for Statewide Education that Bill Plater has been much involved in. Policies are developing for what will be distance education in the state of Indiana. If you have an interest in that, appearing on the golden screen, or your concern about what those issues might be, you may want to tune in, if that is the appropriate verb. Bill can tell you everything that needs to be talked about. Amy Warner, Office of Special Media Projects, is also very much involved in that.

I have been somewhat distressed in talking to colleagues about how many of them have not tuned into the "Balanced Case." I went around the offices in my neighborhood and said, "The Balanced Case is being voted on at 3:30, tell your faculty representative what you think about it." The blank stare which I received told me that they didn't know what I was speaking of. I don't think there is anymore significant issue than the "Balanced Case" in terms of our future as an institution and in terms of many peoples individual futures. Likewise, the Task Force on Faculty Appointment and Advancements. I wish you would go back to your respective units and stir those pots of interest and let people know that you exist in this room to represent those issues. If they don't, we are going to get complaints in the future about, "I didn't know." I don't feel badly if they don't pay any attention and they have troubles "down the pike", but at least they need to be aware that this mechanism for

representation of their concerns and interests does exist.

I only want to say one thing about the next item and that is, if you read the campus newspaper, which you can choose to or not, the article which appeared on the bottom of the front page about, what I have come to call "L'affair Steinmetz", quoted me wrongly and I want to use this opportunity to let you know that I am not as derelict in my duties as it sounded. I was quoted as saying that if she sought a board of review, it wouldn't happen until March. I did not say that, believe me. I said it wouldn't complete its work until March. We would submit it as soon as the request came. I wanted you not to think that is the way things work.

You will receive in the mail, only because I have been requested to send it to you, not for any other reason that I can think of, a document entitled, "IU Information 2000" that has been prepared by the Indiana University Information Resources Council on the look of the University from a technological perspective by the year 2000. It has 20 pages so you will get 10 double-sided pages shortly for your information. At some point, I think in November, Chris Peoples, Acting Associate Vice President and Dean of Academic Computing for the Indiana University system, who chaired this committee, will be on campus to make a presentation in a faculty forum about this report. You will have received this by that time. So, if you have an interest in the technological future of the University, this is where it is going.

Finally, at last meeting we collected money for a campus painting and I just wanted to show that we got \$137.00 and more has come since that time. We will do a full accounting at some point in the future. The person who sent me gave me a \$.50 coupon for macaroni can have it back. That is all I have to report.

WARFEL: Are there any follow-up questions or comments to Dick's report.

PLATER: Dick mentioned the Distance Education and the Partnership for Statewide Education. If any of you are interested, I must call to your attention a meeting of interested faculty and administrative officers of all the public institutions here in Indianapolis on October 29. This would be a good opportunity for you to find out about what is going on and what the plans are. If you have interest in attending that meeting, if you would let Dick, Amy Warner or myself know, we will make sure you get the materials about it. It will be Indianapolis in the afternoon of the 29th, mostly in the Lecture Hall and surrounding classrooms.

WARFEL: Are there any other comments or questions?

AGENDA ITEM V BALANCED CASE - ACTION ITEM (IUPUI Circular 93-17)

WARFEL: We will proceed to discuss the Balanced Case. Pat Blake who is the chairman of the Faculty Affairs Committee is going to remind us where we are on this issue.

BLAKE: It is a larger population out there than the last time I came up here so it must be that you did read the Balanced Case and the other documents in your agenda for today.

What the committee recommended last time was a different wording than what we are recommending today. The reason that happened was that I got a sense from the Council at large that you did not like the wording of "highly satisfactory." So, I took that back to the committee and, again, this is probably half of the old members and half new members. What they decided in the end was to forward and support the concept of Balanced Case and, secondly, the wording of the UFC statement which is shown on IUPUI Circular 93-17.

WARFEL: Last year the University Faculty Council, before we here on this campus had a chance to fully consider this issue, the University Faculty Council voted on the Balanced Case issue in March. That vote resulted in a paragraph in the Academic Handbook being changed. It is on IUPUI Circular 93-17 which is attached to your agenda.

The question has been raised, if this has already been passed by the University Faculty Council, why are we talking about it now? The Executive Committee felt that we ought to give this campus an opportunity to have an opinion about whether or not they liked the Balanced Case principle, even if University Faculty Council had already voted on it. We have talked about it on a number of occasions and there are several different settings. What we are going to ask you to do today is to vote on the motions that the IUPUI Faculty Affairs Committee are bringing to you.

The first motion is we are in favor of the general idea of the Balanced Case. We will take that first. If that passes, their second motion that, although we have discussed variations on language, we prefer the one which the University Faculty Council passed last March and we will leave it alone. That is what we are going to be doing, but first the discussion.

SPECHLER: I am opposed to this concept. I voted against it along with the majority of our IUPUI representatives to the University Faculty Council last month. Let me tell you three reasons why I think that this is bad for the quality of IUPUI and Indiana University.

The first thing is, and least importantly, it really is not necessary, when we look at a good person who hasn't yet shown a full measure of excellence in research or teaching, any of you who have been on as many committees as I have know that people exercise judgment in this area. Why then be against it if it simply is going to do what we can do already? Well, I see that there is a very important reason. In my view, the greater risk to this campus and the University is tenuring people who are not appropriate to tenure. Major departments have been seriously weakened by tenuring people who turn out to be inappropriate. I think that danger is far greater in our situation -- i.e., turning away acceptable researcher-teachers. The problem of separating people who are inappropriate for tenure has become much more difficult in recent years because of legal, social, and ideological developments. The most difficult thing in a university, in my estimation, is separating from a person whom we would probably like very much in personal terms when she or he is inappropriate either because excellence is not there and not promised or, in terms that we will discuss later, because the person no longer fits into the needs of the university. This resolution, this Balanced Case concept, will make it far more difficult to do something which is already terribly demanding on faculty and administrators. The wording is vague -- comparable benefits, very vague.

Now, the third and last reason is that we must hold out excellence as an image of the IUPUI faculty member to the public and to our probationary faculty members. Excellence can be demonstrated in teaching, possibly in service (though that is rather difficult at younger ranks) and most often by research. Many departments hire people with particular missions in mind -- most frequently, the research specialty. That is true in my department, which has graduate needs. They must have people active in research, and yet this resolution allows someone unilaterally to present some kind of vague balanced case absent of any demonstration of excellence. Now, let's be honest about the matter. If a person doesn't show excellence in the first six or seven years of her or his employment at IUPUI, when are they going to show excellence? It just is not going to happen in the vast majority of cases. Will we make mistakes? Certainly we will make mistakes, but I think there are far too many mistakes made in one direction of allowing people who are never going to show capability for excellence in research or possibly teaching to remain in our departments both here and on other campuses then mistakes of this sort where a person really is excellent across the board and can grow in every direction. It is possible that may happen. We can't foreclose that, but the real problem is identifying excellence and separating ourselves from people who do not have the potential for excellence, probably in research but quite possibly in teaching.

UNKNOWN: May I offer a scenario of a faculty member who is a very good teacher but who does not manage to garner a national awards in the area of teaching and therefore would not be considered excellent in teaching. This person could be a very

popular researcher, publish in good journals, and frequently could not possess any national level funding. This person could also be well engaged in service to the university and department. This, I submit, is a kind of professor the public in Indiana would like to have teaching their students, but if the balanced case is not available, this kind of person we are saying is not fit to be a faculty. I do see that someone who is seeking the balanced case would have to present a very strong case and a very good person would truly suffer. I really see us throwing away valuable resources within the university.

M. COHEN: I have a question. This resolution says "promotion." It doesn't say "tenure." I know there is a tie between promotion and tenure from the assistant to the associate level. Does this directly apply to tenure also? This is just promotion?

BLAKE: This is just promotion.

M. COHEN: The School of Education had discussions and we have an alternate resolution which I would like to bring up. I think it might help in the discussion. The School of Education proposes as a substitute a small change in the language.

Alternatively, excellence may be demonstrated by a balance of strengths across the three areas.

BLAKE: Good. You are keeping in the word "excellence".

M. COHEN: That was one of the concerns. I think it represents the previous concern about "satisfactory." You are not talking about somebody who is poor in three areas, but somebody who has really got a very strong case in all areas, but not the kind that would give them national recognition.

WARFEL: Do I understand that you are officially entering that amendment now?

M. COHEN: I could do it now or later.

WARFEL: We will have to take them in a certain order.

BLAKE: You are speaking in support of the issue?

COHEN: Yes.

WARFEL: If the first motion we have before us passes, you will officially enter that for the second? **COHEN:** Yes.

SIDHU: My views are that the balanced case has created a misconception among many colleagues. With the balanced case we are trying to lower the standard of achievement by professors. This is not true. If you want to compare apples and oranges, in some cases the balanced case can be stronger than excellence in research and merely adequate in teaching and adequate in service. In that case, if you can compare them to the balanced case, I think the balanced case can be stronger than excellence in research and adequate in the other two. But, no uniform conclusion can be drawn because even excellence in teaching and excellence in research differs from school to school. Research in the medical school cannot be judged on the same basis as research in any other school. From that point of view, I think basically there is something wrong with the interpretation of the criteria. Excellence has been used in general terms but there is no specific thing available on which you can judge excellence in all school uniformly. So, that is a drawback. If you want to clear the hurdle, you have to go in the other direction clarifying or giving specificity to the all the criteria. So, my point of view is that there are many professors -- those who are pretty close to excellence in teaching -- but they are not accepted as excellent in teaching because some people have a very strong idea of what excellence is and that is being used. So, what we are doing in this resolution is, providing the opportunity. If someone is really good and has balanced case, which is again subjective, giving the opportunity for those people to be considered for promotion. Because they have not achieved excellence according to somebody's criteria or somebody's subjective thinking, therefore they should not be deprived of that opportunity.

KOLESKI: If we ignore the idea of a balanced case, I think we are doing the university some damage. There are a variety of people with a variety of talents that make up the faculty. Some of them are extraordinary in one area. We need them desperately. But, there are others who are really quite good in a number of areas and we need them as well. I think the balanced case takes care of this kind of situation unilaterally personally.

ROSENTRAU: I am Mark Rosentraub from SPEA. This issue was discussed in a meeting of our full professors from both campuses. There is a part of that discussion I want to pass along. I don't know if it is the exact same wording. There is certainly a similar resolution toward this group that has already been passed, maybe by the Bloomington Faculty Council. We have several different points to make. Our full professor group is not a legislative body in the school, so therefore it doesn't vote on matters. There were a couple of things that reflects some of the comments here.

First of all, a lot of what we are talking about seems to be problems based in each school. If, in talking as we just did, that excellence is subjective -- so is an evaluation satisfactory, some school is unsatisfactory, and, therefore, to argue that we can't aim for excellence because it is subjective would almost mean that we cannot do any form

of evaluation because it is all merely subjective. We rejected that notion.

The issue, then, of a balanced case and because somebody can't quantify excellence in teaching -- this is a problem that has to be solved at the school level. We don't seem to have that problem in SPEA, but nor are we particularly well gifted to quantify excellence. We have tenured people. We have promoted people on excellence in teaching, none of whom by the way have received excellent national awards nor have they published basic research on teaching. We simply will want to have student feedback who, by the way, happens to be essential to our consumer model. If the students judge the people as excellent to the satisfaction of colleagues, we have in fact tenured and promoted and, therefore, find no need to think about lowering standards from excellence. Both campuses have people who are expert in measuring teaching performance. There are no shortages of instruments available by which the student feedback can be as unobtrusively as possible monitored and measured and then included in your evaluation process. We have this in the school at least as long as I have been part of the school which is six years and, as I said, stand on the record of tenuring several people, promoting several people for excellence in teaching, again, none of which I can recollect at the moment have any national recognitions distinctions. We reject the notion of a balanced case because of the fact that you cannot satisfy the criteria of teaching excellence. You can. That is a false position.

The third notion. There doesn't seem to be any basis to justify the balanced case for tenure. If the position existed, as my colleague talked about some somebody who is very good in teaching, very good in service, and very good in research, and you still wish to continue them, you are not limited from doing such under several aspects of the personnel system of Indiana University. We have people in the school who satisfies those criteria who are not carried on tenure track lines. We reserve tenure and tenure-track lines for those seeking excellence.

The final point. We know of no organization that achieves the next level if seeks by publicly stating, "We do not focus on excellence." The school SPEA, at least for its tenure track, will not accept nor will we implement programs that pursue anything but the achievement of excellence. We ask that you join us in that pursuit. Once you engage in that pursuit, then you must develop measuring tools within your schools to measure excellence. But, do not stop a search for excellence because you are not willing to invest the energy to measure excellence. We ask that you reject this unilaterally. This is a school issue. It does not involve actions of the Faculty Council.

BYRNE: A point of clarification. I think there are still differences between criteria for tenure and for promotion, and this is absent criteria with regard to promotion. Discussion from almost the first to the last has combined the two. There is some

reason to anticipate that efforts along these lines will progress in the years ahead, especially if promotion and tenure committees are combined as many people seem to favor. But, may I ask anyone in a position of authority at the front table to clarify this. Pat has already done this once. It ought to be made very clear for purposes of this discussion, "Is this not a discussion on criteria with regard to promotion, and could not one be promoted on these criteria and still be denied tenure for other reasons?" Is that not the case?

BLAKE: This is promotion criteria alone.

BYRNE: Is it not somewhat out of order, then, to introduce questions about who should or should not endure forever in our midst as though we are in fact talking about tenure criteria?

BLAKE: Yes, it is. We can have tenured faculty going for promotion on a balanced case.

LEAPMAN: I would like to echo the remarks from the gentleman from SPEA and bring to you the assessment from the School of Medicine. In many of the standing committees in the School of Medicine this concept of the balanced case has been discussed. In two of the committees: 1) promotion and tenure, and 2) faculty steering committee -- it was overwhelmingly felt that we should not embark on a balanced case. In the Executive Committee of the School of Medicine it was discussed and the overwhelming majority also felt that the balanced case should not be adopted by IUPUI. In our Faculty Steering Committee, which is a committee composed of elected members from the entire medical school community, the unanimous vote was that we should not adopt this recommendation. I think that basically the feeling was that it would be somewhat of an embarrassment for a school, with the stature of IUPUI, to, in fact, lower standards for the rest of the community. In fact, the perceptions are at times equal to reality. I think that is what we would be doing. I don't speak for everyone in the medical school because we don't vote as a block, but through those committees I have to tell you that the overwhelming majority felt the resolution was unacceptable and the "Balanced Case" should be defeated.

PETERSON: I think I need to make a comment related to the words that we currently have in our handbook. First of all, it goes through this very explicitly. It says, "promotion considerations must take into account, however, differences in mission between campuses, and between schools within some campuses, as well as the individual contribution to the school/campus mission." There is a lot of flexibility in there as to what we need, as faculty, within our schools.

The other point that I would like to strongly make, unless I am misunderstanding this, "A candidate for promotion should normally excel in at least one of the above categories and be satisfactory in the others." That may be even too flexible. You have the opportunity with that "normally" in there to make a case for whatever. Anybody can make a case on whatever basis they want, but it doesn't mean that it is going to be approved by the committee. If you are a valuable faculty member and you make that case, whether it is a balanced case or whatever, you will go through the system and get your promotion, I feel. But, you have to make a case.

FREDLAND: I think it is all well and wholesome that not everybody should speak but that every idea should be heard. I think I have a small new idea to contribute to the discussion. By adopting the balanced case, it seems to me that what we are doing is avoiding coming to grips with the issue of evaluating teaching effectively. This whole notion emerged out of what was the Commission on Teaching established by the Bloomington Faculty Council. Their report was issued in February, 1992. Let me read you a couple of fragments from it.

Our reward system is perceived to have come to privilege research above all other endeavors. ... We insist upon one primary and presiding recommendation -- that excellent teaching be accorded the same status and rewards as are allocated to research...

What we have not done in this or other institutions is devise mechanisms for evaluating excellence in teaching with the same skill that we think we evaluate excellence in research. With the pressures that are upon us from outside agencies these days, we are going to have to come to grips with that. I think the sooner we do it the better off we will all be. By adopting this, I think what we are suggesting to ourselves is that we really don't have to come to grips with that. I think it would be a mistake to adopt the balanced case because we are sending to ourselves, internally as importantly as any place else, the wrong message.

ALIPRANTIS: I would like to report two votes. A vote of the department of mathematics which is probably the largest department. We discussed this matter and the department overwhelmingly opposes the balanced case. The vote was 26 against, 1 for, and 1 abstention.

We also discussed the balanced case in the School of Science. The majority opposes the adoption of this resolution.

SIDHU: I would like to address a concept that a friend of mine has developed because the idea of the balanced case is not to lower the standards. You can have any language you want. The problem is when you start getting teachers' teaching

evaluated on the same criteria as research and you want to make teaching as research. We should discuss that and tackle that problem. You can have any language you want, but unless you solve this problem, you are going to have professors who are going to suffer because of that. Those days are gone when you could get promotion on excellence in teaching just the way your school had judged you that they can be excellent teachers even though they don't have the national recognition.

GALANTI: I would like to report a vote from the Law School. Both the P and T committees here, which consist of all tenured, full professors and the full faculty, have discussed the balanced case and, unlike other schools here, the faculty from the Law School has overwhelmingly favored the concept of the balanced case. My own thoughts on this are that, yes, I see flexibility in the word "normally" as in the present language. I don't think the word "normally" is underlined in the handbook as it is on the handout, but to me this is not a question of lowering the standards so much as the emphasis has only been on the excellence in one of the three areas. I am troubled with the idea that, "Well, if you are very, very good, we could sneak you through even though technically you have not met the standards that Indiana University expects for promotion -- just promotion, not tenure." It is very possible for someone who is not quite as aware of the actual wording of the language to say, "Well, I am not going to make it" or perhaps be discouraged by a promotion and tenure committee for whatever reason -- you are not demonstrating the excellence that is required for promotion" and there is no pointing out of the alternative of a very good person being promoted on the basis of balance across the board in all three areas. So, I am personally in favor of the balanced case. I don't think it is begging the question of trying to develop an access for excellence in teaching. I think that is a challenge that we are all faced with. I don't think that we can sit back and say "We now don't have to worry about standards. We have lowered the standards. We are going to let anyone who gets on this faculty, under any guise, we are going to promote that person." I don't think that is the intention of the balanced case. I don't think that is going to be the consequence of adopting this language. If it is, then the schools themselves have fallen down. I don't think a school should admit, "Well, we are just taking the easy way out. We are copping out. We have a difficult task to do and that is trying to judge teaching. What are we going to do about it? We will just say the balanced case lets in everyone." I think since the 1990s, with the budget restraints that are going to go on, I don't see people getting promoted and tenured on the basis of being a nice person. I think the case is going to have to be established by the person seeking the promotion and I think, I personally would look very carefully at a file that comes across my desk as a member of the P and T committee, saying "I should be promoted from assistant to associate professor or from an associate professor to a full professor on the basis of my overall balance. I am a little skeptical. I would look very carefully to see whether there has been a strong case. I think

someone presenting a balanced case is going to have to present more evidence to me of being fairly close to excellent across the board. I can't see myself voting for someone who thinks we are talking about someone who is adequate. I do favor the adoption of the balanced case. I am not too keen on the actual language of the UFC proposal. The Law School faculty agree that the language that comes from UFC is satisfactory to us.

KARLSON: I think the language here has a restriction on the word "normally". Presently, promotion is being with excellence in at least one of these categories normally. That doesn't tell us what other circumstances under which a person can be promoted. I feel that this language then defines the exception to the general rule. This is more restrictive than it otherwise would be without this language. That is why I think this language is beneficial because it defines the exception which "normally" otherwise creates and restricts it to what it could otherwise be.

MIRSKY: I am from the School of Science and, as Roko mentioned earlier, the School of Science did vote a majority in opposition to this and I am repeating that here. That is not my main point. My main point or concern is that I was somewhat amazed that the view of the Law School and lawyers in particular. The balanced case has passed that there will not be a lowering of standards. In fact, there will be an improvement. That people won't go around voting just for a nice guy and gal. I see exactly the opposite of that. I find it difficult to see the opening of what I would call "countless loopholes". That is why I said I was surprised that lawyers wouldn't see that sort of thing. I see countless loopholes in a balanced case where you are not going to be mediocre because everyone here that supports the balanced case says, "That doesn't mean we are saying publicly that we accept just good. That is not what it is. But they are also saying it is excellence. So, what it is then is something in between those two. My point here now is that we can handle the in between under the current system, I believe, in all schools, of course, I am more familiar with the School of Science and IUPUI in general. We can handle that as a border land for people who show some accomplishments in a second area. What I see over the next few years is that, that level will become lower and lower and we will be creeping into mediocrity as an acceptable measure for promotion. So, I wish to second, third, or fourth, whatever the right word is, to urge opposition to this particular balanced case.

WARFEL: We have heard support and defense against this. Are we getting close to being ready to consider this?

MORREL: I call the question.

WARFEL: Do I hear a second? **UNKNOWN:** Second.

WARFEL: Will the Council consider the main question? All of those in favor say "Aye." All against? Let me put it to you. The motion we have before us first is whether or not we are in favor of the concept of the balanced case. Let me ask all of those who are in favor of the balanced case to raise your hand. All of those against the balanced case, raise your hand. Are there any abstentions? I think it is quite clear that the motion is...

FREDLAND: I would like to get the number because we are going to have to take this to the University Faculty Council.

WARFEL: Raise your hand if you are in favor of the balanced case. [18 for] All of those against the balanced case. [46 against] Are there any abstentions? [3 abstentions]

The second motion the Faculty Affairs Committee brought to us no longer pertains. Thank you very much, Pat.

UNKNOWN: I would like to bring up a point because it was specifically pointed out that tenure is not mentioned in this proposal. Are we going to hear about this in regard to tenure in the future?

BLAKE: My only feeling is that I don't really know. It was a promotion issue that was brought to us. That is the way we discussed it. I would have a whole different opinion if it were tenure as I would promotion.

MCATEER: How will the results of this vote be conveyed to the University Faculty Council? Are we going to send a statement?

WARFEL: We thought about that. We thought that Dick could take it back to the Agenda Committee.

FREDLAND: First of all, we will put it on the agenda. What we are going to do is ask for an amendment to the Faculty Handbook because the proposal that was adopted last year to accept the balanced case at the UFC was an amendment to the handbook. We cannot ask for reconsideration of the question from the parliamentary point of view because we have a new body of people. It is not the same people who voted last time. I have discussed with our Parliamentarian and the UFC Parliamentarian in anticipation of this happening and what we will do is ask for an amendment. I cannot guarantee that we will carry the day at the UFC. When it was voted on the last time it was a very narrow vote. There is new representation. I think that one of the things you want to do is lobby your UFC representatives on behalf of your interests in this to see that your wishes get carried out.

PETERSON: Just as one adds language by amendment, it seems to me that the appropriate motion now is to remove the language that was added last year by an amendment.

WARFEL: Are you making that in the form of an amendment?

PETERSON: I am saying that this is the way which we should carry this forward is an amendment.

WARFEL: Is there a second? **UNKNOWN:** Second.

WARFEL: We are now moving that the University Faculty Council strike the bold sentence in Circular 93-17. That is what we will be sending to the University Faculty Council. Does anyone wish to discuss this motion?

UNKNOWN: What about the word "normally". Does that go along with the suggested removal or does that stay?

FREDLAND: "Normally" is already there.

GALANTI: I will say for the record that I voted in favor of the proposal which was defeated by the Council, I am going to have to abstain. I don't think I could consciously vote "No". I would like to have my abstention noted in the minutes.

WARFEL: By voting on the motion that is now before us will, in effect, send President Fredland as our representative back to the UFC to see if this can be undone, shall we vote or are there any more comments? All of those in favor, say "Aye". All of those opposed, say "No". Any abstentions? Let's have a show of hands for abstentions, please. There are 15 abstentions.

AGENDA ITEM VI & VII STOPPING THE TENURE CLOCK and TFFAA DISCUSSION

WARFEL: We will now move on to Item VI and VII together. We have initially put Stopping the Tenure Clock discussion on our agenda. It is part of the whole TFFAA issue and I would ask that we regroup. Let's today try an introduction of the TFFAA document. I would like to begin by asking the Council members if they have received this document yet. Yes. Good. If we could accomplish today a tour of the lay of the land on this and get a game plan for how we are going to subdivide and conquer these documents, I think we will have done well.

VESSELY: Do we have any standing rules about these items as far as time? Would it be important at some point in time to adopt standing rules concerning so many minutes pro and so many minutes con? I think one of the members today under our previous discussion said he was fifthing, sixthing, or seventhing the vote. I think we get to a point on some of these issues where it gets complicated. I think we should have some kind of rules.

WARFEL: We may wish to consider that, although today we have ample time and the importance of the Balanced Case issue, I think, warranted full opportunity for people to say their piece. The Executive Committee can discuss that and maybe come with a suggestion to the Council in the future. I think that you will see that some of the things that we will be discussing in regards to TFFAA will be every bit as interesting as the Balanced Case.

VESSELY: I guess I get concerned that sometimes, and that wasn't the case today, who would know that we could run out of things to say and yet still get our two cents worth in. I would hope that the Executive Committee could do that.

KARLSON: I will just point out that what we are dealing with here first is a relatively thick document. Secondly, it is the product of a number of years of work. I don't believe that this body should start off with the idea that in some way we can deal with it in a very short period of time. The body doing this took a long period of time creating it. We are going to have to take some time just to read it and, obviously, since it took them quite a bit of time to go through this and bring these recommendations forward, we should give credit for what they have done, but these are exceptionally important issues. In fact, they are the most important issues that we are going to be dealing with as a Faculty Council. It is the most important ones I have seen before this Faculty Council in 17 years. In that sense, I think we should dedicate whatever time is necessary.

WARFEL: Let's launch into an official introduction to this. Let me remind you that it all started in 1988. From 1988 until 1992 the Task Force on Faculty Appointments and Advancement worked as it produced a report. The documents which you were mailed begin with the charge to that task force and their initial report, which was a very thoughtful, long document that included 33 recommendations and considerable background as to why the Task Force was making these recommendations. That is the starting point.

Last year during the academic year we asked school committees campuswide to look at the task force report and comment about all of it or, in the case of some standing committees, particular parts of it. We received feedback from that effort during the year and had even more information to deal with. It was agreed by the Executive

Committee, Faculty Affairs Committee, the Tenure Committee, and administration that we could best approach this by forming an ad hoc Implementation Committee. During the summer, spilling over into the fall, that Implementation Committee, which consisted of Dean Plater and Dean Nusbaum from Administration, and members of the Faculty Affairs Committee, the Executive Committee, the original Task Force and Promotion and Tenure Committees, tried to take the original recommendations with the feedback we already had and draw together some documents into an action plan. Your packet begins with the original Task Force papers. It goes on to the action plan of the Implementation Committee, and it ends with a large number of documents.

The Task Force report made "recommendations". The Action Plan material produced "documents". The Action Plan also hones in on major issues. Some of these issues must be considered by the Faculty Council because they involve Bylaws changes. Some of these recommendations should be brought to the Faculty Council because they are of great importance to our institution.

I would like for you to look at the pumpkin colored page and I would like to propose that we tackle this big thing in the following way. After this introduction and some preliminary discussion today, we will ask the Council to focus in on issues in an orderly fashion.

At the November meeting, hopefully, we will consider the issue of combining the Promotion and Tenure committees and the issue of Stopping the Tenure Clock.

At the December meeting we will focus in on the issue of adopting a dismissal policy and comment on the many documents that are guidelines for promotion and tenure dossier preparation.

The January meeting, tentatively, we will focus in on the issue of post tenure review and other things that we wish to address. It may go smoothly. It may be rough. It may take longer. But, this schedule will be the starting point for us. Those of us who have been reading these documents all summer have the gist of them, but they are difficult to grab hold of and it is unyielding. It is not easy.

This pink paper I think will help you. The issues which we are going to discuss in the Council are listed in order beginning with Merger of Promotion and Tenure Committees. It will guide you as to what part of your materials you should focus on for that discussion. For example, Merger of Promotion and Tenure Committees came about because of the four recommendations which are listed. After discussions, the Action Plan has two documents to present to you for your consideration, discussion, and adoption or whatever. I think if you use the pink sheet you can subdivide the larger document.

Now, let's open it up to general comments.

KOLESKI: I would like to commend the people who initiated and completed the "Report of the Task Force on Faculty Appointments and Advancements." It was a noble and extraordinary effort. However, I see the document entitled, "Action Plan of the Ad Hoc Implementation Committee Regarding the Report of the Task Force on Faculty Appointments and Advancements" as being important to all faculty members because it is a very thoughtful assessment as to what has greater and lesser significance in the original "Report on the Task Force on Faculty Appointments and Advancements." The perceptivity and selectivity in the consideration of the various recommendations to be considered. Therefore, I would like to see as much or more time and effort devoted to the consideration of "The Action Plan" as the original document. I extend appreciation to the members of both the original Task Force and the Ad Hoc Implementation Committee for their efforts.

SPECHLER: I agree with my friend, Ray Koleski, very much. These documents which I have had a chance to read are extraordinarily thoughtful, not surprising considering the caliber of people who stepped forward to be on these committees. I think particular of the role of Tony Sherrill, who is part of the School of Liberal Arts, and Bernerd Bogar on the Implementation Committee, but there are many of our best members on these committees, so it is not surprising that the recommendations are measured. I would like to make one point about this. To a very profound and considerable extent one way or another we in the School of Liberal Arts are already doing a number of things recommended by the Implementation Committee or the original committee. I would like to mention just one or two.

The most important recommendation sent forward by the Implementation Committee is the review of tenured faculty and that is considered necessary because of change in national legislation. We in the Department of Economics three years ago adopted this even more strenuously. We now review all tenured, full professors in the department every three years. Our experience, I think, has been excellent and constructive. Of course, it signals to a person ...

KARLSON: You are out of order. My understanding is that the issue before the assembly is the procedure by which this is going to be addressed. I think you are addressing what is supposed to be addressed sometime in January.

WARFEL: I actually have, I think, opened the meeting to general comments. I think what we will do now is give ourselves, considering the other things on the agenda, until 4:55 p.m. for other additional general comments.

SPECHLER: I understood this to be a general discussion.

KARLSON: Actually, you are arguing the specific issue which is to be discussed in January and that is post-tenure reviews.

WARFEL: Marty, please finish.

SPECHLER: The most important thing in the Implementation Action Plan is something that we are already doing and it has been highly satisfactory. I would suggest that in the discussions we already mention what various schools and departments are doing along these lines. I think you will find that the wisdom of departments and schools are already doing much in these directions.

BYRNE: I too have nothing but gratitude, appreciation and a sense of the excellence of all of the fine people who have worked on these various ad hoc committees, but I do have a question. I would appreciate clarification as to the meaning of recommendations first and implementation second. It seems to me that the ordinary procedure is to have recommendations come before a body to be considered, endorsed, not endorsed, modified, etc. Having come to some decision in that regards, then the question comes before this body as was before us earlier this afternoon. I don't necessarily approve or disapprove what kind of a recommendation was or was not carried over into implementation action, but is there not perhaps something sliding through procedure by suggesting this body vote on implementing what are, at this point in time, only recommendations that have not been heard in their own terms and on their own merits?

WARFEL: The recommendations can be and have been grouped into the various issues. What I would propose is that the Council first ask the question for example, "Do we approve of the several recommendations suggesting that we merge our promotion committee and our tenure committee? If we approve of that, do we like how it is done in draft document #14 or do we want to fix that up before we approve of that change in the bylaws, etc.? I think it would work.

BYRNE: May I ask one brief question? Are there any conclusions that we draw from an absence of an implementation action document adjacent to one of the recommendations? If we search this carefully, will we find for every recommendation there is some implementation?

WARFEL: For some recommendations there are several documents. For some recommendations there are no documents. And, for some documents there are no recommendations. It is not easy. I know Bill Orme has asked specifically to make a general comment.

ORME: I am the representative to the Faculty Council from University Libraries. At a meeting of the University Libraries faculty organization last week I was directed to draft a statement to be shared with campus library representatives and read at this Faculty Council meeting. This statement has been shared with and endorsed by representatives from the IUPUI Libraries, including those in professional schools. The statement reads as follows:

The original report of the Task Force on Faculty Appointments and Advancements did not directly address review processes for criteria for IUPUI librarians. The report of the Implementation Committee, however, includes numerous passages which specifically address librarians and these passages involve significant issues. Librarians at IUPUI anticipate a review process, including a promotion and tenure process, which involves librarians throughout the Indiana University system. The librarians at IUPUI endorse the appointment of a special committee to be empaneled by Dean Plater and Dean of IU Libraries James Neal which will specify the Implementation Committee recommendation A. We ask that no recommendation included in either report which affects librarians be acted upon until that committee completes its work.

Thank you.

WARFEL: According to our tentative schedule, at the January meeting "other issues" follow the discussion of post-tenure review and the librarian issue was in recommendation A. It may be that by January, progress has been made and, if not, we can certainly consider...

ORME: There is one other thing that I would like to say to that. In discussion of the Implementation Committee's report and its various documents, issues that come before that could have issues for librarians that they do not currently have. We are interested in that group of discussions.

WARFEL: You are asking us to postpone discussion of the entire...

ORME: Not discussion. We are asking that any action on the recommendations be postponed until a special committee has specified these recommendations may have an opportunity to complete its work.

PLATER: What I think you are saying is that, that committee should go ahead and be appointed now so its discussions can take place before this body gets to deliberate.

We should proceed to appoint that committee right away rather than postponing it until later.

ORME: The importance of these documents has already been mentioned in this Council meeting. We realize the significance of these documents and we are aware of the timeline that has been proposed. Once again we appreciate Recommendation A as setting up that committee, but we would like that committee to have a chance to consider these documents before the Council adopts these recommendations.

GALANTI: Have the librarians considered the specific documents? Are there any proposals that we are going to consider as a body that the librarians would not feel have to be examined by the librarian's review committee, or are the comments directed to all of the proposals?

ORME: Due to the fact that the librarians, as a group, have not had the chance to carefully consider the Implementation Committee's report, we would like to have a special understanding in place so that we can have time for consideration.

GALANTI: I gather then we will be just pushing the timeline sometime in the future because they are contemplating that there will be hostile action on at least two of the items in November.

WARFEL: Unless I am wrong, currently librarians do not go through campus promotion and tenure campus tenure committees. Is that right?

ORME: That is right.

WARFEL: So, we could go ahead and discuss what might happen to those two committees since the librarians don't go through them anyway.

ORME: If that is true as stated, however, yes, through the documentation it is decided that librarians do in fact go through campus promotion and tenure committees, we would then find ourselves, in essence, retroactively effected by a decision that has already been made. We don't want to stifle discussions at all. We invite discussions of these documents but we are very concerned that action not be taken on these recommendations until we have a chance to sift the implications for IUPUI librarians.

WARFEL: We are out of time. We will proceed and hope that things will go well.

AGENDA ITEM VIII GENERAL EDUCATION REPORT - EDWARD ROBBINS

WARFEL: Let's go ahead with the rest of our agenda for today. The next item is the General Education report with Ed Robbins.

***ROBBINS:** We are in the process of preparing for presentation to the campus community, all of you and your other colleagues, the second major report from the Commission on General Education. This report is accompanied by a covering memo from Chancellor Bepko and President Fredland encouraging us all to take advantage of the opportunity to participate in discussion of general education that this report will stimulate.

The report lists a variety of ways that you might become involved. Over the past two years the Commission has engaged in a process and it has as its major goal involving as many members of the campus community as possible in considerations about general education at IUPUI. From the discussions that prompted discussions that have taken place the central feature of the process was involving a working draft for a set of principles that might guide the efforts to identify the most appropriate strategies for implementing the principles. This document outlines the nature of that process and the way we would hope it would continue, particularly through inviting and encouraging a wide participation among all the constituent groups. The report shares with you a set of working principles that have emerged out of the last few years effort of the Council. Those efforts have primarily been the involvement of some 100+ faculty, staff, and students and invites you to join in the further efforts to refine the principles because we see those as working principles that will be effected by what we also hope will occur and that is to begin to think about specific ways to implement the principles and to identify ways in which we might determine whether or not the efforts to implement those principles are effective.

Among the requests for your participation is the last page of this that we will hope you will just rip off. It is a survey which we suggest that you give us your thinking about the principles that are there, about the extent of examples or exemplars of implementation strategies that the Commission itself just put together to stimulate thinking, some indicators of effectiveness that accompany those implementation strategies, and then we ask you to respond to one or the other of the opportunities that are listed to participate. That is the possibility of becoming a part of one or the other of a group of working committees that we are going to ask to consider these principles and implementation strategies for them. Another option that we are suggesting is, if you are interested in participating in either existing or new committees that we hope will be established within the academic units which the conversations there will also take up the challenge of refining these principles and identifying implementation strategies that are most appropriate to the academic units.

Then, also to attend an open forum that we have scheduled for November 8 from 2 p.m. until 4 p.m. in the new library. Plan to come to that forum to share with us directly your responses to the work of the Commission. We also encourage you, if you prefer to use E-Mail or Voice Mail, to send us either electronically or verbally on the Voice Mail your comments and responses to the plan that we have laid out. I will be glad to answer any questions.

GALANTI: When did people receive that?

ROBBINS: I suspect some people may have received it today. The printing was completed late yesterday and the distribution process began today and I assume will be finished today. They are in campus mail and, depending on your mail reaches you, today, tomorrow, or certainly by Monday at the latest.

WARFEL: At the risk of being out of order myself, your mention of the faculty forum reminded me that we have scheduled two faculty forums on the TFFAA issues. Let your faculty know that these sessions are available and urge them to personally get involved.

AGENDA ITEM IX QUESTION/ANSWER PERIOD

WARFEL: We have a question-and-answer period scheduled. Are there any questions?

SIDHU: I have one specific question about open faculty forum general discussion. How are the faculty going to be informed? Is it going to be by letter or what?

FREDLAND: Use the campus radio station. We could cut down trees to clear all of Indiana if we sent a letter every time we had a faculty forum. I wish I knew. We have three scheduled. We will probably have to send a letter to everybody.

WARFEL: If you would tell everybody in Physical Education, they would know. Are there any other questions?

AGENDA ITEM X UNFINISHED BUSINESS

WARFEL: Our next agenda item is Unfinished Business. Is there any unfinished business? [None]

AGENDA ITEM XI NEW BUSINESS

WARFEL: Is there any new business?

ALIPRANTIS: (could not understand - too much noise)

PLATER: This is an interpretation of federal law after some extended negotiations and discussions with, in particular I believe, the IRS.

ALIPRANTIS: So that means that for a whole year (could not understand)

PLATER: That is correct.

UNKNOWN: I am in the School of Engineering and Technology. Why was the land in front of the library cleared of trees?

COHEN: May I speak to that? The week of September 20 the same thing happened to all the trees south of the library. I called Buildings and Grounds and the Chancellor. What Buildings and Grounds department said was that the area south of the library is going to be landscaped with a brand new fountain and lots of trees, in fact more trees than we had before.

Also, the trees which were taken down were trees that grow along fences and, therefore, they are not particularly good trees. I sent a resolution to President Fredland. I don't know if it is appropriate for the Faculty Council to take action or not. It also may be a moot point since the trees, at least in this area, are gone. I think the last two trees may be standing by the AO Building [laughter]. I would hope that there would be some resolution that would say when an architect or a landscape architect designs some structure, that they work around the existing trees. We are fortunate that we do have a couple of cross sections from the trees that were removed that we want to save and put in our Curriculum Resource Library in the ES Building.

It is really a shame that the historical significance of the trees that used to be a fence was taken out. People used to live here. I think it is important for us to remember that. I have a resolution that I would like to read:

All landscaping and future building at IUPUI shall consider the saving of existing trees as its first priority. All effort shall be made to build without damaging existing trees.

WARFEL: Is there a second to the resolution? **FREDLAND:** I'll second it.
WARFEL: Is there any discussion?

UNKNOWN: Do you think we should check that with somebody in the botany/biology departments? Some trees grow better in certain soils and shades, etc., than others. It may be the landscape people have taken that into account.

WARFEL: I think that the resolution further asks that the consideration of not cutting existing trees be given. It doesn't forbid them.

PLATER: As Kathy has said, as long as we understand this to mean that consideration will be given, that I certainly would support the resolution as well, but the Board of Trustees reserves to itself all decisions on buildings and planning and it is not within the province of Faculty Council to act upon. But, since the resolution asks that consideration be given to that seems to me to be appropriate, but we have to understand that it's consideration and not something within the power of the Council to act. It is a matter for the Board of Trustees' authority and policy.

WARFEL: Are we ready to vote? All in favor of the resolution, say "Aye". All of those opposed? [none] Are there any abstentions? [none] Is there any other new business?

AGENDA ITEM XII ADJOURNMENT

If not, we are adjourned.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY INDIANAPOLIS
FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING
NOVEMBER 4, 1993
LAW SCHOOL, ROOM 116
3:00 - 5:30 P.M.

PRESENT: ADMINISTRATION: Chancellor Gerald L. Bepko, Dean William Plater. DEANS: John Barlow, Walter Daly, Barbara Fischler, P. Nicholas Kellum, Angela McBride, Sheldon Siegel, William Voos. ELECTED FACULTY: Linda Adele Goodine, C D Aliprantis, Timothy Baldwin, Henry Besch, Patricia Blake, Frances Brahmi, David Burr, Edmund Byrne, Michael Cohen, Michael Dalsing, Naomi Fineberg, Richard Fredland, Karen Gable, Paul Galanti, Michael Gleeson, Jean Gnat, Clifford Goodwin, Dolores Hoyt, Norman Hudson, Juanita Keck, Robert Keck, Raymond Koleski, Joseph Koss, Steven Leapman, Diane Leland, Dana McDonald, Richard Meiss, Arthur Mirsky, William Orme, Vimalkumar Patel, Richard Peterson, Rebecca Porter, Norris Richmond, Margaret Richwine, Edward Robbins, Carl Rothe, Charles Siemenda, Robert Sutton, Karen Teegarden, Jeffery Vessely, Eric Wiebke, Patricia Wittberg, Charles Yokomoto. EX OFFICIO MEMBERS: Janet Feldmann, Edgar Fleenor, Hitwant Sidhu. VISITORS: J. M. Brown [Sagamore], Mary Gilchrist [Chair, Academic Affairs Committee], Erwin Boschmann [Faculty Development Office], Cyrus Behroozi [Chair, Budgetary Affairs Committee], Shirley Nusbaum [Faculty Records Office], Miriam Langsam [School of Liberal Arts], Timothy Langston [Student Affairs].

Alternates Present: David Lewis for James Baldwin, Sherry Bauer for Stuart Hart, Beverly Ross for M. Jan Keffer, Jerry Durham for Lee Schwecke, David Frisby for Maxine Tutterrow [Staff Council President].

ABSENT: ADMINISTRATION: J. Herman Blake. DEANS: A. James Barnes, Trevor Brown, H. William Gilmore, Alfred Potvin, John Rau, David Stocum, Donald Warren, Charles Webb, James Weigand. ELECTED FACULTY: Biagio Azzarelli, Merrill Benson, David Canal, Paul Carlin, Michael Clark, Elaine Cooney, Gayle Cox, Theodore Cutshall, Joseph DiMicco, William Engle, Michael Fritsch, Joe Garcia, Gareth Gilkey, Jerome Kaplan, Eric Long, James McAteer, Lynda Means, Bernard Morrel, Bart Ng, Byron Olson, Daniel Peavy, Michael Sadove, Brian Sanders, Richard Schreiner, Aristotle Siakotos, Jay Simon, Jeffrey Springston, David Suzuki, Rosalie Vermette, James Wallihan, Karen West, Susan Zunt.

AGENDA ITEM I - MEMORIAL RESOLUTION: ROBERT V. KIRCH, SCHOOL OF LIBERAL ARTS

WARFEL: The meeting shall come to order. Thank you all for noticing that our meeting was supposed to start at 3:00 today and actually showing up. We are waiting for the Chancellor who is on his way from the Board of Trustees' meeting in Kokomo. We will proceed with the early parts of our meeting before he arrives.

The first matter of business is a memorial resolution for Professor Robert V. Kirch, from the School of Liberal Arts. Professor Kirch was one of the pioneers in the pre-IUPUI era. He was at the IU Extension in Political Science. He retired as Professor Emeritus in 1988. We will not read the full text of the resolution, but we will stand for a moment of silence.

AGENDA ITEM II - APPROVAL OF MINUTES: MAY 6, 1993

WARFEL: You have had in your possession for a number of weeks the minutes of the May meeting. I think the time has finally come for us to see if we can get them approved. The minutes of the September and October meetings are at the printer and we they are not available today for approval.

Are there any corrections to the May 6th minutes? Hearing none, we will take them as approved.

Ken Scales, President of the Undergraduate Student Assembly, asked if he could come today and address the Council for five minutes. He is between classes between 3:45 and 4:00. I hope that the timing will work out so that we don't have to interrupt somebody. He would like to address the Council about the state of the Student Center.

AGENDA ITEM III - CHANCELLOR'S REPORT - GERALD BEPKO

BEPKO: I think part of the report has already been addressed. We have copies of a memo reporting on the administrative reviews that were conducted in 1992-93. Those that are finished at any rate. Four have been finished. The reviews of the offices of the Dean of the School of Dentistry, the Office of Dean of Student Affairs, the Office of the Dean of the Law School, and the Office of the Dean of the Herron School of Art. Summaries of these administrative reviews are incorporated in this memorandum, some copies of which have already been distributed. We have enough copies now for everyone.

Last year when we reported on this activity for the first time, we said that we would make, in accordance with our policy, a written report to the Faculty Council, to the faculties of the schools that may be involved, and to the staffs in any offices of the campus administration that were the subject of reviews. This memo is our response this year to last year's reviews and it contains those summaries. Last year we said that we should do this in writing so that you would have the benefit of a full

explanation of what happened. We are continuing that practice. We thought it was a good year in 1991-92 and I think 1992-93 also proved to be a good process for helping all of us do our jobs better and to help keep healthy open lines of communication throughout the campus.

The one review which isn't finished is the School of Medicine. It should be finished shortly. As soon as it is, we will report on that both to the School of Medicine, faculty and staff, and to the Faculty Council.

I know we have other things on the agenda, so I will try not to take up too much time with this, but one other point that I would like to talk about is to get your reactions, apropos of Dick's mentioning Clyde Ingle and the Commission for Higher Education, to a draft of a mission statement that has been developed by the staff of the Commission. I should say a word about the work of the staff of ICHE. They are engaged in the process of developing a statewide picture of higher education with each campus and each mission pigeonholed in a place that the ICHE thinks is appropriate. Their goal is to try to streamline higher education in the state and make sure that everyone's doing the job that the state thinks they ought to be doing. In that process they have developed a one-page summary of what they think each campus is, what it is doing, and what it ought to do. I have distributed to you, with a memo from Karen Rasmussen who is the ICHE staff person in charge of this project, the page which they have done for IUPUI.

I think it might be worth a moment to look at it because there are a number of issues raised by this document that we will respond to, but I would like to have you give us your comments as well to inform our responses. They have, to the credit of the Commission staff, now put IUPUI in its own separate category. It is no longer a regional campus. It is now characterized as Indiana's metropolitan university. But, it then says in the very first line, "it serves commuting students from Central Indiana." While we do serve a lot of commuting students, a lot of our students do not consider themselves to be commuters and we don't consider them to be commuters. Not that there is anything wrong with commuting students, it is just that, in terms of our functions, in terms of the constituencies that we now serve and our mission, we are going to comment on this. I think it would be especially interesting to contemplate describing the students who are enrolled, for example, in the School of Medicine as being commuting students. They also say most of our students enroll part-time. While, as a campus, that may be true, it masks a very substantial complexity on the campus that we think has to be acknowledged in this statement of purpose. We do have some units that are almost all full-time. And, even if we have substantial part-time enrollments, it is important to recognize that we have between 8,000 and 9,000 full-time, undergraduate students. That makes us, in that sense alone, one of the

largest full-time, undergraduate student populations in the state.

In paragraph two, the sentence which I think attracts the most attention is the one that says, "its primary responsibility is undergraduate education, plus the professional education it provides in medicine, dentistry, and law." People in business, social work, nursing, public affairs, and a variety of other programs would be surprised to see themselves excluded from this. We will correct that error, but I guess rather than go through and indicate where we see factual problems with the underlying base of information that they work with, I think the important reaction will be on a more general level to say that we think that this, again, represents too narrow a view of what IUPUI's long-term mission is for the state of Indiana. That we have a responsibility to provide a broad range of educational opportunities built around the strengths of the health schools, to provide the region, and the state in many areas, with the kinds of educational services that it needs. That includes graduate education and research in a variety of fields, not only medicine or the graduate professional schools. That is a process that we will be going through this year. You will probably hear more about it. We will be sharing with you any documents that we send to the Commission, but we think it is important for you to know about this because we would like to have your comments. We would like your feedback. We would like to incorporate your thoughts into the responses that we make.

But, as Dick Fredland has said more eloquently than I can, I think this year is going to be important for people who work in our academic family here to address these issues out in the community. People in the community have to understand that Indianapolis's future and the future of the state of Indiana, indeed, is tied up with our ability to succeed in becoming a national model for the urban university of the future. If we have constraints placed upon us that inhibit us from achieving that goal, it will be most unfortunate. We think that all of you with the many people that you have contact with in the community could be very helpful in getting that message out. We need more informed people and people who are willing to stand up and explain what the future of higher education ought to be in this region.

WARFEL: This was just distributed and I haven't had a chance to read through it and give it a lot of thought, but is there anyone who would like to make a comment at this time or ask a question?

MCDONALD: I have a question about it. Apparently the 20,000 is a pretty ambitious number. What is a good number?

BEPKO: They started with 40,000, so it is less ambitious than where they started. I don't know how they come up with these numbers. I think they are just very

speculative guesses about how many students would have to be enrolled in post-secondary studies of one kind or another in order for us to have the same percentage enrolled as other states in this region do.

ROBBINS: Are we to assume that the items which are marked out are to be changed or are they simply to be deleted? One of them is Expected Teaching Load which is marked out and the other one is Community and Public Service which was previously to be added and is now marked out. How can you interpret what to expect as far as the Commission is concerned with those items?

BEPKO: Those items which are marked out, I think, are being removed from this document. But, the one which you mentioned in particular which is of grave concern to all of us -- the expectation for teaching load -- we believe is going to be moved somewhere else. So, it is not going to disappear. It will just be in a different document.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (could not understand)

BEPKO: As you may know, last spring the Commission adopted a set of teaching expectations for all public university campuses in the state, and the adopted expectation for IUPUI's general academic programs was eight sections per year. We have, of course, objected to that and will continue to argue that that is inappropriate for an institution of this kind. The first step in that process is to have us be put in our own category as Indiana's metropolitan or major urban university. The second step will be to adjust those expectations. But, I think you can see the mood of the political community. The ICHE didn't dream this up. This is something that is coming from a larger political base in the state.

BYRNE: Speaking of political, what are the political expectations not to mention budgetary with regard to geographic responsibility? Are these divisions in the State of Indiana so that students will know whether they should go to IUPUI or whether they should not? Why are lines drawn around certain counties? Is it because there is another state institution lying just beyond?

BEPKO: I think that you have probably guessed correctly about the rationale that was used in listing these counties for the Indianapolis campus. I don't think anyone knows where that is leading at this point. The one thing that is of interest is that both Purdue, West Lafayette, and Indiana University Bloomington have a similar listing of counties that they serve too.

FREDLAND: Our number is larger than theirs, however.

BEPKO: That is true.

FREDLAND: Tomorrow at the faculty conference Charles Yokomoto and Kathy [Warfel] are going to represent IUPUI. And, depending on what comes out of that, it might be a thought, if it would be your pleasure, that the Executive Committee could try to draft a restatement of this. I have trouble with lots of line and the categories, for that matter, and bring it to you for your consideration in December since it will probably be too late to effect the Commission if they don't defer their deadlines. But, at least it will still get into the mix before the January deadline for the final report and have a faculty input in a more systematic way than just complaining about it. If you think that would be a useful idea, we could try to do that.

BESCH: So moved.

BEPKO: If I might comment on that. I think we should have one response from the institution.

FREDLAND: And not a separate one from the faculty?

BEPKO: One of the problems with that is that if we have multiple responses, if they are inconsistent in some way, that will detract from the power of our presentation. I would like for us to do this together and would applaud that. On this issue, I don't think that we are going to have much difficulty in reaching a consensus of thought because the issues are very clear, and we all have the same point of view.

YOKOMOTO: I was wondering if two persons might have written this. In one paragraph they talk about ...by virtue of its... comparatively open admission... That is under the Challenge. But, the on the Admission Policy they say, "admission somewhat selective."

BEPKO: It may have been written by different people. It may have been written at different times by the same person. It wasn't read with the critical eye that you have just read it. That is before it came over to us. And, in fairness to them, they are sending it to us for comment. That is one of the comments that we have already concluded we should make. Indeed, the admission standards are quite different for different programs on the campus. That complexity, again, is masked by a single statement about admissions.

MCBRIDE: As Dean of the School of Nursing, the thing that concerns me, is the continuing notion that IUPUI's mission is geographically fixed, when schools like my own, based on this campus, have systemwide responsibilities, too. My own view is

that the only thing that makes us a research-minded Big Ten university is if you think of an Indianapolis-Bloomington corridor, because the two campuses taken together have a complementary relationship.

BEPKO: I think that is a very good point, Angela. In fact, in responding to the Commission's proposals last spring about teaching expectations, we emphasized that what they were doing at that time, and indeed more so now, would tend to destroy the growing and I think very positive core campus relationship between Bloomington and Indianapolis. Indiana University has planned for the last 20 years that its future would be built on the complementary strengths that would grow at both Indianapolis and Bloomington. I think that if you tried to segregate those in the way the Commission has, then it would be a retrograde step. We have pointed that out to the Commission. [I don't think they are as enamored of the core campus or system school concept except on occasion when it has suited their other purposes as we are.]

PETERSON: I am having some philosophical problems with this whole issue of mission. When somebody writes a mission statement for you, no matter how many times you tell them that it is not right, and no matter how many times they revise it, it is never going to be a mission statement of this campus. We are never going to really feel like we have ownership as a campus, as different schools, and as individual faculty. It will be "somebody else's idea of what we ought to be as a campus." I think, philosophically, the Commission has really done things wrong and has caused more division than needs to be done. I think we need to take a proactive role in this and write our own mission statement that comes from us as a faculty as to who we see ourselves as. Yes, we do have certain things that the state wants us to do and try to address those in that mission statement that we develop as a faculty, but to have somebody else hand us something and say, "This is your mission." I am not convinced that any of us are going to feel like the owner.

BEPKO: I think that you are right, Dick. Let me try to make a distinction between one kind of mission statement and another. The kind of mission statement you are talking about is our own self-generated statement of aspirations. That will always be different than this kind of thing. This is a statement of limitations. This is the state's effort to put everything into a compartment so that they think it will be more efficient. It is their effort to regulate so that they can have comfort that they are not spending more money or that faculty members in Indianapolis are not doing more research than they should and are failing in that way to meet the needs of the undergraduate students. So, there will always be differences between our mission statement, which we have had various iterations, of and what they do by way of this limiting statement. What we have to do at this point is acknowledge the statutory authority of the Commission to establish mission statements of this kind for the campuses and do our

best to make sure they don't do something that is inimical to the public interest in that process.

PETERSON: I understand that they need to make some comment about what we are to be as a campus, but we need to be more activity as individual faculty in something that we feel we are supporting and comes from the campus itself. We may have a campus mission statement but it is not something that many faculty would really truly feel that they have ownership in either. I don't think anyone could tell you in this meeting, any detail at all about what is in that mission statement and probably many of us have never had a chance to read it. It has been, I am sure, in many distributions but do you really feel like you have ownership of it? That is the question.

BEPKO: The last time we went through this was in 1987-88. There was a broad distribution of a series of planning documents that hundreds of faculty looked at, read, and commented upon. Bill Plater was the person who led this, and he did an extraordinarily good job of drawing together the far-flung and diverse faculty that work on the campus into one statement of what we are. We are going through a new process right now that is a little different and will take a little longer probably, although we are under great pressure to finish it because the Commission is forcing all of this in a relatively short time. Our response to the Commission's whole movement to limit what we are and also to mandate a lot of measurements of what we are doing ought to be to develop, within the academic community, a statement of mission, vision, values, goals, and objectives, and then determine how we measure what we are doing. That is, we ought to tell them who we are, what we are trying to do, and how we are going to measure it and then let that stand against the sorts of things that they are producing. If we do our job properly and have the right kinds of measurements, I think our product in the public mind will be far superior. That is what we are doing right now.

KARLSON: I have two comments. First, I notice they have a goal of 20,000 new undergraduates. Is there any goal to improve our graduate education in its numbers? And, if not, why not because I think that is very significant to faculty.

Secondly, when I look at this Primary Geographic Responsibility, I have some difficulty when they put in medicine and dentistry as statewide, but I don't want to leave all the counties unnamed here to the Bloomington law school.

BEPKO: In the view of the Commission staff, this is the Marion County Law School, Henry.

KARLSON: In the view of the Law School, and slightly over two-fifths of the Indiana Supreme Court, they are wrong and sizeable proportion of the Indiana Court of Appeals. Put bluntly, the Law School is, as I am sure you are aware having been a faculty member and the dean of the Law School, much broader than that and we hope to get even more so.

BEPKO: And I hope we can mobilize the Law alumni to speak on behalf of this institution in its totality and make sure that it isn't just the Law School that gets statewide mandate, but that the full campus is recognized for what it ought to be.

KARLSON: Well, at least, if we are going to provide support, we will get our fair share.

BEPKO: Don't start negotiating, Henry. [laughter]

KARLSON: The second point is, what about this concept of increasing graduate education? I don't see any goal there. Has that been discussed?

BEPKO: I haven't heard it discussed. I think this is a national phenomenon. If you go around the country from state to state, you won't hear much conversation about graduate education. The concern has been for undergraduate education. It is at least a decade-old focus and I am sure in some places there is great concern but, by and large, in the Indiana Commission for Higher Education there has not been a lot of attention paid to it. Certainly not attention paid to expanding it -- with one exception. There is a lot of concern over family practice physicians.

AGENDA ITEM IV - PRESIDENT'S REPORT - RICHARD A. FREDLAND

WARFEL: We will reverse the reporting of the Chancellor and the President and go directly into the President's Report.

FREDLAND: Just one word regarding the memorial resolution of Bob Kirch. You all owe him a debt of gratitude that you may not be aware of because it was he who hired me to come to this campus. We have missed him very much since he retired and since his death.

One issue about which we can report the conclusion. We adopted a resolution last time ruing the cutting of the trees. I was instructed to write a letter to the relevant authorities expressing our dismay. I have a response from Bob Martin, Vice Chancellor for Administrative Affairs, who says: "Thanks for telling me and we will

keep it in mind." I hope that makes you feel better.

You and your colleagues should have received a four-page document of committee preferences dated October 15 asking for a response by November 1. It is not yet too late to return those forms. If you would stir the pot among your colleagues to ask them to respond. One of the frustrating things I have found in this position -- I came in with very few illusions, I thought -- but one of them was that we could incorporate new people into the process of faculty governance by tapping them to serve on committees which is the beginning of the process. But, the names keep recurring -- the same old names -- I might add. We would like to encourage people to grease the wheels of faculty governance by participating. There are lots of ways we can do that. The last time I had to name a committee I went through the roster of faculty until my eyes fell on one name and I picked that person to be on a committee. I have no idea of what the outcome of that may be, but I don't like that process particularly, but it is the next best thing that I know of if people don't respond to this request. Please encourage your colleagues if you will.

We are due to have a Board of Review election in January for our third of the three Boards of Review. I think we have it right this year as opposed to last year when we didn't have it right. We would like permission of the Council to move the election forward to December because it may be possible that we will have three Boards of Review cases under consideration. If justice delayed is justice denied, we do not want to delay it from December until January unnecessarily. I can't think of any reason why that would upset anything. That will be placed on today's agenda to vote on at a later point. Is that how we would do something like that?

WARFEL: I was wondering if we could see at the beginning of the December meeting if it was necessary to do that and then ask for a suspension of the rules.

FREDLAND: That sounds terrific. We will have the slates out seven days in advance of the December meeting, if this is necessary. We will let you know more about this.

If you were waiting breathlessly for the election results, not from New York City, from New Jersey, or Canada, but from the Constitutional amendment which we approved in this body last spring, it has passed by a overwhelming margin. What was the last count?

CHUMLEY: The last tally was 165 for and 8 against.

FREDLAND: It is not possible to have a flawless election, I find. There was concern expressed. One colleague said, "For the first time in 20 years I am writing a memo."

I am glad that we stimulated that intellectual activity with a constitutional amendment. It came to you without an envelope in which to put your secret ballot which will come anonymously to the Faculty Council office. It struck me that it was not an issue of great importance. We were trying to save paper, envelopes, trees, and of the other things that are associated with it. We won't do that again. We will waste every single envelope we can.

You should be aware, as others are, that your Commission of Higher Education is serving the people of Indiana at the moment by having established six task forces to look at, among other things, how Indiana is going to serve 35,000, 20,000, or 40,000, depending on which document you look at, new students. The mission statement that they are evolving for this campus includes that as one of our primary responsibilities to serve a portion, probably a disproportion of these new students the way it seems to be stated. Another one has to do with faculty productivity. Why aren't you teaching more?

The Commission is having a meeting tomorrow of faculty summoned by the faculty member of the Commission who happens to be an Indiana State University faculty member and a political scientist with whom I am acquainted. We have been invited to send two people to this faculty confabulation that is going to talk about these issues.

I have taken it upon myself to send a memo to all of the Indiana University people going which is, theoretically, two people per Indiana University campus which will be a substantial portion of the number of people there, to separate us from the IVTC folks when we talk about things since our issues are not the same and to try the reports of these task forces delayed beyond their January deadline so that we will have an opportunity for faculty input. I tell you all of this so that if you see something surfacing of this kind, you can be tuned in to what it is. It is the Commission in its deliberative mode without faculty input at the moment. But, we are trying to see if we can do something about that. You may be called upon, as a member of this body or in some other capacity, to meet with one of those task forces or to testify if indeed they hold hearings of what we are asking them to do or in some other way to involve faculty so we can give them a faculty perspective. So, be tuned into that, if you will.

Finally, as we go through our deliberations today and are considering issues of perhaps more import than the routine stuff we often consider, comparable to the Balanced Case that we considered last meeting. I wanted to remind you that you may request a secret ballot, if you wish. Someone expressed a discomfort last time at having to vote with the watchful eye of a dean over his or her shoulder. So, if you wish to request a secret ballot, it can be done. Our Parliamentarian is prepared to

guide us into that mode if you would like. A simple majority vote on a non-debatable motion will get us to that mode.

WARFEL: Are there any questions or comments about anything Dick has presented?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Just as an addendum to the comment regarding the tree cutting, it might be of interest to note that approximately a month ago Mr. Martin moved the red oak approximately 12 inches in diameter from the south side [non-medical side of campus] to the north side in front of the Union Building. It is now planted there.

BEPKO: May I make a comment. I am sorry that I wasn't at the last meeting, but I have talked to Michael Cohen who made the resolution...

FREDLAND: And Cliff Goodwin. We had two.

BEPKO: Okay. I talked to Michael Cohen before the meeting a couple of times and was prepared to talk a little bit about the steps that had been taken to try to preserve the trees in the area that is the courtyard now, the plaza, in front of the library. The analysis was fairly extensive. It involved the evaluation of the type of trees that were involved, their likely longevity, and the ability to preserve the trees if they were left in place and the ability to move them. I don't think they could be moved because they were too deeply rooted. A combination of considerations, the type of tree it is being one that is not likely to live a long time anyway. They may have some that appeal to us. They have been looking at it for a long time. The people who specialize in this kind of thing call them weeds. They were not trees that you would plant for long-term aesthetic purposes. Coupled with the fact that the change in elevation that had to take place because of drainage and lots of other things that were designed into the library and the other buildings would have meant that those trees would have had to have been buried further than they were, making their life expectancy very short--all of which was analyzed very carefully before a decision to remove the trees was made. In addition, there will be a substantial net gain in trees in that area when the library's wood plaza is completed. There will be lots of trees to replace those which were taken out. All of us feel as fondly, I think, as you do about not wanting to lose trees, but in this case, the analysis inevitably led to that conclusion, but the net gain in trees should make us all feel good.

FREDLAND: May I amend my comments? I found my piece of paper with the task forces of the Commission and I wanted to read the titles of the six task forces. They are: (1) Meeting Indiana Needs: enrolling 35,000 additional Indiana students; (2) The Increasing Campus Productivity. I discovered the Commissioner, Clyde Ingle, having

lunch with one of my colleagues today and I suggested to my colleague that he should be teaching instead of wasting his time with the Commissioner. [laughter] The Commissioner thought that was very appropriate. (3) Exploring Funding Alternatives, (4) Improving the Fit Between Secondary and Post-secondary education; (5) Focusing Campus Missions; (6) Assessing Needs for Capital Facilities.

AGENDA ITEM V - SELECTION OF THE VALUE OF N - ACTION ITEM

WARFEL: We have a very full agenda so we will move on to our next agenda item which is selection of the value of N. Circular 93-22 will help us in deciding what the value of N should be for the next two years.

The first sheet of this circular enumerates the membership of the IUPUI Faculty Council beginning with all of those categories that are designated ex officio members of this Faculty Council and they are listed on the circular. You can see that at a minimum there are 23 ex officio members of this Council. If none of the people in these categories was already elected to the Council, the maximum number of ex officio members we would have would be 47.

The main part of the Council is made up of the elected members -- unit representatives elected by each academic unit and an equal number of members elected by the faculty at large. Currently, we have 40 unit representatives and 40 at-large representatives making 80 elected representatives.

The other side of this circular shows you first how we are constituted this year, according to the faculty number in 1992 and the unit representatives we currently have. The rest of the columns are devoted to choices about how many unit representatives we would have if N were 46, as it is now, or if N were 56, 66, 76, or 86. One of the columns shows the number of faculty in each academic unit -- the official number for the month of October this year, which is the number that we need to use.

The bottom of the page shows using the minimal and maximal numbers of ex officio members. It shows how large the Council might end up being for N of 46, N of 56, N of 66, N of 76, or N of 86. With that background, let me open it up for comments. I should also say that the Executive Committee at their meeting last week decided to officially recommend that N be 56.

MEISS: What is N now?

WARFEL: N is now 46. If N remained 46, next year's Council would have between 105 and 129 members.

MCDONALD: What is the average attendance at these meetings? Do we get 50 percent or 70 percent attendance? It seems that sometimes we don't have a real rich group of people and maybe you don't want to hold it down.

WARFEL: There is a paragraph of persons present and a paragraph of persons absent shown on the minutes which we approved today and it comes out about even.

MCDONALD: So, it seems to me that possibly you don't need to slim it down. Are there too many of us?

FREDLAND: I just roughly counted about 59 people here today.

WARFEL: It is, as a matter of fact, the same 59 people who showed up last time.

BESCH: If N equals 56, we still would have about three-quarters of the body elected maximally and just over 60 percent elected if all ex officio persons were not elected. Much beyond that, of course, we get down to the order of about one-half or so elected and the other half done by virtue of the office they hold. The University Faculty Council constitution mandates that only a certain portion, I think it is one-fourth, not be elected. Is that not right?

WARFEL: You are saying the University Faculty Constitution...

BESCH: In other words, the faculty, who are administrative content of the University Faculty Council must be four to one or more.

WARFEL: The ex officios from the administration are the Chancellor and two appointees of the Chancellor and the 18 heads academic units. So, 21 would be the administrative component. So, 21 would be a steady number of administrators.

BESCH: So, by selecting 56, we would go down in affect three members for the School of Medicine and all other units would have the same number.

WARFEL: The unit representatives are elected from the school or library within the school, by the school and sent here. The faculty at-large then elects from the faculty at-large an equal number of representatives. In the case of some schools, they organize and make sure that they get as many at-large representatives elected as they possibly can.

FREDLAND: Call for the question.

WARFEL: Are there other comments. We have somebody calling for the question.
Is there a second to that? **UNKNOWN SPEAKER:** Seconded

WARFEL: There is a second. Is the Council ready to vote on the Executive Committee's recommendation that N equal 56 for the next two years? All of those ready to vote, please say "Aye." All of those opposed. [None] Then I will put the question to you, all of those in favor of N being equal to 56 for the next two years, please say "Aye." All of those opposed. [None] All of those abstaining. [None] N shall be 56.

AGENDA ITEM VI - TFFAA MAJOR ISSUES DISCUSSION

WARFEL: Our next item is a discussion of a major issue coming from the document and work of the Task Force on Faculty Appointments and Advancement. As discussed the last time, we would start at this meeting by considering the major issue of merging the promotion committee and the tenure committee. I will remind you that this issue came out four of the recommendations of the task force in two separate parts of their document. I would like you to have before you the documents which were mailed to -- draft document #14 and draft document #15. Is there anyone who needs an extra copy? We have some extras at the head table if you need one.

Also, as you came in to today's meeting you should have picked up a copy of this creme colored document. I think before we launch into any discussion of how we might change things, we should remind ourselves of how things are now. Currently, the IUPUI Tenure Committee is a separate committee from the IUPUI Promotion Committee. The Tenure Committee is a committee of the faculty defined by the bylaws of the IUPUI Faculty Council which are reproduced for you here, including a description of the composition, how they are elected, terms of office, and responsibilities of the Tenure Committee.

Our current IUPUI Promotion Committee is an administrative committee. It has a representative from each school except for the School of Medicine which sends three representatives to the Promotion Committee. How those faculty representatives to the Promotion Committee are chosen varies somewhat, but in many cases they are appointees of the dean. Some of the reasons behind promoting the idea of merging these committees into a combined Promotion and Tenure Committee for the campus are the following.

- 1) Economy of time and effort. Currently many of the dossiers are considered simultaneously by both of these committees.
- 2) Consistency of review. A larger group being involved with making tenure decisions.
- 3) All of the representatives on the Promotion Committee being elected by faculty.
- 4) The Promotion Committee coming with the Tenure Committee under the Faculty Council bylaws.

There are other things to say about it, but at this point I will open it up to Council discussion.

VESSELY: It seems to me that there is the question of whether the committees should be combined and then the question of how that happens or what kinds of mandates there are once they are combined. I guess I am asking if there is a chance of determining whether the group thinks that it is a good idea.

WARFEL: Similar to what we did with the "Balanced Case" in essence last time. I don't see anything wrong with that or illegal about that. Perhaps we could have a little bit of discussion before we ask people to decide and then come back to that.

KOLESKI: I talked with six members of our School of Social Work faculty and showed them the two documents which we are considering in this body. The first document is the memorandum and the second document is the Task Force statement. The six faculty members reviewing the documents were very much impressed by the talk (could not hear). Furthermore, they feel that the subject matter was important with their academic future on this campus. None of these six persons had seen either document. They felt hurt that they should not have had a chance to read, consider, and respond to its material which will have a significant impact on their future. Each of them asked me to convey to all of you that they feel that the IUPUI Faculty Council should delay any deliberations until they and their colleagues in all schools have had a chance to rediscuss it at the school level and submit their ideas to this body. I wholeheartedly support their requests. I would like to know if people in this room know what has happened to their faculty members and if they have gotten both documents. We are not deciding for ourselves. We are deciding for all of the faculty of this university. I haven't seen or haven't heard about the discussions at the school level and I have to encourage it.

FREDLAND: I can't count the number of times the ways in which we have tried to get this word around. At least every faculty member should have received in the last few weeks a pink reminder. It was announced last year early in the year to all faculty

that it was on-line. A letter was sent to the President of every faculty organization requesting that they apprise their faculty of what was going on and to hold discussions and send feedback to us. I think the School of Nursing did actually do such a thing. At least in those three ways, and probably in other ways, there were committees working on this as well, that the word has gone out. I understand that faculty may be disturbed about this, but they are not half as disturbed as I am.

KOLESKI: May I make one response, Dick. I love the color of your pink. It certainly did bring attention to the material. I thought you did a very extensive job of laying out what some of the issues are or whoever had written the material. I think there is quite a bit of difference between that document and this one which is a summary of represented actions. That is the payoff document, not the pink sheet.

KARLSON: There is a point of order which you should be aware of. Since this will amend the bylaws, it must be referred to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee before it can be voted on. That is contained in our bylaws under Article VI, Section A.

WARFEL: As long as we are reminding ourselves where we are and what we should be doing, let's go back to the pumpkin colored paper that we distributed last time when we sent out how we were going to tackle this very big job, where we were going to start. Let us remind ourselves that at each of these meetings as a topic is scheduled, it is scheduled for discussion and possible action at that meeting. I think what we should do today is to discuss here among our elected body whether or not combining the promotion and tenure committee is a good idea. If after that discussion, someone wishes to move that we delay any sort of preliminary vote, we will do so giving the schools some time or whatever. As Henry pointed out, the Constitution and Bylaws Committee has to get in on the action here too.

Another aspect of this is that many these are not documents that you can take as finished products today. For example, if we could turn to document #14. On page 101, which is the first page of that document, both in the paragraph on Composition and in the paragraph on Election there is a sentence about librarians. We would have to put a circle around each of those sentences with a note that says "that comes later" because the librarians are, as we are involved in this process, having parallel discussions considering librarians issues.

Similarly, one page 102, which is page two of document #14, paragraph f talks about post-tenure review. It is very premature for us today to approach paragraph f at all. We are not going to get to the whole concept of post-tenure review for several more meetings. Yes, we would need to put the issue of whether or not librarians

participate off on a back burner. Yes, we would have to put the part about post-tenure review off on a back burner as well. Yes, we would have to wait for the Constitution and Bylaws Committee and yes, we could give you all another month to consult and think about it before we ask for an unofficial vote. But, let's go ahead and try to make some progress on whether or not we think combining the promotion and tenure committees is going to be a good idea or it is going to be a terrible idea. And if it is going to be a good idea, let's work on document #14 and see what parts of it we may or may not like.

ROTHERS: It seems to me that this is a very good idea for the reasons that are listed there. I have a substantive question. The current Promotion Committee is an administrative committee. The new document says that the committee shall be chaired by the Dean of the Faculties who will preside without vote. It seems to me there is something to be said for having the chair of this committee to be a member of the committee but not necessarily the Dean of the Faculties. The Dean of the Faculties, it seems to me, must be present at these meetings. My substantive question is, is not the next step the Chancellor's Office? Is not that the place where the administration then, as an administrative body, can look at these? Why is it necessary for, at this level, the committee to be chaired by the Dean of the Faculties?

WARFEL: Before we let other people respond to that, the Dean of the Faculties currently is the chair of the Tenure Committee by our bylaws and is and has been the chair of the Promotion Committee. So, we wouldn't be changing to that but we could decide to make that change away from that. Are there any thoughts from the Dean of the Faculties?

PLATER: I am tempted to think that there might be an opportunity for me not to have to chair the meeting, but it would be nice if I also didn't have to attend the meetings.

ROTHERS: I have already said that.

PLATER: No. You said I had to be there as well.

ROTHERS: I think it is essential that the Dean of the Faculties attend these meetings.

PLATER: I think that is right. The substance of the discussion of the cases, I think, is very important to the campus administration to hear and to a part of. Speaking only from my experience and a limited sense of history, I think the primary value of having the Dean of the Faculties chair the meetings is to provide the cumulative institutional memory and history about procedures and processes, and to maintain and manage the flow of a very complicated process. That is not to say that a faculty member could

not do this, particularly if the chair had been a member of the committee for a year or two before, but it does place a very substantial responsibility on a faculty member who presumably has many other duties than administration. Philosophically, I don't have any difficulty with a member of the committee chairing the committee as long as the Dean of the Faculties or a campus administrator would be present to hear all of the issues that are being raised about individual candidates for promotion and tenure.

PETERSON: I agree with the philosophy that Carl has. As I see the philosophy of the tenure and promotion process, I see it as two parallel procedures that start at the lowest level and go up the tree until something ultimately happens with the candidate. That parallel process obviously involves the faculty and their input into this process - the faculty committees, primary, the unit, and the campus committees. On the other hand, the other parallel process is the administrative tree which involves the chairman of the department, the dean of the school, and the campus administration. I think the decisions on recommendations have to be made independently at each of those levels and when those two decisions go up to the next level, of course, each of the people at the next level are privy to both the documents that have come from both the administration and the faculty committees. As the review process goes up to each level the peer committee needs to make recommendations, based on input from lower level reviews, that are independent of administrative influence at the current level. This can not be done with an administrator at that level sitting in on a peer committee discussion. The administrator at each level should have access to the peer review committee recommendations as those recommendations are made. The peer committee should also get copies of any forwarded documents for feedback as they are involved in future considerations of the candidate.

BYRNE: I have been a long time opponent of combining the two. I would like to commend the summer committees for having done a very good job of trying to accommodate a variety of views that saw problems with the merger. In principle then I have a problem with that, but I do see a problem that this very body brought to our attention just in the last meeting. It has to do with the separate source of criteria for promotion on the one hand, and criteria for tenure on the other. Tenure is in some ways, we don't know exactly how, campus specific and, thus, there is some basis for a campus level tenure committee. Promotion, some of the discussion at the last meeting notwithstanding, is the university level matter. Criteria for promotion are determined, for better or worse, at the all-university level and attempts to perceive the promotion criteria as campus specific. We will always be confronted by that. People discuss in one way or another criteria when the committees are combined. People go out of their way to view the criteria as separate and distinct. However, this cannot be assured. It does seem that more attention needs to be paid to just exactly what

are the similarities and differences between the promotion and tenure criteria.

WARFEL: Are there, in fact, any schools that have separate tenure committees? [none] Is there anybody here who knows of a school that has a separate promotion committee and a separate tenure committee? [none]

SIDHU: Kathy, I think we should keep a record of the questions which are being raised and the concerns which are being expressed at this time. There were some basic reasons for keeping the Tenure and Promotion Committee separate. In considering cases for tenure, the mission of a unit and the individual's contribution to that mission were considered very important for granting the tenure. As far as promotion was concerned, that was considered to be the reward granted for the overall contributions made by the individual in meeting the University Criteria in teaching, research, and service.

Secondly, the Tenure Committee is a Faculty Council committee and the Promotion Committee is an Administrative committee. The question is, Who will control the combined committee? The Dean of the Faculties has been presiding over the Tenure Committee as well as over the Promotion Committee meetings. Most probably, he/she will also be presiding over the combined committee meetings. This committee is going to look over the process of making the rules, regulations and procedures of promotion and tenure in various schools/units. As such, this committee will have too much power and control over all the schools/units. The Dean of the Faculties will have a lot of direct/indirect influence in the affairs of the academic units through this committee. I think we need to discuss this concern and try to find out some appropriate solutions for it.

YOKOMOTO: I would like to speak from a school that has had a merged committee for years. It has worked very well for us. For those of you who fear some of the differences in promotion and tenure, for us it seemed to be an advantage. We have had cases that came up for tenure without promotion. We have had cases that came up for promotion and not for tenure. The committee had an amazing ability to adapt. We also had some other problems that we haven't even considered. Our promotion, for the most part, goes to the Purdue route while our tenure goes to the IU route. So, we even have to work with that difference, and being a merged committee helped everybody each year to understand the subtle differences. Had we had two committees, we would have had a tough time communicating with the committees or between committees when the faculties were considering promotion and tenure. So, for us, I think it has worked extremely well. There are only a small number of people in the Purdue schools (Science, Engineering and Technology) that has had this experience. I served on the IUPUI Promotions Committee and I served on what used

to be Panel E and I would speak in favor of the merged committees. There are several advantages.

BESCH: I was unfortunately not at the last meeting, but it was my understanding that the Faculty Affairs Committee was against this suggestion. Is that not correct? I am in sympathy with what I have heard here today but apparently not everybody is ready to join us and the committees to which they were sent did not recommend it.

WARFEL: This question was particularly sent by the Executive Committee to the Promotion Committee, to the Tenure Committee, to the Faculty Affairs Committee. Pat, I will let you answer this question.

BLAKE: The Faculty Affairs Committee objected to the combining of the two committees in the document which we originally sent to the Executive Committee.

WARFEL: And the reasons given?

BLAKE: I think you heard some of the members speak. It was feared that the tenure and promotion criteria would be combined even if not intentionally done so over time. The division being that the faculty wanted more representation for the differences between the two. I think there was some concern that a faculty member wanted to go for tenure they would automatically have to go for promotion at the same time also.

PORTER: Was this the opinion of the Faculty Affairs Committee last year?

BLAKE: Over a year ago.

PORTER: Was it, at that time, dealing with the concept that it wasn't fleshed out. It was not an opinion based on now having to see a document in which we have specifics, so it may represent an opinion at a point in history, I don't know whether you should take that as a current opinion of Faculty Affairs responding to a specific recommendation.

WARFEL: Becky, you were on the Faculty Affairs Committee also, weren't you?

PORTER: Yes.

GNAT: I was just going to make the point that there were two members of the Faculty Affairs Committee on the Implementation Committee. So, I would presume that this recommendation is something that they approved of.

PLATER: In response to several comments that have been made about the importance of having faculty participation in the promotion and tenure process, I would call to your attention that under the current Tenure Committee guidelines that body is convened to consider individual cases only at the request of the Dean of the Faculties. In fact, there could be no faculty participation at the campus level on tenure decisions at all under the current provision. So, what is being proposed here goes a very good distance to insuring, in fact guaranteeing, faculty participation in both the promotion and tenure process. I think just from a faculty point of view this is a substantial improvement.

BRAHMI: I would like to second Charlie's comments. I am not in a school that has a combined promotion and tenure committees, but as librarian/faculty, as some of you may know, we do go through a process. We go through a systemwide promotion and tenure committee that is combined and has been working very successfully for years. I have served on that committee and we do separate the criteria and we made a deliberate effort to evaluate each dossier according to a separate criteria that is set out before us. I would like to second also what Charlie said about it brings a better understanding of the whole process. As a result of serving on that, I have a much better understanding of the whole system. I find that it certainly is an expedient way to do it and saves a great deal of time and effort.

PETERSON: I would like to make another comment about the process per se. I think if we all are cognizant of the mission of our department, if we are cognizant of the mission of our unit, that most of the decision process obviously should take place at that level -- the primary committee, the unit committee, chairman of the department, and the dean of the school. On one hand I can see that there might be some protection at the level of the IUPUI committee. On the other hand the faculty could look at it as yet another chance or he will not succeed and that there will be a committee that is composed quite differently than what he would be getting consideration at the local level. Let's say, for example, somebody from the School of Music is coming up and you have quite a few people from sciences and they really don't know how to do that. "This guy doesn't look like he's done anything, and yet his unit is giving him tenure." So they negate him at that level for not having achieved what they, as a campus committee, now feel... I was on the Tenure Committee one year and I sensed a bit of this "how critical can we get about these units whose missions may not be like the School of Medicine's?" I am a bit concerned that this committee become too powerful in making those "final decisions for the campus" but uphold a campus level criteria where the mission of the school may be very different. I realize in these documents those missions statements do need to be taken into account as you are making those decisions. I am a bit concerned about too powerful a campus committee. If indeed the unit is doing its job

in supporting its candidates, that would be part of their job.

WARFEL: I think we should clarify though that these committees, whether separate or combined, are not making any kind of final decisions.

PETERSON: I realize that, but a negative vote at that level could carry quite a bit of weight.

VESSELY: I am not sure that it makes a difference whether your name was voted down by 4 to 2 or 12 to 10. Sheer numbers doesn't make that committee any more powerful. There were years that I have seen when I was on the Tenure Committee when with only six members obviously there wasn't broad based representation throughout the campus. You are either going on your merits or not at all. So, simply because there are more people on the committee doesn't make your chances any less or any greater from that aspect. Again, at the local level, you asked the question about whether there was any separate committees and there weren't. So, at the local level that is how we making those decisions anyhow.

KOLESKI: I think that Dick Peterson has put his finger on what is happening in our school. There is no question about the merging. The reasons are very good. The concern that comes up is the concern of the responsibilities that are laid out in page two. The issue which comes around is, what if a school felt a person should get tenure at the school level, that person fulfills the functions of what the school is about. If that may be the case, what is the rule or what can be the gaining power of the super ordinate committee at that particular point? Can they decide with a different type of standard that that person really isn't that good for the school?

WARFEL: I think that the committee members can have an opinion. Again, we are back to the word "deciding the fate of the person."

KOLESKI: The discussion goes on in our school to the effect that we are really the captains of our own fate. The fact of the matter is that we are not the captains that we think we are.

ROTHER: Coming from the School of Medicine and having been on our combined Promotion and Tenure Committee for two terms, we have had a faculty member who is chairing it and it works well. It is certainly important that that faculty member be both dedicated and competent. As I see it there are six year terms possible. That would give a faculty member plenty of time to become familiar with the problem and procedures. How many members are proposed -- 20 to 21 members?

WARFEL: Let's turn to document #14. The first paragraph. The composition of the IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Committee shall consist of three members elected at large by the IUPUI Faculty Council and of one representative of each school with five or more full-time faculty based at IUPUI... Going back to the chart of how many units that is, there are three units of our 18 that do not have five members. So, that would get us down to 15. So, that would be 15 members. The School of Medicine gets two extra ones. That is 17 members. Then there are three at large. That is 20. As it is written here, the Dean of the Faculties who would not vote. So, there would be 20 voting members with our current numbers.

ROTHER: In our school the Dean also makes promotion and tenure decisions and can say yes to a faculty member that the committee turned down or vice versa.

WARFEL: Absolutely.

ROTHER: I presume that the Chancellor could do the same thing? So, this committee would not have that kind of overriding power. They would just express an opinion that the Chancellor has to look at, concur with, or disagree with. Am I wrong?

WARFEL: No. You are right.

BLAKE: What if the Chancellor goes opposite of the dean? The dean recommends "no", what does the Dean of the Faculties and the Chancellor do? That is where I see a real problem. Not at the level of the school. What happens to the faculty who met the criteria and the dean, for some reason, doesn't support that and it goes for no? That may be a rare problem, but it happens.

BEPKO: It happens both ways. You are posing the question where a dean goes against the positive recommendation and votes no. I think that there have been cases, these are rare, where the University administration has disagreed with a dean and has voted yes even though the dean voted no.

There have been cases where the dean voted yes and the University administration said no. So, they go both ways.

PLATER: It really does depend upon the individual circumstances. I think the record does show exactly what the Chancellor said, that the campus administration has reviewed the cases based upon the arguments that are being presented.

BLAKE: I believe that some of the faculty who have talked to me are concerned that as IU, and perhaps individual units change directions that there are new criteria

imposed.

PLATER: I have one additional comment on this. It has been said before but it is important to iterate that each one of these reviews -- at the primary committee, the department chair, the unit committee, the dean, the campus committee, and the campus administration -- is subject to review based on the merits of the case brought before it. Each body or person reviewing a candidate for promotion or tenure is obligated to look at the information, the case presented, and to make the best judgment that he/she can based on the records presented and recommend on that. It is my belief that, by and large, that is the way the process works. There are separate, substantive reviews.

WARFEL: I am going to have to limit our discussion today because we have other things on the agenda. Before we stop talking about this, however, let's continue to look at document #14. In particular, I think it is important to note that the listing of responsibilities a, b, and c, are really simply what is already in a, b, and c in the bylaws for the Tenure Committee. The "d" is a new item. The "e" is a new item. Letter "f" we are not talking about and "g" is a new item. So, as you continue to look at these documents I think it is important to keep in mind where we are now and what is being proposed.

YOKOMOTO: Regarding letter "e". This is the first time I have seen reference to standards. We have always talked about criteria, but now we are talking about documents that spell out standards. Is that going to be asked of us for schools to now spell out standards?

PLATER: May I comment? That comes from the Academic Handbook which was amended, I believe, two years ago to use this language to talk about there being standards developed within schools for promotion criteria. This is to reflect the Academic Handbook. I don't have that with me but someone may have the recalled section to which this refers.

PORTER: For those of you who have the entire document, it is in Document #1 on page 48. You will find language that talks about criteria. "Criteria are the standards by which candidates are evaluated." There seems to be cross over language between Document #1 and Document #14.

WARFEL: Ray, very early on you suggested that we should delay any decision about this. Do you want to make that in the form of a motion?

KOLESKI: I like to solo in life, so yes, I would like to make that as a recommendation.

WARFEL: How about delaying it until the next Faculty Council meeting?

KOLESKI: It seems to me the additional step is to ensure that this particular document from which we are working is in the hands of the faculty members of this university.

PLATER: Ray, every member of the faculty was mailed this fall a letter explaining the process and a summary of all 33 recommendations with information about how to obtain the full document if they wished it. We have done that. Each member of the faculty and the librarians received that document. Are you asking us to repeat it?

FREDLAND: It has to go from this body to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee so there is going to be a delay of a certain amount of time in the legal process as well.

WARFEL: Is there a motion to table this discussion until the next meeting?

SIDHU: I would like to see...

WARFEL: I haven't called on you. Was that a motion? Is there a second to that motion? **UNKNOWN SPEAKER:** Second

WARFEL: All of those in favor of tabling this discussion until the next Faculty Council meeting, say "Aye." All of those opposed? Motion defeated. Let me go back to Jeff Vessely. Jeff, you had wanted us to take a straw vote, combine/not combine. Do you want to make that in the form of a motion?

VESSELY: I move that we continue the discussion under the premise that we were going to combine the committees.

BLAKE: Do you want a straw vote?

WARFEL: I would be happy to have the Council vote. I am trying to decide what it is we will be voting on.

BESCH: The train is rolling. Why are we delaying it?

WARFEL: Because I don't have a motion. I can't have a vote without a motion.

KARLSON: Point of order. Since this amends the bylaws, it must be first be sent to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee for consideration. Now, these are the rules

of our assembly and therefore the final action vote on this would be out of order. It must be sent to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee.

WARFEL: Document #14 must be sent.

VESSELY: Can the Constitution and Bylaws Committee go with some sort of a recommendation?

WARFEL: Certainly.

VESSELY: So, in other words we are saying we are trying to circumvent the process...

KARLSON: That is a circumvention of the process. It is supposed to go to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee for their input before you take any final vote. You can't tell them what to do.

J. KECK: Can we not send this to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee indicating that we would support it? That is not telling them what to do. That is just saying that, as a body, we support this document.

ORME: When we do vote, are we voting on the original task force recommendations or the language in these draft documents?

WARFEL: We are not voting on the original task force recommendations. If I can get a motion out of somebody, we could vote on the major issue of being in favor of combining the campus promotion and tenure committees. We don't have that motion on the floor. We have no motion on the floor.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I will make that motion.

WARFEL: Is there a second? **UNKNOWN SPEAKER:** I second it.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Could you repeat the motion?

WARFEL: The motion is that the Faculty Council is in favor of combining the IUPUI Promotion Committee and the IUPUI Tenure Committee into an IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Committee.

FREDLAND: Do we not want to include some of the language in Document #14...

WARFEL: Not now.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: This is just the sense of the body.

WARFEL: We want to combine the committees and then we can continue to discuss what that committee should look like and what its charges should be.

SIDHU: What are the charges? (CHANGED TAPE AT THIS POINT)

VESSELY:

FREDLAND:

KARLSON: "...any resolution to amend the bylaws not arising from the Constitution and Bylaws Committee shall be referred to that committee for review. The Constitution and Bylaws Committee shall report to the Council at its regular meeting.

FREDLAND: Call for the question.

WARFEL: The question has been called. The motion is that this body is in favor of combining the promotion and tenure committees. All of those in favor, say "Aye." All of those opposed, say "No." [A few] All of those abstaining, say "Abstain." [None] What we have now is a sense that this body is in favor of combining the IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Committees. At our next meeting we will look more closely at Document #14 and #15. In the meantime, we will send Document #14 to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee so that they will have an opinion about it in December.

SIDHU: May I make one comment? What Dean Plater has sent to the faculty is, only a summary of the recommendations. That is not a complete document and therefore, the other faculty members are not going to see the full document and be able to form their own opinion or participate in the open meeting. My request is that the part of the document on which we are going to take action should go to the faculty to give them an opportunity to express their opinions.

WARFEL: Hearing no second, we will move on to the next agenda item which is the discussion of the "Fresh Start" issue.

AGENDA ITEM VII - DISCUSSION OF THE "FRESH START" ISSUE - MARY GILCHRIST

GILCHRIST: You have a copy of the Forgiveness Policy Proposal which is IUPUI Circular 93-23 attached to your agenda for today. This document is also referred to

as the "Fresh Start" Policy. The original intent of the Fresh Start policy was to provide former students of Indiana University or Purdue University and/or IUPUI to have their records evaluated as students transferring into IUPUI in the same way that students from other institutions have their records evaluated. Given the conditions that those students had been out of school for five years, had not attended any other college or university during that time, and were still working on their first undergraduate degree and that this policy would be initiated for them only for one time.

The intent was to be able to bring back to campus life some of those capable and mature students who we all know as the majority. This has been going around in discussions in various groups for a number of years. I have a little a historical research project in going through the old minutes of the Academic Affairs Committee in particular.

In 1990, this proposal was approved by the Academic Affairs Committee. It was shared with the Student Affairs Committee and the two groups came together and provided support and recommended the proposal essentially as you see it there. However, there was originally a statement about this being a systemwide policy which has since been discussed and negotiated out.

There also originally was a statement that all IU and Purdue grades or IUPUI grades would be considered regardless if a student was to graduate with honors. This document was forwarded to the Academic Policies and Procedures Committee (APPC). They considered it and created in the summer of 1991 a subcommittee who also reviewed the policy and at that time, when it was returned to the Academic Affairs Committee it then contained the stipulation that students would complete 32 hours which you will find in Item #3 of circular 93-23.

The committee then has worked with this document since that time and it was reviewed again by the Academic Affairs Committee last spring and it was forwarded to the Faculty Council, through the Executive Committee, this fall and comes to you in this condition with our recommendation that it be something that we would like to do at IUPUI. That is the history of it. Are there any questions?

BYRNE: I have a problem with the last sentence of paragraph #1. Whatever else the new majority people are they are not procedure wise with regard to how things are done in the strange world of academe. I don't think I understand why they have to make the move during the first semester or sooner. The assumption is that they are well informed about policy and procedures and if they don't do it, it is their own fault. I would suggest striking the whole sentence.

WARFEL: Is that a motion?

BYRNE: I am prepared to so move.

WARFEL: Is there a second?

GOODINE: I second that.

BYRNE: I don't know what I am moving.

WARFEL: Does the person who seconded the motion know what the motion was?

R. KECK: Is this only within the IU system or will people from other institutions also be able to take advantage of this?

GILCHRIST: They already have that privilege. To transfer in from Slippery Rock your GPA is based upon the passing grades.

R. KECK: Under item #2 it says C, P, and S. Would a passing grade of a "D" be...

GILCHRIST: No. Not under the C-. However, there is a typographical error in this. There should be a C+ in there.

R. KECK: I have a couple more questions.

LANGSAM: There should also be an A+ in there as well.

R. KECK: Would the Forgiveness Policy Proposal be listed somewhere on a person's transcript (could not understand) that the person chose their option for this?

UNKNOWN: It says that all of the courses remain on the transcript, but they just don't include them. Somewhere it would have to say that.

R. KECK: The question is, would they be on the final transcript? Would a person be allowed to graduate with honors after having this Forgiveness Proposal approved?

GILCHRIST: In the original proposal that was a stipulation. Somewhere along the line in the discussions and the review that disappeared.

YOKOMOTO: It didn't really disappear because the rule is still there. For instance, for honor degrees all courses taken are considered. Because all grades will remain on

the transcript, that can be done. For those of you who might wonder why all grades remain on the transcript, we were told that for financial aid, grades are still needed. Even though Fresh Start computes the grade point one way, all grades remain on the transcript. For internal purposes, if the University/school or department require that all grades be counted, they still can be.

R. KECK: The last question I have is, if new criteria for graduation within a school had been put into school bulletins, do the graduation criteria fit as per the time of the Forgiveness acceptance? Do you understand what I am saying? If the student started five years ago and at that point in time there were different criteria for graduation, would the criteria for graduation be at the time of the student's initial application and initial matriculation or would it be at the time of the Forgiveness rule acceptance?

GILCHRIST: It is my understanding that a student functions under a given bulletin and, if that was at the time they were accepted into the program, but by the same token Item #4 provides for the dean to grant the petition and also to impose stipulations or conditions so that there is no intent to remove authority from the school as to who is in their program.

R. KECK: So that would be the dean's responsibility?

GILCHRIST: Yes or their agent.

GALANTI: I have a question. In paragraph #1, *(and have not attended another university in the interim)* -- Would this preclude application of the Forgiveness Policy to a student who has been out of IUPUI for five years but took courses at Indiana Central?

GILCHRIST: Yes. That is exactly what it means. The intent was that they have been totally out of school and have now decided to re-enter. We all have worked with these students, I think, in many instances. They are not the same people they were five years ago.

GALANTI: One course at the University of Indianapolis...

GILCHRIST: That is the intent.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Why?

GILCHRIST: Because this is our definition of a fresh start.

LANGSAM: I have two points. One, in paragraph #1 it says "*This rule would be available to students returning to IUPUI in the Fall of 1992 or later.*" Would it be considered a friendly amendment to suggest that, if and hopefully yes, this is passed that it is the following fall rather than the fall of 1992 which requires some very strange backing up?

GILCHRIST: Yes, I agree.

LANGSAM: Secondly, I would like to speak very much in favor of this to allow our students to be on the same footing as students who come from other universities. I just got back from St. Louis from the National Honors Conference and we took four of our honor students with us. I don't want to give you the details, but I will tell you that two of them came to us with past experiences that were abominable and are now almost straight A students. I think you would have all been very proud of them. I know that the audience was awed by these outstanding students who right have been albatross of, in one case, something 15 years ago when they were very, very young. So, I think that is the thrust of this and I think it would be a wonderful addition to IUPUI for our students.

BLAKE: I agree with the idea that the last sentence in the first paragraph be eliminated, but I am also concerned that somebody attend to the process whether it is Student Services, the Registrar, or whatever so that this option is made available to all students and be monitored so that no one is disadvantaged.

MEISS: With regard to that same consideration, if students are not given exit counseling, they may not willingly take one course that would preclude their taking advantage of this.

WITTEBERG: I have two points. One is in regard to the one course somewhere else. Would it be possible to make some sort of a policy that says "been out five years without taking anything" but if when they were 18 they bounced from IU Bloomington and then they had one-half of a semester some place else, and then they flunked out of that, and got totally confused and were out 15 years. There would be like a five year gap there before starting IUPUI where no courses were taken anyway.

GILCHRIST: That could happen the way it is stated here now.

MIRSKY: I was consulting with my colleagues, Charlie Yokomoto. Coming back to Ed Byrne's comments about the last sentence on paragraph one *Students must make application for invocation of the policy prior to or within the first semester of resumed enrollment.* We were thinking that actually the system ought to be set up such that

somebody like the initial counselors, when the students first comes in, or somebody in the Admissions Office, should be advising students of this. In other words, there ought to be some institutional trigger that gets us going rather than leaving it to the student to somehow find out about it and take the initiative. The logical person would either be someone in the Admissions Office who sees these transcripts when they come in who has to evaluate them or the first counselor that the student meets with.

FINEBERG: I think that the way this is written, if they went to IU 15 years ago, took a course some place 10 years, and now came back, that this would not apply because it says "have not attended any other university in the interim." I think it needs to be rephrased to say "have not attended any other university within the past five years" so that someone who came here 15 years ago, flunked out from somewhere else, and all of this is 10 years in the past. I think the intention is that they should be eligible, but as it is written they are not. So, I would make an amendment to this that even if they attended another university, if they had not attended any university at all for the past five years, they would then be eligible for this.

WARFEL: Is there a second to that?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I will second that.

ROTHE: Are we going to vote on these amendments or not?

WARFEL: Certainly, we are. We will finish our discussion then we will be vote.

ROTHE: We had one a long time ago and we didn't vote on it.

WARFEL: We will vote on it before we vote on the main question. We will vote on them in the order of precedence before we vote on the main question.

ALIPRANTIS: I have a problem with the last sentence in paragraph #2. *Only courses with grades A, A-, B+, B, B-, C, P and S would be counted toward degree completion.* I would like to add "Only courses with grades of A, A-, B+, B, B-, C, P and S and with the consent of the department or the school would be counted toward degree completion."

WARFEL: All of these petitions have to be approved by the dean.

GILCHRIST: Don't you do that to any transfer student?

ALIPRANTIS: We do it and we don't.

GILCHRIST: This is only for our own students who have been out of school for that period of time. I think that is a situation that each school has to deal with. I would think that you do to any transfer student.

ALIPRANTIS: We teach between 7,000 and 8,000 students in the department of mathematics. If someone has an A+, it is easy to say "yes." But, we would like to have these students who come into this program...

FINEBERG: I do not agree with that. **ALIPRANTIS:** Why not?

FINEBERG: Because it is true with biology. If you took biology five years ago, could you go... I think that is the part that when someone transfers who has been out of school for a while, someone in the department has to look at their records and decide where to place them. That is true in every field.

YOKOMOTO: I think I know what he means. It is the wording again. When someone transfers in and the credits have been forced to stay on the transcripts it means that they have been entered into the computer, but the departments still have the say on whether they will then accept a course, especially if it is 10 or 15 years. I am looking at the date right now. But, I didn't see it until now. But, when Roko was saying so, that the wording said that it will be counted toward your degree completion rather than to be eligible for the incomplete depending upon the department. I think that is what he is talking about now.

PORTER: Change the word "would" to "could" in paragraph #2.

WITTBERG: I have a question then. Sometimes we would have a student who would take, because of only being part-time, a long time just to get a grade from IUPUI. This may matriculate to 1980, take courses very slowly, and not get done until 1992. Especially in Liberal Arts, or something, they may have taken their math requirement in 1983. Do we spring it on them in 1992 that because they took their math 118 back in 1983, you really have only been in this school all this time, do you have to take it again?

WITTBERG: Yes, but this has to do with introductory courses, not the major completion. That is the difference.

ALIPRANTIS: Then change the word "would" to "could".

WARFEL: There are three amendments to this document. The most recent one is in paragraph #2. In the last sentence, *Only courses with grades of A+, A, A-, B+, B,*

B-, C+, C, P and S could be counted toward degree completion instead of would. All of those in favor of this amendment, say "Aye." All of those opposed, say "Aye." [a few] [amendment passed]

Going backwards, the next amendment is in paragraph #1 in the text that is in parentheses "away from the IU system for five years or more" (*and have not attended another university within the past five years.*) instead of "in the interim." All of those in favor of that amendment, say "Aye." All of those opposed? [a few] [amendment passed]

The last amendment to the document is again in paragraph #1. The proposed amendment is to strike the last sentence. That is to strike the sentence *Students must make application for invocation of the policy prior to or within the first semester of resumed enrollment.*

ROTHE: Point of order. Would you clarify that, if this has passed, who will tell the appropriate students? I like the earlier wording of "will normally be..." be..."

FREDLAND: It is like any other policy -- Admissions Office, Dean of Students.

MIRSKY: We recommended the Admissions Office or a counselor.

PLATER: I would propose that, if this is adopted, to send the policy to the academic deans asking them to implement it with a carbon of the letter to the Admissions Office asking them to develop a policy to notify eligible students upon admission of the policy and asking the Registrar then to develop the necessary process to see that individuals for whom the policy is approved have the benefit of this on their transcript.

ROTHE: I second that.

WARFEL: We will vote on that in a minute. Let's go back to striking the last sentence in paragraph #1. All of those in favor of striking the last sentence in paragraph #1, say "Aye." All of those opposed, say "No." [a few] May I have a show of hands. All of those in favor of striking the last sentence in paragraph #1, please raise your hand. All of those against it, raise your hand. The sentence is stricken.

FREDLAND: We also amended 1992 to be 1994.

WARFEL: That was a friendly amendment so we didn't have to vote on that. Now we have a motion saying that if we adopt this policy it will be implemented in an

appropriate and effective way. All of those in favor of that motion, say "Aye." All of those opposed. [amendment passed]

Is the Council ready to address the main question? I see a few hands indicating "No."

J. KECK: A person who has been cleansed and has a fresh start, is that person then entitled to all these academic bankruptcy and strikes for three, three-hour credits (could not understand

WARFEL: Miriam, do you know the answer to that?

LANGSAM: I think the idea is that FX is not addressed in this policy so the move regarding FX would stay in the distance, so you would always have the three FXs. If you have already used some of them, you would only have what is left. Since it doesn't address that, I wouldn't think that it would change it.

SCHREINER: In the preliminary paragraph, the introduction, I guess I am a little concerned about the last sentence which has some biases to the extent which I don't think are necessarily valid. I think the phrase *particularly those comprising the New Majority* is troublesome to me because I think it implies that the New Majority is going to rush forward to use this policy. I don't know that that is necessarily the case.

WARFEL: Would you like to move to strike "particularly those comprising the New Majority? Are you moving to strike the whole sentence?

SCHREINER: I would move to strike the last sentence.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I second that.

WARFEL: Is there any discussion? We have an amendment to strike the last sentence of the introductory paragraph. All of those in favor, say "Aye." All of those opposed? [amendment passed] Now, is the Council ready to vote on the main question? Apparently not.

ROSS: I have a question. I am concerned that if we move the date of fall of 1992 to the fall of 1994 are there students who have just entered our system or who will enter the system in the spring semester who could benefit from this? Are we saying either wait and come in next fall or you can't take advantage of this?

LANGSAM: In order to get exceedingly slow-grinding machinery in place, as Bill has addressed, it will take us some time and rather than do something which we are not

prepared to do, it seems to me that that's the luck. I think it will take new bulletins and information to get us ready to have this policy in force. I would suggest that we delay it.

WARFEL: Is the Council ready to vote? All of those in favor of the Forgiveness Policy Proposal as amended, say "Aye." All of those not in favor say "No." Are there any abstentions?

MILLER (Sagamore): I have a very brief question. I notice that the primary number one paragraph it talks about students from the degree programs from the IU system. Has there been any discussion about extending that to prior students at Purdue?

GILCHRIST: Yes.

MILLER (Sagamore): It doesn't say so in the first paragraph. That was a concern of mine because I saw that it said "The Academic Affairs and Student Affairs Committees of the IUPUI Faculty Council recommend the Fresh Start Rule" but yet in #1 it says "been away from the IU system...". It doesn't necessarily say Purdue.

GILCHRIST: Somewhere in the Archives concerning the Academic Affairs Committee there was a letter from David Bostwick asking that the Purdue students not be included in that. I don't remember the argument of that.

WARFEL: I wonder if we ask you to sort that out and report to us next time.

GILCHRIST: That is a good point because I have been dealing with this.

WARFEL: Thank you, Professor Gilchrist.

AGENDA ITEM VIII - QUESTION-AND-ANSWER PERIOD

The Chancellor will stay after the meeting to answer questions.

AGENDA ITEM IX - UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Because of the lateness of the hour there was no unfinished business.

AGENDA ITEM X - NEW BUSINESS

WARFEL: We do have an item of new business. Jean Gnat will report to us on the Campus Campaign.

GNAT: Last year I appeared before the Faculty Council at which time a resolution was approved endorsing the inauguration of an annual fund raising program. I am here this year to announce that we are beginning work on the second annual campaign. Before I give some particulars about some of the people who are serving on the Steering Committee, I would like to report on the results of last year's campaign which was conducted during the Spring semester of 1993.

There were 898 staff and faculty donors who made new commitments to campus initiatives, including the libraries, faculty and staff development, scholarships and specific departmental and school programs. Over \$88,000 was given in response to the campaign.

This year, in accordance with the charge that this be an annual campaign, a Steering Committee has been formed to oversee the 1994 Campus Campaign. I have agreed to co-chair the campaign for 1994 with Mary McCullough, Allied Health Sciences, the 1993 Staff Council representative. Other members of the Steering Committee are Glenn Irwin (Emeritus Faculty, Medicine), Honorary Co-chair; Howard Schaller (Emeritus Faculty, Business), Honorary Co-chair; Elizabeth Grossman (Emeritus Faculty, Nursing) IUPUI Senior Academy representative; Steve Bricker (faculty, Dentistry) IUPUI Faculty Council representative; Stant Clark (staff, Campus Facilities Services); Ray Maesaka (faculty, Dentistry); Richard Ruwe (Staff, Herron), IUPUI Staff Council representative; and Patricia Treadwell (faculty, Medicine).

Additional working committees are being formed and a volunteer structure is being put in place to conduct the campaign. Last year many individuals indicated they would be willing to serve again in the future so we are asking them to serve on these smaller committees. We ask that you support the campaign whichever way you can. We appreciate the help you gave us last year.

WARFEL: Are there any comments about the campus campaign?

FREDLAND: To the gentleman in the corner with his hand up [Ray Koleski] and any other of the groups who have rebellious colleagues I cite to you Article III, Section A(1) of the Faculty Constitution which says: The Faculty Council exercises the authority of the faculty as it is enumerated in Article I" which includes our Promotion and Tenure issue or anything else. So, if they have any concerns, you are their elected representative here. This is democracy at its finest.

KOLESKI: The introduction was so formal I thought you were sending me to prison. I have a few questions. What exactly what did we and did we not vote on in Document #14? Did we accept all of pages 101, 102, 103?

FREDLAND: We adopted them in principle.

KOLESKI: That is in the Background statement. The Background statement says, in the first sentence: The Task Force on Faculty Appointments and Advancement has recommended that the campus promotion and tenure committees be combined and that membership be restricted to persons holding full rank. That is what we accepted?

WARFEL: No. When we come back next month Document #14 will be in front of you. We will have consulted with the Constitution and Bylaws Committee. We can discuss Document #14 line by line, make amendments, if necessary, and decide how to proceed next time. We have not accepted Document #14 at this point.

KOLESKI: Since the thrust of the Faculty Council is going to be in this direction for the full year, can you tell us, as the chair, as much as you possibly can about what the focus of the agenda is for the next meeting so we can go back and create that dialogue?

WARFEL: Yes. For the December meeting, because we only have one hour, and then we break and have the faculty meeting with the State of the Campus Address, I think what we should focus on is the promotion and tenure documents. If we have time, we will move on to Stopping the Tenure Clock. I intend to follow the order, although the months will be pushed back.

KOLESKI: At the end of the meeting you could say this is what I see as the next discussion items.

WARFEL: I would remind people that there is an open forum tomorrow on the major issues. Ken Scales didn't show up today. Is there any last piece of new business?

AGENDA ITEM XI - ADJOURNMENT

WARFEL: I would like to thank you all for your enthusiasm and civility. This meeting is adjourned.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY INDIANAPOLIS

Faculty Council Meeting

January 13, 1994

Law School, Room 116

3:30 p.m. - 5:30 p.m.

Present: Administrative: Chancellor Gerald Bepko, Dean William Plater. Deans: John Barlow, Alfred Potvin, Sheldon Siegel. Elected Faculty: C D Aliprantis, Darrell Bailey, Merrill Benson, Henry Besch, Frances Brahmi, Edmund Byrne, William Blomquist, Michael Cohen, Elaine Cooney, Theodore Cutshall, Naomi Fineberg, Richard Fredland, Karen Gable, Paul Galanti, Jean Gnat, Clifford Goodwin, Stuart Hart, Dolores Hoyt, Norman Hudson, Juanita Keck, Diane Leland, Eric Long, James McAteer, Dana McDonald, Lynda Means, Richard Meiss, Arthur Mirsky, Byron Olson, William Orme, Vimalkumar Patel, Richard Peterson, Rebecca Porter, Norris Richmond, Margaret Richwine, Carl Rothe, Lee Schwecke, Charles Slemenda, Robert Sutton, David Suzuki, Karen Teeguarden, Jeffery Vessely, Eric Wiebke, Charles Yokomoto, Susan Zunt. Ex Officio Members: Janet Feldmann, Edgar Fleenor, John Pless, William Schneider, Hitwant Sidhu, Martin Spechler, Kathleen Warfel. Alternates: Deans: Doris Merritt for Walter Daly, Jerry Durham for Angela McBride, Barbara Wilcox for Donald Warren, Elected Faculty: David Lewis for James Baldwin, Subir Chakrabarti for Rosalie Vermette, Ex Officio Members: David Frisby for Virgie Montgomery. Visitors: Erwin Boschmann (Faculty Development Office), Mark Grove (Registrar), Raima Larter (President, School of Science Faculty).

Absent: Administrative: J. Herman Blake. Deans: A James Barnes, Trevor Brown, Barbara Fischler, H. William Gilmore, P Nicholas Kellum, Norman Lefstein, John Rau, David Stocum, William Voos, Charles Webb, James Weigand. Elected Faculty: Biagio Azzarelli, Timothy Baldwin, Patricia Blake, David Burr, David Canal, Michael Clark, Gayle Cox, Michael Dalsing, Joseph DiMicco, William Engle, Michael Fritsch, Joe Garcia, Gareth Gilkey, Michael Gleeson, Linda Goodine, Jerome Kaplan, Robert Keck, M Jan Keffer, Raymond Koleski, Joseph Koss, Steven Leapman, Bernard Morrel, Bart Ng, Daniel Peavy, Edward Robbins, Michael Sadove, Brian Sanders, Richard Schreiner, Aristotle Siakotos, Jay Simon, Jeffrey Springston, James Wallihan, Karen West, Patricia Wittberg. Ex Officio Members: Barbara Cambridge, J Vannoy Faris, Henry Karlson, Steven Mannheimer, B Keith Moore, Helen Schwartz, Student Representative.

AGENDA ITEM I - ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT - CHANCELLOR GERALD BEPKO

WARFEL: The January meeting of the IUPUI Faculty Council will come to order. We will now have the Administrative Report.

BEPKO: Thank you. Just a couple of items beginning with a report on enrollment for the spring term from Bill Plater.

PLATER: I suspect, as most of you know from looking around your classrooms, down the hallways, and in the parking lots, we are still down a little this spring from what we were a year ago – which is almost parallel to the fall semester experience. The first day enrollments show that we are down about 2.6 percent in headcount enrollments and about 1.6 percent in credit hours. The comparable figures for the fall semester were down 2.8 percent in headcount and 3.4 percent in credit hours. This is roughly the same. Most of the other campuses of Indiana University have also experienced slight enrollment decreases. There are a few exceptions where there have been increases. We don't know about the other public institutions in Indiana, but this would suggest that the trend of the fall semester is continuing for the spring. It continues to give us concern about the future enrollments for, certainly, our campus and other public institutions in Indiana.

Within the IUPUI campus, most schools experienced enrollment decreases both in headcount and in student credit hours. There were a few notable exceptions, although the percentage increases are perhaps small, in most cases. Allied Health, Law, and Social Work and the Columbus Center all experienced, by comparison, significant enrollment increases. Otherwise, the trends seem to be steady or down slightly.

BEPKO: We continue to have discussions with deans and with the Planning Committee of the Faculty Council and the administration about mission, vision, values, goals, and objectives as we try to create the framework for having a set of key indicators to show our progress as an institution and how we are increasing our impact and our outputs for the state of Indiana. You will be hearing more about that as the spring term unfolds.

Something else you will be hearing about which Dick Fredland will probably mention as well, is the creation of the Joint Committee on Learning to deal with teaching and scholarship. It is a joint committee because it is composed of Trustees of Indiana University and faculty of Indiana University working together. The joint committee had its first meeting in December and has designated some working groups that will prepare reports to go back to the larger joint committee. The working groups will deal with topics such as productivity, evaluation, technology, faculty development, student preparedness, part-time faculty and associate instructor training, and communicating with the public/reward systems. The working groups are meeting right now. I am the convener of the working group on productivity. The working group on productivity will be communicating with the campuses. The first point will be to reaffirm and to elaborate on the measures that we have used for determining productivity in the past; those having to do with increasing enrollments, increasing credit hours by an even greater amount than we increased enrollments, as we have said so often, suggesting that our students were making better progress toward their academic objectives; at the same time, increasing the external support that we have for our various activities and all of that while we are getting less money from the State. That is the kind of productivity that we have been emphasizing. We will continue to refine those measurements, but at the same time, there will have to be, as a result of Trustee interest, Higher Education Commission interest, and public concern more elaborate and refined measures of productivity. We will be working with some sample departments from different campuses to project models that the joint committee can use not only to determine what are the best ways of looking at productivity issues for our own internal purposes, but also for purposes of explaining faculty work to the larger public. I am sure you will hear more about that.

The Trustees will meet here next week for a retreat, a two-day meeting. Included will be an opportunity for us to talk about our priority objectives for this campus, a list of which was distributed here at the Faculty Council meeting last fall -- at the December meeting I believe, along with documents related to the mission, vision, values, goals, and objectives discussions. We will also have six faculty members making presentations at the Trustees' meeting on Wednesday in the morning. These presentations will be built around a theme. The theme is "External Support for Teaching Purposes." We know that all external support benefits the pedagogical activities of our faculty. Grants of every kind have an impact on the quality of our teaching, but there are some grants that are directly used for creating a better teaching program. Of the \$89 million or so that we received last year for faculty activities in general, about \$4.7 million was received for teaching grants. We are going to take six faculty members who have received grants for different types of teaching activities. There will be three from the general academic programs and three from medicine.

Also, at the Trustees' meeting, there will be a discussion of budget. The first analysis will be made of the problems that we confront for 1994-1995. On late Tuesday morning, there will be a discussion in the public session of the problems that we will confront if tuition increases are held to a limit roughly approximating the increase in the consumer price index. As you know, we have had a pattern of raising undergraduate tuition by something more than the cost of living, and, of course, we have raised graduate professional school tuition rates at an even faster pace. This year the Trustees have made even more comments and expressed even deeper concern about how rapidly tuition increases. There is more discussion about affordability. I think there will be very serious issues raised about how high tuition can be increased. Even though we are getting less money from the State, we may be limited in the amount by which tuition can be increased even more severely than we have been in the past. We are going to talk about how serious the problems will be if tuition, for example, is limited to the cost of living or say four percent increase rather than the seven percent that was projected for the 1993-1995 biennium.

There is a meeting tomorrow of the Commission for Higher Education and the Trustees of all the public institutions in the state. They will be talking about what the Commission sees as a crisis in higher education. The Commission has posed the issue this way, as I think we may have talked about before. They have said that we have to have somewhere between 20,000 and 40,000 more students studying at Indiana's universities, both public and private, in order to bring Indiana up to the national average of percentage of students studying in the postsecondary level. They pose a separate question and say, "How are we going to pay for that in that the state will not be able to afford to give much, if anymore, money to the institutions?" That, in their minds, raises questions of productivity. It raises questions of teaching more. That is going to be

a topic of discussion between the Trustees of all the institutions and the Commissioners tomorrow.

One final note. We will leave on the table, and you may pick them up as you leave today, copies of the most recent version of the "Mission Statement" that has been incorporated in the Commission for Higher Education materials. I thought you might want to have it for your information. Improvements have been made right along in this document. Recognize that this is not a real mission statement. It is not a statement of aspirations. It is not a statement that we would use ourselves to envision what our future will be. This is a statement of limitations to try to categorize and pigeon-hole campuses within the state so as to keep campuses from aspiring to things that would cost more money than the Commission for Higher Education thinks the state can afford. We think those are separate questions -- costs on the one hand and mission on the other. But, they have tied it together and come up with this statement of limitations. It is much better than it was. We have been put into our own separate category, as I think we have mentioned at previous meetings. We are now referred to as "Indiana's One Metropolitan University." You can see what is on this page if you would like to pick it up at the end of the meeting. Thank you.

MIRSKY: Who did you say prepared that page?

BEPKO: The staff of the Commission for Higher Education. We had our own mission statement and our own statement of vision, but the Commission staff and the Commissioners recognized that there will be a difference between what we do and what they do. Our mission statement and our vision for this university is going to be different because we are looking at the future and thinking about what we can become, what we are now in realistic terms, and how we can serve the state of Indiana best. What they are trying to do is limit what campuses will do because they are concerned about spending state money.

WARFEL: Are there any other comments or questions?

AGENDA ITEM II - PRESIDENT'S REPORT - RICHARD FREDLAND

FREDLAND: Thank you. After what Jerry just said, I say this almost every month and I will say it again. But, I would encourage you to tap your colleagues on their shoulders and get their noses out of their test tubes, books, or their computers to remind them of the things that Jerry has been mentioning because we can ill afford to be ignorant of this process. One of the things that I have become convinced, with perhaps nothing else in my year and one-half in this position, is how much our colleagues don't know about what is going on beyond the horizons of their desks, or their office, or their classroom. Just remind them that these things are happening because they need to be attentive to this. It does effect how our lives work.

Jerry said I should mention something about the Joint Committee on Teaching. It was part of our report last month. It is going on. We are still looking for ways to identify productivity. If you have any clever suggestions about we indeed can document the productivity of the faculty member, put it in writing and give it to me. I would very much welcome that. This is the philosophers' golden stone that we haven't been able to put our fingers on yet. It is not going to be a single thing. I am confident of that. The ways in which you can document how you can justify your keep.

Tomorrow is the last day to turn in nominees for the University Faculty Council election. If any of you have a nominee, you need to get in touch with Bernice in the Faculty Council Office. Likewise, you will shortly receive at-large election ballots for the IUPUI Faculty Council. We have completed the first round of nominations.

Jerry mentioned the Board of Trustees meeting which is here next week. I would highlight the fact that it is going to be on Tuesday and Wednesday. A lot of the sessions are open to the public. It is going to be in the Conference Center as early as 9:15 on Tuesday morning and periodically throughout Tuesday and concluding with an open business session at 1:00 on Wednesday. You can feel free to wander in to a lot of those sessions if you haven't got anything more productive to do.

The review of administrators for this year is under way I am pleased to report. The five administrators who are being reviewed this are Vice Chancellor Temple, Paul Bippen (Director of the Columbus Center), John Barlow (Dean, School of Liberal Arts), Trevor Brown (Dean, School of Journalism), and Michael Cozmanoff (Bursar). We await with great eagerness from last year the final report of the review of the Dean of the School of Medicine which we have great confidence will appear sometime.

Jerry is in the process of appointing, in collaboration with the leadership in student government and the Faculty Council, a committee on student evaluations. I brought the Sagamore to last month's meeting with the editorial to try to exploit more fully student evaluations of teachers so students may fertilize their grapevine about what courses to take and what courses not to take. This is probably, in the general steam of things, a good thing. It is probably not quite as easily done as some students would like to think it is, but we will be working at that.

We will be considering over the next few weeks a request from the faculty in the School of Allied Health to see if we can get them represented in the Faculty Council as a school as opposed to a subsidiary of the School of Medicine by their choice. It presents a constitutional dilemma that we are working on. If you have any profound thoughts on that, you may want to share them with members of the Executive Committee. If you have any strong objections, you may want to do that as well.

Finally, the University Faculty Council is going to meet on February 8 in Bloomington. It will finally deal with the Balanced Case, we hope. I thought you might like to know that. If you have instructions for your representatives on the University Faculty Council, you may want to feel free to let them have the benefit of your thinking on that subject.

WARFEL: Are there any questions or comments about Dick's report?

SPECHLER: Dick, as you know, President Ehrlich, at his first appearance to the University Faculty Council, raised three ideas concerning educational policy to raise the standards for our students and ourselves and to come back greatly inflation at the University as a whole. The most controversial of those proposals was to add to the grade report the percentage of students in any particular section receiving a grade higher than the one the student received the other ideas were for many FX and the time for withdrawing from classes. He recommended those three choices. My question is, what are we doing at IUPUI to examine the wisdom of those three changes?

FREDLAND: Your dutiful co-secretaries of the University Faculty Council sent it to the University Faculty Council's Educational Policies Committee for their consideration. We arbitrarily made the decision to consider them at the University level as opposed to the campus level. Nothing is specifically being done at IUPUI about that. It is before the committees of the University Faculty Council with a request that they report, I think in February, on that matter. I know that the chair of the committee, disagreeing with these proposals, refused to summon the committee to meet for a while. We have to work at that. These are not universally agreed upon values. They will be vented at the University Faculty Council level. Once they have been dealt with there they will ramify through the system. I happen to be a staunch supporter of the idea and as long as I am around I will keep the issues alive.

SPECHLER: I would have though that we learned something from the Balanced Case issue of allowing these things to be considered in their first instance at the University Faculty Council which is dominated by Bloomington representatives and not considering it here until after some unfavorable decision is made wherever the University Faculty Council meets. What is wrong with referring it to the Educational Policies Committee on this campus and get started on, what as I regard too, as a rather important matter?

FREDLAND: There is no reason not to. It would go to the Academic Affairs Committee on this campus and it could very well go there and, if it is your will, I will be glad to send to them and let them discuss it as well.

MIRSKY: I will be glad to second that if you need one to do anything.

YOKOMOTO: I am a member of the Academic Affairs Committee and it has already been brought up and it will be on the agenda.

WARFEL: I don't think a second is necessary.

MIRSKY: I was just indicating that I agree that we ought to be doing something instead of just sitting and waiting.

WARFEL: Are there any other comments or questions about Dick's report?

AGENDA ITEM III - ELECTION OF FACULTY BOARDS OF REVIEW

WARFEL: We will move on to agenda item III which is the election of the Faculty Boards of Review for the coming year and beyond. Susan Zunt is the chair of the Nominating Committee. She and her committee will distribute the ballots. Did you want to give any general instructions before they vote?

ZUNT: If I could, thank you. I would like to acknowledge the people who have worked so hard for you this last semester and are still working on the Nominating Committee. The Nominating Committee which you elected includes Karen Gable, Henry Besch, Frances Brahmi, Michael Cohen, Patricia Wittberg, and Paul Galanti. We will be distributing the ballots and will have the results for you this afternoon. Only elected members, ex officio members, and alternates may vote. If you are a visitor, you are not eligible to vote.

The results of the elections were as follows:

FACULTY BOARD OF REVIEW #1: Anne Belcher, Gerald Powers, Gerald Preusz, Patricia Wittberg

FACULTY BOARD OF REVIEW #2: Janice Froehlich

FACULTY BOARD OF REVIEW #3: Margaret Fierke, Paul Galanti, Donald Newell, Dixie Ray, Carl Rothe.

I move at this time that the Nominating Committee destroy the ballots and retain the tally sheet in the Faculty Council Office.

MCATEER: Does that mean that Board of Review #1 doesn't have a Law School representative?

ZUNT: A Law School representative, as a consultant, can be selected. If you have the right to identify a Law School faculty member to serve as a consultant. That person does not have to be an elected member of the Board.

WARFEL: Does the Nominating Committee have our permission to destroy the ballots? [yes]

AGENDA ITEM IV - CONTINUED "MAJOR ISSUES" DISCUSSION

WARFEL: While the Nominating Committee is counting the ballots, we will proceed with our discussion of the major issues that emerged from the TFFAA document. Once again, we will begin by considering the topic of combining at the campus level our promotion and tenure committees into a single joint IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Committee.

To refresh your memory, the Council voted strongly in favor of the idea of doing this. We have spent several meetings discussing a draft document, known as Draft Document 14, trying to decide exactly how we would do that, what the committee would be like, and how it would function. That document has been amended and we have been awaiting the advice of our Constitution and Bylaws Committee on Draft Document 14 since it is a bylaw change. Thanks to their hard work they have for us today a version of this document that comes from the committee as a substitute amendment for Document 14. Since it is coming from a committee it is seconded. We will be discussing the Constitution and Bylaws' version of this document.

Cyrus Behroozi, the chair of the committee this year is ill temporarily, therefore, Harriet Wilkins is here to lead us through this. Is everybody organized in their mind the version we had been working on was circulated with the agenda as IUPUI Circular 93-25A. Harriet is going to lead us through this document which was available on the front table as you came in today.

WILKINS: Let me make a couple of comments before we begin to talk about the changes that we are suggesting to you. As you well know, this document came to us in a somewhat extraordinary way. In the past, generally speaking, ideas for revisions to the bylaws and constitution have been presented to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee in an idea form and the language has been drafted by the committee and brought by the committee to the Council or the committee has consulted with people who are bringing proposals for amendment to the Council prior to actually bringing those proposals here.

In this case it was the reverse. The matter was brought to the Council and then when it was called to the Council's attention that this needed to be reviewed by the committee, it came to us. We talked first at considerable length about what our appropriate role was in relation to this matter. It was the opinion of the committee that it was not our role to deal with the substance of the proposal but rather to look at what we called constitutionality and the clarity of the language. Those are not always so easy to keep apart. What I mean to say is that this proposal which is before you today does not come either with the endorsement of, nor with the disapproval of, the Constitution and Bylaws Committee with regard to the matter of combining the tenure and promotion committees. We felt that was not our role and that what we should do was to be sure that this would fit properly into the Constitution and Bylaws as they exist and that the language should be as clear as possible to people who were not engaged in the original conversations.

As we worked through the matters in the draft and one of the other issues in our dealing with this is it was somewhat of a moving target as you well know. The form of the proposal which was originally given to us in November was changed at the December meeting. What you have before you is our work on the form of the proposal that came to you in December. That means that those items related to librarians were blacked out and the item about post-tenure review was blacked out so we did not consider those further. One of the difficulties that we experienced in looking at this matter was that there wasn't really anybody to have a conversation with. At the December meeting Cyrus brought to you an initial report from the committee in written form in which we addressed some questions which we felt were matters of substance and, therefore, really not appropriate for us to be dealing with. The problem is that the task force which drafted the original version was dissolved and so there was no "they" for us to have a conversation with. When we came up against something in the language which we felt was unclear, it was not easy to get a definitive statement about what that group may have intended in the first place.

What we decided to do, therefore, was to bring you a revised version of the draft and to call to your attention those places where we felt that the revision that we are presenting to you may be, in some sense, a substitute change. We call them "substitute changes" because, in reality, what has happened is that we looked at various ways that the original language might have been read and picked one. We wanted you to know that, that was the place where we felt that the language that we are proposing to you may not be exactly in accord with the intention of the original movers of this proposal, but where we felt, in order to achieve some clarity for those who had not been party to the discussion, some clarity needed to be provided. What you have in these pages, therefore, is the first page (front and back) is the proposed language for the amendment. We have noted in italics the words which we have changed or added and with asterisks those places where we have notes. On the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth pages you have that same text with our

notes are shown in boxes so that you can see something about our conversations and where we are coming from in that. We present it to you for your consideration and Kent or I will be glad to try to answer questions about the language that we are presenting.

WARFEL: Some of you may have been thinking about this document ever since December 2, but I would imagine many of you have not had it at the forefront of your thoughts. It might be useful for us to briefly go through it, section by section.

WILKINS: If you are going to do that, let me suggest that you turn to the third page where our comments are shown in the boxes. Let me simply say something about those. Some of the matters are simply matters for clarity, for example, putting in "the following" and making a list of the membership rather than having that all in the same sentence. We simply note for you that at the present time there are two units, at least from this circular, which would not have representation on this council with the language that is here. We have added the term "or unit" all the way through the document just because that is what the constitution generally does for some reason.

PLATER: Do you wish to discuss this section by section? I would like to comment on this first section but would you rather I wait until we have gone through the entire document?

WARFEL: I thought we would let her say whatever she has to say and then we would hopefully, in an orderly way, go through it.

WILKINS: Let me make one other comment about Section I which is the language "normally should". It was called to our attention that it is possible that there might be schools or units which would not have full professors or where the full professor would also be the chief administrator and we felt that this language would enable representation from those schools or units in the way that the original language did not.

WARFEL: In the first on Composition, the IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Committee... just taking that section for discussion purposes right now, we can see that the Constitution and Bylaws Committee has suggested in terms of clarity. One change of some substance from the document that we were working on is in the last sentence of the Composition section. Your committee's version says "the chair of the committee shall be elected from and by the elected members of the committee. That word "elected" is a new word.

WILKINS: That was in response to the action of the Council the last time where there were two sentences voted on the chairmanship of the committee. As we rewrote this and listed the membership to include the Dean of the Faculties as the third person there, it was our impression that the action of the Council in December was that the Dean of the Faculties was not to be the chair of the committee and it was that rearrangement which necessitated the term "elected."

WARFEL: I think what they actually voted on was that the Dean of the Faculties would not automatically be the chair, but saying that only the elected members could be chosen as the chair is saying something slightly different. I am not sure which was the Council's intention because I am not sure that it came up.

PLATER: We specifically said that the Dean of the Faculties could be elected.

WILKINS: Then the language at that point was not clear to us in the written version which we received from your action in December so you may want to strike that.

BYRNE: Will you accept a comment? I see a different sort of problem with the word "elected" because there is nothing in this document or in the present procedures that requires that representatives from units be elected.

WARFEL: If we could, could we stay on the issue of the sentence in question?

BYRNE: I thought I was discussing the word that was under discussion -- the word "elected."

WARFEL: What we are trying to discuss right now is whether or not the Dean of the Faculties could, under any circumstances, be chosen as the chairman of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

FREDLAND: I think it was the sense of the body that that was a possibility.

WILKINS: I would then presume that you would want to strike that. That was not the way the action was interpreted to us and it was not what we interpreted from the language that was passed.

WARFEL: I think it best if we could have a motion to amend this version by striking the word "elected" in that line.

VESSELY: So moved.

WARFEL: Is there a second? (It was seconded) All of those in favor of the amendment, to strike the word "elected" say "Aye." All of those opposed? Ed, do you want to get back to your concern?

BYRNE: My concern is now nullified.

WILKINS: If I might comment on Section II which is the language from the original draft, it deals with the selection of the membership and, indeed, all of the membership, except the Dean of the Faculties, are to be elected by various bodies. There is no change there in substance from the original proposal.

WARFEL: Before we slip into the second section about election of the committee, are there other comments about the composition changes?

MIRSKY: I just wanted to ask the question whether "normally should". I know what you said the intent was which was to take care of those schools which perhaps don't have available full, tenured professors. Could "normally should" the way the sentence reads now be applied to a school that does have tenured, full professors but in some way an associate professor, for example, was put up under this wording? There is nothing in there that says "normally" should hold an appointment at the rank of professor in those schools which do not have available.

WILKINS: I think that would be a possible interpretation and you might want to limit that.

MIRSKY: That would bother me. I think perhaps it ought to be qualified for those schools which do not have available whatever that word was. You should have indicated that "normally should" applies only in exceptional cases where suitable faculty are not available.

WARFEL: Is there anything else about the composition?

N. FINEBERG: If we want to reword that, we have to be really careful because I have a unit which only has one full professor. If you say that if there is a full professor, they have to serve and they would be there forever. I would opt for leaving it as "normally should" with an understanding of the intent.

WARFEL: Are there any other comments on this point?

YOKOMOTO: The problem with the words "normally should" is that sometimes we forget where the seal of authority is. Is that on the choice of the school or is that the choice of a _____ and where does the power lie?

FREDLAND: I think the answer to that is in the next paragraph -- "School or unit representatives shall be elected by the respective promotion and tenure committee of each school or unit from among its eligible

members in accordance with the procedures established by each school or unit." So the enforcement of this is at the level of the school. If you send your guy over the campus committee, it should be according to your school's procedures. We have lots of schools that are not organized very effectively to do this I might add. So, by default the power gets reversed.

VESSELY: It has been my experience that "normally should" is an advisory statement. If you had to do that, it wouldn't say "normally should."

PLATER: On a slightly different point, I appreciate the explanation of why the term "or unit" was added, but I think in this particular instance adding the phrase "or unit" would complicate matters unduly and allow for or possibly invite units with schools to think that they might be able to elect their own representatives. It was clearly the intent of the committees that proposed this document that membership on the promotion and tenure committee would come from a school and not any other unit. I think the two units which you refer to here -- Music and Continuing Studies -- are both schools. They are not units. They are schools. They just don't happen to have five full-time faculty members. So, I would ask that we remove the term "or unit" from this section of the bylaws to be very clear that membership on the committee is limited only to a person elected by a school.

WARFEL: Taking that as a motion, is there a second to remove the term "or unit" in Section 17

PETERSON: What is the intent of the unit there? Does the Constitution and Bylaws Committee have an intent in stating "or unit"?

WARFEL: That is the typical language throughout both the University Constitution and the IUPUI Constitution. We were just trying to be consistent, but if there was some real intent in excluding that, I think that would be up to this body. I would just suggest that, if you want that deleted, that we delete it all the way through and you don't have to make an amendment every time.

HOYT: If librarians are added afterwards, you would have to put a separate statement concerning libraries instead of a school.

WARFEL: I have some handouts concerning that, but I thought we should deal with this first. We have a motion to remove the "or unit" originally just in the Composition section and possibly throughout the entire document. Do I have a second? (It was seconded)

SIDHU: Will the librarians be considered as a school or a unit?

WARFEL: They will be considered as library. Is there anymore discussion on this motion to amend the substitute language?

PLATER: Dick may want to read the section which he found in the Constitution which defines a unit. It would be possible for a unit to be a center or some other program that is organized in such a way that it has a director as a head which would mean that unit might then request to have its own representative on the promotion and tenure committee. Again, I think this is not what the committees had in mind when they proposed the language here.

FREDLAND: I am reading from Article III, Section D of the Constitution. "The rights and responsibilities of Article II are exercised by academic units within the University through faculty organization established by those units... In order to exercise the rights and responsibilities of Article II, an academic unit must have as its head a dean or director who reports directly to the Chancellor of IUPUI or the Chancellor of Indiana University Bloomington."

BESCH: As the author of that language I can assure you that it was written for two purposes -- to preserve the _____ act of not calling the library "schools", first, and secondly, to touch on an earlier point that was

made today, so that the School of Allied Health, which is a part of the School of Medicine in the way it is organized, does not, therefore, report directly to the Dean.

WARFEL: Are there any other discussion of the point under consideration?

ROTHER: In Section I it says specifically the School of Medicine gets three representatives and Allied Health gets one representative.

BESCH: (Could not understand)

ROTHER: The one in the Constitution, it seems to me, "unit" is a generic term not a specific one.

FREDLAND: But a unit has to have a dean reporting to the Chancellor.

WARFEL: We have schools that aren't units.

J. KECK: I think that Henry's comment, as one of the authors who came up with the idea "unit", it would appear that those units doesn't have the meaning, that meaning isn't needed anymore in their statement if we have a separate reference to librarians and Allied Health is specifically mentioned. I would support removing reference to unit also.

WARFEL: Is the Council ready to vote? All of those in favor of eliminating the term "or unit" say "Aye." All of those opposed? [unanimous] Are there other comments about the Composition section?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Is the intent that those members shall be senior members of the faculty; that is, associate and full professors? Because the University has tenured faculty at assistant professor ranks and if the intent is to have these members at the associate or full professor rank, then I would suggest that what we ought to say is that _____ the faculty shall be tenured members of the faculty holding senior rank, preferably at the full professor level. Because the shall means this is what will happen. I think that the intent of this group was that then there is also preference that these members be full professors.

WILKINS: It seems to me that that is addressed by the original committee in the second part of that sentence.

WARFEL: Were you making a motion?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I would make that motion because I think otherwise if you want assistant professors on this, unless you exclude them specifically, a tenured, assistant professor could be appointed by a unit or a school.

ALIPRANTIS: Could you remove the word "normally" and leave the word "should"? (Could not understand the rest)

WARFEL: Is there a second to that motion?

BESCH: I will second it.

WARFEL: Is there any discussion of Professor Aliprantis' motion which is to strike the word "normally"?

ORME: I know we are trying not to bleed in the librarians, but there is wording which is the librarians' draft of this document that might be helpful. I would like to read it at this time:

All members of the committee shall be tenured, and to the extent practicable, should hold appointment at the rank of professor or librarian.

Hopefully, that would address the issue that we term, amongst ourselves, a critical issue. The issue, which you mentioned, of having one full ranked available or quite possibly, in the case of librarians of which very few have full rank who may be supervisors.

WARFEL: That may be helpful but now we have to discuss whether or not to strike the word "normally". Is there any other discussion about striking the word "normally"?

PORTER: If you strike the word "normally", you are still left with "should" which is not a mandate. So, if we take out normally, it is a little more of a mandate?

WARFEL: Are you suggesting that that may not be the most critical part of the document? Are there any other comments to the point? All of those in favor of striking the word "normally", say "Aye." All of those opposed to striking the word "normally", say "Aye." [The vote was about even]

All of those in favor of striking the word "normally", please raise your hands. All of those opposed to striking the word "normally", please raise your hands. The results are 29 in favor and 22 against. Therefore, the word "normally" will be stricken.

Librarian Orme, did you want to pursue your statement.

ORME: It seems to me that I will at some point. Whether this is the time to speak to this issue, I am not sure.

WARFEL: Shall we proceed to the section on Election?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: What do the rules say about an ex officio member being chairman of that committee?

WARFEL: The Roberts' Rules?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Can an ex officio member of that committee be the chairman of that committee?

FREDLAND: An ex officio member of a committee is a full member of the committee.

BEPKO: Let me see if I can state the question as to whether an ex officio member can be elected chair in general? I don't think it matters what is true in general, or what is true under Roberts' Rules of Order. We just voted a few minutes ago to say that the only ex officio member that, I think, now that is serving could be elected chair. So, whether in general it is true that ex officio members can be chair or otherwise, we certainly have already resolved in our own thinking that an ex officio member can be. We can write our own rules for this purpose. We don't have to be guided by any convention from Roberts' Rules of Order or otherwise.

WARFEL: As a matter of fact I am an ex officio member of this body.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Are you voting or non-voting?

FREDLAND: She is a voting member.

GNAT: According to Roberts' Rules of Order, you are a voting member unless stated otherwise.

FREDLAND: Ex officio only determines how you get here. It doesn't have anything to do with your responsibility once you get to the body.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We are accepting the statement under 1. Composition where it states "the Dean of the Faculties *who* shall serve as a member ex officio without vote. I wanted to be clear on that.

WILKINS: That was the language that you adopted at your December meeting.

ROTHERS: As I recall, Roberts' Rules very clearly says that ex officio means they have the full rights of being a member.

WARFEL: Thank you. Let's move on to the Election portion of the document. Are there any questions or comments about this section?

HOYT: To be consistent are we taking out "or unit"?

WARFEL: Yes, we are removing "or unit" throughout the document.

ROTHERS: Could you clarify something for me something in the second line. It says ...from among its eligible members... The word "its", is that the school or what? It seems to me that it would be helpful if that is the case, it should state "School representatives from among its eligible members shall be elected... Otherwise, you could imply that they could come only from the schools tenure committee.

WILKINS: This is the language that was in the original version. I think it was our reading that that was the intent. That is the reason that we put this note in here to you that it appears to us that this does indeed have, if that is the accurate reading, certain restrictions on what schools and units can do in terms of constituting their tenure committees. I think that is unclear so we didn't deal with that.

WARFEL: The people who are eligible to be elected to the campus committee are the people who are serving on the school's promotion and tenure committee. Is that what we mean?

ROTHERS: But, my problem is that major school's term of election is different than a term ____ so therefore they would be off their school's promotion committee and most schools might want to pick somebody who had served on the committee several terms.

WARFEL: So, you wish to substitute "from among ~~the schools~~ eligible members...?

ROTHERS: I move for it to read as follows: "School representatives, from among its eligible members, shall be elected by the respective promotion and tenure committee of each school in accordance with procedures established by each school."

WILKINS: The difficulty is that it is not clear as to what "its" refers to. Another option would be to replace "its" with "the school".

WARFEL: I think that would be clearer to most of us.

WILKINS: So, it would read "School representatives shall be elected by the respective promotion and tenure committee of each school from among the school's eligible members..."

WARFEL: Is there a second. [It was seconded] Is there any more discussion about this.

PETERSON: I think there is an intent in the original wording, at least from my perspective, that those people either are currently on or have some significant experience on the ____ school level or at the promotion and tenure level. Otherwise, how can they represent the people who are going forward to the next level? If we totally leave out that ~~prospective~~ and that is what I think that is what the "its" really did refer to that someone who was currently on that school's promotion and tenure committee. I think we lost something that should be preserved.

WARFEL: Possibly. Remember it is only the school's promotion and tenure committee that is involved in making the decisions. I think it would be unlikely for them to send an uninformed person.

J. KECK: I don't know why I am speaking against the motion. I _____ the idea that the members who were never sent to the campus promotion and tenure committee had been a member of the school's promotion and tenure committee that year. I think that person is much more able to advocate appropriately for the candidate if that person has been involved with the discussions about that candidate's dossier _____.

WARFEL: Are there other comments regarding this substitution?

MEISS: That sounds like a conflict of interest. If you pass judgment on somebody at one level and then head them off at the pass...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It was my understanding that it would be left up to each school to decide how to what procedure they would use.

WARFEL: You are suggesting that the interpretation of "its" is the local...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I would (could not understand)

BESCH: Would it be possible to have both things by saying, "...from among the school's current..." If you would accept a friendly amendment to say "...the school's current..."

WARFEL: I think that dramatically changes the intent of the original substitution.

SPECHLER: I no where see the provision that a representative from the school _____ case of every candidate who comes from her/his school. If Dick Peterson thinks that that is the intent, I respect his experience, but suggest that he ought to be in favor of going even further and requiring that the representatives of the IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Committee be a member of the committee who voted in favor of that candidate.

WARFEL: We have before us a motion to substitute the words "the school's" for "its" so that the Election paragraph would begin by saying:

School representatives shall be elected by the respective promotion and tenure committee of each school from among the school's eligible members in accord with procedures established by each school.

GALANTI: A point of clarification. Does "eligible" mean eligible for the combined promotion and committee at IUPUI or eligible to be a member of the school's promotion and committee?

WARFEL: That means eligible for election. All of those in favor of the substitution of the words "the school's", say "Aye." All of those opposed to the substitution of the words "the school's", say "Aye." [A few] Motion passes. Are there other comments about the Election section?

FREDLAND: On the second page, the paragraph that appears at the top of the page provides that "Elections shall be held prior to November 1; the dean or chief administrator of each school shall notify the Dean of the Faculties of the name of the representative... We have just gone through an elaborate process of getting this person elected by procedures determined by the school. It strikes me that the faculty ought to be sufficiently competent to notify the Dean of the Faculties office who got elected by their own procedures and not have to rely upon the dean to convey that information to convey that information. So, I would like to suggest that we substitute ~~the concept of President of the Faculty~~, or whatever the corresponding idea would be, at the school level. I have an ulterior motive and that is to try to identify the responsibilities that faculty have and hold them accountable for this as opposed to passing off our responsibilities to deans who have plenty responsibilities of their own.

WARFEL: In the first paragraph of the section on Election, Dick's motion, I think, is that the sentence should read: "Elections shall be held prior to November 1; the ~~dean~~ head of faculty governance of each school shall

notify the Dean of the Faculties..." Is that your substitution?

FREDLAND: That is my substitution?

WARFEL: Is there a second? [seconded] Is there any discussion about this?

GALANTI: Some schools do not have a person designated as the head of the faculty. Would it better if we refer to the chair of the promotion and tenure committee who I think would be an appropriate person to relay the result of the election?

WARFEL: Is that friendly?

FREDLAND: I consider it very hostile. [laughter] I said I had an ulterior motive. Get yourself a president if you don't have one.

WARFEL: I guess we are _____ the faculty governance since we can't amend an amendment to an amendment. Are we ready to vote on substituting "the head of the faculty governance"?

ZUNT: I have a comment. I think it is very difficult, even when you have an elected faculty member, they may not have adequate support staff and sufficient clerical support to make this sort of notification done. At least the deans' offices generally have administrative clerical support / staff support and this sort of thing. Deans are generally are (COULD NOT UNDERSTAND) referring to this statement. So, if it requires that the deans give this information, then there will be _____.

J. KECK: As a current president of a local school's faculty council, it is my responsibility to notify somebody no matter whether it is the dean or whoever. I would just as soon skip that middle person. If I have to send written notification to somebody, I would just as soon send it to the Dean of the Faculties. As a president, I don't think it is going to save me that much. I already have to send that information about unit representatives to this body, etc. I don't think this would add that much.

WARFEL: Are there any other comments at this point before we vote on it? All of those in favor of changing so it reads the head of the faculty governance instead of the dean or chief administrator, say "Aye." All of those opposed, say "Nay." I think the Ayes have it. Are there other comments about the Election section? If not, we will move to the Terms of Office section.

WILKINS: We call to your attention here that the draft which we had before us was very ambiguous at this point. In the current constitution, under the Tenure Committee, it is very clear that terms run from the 1st of July until end of June. What I will say now is just a personal opinion not the opinion of the committee. It is my sense that the terms of the at large members would run from the May meeting of the Council when they were elected their successor was elected and the representatives whose ~~schools~~ would run from November to November. But, that was not stated in the original document. We do not offer any language about that. If you want us to try to deal with that, we will. What was in the language of the original proposal was simply when these elections were supposed to take place and the number of years that people were to serve but the beginning and ends of terms were not stated.

One other thing. You notice that we have suggested language about the election of the chair. In the action which you took in December you did not say anything about when the chair was to be elected and how long the chair was to serve. We, therefore, took it upon ourselves to make a recommendation to you.

BESCH: One other point that is not mentioned. The last line states "No member of the committee may serve more than six consecutive years." That would include the ex officio members.

WILKINS: Perhaps there is a place you want to put elected in?

WARFEL: Are you moving to add "elected" there so it would read "No ~~elected~~ member of the committee may serve more than six consecutive years.

BESCH: Yes.

WARFEL: Is there a second? [seconded] Is there any discussion? All in favor, say "Aye." All opposed, say "Nay." [passed]

ROTHE: Is it not important to know when the term starts?

WARFEL: There is kind of a ~~rhythm~~ to the year. I suppose the elections shall be held prior to November 1.

WILKINS: You have three members being elected in May and you have other members who are being elected in the fall. It is not clear as to when the committee begins its work and I don't know what the intentions of the original committee were and, quite frankly, just in getting our report to you, that was something that we didn't get back to. Perhaps the original task force intended for the terms to be staggered.

PLATER: The practice that we follow now is that each December the separate promotion and tenure committees are convened for an orientation session prior to their beginning work in January. It was my assumption that would be the time at which an election would take place because all eligible persons would then have been identified by the November 1 deadline. That would be the time to go through the rules of operation, the procedures to be followed, the calendar for meetings, etc. Whether it was done under the auspices of the Executive Committee or the Dean of the Faculties wouldn't make much difference practically as long as that were the time frame in which the election were held.

PETERSON: You are talking about the certain amount of work on the part of the committee which used to consider the dossiers that come forward, but I feel there are other responsibilities of the committee that might be ongoing responsibilities throughout the year considering things like the procedures that are in the school, if necessary. Some of those might be better handled in the fall. I don't understand why we would have to put this as late as November 1. It seems to me that the promotion and tenure committees, at the school level, certainly must start functioning in the fall when they begin to consider their dossiers. There is no reason why those committees couldn't immediately elect that representative that would go and then you have an over-complement to the committee in the event that there was business to be brought before them.

PLATER: I have two comments. One is that I would assume that the chair, once elected, say in November, would serve through the year. If that person were not to be on the committee the following year, that would pose a problem for the early fall months. But, more than likely, there is not going to be that kind of business coming before the committee.

On a practical side, there are some schools that, for whatever reason, have difficulty meeting the deadline; an October deadline would be hard for some schools to meet and identifying who will be their representative for the promotion and tenure committee. The committees may be operating but for some reason or another it is hard for them to identify who their representative will be for the school. Each year we have to call at least two or three schools and urge that they identify the person so we can begin having orientation meetings even as late as late November or early December.

WARFEL: Would there be anything wrong with the term "starting November 1 and ending October 31?"

PETERSON: For the people who are elected to the Council, as we said earlier, I suppose we could delay their entrance into the committee until that date. It seems reasonable to have a consistent start date for all members of the committee.

VESSELY: The election is simply done in May because that is the last Council meeting. You are elected in May but you don't start until November.

ROTHE: I move that the following sentence be added: Term of office shall start December 1. I use that date because traditionally it has worked.

WARFEL: Where do you wish to insert it?

ROTHE: Right after ...consecutive years... and before The chair shall be elected annually.

WILKINS: You may want to have that as the first sentence in that section. In other words, it would read "Terms of office shall begin on December 1..."

WARFEL: Is there a second? [seconded] Is there any discussion?

SCHWECKE: Why are we moving it later? It already says to be elected by November 1.

WARFEL: Probably because traditionally the Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee revs up at the beginning of December.

SCHWECKE: Would that include having orientation sessions?

PLATER: It would give a lot more flexibility. I think November 1 would be as good a date as December 1.

WARFEL: Promotion is December 1. Are there other comments? All of those in favor of adding the sentence "Terms of office shall start December 1" as the first sentence in the section on Terms of Office please say "Aye." All those opposed, say "Nay." The ayes have it. Are there other comments about the Terms of Office?

Let's tackle the last section which is Responsibilities.

WILKINS: I would like to make a couple of comments. One of the problems that the committee has had is that Henry Karlson, who is the Parliamentarian for this body and also a member of our committee, has not been available recently. He is probably the only person who knows what this means. This needs to be addressed but we felt that this was not the time to do that.

WARFEL: As we reminded the Council earlier, the current Bylaws regarding the Tenure Committee: assigned responsibilities to the Tenure Committee a, c, and g are basically repetitions of what is already assigned to our current Tenure Committee. I think what a probably means is that this group is supposed to keep an eye on promotion and tenure policies within the University in general. For example, if Bloomington comes up with a crazy idea, this body would help us.

WILKINS: The second item, b, the original language looked to us like nobody could be considered for full professor. Since we presumed that people would have normally gotten tenure before they were coming up for full professor, that is why we put the "and/or" in there. It was strictly "and" in the original draft document.

The other item which was added is "g" which is in the current Bylaws and provides for an initiation of an investigation by an individual faculty member. We felt that was a substantive change. The committee felt that that was a loss in the draft that came from the committee and would recommend that you put it back in.

This last item was half of the item that you passed on December 2. One of the things we tried to do was to be a bit more consistent than the original document of having things in particular segments of the document, so here is where duties were discussed.

WARFEL: With that, the section of Responsibilities is open for discussion.

PORTER: In returning, what is now g, to the document, was there discussion also ____ of the promotion process?

WILKINS: No, there was not that discussion. We just took the language directly from the current bylaws section on the tenure committee.

PORTER: I would like to make a motion to amend section g to insert in line two, insert "~~promotion and~~" so it would read

Investigate and evaluate, when requested to do so by any faculty member or librarian, the
~~promotion or and~~ tenure...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I second that.

WARFEL: There is a second. That amendment is now open for discussion. All of those in favor, say "Aye." All of those opposed, say "Nay." [Motion passed]

PLATER: I am not sure that the Implementation Committee discussed this issue thoroughly. I wouldn't want to speak on behalf of the Implementation Committee. My own thinking in why that was omitted is that the Faculty Board of Review process is the better and more effective way for individual faculty to address these kinds of issues than through this committee, particularly in its combined form. I would like to urge that we consider not adding item "g" back in. Instead, saying to ourselves that, if an individual faculty is concerned about procedural issues, that it can be addressed through the Faculty Board of Review process.

WARFEL: Is there a second to that motion? **VESSELY:** Second.

WARFEL: We can discuss it now.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I thought the responsibility of the Board of Review was to look at specific cases and this group was looking at the process rather than individual differences ____.

MEISS: I would echo that. I think means that any interested faculty member, whether they are applying for promotion or tenure, should be able to request this review.

VESSELY: It seems to me, at least in reviewing those cases, that if a sufficient number of that involved the process which included the department chairperson or the chief academic officer, so the report only goes back that far anyway, at least in a number of cases, it ends up in a board of review anyhow because the investigation is done and the report is made to the person who was part of the problem gets the report and the conversation is over. So, if you go a step further then there is a board of review anyhow. So, it seems that unless that report is made to the level above where the system potentially breaks down, it ought to be left up to the board of review. Any faculty member can make that same request. It doesn't have to be in the case of a specific person's problems.

MCATEER: I would say that the Faculty Boards of Review are probably equipped to analyze the problems and procedure regarding and individual. They may not be equipped to analyze ____ a procedure within its school or unit. It seems to me that the body in question that deals with these problems of promotion and tenure is the group that knows how things out to be done.

WARFEL: Are there any other comments to this point? The motion is to eliminate paragraph "g". All of those in favor of eliminating paragraph "g", please say "Aye." All of those opposed to eliminating paragraph "g", please say "Nay." [Nays have it. Are there other comments about Responsibilities?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I have a question regarding "g" as to whether or not the "or unit" should be deleted here also since we deleted it everywhere else?

WARFEL: It is a little bit different use of it. My interpretation is that this "unit" is not like the others.

SPECHLER: On paragraph "g", I think that this really goes too far by mandating an investigation or evaluation following the request of any faculty member. This committee is already asked to do a very large and important task for the university, but "g" opens them up to a larger amount of additional work on the request of a single faculty member when that request may have already been considered by other bodies and may have no merit whatsoever. I would suggest amending "g" to say, "to receive requests by any faculty member to investigate and evaluate... and to make a written report... leaving open the possibility that the committee, in their wisdom, consider that the request is without apparent merit.

WARFEL: Would you please repeat the language?

SPECHLER: I move to amend paragraph "g" to say

To receive requests by any faculty member or librarian to investigate and evaluate the tenure process and to make a written report...

WARFEL: Is there a second?

MIRSKY: I second it.

WILKINS: May I ask a question? That means they would not then ever investigate or evaluate?

SPECHLER: No, of course not. The idea is to give them the expression to investigate when the matters is to be waived, but the way it is written, I think we are giving the lawyers of this community yet another way to attack tenure decisions when they are made in an unfavorable way. That is the a direction we should not be going.

WILKINS: Then, may I suggest that you might want to say "Receive requests from individual faculty members... and, if appropriate, to investigate and evaluate.... It seems to me that the language that you gave, in a sense, prohibited their actually conducting an investigation.

SPECHLER: That is fine. Then it would state, "To receive requests, to investigate and evaluate and, if appropriate, ...

GALANTI: Another change that will have to be made because it then goes on to say "and make a written report as a result of such investigation and evaluation **CHANGED TAPE AT THIS POINT**)

SPECHLER: ...to be discretionary on both. It is to "receive a request, to investigate and evaluate, if appropriate, and to make a written report of the results.

VESSELY: Results of the request?

SPECHLER: Yes.

SPECHLER: Or, if appropriate, the evaluation.

BEPKO: As a result of whatever action they decide to take.

SPECHLER: Yes.

WARFEL: To make a written response to the faculty.

ROTHER: I am going to vote against that motion because it seems to me "request" is not a mandate. So, to any request, the committee can say "I am sorry." If you want it to be a mandate, you have to use something other than request.

WARFEL: Are we ready to vote? Do you understand what this would say if we vote in favor of it? [The reply was no] I think it would say "To receive requests by any faculty member or librarian to investigate the promotion and tenure process of any department or unit and, if appropriate, to act and to make a written response to the faculty member making the request and to the department chairperson or the chief administrative officer of the unit."

MIRSKY: Madam chair, "if appropriate, needs to be earlier."

BYRNE: Madam chair, I would like to move a substitute amendment.

WARFEL: This is a substitute amendment which is being amended and we cannot amend an amendment to an amendment.

BYRNE: I want to suggest a substitute to the amendment before the floor. In the absence of a parliamentarian, I ask any parliamentarian to say whether I may make a substitute or not.

BESCH: You may.

BYRNE: I would like to suggest that all reference to "as need or requested" be stricken and "as needed or requested" to be added after "shall".

WARFEL: Somehow that seems like more than a substitute.

WILKINS: It seems to me that what is before the floor right now is dealing only with "g" and the language you are talking about is dealing with other items and perhaps you need to finish dealing with "g" first.

WARFEL: We will get to that. Can we continue with paragraph "g"?

MEISS: We might remind people that the last half of the sentence which begins The IUPUI Promotions and Tenure Committee shall... The wording that was just proposed ____.

ORME: Dr. Mirsky, it was my understanding that when the original motion was made, "if appropriate" would come earlier in that sentence, it would read something like: "Receive requests by any faculty member or librarian and, if appropriate, investigate and evaluate..."

MIRSKY: Exactly.

SIDHU: Who is going to decide whether it is appropriate or not?

WARFEL: The committee.

SIDHU: You are trying to change the language so that the amendment can be defeated one way or the other, but the intent was that every faculty member has the right for making that kind of request.

WARFEL: Yes, and that is still true.

SIDHU: That is what we are taking away from the faculty.

WARFEL: No. Every faculty member has the right to ask the Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee to investigate and evaluate the process that goes on their department or their unit. And, if the committee believes that it is not a frivolous request, they can ____ to do it.

SIDHU: We would like to have the exact language of the motion to be made.

WILKINS: The motion, as I understand it, would read:

Receive requests from any faculty member or librarian and, if appropriate, investigate and evaluate the promotion and tenure process of any department or unit and make a written report to the faculty member making the request, to the department chairperson, the chief administrative officer of the unit.

MCATEER: Does that mean that a faculty member can request the evaluation of (could not understand)?

WARFEL: Yes.

MCATEER: Does that mean that the Promotion and Tenure Committee can then be used as a resource by a Board of Review? The Board of Review is stuck (could not understand)

WARFEL: Yes.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I would like to call the question.

WARFEL: We have a motion to call the question which is undebatable. Is there a second to the motion?

FREDLAND: I second it.

WARFEL: It is undebatable. All of those in favor of voting on this switching the language in paragraph "g", say "Aye." Opposed? I think we have at least two-thirds Ayes. So, we are now going to vote on the new language for "g". Is everyone clear on what the new language for "g" is? All of those in favor of the new language, say "Aye." All of those opposed to the new language, say "Nay." Is there any doubt about how that came out? [none] Are there any other comments about Responsibilities?

PLATER: On item e, the intent, I think, of the Implementation Committee was not to have the Promotion and Tenure Committee taking up issues of criteria which may very well properly belong to the Faculty Affairs Committee, but to consider the documents which specify standards used to interpret the criteria. This term "standards" is used elsewhere, in the Academic Handbook, to refer to the documents prepared at the department or school levels. At the campus level it would be the guidelines for the preparation of promotion and tenure dossiers. It would be my contention that this committee is better able than any other committee to evaluate those documents and their effectiveness in assisting individual faculty because that is what this committee does. It looks at the dossiers and each year should be able to give advice and feedback both to the campus and to the individual schools on how they can make their own standards, as the term is here used, better. I would urge the original language be retained and that we understand that this committee is looking at the standards as opposed to criteria, I think, there is a clear difference between standards for interpretation and the criteria.

WILKINS: Is that clear that the original language was primary unit in campus levels in item "e"? We saw potential conflict there with the current responsibilities of the Faculty Affairs Committee.

PLATER: I think that what I would propose is adding the "and campus" back in but also have this body understand the distinction between the standards that are used to interpret criteria, which is what this body will take up, and the criteria which may very well properly belong to the Faculty Affairs Committee.

WARFEL: The motion you are making is for "e" to read:

Review as needed the requested documents which specify standards that are used at the primary, unit, and campus levels...

Is there a second to adding "and campus" back in?

FREDLAND: I second it.

WARFEL: Is there any discussion about that? All of those in favor say "Aye." Opposed? [a few] Are there other things about Responsibilities?

ORME: Could we return to paragraph "g" for a moment? For the sake of consistency to add "or librarians" at the end of the third line.

WARFEL: Would you read what the third line is now?

ORME: A faculty member or librarian...

WILKINS: ... to make a written report to the faculty member or librarian...

WARFEL: Is there a second? [Seconded] Is there any discussion? All of those in favor, say "Aye". All of those opposed? [none] Are there other comments about Responsibilities?

Let me remind you where we are. We had Draft Document 14 as appeared in Circular 93-25A before us. We are now considering the motion to substitute this as we just worked on it for that draft document. We will be switching this draft, as we have amended it, for the old draft. Are we ready to vote on whether or not we want to substitute today's draft as we have worked on it for last month's draft? All of those in favor of substituting the drafts, say "Aye." All of those opposed? [none]

The hour is late and how is this for a plan? We will get a clean version of this as we have amended it today. At the next meeting we continue with the librarians amendments which don't call for that much controversy into the discussion. Then, pending other discussion, we might vote on accepting the document at our next meeting rather than pursuing it more today.

PETERSON: Will the librarians' document be distributed to us then?

WARFEL: We will distribute it at the meeting. I think we will leave the issue of "major discussions" for today. Thank you very much, Harriet, and your committee for all of the work that you have done. Thanks to the Council for being so diligent and thoughtful about the content.

AGENDA ITEM V - QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

WARFEL: We have a question-and-answer period and new business on our agenda. We have six minutes. Does anyone have any questions they would like to ask?

SPECHLER: This question is against the background of declining enrollments in many of the schools at IUPUI. We in the department of economics on this campus, along with the other departments of economics, note with some alarm the fact that at least two of the professional schools at IUPUI and elsewhere at Indiana University are now offering courses which are essentially substitutes for courses that we have been offering for many years. Some people regard this as "poaching." But, I prefer not to condemn such competition out of hand. My question for either Dean Plater or Chancellor Bepko is, what is the procedure for deciding on a disinterested basis and on the merits whether professional schools can begin to offer courses which are essentially similar to the ones received for years from other units of this university? We were promised by Dean Plater in informing Responsibility Center Budgeting that there would be a kind of public utilities commission and that such competition would not be allowed without some kind of minor consideration. Now, again, we don't object to competition. We do object to duplication in times of budgetary stringencies and if unfair competition is to be allowed in this area, we in the economics department would like to know whether we will be allowed to offer courses in environmental science, management, securities law, and nursing and if so, to whom do we apply?

PLATER: If it is possible to defer the last part of your question to another meeting, I will try to respond to the first part. In the interest of trying to avoid creating committees that perhaps weren't needed or whose charge would be ill-formed, we have not yet created the kind of regulatory commission that you referred to. But, this specific issue has arisen and there is the beginnings of a plan to address it. The current thought is that we already have an effective body for addressing these concerns at the graduate level -- the Graduate Affairs Committee -- which in effect has played that role for many years. We do not have a parallel body for undergraduate courses or degree programs. The tentative plan is to create a committee or perhaps a subcommittee of the Council of Undergraduate Learning, which is composed of representatives of all the schools as well as appropriate committees of this body, to deal with issues of undergraduate education and to ask this committee to play a parallel role to the Graduate Affairs Committee in reviewing new course proposals and substantive changes in undergraduate degree programs. It has not yet even been written as a draft. It will come forward to this body for further discussion before we enact it. But, that is the plan to respond to the very issue that you have raised, Martin. It is an important issue and it needs to be addressed.

There have been a few particular cases that have come up recently and they have been addressed on an ad hoc basis by inviting the parties of the concerned units to sit down and discuss the resolution and, thus far to my knowledge, all specific disputes have been resolved. It is clear that we need a more systematic way of reviewing major changes in undergraduate programs.

WARFEL: Are there any other questions?

AGENDA ITEM VI - UNFINISHED BUSINESS

[Due to the lateness of the hour there was not time for unfinished business.]

AGENDA ITEM VII - NEW BUSINESS

[Due to the lateness of the hour there was not time for new business.]

AGENDA ITEM VIII - ADJOURNMENT

WARFEL: The meeting is adjourned.

**INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY INDIANAPOLIS
FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING
FEBRUARY 3, 1994
LAW SCHOOL, ROOM 116
3:30 - 5:30 P.M.**

PRESENT: ADMINISTRATION: Chancellor Gerald Bepko, Dean William Plater. DEANS: Barbara Fischler, P Nicholas Kellum, Sheldon Siegel, William Voos. ELECTED FACULTY: C. D. Aliprantis, Patricia Blake, Edmund Byrne, Elaine Cooney, Theodore Cutshall, Naomi Fineberg, Richard Fredland, Paul Galanti, Gareth Gilkey, Jean Gnat, Linda Adele Goodine, Dolores Hoyt, Norman Hudson, Jerome Kaplan, Juanita Keck, Robert Keck, Raymond Koleski, Joseph Koss, Diane Leland, Eric Long, James McAteer, Dana McDonald, Richard Meiss, Arthur Mirsky, Bart Ng, Byron Olson, William Orme, Richard Peterson, Rebecca Porter, Norris Richmond, Margaret Richwine, Carl Rothe, Brian Sanders, Aristotle Siakotos, Charles Slemenda, Jeffrey Springston, David Suzuki, Karen Teeguarden, Jeffery Vessely, Patricia Wittberg, Charles Yokomoto, Susan Zunt. EX OFFICIO MEMBERS: Janet Feldmann, Edgar Fleenor, Henry Karlson, Hitwant Sidhu, Kathleen Warfel.

ALTERNATES PRESENT: DEANS: Rose S. Fife for Walter Daly; Jerry Durham for Angela McBride. ELECTED FACULTY: David Lewis for James Baldwin, Julia Tyler for Frances Brahmi, Kenneth Fife for Stuart Hat, Golam Mannan for Edward Robbins, Subir Chakrabarti for Rosalie Vermette. EX OFFICIO MEMBERS: David Frisby for Virgie Montgomery.

ABSENT: ADMINISTRATION: J. Herman Blake. DEANS: John Barlow, A James Barnes, Trevor Brown, H William Gilmore, Kathy Krendl, Norman Lefstein, Alfred Potvin, John Rau, David Stocum, Donald Warren, Charles Webb. ELECTED FACULTY: Biagio Azzarelli, Darrell Bailey, Timothy Baldwin, Merrill Benson, Henry Besch, David Burr, David Canal, William Blomquist (alternate for Paul Carlin), Michael Clark, Michael Cohen, Gayle Cox, Michael Dalsing, Joseph DiMicco, William Engle, Michael Fritsch, Karen Gable, Joe Garcia, Michael Gleeson, Clifford Goodwin, M Jan Keffer, Steven Leapman, Lynda Means, Bernard Morrel, Vimalkumar Patel, Daniel Peavy, Michael Sadove, Richard Schreiner, Lee Schwecke, Jay Simon, Robert Sutton, James Wallihan, Karen West, Eric Wiebke. EX OFFICIO MEMBERS: Barbara Cambridge, J Vannoy Faris, Steven Mannheimer, B Keith Moore, John Pless, Helen Schwartz, William Schneider, Martin Spechler, Student Representative.

VISITORS: Trudy Banta, Erwin Boschmann, Mark Grove.

AGENDA ITEM I - CALL TO ORDER

WARFEL: We will begin the February Council meeting. I hope you brought your agenda and attached items to the meeting with you. You will notice that towards the back of the agenda are a number of pages pertaining to Transferability of retirement funds and TIAA/CREF. We had hoped to have Dan Rives present today to discuss these with us and he was unable to come this time, so we will save that until next month.

AGENDA ITEM II - APPROVAL OF NOVEMBER 4, 1993 MINUTES

WARFEL: The next agenda item is the approval of the November 4, 1993 minutes, but there are so many people who have said that they haven't received them yet that I think we will postpone that until next month also.

AGENDA ITEM III - ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT - CHANCELLOR GERALD L. BEPKO

BEPKO: I have a couple of quick items. The first is one that you will probably hear or read about in the newspapers in the next day or so. It has to do with the School of Nursing. The school, as you know, has been both blessed, and in some degree, cursed by a dramatically expanded pool of applicants for admission into the nursing major. Over the last three years the numbers of students interested in nursing majors has grown geometrically. The good news is when your major field is popular, you have better students and it is fun to be in demand. The bad news is that there were quite a number of students who had enrolled at IUPUI or at Bloomington expecting to major in nursing and then were disappointed because, while their grade point

averages were pretty good by historic standards, and five years ago may have been admitted without any difficulty, today, because of the extra competition, they were denied. Now they have opportunities to apply for second and third chances at admission, but some were caught in this and felt victimized. They have lodged complaints with the school, the university, their local legislators, and as you would imagine, with the Commission for Higher Education, which serves as something of a general purpose recipient for complaints about programs at IUPUI in general and nursing in particular. The Commission has proposed some methods of dealing with this issue both for the short term and the long, the long term having to do with providing a better system of alerting students of the competitive nature of nursing so that they are not under any misapprehension about what their chances are. Of course, we have already done that. We will have more plans in the School of Nursing to announce later in the spring.

With respect to the short-term problem of trying to help some of those students who were in this very sympathy-provoking position -- having come here wanting to study nursing, believing they would have that opportunity and then being foreclosed by this new competition -- we have tried to create some extra spaces. We have tried to develop some new ways of trying to get them admitted into the classes, but in the midst of our efforts to address their needs, the Commission has gotten more active. They have been responding, I think, to the admonitions of some of the members of the General Assembly. The ICHE staff today proposed that the institutions be required to file a plan that included setting aside one-half of the spaces in the 1994-95 nursing class, all classes that were admitted in 1994-95, to be held available as an entitlement for the students who were in this backlog, as the Commission has referred to it. We have tried to avoid the word "backlog." We think of it more as a group of disappointed applicants. We are very concerned about those people. They are our students and we want to do the very best for them. We just don't think the word "backlog" is an appropriate way of describing them. In any case, this was proposed to the Commission this morning. The Commission did not adopt this proposal. They simply said that the institutions should file a plan on how they are going to deal with this question by April 1 and then the Commission will look at those plans at their April meeting. They said that the staff proposal that included this one-half class set-aside should be taken into account by the institutions, but it did not represent anything that would be binding and was simply something that the staff had suggested as one way of addressing the issue. I raise it because it seems to me to present what may be the high-water mark of intrusion by the ICHE into the academic affairs of the university. To actually specify who we will admit is something extraordinary. I think the Commissioners themselves realized that and that is why they did not adopt the staff's recommendation. They simply said that every institution should file its own plan, whatever that plan may be, and only sent the staff's proposal along for information purposes to the institutions.

I think that the staff meant well in recommending this. I don't think they were being aggressive or indifferent to our interests in making this encroachment into the affairs of the university. I think they were trying to help with what they see as a very sticky problem and thought that maybe the set-aside would help us. Indeed along the way, they may have had some encouragement in thinking that. But, on reflection, it seems to me that the set-aside is a bad idea and a fairly significant encroachment into the affairs of the university. We resisted it and the Commission did not adopt it. But, you should be aware of it not only because of the facts themselves, but also because it is some indication of the mood that you find in the community -- a willingness to take over if they think people in political life think that things in the universities are not going as they would like them to go.

The other issue that I will mention is something that I think Dick Fredland is going to talk about and maybe others as well and that is that next Tuesday the University Faculty Council will take up the issue of the Balanced Case once again. I think our position on this is clear both as a campus, campus administration, and Faculty Council. We don't think that the proposal to create a Balanced Case is a good idea. We think that excellence ought to be a standard by which we judge ourselves in every aspect of our work, especially teaching, and that we should not retreat from that. That is not only symbolic, it is a way of defining ourselves as a university. A pursuit of excellence is the essence of the university. We are eager to see that the University Faculty Council does not take actions which ignore the strong vote of this Faculty Council and our position on the Balanced Case or that create some kind of constitutional crisis where the University Faculty Council has taken a position on an important issue of academic affairs that is directly contrary to the position

that has been taken by our Faculty Council and our administration. The reason that I think that may be a constitutional matter is because the issue is one of such importance that it strikes me that it would put stress on the constitutional relationship between us and the University Faculty Council if they ordered us to have as our standard for promotion and tenure something that we did not agree with. At any rate, I think that it is important that all those people who are University Faculty Council members be present, or I hope that those people who are University Faculty Council members will vote the principle that was adopted by our IUPUI Faculty Council. If those University Faculty Council members cannot be present, I think they can vote by proxy. As far as I know, you don't have to actually be there to cast the vote. So, I hope you will be there to represent our interest or have a proxy there to represent our interest and that we can succeed in having our own way of defining how we advance ourselves as members of the faculty. I don't know how else to describe it. I think we ought to be able to define the way we advance ourselves and how we define this institution in academic terms. If the University Faculty Council orders us to do something we think is not right, that creates a crisis. Maybe the word "crisis" is overused these days, especially with respect to whether there is a crisis in health care, but I think this is at least as much of a crisis as the one that has been debated in Congress.

WARFEL: Are there questions or comments?

MIRSKY: Isn't promotion and tenure campus specific?

BEPKO: Tenure is, yes.

BLAKE: I have heard that the document of the University Faculty Council did provide more than was intended by the IUPUI Faculty Affairs Committee. The UFC document is for promotion and tenure. IUPUI intended that the Balanced Case is applied only to promotion.

FREDLAND: If you read the University Faculty Council document, the word "tenure" is in brackets. I called Paul Eisenberg's, (the President of the Bloomington Faculty Council) who prepared that document, because the faculty handbook under "Tenure" says "The criteria are similar." He was including in that word as a reminder that these criteria would also apply since there are no tenure specific criteria. So, that is why it is there. At least one member of this body has chastised me on that fact. I will raise that at the UFC meeting on Tuesday but that is the reason for it. It is not that anybody is trying to pull any wool over our eyes, I don't think.

MCDONALD: Chancellor Bepko, don't you feel that the universities have defended themselves against the Commission's various initiatives rather well in that the mission statements and the productivity mandated changes have been at least reverted back to the universities' control?

BEPKO: I would say that we have made progress; but with respect to IUPUI, we still have a ways to go because I think that there still is not a full appreciation for the impact and potential of this campus. But, we are making progress. Certainly there has been progress in terms of the mission statement and how it is phrased. I might mention, just as an update, something that happened this morning at the Commission meeting. The Trustees of the University last month adopted a resolution on the subject of mission statements. This was done at the insistence of the smaller campuses. The smaller campuses did not like being described as "regional campuses." They thought that they should be described using the nomenclature of the AAUP so that the smaller campuses would be characterized either as comprehensive institutions (those who had enough graduate programs to qualify under the AAUP guidelines) and then also general baccalaureate institutions. The President, after some consultation, agreed to take that to the Trustees along with a proposal that there be a reaffirmation of the core campus concept. That is, if you are going to say something about the smaller campuses, you ought to say something about Bloomington and Indianapolis as well. So, the whole package was taken to the Trustees. The Trustees did adopt and reaffirm the core campus concept of Bloomington and Indianapolis as an interdependent set of academic programs. They also characterized the smaller campuses as they wish to be characterized -- either as comprehensive institutions or general baccalaureate institutions. That was proposed for the Commission this morning. The part of it that was proposed was the part having to do with the smaller campuses. After about 30 minutes of discussion, there was a vote and the vote was 5 to 5. The vote was on the motion to change what is now in the mission statements. So, there is no change.

The proposal did not succeed. They did not choose to embrace the wording suggested by the IU Trustees. But, to go back to the mission statement, generally, there has been a lot of progress in developing a mission statement that more accurately reflects what this campus can contribute to the State and is contributing to the state. It is especially good that they took out of the mission statements the course section teaching requirements which we think don't belong in a mission statement in the first place and were grossly out of proportion as applied to this campus; the ones which they have used. So, there has been some progress there. We do have a ways to go.

KARLSON: As long as you have mentioned that resolution of the Board of Trustees, while reaffirming the core campus concept, in Bloomington it is the center of graduate study and research and IUPUI it is a broad range of academic programs. We are a core but evidently we are just one of the seeds in that core, and they are the real core because they have graduate study and research and we don't. Is there any move on to tell the Board of Trustees that we also have graduate study and we should also be doing research here? They totally left that out of the description, and I find that very frightening.

BEPKO: I read the resolution in a little different way. I think that there is a reaffirmation of the commitment to having one entity that has a range of responsibilities and Bloomington and Indianapolis are both included in that. I think there is a recognition that graduate education and research are a part of IUPUI's mission. If it isn't reflected boldly enough in this resolution, and I believe it is, then it is clearly reflected in the speeches that have been made over the last couple of months by the President of the Board of Trustees, Bob McKinney, who has spoken in public in front of the Commissioner for Higher Education about the need for enhancing graduate education and research on this campus.

KARLSON: I would just say that it speaks in the resolution, which I read very closely and showed to some of my colleagues who had the same problem of the Law faculty, and it very clearly says that Bloomington they reaffirmed as a center of graduate study and research. Then they speak of the broad range of academic programs in the state capitol as IUPUI. I don't think it was by inadvertence that they did not reaffirm any graduate study or research as part of the function of IUPUI.

BEPKO: I think that if there was any difference between the two campuses, it was only to reflect the fact that all of us have acknowledged that the purpose of IUPUI is not to emulate Bloomington. It is to be a new model that will increasingly come center stage in American higher education, not to discount what we are doing but to make it different and, in my view, better in many ways than what goes on in Bloomington.

AGENDA ITEM III - PRESIDENT'S REPORT - RICHARD FREDLAND

FREDLAND: I can't help but think that when the history of IUPUI is written that the Chancellor's ringing words about Balanced Case and the constitutional crisis will be the equivalent of Patrick Henry's "give me liberty or give me death." This is a new era for relations with the rest of the system.

As a political scientist I can't resist making a political observation about what will happen on Tuesday. It seems to me that the Balanced Case will remain in the language of the handbook since it is there now having been past last year. What we are asking for is the language to be rescinded; however, a lot of people who are in favor of the principle of the Balanced Case also have trouble with the technicalities of the language, especially the two adverbs. If you have committed this to memory, you will recall that it begins "normally" and then somewhere along there is a second clause that begins "alternatively." The purists can't handle those two adverbs. So, the language may very well change. If indeed the principle stands, it is going to my agenda item to see if we can change the language to something that is perhaps starchier than the language that is presently there, but I don't have a lot of hope for that either. It is very much of a function of who is there on Tuesday. You can hope for a blizzard which will keep the people from the regional campuses perhaps more away than they might otherwise be.

Last May the Trustees appointed an outfit called the "Joint Commission on Learning: Teaching and Scholarship. The Chancellor and I are among the 15 or so members of this, and we are doing what several

other bodies have done around here trying to figure out what we can do to enhance those three activities which is the primary mission of the university. It is a systemwide activity. You will be hearing more about this I expect as the academic year draws to a close. It is supposed to report back to the Trustees at their next meeting. There may be some guidance there that will be helpful to us in doing a better job of measuring ourselves against outside expectations hopefully. Along with that, on this campus there is underway -- and this simply became information as the Task Force on Faculty Work, yet one more place where you are being scrutinized, the annual report form that you fill out telling the university what you have done this year, is in the process of being modified. The initiative began in Dean Plater's office and it is now in the hands of Vic Borden who is in Institutional Research. A new and improved form of that may come around again with the intention of making it the facilitating our reporting of what we are doing so that when you report what you taught last year it is not just one line of so many students and so many contact hours, but it is a bit more explanative to raise the quality of the information about the things that we do beside publication which is the easy thing to do in terms of transmitting information. So, there is a lot of energy being devoted to that. I hope that when these things come to your awareness, and they will sooner or later, that you will be attentive to it and make your contributions. The annual reports forms will be out and circulated at some point in the future for your responses. It is Draft Document #24 in the TFFAA document.

ALIPRANTIS: Why did we change it?

PLATER: As Dick has indicated, the form is to provide more information and to use the form as the basis of creating a data base so that we can gather the information that is being reported by the faculty. Right now the only way in which we can gather quantitative information that could be reported to ourselves, to the Trustees, or the Commission for Higher Education is from the Instructional Effort Report, (IER), which, as you know, if you fill it out, contains very little detailed information and doesn't reflect the diversity and the complexity of our work. So, we would like to use the annual report form to begin collecting information that we can use then to explain what we do as a faculty in an institution as large and complex as IUPUI.

FREDLAND: Take my word and Dean Plater's word for it, it is an improvement, I think.

PLATER: It will be easier to fill out.

FREDLAND: At our next meeting we will elect a President and Vice President of the IUPUI Faculty for the next two years.

Last week's Sagamore had an editorial about interim use of the Student Center in an effort to bring for information something that a lot of people have worked very hard about and I guess there still is conversation going on about the potential trade off of taking some of the money that might have been used for remodeling to use as part of the old library as a student center in the interim until actual remodeling begins later in the spring or early in the summer. That may very well happen and is something that is looked forward to by the student among us.

In the mail is the latest edition of the IUPUI Supplement to the IU Academic Handbook. The people who have worked on the Handbook Committee have put in long hours to bring this to fruition. As nifty as it looks it can't possibly reflect on how much energy went into that.

As a consequence of funds that were gathered during the Campus Campaign last year a Faculty / Staff Emergency Loan Fund is being established. At the moment we have a committee of two staff and two faculty, (Faculty: Jeffery Vessely and Marion Wagner; Staff: Marsha Neawedde and Phyllis Ratcliffe) who are willingly working to draft some guidelines for the operation of this loan fund. It will probably be the end of the fiscal year before that comes to be.

Several of my colleagues assaulted me in the last few days about rumors that were broadcast by a local media, and I don't know which of the local media, about some potential misbehavior of the Presidential Search Committee. Rumors, as so often happens, have gotten beyond the facts by quite some distance in this case. What appeals to have happened is that in the normal course of events the Presidential Search Committee sent

out letters to legislators asking if they had a nomination to make for the presidency of Indiana University, and letters were sent to a lot of people. A couple of members of the legislature apparently let it be known publicly that they had nominated a former legislator. Then the chairman of the Presidential Search Committee, Trustee Harry Gonso, was quoted as having said something that apparently he did not say that seemed to suggest that this legislator was going to receive more than the routine kinds of consideration that everyone has received. Lest you become irate that the search process is given undue consideration to a legislator, I think that is not the case. The committee will meet tomorrow and we will know whether we are going to give undue consideration, but at the moment I think that is probably safely said.

Finally, again to make you aware, the Budgetary Affairs Committee has been spending the year in conjunction with administrative appointees, to do this in a joint way, looking at Responsibility Centered Management. I guess by the end of the year we can look forward to a report, is that a reasonable expectation?

R. KECK: That is the timeline at this point.

FREDLAND: That should be enlightening to all of us who are in a responsibility center.

MIRSKY: I have just one minor question for the President. How come sitting over here and just looking at the name cards on the front table, I wondered how come the President of the Faculty has a name tag which is about one-half of the size the other name cards?

MIRSKY: Perhaps the budget would allow for someone to put the President's name on an equal size with the others.

BEPKO: I would like to ask the same question. Why do some members have large lettering, like Dana McDonald, and some have small like Art Mirsky?

MIRSKY: Well, some of us don't really care about that.

BEPKO: But you care about this.

MIRSKY: That is symbolic up there.

FREDLAND: We will have it changed.

BEPKO: I think the President should have even larger letters than everyone else up here.

AGENDA ITEM V - CAMPUS CAMPAIGN - JEAN GNAT

WARFEL: We have Jean Gnat here to give us an update on the Campus Campaign.

GNAT: I am glad Dick mentioned the loan fund, because that was an outcome of last year's Campus Campaign, and it is a very solid example of what can be done with the annual campaign. Our theme for this year is "Partners In Progress: Assuring the future. The priorities which were developed by a group of staff and faculty are faculty development, staff development, libraries, scholarships, the student center, and the Shape the Future Fund which is unrestricted giving. The kick-off is going to be February 14. There has been a flurry of activity in the Foundation Office as the volunteers are being given information on how to approach the people in their units. We have over 130 volunteers who have been actively identified and we know that there are units which are still working on this. This is a wonderful commitment on the part of these people. They are all busy people, as we all are, but they have taken the time to show that they have an interest in IUPUI. Our goal for this year is to raise an additional \$100,000 in new commitments to support these campus initiatives. We would like to see either the priorities that we have mentioned be supported or, if you have other needs that you know of in your units, we are happy to have you support those. As you are approached

by your volunteer be helpful and supportive. It is very difficult to ask for money, so if you can't say anything nice about the Campaign, don't say anything bad.

WARFEL: Jean, does the School of Medicine have a campaign which is separate from the Campus Campaign?

GANT: Yes. But, if you contribute to any other campaign during this annual time, you will receive credit towards contributing to the annual campaign. We are not conducting all sorts of campaigns. There is a central reporting line and you will credit for your contribution to the annual campaign.

AGENDA ITEM VI - ATHLETIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE REPORT - WILLIAM KULSRUD

Professor KULSRUD was unavailable for today's report.

AGENDA ITEM VII - CONTINUED "MAJOR ISSUES" DISCUSSION

WARFEL: Let's proceed to Agenda Item VII and continue our discussion on the major issues that came out of the original TFFAA work. As you no doubt recall, we are still on document 14 which in its latest version is attached to your agenda.

Last year we took the substitute version that was provided by our Constitution and Bylaws Committee and amended it to come up with the draft that we now have before us. One thing that we knew that was still pending in regard to this was the amendments that have come forth from the librarians' special study committee and Dean Neal. These amendments, modified in such a way as to fit our latest draft, appear on these peach colored sheets which I hope you all have picked up. These amendments are fairly straight forward and basically have to do with adding the one representative that is elected by the IUPUI Library faculty and to the fact that the dossiers of librarians will be considered by the campus committee. Are there questions or comments about these librarians' amendments? Bill, did you want to say anything about this?

ORME: I don't know that there is all that much to say. I suppose I probably should call attention to something that we discussed briefly last meeting when we were struggling with the notion that the committee would be tenured and full ranked. That was a concern to librarians. At the last meeting we mentioned that we had arrived at some wording that we thought might help several units out and I would call attention to that which is listed on the front page of this peach colored insertion. It is the second insertion, (page 1, lines 27-28). That sentence, if adopted, would read:

All members of the committee shall be tenured and to the extent practicable should hold appointment at the rank of professor or librarian.

That speaks again to problems that I would refer to as problems of critical mass in terms of the number of full rank faculty or librarians within a unit, many in our case of which are supervisors. There is some discomfort in having supervisors, in essence, have two hats to wear during the course of the tenure process; one as a supervisor and one as member of the campus committee. The other things in here are things that don't really cause much in the way of controversy. It is an issue that has been discussed in prior meetings. Again, I think the language the special study group came up with might be helpful to this particular issue.

MEISS: In these deliberations we have been scrupulous about separating the words "faculty" and "librarian." Now we have the term "library faculty". I am not sure that I know exactly what that means.

ORME: Are you referring to IUPUI Library Faculty? That is an organization on campus that involves all of the campus librarians. It is the only entity really that covers the interests of all librarians on the IUPUI campus whether they are at the University Library or one of the professional schools.

RICHWINE: It is those who have an academic appointment.

SIDHU: I just wanted a clarification about the paragraph at the bottom of page two of the peach colored handout concerning the IUPUI Library Faculty including librarians from the professional schools. According to discussion, at the previous meeting, the librarians from the professional schools could have been and have been elected as the faculty members at large as members of those schools. Can they still be elected as members of those school faculty or will they fall into this group and cannot be elected as members of the faculty of those schools?

WARFEL: What we have here would apply only to how they go through the promotion and tenure considerations. University librarians would remain a unit for our purposes and professional librarians would remain part of their schools for our purposes. This would apply only to the promotion and tenure process. We are not creating a new official academic unit that includes all of the librarians.

SIDHU: In other words, you are going to use librarians into two groups; one for the promotion and tenure purpose and one for the general election to elect representatives to the Council. Is that correct?

WARFEL: Would a librarian like to speak to this?

MCDONALD: That is the way it is now.

SIDHU: It is not now.

MCDONALD: Yes. That is the way it is now. A librarian in the medical library is elected by the School of Medicine to this group.

SIDHU: But, in the past they have never been members of the IUPUI Library Faculty?

WARFEL: That is correct. That is what Dana is saying. This simply reflects what is happening now. Dana comes to this Council from the School of Medicine because the School of Medicine elected her. When she goes up for promotion, she goes through the Librarian route, not the School of Medicine route. This is reflecting how it works.

ORME: I think Dr. Sidhu does have a valid point for the composition of the campuswide committee. If you look at Draft Document 14 as it stands now, it is somewhat analogous to the situation where schools can elect representatives and members at large from the IUPUI Faculty Council. A member of the same school would have in essence two opportunities to be on that campus promotion and tenure committee. That same opportunity would be presented, I think, for the professional school librarians under this proposal because the IUPUI Library Faculty group would have the opportunity to elect a member from any of the campus libraries as well as having professional school librarians have an opportunity to be elected by their faculty.

VESSELY: What I am reading is that, if we adopt the amendments that some librarians, and I am not sure I understand how they are differentiated, but some would have three opportunities to be elected to the promotion and tenure committee either from their school as one of the school representatives or as an at large person, if they hold that rank, or from the IUPUI Library Faculty. Actually, they would have three groups that they could be elected by. I think the question was, if that is the case, then that gives them one more shot at election than everybody who is not a member of the IUPUI Library Faculty have.

WARFEL: All librarians may not. For example, the School of Medicine, is there a librarian on the School of Medicine's promotion and tenure committee?

MCDONALD: No. That could not happen.

WARFEL: Which is the committee that sends someone to the campus level. So, why they would choose a librarian is beyond me. Theoretically, you are right, but I doubt that it would ever happen.

GNAT: Not only that, but it is spelled out where the representatives are going to come from, from the School

of Medicine. I think that in the Law School the librarians serve on the promotion and tenure committee. And the same thing is true of the School of Dentistry; librarians are not eligible to serve on their promotion and tenure committee.

WARFEL: Are there any more comments or questions about the librarian amendments? Is the Council ready to vote on the adoption of these amendments in Draft Document 14? All of those in favor of accepting the amendments as part of Draft Document 14, say "Aye." All of those opposed? Abstentions? (unanimous for adoption)

At this point, it may be that we have Draft 14 now amended to include librarians, in something that should be very close to a final form. With some trepidation I ask if there is any other discussion about Draft Document 14.

YOKOMOTO: Draft Document 15 says something about members of the campus Promotion and Tenure Committee being elected from unit committees. Is that in our Draft Document 14 also? I don't see anything that says something to that effect in Draft Document 14.

WARFEL: Should the Council ever finish with Draft Document 14, we will proceed to Draft Document 15.

YOKOMOTO: I guess my question is, since Draft Document 15 seems to imply that the members will be elected from unit Promotion and Tenure committees, we need to have that in Draft Document 14 also.

WARFEL: Run that by me again.

YOKOMOTO: Draft Document 15 says "In addition, the implementation committee has recommended the creation of a combined campus Promotion and Tenure Committee, to be elected in part from members of unit committees."

WARFEL: When we get to Draft Document 15, we are not going to vote on the background statement but only on the motion statement.

YOKOMOTO: I was just wondering if we had overlooked something.

WARFEL: As I remember it, we discussed that at Council two meetings ago and that it was clarified last time and we amended the Constitution and Bylaws version that they brought to us. I think we specifically talked about that and decided that the unit promotion and tenure committee would elect from among the schools' eligible members who was going to be sent to the campus committee. Are there any other general comments about this?

KOLESKI: This in relation to Item 4b. Does this language change the relationship to decision making regarding tenure from what it was? Does this shift more control over decision making regarding tenure from the schools to the IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Committee?

WARFEL:as it currently is in place:

- b. Advise the Dean of the Faculties of IUPUI at that officer's request with respect to the tenure status of an individual faculty member of librarian.*

What it now says is:

Recommend on the promotion and/or tenure of those candidates who are presented for consideration by the schools...

So, it has been the practice of our current Dean of the Faculties to have all of those dossiers for tenure decisions reviewed by the Tenure Committee. Under the old Bylaws, the Dean of the Faculties could have had none of them reviewed by the campus committee. So, it is a change that says the new campus committee is going to review those dossiers.

KOLESKI: If the units suggested tenure with the new campus committee but the IUPUI level did not, what then does occur?

PLATER: The same thing would occur in the future as occurs now. Those votes were simply recorded as independent evaluations of two separate bodies and passed along for the consideration of the successive body considering the dossier.

KOLESKI: Thank you.

WARFEL: Does anyone else want to raise questions about Draft Document 14? If not, I think the time has come to ask you to vote on accepting Draft Document 14 as we currently have it before us as the new Bylaw replacing Article III, Section C of the Bylaws of the IUPUI Faculty Council. Are you ready to vote? All of those in favor of accepting the new bylaws, say "Aye." Opposed? Abstentions? [passed unanimously in favor of accepting]

Let us proceed to Draft Document 15 which is also attached to your agenda. The background information, as Professor Yokomoto pointed out, is not exactly the right wording anymore, but what we need to vote on the text of the Motion itself. The motion has two paragraphs and at the end of the first paragraph there is a sentence about the librarians. The librarians' special study group has said that they would like that sentence stricken in its entirety. Unless the Council has some objection, we would be considering the motion as we see it before us except that the sentence "*Librarians at IUPUI are to follow a parallel process as specified for faculty*" isn't in there anymore. Is there any discussion regarding the motion?

FREDLAND: I hate to be a stick-in-the-mud, but in the absence of the Parliamentarian doing his duty, an amendment to the Bylaws requires a vote of two-thirds of those present and voting. A voice vote didn't really accurately reflect that. I think we should do a show of hands to be sure that we have done it right since we are going to be doing several amendments.

WARFEL: There were no "nays" and there were no abstentions.

KARLSON: Actually, there were no nays and no abstentions which would lead me to believe that more than two-thirds voted in favor of it. A bylaw, I believe, is effective when passed. So, this is effective today.

FREDLAND: Is there a ruling from the chair?

WARFEL: I think you are a stickler. [laughter]

KARLSON: Having been a parliamentarian my philosophy is that you don't intervene as a parliamentarian unless there is a need. And not having any heard abstentions or objections, I saw no need to intervene.

WARFEL: What about the motion in Draft Document 15 as we have it before us? If you have nothing to discuss, may I ask you to vote?

GALANTI: What about the last sentence in the first paragraph under MOTION? Has that been changed or is somebody going to move to strike the sentence "*Librarians at IUPUI are to follow a parallel process as specified for faculty*?"

WARFEL: I take it that, coming from the librarians special group, that it is basically moved. Shall we vote on eliminating that?

KARLSON: Once a resolution has been moved and seconded, as I believe this one has been, it is before us for discussion, it belongs to the organization and you cannot strike anything without a formal amendment. So, there would have to be a motion to amend the motion by striking those words.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So moved. [seconded]

WARFEL: Is there any discussion related to striking that sentence?

ORME: Was the strike recommended because it is felt that this sentence is no longer needed?

WARFEL: Yes.

ORME: This is wording that you don't have in front of you but I will read it:

***RATIONALE FOR STRIKING THIS SENTENCE:** The unit level review is the Indiana University Librarians Promotion and Tenure Committee. The composition of this committee is established on a systemwide basis. At the Primary level, the differences between the four libraries on campus would make a single charge extremely difficult to administer. IUPUI University Libraries have a primary level procedure in place. Dentistry is included in the school promotion and tenure committee process and would be reviewed with the overall motion. Law and Medicine libraries do not have formally established primary committees or procedures.*

So, we have a couple of mish-mash of various procedures that make this very difficult to administer campuswide.

WARFEL: Are there other questions or comments related to discussing the striking of this sentence?

HOYT: I think I am confused by excluding a sentence that makes some kind of exception. By excluding it, we are saying that we are following exactly the same process.

WARFEL: Except, the rest of the motion talks only about what the schools should do, not about what libraries should do.

SIDHU: If you eliminate this, you will have to have some kind of language where all the librarians can be reviewed or another process can be used. In the absence of that, you might run into difficulty. Before you eliminate this one you need to find some substitute which will take care of their problem. Otherwise, you will be evaluating without policy.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I think that all the librarians are asking for is to be exempted from this review according to established procedures that would make this kind of review very difficult for them.

WARFEL: All of those in favor of striking the sentence, say "Aye." Opposed? [none] Abstentions? [none] Is there any discussion about Draft Document 15 with that sentence eliminated?

VESSELY: The comments which I have heard that are of some concern, it is not very clear in a motion that relatively narrow, is the extent to which the words "review" and "evaluate", to the extent to which this committee could tell the various units what kind of criteria they should actually be using. It is one thing to say, "We are going to look at the process" and it is quite another to say, "We are going to actually step in and say that, that set of criteria should not be used or you should make some changes or whatever." There is a number of faculty, maybe not in this group since there has been discussion, but outside of this group there is a number of faculty who are concerned that the committee will have the power to actually step in and tell a school what to use to determine their candidates eligibility. I guess I would like an explanation of why that isn't the case, if so, or if there were language to put in there that clearly defines the limit of these powers.

WARFEL: My reading of it is that this motion is simply urging the schools to have combined committees which we already established two meetings ago that they all do. It is urging them to have only tenured members at the unit level committee, and it is urging them to establish procedures. I don't think anywhere in here it is telling them more specifically anything about criteria, except that they should have procedures so that people in their units know what the criteria are. Do other people want to comment on this?

PLATER: Jeff, are you referring to the second paragraph of this? As I read it, what the combined committee is to do is to go back and ask the schools what it is they have done to try to achieve the goals that are set forth here, prepare a summary report of where the schools are, and let this body know the progress in achieving the goals. I don't see anything in here that is absolutely mandatory. It is to request and advise the schools' work towards the common objectives as outlined in the first paragraph and as reflected in Draft Document 14 which we just passed. In this context, though, we need to say that the criteria for promotion and tenure are those that are stated in the Academic Handbook, but in addition each school has been asked to develop what are called "standards" for the interpretation of these criteria applied to the unit in specific regard to the mission of the unit. I would assume that in most schools the promotion and tenure committee will have something to say about those schools' specific documents. That is already a responsibility of the schools. The campus promotion and tenure may be asked to review school procedures by an individual member of the faculty, but even under those circumstances, the campus committee would only make recommendations back to the school about any possible changes. It could not mandate the change.

VESSELY: I think that is what I have understood all along. But, as you talk to faculty who don't come to these meetings, they are just generally not as involved. They see that language and, not having heard your explanation, it makes them nervous. It cuts across a variety of schools where they see that and say, "How far reaching is this?" I guess there was a way to capitalize the explanation you just gave, maybe not in preparation of this, but as a way of then going back to the faculty and saying to the faculty and the various units, "We passed this and here is what it really means."

KARLSON: The problem is the confusion of language. If you look at the first sentence, it says "...to ensure..." Ensure is mandatory language. Departments and schools "should"... The word "should" is suggestive language. Then if you look at the first sentence in the second paragraph which says "...requests Chancellor Bepko to convey this request..." A request is anything but mandatory. This entire motion, as to whether it is mandatory or not, is schizophrenic in its language. Therefore, I would assume that probably the second paragraph which defines everything preceding it as a request, is the one which we should affix upon as the final definition.

PLATER: Not to disagree with the Parliamentarian too much, I think that the various language terms (ensure, should, must and request) were intended to reflect different degrees, and that is how the language should be taken. I think the intent is that, as I guess now is the case, the promotion and tenure committees are combined in all the schools. I am not sure whether that is true at the primary level. There may be primary committees that are separate, but I am assuming that most of them are combined. In that sense maybe "ensure" is to be more directive than later on where the Council is requesting the Chancellor to provide this information and urge schools to observe the points which are made in the first paragraph. I think the language is appropriate for the actions being proposed.

SAGAMORE REPORTER: In the first paragraph of the motion where it reads "Departments and schools should establish procedures..." does that mean that it will be up to the individual committees to decide how often they will meet and how many will be on the committees? Will that be entirely up to them and to the individual committee?

PLATER: Exactly. The departments and schools that are establishing the procedures would determine their own rules of operation within whatever broad university guidelines may pertain. Here we are suggesting some limitations such as membership being limited to tenured members of the faculty.

KOLESKI: This is what I was pursuing when I asked the question in relation to promotion and tenure before. It still is unclear as to what the relative responsibilities are of central (could not understand) It doesn't say in any point in time that the campus promotion and tenure committees do all of these things. It says further down "The Faculty Council further urges that the primary and unit committees establish procedures... It sounds as though this is a statement which comes from the Faculty Council. Does it charge the campus committee with this responsibility to exercise these obligations?

PLATER: In that particular sentence this body, by passing this motion, would urge that each school develop a procedure whereby the primary and unit committee confer with each other about the standards they are using. Right now there is nothing that requires that a department committee and a school committee use the same standards.

KOLESKI: This is fine, but I am not sure to whom these unit committees are responsible. Are they responsible to the campus committee?

PLATER: They are responsible to the school.

KOLESKI: If they don't abide by certain kinds of things, then someone else says "You are not abiding by certain things."

PLATER: Under Draft Document 14 that we just passed, an individual faculty member may request the campus committee to review unit committee procedures and make recommendations back to that faculty member who was complaining and to the unit about changes that would seem to be appropriate upon review or consideration of the problem that was identified.

KOLESKI: Let me make one more statement. This is consistent with the point that Jeff was making. There seems to be some concern that if schools and sub-schools put more of an accent on research or some schools put more of an accent on teaching, that the campus committee can then step in and say "That is improper."

WARFEL: In what we just passed about the responsibilities of the campus promotion and tenure committee, it is charged to review the documents that talk about... In "a" it states: Review, as needed or requested, documents which specify standards used at the primary and unit levels... and when such documents are deemed deficient, recommend changes to the school or libraries. We have discussed this before at length. What this was intended to mean was the campus committee should review the documents. Basically, if the unit doesn't have fair documents or the people in the unit don't stand a chance of knowing what the criteria are going to be for this, then something ought to be done about those documents. Not that something is going to be mandated about the criteria being wrong.

KOLESKI: If something ought to be done, who is going to do it and where it does it state that?

WARFEL: The point is, what if documentation is thought to be not all that what it should be? The campus level reports back to the unit and says, "You need better documents." Who is going to make the unit have different documents? I don't think it says.

KOLESKI: It doesn't say who has that responsibility?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: No.

MIRSKY: To me this document is okay the way it is. I think people are reading things into it which aren't there. The way it operates is there are three levels -- there is a primary committee level for promotion and tenure, there is a unit for the school, and there is a campuswide one. Any individual goes up through all three levels. Of course, there is another level beyond that which was alluded to before. And there are levels beyond that. We are only concerned here now with the first three levels -- primary, unit, and the campus. The primary committee, the unit committee, and the campus committee should have basically, more or less, the

same criteria for promotion and tenure.

The analogy that I have looked at is that in this country we have states which have constitutions and we have the federal government which has a constitution, and I was going to say that I thought we had cities which have constitutions, but they have something a little different. In any case, everybody knows that the state can regulate all of the rules it wants to with _____ guarantee under its constitutions, but that may not be at odds with the federal constitution which guarantees certain rights [criteria]. The promotion and tenure, as I see it, is somewhat similar. The university-wide has a certain set of criteria and the units can make up their own standards so long as they are not in serious opposition to the school-wide criteria. Nobody is telling anybody what to do, but a primary committee which promotes someone to move on up the line knowing that their standards are at serious odds with the unit committee standards or the campus-wide would probably not be advising the applicant well.

KOLESKI: I appreciate the analogy and I think it is a very good one. At the same time when one sits at the state level one says "To whom is one accountable -- to the court, to the Executive branches or the congress in a sense. To clarify this, I simply don't see a statement of the committee campus on promotion and tenure being included in this particular motion. It would seem to me that would clarify it.

BYRNE: I think I see this a bit differently. I understand that you do not wish the background language to be included as part of the motion, but in fact, it is there and it does say "...the following resolution directs schools and departments..." If you can have a crisis at Indiana University, maybe you can have a crisis on one particular campus. The question which has arisen in my mind is whether we, as a Faculty Council, are (intentionally or unintentionally) mandating that each individual school combine promotion and tenure committees? If in fact this has been found appropriate in all the different schools, so be it; but that being the case, what is the point of requesting, directing, suggesting, or proposing this possibility if they are already "in compliance?" Let me put this in the form of a test case. What would be the implications under this language of a particular school having tried a combined committee and deciding that it really doesn't work well. It is not their sort of thing after all so they decide not to do it. Would the "direct" word come in or the "ensure" word or the "urge" word? Which word would be controlling?

WITTEBERG: Also, there was a misunderstanding a while back. Draft Document 15 refers only to the procedures whereby promotion and/or tenure; not the criteria by which the candidate will be judged. The background paragraph is more specific than the motion itself. If we include the background paragraph in the motion itself will become more specific, whereas, as the motion stands right now, it simply is saying, referring back to Section 4b of Draft Document 14, "as needed" would mean as judged by the campus committee or "requested" by _____ check out the procedures. Is it one committee or two committees? Do they talk to each other? Do they talk to members of the department? Do they talk to the school? It is a much more trusting vocabulary.

WARFEL: The motion is the motion. The background is the background.

KARLSON: But obviously when interpreting the motion, you have to look at the background in order to decide what the language is supposed to mean. That is a typical method of interpretation of statutes or ordinances or anything that is enacted. You look at the legislative history. But, the point which I raise is slightly different. Again, I see a little problem here of one size fits all. The librarians, with great wisdom, have said "No, it does not. We don't want to be within this "one size fits all" category. The question is whether or not other schools should have this same right as has now been exercised by the librarians to say, "Not us." So, at the very least, since we have granted this great benefit to our librarians, one consideration would be why don't we table this and ask the schools representatives to go back to their various schools and ask if they wish to be given the same grace which has been granted librarians. That's one.

Number two. One size fits all. Let me give you an example. Continuity of membership, through staggered terms of office. That is great except at the Law School, first we have no primaries or unit committee. They are combined. So, in one school you will have a unit committee, a primary committee. We don't have that.

We combine both. So, there is only one committee at the Law School. Secondly, all full professors with tenure and all associate professors with tenure are members of the committee. Not just staggered terms, but in perpetuity, meaning, of course, now, are we going to have some other method where our terms are staggered? Because that is what this resolution says. That is the method by which you assure continuity. I really don't know what this means. What parts are mandatory? What parts are suggestive? Until I do, I don't know what I am voting for and unless I know what I am voting for, I don't like to vote for it.

SIDHU: I think there are two or three issues here. One is that the printed wording, their intent and interpretation may not be the same. There is a lot of fear about the way it will be used. Dean Plater pointed out that he is not going to use it the wrong way and I believe his words. But, there is a fear about the language as it is written here that if somebody wants to misuse it, he/she can be free to do so. My suggestion is that the IUPUI Promotion Committee should not develop any uniform standards for all the schools. The schools will need to have the opportunity to develop their standards, and those should be sent to the Dean of the Faculties for discussion and approval of that committee. You cannot have the same standards for all schools and you cannot expect them to meet all the standards in a uniform fashion.

MEISS: I think we are elevating a resolution to the level of the bylaws in this discussion. Hey folks! go back and check to see if you are doing this or not.

KOLESKI: In relation to what was just said, "Hey folks! go back and tell us whether you are doing this or not." Then comes the next sentence. "If you are not, then what?"

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Something that Dean Plater said before was sort of clear. (could not understand) Criteria are stated in the Academic Handbook. As stated in the handbook, "standards are to be developed by the school with the campus committee in a position to recommend..." This is quite straight forward.

MCDONALD: It seems to me that the intent of the document is to give faculty recourse if they feel they have been injured if they have a reason. If the reasons rest on their not getting good documents in place, (could not understand) This is for individual faculty support and insurance.

WARFEL: It is a relatively short document. Are there specific amendments that someone would like to offer to them acceptable?

MIRSKY: Move for the question. Are we allowed to do that?

WARFEL: Yes. I think you are allowed to do that. It has been moved for the question. Is there a second to call the question? [Seconded] That is undebatable. We shall vote on whether or not the Council wishes the question to be called, which requires a two-thirds vote. All of those ready to consider the main question which is to vote on this motion, say "Aye." All of those not ready. [There were a few] Can we see a show of hands for the people who said they are ready? [28] All of those who are not ready, please raise your hands. [11]

KARLSON: Now you vote on the motion as amended.

WARFEL: All of those in favor of the motion as amended say "Aye." All of those opposed, say "Nay." All of those abstaining? I think the motion passed. Does anyone want a show of hands? All of those in favor of the motion, raise your hands. [31] All of those against the motion, raise your hands. [14] All of those abstaining, raise your hands. [2] The motion passes.

Let's turn to the document on Stopping the Tenure Clock which is included with your agenda. You have two versions of this document because the Faculty Affairs Committee gave us one version in October and we changed it in November. The November version, IUPUI Circular 93-24, which is the latest version, is the one that we will consider to be before us at this time. This document is now open for discussion.

MCDONALD: I would like to point out that "ordinarily" is misspelled in the third line. I would like to suggest that, three lines from the bottom, this revision should not be recorded in the new "Notice of Terms of Initial Appointment" but perhaps a new "Notice of Terms of Appointment". It seems to me to be somewhat contradictory to say a new Notice of Terms of Initial Appointment." So, I would recommend dropping the word "Initial."

PLATER: There is a form called "Notice of Terms of Initial Appointment" that records the official...

MCDONALD: Yes, I know that.

PLATER: So, you are proposing renaming the form?

MCDONALD: Or revised or something.

MIRSKY: Doesn't the term "new" mean they are revising the initial appointment form?

MCDONALD: A document of initial appointment three years after you are initially hired seems to be somewhat confusing.

WARFEL: Are you moving that we substitute "revised" for "new"? Or, do you want to make a different motion?

While she is thinking about it, does anyone else want to comment on the Stopping the Tenure Clock document?

BYRNE: Assuming there is no opposition from others on the committee, I don't see any problem about simply striking the word "new." Someday it will no longer be new.

WARFEL: Is that a motion?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It is new to the individual. It is not a new form.

PLATER: Perhaps this is a substitute Notice of Terms of Initial Appointment.

UNKNOWN: Revised.

PLATER: It is not revised. It is simply a matter of taking the original one and tearing it up and throwing it away and putting a new one in the file. You are not revising it.

GALANTI: We are really thinking in terms of adding something to the person's Notice of Terms of Initial Appointment. Could we substitute, recorded as an addendum to the faculty member's Notice of Terms of Initial Appointment? I believe what we are contemplating here is, it is not a new document. It is not a set of new terms. It is adding to the existing terms of appointment.

PLATER: We could accommodate that change. All I have been doing is to reflect on what we have done in the past when there has been a new Notice of Terms of Initial Appointment. We literally have taken the old document, torn it up, and replaced it with a new form, which is in triplicate, of which the following persons receive a copy: the candidate, the chair, the dean, and the Dean of the Faculties, etc. But, we could handle this process by leaving the original form there and amending it by a codicil that is attached to it. That would make it easier for everyone.

WARFEL: Is that a motion, Paul?

GALANTI: I will make it as a motion.

WARFEL: The motion is to strike the words...

GALANTI: ... "in a new" in the third line at the end of the motion, and substitute "as an addendum" to the faculty member's Notice of Terms of Initial Appointment.

WARFEL: For the sake of clarity, would you read the entire sentence as you would have it read?

GALANTI: *Any probationary period extension must be approved in writing by one's department chair (if applicable) and academic dean and by the Dean of the Faculties, and is to be recorded as an addendum to the faculty member's "Notice of Terms of Initial Appointment."*

VESSELY: I second that.

ORME: I would like to request that the phrase "or librarians" be included in that sentence.

WARFEL: Paul, would you accept that as a friendly amendment?

GALANTI: I will accept that.

WARFEL: So it would now read "...as an addendum to the faculty member's or librarian's *"Notice of Terms of Initial Appointment."* Is there any other discussion of Paul's amendment? All of those in favor of the amendment, say "Aye." All of those opposed? [none] Abstentions? [none] The amendment passes. Is there any other discussion of the document?

ROTHE: In line four which reads "A substantial and unexpected change in one's health or work environment..." I don't see in previous versions the term "unexpected." It is very difficult to define that. Could someone tell me why that term is there?

WARFEL: Would the Faculty Affairs Committee like to speak to this?

BYRNE: One of the questions is, if it is a substantial condition which existed at the time of initial appointment, why wasn't it referred to then? If it is not necessary to be that specific with suggestions as to when a modification of this kind is appropriate, then it seems the thing to do, in the interest of keeping it as absolutely bone bare as possible, is to let particular applications arise as they may. Much of this is intended to be an "e.g." They are all "e.g.'s". There are others. No one who has thought about this document has probably come up with the ideal.

KARLSON: (could not understand) laws dealing with the handicapped individuals or it is foreseeable that there may be a change in their physical condition which would require an extension arising from their handicap. I think the word "unexpected" is not only ill-defined, but perhaps bad.

BYRNE: Doesn't your objection go for the word "substantial" as well?

KARLSON: No, because for me, a substantial (could not understand)

BYRNE: Substantial, but it wasn't known at the time of the initial appointment.

KARLSON: No. You can say a foreseeable consequence, but you just don't know when it is going to go _____. Therefore, it is not unexpected.

BEPKO: If it is expected, can't you deal with it at the time of the initial appointment?

KARLSON: Generally, you don't. Generally you don't start your initial appointment by saying, "But, my tenure clock may be changed at any time." I have never seen that done. Maybe it has been.

BEPKO: You are talking about a person who has a handicap, is physically challenged in some way, and (changed tape)

WARFEL: The lawyers are doing it.

ROTHER: I would like to move deletion of the term "and unexpected".

WARFEL: Is there a second? [seconded] Is there anymore discussion about deleting the term "and unexpected"? All of those in favor of the motion to delete those two words, say "Aye." All of those opposed? [none] Are there any abstentions? [none] The motion passes.

MIRSKY: In the third line the word "ordinary" should be "ordinarily". Is that correct?

WARFEL: That is correct.

MIRSKY: I have a question which I guess is information from anybody. Isn't there a policy now where a faculty member can fill out a form and take a leave of absence for some reason?

WARFEL: That is a good point to clarify. There is already a way to stop the tenure clock for people who take a full leave of absence. That is not what we are talking about here. If they are gone for a block of time, then they are gone. This is for people who continue to work under adverse circumstances, who continue to be here but just want a little more time on their tenure clock.

MIRSKY: Why do we need this procedure? Why can't the faculty member simply take a leave of absence?

WARFEL: This isn't for a faculty member who wants to take a leave of absence. This is for a faculty member who continues to work but under extraordinary, adverse, and possibly, unexpected circumstances.

FREDLAND: To continue to get paid and do your job.

WARFEL: I would also remind the Council that this already happens. One of the reasons we want to adopt some language about it happening is so that it can be written in our handbook and everybody knows it is a possibility as opposed to it happening focally.

NG: I was just going to mention that one of the Terms of Initial Appointment, under certain circumstances, _____ and I myself (could not hear) situation where (could not hear) Dean Plater share with us, as an example, _____ determine initial appointment can be made null and void.

PLATER: Under conditions that are described here, a faculty member may have come with prior service credit, and conditions under which he or she were working were not what they were expected them to be; (e.g., a laboratory was not set up due to no fault of the faculty member). There is thus a circumstance that prohibited him or her from doing the work that he or she was asked to do, and by the agreement of all parties concerned for the benefit of the institution the probationary period was extended beyond what it was originally agreed upon in the Notice of Terms of Initial Appointment.

ALIPRANTIS: I have just one comment. "Under unusual circumstances" I have a feeling it eventually would become "usual circumstances".

WARFEL: It is done. We are not really voting on whether or not it should be done, but on a policy to describe the fact that it is done.

BYRNE: The second sentence in effect puts the campus on record as to certain kinds of happenings that would be taken seriously. The next sentence refers to what faculty in a particular unit who might do. This is a response to particular concerns that were raised by one unit or another. It would be my understanding that

they can develop more specific or narrow requirements for their use.

ORME: Addressing the concerns on the other side of the room, I agree that the potential exists here for defining a class of unusual circumstances, but I don't think that simply defining that class allows them to become any less unusual.

J. KECK: There are some faculty members who are in between juniors and seniors, but another reason I am in favor of this policy is that someone I know quite well was hired in the spring of 1985 and over the next five years had five major surgeries. The only time this person has been ill in their entire life. Three of those were every six months for the last 18 months of her tenure/probationary period. There was no policy like this that was obvious, so this person continued to try to be successful and, fortunately, was. But, it had a tremendous negative impact on getting things done and being scholarly under such adverse conditions without an obvious potential to extend one more year. It would have made life a whole lot easier.

FREDLAND: We will call this the Juanita Keck Memorial Resolution. [laughter]

J. KECK: I strongly support the wording and I strongly support taking out the unexpected because, frankly, by surgery four and five, it was expected.

WARFEL: Are there other comments? Is the Council ready to vote? All of those in favor of the document that we have as it has been amended, say "Aye." All of those opposed? [a few] Abstentions? [none] The motion to accept passes. We will close our discussion about major issues until the next meeting when we will take up the proposed versions of Dismissal Policies for Tenured Faculty and Librarians.

AGENDA ITEM VIII - QUESTION/ANSWER PERIOD

WARFEL: We have on our agenda a question and answer period. Are there any questions? [none]

AGENDA ITEM IX - UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business.

AGENDA ITEM X - NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

AGENDA ITEM XI - ADJOURNMENT

The Council meeting is adjourned.

FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING
MARCH 3, 1994
LAW SCHOOL, ROOM 116
3:30 - 5:30 P.M.
INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY INDIANAPOLIS

PRESENT: **ADMINISTRATION:** Chancellor Gerald L. Bepko, Dean William Plater. **DEANS:** John Barlow, P Nicholas Kellum. **ELECTED FACULTY:** Merrill Benson, Henry Besch, Patricia Blake, Edmund Byrne, Michael Cohen, Elaine Cooney, Theodore Cutshall, Richard Fredland, Michael Fritsch, Paul Galanti, Jean Gnat, Linda Goodine, Clifford Goodwin, Stuart Hart, Dolores Hoyt, Norman Hudson, Jerome Kaplan, Juanita Keck, Raymond Koleski, Joseph Koss, Steven Leapman, Diane Leland, Eric Long, Dana McDonald, Richard Meiss, Bernard Morrel, Byron Olson, William Orme, Vimalkumar Patel, Richard Peterson, Rebecca Porter, Norris Richmond, Margaret Richwine, Carl Rothe, Lee Schwecke, Jeffrey Springston, Robert Sutton, David Suzuki, Karen Teegarden, Jeffery Vessely, James Wallihan, Eric Wiebke, Patricia Wittberg, Charles Yokomoto. **PARLIAMENTARIAN:** Henry Karlson. **EX OFFICIO MEMBERS:** John Pless, William Schneider, Hitwant Sidhu, Kathleen Warfel. **VISITORS:** Trudy Banta, Erwin Boschmann, Mark Grove.

ALTERNATES PRESENT: **DEANS:** Rose S. Fife for Walter Daly, J M Ebbert for Kathy Krendl, Juanita Laidig for Angela McBride. **ELECTED FACULTY:** David Lewis for James Baldwin, Kellie Kaneshiro for Frances Brahmi, William Blomquist for Paul Carlin, Beverly Ross for M Jan Keffer, Owen Burkinshaw for Bart Ng, Golam Mannan for Edward Robbins. **EX OFFICIO MEMBERS:** David Frisby for Virgie Montgomery.

ABSENT: **ADMINISTRATION:** J Herman Blake. **DEANS:** A James Barnes, Trevor Brown, Barbara Fischler, H William Gilmore, Norman Lefstein, Alfred Potvin, John Rau, Sheldon Siegel, David Stocum, William Voos, Donald Warren, Charles Webb. **ELECTED FACULTY:** C D Aliprantis, Biagio Azzarelli, Darrell Bailey, Timothy Baldwin, David Burr, David Canal, Michael Clark, Gayle Cox, Michael Dalsing, Joseph DiMicco, William Engle, Naomi Fineberg, Joe Garcia, Gareth Gilkey, Michael Gleeson, Robert Keck, James McAteer, Lynda Means, Arthur Mirsky, Daniel Peavy, Michael Sadove, Brian Sanders, Richard Schreiner, Aristotle Siakotos, Jay Simon, Charles Slemenda, Rosalie Vermette, Karen West, Susan Zunt. **EX OFFICIO:** Barbara Cambridge, J Vannoy Faris, Janet Feldmann, Edgar Fleenor, Steven Mannheimer, B Keith Moore, Helen Schwartz, Martin Spechler, Student Representative.

AGENDA ITEM I - CALL TO ORDER AND MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS

WARFEL: It may look like spring outside, but this is the last winter meeting of the Faculty Council for this year. I think some of our colleagues are out enjoying the sunshine. Unfortunately, we have to begin our meeting with memorial resolutions for five faculty members. These include Robert Derry, School of Dentistry; Robert Garrett, School of Medicine; Timothy O'Leary, School of Dentistry; Samuel Patterson, School of Dentistry; and Richard Powell, School of Medicine. The text of the memorial resolutions is included with your agenda and will be entered into the minutes. I would like to ask the Council to stand for a moment of silence. Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM II - APPROVAL OF NOVEMBER 4, 1993 MINUTES AND DECEMBER 2, 1993

WARFEL: There are two sets of minutes of Faculty Council meetings available for approval. One is the November 4, 1993 meeting which were mailed out previously and the other is the December meeting which is attached to the agenda. Are there any corrections? If not, we will take them as approved as distributed.
[Theodore Cutshall should have been shown as present at the November meeting]

AGENDA ITEM III - ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT - CHANCELLOR GERALD BEPKO

BEPKO: In the interest of letting at least one person enjoy the beautiful weather while driving back to Bloomington, we thought we would make as a part of the Administrative Report what appears on your agenda as Item VIII - Transferability of TIAA / CREF benefits. To make a presentation on this we have Dan Rives from the Human Resources Office in Bloomington. Dan, would you like to do that now so that you will be free to leave when you are done?

RIVES: I am distributing copies of an update to the material which was attached to your agenda. More than not when I talk about benefit programs it is a little more controversial especially since we are trying to avoid rising costs of healthcare and things of that nature. But, talking about transferability and retirement is going to be a pleasure today. As you know, for faculty and professional staff within the University the retirement plan is what I call a "define contribution plan." The University allocates monies to accounts and those accounts have cash balances when you retire. Indeed, your retirement benefits are based on the value in those accounts, which is a combination of both what the University contributes and all the earnings throughout one's employment. The University has been contributing those monies to TIAA / CREF. Within that scheme there are six investment vehicles for employees to choose from.

In 1990 TIAA / CREF, in responding to their consumer pressures, and I really think it was inevitable based on IRS regulations, allowed institutions like Indiana University to adopt something called "Transferability" which is in essence the option of transferring monies from the five CREF accounts to an alternate 403(b) vendor. Indiana University, in consideration of that option, had a task force consisting of faculty and administrators, looking at the option. The recommendation was, "Yes, let's pursue it." The University said, "Yes, but not if it adds additional costs to the University's benefit programs." The faculty committees, in essence, said, "But, if we are going to do it, let's do it in a way that we don't add costs to those participants who do not want to transfer monies to another vendor. I was given the charge to look for a way of accommodating both issues.

Let me stress that what I am going to be talking about is Transferability, not an optional retirement plan. In the last couple of months I have noticed a little bit of confusion by individuals saying, "Why can't money go directly to another vendor?" That is another issue. The only thing that this specific modification will address is the ability to move funds from CREF to an alternate vendor. Within the handout you will notice some of the proposal criteria. I am not going to spend a lot of time on that. I think it is very self-explanatory. We certainly want to protect the IRS tax treatment so it has to be within the framework of 403(b) of the Internal Revenue Service Code. Again, we don't want to add cost to the University. We want to do this in a way that it is not going to add costs to anybody who doesn't elect it.

Using this criteria, I looked at two vendors that have large families of funds. Those two vendors are Vanguard and Fidelity. I personally spoke to Vanguard. Vanguard's response was, "Yes, we would like to work with Indiana University, but we would like retirement contributions to come directly to Vanguard." That would be what I would call an "optional retirement plan" and that is not what is being considered at this stage. In essence, they were saying, "When you get to that stage we will talk to you."

Fidelity is the only other large vendor with very large numbers of equity funds which is what individuals wanted to have as alternatives. Fidelity said, "Yes, we would be glad to work with Indiana University just like we are working with many other schools." In response to that, we developed an assessment with Fidelity to respond to all of our concerns. The net result is that, within the 120 international and domestic funds that Fidelity has availability, if you indicate that we are looking at those funds which have some basic retirement criteria, i.e., no select funds, no precious metal funds, anything that is very high in risk. What I have come with are 41 funds within the Fidelity family that would be available for individuals to transfer monies to. Those funds are listed on the handout. The difference between the document attached to your agenda and the document which I distributed today is the addition of some five new funds.

Fidelity will dedicate something they call a "transfer disk" for individuals who provide assistance to individuals who want to initiate transferability. Instead of calling my office and instead of calling Human Resources at the IUPUI campus, if you wish to elect Transferability, you would call the 800 number and they would help you get the contract with Fidelity and the appropriate application to move forms from CREF funds over to their funds. There are two pieces of paper that need to be completed to initiate and complete that transaction. Fidelity will provide that kind of support to make it as turnkey as possible. There would be a charge to those participants electing to move monies to Fidelity of about \$12 per year. Let me back up. There are no sales or load commissions on these 41 funds. We would be categorized as an institutional investor and, as such, they would waive any of those sales charges you would normally see if you were participating with them on an individual basis. That is one of the

benefits we would get as an institution. That \$12 would be charged as an annual basis for some of the administrative work that Fidelity would do and it would decrease over time. Fidelity is currently one of our Tax Deferred Annuity (TDA) vendors. We have about \$25 million to \$30 million of your own money with them. As that total amount increases to \$50 million, that \$12 fee will drop down to \$6, and as we get close to \$75 million, it will go away entirely. At some point in the future there would be no additional administrative charge for those people electing to move monies over to Fidelity.

I am anticipating that we will have this fully implemented on July 1, if not June 1. The process that we have to go through is to ensure that we have a plan document with Fidelity so that they have the same plan provisions as we have in TIAA / CREF, i.e., cashability and transferability. So, if you were to move your monies to Fidelity, you can move it back to TIAA / CREF. I need to complete some communication pieces, provide them to you and all faculty and eligible staff employees and hold some sessions so we can answer your individual questions. With that said, I have gone through an overview what the program is going to consist of. Is it appropriate to entertain questions?

WARFEL: Are there any questions or comments for Dan?

FREDLAND: I am not going to let you get away easily. Over a long period of time we have talked about the question of Transferability in faculty fora here and in Bloomington. All of sudden I see that it has been solved. The problem has been dealt with and it has been decided that this becomes the option. I am certainly not in any position to argue about the merits of this one or another one, but I guess I am sort of curious about the rationale. I see a sentence or so in here which state, "Two of the largest vendors who meet the above criteria.." which are these two and one is not interested, so we end up with this one. It is just the way things "shook out" as to how we got to this point.

RIVES: It was by process of elimination and there certainly are other vendors that would be interested in Transferability such as Valic, such as some of the Calvert funds, etc. Some of them are very limited in terms of equity funds, and indeed we are probably talking about families of funds that can be counted on one hand, basically.

SCHNEIDER: I have a couple of questions about Transferability. The funds have to be in TIAA / CREF first and then you transfer them over?

RIVES: That is correct.

SCHNEIDER: So, if you determine (could not understand) transfer the subsequent quarter or the subsequent year _____. The second question regards transferability. If one were to leave this institution and return to another institution, would all of this follow?

RIVES: Let me answer the first part of your question. Yes, it is indeed transferability, not sending monies directly to Fidelity. TIAA / CREF currently allows those transfers to take place with no charge four times a year. So, you could do transfers quarterly or periodically as long as it did not exceed four times a year. TIAA / CREF is talking about a \$15 charge for every transaction in excess of four times a year. However, I will be honest with you, they have yet to impose that charge on any other institution. There are many other institutions who elected transferability.

The second part of your question deals with portability or retention of it. Any funds that are Indiana University contributions and go to either TIAA or CREF can later be transferred to Fidelity, they would be governed by the Indiana University provisions. So, if you were to leave Indiana University and you had an accumulation in Fidelity, you could move them back to TIAA / CREF if you wished. Or, you left Indiana University and you had funds with TIAA / CREF, at a later point in your career you could move them to Fidelity as long as Indiana University maintained that agreement with Fidelity. So, there is a sense of retention of these procedures, whatever applies to the Indiana University portion of your contributions. If you come to us from another school and you have money

in TIAA / CREF, those monies are, in essence, governed by the provisions of which school that had the contract with TIAA / CREF.

SCHNEIDER: Wouldn't it be the opposite if you came from a school that doesn't have the arrangement with Fidelity?

RIVES: That is a good question. If they do not have that arrangement, you would not be able to transfer monies to Fidelity. With the Indiana University funds you could move them to Fidelity or move them back and forth. But if you go to a new school, those funds, if they don't have transferability, cannot be moved to Fidelity.

SCHNEIDER: TIAA / CREF keeps track of the account for consulting that came from Indiana University (could not understand)

RIVES: That is correct. There is a degree of complexity here for those of you who elect to move monies to Fidelity then you are dealing with two account statements. When you retire you have accumulations in two separate places. You can elect to move them into one place or the other.

BYRNE: If you have funds that you already put into Fidelity and then you move them back to CREF, do you know, will CREF set up a separate account or would it go right into one's existing CREF account? The reason I ask is because for 10-year-transferred TIAA money they set up a separate account just for that rather than simply pouring it into one's CREF account.

RIVES: I just said that is TDA monies, in which case they would segregate the Tax Deferred Annuity monies from your basic monies.

BYRNE: Is that SRA money?

RIVES: SRA is a form of a retirement plan. I am using those synonymously, but to my knowledge, it would go into your normal or regular account with TIAA / CREF and then you would have to designate the investment choice.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I have a question about activity amongst the Fidelity funds. You mentioned that CREF has a four times a year limit without a fee. Moving from CREF to Fidelity, can you then move monies within Fidelity accounts? Does that count for CREF, and does Fidelity have a cap on activity?

RIVES: Currently, Fidelity has no cap on moving monies within their funds or moving out of Fidelity. They have put no limitations on that. Once you move money into Fidelity there would be no relationship to TIAA / CREF for those monies. If you look at the set of funds on the second page, let me draw your attention to three of them. I said there are no loads, sales or commissions, but there are three funds that have 90-day redemption fees. In essence, if you were to put monies in those three funds, and I am looking at the two funds in the Growth Fund category and, if you go down to the International Funds category you will see the Emerging Markets Funds. In those three funds there are redemption periods. If you move monies in there and take it out in less than 90 days, there is a portion of a percentage charge to your account for that transaction. That is not for the administrative transactions. That is for the handling of the equities.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: If you move your funds to Fidelity and then upon retirement is there new options that are available through whatever options are available through Fidelity for retirement plans just like there is with TIAA / CREF? There are different plans and you would select whatever Fidelity had.

RIVES: When you retire and you want a stream of income, then you purchase an annuity. Fidelity has contracts with insurance companies like Met Life, as an example. So, you can initiate an annuity with Met Life or move your monies back to TIAA / CREF and initiate an annuity with TIAA / CREF as an option.

SIDHU: Is there any information available about the security of the monies of the two companies regarding which is better than the other or are they equal in the long run? I was wondering if you have any information supporting that.

RIVES: Both companies and investment managers are in the top of their field. I don't recall the specific rating criteria, but they both have the highest rating criteria. However, what we are looking at are funds that have different portfolio criteria. Some are more risky or less risky. So, you would want to pay a lot of attention to the fund that you would select. With 41 funds with Fidelity, I said they all meet some basic retirement plan criteria, but they all have a wide variety of portfolios. Some are fixed income, some are very risky or riskier, more aggressive stock options. Within Fidelity, there is a new group of funds called the "Asset Allocation Funds" which take away some of the investment decisions you may otherwise have to make, depending on how aggressive and sophisticated you are in getting involved in all of this. These funds have been around since inception for about three to four years. They provide another level of opportunity for some of you who want to look at categories of bonds and equities, and have someone else manage that portfolio for you. In essence, they are groups of portfolios so that they are that much more diversified.

WARFEL: Thank you.

BEPKO: Thanks, Dan. I have a couple of other items. First of all, on at least one, and perhaps four occasions in the past we have talked about cleaning up the administrative reviews from the 1992-93 academic year. The one outstanding was the review of the Office of the Dean of Medicine. That review is now complete. We have met with the review committee and are going to meet with Dean Daly. That should be wrapped up shortly. A written report will be available for the April meeting of the Faculty Council. It is a generally favorable and positive report. There were some good suggestions about the future.

Also, one last item about a series that we started this year called "Forum on Issues of Higher Education." We had lamented that, while higher education is debated a great deal in the communities these days, there is often more heat than light. Very few people are invited to talk with authority about these issues who have a national standing to speak about issues of higher education. People like that are seldom brought to Indianapolis to speak on issues of importance to all of us and when a few are invited to speak in Indianapolis, they are usually invited by other people who may invite only those who give an opinion on particular portion of the spectrum of ideas on higher education. We thought that we should join this process and try to do more publicly to talk about issues in higher education. We began the series as a part of the 25th anniversary celebrations this year. The first speaker was Alexander W. Astin who is a very well known author and scholar on issues of higher education. He is a Director of Higher Education Research at the University of California at Los Angeles. He spoke in January about Assessment, Accountability and Educational Reform: A Question of Values, as he put it. The reason I mention this today is to suggest that you might pick up one of these brochures. Tonight at 5:00, there will be a reception at the University Place Conference Center and then at 6:00 a presentation by Patricia Cross. Pat Cross is the Elizabeth and Edward Connor Professor of Higher Education at the University of California at Berkeley. She is going to talk about Improving Undergraduate Learning and focus on recent knowledge about how students learn, how to assess learning, and how teachers can make classrooms into laboratories for systematic observation of students' learning processes. The last in the series this spring will be on April 14 when Peter Ewell, Senior Associate at National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS), will talk about Accountability and the Public Agenda for Higher Education: National Trends and Emerging Responses." You are welcome to join in this. It is designed for both University people and for the community. There are extra brochures up here if you would like to pick one up on your way out. To answer the question that is, I am sure, emerging in some of your minds, we pay for this out of a new Chancellor's Circle program that we inaugurated about two years ago whereby we have raised a fairly substantial amount of money each year for discretionary projects of just this kind to enrich the University community and the larger community of Indianapolis.

WALLIHAN: I don't know whether it is possible to get him on this campus, but a notice just went around that Jack Getman, formerly of the Law School at Bloomington, will be giving a presentation on March 23. Jack is a guest of the Institute for Advanced Study and has just written a book on higher education.

BEPKO: I saw that and I know Jeff well. It is an interesting possibility for the future. His book just came out in 1993, I think.

AGENDA ITEM V - PRESIDENT'S REPORT - RICHARD FREDLAND

FREDLAND: I have a long list of things to announce. I feel like the town crier. You may want to keep your calendar out if you have gotten it out to deal with the higher education series.

We have four faculty fora scheduled for this semester. The first one is next Tuesday in which we are going to have reports on the State of Student Government. It is a two-part for the price of one. The second part is a report from the Joint Center for Higher Education which is physically located at 38th Street managed by JoAnne Switzer. It is scheduled for March 9 at 2:30 in the Business/SPEA Building, Room 2003. If you haven't already, you will be receiving flyers on these. The one which you cannot forget is on March 22 at 10:00 a.m. in the auditorium of library - first come - first serve. This will be an assessment by the campus Budgetary Affairs Committee on Responsibility Centered Budgeting. The Budgetary Affairs Committee has spent this entire year looking at budgets relatively across campus. They have drawn some conclusions that I think are valuable for all of us to have in our heads as we look at our own situation. I think you will find that well worth your while.

In April we have two more - one on Health Care which will be held on April 8 in Business / SPEA Building, Room 3009. The other one is on the Review of Administrators to be held on April 26. This will be held in the University Conference Center, Faculty Club from 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. Speaking of which, I cannot help but note what may be a Freudian slip by the Chancellor in talking about "cleaning up" the review of administrators. As you will recall, the policy is that the committee reports to the Chancellor and he cleans up the review and presents a summary to us.

Next Tuesday in Indianapolis the University Faculty Council will meet from 1 - 5 p.m. Again, two for the price of one because we did not meet last month because of the weather. You may be interested in some of the issues that will be dealt with there. For the last time Balanced Case. Conflict of Interest probably for about the last time also. We have been working on a University wide policy on Conflict of Interest that has been negotiated with the Office of Research and University Graduate School - George Walker, Vice President of, that effects your rights to your discoveries, your writings, your professional productions. We will be voting on whether we change the presiding officer of the University Faculty Council. from the President of the University to an elected faculty member. We will briefly be looking at the question of Code of Student Ethics and "hate" speech. We will be voting on a resolution to propose adding a faculty member to the Board of Trustees of the University. Finally, we will be looking at changes in educational policies affecting the FX grade, the dates of withdrawal, and for want of better terms, grade indexing - attaching a class GPA, for example, to a student's grade in a given class. All of this brought to you next Tuesday from 1-5 p.m. in Room 132 in the Conference Center. I have given them in the order in which they are on the agenda.

I will report to you that the Bloomington Faculty Council voted at its meeting last week not to amend their policy on Review of Tenured Faculty, which is a policy very similar to the one that we adopted. In April we have a dedication of the library which you will certainly hear about in its own right, but associated with that the faculty will be sponsoring a farewell gathering for Thomas Ehrlich. You will hear more about that as time goes on.

You should have received in today's mail a supplement to the Supplement to the Academic Handbook which you should have received last week. Put them together on your desk and do not lose them. You will not get another Faculty Handbook for another couple of years, but it is the general consensus that policies adopted here are immediately in effect even though they haven't been printed in a Faculty Handbook. So, what you received in the mail is also part of the canon of law under which you operate.

At the risk of sounding crass or irreverent which has not stopped me before, I have raised an issue that you may wish to say something about or not say anything about. I notice in the agenda we have five memorial resolutions which take up a lot of paper for everyone on the campus who receive this. It struck me that the relevant parties

are not quite as numerous as the number of people who receive this document. It might be that we could devise a way to not distribute all of these words to all the people who are involved. I was discussing this before the meeting and one of my colleagues pointed out to me that she was reading them very carefully to see what she could expect at some future date. If that serves a purpose for you, fine. If it seems that we could deal with this in some other way, I am certainly open to suggesting that we do it some other way.

WARFEL: Would you clarify what you said about the Bloomington Faculty Council? They decided not to do what?

FREDLAND: They have a policy in place to review tenured faculty every five years. In other words, post tenure review. They did not expand on that to require external reviews which was the proposal.

WARFEL: Just as a point of clarification. You went on and said that their policy was similar to the one we adopted and we have not adopted.

FREDLAND: That we may adopt.

CUTSHALL: The question that I have is why the policy for the FX Policy and the Withdrawal Policy has not been brought forward to the IUPUI Faculty Council before it went to the UFC Faculty Council?

FREDLAND: It came out of the Academic Affairs Committee. The Academic Affairs Committee took it to the Executive Committee and I guess it should be on our agenda. But, it is going to get to the UFC first. Again, this is one of those interesting cases where it is going to get there before it gets to us. It has gone through our committee and our committee has recommended against all three of them as has the Educational Policies Committee of the University Faculty Council. It is a matter of synchronization one more time. You have caught me flat footed but I think it will be here after it has been there in the normal course of events. I have proposed to the University Structure Committee that we re-examine the flow of material so that this kind of thing doesn't happen. It should not happen but it has happened. One of the problems is the University Faculty Council meets only five or six times a year. We meet after their last meeting and if we dealt with things in the course of the year, it would not get to them until the next year which creates another kind of problem of another sort. The sequence of events is totally out of sync on the two levels. This has driven me up the wall on more than one occasion; the balanced case being the most significant example of it. It is at the bottom of the agenda on Tuesday. If it seems like it is possible, we can postpone it there. We can have it here before we have another meeting there.

AGENDA ITEM V - CLINICAL RANKS. REVISION OF POLICY

WARFEL: The next item on the agenda is an information item about clinical ranks. Patricia Blake, Chairman of the IUPUI Faculty Affairs Committee, will tell us about it.

BLAKE: Thank you. For the last two years the Faculty Affairs Committee has been working with the Law School faculty on whether or not they could implement the policy on clinical ranks. The Law School does have two positions and at the most it would be four positions out of 36 faculty, who would qualify for this, who actually go to court with their students and act as a preceptor for them while they are in court. Therefore, they do fulfill the criteria for clinical rank. In discussing their concerns, the Faculty Affairs Committee said they will not be the only unit who might come up with this problem. So, we foresaw that there would be other programs who would want the same type of clinical ranks in their units. We are proposing to strike from the present policy the comments on your handout which say including physicians, dentists, nurses, optometrists, audiologists, and speech pathologists primarily providing patient related services.

Then, if you drop down, you will see that we changed the wording "patient" to "professional" services. Those are the only two changes. We debated and retained the 15 percent. I checked with Dean Plater and that is being maintained in the University. If we change the wording, then the units could come to Faculty Affairs and go through the process without going through a whole total language change with the University itself. This is a point of information. I would be glad to answer any questions. There are other committee members in the audience.

We hope to vote on it next meeting. On the back of your page the section marked "Rationale" has items stricken out. However, there should be no blocking in this section. It is just rationale.

WARFEL: Are there questions or comments about proposing that the language for Clinical Ranks be changed? This is something that that would have to be changed in All University Academic Handbook and, therefore, it is not something that this Council could decide about on its own.

HOYT: Why is the last sentence crossed out?

BLAKE: It is a negotiating point. If you come in at a clinical rank, you would have to go through the search and screen to move over to a tenure track position. If a clinical rank faculty, wanted to come on tenure track, they would negotiate like any faculty coming from another university.

AGENDA ITEM VI - ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

WARFEL: We will move on to Agenda Item VI with the Nominating Committee.

BESCH: On behalf of the Nominating Committee, I would like to distribute the ballots. If there are any Nominating Committee members here today, would they please come forward.

[The results of the election were Kathleen Warfel, President and Richard Turner, Vice President].

AGENDA ITEM VII - CONTINUED "MAJOR ISSUES" DISCUSSION

WARFEL: We will move on to the next agenda item which is to continue our discussion of the major issues that came out of the TFFAA work. As you recall, we have finished work on the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Policy for Stopping the Tenure Clock. The next item on our schedule is to talk about the Procedures for Dismissal of Tenured Faculty and Librarians. We have some guidelines about dismissal of faculty and librarians from the University Academic Handbook which points out that dismissal shall occur only for reasons of a) incompetence, b) serious personal or professional misconduct, or c) extraordinary financial exigencies of the University. There isn't much more guideline given towards the actual procedures that would be used to dismiss a tenured member of the institution. The campus is currently operating under an interim policy. It is the feeling of the original TFFAA group and of the Implementation Committee and of others that the campus should adopt a well considered, mutually agreeable set of procedures to make dismissal possible when it is, in fact, necessary but to protect the tenured members as much as possible. That is what we are about now. The original Draft Document 19, which was distributed last fall and which was redistributed with your agenda, was a version that had come out of the Implementation Committee that worked last summer. Early feedback about that Draft Document 19 pointed out that there were some gaps in it, some lack of clarity, and it was not in the tidiest form. The Executive Committee has before us now a "fleshed out" version of Draft Document 19 which was mailed out to you. It follows the same page format as the original Draft Document 19 and, because it tries to keep the same sections on the same page, required legal size paper so we will call it the long version.

With that said, by way of background, the original document and the substitute version are open for discussion by the Council.

BYRNE: The new version is certainly an improvement; however, the criteria and the examples provided for incompetence on the one hand, and misconduct on the other involve quite different procedures. I should, therefore, like to move that Part 1 and Part 2 be separated for purposes of discussion and that we consider Part 1 as a document for possible adoption. Then, separately, afterwards Part 2 of the document for possible adoption.

WARFEL: Is there a second?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I second that.

WARFEL: The motion is now to separate our discussion of the two parts focusing first on Dismissal Procedures for Alleged Professional Incompetence and, subsequently, on Dismissal Procedures for Misconduct. Is there any discussion about the motion to separate? (CHANGED TAPE AT THIS POINT AND MISSED SOME OF THE DISCUSSION)

WALLIHAN:hopefully the peer review requirement is at the core of the procedure, and particularly in the incompetence procedures. It seems to me that it would make sense that we should pay separate attention to those.

WARFEL: Are there any more comments? All of those in favor of dividing the discussion, say "Aye". Opposed? Abstentions? Motion passes. We now have before us a draft document as a proposed amendment and we can discuss the first half of it.

PORTER: Do you have any order in mind if we have a question over different parts? For example, I have a question on something on page 4. Should I ask it now or wait?

WARFEL: I think that eventually at some point we need to go through whichever version we decide to go through in a very orderly way. This is an extremely important document and we should all be sure that it is amended to our satisfaction before we adopt these procedures. At this point, early in the discussions, why don't you just take a shot at it?

SCHNEIDER: Could you tell us where we are in the procedures? Is this a substitute motion?

WARFEL: This is moved as a substitute version. It is moved to divide our discussion either of them? Both of them?

SCHNEIDER: Will we vote on them separately?

WARFEL: I was hoping that the Council might discuss the merits of...

SCHNEIDER: What are we going to vote on?

WARFEL: The motion we voted on was to divide our discussion; talking first only about the Dismissal Policies for Incompetence before we talk about the Dismissal for Misconduct. We still have before us a motion to substitute.

WALLIHAN: When you say substitute motion, are you considering the second document with reference to incompetence an amendment to BB 19?

WARFEL: The Executive Committee puts this out as a substitute for the motion and for the total procedures in Document 14 not just in the first half.

WALLIHAN: In other words, we vote the second document up or down as an amendment replacing, in effect, the first. Is that the procedure you are suggesting?

KARLSON: If I might reply to this, I assume this is addressed to the Parliamentarian. The question involved is two-fold. If there was a motion originally pending, once that motion was originally pending, then that is the motion before the assembly and not this one. To the extent that this one is a substitute motion, you should vote against that first motion and then vote in favor of this one. This would not be an amendment to that motion because its adoption is effectively a rejection of the earlier motion. In fact, at least what was distributed to me said that at the March meeting the Executive Committee will move that the attached document be accepted as a substitute. No such motion has been made.

KARLSON: Technically, such a motion would be out of order if there was already a pending motion before the assembly that motion must be dealt with.

FREDLAND: I would like to move that we substitute all the language in the second document for the language in the first document under Roman I.

KARLSON: Again, that is an improper amendment. It is merely calling for you to reject the earlier motion. Something which is just a rejection of the earlier motion is not a proper amendment. Roberts' says that exactly and I have got Roberts' here with me.

BESCH: One purpose of making an amendment is to change the intent of the original motion or of a subsidiary motion.

KOLESKI: (Too much talking at head table. Could not understand what Professor Koleski said)

KARLSON: In order to clear up any discrepancy in the interpretation of Roberts', under Improper Amendments #2 says: "One that merely makes the adoption of the amended question equivalent to a rejection of the original motion."

BESCH: But, to change (Besch to send something on this)

KARLSON: But, that is a different issue. I don't believe the other one was ever made as a formal motion before this assembly. [Correction to this statement made by several people] Was it made as a formal motion before this assembly?

FREDLAND: I just moved it.

KARLSON: I don't mean this one. I meant the earlier one. The earlier document was distributed but it was never made as a motion. This is then the only motion before the assembly.

FREDLAND: Have we been treating these as committee report and automatically move?

KARLSON: No, because it has to be a standing committee report. This is not a report of a standing committee. This is a report of a special committee and, therefore, it has to be moved and seconded.

FREDLAND: I move that we deal with Draft Document 19 as you have proposed it -- the long document as the item to be discuss. [Seconded]

WARFEL: Does everyone understand Dick Fredland's motion? Would you repeat your motion?

FREDLAND: I move that we consider long Document 19's Roman I.

WARFEL: Is there any discussion of Dick's motion?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Call for the question.

WARFEL: Is there a second to the call for the question? [seconded] Is the Council ready to vote on Dick Fredland's motion? All of those who are ready to vote, please raise your hands. All of those who are not ready to vote, please raise your hands. It is quite clear that more than two-thirds are ready the question. All of those in favor of Dick Fredland's motion to consider the long version of Draft Document 19, please say "Aye." All of those opposed? Are there any abstentions? I think we are now officially considering the long version of Draft Document 19.

PORTER: On page 4 of the long document the first paragraph where it is discussing the composition of the committee. There is reference to a unit promotion committee and pertinent primary promotion committee. It does not state who determines who is the pertinent primary promotion and tenure committee. Also, it does not indicate how many people are to be on the committee. I would like to have those two points clarified.

WARFEL: I think the "pertinent" was meant simply (could not hear)

PORTER: I don't have a recommendation in terms of the number, but it seems to me that if an election is to be held, it would be helpful if a number is identified.

HART: I was wondering if we don't need to worry ourselves to the expectations for today beyond this. Unless you are much more optimistic than I, it seems to me that the wise thing might be to raise the issues of genuine concern. If you have a clear recommendation, make it, and then see that these issues are collected and that we receive another draft with positions on each of the issues, with the exception being on some issues that we feel just must be discussed at length today.

WARFEL: I agree highly that this is a very important document and that the Council should not rush into anything. I think the most useful thing for today would be to take shots at it, point out things about it that still needs fixing, hopefully have an opinion about what the fix is, but certainly not to act on accepting the document today. I don't think anybody is ready to accept it. The first thing that has been pointed out is that in the part about Dismissal on Grounds of Professional Incompetence, once you are past the informal two-year notice period, and into the more formal proceedings period, there is instruction about what your group of peers for the purpose of review will be. Becky has pointed out that it doesn't say how many peers will be on the review committee. Does anybody want to address that particular point further?

PLATER: I was going to address the original document. It proposed three members from each of the two committees for a six-person committee. I just said that for information.

WARFEL: How do you all feel about six?

BYRNE: I have some concern about mandating how each academic unit ought to proceed in dealing with these matters. But, without suggesting that all of that in the language be stricken, although I wouldn't like it, I am particularly unhappy with the process of selecting such committees to determine incompetence. Given the way the promotion and tenure committee is put together, it isn't obvious that there would be anyone on it who has any particular expertise in judging the competence of the individual who is allegedly incompetent. That inadequacy is only compounded when those who do take on the review responsibility have been chosen by lot rather than on the basis of some upfront understanding of what constitutes competence in the person's discipline.

KARLSON: The only point that I would make, my experience is that whenever you have a committee you should have an odd number. Otherwise, you have difficulty and the possibility of a split. This becomes particularly significant, I think, as I read through this because we assume that the committee will either have a determination one way or the other. But, if you have even numbers, it is possible to totally split votes, and, therefore, there will be no majority or minority opinion. This also involves another very important issue which is more basic than the mere number and that it is the substantive effect of a committee's determination. As I read through this, even though all of your peers unanimously believe that you are competent, (could not understand) and that is because the administration has no mandate, duty, or responsibility to ever follow the recommendation of a committee in these proceedings. I find that very significant and I find that very frightening because my belief is that tenure is _____ a factor particularly competence is apparently _____; not tenure, which deals with your contract with the university, but competence is alone a factor for your peers to determine. If your peers say you are competent, that should end the matter right there.

The other issue which I find somewhat important and this is on the third page in, in the third paragraph from the bottom where it says "the intent of this notice..." It provides, however documented review of performance may

be used to hold your salary down. That issue was raised before Boards of Review a number of years ago on the issue of whether or not you have been given an affirmative reduction in salary as opposed to a mere removal of tenure. The determination of that Board of Review was that an affirmative reduction of salary is the functional equivalent of a removal of tenure. That was the determination of the Board of Review because the factor is that to say, "Yes, you can stay as long as you want, but you are not going to get paid" is to deny you tenure. One of the functions of tenure is to provide of level of economic security. Therefore, I would be heartedly opposed to a procedure that would allow the administration to affirmatively alter your salary as opposed to deny you being paid which is a different function totally. On the procedure that did not fully comply with an _____ in a determination _____ the removal of tenure. That is another issue which I think is very important and again would be contrary to a procedure which has been previously followed.

The other point which I find disturbing here is, and I wish to emphasize this, that at all stages if a dean wants to start this proceeding, and if there is a committee who say you are performing perfectly, the proceeding is still going to happen. To put this upon a person without any peer determination the the person acted in an incompetence manner, again I think is inappropriate. I would heartedly suggest that either we reject this document in total or we move to amend it in such a manner so that if there is a peer evaluation establishing competence of a tenured faculty member, that that end the proceedings.

Secondly, I would like to see the provision that once there has been a determination of competence, that there is a hiatus to some period within which these allegations cannot be immediately renewed. You can't be placed in double jeopardy. In other words, you go through this for two years, you are determined by your peers to be competent, the administration starts it up again next year.

WARFEL: Do you want to address the "if and only" if issue?

PLATER: I am not sure that I want to make a lengthy argument, but it does seem to me that once the proceedings are initiated that the administrative officer responsible for initiating them, presumably the dean of the school, should be able to carry the process through to its full hearing to the level of the Chancellor. I have been talking about this issue with others, and the Implementation Committee and the Executive Committee have pointed out that all of the actions leading up to the dismissal of the tenured member of the faculty by the Chancellor is subject to a Faculty Board of Review. It seems to me that there is a very substantial number of provisions in place to insure that the faculty members have the benefit of peer review. In stopping the consideration of competence at simply the earliest level where it is often most difficult for faculty bodies to separate themselves from colleagues, is a mistake. As we think about this as a faculty, we have to keep in mind that this is not a tool or device for administrators to get rid of faculty, but it is for the benefit of us dealing with colleagues who are not contributing to the work of our department or our unit. It seems to me that we ought to at least allow the review to go through the full process with the understanding that the Faculty Board of Review is the ultimate faculty review after the determination of the Chancellor.

WARFEL: We are on page four, the second paragraph from the bottom. The way it reads now is that "If the peer committee finds that the faculty member or librarian is not incompetent, the committee will recommend that the proceedings terminate and that the administrator withdraw the allegation in writing. If the administrator proceeds with the process despite the peer committee's findings, the peer committee must be notified and be afforded an opportunity to comment to the dean. All commentary from the peer committee must be a part of the record considered by all subsequent reviewers and must explicitly address the peer committee's findings if they disagree with the written reports." For point of clarification, this is what we are talking about. The suggestion is that, the administration says it is important to be able to be able to proceed in some cases. Henry says, if your peers say that you are in fact (could not understand)

WALLIHAN: The document appears to cast the department chair in the role of prosecutor. I would think that keeping the preparation at the level of the dean, as stated throughout the document, is appropriate without referring to the chair. All references to consultation with the chair can be deleted.

WARFEL: You are objecting to the dean consulting?

WALLIHAN: Yes, with the chair at least. Deans are in a position to get information from a number of sources. Why single out the chair as consultant? That seems, among other things, to compromise the chairperson's role and reduce their effectiveness. It is sufficient to say that the dean act in the role of "prosecutor."

WARFEL: Your idea is just to say nothing and the dean can consult whomever?

WALLIHAN: I have yet to hear a compelling argument for the need for this document and the rationale for it being a campus-level document. We heard in the initial charge to the Task Force that it was necessary because of the removal of mandatory retirement which, of course, has already occurred. Does the case need to be restated in a compelling way or are there new reasons that have emerged?

WARFEL: Whether or not we as a faculty adopt procedures, tenured people are dismissed. I think most of us would like to have a procedure where there is some sort of assurance that some peer review will be in there or some time periods will be designated. Otherwise, it is just up to you know who.

PLATER: We, in fact, do have peer review in our procedure that we are using. I think something like that is referred to in the earlier document. This goes much further in providing the assurances and details that the faculty would like about the procedures that are followed. There is an interim document. It is not used frequently, but using it once is an important matter for the faculty as whole, and I think that we as a faculty should have procedures for the orderly review of faculty who are considered by administrative officers, if not peers. We need to have this addressed by a process that everyone knows in advance. I also want to speak on the point which you raised about the department chairs. I don't recall the specific language in here, but I would think that as faculty we would like to have some assurance that department chairs were, indeed, going to be consulted in this process. Department chairs have a great deal of insight and information, and I think such consultation is a matter of a right for faculty. I would want to make certain that my department chair were being consulted by the dean before actions were being taken or as a part of actions being taken.

FREDLAND: [With the temporary absence of Vice President Warfel] I have become Vice President.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: May I make a response?

FREDLAND: You may.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: My response there is to, among other things, page 3, the paragraph under _____ where a department chair or equivalent is designated, I believe, as being an administrator ____ reference. That is really formalizing the role somewhat. On the onset, they being one of the people who might be appropriate to consult.

FREDLAND: I would like to exercise the right of the response of the department chair and I would not like to see this prosecutorial role (to use your image) left in the hands of the dean. I would like for department chairs and peers to be available to be defenders. They are not automatically a prosecutor simply because they are consulted. I would like to think that department chairs are better tuned in to what we are talking about here than deans are by the nature of the role they play. I see it as a role that I think ought to be very much up and down the hierarchial ladder.

KARLSON: I wish to make a comment concerning what you described as a prosecutorial role. I again would emphasize the need for some final determination by a peer review committee as posed to us by the administrative process. The problem is that by the time an administrator, a dean, has made up his or her mind that this person is incompetent to a stage that they are going to initiate such procedures, then it is pretty well a fixed opinion. Fixed opinions of that manner are very difficult to shake, as any psychologist will tell you, because once you have a fixed opinion, you edit information which you have received before the adoption of bias or prejudice. There are plenty of studies done on that. The issues involved then would mean that we have a person who has already made up their mind and you resourceful peer review committee which finds that you are not incompetent has no impact

because that peer review recommendation has no impact. So, in effect, what we have is a case where the prosecutor decides to take the case to the jury and if he doesn't like the jury's results, he continues anyway and puts the man in jail. That is a procedure so absurd and so lacking in due process and so inherent in the conflict of interest that it would be, I think, totally inappropriate for this faculty to adopt it.

KECK: Having been part of the Promotion and Tenure Committee in which a case was pending and also involved in another case, the cases would have been extremely difficult without the input of the chair's component. An interesting result among faculty members who were faced with this because they were elected to the Promotion and Tenure Committee was number of faculty members said "I don't understand why the dean doesn't just bite the bullet and do her job -- take care of this. There was not universal agreement that this was a faculty job. Most of us set that straight that this was indeed a faculty review process. One of the things that concerns me, having been through this twice, is the general feeling I hear as though administrators can't be trusted and have it out with somebody that they want to get rid of. The deans and the chairs still continue to operate within a faculty arena. Our experience was sort of the opposite. That it was more difficult to get administrators to move on a situation that came from faculty requests to do something about it. We ought to be having a hard time responding to the idea that administrators are out to get us. You all know that I am a strong advocate of faculty governance, but the fact that there appears to be so little trust concerns me.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It seems to me that this document is thoroughly protective if the person's peers and administration thinks this person is incompetent. However, if the peers think that the person is competent, then it has a problem. It loses some continuity. For example, the first step is notice of the alleged incompetence, the second is peer review, the third step is the dean, and the next step is _____ then there is the formal proceeding and then another peer group. If the peers feel this person is competent, and the dean and administration proceed as if this person were incompetent, then what is the next step after that? Is there another peer review?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: The next step would be a board of review which can only recommend.

WARFEL: That is correct. The thing that isn't listed is to take that matter to court. If, in fact, the records showed that your peers thought you were competent, the board of review thought you were competent, the case you made showed you were competent, and these people dismissed you anyway...

PLATER: I think it is clear that the administrative officer is trying to present the case and that is why Jim and others have used the term of the "prosecutorial" role of the administrative officer. It also seems to me that you described, in reciting all of the steps, a really large number of peer reviews that have to be taken before a person would actually be recommended for dismissal for incompetence by the Chancellor. I don't recall the documents now, but I think the procedures that are proposed here go very substantially beyond those recommended by the AAUP for dismissal for faculty for incompetence. Their procedure basically calls for a single peer review, and we built into this process, depending on how you look at it, three peer reviews.

KARLSON: I would like to address an earlier statement. Idealistically, there would be no need for my discipline law, because everyone would act appropriately at all times. The mere existence of the building where you are sitting proves the falsity of that idea. I have personally been involved in Boards of Review where the board of review formally filed that a chairman of a department should be reprimanded for misstating (falsifying in other words), lying about the teaching ability of a person who they wished to get rid of. I have been with a board of review in which the board of review officially recommended that the dean of the school involved be formally reprimanded for reviewing with this member of the faculty in an attempt to remove the determining tenuring process. So, ideally we would have none of these problems. I want to go back to another case which was mentioned, and I was involved in some of cases at your school in which we documented that the chairman of the department had kept what is a standard known technique in the area of employment litigation. What we call a selective file. When making information concerning this faculty member was developed, and I won't go into how it was developed although it was a very improper manner, that information was preserved. Of all affirmative information sent concerning that, positive comments were affirmatively removed from the file and not preserved. Fortunately, the faculty member had kept a separate file. The mere thing I wish to point out here is ideally you

would be correct, but we set procedures, not for the ideas but the for the exceptions that has made this building where you sit necessary.

KECK: You are negating the whole underlying component of peer review as though... I don't see them as documents where the process has no effect. Having served during one procedure on the same board of review of which you speak, and being involved in the other, this procedure would have served us very well and without it we had ore difficulties because we didn't have... There are times when faculty simply are not competent and do not serve the university well and we have to do something.

AGENDA ITEM VIII - TRANSFERABILITY REPORT - DAN RIVES

See Agenda Item III - Administrative Report.

AGENDA ITEM IX - QUESTION / ANSWER PERIOD

Due to the lack of time there was no question/answer period.

AGENDA ITEM X - UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Due to the lack of time there was no unfinished business.

AGENDA ITEM XI - NEW BUSINESS

Due to the lack of time there was no new business.

AGENDA ITEM XII - ADJOURNMENT

WARFEL: One of the things that we have to do is get out of this room. We will continue our discussion of this.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY INDIANAPOLIS
FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING
APRIL 7, 1994
LAW SCHOOL, ROOM 116
3:30 - 5:30 P.M.

PRESENT: Administration: Chancellor Gerald L. Bepko, Dean William Plater. Deans: P. Nicholas Kellum. Elected Faculty: C D Aliprantis, Patricia Blake, Edmund Byrne, Michael Cohen, Elaine Cooney, Gayle Cox, Theodore Cutshall, Naomi Fineberg, Richard Fredland, Karen Gable, Paul Galanti, Linda A. Goodine, Clifford Goodwin, Stuart Hart, Norman Hudson, Jerome Kaplan, Robert Keck, Raymond Koleski, Steven Leapman, Diane Leland, Dana McDonald, Richard Meiss, Arthur Mirsky, Bernard Morrell, Bart Ng, Byron Olson, Richard Peterson, Rebecca Porter, Norris Richmond, Carl Rothe, Brian Sanders, Karen Teegarden, Jeffery Vessely, James Wallihan, Eric Weibke, Charles Yokomoto. Ex Officio Members: Edgar Fleenor, Steven Mannheimer, John Pless, William Schneider, Hitwant Sidhu. Parliamentarian: Henry Karlson.

ALTERNATES PRESENT: Deans: James Carter for Walter Daly, David Lewis for Barbara Fischler, Jerry Durham for Angela McBride. Elected Faculty: Carlyn Johnson for Michael Gleeson, Barbara Albee for Jean Gnat, Barbara Norton for M Jan Keffer, Chris Leland for Edward Robbins. Ex Officio Members: David Frisby for Virgie Montgomery (Staff Council).

VISITORS: Bill Kulsrud (Athletic Advisory Committee), Erwin Boschmann (Dean of the Faculties Office), Vice Chancellor Trudy Banta, Mark Grove (Registrar), Jim Brown (Sagamore).

ABSENT: Administration: J. Herman Blake. Deans: John Barlow, A. James Barnes, Trevor Brown, Kathy Krendl, Norman Lefstein, Alfred Potvin, John Rau, Sheldon Siegel, David Stocum, William Voos, Donald Warren, Charles Webb. Elected Faculty: Biagio Azzarelli, Darrell Bailey, James Baldwin, Merrill Benson, Henry Besch, Frances Brahmi, David Burr, David Canal, William Blomquist/Paul Carlin, Michael Clark, Michael Dalsing, Joseph DiMicco, William Engle, Michael Fritsch, Joe Garcia, Gareth Gilkey, Dolores Hoyt, Juanita Keck, Joseph Koss, Eric Long, Lynda Means, William Orme, Vimalkumar Patel, Daniel Peavy, Michael Sadove, Richard Schreiner, Lee Schwecke, Aristotle Siakotos, Jay Simon, Charles Slemenda, Jeffrey Springston, Robert Sutton, David Suzuki, Rosalie Vermette, Karen West, Patricia Wittberg, Susan Zunt. Ex Officio Members: Barbara Cambridge, J Vannoy Faris, Janet Feldmann, B Keith Moore, Martin Spechler, Kathleen Warfel, Student Representative.

AGENDA ITEM I - CALL TO ORDER

WARFEL: Let's come to order, please.

AGENDA ITEM II - MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS

WARFEL: We begin our meeting today with two memorial resolutions. One for Edward C. Moore who was Dean of the Faculties and Executive Vice Chancellor of the campus. The second is for Patricia Boaz who was Associate Professor of Chemistry and later served the campus in many capacities including acting as Dean of Student Affairs and Director of the Adult Education Coordinating Center. We will enter the whole text of their memorial resolutions into the minutes. I ask that the Council stand for a moment of silence.

AGENDA ITEM III - APPROVAL OF MINUTES - JANUARY 13, 1994

WARFEL: The January minutes have been distributed. Are there any corrections to these minutes which are now printed on white, recyclable paper? Hearing no corrections, we will take them as approved.

AGENDA ITEM IV - ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT - GERALD L. BEPKO

WARFEL: Chancellor Bepko has been detained temporarily and has asked that Dean Plater give the Administrative Report.

IUPUI Faculty Council Minutes

April 7, 1994

Page 2

PLATER: Chancellor Bepko is meeting with the Commission for Higher Education at this moment. After the agenda item that touches on IUPUI is concluded he will be here. He has asked that I introduce, on his behalf, Vice Chancellor Eugene Tempel who would like to say a word or two about the library dedication that will take place tomorrow.

TEMPEL: Thank you, Bill. I want to invite all of you to join us tomorrow in celebration of an important dedication on our campus -- the dedication of our new University Library. It is a symbol of unity for the campus, and tomorrow's celebration also marks the closing event for our 25th Anniversary celebration of the founding of IUPUI. I hope you will join us for all of the events that you possibly can.

There is a faculty symposium tomorrow morning in the Lilly Auditorium of the new library. It is called the "Virtual, Virtuoso, and Virtuous Library". It is organized by the chair of the Dedication Committee Sharon Hamilton. We hope you can join us at 9:30 tomorrow morning at the library.

During the day tomorrow in the library authors will be signing their books. The IU Press will have a display all day tomorrow and you can get your own personal copy of books signed by IU Press authors. Among them will be Herman Wells.

I hope you will also join us for the dedication at 2:00 on the fourth floor of the library. If you haven't been on the fourth floor of the library, you will see that it is a beautiful, magnificent setting. It looks out over the Science / Engineering/Technology complex. It is a great view that will provide a marvelous celebration for us. However, I want to warn you that when you get there, this fourth floor area was not designed as an auditorium. It was designed as a library. The seating will be limited. There will be a reserved section immediately in front of the dedication platform and I urge you, as faculty members, to join us there. We will be reserving seats for the major donors to the library, legislators, and faculty members. As you approach the area simply identify yourself as a faculty member if you want to be seated in front near the podium. There will be additional seating around the open foyer on the fourth floor, and there will be standing room, of course, on the fourth floor as well. If we have an exceptionally large crowd, we have spill over space on the third floor with video monitors where you will be able to view the dedication ceremony by video and there also will be video monitors in the auditorium on the first floor. If you want a seat during the ceremony, I urge you to get there early.

I think we have planned a marvelous day of activities for tomorrow. It will be a wonderful way to celebrate the bringing together of the campus through the library. We hope the weather will be nice. There will be a reception following the dedication initiated by the Chancellor cutting a ceremonial cake. If you have any questions, I would be happy to answer them.

MIRSKY: I have a question that goes a little beyond your comments, if I may. I recently heard and read comments to the effect that the library was a centerpiece for the academic programs here at Indianapolis. I believe that. I can see it all around. My question is, as part of the spirit of this centerpiece, is there a move on to try to get the library an increased budget so that they can get the kind of journals and books that are necessary for a good library? The reason I ask is because about a week ago I attended a meeting of Library Committee members in which I was sitting in for someone else or I may have never known about it, but the members of the committee were told to go back to their departments and have their departments cut a number of journals in order to meet what I guess is a "reduced" budget for the library. That didn't seem to fit with comments you made. I would like to have you comment on that.

TEMPEL: I will comment very briefly and ask Bill Plater to help me with this. The answer is "yes", there was a concern last year at the General Assembly to get a major increase in operating funds for the library. The Chancellor may want to comment on it as well. We believe that there was a commitment by the General Assembly (an understanding) when the building was built that additional base monies would also be allocated to the campus to operate the library properly. We are trying to hold them to that commitment. As you know, the General Assembly simply hasn't allocated additional funds in the past two biennia. So, that request has not been addressed. I think the campus has taken some steps internally to reallocate funds. I know we talked yesterday about making another major effort with the General Assembly in 1995 when we will have the next opportunity to try to get the operating

support the library needs to realize its full potential. Bill, do you want to comment?

PLATER: The last biennial request included about a \$5 million request for operating budget for the new University Library. It is about that amount of money that we believe the new facility and the size of the campus requires for the operation of a library appropriate to this campus. It is a very substantial increase in the budget.

In the interim, the campus has reallocated funds to support the library, not to the degree that is required, but it has made some progress. For example, in a five-year period, we have made internal reallocations that will allow for nearly a 100 percent increase in the acquisitions budget alone of the library.

Let me quickly point out the allocation for acquisitions has been held until completion of the new building and the cash has been used to help pay for some of the work inside. But, as of next year, the budget that will be available and will be spent on acquisitions will be roughly 100 percent greater than it was five years ago. We are making some progress, Art. The real difficulty, I think, that is reflected in your comments, is that the cost of acquiring materials has gone up so rapidly that, despite rather significant increases in the budget that we made available, it has just barely kept pace with inflation. The inflation on library materials is perhaps the greatest of any part of the University. Dana, would you comment on this?

MCDONALD: It is true that in the last decade the costs of library materials have tripled and no library has been able to keep up with both the cost of the printed material inflation and the cost of new technology which comes on-line.

ALIPRANTIS: It is my understanding that there was going to be a complete reallocation of resources in the library according to the number of students and the number of faculty within the department of your school. Is that correct?

LEWIS (For B. Fischler): I just saw the numbers for the materials budget this morning for the first time this year. They were better than I had anticipated. We are looking very closely at how funds are allocated to different schools and we are attempting to balance the contributions that come from the schools with the amount of money that the library needs to support those schools directly. In the case of the School of Science, particularly, we have run into the problem of inflation of the cost of materials which runs at about 18 percent a year. We have simply hit the wall on our ability to fund those expenditures out of library reserves which what we have done in the past several years. I think the School of Science is a very special case. The library has been spending money out of reserve funds to cover the inflation of journals and we have run out of money to do that even with reasonable increases in our budget. We are in the process of looking at those allocations right now. We haven't made any commitments, but what we are trying to do is balance what we get from the different schools with what we give back to the schools in the way of commitments to resources.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: What do you mean by "what you get from the different schools?" Is it through tax that the schools pay to...

LEWIS (For B. Fischler): We are looking at primarily using the tax as a measure of equity between the schools. That is the strategy we are taking right now. We have not finalized these and it is premature to speak about it right now. I think the situation in the School of Science is primarily as a result of the inflation of journals rather than anything else.

NG: I think there is also a fundamental difference between the costs of things like journals that even affect inflation and I hope you take that into account. Because, otherwise there is absolutely no way you can (could not understand)

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We are looking at all of these things. That was the meeting, the one that Bart just mentioned. I phrased it differently because I don't have the "silver tongue" that he has.

PLATER: I think these things are of interest to us all, but the issues of financing library acquisitions are enormously complex and we do have a Faculty Council Library Committee that is monitoring these matters. I know in recent years, Jim Neal, the University Librarian, has made a presentation, at least to the University Faculty Council, on the broad issues of increasing costs and on the way in which the university is trying to respond to them. It may be appropriate for Jim to come and make a presentation here to this group or certainly to direct questions to the Library Advisory Committee. I don't think we should enter into discussions on whether the School of Science is getting its fair share of the resources, especially on the eve of what should be a wonderful celebratory occasion for us. We should be very appreciative and grateful of the magnificent structure that we have and be optimistic about filling that structure with books, periodicals, and other kinds of information resources.

There was one additional comment that I wish to make. It is a note of concern about enrollments for the coming year. As I think all of you know, this year we have experienced a significant decrease in both headcount students and credit hours, which have had some significant and economic impact on all of our schools, perhaps more in the general academic areas than in the professional schools, but it has been noticeable. Unfortunately, the early returns for continuing students who are registering for next year suggest that the decrease is continuing. We are quite concerned about enrollments for next year. We will try to keep you posted on this matter as the numbers come in and we have a better understanding of what enrollments for the fall will bring. We wanted you to know that there is some cause for concern for the second year in a row about the lower student body population both in credit hours and in headcount.

JIM BROWN (Sagamore): Do you think that perhaps the continuing decrease in enrollment has anything to do with continuing increase in tuition fees?

PLATER: There is undoubtedly some correlation. The increase of Indiana University is below that of several of the other state institutions. At Indiana University and at IUPUI the increase appears to be below that of the other comparable state institutions; not below IV Tech, but that is not the same type of institution as ours. In terms of our own state market, it is not the factor that we might assume that it would be. I think the value and the quality of education is still below market, if you will. But, undoubtedly, continuing increases in costs of education have been a factor. There is a study being conducted of high school graduates and their parents and counselors sponsored by the Youth Institute. I think the study, which is called "High Hopes: Long Odds", has identified financial aid and college finances as one of the biggest factors in determining post-secondary participation of students. So, clearly it is a matter of concern.

MCDONALD: Dean Plater, I was wondering if there is any ongoing evaluation of the possibility of launching something like the public relations campaign that Ball State has initiated.

PLATER: It certainly is an issue we have all been paying attention to and are concerned about. You are right. We don't know what the figures for Ball State are in terms of their projections for next year, but certainly their enrollments continued to increase this year while those at IUPUI and several other state institutions did not. They have invested a great deal in marketing and that is something that we need to pay attention to. I am sorry that Gene Tempel has left because he could address this issue better than I. During the past year we have had a task force, Marketing for Enrollment Committee, that has made a number of recommendations about actions that we can take to improve the situation. We unfortunately have severe financial limitations and won't be able to implement all that they have recommended, but we will make some progress in implementing that plan next year including a more aggressive marketing through public media (newspapers, radio, television) and perhaps more importantly in trying to improve the services that we provide to those students who do make contact with the institution. It is perhaps self-serving to say that many of the administrative offices are underfunded even in comparison with the academic units, which all of you know, are in desperate straights in some cases. But, we have a very small Admissions Office and a very small Financial Aids Office, and a very small advising office in comparison with other comparable institutions. Unfortunately, I think we turn away many students who come here seeking admission simply because we don't serve them very well upon their first contact with the university. We are trying to address those concerns for next year.

KAPLAN: Does Ball State get substantially more support per student than we do?

PLATER: We have made the argument in the past that their state appropriation per student is higher than ours. They might argue, as we would I suppose, that it is not enough no matter what it is. There seems to be little payoff in trying to propose increased state appropriations for IUPUI based on what the allocations are for other universities.

KAPLAN: It has been recognized for a number of years and nothing has seemed to change.

[CHANCELLOR BEPKO ARRIVED AT MEETING]

PLATER: I think the Chancellor may want to comment on this when he understands better what we are talking about.

KAPLAN: You made a statement about one year ago that the amount allocated per student for us wasn't as good as the other campuses.

PLATER: (talking to Chancellor Bepko) This is in the context of Ball State having conducted a very aggressive marketing campaign in the Indianapolis area. This is further in the context of our projecting decreased enrollments again for next fall. Jerry Kaplan was pointing out that Ball State and some other state institutions seem to have considerably larger appropriations per FTE student than IUPUI.

BEPKO: I don't know how much larger it is at this point, but it is larger. We suffer, as I think we probably have explained several times over the years, from having what appears to be a larger appropriation per FTE than we really do because we have some other costs mixed in with our academic program budgets. For example, some of the sports facilities are here on campus. They are part of the IUPUI budget. Whatever fee replacement is provided for retiring bonds, if there were any issued, and on some of the facilities they were. Also, the costs of maintaining buildings is in our budget. Yet, those facilities really don't directly impact on the academic programs. For that reason our budget looks a little bigger and our per student expenditure and our per student appropriation both look a little higher than is fair. The other thing that makes us look a little better funded is our mix of programs. We have a health budget and a general academic budget. In the general academic budget we have a mix of programs that is unique in the state. We are the only budget that has a law school, for example. The Herron School of Art is different. The School of Social Work is different. The School of Physical Education is different. And, the impact of those special schools tends to make us look, as compared with the other campuses, as if we have a little more money than they do. We suffer because of that. We have explained this. We have prepared documents to show that our funding is really lower than it seems to be. It is also too low in the basic academic programs, particularly the Arts and Sciences. I think that it will be a slow process of catching up. There are some substantial question about what we should catch up to. That is, we face competition both for students and for the attention of the state. If you go to the people in the General Assembly or go to the average person on the street and say "IUPUI should have better funding than Ball State," they would say "Why?" The cold truth is that people don't think we are doing the same kind of work as Ball State. We may think that we have a much broader and grander mission, but that isn't something that is well understood out there across the state where people vote and from where the representatives are elected. People on the street, even here in Indianapolis, might think that Ball State is supposed to be funded better than IUPUI. So, we have a real challenge to change that public attitude to establish, as we have been talking about here for quite some time, a new model for urban university, show its value to the city and the state in a way that hasn't been done before and correct this funding problem that we have been observing for a long time. It is not something that started yesterday. It is something that started in 1969 when IUPUI was formed. Don't forget, IUPUI was formed out of two-year degree programs and baccalaureate degrees were not offered here in all departments until after IUPUI was formed. That is a place, through your degree programs, where you would expect there to be a little lower base of funding. So, we started with a lower base of funding that people expected and we have been growing at that pace, I think, ever since.

KARLSON: I get the impression that many people consider us, for a lack of a better term, a "community college" and not a university. That is because we grew out of what was, in fact, a two-year community college type program. One of the main characteristics that we fail in is the existence of a residential campus. Many people feel that if you don't have a residential campus, no matter what you call yourself, you are something in the

category of a community college and, therefore, less academically sound. Is there any movement on to give us a residential campus?

BEPKO: Nobody is going to give us anything.

KARLSON: To allow us to be a residential campus.

BEPKO: I think that the answer is yes. We don't need anyone to allow us. We are on track to do that. We will be bringing to the Faculty Council plans for the construction of additional housing on campus. It is already in the planning stages. We have not settled on exactly how much or exactly what kind of housing it will be, but for the past 18 months or so we have been preparing the plans to use the area that has now been converted into a parking lot where the old police roll call and fire department drill site was, to use that area west of Michigan almost to the river, as a site for the development of housing. That is what is on our master plan. As soon as we get finished using that for a parking lot, we will have a request for proposals so that we can have additional housing built there. We will be talking to you a lot about what that request for proposals ought to say. I agree with you that, not just to elevate our statute, if you do things to elevate your statute alone, I think that may fail and may be misunderstood in the community. We do need more campus life. We need more seven day a week, 24-hour a day life on campus. It is part of the attraction for students. It is part of the package that we could present to students that will give them more of an incentive to complete their degrees and more incentive for different students and more students to come here. We think that for all those reasons we ought to go ahead with this plan.

JIM BROWN (Sagamore): Chancellor Bepko, do you think that perhaps encouraging more recruiting from the individual schools would help combat the problem of decreasing enrollment?

BEPKO: We think so. We think that a lot of people still don't understand what high quality education is available here. Recruiting efforts and communications of all kinds would be helpful. We do have a Marketing For Enrollment Committee. After last year's drop in enrollment, we thought that we should have a committee look at this whole issue. The committee has made its report and we are implementing the parts of the report that we can afford to implement right now. Yes, I think we need to communicate more what an excellent institution this is.

AGENDA ITEM V - PRESIDENT'S REPORT - RICHARD FREDLAND

FREDLAND: I heard the key words "enrollment and underfunded" and it brings to mind the Political Science department which is near and dear to my heart which has 7.5 full-time faculty for our student body of 16,000 or 17,000 FTEs and DePauw University has more faculty than we do with 2,400 students. So, underfunding begins at home, I have noticed.

If Barbara Fischler were here in the flesh instead of by virtue of a sign, I think we ought to give three cheers for the library and to add to what Gene Tempel has said. That brings to mind the notion that I put before you several months ago about, if everyone gave a dollar, we could buy a nice piece of art. Not many people agreed with me, but with the few dollars that we were able to extract from a few generous faculty and some injected from the Chancellor we have, instead of a "nice" piece of art, a plaque. Is it brass or brassy, Steve?

MANNHEIMER: It is bronze.

FREDLAND: It will appear at some future time when we finish negotiating with the authorities about when, where, and how it will be "glued" up on the wall of the library. It will be out of the caster's mold by tomorrow I am told by the representative of the Art Committee who is among us today. Those of you who donated toward the purchase of it will be invited to a special showing.

In your report you did not mention reviews of administrators. I know that the review of Vice Chancellor Tempel has been completed. There are four others in the mill which I presume we will hear about perhaps before the end

of the year.

BEPKO: Yes.

FREDLAND: You will recall the Balanced Case. You probably thought you have heard the last of it, but you have not. You should have received in your mail individually a one-sheet Balanced Case language printout within the last week or two. That isn't exactly the way it is. When it was approved at the University Faculty Council, and it was approved over the objections of us from this campus a month or so ago, it was worked out in a very long and torturous session. Some of the language came out to be, as some people would say _____. The language has been worked on and it will be in another version of the language without tinkering with the meaning just for editorial purposes. So, if you see it appear the next time in slightly different language from what you may have memorized, do not be surprised. The Agenda Committee of the University Faculty Council has tried to deal with some objections of the logicians among us who did not like it. I hate to even bring this up, but I don't want anybody to hold it over my head that the language changed and you didn't know about it. I have a copy of what I think is the current language, but I am not going to print it anywhere until it comes out in some formal document, hopefully from some place other than anything that I have to do with.

I would like to invite you to mark your calendars for the afternoon of April 13th between 3 and 4 p.m. Virgie Montgomery, President of the IUPUI Staff Council, and I are sending you an invitation for a farewell reception for President Ehrlich which will be held in the Ballroom of the Conference Center. The President will be there and there will be something to eat and drink. You might want to come by briefly and say whatever you would like to say.

On April 14th at 5 p.m. there will be a reception and at 6 p.m. a presentation by Peter Ewell who is from the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems. He will be talking about Accountability in Colleges and Universities. [President Fredland read from a pamphlet] This is a historic shift in the relationship between society and higher education.

Professor Mirsky is retiring this year. This will be his last Faculty Council meeting since he leaves the University in good spirit and good heart. We are sorry to see you go. There will be a seat vacant as a consequence of that.

Your minutes are now recyclable. Now you know what to do with them -- recycle them and tell your neighbors so we can see if we can make that work.

The flasks which you see up here have been awarded to the Dean of the Faculties for "dumping his plump."

MANNHEIMER: If I may correct Dick's language. You claimed that this bronze plaque might be considered a work of art. I would ask that you indulge my definition that it was made by an artist with an expressed purpose in mind, although a program was laid before that gentleman. Just because a great chef doesn't cook a 12-course meal but instead spends his time on perfect cheeseburgers, it nonetheless is cuisine. I am hopefully confident that the faculty and the administrative monies that went into this will be well spent. People can see this plaque and feel proud that they contributed toward it.

KOLESKI: This is a question in relation to the Balanced Case. If the University Faculty Council chooses to go in that direction, then how is this reconciled with our present position on this campus?

FREDLAND: Let me add, if you read the Balanced Case carefully in any of its incarnations, it really hasn't changed all that much. It makes it possible for some people to make a case who might not otherwise have been able to make a case with balanced strengths, as the language presently reads. It says: "Evidence of balanced strengths that promise excellent overall performance." That is what we are presently looking at.

MANNHEIMER: President Ehrlich will be delighted to talk about it at great length at his reception on the 13th. [laughter]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Can individual departments set up different criteria?

PLATER: No. The criteria are published in the Academic Handbook, as Dick has suggested. The Handbook calls for departments and schools to develop statements, I think the term used is "standards" for interpreting those criteria, but the criteria are, I think, reasonably clear now as they are spelled out in the Academic Handbook.

KOLESKI: Does this mean that we have to go back and choose our promotion and tenure statements within our own schools?

PLATER: You mean to allow for the Balanced Case?

KOLESKI: Yes.

PLATER: Without looking at what the actual school document says, I would be hard pressed to answer that. As Dick has suggested, the current language of the Academic Handbook allows for the Balanced Case. Thinking about some of the statements that I can recall, I don't think they need to be changed because of the change in the Academic Handbook language. There may be a school where it would be appropriate to make a change, but without looking at the document, I couldn't venture an opinion. But, my guess is that few schools will need to make any changes in their documents as a result of the change in the Handbook.

BEPKO: One reading of these changes is that there really hasn't been any substantive... In fact, the old statement said normally, you have to have an area of excellence. The new statement says normally, you have to have an area of excellence. Then it goes on to say "in exceptional cases you could have this balance of strength that promotes overall excellence. I am not so sure that, that is greatly different. In fact, one way of looking at it is that before it said "normally" and I don't know what percentage of cases you conjure in your mind when you say "normally," but whatever it happens to be, think of that percentage and then think of the percentage after you say "normally" but in exceptional cases you could have a different approach. It doesn't seem to me to change much and, if it changes at all, it may even make it narrower. Because, before it said "normally", and you have to decide what wasn't normal. Now it says, "in exceptional cases."

KOLESKI: The two standards that we use now to rate performance in teaching, research, and scholarly activities, and service are "excellent" and "satisfactory." Under the present system, to the best of my understanding, one has to be "excellent" in one area and "satisfactory" in two areas. To introduce the Balanced Case into this situation with the use of the same standards, until this is clarified, may mean that a person being judged under the Balanced Case statement may have to be either at the standard of "excellent" in all areas or "satisfactory" in all areas. There is no intermediate standard between "excellent" and "satisfactory" for making a judgment under the Balanced Case.

WARFEL: If there are no other questions, perhaps we should move on to the next agenda item.

AGENDA ITEM VI - CLINICAL RANKS DOCUMENT - PATRICIA BLAKE

WARFEL: The Faculty Affairs Committee brought to the Executive Committee language that has been proposed to replace the language currently in the IU Academic Handbook regarding clinical ranks as you see before you in IUPUI Circular 94-14. Both the Faculty Affairs Committee and the Executive Committee endorse these changes. We are asking the Council to endorse them as well. Are there any comments or questions about the language?

LEAPMAN: Dean Daly and I talked to the Executive Committee from the School of Medicine. We do have some concerns with the language as written. As many of you know, the clinical rank was developed in 1987, or at least approved in 1987, and primarily related to those faculty members in health-related schools such as Nursing, Optometry, Medicine, etc. Over the past seven years, since 1987, at least in the School of Medicine, we have had 150 non-tenured clinical positions developed and filled, and I think these people now contributed significantly to the school. What has happened is that over the last seven years, we have very closely approached the level of our 15 percent cap as was stipulated back in 1987 as is stipulated here. The other schools in the health-related sciences, such as optometry, also approach 15 percent; Optometry is 15 percent; Nursing and the allied health

care areas are about 6 or 7 percent. Because of increasing demands in some of the clinical services in the University health-care system, in at least the School of Medicine, it is almost certain that there is going to be a need to expand our faculty members and there is a significant amount of data that would support that. Our concern is the verbage that reads, in the first paragraph, that there shall be no more than 15 percent of the total full-time faculty of each school.

What we would propose is an amendment to this document that states that the number of full-time, salaried, clinical appointees should be determined by the voting faculty from each particular school in the University and let the school itself determine the number of non-tenured, clinical track appointees that it should have.

WARFEL: This really is raising a second issue. The document we have before us, which pertains to the result of the changes that you see in the document as it is originally presented here today, would allow schools, other than health schools, i.e., for schools like the School of Law which do active clinical instruction, also to use clinical ranks. That is issue number one.

You are now introducing issue number two which is that, instead of the university-wide 15 percent cap for each school, that each school faculty should be allowed to decide how many clinical rank, full-time people they want. Is that correct?

LEAPMAN: Yes. That is issue number 1A.

BYRNE: I don't necessarily oppose the recommended amendment in principle, but I should comment briefly perhaps on the history (which other people know even better than I do) of the original cap. I am told, and I am happy to be corrected if I am mistaken, that it was the School of Medicine originally that argued for the 15 percent cap. The occasion for this reconsideration of the document was interest on the part of another school, a school other than a health-care school, in having access to these ranks. In fact, they already have them and it is just a question of what kind of fair treatment they will be able to provide. That particular school has no interest whatever in changing the 15 percent cap. The idea that each school might determine that individually, does not respond to the original reason for the 15 percent cap; mainly, because it might well constitute an interesting way to avoid establishing tenure track positions. I would, therefore, hope that one could take a vote on this matter as it stands. The issue that is really before us in this document, as it reads, is whether clinical ranks should continue to be restricted to health care type schools or ought to be available also to other academic units. Whether the issue can be resolved before the floor here after further consideration, I have no way of knowing. I rather imagine that we could come involved in a lot of talk about tenure and other things.

KARLSON: I will point out that there was no second to the amendment so there is no amendment pending before the assembly.

FINEBERG: I second the amendment.

BYRNE: Was I out of order?

KARLSON: Technically, yes. You were speaking to an amendment which had not yet been seconded.

BYRNE: I was explaining why a 15 percent cap is a part of the clinical rank policy.

WARFEL: Is there any other discussion of Professor Leapman's motion from the School of Medicine faculty?

FINEBERG: I think it is important to realize that the Medical School has been severely impacted by the changes that are going on in Washington. The ways in which we deliver clinical services, to some extent, are going to have to change whether we want to or not, whether we want to expect research or not, we will need people who primarily provide patient care and teaching. We are going to have to change if we are going to continue to get patients under the new types of payment plans. If we don't have more flexibility than the 15 percent, it is going to become a very serious problem to the Medical School. It will be a serious problem if we don't have the

flexibility to deal with these enormous changes that are going on in the American health care system.

BLAKE: I think that Steve and Dean Daly made a very strong case for removing the cap for the Medical School. I am not so sure that removing the cap for everyone is the most appropriate thing to do. I also know that this proposal goes all the way to the top, so it does seem like maybe, if we are going to fuss with one part of the document, maybe we should be together on both things before we go. I agree with Dr. Fineberg. The health care system is something that (could not understand) itself. I think Dean Daly told me there were 305 faculty hired on a tenure track within the last five years. My question to him was, "How much money did you take from tenure track to hire these clinical faculty and did you take any lines?" His reply was, "We don't have lines in the School of Medicine." He also said that, as far as that money was concerned, it wasn't prohibiting them from hiring tenure track faculty. That made me feel better.

VESSELY: In any of the presentations, was there any discussion about some "middle ground?" It seems like we are discussing going from 15 percent to no cap and putting the decision for that in the hands of the people doing the hiring. I was just curious as to whether there was a discussion of going to 25 percent or keeping control outside of the academic unit.

WARFEL: There was a discussion about, as I recall, 25/40/75. The way it came around to saying "Well, the faculty ought to define." The feeling was that the faculty within the school that is going to be affected ought to make this decision. If we left it in their hands, would it be in good hands?

KARLSON: I have difficulty with the term "faculty" which has more than one meaning. Understand, in some schools, it is my understanding, the voting faculty include non-tenure track. One of the reasons why we have tenure and tenure-track is to protect faculty in the exercise, not only in their teaching capacities, but in their managerial capacities. By the way, faculty are considered managerial by the National Labor Relations Board. That is why we can't have unions because they are part of management. One of the protections which we have in our managerial capacity is, of course, this protection of tenure. The point which I am trying to make here is, first, if you are going to talk about voting faculty, how are you defining it? I would have much less difficulty with this if it were in the hands of the tenured voting faculty of the institution, not just whatever you happen to define as your voting faculty.

LEAPMAN: Voting faculty in the School of Medicine relates, in terms of the University, to all tenured positions. In terms of voting vis a vis, the election of officers and the election to various committees within the school itself, all members, whether they are tenured or non-tenured, become voting members.

KARLSON: Would this be the tenured and non-tenured voting...

LEAPMAN: We certainly would be willing to make this tenured and tenure-track full-time faculty as defined by the University itself.

FREDLAND: I would remind you that this came from the Law School. The Law School wanted clinical positions. I don't want us to hijack our discussion into the 15 percent concern. I think it is terribly important whatever you may think about the cap, let us not lose sight of what we were originally attempting to do. I am not taking a position on the cap, but we need to keep that in mind.

WARFEL: That is right but we have to discuss the amendment.

SCHNEIDER: As a faculty member in a school and department that wouldn't know how to relate to this problem, a couple of analogies come to mind -- part-time instructors or instructors. Is there a cap on the use of part-time faculty?

PLATER: There is a more analogous rank in "scholar" or "scientists", which is a recognized rank of the university (scientist, associate scientist, assistant scientist) and there are no limitations on the number of those persons. Their status is defined differently, as is that of the clinical faculty. They do not have all the privileges and rights

of tenured or tenure-track faculty, including access to sabbatical leaves, etc. The way in which schools treat them as voting members of school faculties will vary according to the bylaws of that school. The full-time clinical rank is the only one on which there is a cap.

SCHNEIDER: What was the justification for these other kinds of positions?

PLATER: Some earlier expressed a concern about the impact on the overall faculty by "eroding" the tenure/tenure-track faculty as we understand the faculty to be by increasing the number of persons who can have all the rights and privileges and responsibilities of tenured faculty.

BLAKE: In the School of Nursing, the clinical faculty have very little time to do research. New faculty on the tenure track are protected and given time so they can make tenure. The faculty we hired in 1987 were not given time and many of them are still only masters prepared. We could not carry out our clinical education without them.

SIDHU: I would like to have some information. Before we take any action on this amendment, I think we should know the line of action. As I understand it, this arrangement of the 15 percent cap went before the Board of Trustees for approval. The reason was that it will have impact on the University as a whole and they were not going to give that authority to individual schools. If that is still true, I think it would be very difficult for each school to go to the Trustees every time they make a change on the cap or whatever number they want. That is the difficulty they will have to face and I would like to have clarification on that.

Secondly, the problem at this time seems to be the problem of the Medical School. On the basis that, I don't think it is reasonable to open the cap for all the other schools. I think we need to deal with this in two parts and make a special case for the School of Medicine. As far as the other schools are concerned, they should be given the same opportunity, but we need some kind of cap for those schools.

M. COHEN: The School of Education has gone through major changes in its undergraduate program. One of the issues that we are negotiating with is using the term "clinical" faculty for a group of instructors who will be based primarily in the schools.. The problem we might have with this is that full-time, salaried, clinical appointees may exceed 15 percent. I think most of ours would not be full-time. Does that mean we might add them together to make 15 percent or is there no limit on part-time clinical faculty? We can't tell at the present time, but we might foresee a time when we would have some full-time, salaried, clinical appointees. With 30 faculty and about 1,000 students doing undergraduate programs, it would be very easy to get more than 15 percent from the clinical rank. At that time we might come back and ask for the same waiver as the School of Medicine.

KARLSON: I would like to answer his question. Why do we treat clinical different from scientists? First, the main difference is scientists is research; clinical is teaching. Teaching has traditionally had as one of its prerogatives the tenure track in order to protect the academic freedom of the teaching system. We have not generally, although academic freedom is important in research, considered it as important in research as we have in the area of teaching. Also, there is a definite antagonism towards the concept of tenure existent in the United States and in other countries today. England has done away with tenure by statute. The concept that we can separate a full-time teacher at a university from the tenure track is one which I find to be somewhat repugnant. Because, if we accept an unlimited number of full-time teachers who are not tenure track, we are denying the need for tenure itself. I would think long and hard as a tenured faculty member before giving that message considering what the status of tenure is in our society today. I would suggest we vote against this amendment and we get down to the original issue before us and then, if a particular need for the medical school can be demonstrated, that should be brought up on a separate measure.

PORTER: In part, I need some information on it to be procedurally correct. Let me tell you my intent and you can tell me what I should do. It seems to be that the 15 percent issue is a large issue. We have heard people starting off statements with, "I think" and "I believe." Some individuals had direct conversations about the impact of the School of Medicine and others not being privy to those discussions. I would like to somehow defer this amendment to the Faculty Affairs Committee for discussion. I think it is too large of an issue for us to deal with on limited information in this body. We could then move on with the original recommendation which has been

brought here today by Faculty Affairs. How do I go about doing that?

KARLSON: The amendment is still pending. The question is can you send the amendment without sending the bill to which it would amend? The answer is, No. If you were to send the amendment, you would have to send the underlying.

BLAKE: Then the point is to defeat the amendment.

KARLSON: This is right. What you should do at this point is to defeat the amendment and then a separate resolution should be brought up asking that the Faculty Affairs Committee consider the issue of the 15 percent cap for the School of Medicine and other schools on this campus. But, you would have to defeat the amendment.

PORTER: Then, I would urge you to consider defeating the amendment at this time because we would be voting from a lack of information (**could not understand**) not only within the School of Medicine, but on other schools within this campus. Until we have a group of faculty that have an opportunity to discuss this, we are acting from a lack of information.

BLAKE: I call for the question.

WARFEL: Is there a second to calling the question? **VESSELY:** I second it.

WARFEL: All of those in favor of calling the question for Steve Leapman's amendment, say "Aye." Are there any opposed? I think there were at least two-thirds in favor of calling the question.

FREDLAND: Could we have the amendment re-stated?

WARFEL: The amendment was to replace a sentence about full-time, salaried, clinical appointees shall represent no more than 15 percent of the total full-time faculty of each school to be replaced with *the number of full-time, salaried, clinical appointees in each unit shall be determined by the voting tenured faculty of each school*. All of those in favor of the amendment, say "Aye." All of those opposed to the amendment, say "Aye." [voting by show of hands] All of those in favor of Dr. Leapman's amendment, raise your hand. All of those opposed to the amendment, raise your hand. [18 for and 35 against] The amendment to the motion is defeated today.

KARLSON: The original motion is now before us, now we can move the question on the original motion.

WARFEL: The question of voting on the original motion has been raised and seconded. All Council members in favor of calling the question, say "Aye." Are there any opposed? [a few] Then we will vote on the language in Circular 94-14 as it came to us without any amendments. All of those in favor of this, say "Aye." All of those opposed? [a few] Are there any abstentions? [none]

FREDLAND: On the same subject, I plan to talk while I think and invite Steve Leapman to do the same thing. If we stick with the 15 percent, the School of Medicine is going to be in violation of this by the time that the Dean of Faculties gets back to his office and punches the computer to find out what the number is at the moment. As the future comes upon us, it is going to be even more so, and so we have put the School of Medicine in a untenable position. I don't think we can leave it that way. I think we need to put our collective heads together to come up with some kind of formulation that will enable us to go to bed tonight with a clear conscience and still enable the School of Medicine to get its job done. I am not at all doubtful that we can do it. I invite you to come up with something we can live with.

LEAPMAN: I would like to know what the process is. If we have to take it back to the Faculty Affairs Committee, then if that requires a motion to do so, I have a couple of questions: a) are you going to require the motion, and b) what is the time table with which we can accomplish what we need to accomplish? Regardless of what that number is, whether it is 15, 20, or percent, I think it is untenable to wait until this group convenes next year. I think that is unfair.

FREDLAND: I would be open to an amendment to the proposal that we just passed right now, if we can come up with some creative language. I am inviting you to be creative.

BYRNE: As it develops, we are getting into a situation of people having to rhetorically divide between those who like the School of Medicine and those who don't. May I remind this body that the 15 percent language has been in the Academic Handbook since many years ago. Am I to suppose that had the issue not been brought to us, a committee has was approached by another school, that it would have lurked there in the dark unbeknownst to anyone and the problem would have emerged and the School of Medicine would have collapsed? I can't believe that. What is the difficulty about drawing upon the resources of the Faculty Affairs Committee, not that they need a lot more things to do in the month of April. People can bring their information and we could have it back for the May meeting.

SUTTON: I move that this 15 percent be temporarily suspended with relation to the School of Medicine until the Faculty Affairs Committee can consider the matter and report back to this body.

KARLSON: I have to refer that motion out of order because we can't suspend anything. This is a Faculty Handbook. This is a proposed change to the IU Academic Handbook. All we can do is propose changes. We can't make them. Since we can't change them, we can't suspend them. This is a University-wide policy is the way I understand it and approved by the Board of Trustees. We can't suspend what the Board of Trustees has done.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Why do we have it if we can't suspend it?

KARLSON: We can recommend. We can't change anything in the Academic Handbook and we can't change anything that has been passed by the Board of Trustees. So, your motion is out of order because it is beyond the powers of this assembly.

BEPKO: I think you could move to recommend to the Trustees, that they suspend the application of this policy pending whatever consideration the IUPUI Faculty Council, and any other faculty bodies, will give it.

SUTTON: I so move. **BLAKE:** I second it.

WARFEL: Does everyone understand what has been moved and seconded at this point? That is, to recommend to the Board of Trustees they suspend the 15 percent cap for the School of Medicine during a period of time while the cap issue is looked at more broadly.

SUTTON: For how long?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: For the time necessary, but no longer than a year.

PETERSON: Scenario. So, we suspend this and either we don't approve it at the next go around or the President or the Board of Trustees doesn't approve this, now the School of Medicine has 25 percent non-tenured faculty in the school, what do we with that extra 10 percent? I know we have similar scenarios in other schools at this point, because they are so small that one faculty member represents 15 percent of the school. That is hypothetical, but there is one school which is over the limit because it has such a small number of faculty.

SCHNEIDER: I have a simpler suggestion. What if we simply suspend it, moving that the motion we just had forward for a month? In other words, waiting before we send it to wherever it goes (could not understand) during which time it would give the Faculty Affairs Committee a chance to hear about making an amendment at the next meeting.

WARFEL: I am not sure what your suggestion is.

SCHNEIDER: My suggestion is to wait one month before sending forward the motion we just passed.

WARFEL: We didn't just pass anything. We made a motion to...

SCHNEIDER: No. We just voted to change the clinical language.

FREDLAND: What about referring it to the Executive Committee? That won't get it so far into the bowels of the institution.

KARLSON: You can't refer something that has been passed. You can refer it to a committee before it is passed, but not after it is passed. What you are really asking now is a motion to reconsider what we have passed. A motion to reconsider can only be made by a person who voted in the affirmative and there are some other technicalities involved. Once you have passed something, you can't refer it to a committee and that is basically what you are saying.

WARFEL: You made the motion that is now on the floor...

SUTTON: Whatever you do with the motion, the Faculty Handbook still says 15 percent and my proposal was to deal with that situation right now so that the School of Medicine, and any other schools making this amendment, (could not understand). Would it not be in violation of the Faculty Council?

FREDLAND: I have experience in the Balanced Case and I delayed it for a whole year by not sending it forward even though it had been passed. Why don't I just take this piece of paper and we will leave it around the office for a while, take it to the Executive Committee, call up Pat Blake and Steve Leapman, and we will figure out what words to put in here and we will bring back an amendment next time.

LEAPMAN: What about the present wording?

FREDLAND: We are going to amend the present wording next time.

LEAPMAN: I think that the acute situation is not acute enough to require that we have to raise the cap or remove the cap by a new motion. I think that our body would be best served if we took Professor Fredland's position. As I understand it, you would take this particular proposal to the Faculty Affairs Committee, verbiage would be addressed, and it would be brought back before this body and voted upon and we would address the current issue either next month or the month after.

FREDLAND: There is no month after. It would have to be next month.

LEAPMAN: I would fully support that.

WARFEL: We have a motion on the floor. It has been seconded. It was to recommend that the Board of Trustees suspend the cap. Are we in the mood to withdraw or amend that motion?

KARLSON: The first motion was to suspend it and we can't do that. The second motion was to recommend that the Board of Trustees suspend it for a period not to exceed one year or until such time the report has been brought back to our faculty on the issue of the limit.

FREDLAND: Call for the question. VESSELY: I second that.

WARFEL: The motion which is on the floor is to recommend that the Board of Trustees suspend the cap for the School of Medicine for the period of one year. All of those in favor of calling the question, say "Aye. Are there any opposed? [none] All of those in favor of the motion, say "Aye." All of those opposed? [several] I think the

"No's" have it. That motion is defeated. Are we going to move to reconsider?

FREDLAND: We are going to "muddle" until next month.

WARFEL: Let the record show that we moved to muddle. [laughter]

FINEBERG: I move that we refer the question of the cap to the Faculty Affairs Committee and the Executive Committee and ask them to report to us at next month's meeting so that something can be done about this before the summer break.

VESSELY: I second that.

WARFEL: Is there any discussion about this motion?

ORME: Does that take into account that this still has to go before the University Faculty Council?

WARFEL: Yes. It will be next fall. Next Tuesday is the last University Faculty Council meeting of the year, so it doesn't affect that.

SIDHU: I support the motion that was just made and request the Executive Committee, as well as the Faculty Affairs Committee request Chancellor Bepko to approach the Trustees to find a temporary solution to the medical school's immediate problem.

VESSELY: I guess the real question is what is going to happen to Dean Daly if he is in violation? I know we talked about "just leaving it around the office," but if nothing is going to happen, I think we should keep proceeding to solve the problem as best and as fast as we can and hope that no one gets arrested in the process.

ORME: The second question seems to relate back to Henry Karlson's comments. What is an appropriate level for the percentage of clinical appointment? Can there be such a thing as an appropriate level or is it whatever the school perceives it needs? I think that is a legitimate question and whoever we are referring this to needs to wrestle with this.

WARFEL: Are we ready to vote on the motion to refer this to our Faculty Affairs Committee and our Executive Committee and discuss it at the May meeting of this body?

BLAKE: May I ask one more question? Would AAUP have any stand on this?

WARFEL: We can check on that. I have their guidelines, but I don't have their guidelines memorized. Are you ready for the question? All of those in favor, say "Aye." All of those opposed, say "Aye." [a few] The motion to refer it to the Faculty Affairs Committee passes.

GALANTI: May I ask what is the status of the motion on the clinical ranks that this body did approve? Is that going forward to University Faculty Council at its next meeting?

WARFEL: It will be going forward with all due "muddling".

AGENDA ITEM VII - STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

WARFEL: We have standing committee reports beginning with Mary Gilchrist of the Academic Affairs Committee. Mary, for the sake of verbatim records, talk up at the podium, please?

GILCHRIST: At the January 24th meeting of the Academic Affairs Committee three resolutions were approved by that committee that we have brought today to put before you. They deal with the FX policy, the proposal about

student class standing being placed on the transcript, and the proposal to move forward the date for withdrawing from class.

The committee, as you can see from the proposals, opposes the elimination of the FX policy on the belief that it violates some safeguards that protect our students. The policy is in no way misleading to anyone who reads the transcript and because it is of value to our students.

In the second resolution, we recommend that you oppose the proposal to enter the student's relative class standing along with the grade on the transcript. We were unclear as to the problem that this was attempting to solve and what audience might benefit from that particular action.

In the third resolution, we opposed moving forward the last date when a student may withdraw from class. The withdrawal date might be moved to the tenth week without jeopardizing students but not earlier than that. It was the concern of the committee that, by making the final withdrawal date earlier in the semester, students would not have sufficient time to make a reasonable decision about whether or not they should withdraw from a class. If academic units enforce the existing policies, we believe the students will not be disadvantaged. We bring these resolutions to you and ask for your approval or disapproval.

COONEY: Regarding the FX policy, my understanding is that our students in the School of Engineering and Technology, as they are going through the IU system, the FX policy works, once they graduated and they are receiving Purdue transcripts. The Purdue system does not have that policy and then the FX reappear on their transcripts.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: There is a slight variation to that. In fact, FX is not recognized by Purdue. But, if a student has retaken the same course, then the grade is removed from the GPA, though it is now the Purdue transcript. There is no limitation on the Purdue record, as there is in the IU system, of three courses.

FREDLAND: I would like to request that we vote on them individually.

WARFEL: All of those in favor of the first resolution, say "Aye." Are there any in opposition? [none] Any abstentions? [none] Is there any discussion of the second resolution?

FREDLAND: I would like to oppose it because I am very clear on the role that this resolution is intended to play. That is to identify where grade inflation has taken place. If, for example, every student in the class receives an A, the grade that will go on the transcript is the student's A and the 4.0 that indicates all the grades in the class were A. If on the other hand, the student receives the only A in the class and the grade point average for the class were 1.7 and that A stands (could not understand) I think this is a very important way in which we can deal with the unarguable, in my book, fact that grade inflation without in any way forcing anybody to do anything that they wouldn't otherwise do.

WARFEL: I think that you are right about the intention. The School of Medicine has essentially done it for years on medical students' transcripts indicating the percentage of each class that received each grade in each course.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Does that language support your intent? The term "class standing" can be interpreted two ways.

WALLIHAN: I don't like that language. One is the distribution of grades in that particular class. The other is the individual standing and ranking.

FREDLAND: I only thought of it as the class GPA; a very specific number. I don't know that class standing gets more complex.

GILCHRIST: I think the original indicated both that individual students ranked within as well as the relationship of the grades.

LEWIS (for Barbara Fischler): I believe the way that it was originally phrased was that there would be some kind of count of students who had grades equal to or above. Not a GPA summary of the class itself. And, not the same kind of grade distribution as was mentioned of the Medical School. Just something that says "this many students scored this great or above."

HART: This seems to suggest that a faculty member who does an exceptionally good job of teaching and uses a mastery approach and whose students then are able to attain criterion referenced standards and achieve quite highly will find their grades will not be given as much weight because they were not among students who did poorly.

KARLSON: There is another problem here. In certain seminar courses it is not uncommon to give an incomplete so the student can complete a paper. That would mean those students who complete their papers early are going to be... we don't have the full grade distribution for the class yet. So, it is going to misrepresent it for a period of time.

LEWIS (for Barbara Fischler): I think another clarification that needs to take place, not taking a position one way or another on it, is whether or not this grade distribution given is within an individual section or within an individual course.

WARFEL: Dick, Is this on the agenda for next Tuesday's UFC meeting?

FREDLAND: Yes.

WARFEL: The University Faculty Council is going to deal with this on Tuesday.

VESSELY: Call for the question.

WARFEL: Is there a second to calling for the question? [seconded] All of those in favor of calling the question, say "Aye." Are there any opposed? [a few] All of those in favor of this resolution, say "Aye." All of those opposed, say "Aye." [defeated] Is there any discussion on the third resolution?

FREDLAND: People get married, get divorced, declare war, and commit suicide and no time limit is decided on. I don't think that suggesting a student needs ten weeks to decide whether to withdraw from a class is an inordinately short amount of time. I could argue that we not disadvantage any student by moving the withdrawal date earlier either.

GILCHRIST: The idea was that it went back to the mid-term time at the eighth week. Somebody has to grade the paper, get it back to the student, and the student has to have an opportunity to get back to the faculty member to bring those grades together and a little bit of time to think about it. They now have 12 weeks in which to do that. I think the proposal was to take it back to the mid-term. We felt that was a disadvantage to the student.

FREDLAND: The student enrolled in the class without any advice whatever, so it strikes me that faculty members ought to adjust their lives...

VESSELY: A number of schools have raised their standards. It is no longer a C average that keeps you in school. Students are making decisions more often now to withdraw when in fact they are passing the course. They may be passing it with a C because that is not going to get them their 2.5 to stay in school or whatever. There is a lot more of that withdrawal taking place, not by students who are hopelessly failing, and if we are hoping that the mid-term is going to enable them to recover miraculously. In fact, they are passing with a C, but now they realize they need a B. I just say that to say that we are not always talking about a student who is failing miserably and could have decided that at six weeks, eight weeks, ten weeks, or during registration.

WARFEL: Are there any other points to be made?

YOKOMOTO: In discussion within the committee it has been brought up that in some departments there is no exam before midterms. Students have no idea how they are doing until the mid-term. Without some kind of feedback, it might be difficult to make that decision.

M. COHEN: In all the discussions we have had about standards and grades for students, I think very often we are blaming the students for decisions that we as faculty are not willing to make. I would hate to see us disadvantage students for some perceived problem we might have whether it is grade point average or something else. I think if we make this much shorter than 10 or 12 weeks, then we are really putting pressure on the students for something that maybe we should have taken care of a long time ago.

GILCHRIST: They can withdraw up to the 12th week and then the last quarter... They can withdraw anytime, but to withdraw just flat out, it is at the 12th week.

M. COHEN: The one says at the 10th week?

GILCHRIST: The precedent suggested originally went back to midterm time.

M. COHEN: If we make it any shorter than 10 weeks, I think we are really putting the student at a disadvantage.

GILCHRIST: That was the feeling of the committee.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Call for the question.

WARFEL: Is everyone ready to vote?

ROTHER: What would a "yes" vote mean?

GILCHRIST: [reading] It is resolved that the faculty of Indiana University - Purdue University Indianapolis is opposed to moving forward the last date when a student may withdraw from classes. The withdrawal date might be moved to the 10th week without jeopardizing students but not earlier than that.

WARFEL: We had a call for the question. I am not sure if there was a second. Was there a second?

VESSELY: I second it.

WARFEL: All of those in favor of calling the question, say "Aye." All of those opposed? [a few] All of those in favor of this resolution, say "Aye." All of those opposed? [a few] Are there any abstentions? [none] The people in favor of it win.

The way I see it we have 10 minutes and we have some important items left on the agenda. There are several important things left on the agenda that we are not going to get to today. We will, of course, finish our committee reports. Bill Kulsrud has been waiting extremely patiently and so has been Patricia Wittberg.

We have a problem with the major discussion section. One of the reasons that we have changed the topic is that Dean Plater and his office are eager to get papers ready for next year's rounds of dossiers. He needs input now, essentially. That is why we wanted very much for the Council to have a chance to comment on Documents 1 and 24 for today. Perhaps, we can arrange another setting to do that.

For Dismissal Procedures you have a handout which you can read over. It is a summary of comments made at last month's meeting regarding dismissal policies. We can proceed with that at next month's meeting.

The Commission on Health Care report also is in a written format. We will put it on the agenda for next month.

IUPUI Faculty Council Minutes

April 7, 1994

Page 19

Let's proceed with our other committee reports. Athletic Affairs Committee, Bill Kulsrud.

KULSRUD: I appreciate the opportunity to come before this body and give you a quick report in the interest of time about athletics and what is going on with the Athletic Affairs Committee. Our charge is to oversee and advise the operation of the intercollegiate athletics program, as well as to consider matters that relate to recreational activities and intramurals when those matters are referred to our committee.

Our primary job is to ensure that we are in compliance with the rules and regulations of the bodies that govern our student athletes' participation. In that regard, I would like to say that Mark Grove does a yeomen's job in helping us to ensure that we are in compliance with the rules and regulations of the NCAA and NAIA.

Let me give you a quick report as to where we are and what has happened this year. As you know, we became a member of the NCAA Division II at the beginning of this year. As a practical matter, we are going through a transitional phase. We are still in the process of trying to schedule Division II opponents. We actually do not qualify to play in post season competition until the 1995-96 academic year. Nevertheless, we are full voting members. The Athletic Director, Hugh Wolf, and I attended the NCAA National Convention in San Antonio in January. We spent two one-half days voting on propositions. You may remember that there was a lot of controversy by the Black basketball coalition at that meeting. If you would like to review our voting record on the 120+ propositions, it is in the NCAA newsletter.

As far as exciting activities are concerned, one of the things that we found out at the NCAA convention is that, as an independent, you are a "lone-wolf." There is nobody to associate with. You are completely independent in all sense of the word. One of the things that we recognized very quickly was that we needed to become associated with a conference. We had recognized that last year and we applied for membership in the Great Lakes Valley Conference and we were denied admission. Therefore, one of our missions at the NCAA Convention was to talk to other schools who might be interested in forming another conference or perhaps talk to schools or other conferences about our possible admission. Since that time, I was in a meeting with Hugh Wolf and representatives from nine other schools a couple of weeks ago in St. Louis. It was an exciting meeting about the possibility of forming a new conference or at least gaining admission, perhaps again, to the Great Lakes Valley Conference. As you can imagine, to be a member of a conference would really help our sports program.

On the other athletic fronts, as most of you know, we have four mens' and four women's sports. Our teams this year have done reasonably well. Our mens' soccer team did extremely well. They were the district NAIA champs. With respect to soccer, I will make this one important point. We were able to hire Pete Kapsalis as our new soccer coach. As our new coach, Pete is very well connected in the soccer community. He will bring new life to the soccer program, although we have done extremely well. He is the type of person who can bring national prominence to our program. To give you an idea of what this might mean, in the Golden Boot, which is our annual soccer event, this year it appears that, if everything works out, the main event will be IUPUI playing Michigan State and IU will play at Butler.

Of course, if you saw any of the basketball games, we had a tough season. Probably the most notable thing in that regard is our coach, Bob Lovell, has recently resigned. We are in the process of forming a search committee for a new coach. Of course, this is an extremely important decision as we start trying to make progress toward Division I. We are looking for an individual who perhaps could build a program that would be able to compete at that level.

There are a couple of other things that our committee has been looking at. Funding of the athletic program is terribly underfunded like everything else. The per student athletic fee pales in comparison to other schools. Ours is \$5; Georgia State has \$28 per quarter; University of Illinois at Chicago has \$80 per semester. That produces about a \$2 million a year budget which is 70 percent of the total budget. When we start comparing ourselves to peer institutions, it becomes quite apparent that we are terribly underfunded. In this regard, our committee has supported a possible increase in the student athletic fee.

This year, before his untimely death, as most of you know, Mike Carroll was a strong booster of not only IUPUI's

athletics, but also of IUPUI. Consequently we started the Mike Carroll Endowment with the help of our friends from the Metro Athletic Club. It appears that we are going to be very successful in generating funds.

As far as other things are concerned, we are talking about matters such as the colors of our sports teams and the colors of IUPUI. It seems to be somewhat controversial.

We also have some serious concerns about our student athletes. Can you imagine Bobby Knight coaching his basketball team and asking where Damon Bailey is? Because Damon Bailey wasn't able to get his classes all scheduled in the morning. Instead, he was forced to take those classes during practice. We have a lot of problems like that with respect to our student athletes that have come to our table.

To sum it all up as far as where we stand regarding athletics, I think we are taking a very big step going into Division II. I think our program is in very good hands with Hugh Wolf. He has done a tremendous job. I think he will, to quote Chancellor Bepko, "bring more campus life to this university."

At the last meeting I attended for the Conference affiliation, the President at the University of Missouri at St. Louis made virtually the same comment that Chancellor Bepko made earlier about the need for campus life. She singled out the importance of athletics and residential housing. Those are the kinds of things we are looking for when we look for a conference. We are looking for a conference with peer institutions that has had the same types of problems we have, the same type of faculty, and seek the same kind of excellence in their programs.

WARFEL: Thank you, Bill. We do have a problem that there is a class in here at 5:30. I apologize for Pat Wittberg for not getting to her report. We are adjourned.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY INDIANAPOLIS
FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING
MAY 5, 1994
LAW SCHOOL, ROOM 116
3:30 - 5:30 P.M.

PRESENT: Administration: Chancellor Gerald L. Bepko, Vice Chancellor William Plater. Deans: John Barlow, Alfred Potvin, Sheldon Siegel, David Stocum. Elected Faculty: C D Aliprantis, Henry Besch, Patricia Blake, Frances Brahmi, Edmund Byrne, Elaine Cooney, Gayle Cox, Theodore Cutshall, Michael Fritsch, Richard Fredland, Karen Gable, Paul Galanti, Gareth Gilkey, Jean Gnat, Clifford Goodwin, Dolores Hoyt, Jerome Kaplan, Juanita Keck, Raymond Koleski, Joseph Koss, Eric Long, James McAteer, Dana McDonald, Lynda Means, Richard Meiss, Vimalkumar Patel, Daniel Peavy, Richard Peterson, Norris Richmond, Margaret Richwine, Carl Rothe, Brian Sanders, Lee Schwecke, Charles Slemenda, Robert Sutton, David Suzuki, Karen Teegarden, William Voos, James Wallihan, Susan Zunt. Ex Officio Members: William Schneider, Hitwant Sidhu, Vice President Kathleen Warfel. Visitors: Erwin Boschmann (Dean of the Faculties Office), Scott Evenbeck (Undergraduate Education), Vice Chancellor Trudy Banta (Planning & Institutionalized Improvement), Alan N. Crist (Director of Admissions), Mark Grove (Registrar).

PARLIAMENTARIAN PRESENT: Henry Karlson.

ALTERNATES PRESENT: Deans: James Carter for Walter Daly, David Lewis for David Lewis, Marv Ebbert for Kathy Krendl, Floyd Robison for Stuart Hart, Jean Hamilton for Norman Hudson, Eric Pumroy for William Orme. Ex Officio Members: David Frisby for Virgie Montgomery.

ABSENT: Administration: J. Herman Blake. Deans: A James Barnes, Trevor Brown, H William Gilmore, P Nicholas Kellum, Norman Lefstein, Angela McBride, John Rau, Donald Warren, Charles Webb. Elected Faculty: Biagio Azzarelli, Darrell Bailey, Timothy Baldwin, Merrill Benson, David Burr, David Canal, William Blomquist (for Paul Carlin), Michael Clark, Michael Cohen, Michael Dalsing, Joseph DiMicco, William Engle, Naomi Fineberg, Joe Garcia, Michael Gleeson, Linda A. Goodine, Robert Keck, M Jan Keffer, Steven Leapman, Diane Leland, Arthur Mirsky, Bernard Morrel, Bart Ng, Byron Olson, Rebecca Porter, Edward Robbins, Michael Sadove, Richard Schreiner, Aristotle Siakotos, Jay Simon, Jeffrey Springston, Rosalie Vermette, Jeffery Vessely, Karen West, Eric Wiebke, Patricia Wittberg, Charles Yokomoto. Ex Officio Members: Barbara Cambridge, J Vannoy Faris, Janet Feldmann, Edgar Fleenor, Steven Mannheimer, B Keith Moore, John Pless, Helen Schwartz, Martin Spechler.

AGENDA ITEM I - CALL TO ORDER - VICE PRESIDENT KATHLEEN WARFEL

WARFEL: I'll call this meeting to order.

AGENDA ITEM II - MEMORIAL RESOLUTION

WARFEL: We begin our meeting today with a memorial resolution for Dr. Steven Bricker, a professor in the School of Dentistry. We will enter the full text of the memorial resolution into our minutes. I will ask you to stand for a moment of silence.

Let me welcome you to the last meeting of the Faculty Council for this academic year. We finally have nice weather. We will proceed with the Administrative Report.

AGENDA ITEM III - ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT - CHANCELLOR GERALD L. BEPKO

BEPKO: In view of the nice weather, I will resist the temptation to make a long report. It is the year end. It is the end of the academic year. Classes are over. Exams are under way. That is a great time of year. Although I am not teaching this semester, I remember well when I was teaching full-time, the exhilaration that came from

finishing the academic year. It has been a great academic year -- our 25th Anniversary year during which we have celebrated 25 years of achievement and dedicated some buildings (the Science/Engineering/Technology complex and the library) that add immeasurably to the unity and to the accomplishment of our campus. All in all, thanks to you it has been an excellent year and I say congratulations.

AGENDA ITEM IV - PRESIDENT'S REPORT - RICHARD FREDLAND

FREDLAND: I have been working on what I had on my hard drive labeled "swan song" for a long time. I was trying to figure out what I would say as a parting observation. Having tenure and two volvos, I thought I would take the opportunity to express a couple of thoughts that have occurred to me after two years in this position.

First, I have been very disappointed in the fact that I haven't been able to be as proactive in the role of Faculty President as I would hope and it comes from the necessity of being reactive. We have very limited resources from which to deal with the responsibilities that come to us. Therefore, you spend a lot of time doing things that have to be done rather than things that you would like to do. I think that the structure of the university, and I am thinking now of One University and Eight Front Doors and the responsibilities that go with that which are much beyond what appears in this room, creates tensions and mitigates against the building of effective community. Not that we don't have community, but it is very difficult to deal with. The academy has also been under fire from the larger community for what comes to be questions of accountability and productivity. Since we are not producers of a product, I think it is really unfortunate that we are being asked to deal with what we do in business-like terms. I think it is our number one priority to resist that sort of thing. It is equally important that we sublimate those concerns into qualitative measures of what we do as opposed to quantitative measures. We cannot avoid dealing with them. We should not avoid dealing with them, but we have to work doubly hard to keep the arena in those places where it reflects what we actually do.

I have a concern that the university, and I think of the entire university, I think of the whole business of the academy, but I think we are unduly concerned about image. One example, and this is simply one example that happened to be driven home to me. If you were at the dedication of the new library, on the platform there was not a single faculty there as a faculty member. The platform was replete with Trustees and a whole array of vice presidents and administrators of one sort or the other. I think that it reflects the new paradigm of the university. That the university has a face that it presents to the larger world that is concerned with public relations matters as opposed to the ongoing business of the academy. I realize that I may be sweeping the tide back on the beach, but from the tradition out of which I have come in liberal arts, that is simply not the way it is supposed to happen and it bothers me.

Nonetheless, the fact that we must leave administration to administrators is not a curse but a blessing of sorts because there are many things that need to be done that we are, by temper, ill-suited to do. I wrote a letter to the Board of Trustees a month or so ago making the very surprising observation that the administration of the university is not maligned. That Indiana University 'ain't broke and it doesn't need fixing.'

Because, I think that the Trustees, the Commission of Higher Education, some members of the legislature, and the public at large have been much too unappreciative of what the university is about and I think we have to keep that constantly in balance. On the other hand, if we are going to confront the challenges that face us with enthusiasm and effectiveness, I think we need to have a renewed appreciation of what we are about. It isn't confined only to this university. I had the delicious observation made by the AAUP President of another institution that, that university had hired 200 new administrators in the period that they had hired one new tenure-track faculty. As much as I would like to believe that, even I find that somewhat hard to believe. But, the general tenor of that is not lost on me as a faculty member. When we have administrators who have budgets three quarters of a million dollars, twice the size of my department, for example, it does call into question exactly how we are disporting our resources. I think we need to realize that. For example, one-fourth of the students on this campus are enrolled in the Undergraduate Education Center. Yet, we have as many chancellors and vice-chancellors as there are

advisors for these 7,000 students. It seems to me that, if we focus on what the business of the university is about, one of the major focuses is dealing with the enormous problems that students in a basically open-admissions institution come to us with and that requires counseling of very professional and extensive sorts and we don't have the resources to do that. I think we have to look at our priorities.

I think we need to look at the relative allocation of resources within the institution. For example, the fact that over the last five or six years, according to the Budgetary Affairs Committee's review of the Responsibility Centered Management, academic expenditures have grown by approximately 45 percent while administrative expenditures have grown by 120 percent. I think we have a responsibility in our role as faculty to keep that in mind. We are not without other kinds of responsibilities and I think we need to remind ourselves of that. We have the exceptional privileges of tenure, sabbatical leaves, and intellectual freedom. I think we need to appreciate that and resolve to do what we can to maintain it. We have the corollary responsibility of making hard choices when it comes to primary committee decisions about who should be tenured and promoted, when it comes to awarding grades, when it comes to those factors that affect the quality and effectiveness of the institution. Not the least among these is as forward looking in the matters of pedagogy as we are in subject area matters. We all pride ourselves in keeping at the forefront of our discipline, but a lot of us are not as eager to be at the forefront of how it is we go about dispensing our knowledge and the process of what President Brand talked about the Scholarship of Discovery.

Having said all of that, I am persuaded that undergraduate education at IUPUI is in the forefront of undergraduate education in this country. I spent a few days at the American Association of Higher Education meeting in Chicago a month or so ago. There was not a single topic that I heard raised in that meeting in many sessions that had not been talked about on this campus in very similar sorts of terms. There is not much to be known about higher education that we don't know on this campus and we are not practicing it. These are not new thoughts. They are not unique to me to be sure. I have shared them over the years in as many settings as I could. It is much the same thing I said two years ago. I think I do have a more sober understanding of the difficulties that we are confronted with now. But, I think we do need to continue to do these rights things on the campus.

In that process, I would commend Chancellor Bepko and the administration for their eager collaboration and cooperation for the two years that I have been here. We have regularly shared thoughts at a very high level of trust and sophistication. And, to the extent that the temper of the times has allowed, I think we have considered a lot of authentic educational matters. Chancellor Bepko and others have been very open to divergent perspectives and I can guarantee you I have provided, I think, some of those.

There has been untiring efforts on the part of a variety of other people this year that you should be aware of. I would single out especially President-elect Warfel without whom faculty governance would not have worked. She has been thoughtful enough to put on the board the names of the committee chairs this year. If you were on one of the committees or if you are one of the committee chairs, you realize how much work you do and how little thanks there is for doing it. I would like to, on behalf of everybody, thank you for that because without that nothing would happen.

Finally, Bernice Chumley has labored long and hard in the Faculty Council Office as the one staff person that we have for Faculty Council and Staff Council. She has wallowed in seas of papers and tapes diligently and effectively all year and I want to thank her.

This brings me to a constitutionally-mandated report on Boards of Review. As best as I can determine, this year we have had three boards of review. Two of which are still at work. One case was resolved by mutual agreement between the parties. At least four other grievances have come to my attention which have been resolved short of going to a board of review.

I will mention the following so they will be in the minutes and in your minds for next year. Still before the Council are the following:

- Developing a mechanism for campus curriculum and planning.
- Approving a policy for handling institutional data.
- Concluding discussions on the TFFAA recommendations.
- Status of the Forgiveness Policy.
- Reports on four of the five administrative reviews that have gone on this past academic year and have not been completed.
- Continue to examine Responsibility Centered Management especially in the light of a new President at the University.

That brings me to one final set of observations. The Executive Committee met with President Brand one day this week for the first time. This is not something we normally do with the President of the University. He has spent two or three days on various campuses this week. He met with the University Faculty Council Agenda Committee for a couple of hours, with our Executive Committee for a couple of hours, and with the Bloomington Faculty Council Executive Committee suggesting a high-level of attentiveness to faculty concerns. Just a few of the issues which raised that I would highlight for your awareness that suggest the kinds of priorities he would have. One was his observation that IU has a need to convince the general public of the value of general education. The Academic Cabinet of the University was meeting this morning and discussing this very issue as the budget is prepared for presentation to the legislature next year. He articulated a very strong interest in providing strong student services for a commuter campus. He presented the findings of George Kuh, our colleague in Education in Bloomington, which I think I presented two years ago in a similar setting here, which have become standard across the country with one other corollary set of findings and that is students learn more out of the classroom than they do in the classroom. That informal interaction with faculty and peers is what really matters and that is where education takes place. He alluded to how IUPUI was a model university. We went on to discuss that at substantial length and invited him to document it from his perspective. I think he did that very well. He expressed a strong commitment to the principle of tenure not to the reasons of financial security or job security, but for the reasons of academic freedom which may not be pressing us now but may once again become a matter of concern. I think we have had a good beginning with him as President of the University and I think we need to continue to assert the interests of the faculty and the interests of IUPUI and keep them on his agenda.

Finally, there are at least two members in this room, in addition to one I noted last time, who are here for their last time. Ted Cutshall is retiring from the University this year. He has been a long time, enthusiastic member of this body and supporter of faculty governance and I know we will miss him. While Pat Blake is not retiring from the University for another year, she is retiring from the Faculty Council today. She is wearing on her lapel a 25-year pin that she received today from the School of Nursing. We will miss her also especially for her diligent work as chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee this year. I thank them both. [applause]

WARFEL: Thank you, Dick. Are there questions or comments related to the President's report? We have a visitor who we would like to give an opportunity to speak, but we will do the elections first. Also, unless there is an objection, we will add an item to our agenda.

AGENDA ITEM V - ELECTION OF EXECUTIVE AND NOMINATING COMMITTEES

ZUNT: You have before you, with the agenda for this meeting, the slates which had to be distributed to the Council at least seven days prior to the election. Kathy, at this time would it be appropriate, while we are distributing the ballots for the election, for me to introduce the second part of our report which is the issue of the Tenure Committee? I apologize to you. I wasn't at your last meeting. Patricia Wittberg was here to give the report from the Nominating Committee, but I understand your business was so extensive that you simply couldn't address that issue. Attached to today's agenda is IUPUI Circular 94-25 which is a memo from the Nominating

Committee. I might ask that the actual date of that memo be April 7th which is the date it was submitted to the Council in writing rather than the May 5, which was the date it was orally reported to the Council.

To summarize, you will remember that the Tenure Committee was replaced at IUPUI in February with the Promotion and Tenure Committee. This was effective immediately which is a somewhat unusual circumstance, but it is in our minutes that this was effective immediately. This required three members at large be elected by the IUPUI Faculty Council and one librarian representative who will be elected by the IUPUI library faculty. The terms of office are for three years. We already have in place three members to the previous Tenure Committee who were elected for a two-year term. After discussion within the Nominating Committee, we are asking that the Faculty Council allow those newly-elected members to complete a two-year term. Those members are: William Bosron (School of Medicine), Paul Galanti (School of Law), and Carlyn Johnson (SPEA). The Nominating Committee is asking that you support this recommendation. We also further recommend that the 1995 Nominating Committee prepare a ballot that would allow for staggered terms. This was not part of your original provision on February 3 when the committee was set up. But, the Nominating Committee is recommending that be done a year from today. Patricia Wittberg is the chair of the Nominating Committee for next year. I would be happy to answer your questions. I don't know if you need a motion to support our recommendation. Are there objections to what we are recommending? [No objections] We appreciate your support of allowing Professors Bosron, Galanti, and Johnson to complete their term and then we will address the committee next year with staggered terms.

[The following persons were elected:]

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE: C D Aliprantis, Paul Galanti, Raymond Koleski, Karen Teegarden.

NOMINATING COMMITTEE: Timothy Brothers, Elizabeth Evenbeck, Dolores Hoyt, Michael Penna. Dolores Hoyt will be the chair in the second year.

WARFEL: Thank you, Susan. Chancellor Bepko will now introduce our visitor for today.

BEPKO: We know we will get questions about this, so let me anticipate something from the Question and Answer Period. This has to do with the 500 Festival Mini Marathon that is held early in May over the last couple of years and will be held tomorrow. The route goes from the Circle out to the Indianapolis Motor Speedway and then back -- twice across campus. Last year we experimented with this and we thought that it fit the overall policy that we have adopted for the University and the use of the University campus. Actually, in this case, they are not using the campus. They are using public streets and we have little to say about what they do, although we have been consulted and have agreed that, if we can have the mini-marathon come across campus, bringing thousands of people onto campus to see how beautiful the campus has truly become, and it does not cause any disruption of the academic activities on the campus, if we could plan it so that it will cause only relatively minor inconvenience, that this is an advantage. We will have people becoming more familiar with and friendly toward us. We will be a better partner of the community with little costs. On that premise, we experimented last year and thought it was quite successful. We didn't have any serious problems that were reported. This year we have worked with the city police and the people who will be managing the mini-marathon. Notices have gone out to all university employees, including students, and there may be some questions about that. Our Director of Public Safety John Mulvey is here and he may wish to say a word about this. If you have any questions about specific problems that might arise, I hope we can answer them and if we can't, we will get the answer and, if there are adjustments that have to be made that can still be, made we will make them.

MULVEY: I don't have any comment but I will answer questions.

KARLSON: I would like to address one. This was called to my attention by a student in a school other than the School of Law. They were told, although they had their examination later in the day, that they had to be on campus before 8 a.m. otherwise they would be delayed getting to campus because of something that was obviously considered more important than academics and they would have that held against them at the exam

time. I would like to know what communication was given to faculty that they would be telling students who were taking examinations at noon that they had to be on campus before 8 a.m.

BLAKE: Nothing. I received the communication and there was nothing about that specified.

KARLSON: I have the communication right here and it says "students must be on campus by 7:45 a.m." That is what the students were referring to.

BEPKO: Mark [Grove], do you know about this?

GROVE: John and I talked about two weeks ago about this. He prepared a map. We sent the mailing to all faculty who had examinations Friday morning or whose classes were eligible without examinations Friday morning -- not the afternoon or the noon slots. We sent them a copy of John's map as well. That was just for those exams starting at 8 a.m. and at 10 a.m., not later times. I understand how the reading of that might give that impression.

BEPKO: It is clearly not the case that someone would have to be here before 8 a.m. In fact, if you had an exam at any time, you could come just before the exam. The only limitations are that you can't drive your car across Michigan Street. You have to use the overhead pedestrian walkways. But, you could park in the north tier and walk onto campus at anytime during the morning. The recommendation is, because of the commotion, that you plan a little extra time.

PETERSON: I am a little concerned about having notified all of the faculty members who are giving exams tomorrow morning because I did not receive communication from anybody except the routine folder that came from the Police Department. I have an exam tomorrow morning at 9:00. I am now a little concerned about those students. I didn't make a specific announcement to them trying to accommodate for this during class. I have a timed exam where I expect students to be there on time so I can do certain things in a timely manner.

BEPKO: How many students do you have, Dick?

PETERSON: I have 160 students. I did not receive a communication regarding this.

COONEY: I would like to make a suggestion. Between now and when this happens next year, eliminate final exams while the marathon is going through campus.

BEPKO: That is certainly a possibility. I think that was discussed last year and it was our view that there was not enough potential disruption and we don't think we should change our schedule for any event outside the institution. If it came to the point where we thought we couldn't do this and have our exams at the same time, I suppose the best choice would be not to do it. I am concerned about Dick Peterson's exam. Will it be in the Van Nuys Building?

PETERSON: Yes.

BEPKO: That is easier and students probably won't be affected by the traffic.

PETERSON: The problem is that there is no parking on that side of the street.

BEPKO: But, there is. It is the whole north tier along North Street. Most medical students park on North Street by the hotel.

MULVEY: The only problem they will have is with the exit from I-65 and I-70 being closed. If they go down to the next exit, they can get down to Michigan Street and come out Michigan Street. We will keep Michigan Street

with cross traffic open until just before the runners come back on campus.

ALIPRANTIS: In my department we have a common final for all sections at 10:00.

FLEENOR: I called Parking Services yesterday morning to get clarification and I was also informed that 10th Street would be closed starting at 8:30 a.m. That is going to knock you out of a lot of other parking areas that you haven't discussed.

MULVEY: No, because they can still get on to them from Michigan Street and North Street at that point in time.

KARLSON: There are a lot of things that are theoretically possible if people are prepared ahead of time. It is quite obvious that people have not been prepared ahead of time. So, the next question which I have to ask you is, will you have people out with detours standing there to give information when this chaos starts?

MULVEY: We will have our people at every intersection on campus beginning at 8:30 a.m.

KARLSON: It is going to be chaos.

BEPKO: It wasn't last year and we hope it won't be this year. I think the best evidence of what will happen is what actually took place last year. As far as I understand, there was no disruption. People may have been asked to endure a very minor inconvenience, but it is no more than what we hear about all the time in terms of having to park further away from buildings than students would like. We recognize that there is a potential for difficulty. We will have people out there with the right kind of attitude and the right kind of instructions so that we can nip problems in the bud and prevent people from being delayed in going to their academic responsibilities.

SUTTON: Will our garage passes be honored at other parking lots? And, if so, how will that work?

MULVEY: Yes. If you will show your garage pass to the attendant, they will let you in and out.

SIDHU: Am I correct in assuming that Michigan Street will not be closed at 8 a.m.?

MULVEY: That is correct. It will not be closed.

SIDHU: Also, West Street will not be closed coming from the south, is that correct?

MULVEY: That is also correct. Michigan Street, on campus, two lanes will be open at all times. But, off Michigan east of the campus, at the end of the race Michigan Street will be closed.

WARFEL: Thank you very much.

AGENDA ITEM VI - CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

WARFEL: Let's move on to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee amendment. Circular 94-20 is attached to your agenda.

BEHROOZI: Thank you. For some time an officer of the IUPUI Staff Council has been an informal member of the IUPUI Faculty Council. In fact, the President of the Staff Council is currently listed as an ex-officio member of the Faculty Council. In response to a request, the Constitution and Bylaws Committee has reviewed the question of the membership of the President of the Staff Council and has proposed an amendment to formalize this membership. The rationale for this is very similar to the rationale for the membership of the President of the IUPUI Student Assembly as set forth in Article IV, Section A.4 of the Faculty Constitution. The rationale is essentially

to facilitate the linkage and communication between the Faculty Council and, in this case, the IUPUI Staff Council. In the proposed amendment as distributed, inadvertently one word has been omitted. With the addition of the word 'Faculty' to the amendment, we propose to add Article IV, A5 of the Faculty Constitution as follows:

5. Staff Member. The President of the IUPUI Staff Council shall be a non-voting, ex-officio member of the Faculty Council. When the Staff Council President is unable to attend meetings of the Faculty Council, she or he may send a designated representative.

WARFEL: Is there any discussion of this motion?

SIDHU: Is there a reason why we are proposing this membership as a non-voting, ex-officio member? Most of the ex-officio members are voting members.

BEHROOZI: This is similar to the membership of the President of the Student Assembly and the rationale for that is that a student representative, or in this case, a staff representative, would not be considered a faculty member.

WARFEL: Is there any other discussion? If not, I will ask the Council to vote on this motion. All of those in favor, say "Aye." Is there anybody opposed? [none] Any abstentions? [None] The motion passes here and when the academic year begins in the Fall, we will take the proper steps of mailing the notice and waiting for objections and then finally voting on this Constitutional amendment. Thank you very much.

AGENDA ITEM VII - FRINGE BENEFITS COMMITTEE REPORT

WARFEL: Professor Ed Robbins will present the Fringe Benefits Committee Report.

ROBBINS: The major purpose for this report is to give you an opportunity to raise questions and discuss the substance of the items which were distributed in IUPUI Circular 94-21. We have the advantage of Kathy Warfel's membership on the IU Health Care Commission to respond to questions and to provide additional information about those items which are outlined in that circular. However, there are two of them that the IUPUI Fringe Benefits Committee is prepared to ask you to consider. Specifically, those are items 5 and 6 of that document. The first of those relates to the establishment of a uniform IU contribution to all health care plans. The second one relates to the elimination of the \$300 deductible level for the PCI Plan. In that context I would present to you the first of two motions that the Fringe Benefits Committee makes to the Council.

The Fringe Benefits Committee moves that the IUPUI Faculty Council recommend the following health care policy:

IU contribute a "fixed-dollar" amount across all IU-sponsored health care plans. These contribution amounts would replicate the approximate contribution ratios that currently exist for the four membership levels (Employee Only, Employee/Child, Employee/Spouse, and Family) available for each plan. This methodology shall apply to both medical and dental components.

That comes to you as a motion from a standing committee and then is before you moved and seconded for discussion.

WARFEL: Does everyone understand this motion?

BYRNE: You said it would be a "fixed-dollar" amount for each employee. Is that correct?

ROBBINS: That is correct. For each of the health care plans and for each of the options within those plans contributions that are shared between the employer and the employee. Currently, those vary by plan for each of the sub-parts of those plans. This proposal would simply equalize those across each of the plans so that the contribution that the employee receives to their plan would be the same from Indiana University regardless of

which of the various plan options they selected. That is, either the PCI plan or the Managed Care plans. If you look at the last item of the circular, you will see an impact summary. If you look down the columns, you can see the number of people that would be impacted either positively, negatively, or the number that would not be impacted at all. That is, for whom, under our current plan this would result in no change. The contribution of the University would be the same. In terms of the dollar amounts of the impact, the previous table shows a comparison of what the proposed plan would result. You can see it varies from an increase which its largest amount is probably about \$7 or \$8 a month and a maximum decrease of some \$45 because of the way in which those contributions have been disproportionately applied to those plans in the past.

KARLSON: I am confused. When I look at the first chart, is this the proposed impact or is that what we presently have?

ROBBINS: This is the application of this particular proposal to the current plan. For example, if we were using this particular proposal now, this is the way it would apply to our plan. And, it would apply relatively the same way in the plan for next year. I say "relatively" because the plan costs for next year have not been established, but the thing that would be a feature of that plan is that, as you can see, for the employee only contribution in each of these plans is the same. That would be the same for next year's plans. The proposal is for the University to continue its current participation at the 70/30 ratio; that is, 70 percent of the cost of the overall plan is provided by the University; 30 percent is provided by the employee.

KARLSON: In effect, this creates four classes -- Employee Only/Employee With Children/Employee with Spouse/Family. Within each one of these classes you are going to have the average or between the classes. That is what I am not clear about.

WARFEL: This doesn't create those classes. Those classes have always existed. The 70/30 covers each plan, not each level of the plan.

KARLSON: What I heard Professor Robbins say is that a faculty member who has a family, as opposed to a faculty member who is alone, we are going to have the average between those two and each class gets treated differently. There is an average within the class or an average of all the classes which the University will be paying.

WARFEL: The University does in fact subsidize...

ROBBINS: If you look at the relationship between the total premium, the IU contribution, and the employee contribution, you can see that relationship varies across the categories of employee only/employee and children/employee/spouse, and family. Even though the overall contribution is 70/30, the contribution with each of those varies because the highest proportion of contribution is to employee only and with the lesser contribution on the part of the University when it applies to employee/children and employee/spouse, and family. The general formula that the University has followed, and I say "general formula" is that the University pays 90 percent of employee only and 50 percent of dependents. You have to understand that, while that is a formula or a principle that is used in budgeting for this, the actual contributions in the final analysis are determined by what the experience is for the plan. The University, in fact, pays everything that the employees don't pay. That is the way our plan works. Even though they budget it on the basis of these formula, when the bills come in, they pay all the bills. The money that they don't get from the employee is money that the University has to provide. If at the end of the year, you calculated the actual expenditures across all of those, you can be assured that it will never compute to be exactly as the formula would have projected it simply because the experience in each of these categories is affected by the individual cases that occur in each of the categories.

The important thing about this particular proposal, I think for your consideration, is the equity issue. What we have had in the past is a plan in which those of you who participated in some of the plans and in some levels of the plans, subsidize those who were in others because the contributions were not equal. If you will look at the last page, (THE SECOND SIDE OF TAPE ONE WAS BLANK), (discussion continued on the uniform "fixed dollar" and

IU contribution rate, the elimination of the \$300 deductible level, and on the new Managed Mental Health Care Plan. The Council had many questions about the latter, and it was agreed that Dr. Burdine would be invited to make a presentation to the IUPUI Faculty Council in the fall.)

AGENDA ITEM VIII - CONTINUED 'MAJOR ISSUES' DISCUSSION

WARFEL: This will be on the agenda for the September meeting.

AGENDA ITEM IX - QUESTION / ANSWER PERIOD

(This information was on the side of the tape which did not tape properly.)

AGENDA ITEM X - UNFINISHED BUSINESS

(This information was on the side of the tape which did not tape properly.)

AGENDA ITEM XI - NEW BUSINESS

President Warfel presented a plaque to President Fredland which was inscribed: "The First and the Best -- Dick Fredland, President, IUPUI Faculty Council, 1992-1994. President Fredland received a standing ovation following the presentations.

FREDLAND: The last time I received an award it was Hitler's birthday and I thought it was a pretty good celebration thereof. I am not sure what this celebrates. I have appreciated doing this and I expressed my thanks and my frustrations, but I think we have a good thing going. This University is doing good things and it is largely because of the enthusiasm of faculty. So, I hope you will continue to do what you have been doing.

BEPKO: It is almost anti-climatic to grant another award, but I would like to say something about the leadership of the Faculty Council. I think we have very good conditions at IUPUI in terms of faculty governance and systems. I think our boards of review have functioned well to protect the interests of both individual faculty members and the institution. We have a good forum here in the Faculty Council. We have created some good initiatives, particularly in the last couple of years. The things I had in mind include creating the administrative review process which was a joint effort on the part of the Faculty Council and the administration. I think we have a high level of candor and openness on this campus. It has been encouraged by our system of responsibility center management which creates much more information for us and it also creates a general information rich environment for the whole academic community. We have had, I think, over the years an excellent level of collegiality. Several years ago, as you know, we conducted the study under the auspices of the Task Force on Faculty Appointments and Advancement. We did a survey of all faculty and asked a question that was particularly important as to why they stayed at IUPUI despite the fact that in many areas our salaries are lower than our peer institutions. Why they didn't take appointments at other universities? The most commonly offered explanation, the most commonly designated reason why people stayed here was peer relationships, the atmosphere, collegiality, and support that we think is one of the most important ingredients in academic success.

It is clear to me that IUPUI could not have grown as it has and we could not have achieved many of the, I believe, wonderful things we have achieved without this mutually reinforcing collegiality. For that I thank all of you and, in particular, because I have had an opportunity to work with almost everyone in the room, but very closely with Susan Zunt, Jeffery Vessely, and Dick Peterson as leaders of the Faculty Council. But, this last two-year period I have had the very good fortune to be able to work very closely with Kathleen Warfel. She has offered wise counsel and has made very good suggestions, made her points very effectively, and has brought about change within the institution and she has wielded a superb gavel at these meetings. I would like to offer to her as an

expression of our esteem and affection on behalf of the University administration a plaque which reads:

To Kathleen Warfel, in appreciation for your dedicated service as Vice President of the Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis Faculty for the years 1992-1994.

WARFEL: Thank you very much.

BEPKO: I think there are two excellent years ahead both because of Dick Turner and because we have had a chance to get to know Kathy better.

Now, for Dick Fredland who is retiring as President of the IUPUI Faculty, I want to say initially that I have very much appreciated Dick's being in Africa and in Maine a couple of years ago because while he was gone we created a couple of vice chancellor's positions and some administrative posts.

From our perspective we have had a great time working with Dick. I think he has been, as Kathy put it, a fabulous President of the IUPUI Faculty. I think he has brought real wisdom, sagacity, good cheer and a sense of humor. He too has made his points well and has had a major impact on the institution over these two years. I can think of many things, but I have been particularly impressed by his role as spokesperson for all us with the Trustees of Indiana University. The way he projects himself to the community at large and, I think, creates for us a very good reputation as an academic institution as a result of that work in the community. I mentioned as a part of the State of the Campus message this year that we might wish to go back to the 19th century and look at how faculty members were towards the community. They were consulted by the leadership of the community in almost every issue. They were themselves like bank presidents are today and presidents of large corporations. I think it is worth considering that as one of the many roles that faculty play within an institution like ours, especially an urban university, I think Dick embodies that type of leadership, both within the University community and in the larger community. I am particularly interested in what he did by way of providing leadership for this body when we were challenged by the issue of the Balanced Case. I think the Faculty Council at IUPUI conducted itself in very proud fashion in dealing with that issue. You might have a different view about how it should have come out, but I think our discussion of that issue and, in part, because I agreed with our resolution of that issue, was something that brought real pride to me and I think showed that the IUPUI campus is ready to play a leadership role for the whole University. Indeed, we have played that role all along, but this was a shining example of how we can do that and be the very best. In fact, right after the Balanced Case issue was discussed and we made our position with respect to the Balanced Case, I saw Tom Ehrlich and said, "Tom, we hope you understand that this marks the moment when you have a new flagship campus at Indiana University." He shook his head, "Yes."

I feel so strongly about Dick's leadership that I am about to insult him by saying that he would make a very good dean or vice chancellor. [laughter] But, most important of all, with heartfelt affection, appreciation, and respect for what he has done for all us I would like to give him this symbol which is similar to the one that we gave to Kathy. It reads:

To Richard A. Fredland, in appreciation for your dedicated service as President of the Indiana University-Purdue University Faculty for the years 1992-1994.

Congratulations, Dick.

AGENDA ITEM XII - ADJOURNMENT

WARFEL: Our meeting is adjourned. Have a good summer.