

INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS

Faculty Council Meeting
Thursday, September 1, 1988
Law School, Room 116
3:30 - 5:30 p.m.

Members Present: Administrative: Chancellor Gerald L. Bepko, Dean Carol Nathan, Dean William Plater. Deans: John Barlow, Nicholas Kellum, Bruce Renda, Sheldon Siegel, William J. Voos. Faculty: Billy Abel, C. D. Aliprantis, Margaret Applegate, Morris Aprison, Richard Beck, Frederick Bein, H. R. Besch, Jr., Willard Bostwick, David Burns, Victoria Champion, Mervyn Cohen, Theodore Cutshall, Joseph DiMicco, Elizabeth Evenbeck, Margaret Felton, Richard Fredland, Bhuwan Garg, Donald Gartner, Phillip Gibbs, Vania Goodwin, Celestine Hamant, William Hodes, Dolores Hoyt, Charles Hutton, Rosemarie Jones, Jerome Kaplan, Henry Karlson, Juanita Keck, Richard Kovacs, Michael Kubek, James McAteer, Dana McDonald, Richard Meiss, Judy Z. Miller, Michael Mitchell, B Keith Moore, Bernard Morrel, Carl Newton, Byron Olson, Richard Peterson, Jeanne Pontious, Richard Rink, Edward Robbins, Glen Sagraves, Susan Sutton, Karen Teeguarden, Jeffery Vessely, Harriet Wilkins, Charles Yokomoto, Jack Zecher.

Alternates Present: Deans: John Hunger for A. James Barnes, James Carter for Walter J. Daly, James R. Roche for H. William Gilmore, Hugh Wolf for Howard Mehlinger, Scott Evenbeck for James Weigand, Georgia Miller for Jack Wentworth. Faculty: Rosemarie Jones for Carl Andres, Marc Simon for Christian Kloesel, Carol Taylor for Rebecca Markel. Student Representatives: Nathan Brindle (Student Body Vice President) for Gloria Smith (Student Body President).

Visitors Present: Erwin Boschmann, Associate Dean Faculties/Chemistry; T. Kay Carl, Division of Allied Health Sciences; Dan Gardner, Graduate Assistant, Chancellor Bepko's office; Beverly E. Hill, Budgetary Affairs Committee Chairperson; Kim Manlove, Dean of the Faculties Office; John Snyder, Allied Health Sciences, School of Medicine; Dorothy Webb, Theatre.

Members Absent: Deans: Constance Baker, Robert Keck, Norman Lefstein. Faculty: Elaine Alton, Cecil Brown, William Crabtree, Paula Differding, Robert Dittus, John Eble, Morris French, Robert A. Harris, Eugene Helveston, Narcissa Hocker, Louis Holtzclaw, Florence Juillerat, John Lappas, Richard Lawlor, Donna Marzouk, Robert Mendelsohn, Bartholomew Ng, Gerald Powers, Douglas Rex, Richard Rogers, Beverly Ross, A. N. Siakotos, Craig Stoops, Kathleen Warfel, Henry Wellman, Karen West.

AGENDA ITEM I - Approval of Minutes: April 7, 1988 and May 5, 1988

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: I think we are ready to begin our first meeting of the year. We will begin with the ritualistic approval of the minutes of the last two meetings that we had - April 7 and May 5. I think we could do it with one motion if someone wants to offer the motion. The motion is made and seconded for approval of both meetings' minutes. All in favor, say "Aye." Are there any opposed?

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

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: Our next item of business is from my office. I have some introductions to make of persons who have been appointed to new positions since the last meeting of the Faculty Council. Some of those persons are here today. I would like to introduce them and ask you to join me in greeting them in their new roles. Some of the persons who have been appointed are not here. I will mention them also.

In random order, let me start with the new Associate Dean of Faculties whose responsibilities will include lifelong learning, and more, meaning that he will also have number of responsibilities associated with how students are brought into the University and how they are cared for in their earliest stages of University learning. That is Scott Evenbeck from the School of Science. Scott is here.

Next, another person who has been appointed as Associate Dean of Faculties. His area of responsibility will be assessment. After a search that was conducted this summer, we are pleased to announce that Erwin Boschmann, from the School of Science, is our new Associate Dean of Faculties for assessment in his portfolio.

Next, we have a new head of the Division of Allied Health Sciences who is joining us after a national search. He held an appointment at the Ohio State University until he resigned to join us this fall, John Snyder.

Last, but not least, a person whom I talked to you about earlier and who was mentioned at the May meeting as being recommended for this position but may not have technically held it at the time we met in May, is Vice Chancellor for External Affairs, Eugene Tempel. Would you join me in greeting these persons?

We have some other persons who have been appointed but who are not here. Let me mention who they are: we have a new Dean of the School of Nursing, Constance Baker, who was Dean at the University of South Carolina School of Nursing until she resigned to join us on July 1.

We have a new Dean of the School of Public and Environmental Affairs, Jim Barnes, who until August 1 of this year was the Chief Operating Officer in the Environmental Protection Agency. He held a faculty appointment at Indiana University before going into government service.

We also have a new Dean of the School of Optometry, Jack Bennett, who joins us after having been Vice President of Ferris State College and Dean of their School of Optometry.

We have an Acting Dean in the School of Science from the ranks of the faculty of the School of Science. He held an Associate Deanship in the School of Science: Bob Keck.

We have another person whom we have recruited after a lengthy search to be the new Director of the Center on Philanthropy, Bob Payton. For 10 years Bob was President of the Exxon Education Foundation and for the last year has held an appointment at the University of Virginia. He was previously a United States ambassador and was also President of two universities, the last of which was Hofstra University in New York.

The next person who I would like to introduce was the most recent appointee by

the Board of Trustees of Indiana University. After a national search, we found that the very best person to be Dean of the School of Liberal Arts was right here at home. I am pleased to introduce and ask you to join me in greeting John Barlow.

The Faculty Council adopted, in the academic year 1986-87, a new rank for faculty known as the clinical rank or clinical track. Since the adoption of that clinical rank or clinical track, we have had a number of questions raised about guidelines for transfer from tenure track positions to the clinical track. We have developed guidelines in consultation with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council and other interested persons within the University. The guidelines will be sent to the affected schools. The affected schools are Medicine, Dentistry, Nursing, and Optometry. The guidelines will be sent to faculty members through the deans' offices shortly. We think that the guidelines will answer all the questions that have been raised about transferring from tenure track to clinical track.

We have good news to report on a number of fronts. Let me mention the first of those items and then ask Bill Plater to give you some other good news. We have, as you know, been working over the summer to try to raise money privately to construct a new main library for the campus. When the academic year closed, 1987-88, we had announced that we would be working on this fund raising program throughout the remainder of the calendar year. We didn't have anything formally to announce at that time we closed the academic year or at our last Faculty Council meeting. Since then, over the summer, there have been a couple of public announcements which you may have seen. The most prominent was that the Lilly Endowment has pledged \$12 million to the library project. Since that time we have learned that there are other gifts, one of which is public. This came from Ruth Lilly and will provide \$2 million for special collections. Two more gifts, which we are not yet at liberty to announce publicly but yet which have been pledged to us, amounts to another \$1.5 million. So, if you add all that up, it comes to \$15.5 million of the \$18 million that we have committed to raising \$18 million before we go to the State in January and ask for the legislature to provide the remaining funds through bonding authority. We are confident that we will have the \$18 million when it is needed. Even if we don't have all of the \$18 million in pledges as of December 1, when we hope we have them, we will have a very substantial percentage of the money that is already pledged to us in hand over the next two years and we will have a substantial accumulation of interest on that investment. All of that suggests that there should be very little concern at this point that we will reach the \$18 million goal, which means that we have even more hope that in the 1989 session of the General Assembly there will be funding provided not only for the library but for the Science/Engineering/Technology project, Phase III.

The other bit of good news is something Bill is going to tell you about having to do with enrollments.

DEAN PLATER: I am sure that it is no surprise to anyone in this room, if you have counted empty seats in your classroom or tried to find a parking place that enrollments are up this year. In fact, we have set a new enrollment record and, although we can't release the figures officially yet, I think that there is no point in keeping too many secrets. The headcount enrollment this fall is up five percent over what it was last year. We are about 200 students short of reaching 25,000 students enrolled in IUPUI which, of course, is a record headcount enrollment.

Perhaps the best news though is that student credit hours are up by almost an identical percentage. Overall we are up 4.7 in student credit hours which, of course, means somewhat of an increase in revenue based on the fees that students pay. I think we can also take part in not only the overall increase on campus, but we experienced a 24 percent increase in beginning students over last year. There also was a five percent increase in transfer students, resulting in a combined total of 18 percent increase in all new students coming to our campus this fall in comparison with last year. So, in terms of our approach to the legislature and the plans that we have for the campus in our development planning, this is very good evidence that we are on the right track.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: It may be mentioned again later but one of the reasons why we have a larger enrollment, especially at the freshman level in the undergraduate schools, is because we have done a little bit of added recruiting that we may not have done in previous years. We are not trying to coax anyone, unduly, to enroll at IUPUI, but we are providing a little more information about the high quality programs that are here. Carol Nathan, among others, deserves a tribute for what she has done, including her Person-to-Person Program.

In front of you you will see something else which should contribute to providing a better impression of our academic programs at the undergraduate level and that is a new booklet that will be used in undergraduate recruitment beginning this year. We hope that you will take a look at it and give us your comments and advice on how we can continue to improve the images that we transmit from the University to the community.

Finally, planning is still very much in the forefront in the University. The All-University planning process entitled, "IU One University: Indiana at its Best," is going forward at apace. You should have received, in the IU Newspaper, the most recent incarnation of the planning paper for the whole University, for all eight campuses, with the theme "One University with Eight Front Doors." This is going to be, I think, a continuing, important matter for all of us as faculty members. I hope you will take time to look at this most recent revision and stay abreast of the All-University planning process. I think it is important because of the subject matter, academics, which is what I think all of us are most interested in and hold dearest to our hearts. But, it is also important because the University is using this planning agenda for its appropriation requests to the 1989 General Assembly. If you would like to know more about that, you will be getting some literature shortly. Also, there is a golden opportunity for you to find out directly from the people most intimately involved in the planning process, and how it will translate into appropriation requests and, we hope, more resources for this campus and all of Indiana University. There will be a meeting on September 14 from 2:30 - 3:30 in the afternoon in the Conference Center Auditorium. You will receive a memo on this shortly but I want to emphasize it here. Presiding at the meeting will be the Presidents of Indiana and Purdue universities. Presidents Ehrlich and Beering will be here to talk about planning and, in particular, the Indiana University operating appropriation requests to the General Assembly. These requests most affect us even with respect to the Purdue schools since all our funding comes through appropriations to Indiana University.

The planning process for One University will go forward in the fall term. A number of groups will continue to work, but I think the most important for faculty

on this campus will be continuing study by our Council on Undergraduate Learning on implementing some of the initiatives that are found in this One University planning document. The campuses are going to be asked to consider how to implement some of these strategies, including such things as capstone courses, computer skills, and writing requirements. The Council on Undergraduate Learning is going to be taking up those matters this fall in the hope that we will be able to have some responses as to how we can implement some of these ideas in our various programs in various ways for the academic year 1989-90. Because this is a very important area and because we would like to work as quickly as we can to respond to the University's initiatives to emphasize undergraduate education, it is important that we have these initiatives under way by the time the General Assembly convenes in January.

Incidentally and parenthetically I would say that it is important to us because we think it will be significant to members of the General Assembly that, while our planning process results in appropriation requests, it also results in actions that don't immediately require money. We are working diligently on enhancing undergraduate education as one of the major themes of this planning process. At the same time we are asking for money from the General Assembly this process will go forward. Because of the importance of this matter, I have asked Bill Plater to work directly with and be personally involved in the Council on Undergraduate Learning and with all of the deans who head undergraduate schools to try to make progress in responding to these initiatives by the end of this fall term.

The campus planning process has also gone forward and it really is very much compatible and integrated with the One University planning process. There is a little different nomenclature, but the academic issues are the same. The campus planning process has emerged from the stage with which I think most of you are probably familiar - which was contained in the document that we distributed in February to the Faculty Council - The IU Development Plan: 1988 - 2000. Over the summer we have tried to draft and publish an abridged version of this campus plan. We have been working on a document that is not only suitable because it captures the essence of the longer, unabridged document, but which also is more readable to lay people in the community, one that we can use as a sound external piece as well as an internal statement for the future. We have gone through a number of drafts of that summary and in very short order you should be seeing a booklet which will be entitled "IUPUI By The Year 2000." It will contain our abridged version of the campus plan. This is what we are going to take into the community, along with the One University planning document and our appropriation requests and our celebrations of the 20th anniversary of IUPUI, and begin to convince the leaders of the community, both in private life and in government, that this is a very important time to invest in IUPUI. As Bill mentioned, it is especially important that we have a record enrollment, not that we planned it that way but fortunately it worked out that way at the same time that we are trying to draw the attention of the leadership of the state to IUPUI and convince them that this is the most important time to invest in our future.

When we make these presentations to the community leaders throughout the fall, we are going to be using the documents that I mentioned but most prominently this booklet. It has serve as an introduction to the presentations that we will make. We also have a new videotape about our campus plans almost in its final form. We thought we would show it to you here. There is still time to make changes in it if

you see something that is inappropriate or incorrect. We will note that there are a couple of things in here that are going to be corrected including a couple of scenes that are repeated. There also may be a few more views of West Lafayette and Bloomington classrooms than may be appropriate. We think that references to West Lafayette and Bloomington are very appropriate, but we shouldn't try to present views of those campuses in a way that suggests that we are showing views of IUPUI. We thought there may be some lack of clarity in this version of the tape on that point. Those things are going to be changed. They aren't monumental changes but in case you noticed them, I wanted to mention them in advance. By and large, we think the videotape is going to be something that will capture the interest of people in the community. We would like you to see it. [The tape was shown to the Faculty Council members.] The person who took the lead in preparing those pieces, including the video, is Gene Tempel, Vice Chancellor for External Affairs. His principal deputy in that was Amy Conrad Warner with whom some of you are familiar. She did most of the work as producer and director of the tape. We are going to show this to the Trustees in an amended fashion next Friday. After that it will be broadly available in case you want to use it for any purpose.

We would appreciate your joining with us in working in the community to try to make this a banner year for IUPUI in terms of private fund raising and in terms of public support. We think that the items that we prepared over the summer will assist in that quest and we hope you all join us in working this fall to enhance the resources of IUPUI.

AGENDA ITEM III - Executive Committee Report - Jeffery Vessely

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: The next item of business is the Executive Committee Report. The other new officer with us for the first time in his new role is Jeffery Vessely.

SECRETARY VESSELY: Thank you, Chancellor Bepko. I thought today that I would get my year off to the proper start so I invited Susan Zunt to make a report on the Faculty Club. Susan can't be here but I think my year will get off to an equally good start by her replacement Henry Besch who will give us an update on the Faculty Club.

PROFESSOR BESCH: Thank you, Jeff. Susan wrote up a short description and I, without any change, will read it to you. The University Faculty Club of Indianapolis, Inc., on the Capital Campus is now incorporated under the laws of the State of Indiana. Counselor Lawrence A. Jegen, III has generously guided the board of directors, elected in May, in the development of the articles of incorporation and the bylaws. Final approval of the bylaws by the directors is pending.

A plan for developing a room located on the concourse at the University Place Conference Center has been approved by the IU Architect's Office and the board of directors. Renovation should be completed by mid-November, and we expect to hold the first regular membership meeting in the site at that time. Following a survey of interested faculty, the annual dues for a regular member is \$75. Any faculty member paying the regular membership fee of \$75 prior to December 31, 1988 will be listed as a charter member. To encourage donations in our early development, the Board has established two other membership categories - Founding and Patron.

The Founding Member makes a donation of at least \$250, in addition to the annual dues of \$75 for a total of \$325. Like Charter memberships, Founding memberships are available only until December 31, 1988.

The Patron level of membership is for those individuals, departments, or corporations making substantial donations, \$2,000 or more.

The Board has tentatively agreed to open the University Faculty Club from 11 a.m. to 6 p.m., Monday through Saturday. The hotel will provide food service. Bar service will be available on a room service basis, at this time. The goal is to have evening service available as soon as possible, depending on faculty interest and use and staffing.

One hundred and eleven IUPUI faculty have already signed as members. (See attached Membership Application). You should be receiving your dues statements shortly. I am the Treasurer so I know that they have been sent out. If you have additional questions that I am not able to answer now or if you would like to discuss matters further, the Secretary, Linda Brothers, will be delighted to talk to you. She will also have the applications for membership. Her phone number is 4-8772. She is located in ET 1211F.

SECRETARY VESSELY: Are there any questions? Thank you, Henry. I have a few items. I would like to echo Chancellor Bepko's comments about the need for moving forward with the One University plan. I attended a meeting with the President and the faculty leaders from our other campuses. I might say that they were much more pessimistic about our chances of proceeding on those deadlines than the President would like to have had it be. But, I can promise that I kept up my eternal, almost to a fault, optimism and assured him that we would have our committees continue to work and would be ready with any report he needed by December 1. So, if you are asked to serve on a committee or to continue on a committee, remember that I have laid our reputation on the line. I was in the vast, vast minority of IU's campuses. I think each of the other campuses expressed the notion that absolutely there could not be significant movement forward before sometime at the end of the second semester. I really think from this summer's work that I saw faculty members take summer vacation time and move forward in a much much shorter period of time and I am hoping that we are able to do that same thing this fall.

The Board of Trustees will meet next weekend on our campus. We will have a presentation to the Faculty Relations Committee of the Board. Barbara Fischler will make that presentation. It will not be the standard presentation about the library in terms of bricks and mortar but Barbara has agreed to include in that report some additional information about the importance of our library and the connection it will make to the community and other things that would go beyond a bricks-and-mortar report. It will be on Saturday morning. I don't have the exact time. I don't think there is an exact agenda out but it is usually in the vicinity of 8:30 to 9:30 and it lasts for one hour. So, I hope I will receive a few phone calls the first of the week from you wanting to know exactly when it is so you could be there to support Barbara.

On another note, the Trustees' Investments Committee is scheduled to give a report on the 18/20 plan as they were at the August meeting. This time it has

been indicated that that report will be given and following that there will be a number of meetings set for Indianapolis and Bloomington and for the regional campuses to discuss the gist of the report. There are about as many variations of what the Board might do with the 18/20 plan as there are Board members. I got a little sense in August, at the last meeting, that there are at least some Board members who realize that it will be extremely difficult to take from the faculty things that the faculty have been promised, so there may be some middle-of-the-road compromise, maybe including a cap which is not there or changing the rules for new faculty. At any rate, I would hope that if you are available for the public meeting to listen to that report which would be Saturday afternoon, again usually between 1:00 to 2:00. That time hasn't been set yet. I would hope that you would be there to hear that. There will be several members of the Executive Committee and the Fringe Benefits Committee there. I think that a show of support by our faculty would be appropriate. We attend these meetings much better than other campuses do and I think that it is recognized by the Board that we are interested parties and not conspicuous by our absence. They are not in a position to make a final decision since they have suggested there would be open meetings, yet I think it would be important for them to know that we are there to hear in fact what they propose.

There have been several committee changes since the committees were published. I might give you those now. In your Faculty Council packet it is reported that John Barlow is the Acting Dean of the School of Liberal Arts. In fact, as we heard today, John is now the Dean of Liberal Arts. Under the **Academic Affairs Committee**, Creasie Hairston, whose term was to expire in 1990, has been replaced by Jerome Smith from Social Work. Under the **Budgetary Affairs Committee**, Richard Rogers' term should expire in 1989 instead of 1990. Dorothy Webb was inadvertently left off the **Budgetary Affairs Committee**. Her term expires in 1990. Under **Fringe Benefits Committee**, Robert Nevin's name should be removed from the term expiring in 1989. Under the **Nominating Committee**, because of Scott Evenbeck's new appointment, he has been replaced by Glen Segraves who will continue for one more year as the Chair of the Nominating Committee. Charles Yokomoto's name was inadvertently left off the **Nominating Committee** membership. Dr. Erwin Boschmann has asked to be replaced on the **Tenure Committee** and we are currently facilitating that replacement. We need to notify the next highest vote getter in that last election and that person hasn't been notified as yet so we won't make that announcement until the October meeting.

We received a report at the last Executive Committee meeting from John Nolte, Director of Parking and Transportation Services. He indicates that they are moving forward on a parking and shuttle plan. He will report to the Faculty Council at the first opportunity. I think at this time he is finalizing those plans and determining what kinds of shuttles can be secured and what the routes would be. If you have some information that you think should be included for consideration on determining routes, you should contact Mr. Nolte at Parking Services. That concludes my report.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: Thanks, Jeff.

AGENDA ITEM IV - Question and Answer Period - 10 Minutes

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: Next we have our standard question and answer period. Are there any questions or comments to start the year?

PROFESSOR CUTSHALL: In regard to the committee that was supposed to consider the name change of this place during the summer, are there any recommendations? Judging from the video, I assume that IUPUI is going to stay in place.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: The committee is still working. This has been an issue that has been discussed for 20 years now and we are finding that it may take another 20 years to resolve it. But, the committee is working and I think that the next step in the process is to have some focus discussion groups convene to consider the different possibilities and react to those different possibilities. These would include focus groups of students, alumni, faculty, staff, community leaders, and media representatives. The issue is still pending and there has been no definitive resolution.

PROFESSOR KAPLAN: I have talked with my colleagues and they have asked about the move downtown from 38th Street. Could something be written up so that it would be clear? I also feel that the rights of students seem to be slightly overlooked. Students may be running back and forth between Chemistry and Biology on two different campuses. I think the design is backwards.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: I can't answer the question about how the move is going to be made because I don't know all of the details. There are people in your school who have been working on this for a long time trying to take account of all of the variables. I suppose the most significant variable is how soon both buildings will be finished. We hope that is sooner rather than later. We hope that, if the final phase of Science/Engineering/Technology and the entire complex is funded in the 1989 session, we may be able to finish the final phase within a very short period of time after the phase that is in the works right now. That would mean that the logistics would be made much less complicated and the move would be much easier. If there is a gap, the longer the gap the more complicated the problems become, but Bob Keck and Bruce Renda have worked very hard on trying to develop plans that will create the optimum conditions. We don't want to wait at 38th Street until all of the buildings are built because that may mean encountering problems that are more serious than the logistical problems that we would have to encounter if we move part of the remainder of the 38th Street programs to the main campus before moving the rest. I can only refer you to Bob Keck at this point. I know these problems are very complicated and they are doing, I think, a very very good job in sorting them all out and developing a plan that meets as many faculty concerns as possible.

PROFESSOR HODES: We were given a brochure on the way in. Is that part of the discussion for later? I was curious as to what the relationship of this is to the videotape.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: They really aren't related except in a most indirect way. This publication is going to be used for general information about the campus. It is directed to prospective applicants for admission to the undergraduate programs. The video is for community leadership, members of the General Assembly, business

leaders, and the community in general. It was designed not to cause people to enroll but to cause people to donate money or talk to their legislative representatives and senators about supporting additional funds for all of IUPUI's programs.

AGENDA ITEM V - TIAA/CREF Benefits for 10-Month Appointees

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: Our next agenda item is a report on TIAA/CREF Benefits for 10-month appointees. Professor Aliprantis will make this report.

PROFESSOR ALIPRANTIS: This resolution was made at the Faculty Council meeting in May; however, there wasn't enough time to discuss it so we asked for it to be tabled until this meeting. The resolution has to do with the following. Let me explain. If you are a 10-month appointee and teach during the summer, you do not get any TIAA/CREF benefits. On the other hand, if you have a grant and you are not a 10-month appointee, you still are not allowed to get TIAA/CREF benefits. So we think this is unfair and we made a complete study on how much it will cost the University to provide this for everybody that teaches during the summer. We estimate that the total cost of the University for paying TIAA/CREF summer fringe benefits to its full-time 10-month appointees will not exceed \$200,000. The committee passed the following resolution:

IUPUI should make TIAA-CREF contributions for all full-time faculty and librarians for salary paid for summer employment.

This was for discussion. I would be happy to answer any questions you may have. This resolution comes to you from the Fringe Benefits Committee.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: I made a couple of comments at our spring meeting. I think that the gist of those comments was that the money will have to come from somewhere and that somewhere is the regular academic year budget. We are not going to create any new money. What we are contemplating here is just paying ourselves in a little different way. The \$172,000 is now in what we pay ourselves for ten months. The proposal is to take \$172,000 out of what we pay ourselves for ten months and transfer it into the summer fringe benefit package. I think that the important thing to keep in mind is that, as I mentioned, this will not create new money. It will simply create a different method of payment which will create slightly greater incentives to teach in the summer than are currently available to faculty.

PROFESSOR ABEL: I have two questions. Why can't we create new money and when we receive appropriation from the legislature instead of \$90 million, request \$90,200. Why can't we create new money for this purpose? If we are going to establish efficient and effective quality faculty, this is one of the arguments which I think we could use to develop that.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: I think the reason it wouldn't be useful for us to talk to the legislature about this is because most people in the political community, and our own Trustees, think that our fringe benefits, especially TIAA/CREF benefits, are already very generous. I don't think we would get anywhere, in fact I am confident we would get no where, going to the legislature saying "We need more money because we need fringe benefits for faculty in the summer." I think that would be

counterproductive. What we have to ask for from the General Assembly are things that we think are important to the academic programs which we have a reasonable chance of succeeding in getting. That means that we are asking this time for attract-and-retain funding so that we can pay faculty members more. We are urging that the compensation package should be larger, not because our fringe benefits aren't good enough but because we are generally not earning as much as our peer institutions are paying. That is the request that is being made and not for fringe benefits. So, what would happen is that we would take, if this recommendation were implemented, money from the general salary pool and reallocate it to summer fringe benefits.

PROFESSOR ABEL: My point is whatever you call it in request for additional funds, whether it is academic programs or not, to ask for enough to take care of this particular need. I think you have answered the question. You could ask for enough increase, whether you call it fringe benefits or not. If they won't buy fringe benefits but they will buy academic programs, then that is where you need to ask for additional monies to take care of this.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: We are asking for more money and the issue, it seems to me, is whether that money should be paid as we currently pay it or whether we should take money out of our ten-month budget, if you will, and transfer it into a summer budget for fringe benefits. There won't be any more or less money. The only question is whether we pay ourselves a little less during the academic year so we can pay ourselves a little more fringe benefits in the summer. That is the only economic dynamic in this recommendation.

PROFESSOR ROBBINS: Part of the issue is equity; that is equity between those individuals who work 12 months that have to be divided between a 10-month and a summer appointment and those who are appointed for 12 months. There also is a little bit of inequity, at least from the committee, between our sister institution at Purdue where faculty who work in the summer do receive those contributions. It seems to me that one part of the discussion could be how we might make this equitable. One obvious approach would be to eliminate this particular fringe benefit for those who are on 12-month contracts. That probably would be difficult to achieve but nonetheless it would address the equity part of the issue.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: If I could address that from my own perspective. I have been paid both ways and I think that the fringe benefits that are paid for people on 12-month appointments are part of the package that is available for people who accept jobs which involve greater responsibilities. Many people move from 10-month contracts to 12-month contracts without a very significant increase in overall compensation. My own case may be one that is a useful example in this connection. That is, the little bit of extra income that you get through having TIAA/CREF benefits for the entire twelve months is part of the compensation package offering an incentive for giving up a life's work that is very satisfying and going into administration, which has its own advantages but may have its own particular costs and extra burdens. No one would say that a person taking a 12-month appointment as an administrator shouldn't get a little extra money. This is part of the little extra money. I don't see it as an equity issue.

PROFESSOR J. KECK: I also believe that faculty persons who give up their summers also deserve a little extra money for servicing the university. If you

figure out what percentage \$200,000 of \$90 million, it is .002. Out of my salary, it would be \$75 a year. The government gets half of that. To be fair to all people who serve the University in the summer, is that very much to ask of faculty during the regular year? It is not taking that much from each individual to be fair to faculty members who give their time to the University in the summer.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: When you say "fair," and I recognize you can have your interpretation of fair, I am not sure what your argument of fairness is. Faculty members who work in the summer in many schools are paid an incentive to teach and work in the summer. That is the incentive for the time and effort that are involved. It is the proof of the pudding that many many faculty members seek teaching assignments in the summer. The question of fairness I am not sure I agree with.

PROFESSOR J. KECK: That is from where the question came. In fact, teaching in the summer is often more arduous, you have to teach in six weeks what one would ordinarily have 16 weeks to teach. This would take much more faculty time in consultation with individual students. There are things about summer teaching that are less desirable but the people who are asking for summer TIAA/CREF do believe in the common knowledge about the fairness. They can't on a grant get fringe benefits that they believe they deserve.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: Well, the issue of TIAA/CREF benefits on grants is something that we have worked on over the summer. I don't think we have resolved it yet. We had hoped by this time to have some way of addressing that issue. I have a full appreciation for the irony of seeing an outside agency willing to fund TIAA/CREF benefits for summer work, but seeing the University unwilling to accept it on behalf of the faculty member. We just have a different assessment of fairness. I think, personally, that we should be trying to create more income during the 10-month academic year not in the form of fringe benefits, but in the form of salary. We have plenty of fringe benefits in my view. We don't have enough salary. I would like to put every dollar we get into salary for 10-month contract so that faculty members didn't have to teach in the summer in order to earn money. And, if they did teach in the summer, they would be teaching because they wanted to teach and not because it was an indispensable part of their annual income package.

It is, in my own personal view, a retrograde step to try to put more money into our summer compensation for teaching. I think we should be working on getting our 10-month salaries up to the point where faculty members can choose to teach or not teach. I also think that our fringe benefit packet already is so great that, for me, the difference between TIAA payments on 10-month and 12-month means nothing. In answer to the question before, I wouldn't really care about giving up the TIAA/CREF payments that I get in those two extra months. Retirement is a little ways off for me, but I think about it from time to time, and when I think about it I think that because of our generous TIAA/CREF payments I am probably going to have more money compared to my colleagues outside of the University, in retirement, than I have now.

PROFESSOR HODES: Does anyone in administration know what percentage of 10-month employees do in fact teach the extra two months?

PROFESSOR ALIPRANTIS: It is approximately 50 percent of the full time faculty who are teaching in the summer.

PROFESSOR HODES: When you say it doesn't matter in bookkeeping as to whether we get more in the 10-month as opposed to 12-month periods, is that only true of people who are in fact teaching 12 months? There are people who are only teaching 10 months and don't teach those extra two months, if you take the income out of those people for the others. I won't say which way to go because it is a much more difficult issue.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: The thirty percent who teach every summer or most summers are asking everyone including the 70 percent who don't, to pitch in a little bit so the 30 percent make more in summer in fringe benefits, not in regular compensation.

PROFESSOR ALIPRANTIS: Let me make two more points. Some of us who teach during the summer not only teach but we do community work during the regular academic year. I think personally I am deprived of the summer. I need more community activity during the summer, more teaching and more issues.

Two years ago, we voted unanimously to give these benefits to part time people in the Medical School. The 10-month people are not getting it.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: I don't remember that. Maybe someone can clarify that for us.

PROFESSOR CARTER: I am here representing Dr. Daly. I cannot imagine part-time...

PROFESSOR ALIPRANTIS: Not part-time employees.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: Are you talking about clinical track faculty? The clinical track faculty are full time faculty member.

PROFESSOR ALIPRANTIS: You renew their contracts year by year.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: There are lots of full time employees who are not tenured faculty members who are entitled to TIAA/CREF benefits. Everyone above a certain level in the administration of the University is entitled to TIAA/CREF benefits. So, the fact that the clinical track appointees are not tenured faculty doesn't distinguish them from lots of other people who have historically earned TIAA/CREF benefits.

PROFESSOR CUTSHALL: My question is why doesn't everyone go on a 12-month contract? It seems to be as though a 10-month contract has become somewhat obsolete. After all, the idea is having some involvement based upon the old agricultural days when everybody was living on a farm and during the summer everyone went out and farmed. Today we have a very full-time summer program going. If we were to cancel that summer program, you would have students pounding on your door right away wondering what was going on. So, it is not that the faculty are just teaching in the summer because they want to. They are needed in the summer. On the same point of equity, we simply feel that we should get the

same benefits as the 12-month faculty get.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: You are absolutely right in that our summer program is the largest of any university in the state. We have an extraordinary summer program. What is your pleasure, Roko? Are you presenting this for a vote?

PROFESSOR ALIPRANTIS: Yes, for a vote.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: Is there any further discussion? All in favor of the motion, say "Aye." All opposed, say "Nay." The ayes seem to have it although I think there are more abstentions than votes. That is a situation that may make this vote less meaningful. I think this is an important issue. We have to take this to the University administration and I would hope that everyone would vote on something like this.

Let's have a vote by standing if you vote yes. The motion is:

IUPUI should make TIAA/CREF contributions for all full-time faculty and librarians for salary paid for summer employment.

All in favor, stand. Those opposed, stand. There are 30 yes and 19 no.

I think that this will probably have to go to the University Faculty Council because it involves a compensation matter that I think would have to be University-wide. We will communicate this to the University Faculty Council as a matter adopted by the IUPUI Faculty Council.

AGENDA ITEM VI - Budgetary Affairs Committee Report - Beverly Hill, Chair

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: Next we have a report of the Budgetary Affairs Committee and Beverly Hill will present this.

BEVERLY HILL: She discussed the Budgetary Affairs Committee structure and reporting mechanism and introduced the Responsibility Budgeting Center concept and distributed the following: (1) Budgetary Affairs Committee Report to Administrative Officers IUPUI on the 1988 Budget Hearings and Responsibility Center Budgeting and Accounting. (A copy of this may be obtained through the Faculty Council Office by calling Mrs. Bernice Chumley, 4-2215.)

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: Are there any questions? Thank you, Bev. We want to make sure that everyone has signed in. We have a new system in place which was designed to avoid the long lines which used to form with persons waiting to sign in. The new system involves the sign-in sheet being passed around. Please make sure you have signed the sign-in sheet before you leave the room.

AGENDA ITEM VII - Old Business

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: Is there any Old Business which we should take up? [None]

AGENDA ITEM VIII - New Business

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: Is there any New Business?

BARBARA FISCHLER: May I make an announcement, please? I will be sending out a memo about this but I would like people to try to get it on their calendars now. Elaine Sloan, Dean of the University Library System, has resigned to accept the Vice Presidency of Columbia University. The Search and Screen Committee co-chairs wish to talk to the librarians and the faculty and the administrators about the qualifications they would like to see in the new dean. The two co-chairs are scheduled to be at IUPUI on Friday, October 7 to meet with the faculty and students from 2:15 to 3:00. I would hope that as many of you as possible would come and talk to them about the position.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: Don't forget the two Presidents' meeting here on September 14 at 2:30 in the Conference Center Auditorium. Are there any other questions or comments? If you have any comments about the video, Gene Tempel is the person you should direct them to or one of us.

AGENDA ITEM IX - Adjournment

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

INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS

FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING
Thursday, October 6, 1988
Madame Walker Urban Life Center
3:30 - 5:30 p.m.

Members Present: Administrative: Chancellor Gerald L. Bepko, William M. Plater.
Deans: Constance Baker, John Barlow, Walter J. Daly, Robert W. Keck, R. Bruce Renda, Sheldon Siegel, William J. Voos. Director: Barbara Fischler Faculty: Billy Abel, C. D. Aliprantis, Margaret Applegate, Richard Beck, Henry Besch, Jr., Willard Bostwick, David Burns, Victoria Champion, Theodore Cutshall, Dornith Doherty, Joseph DiMicco, Eleanor Donnelly, John Eble, Morris French, Bhuwan Garg, Vania Goodwin, Narcissa Hocker, William Hodes, Dolores Hoyt, Charles Hutton, Florence Juillerat, Jerome Kaplan, Henry Karlson, Robert Keck, Richard Kovacs, Michael Kubek, Richard Lawlor, Rebecca Markel, Donna Marzouk, Dana McDonald, Richard Meiss, Judy Z. Miller, B Keith Moore, Bernard Morrel, Byron Olson, Richard Peterson, Jeanne Pontious, Edward Robbins, Richard Rogers, Beverly Ross, Glen Sagraves, A. N. Siakotos, Karen Teegarden, Donald R. Tharp, Jeffery Vessely, Kathleen Warfel, Henry Wellman, Harriet Wilkins, Charles Yokomoto, Jack Zecher.

Alternates Present: Deans: John M. Hunger for A. James Barnes, James R. Roche for H. William Gilmore, Sue Barrett for P. Nicholas Kellum, Hugh Wolf for Howard Mehlinger, Tom Lenz for Jack Wentworth. Faculty: David Wilson for Frederick Bein, Marc Simon for Christian Kloesel.

Members Absent: Administrative: Carol D. Nathan. Deans: Trevor Brown, Norman Lefstein, James Weigand. Faculty: Elaine Alton, Carl Andres, Morris Aprison, Cecil Brown, Mervyn Cohen, Dewey Conces, Robert Dittus, Elizabeth Evenbeck, Margaret Felton, Richard Fredland, Donald Gartner, Phillip Gibbs, Celestine Hamant, Robert A. Harris, Eugene Helveston, Louis Holtzclaw, Juanita Keck, John Lappas, James McAteer, Robert Mendelsohn, Michael Mitchell, Carl Newton, Gerald Powers, Douglas Rex, Richard Rink, Susan Sutton, Karen West.

Ex Officio Members Absent: Shirley Newhouse, Glenda Smith.

Visitors: Erwin Boschmann, T. Kay Carl (Division of Allied Health Sciences), Linda Kasper (IUPUI Fringe Benefits Committee Chair), Wendell McBurney (Research & Sponsored Programs), John Snyder (Allied Health Sciences).

AGENDA ITEM I - APPROVAL OF MINUTES

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: The first item of business today is the approval of the minutes from our last meeting on September 1, 1988. Is there a motion to approve?

PROFESSOR ALIPRANTIS: I have two corrections. The first correction is under **Members Absent.** Professor Bart Ng is on leave of absence for the remainder of the year. The second correction is at the very top of page 13. That should read: "It is approximately 30 percent of the full time faculty who are teaching in the summer."

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: Thanks, Roko. Are there any other corrections? Your specific comments on the minutes cause me to think that a substantially greater percentage of faculty members are reading the minutes than I thought before. [Also, Barbara Fischler should be marked present. She was inadvertently left off the attendance.] There has been a motion for approval. It has been seconded. All in favor, say "Aye." Are there any opposed? They are approved with the corrections that were noted.

AGENDA ITEM II - PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: There are a couple of items of business that I would like to mention under Presiding Officer's Business. First of all, I hope that you will pick up, if you haven't already, a copy of the brochure that we discussed at the September meeting of the Faculty Council. This is a summary of the planning document dated February 1, 1988. It is a summary that is designed for general public consumption. We hope to use this brochure, along with the video that we showed at the last Faculty Council meeting, to convey some of the excitement, the vision, and the potential of this campus to the community. We hope, in other words, that it helps us raise money from the community through charitable gifts. We hope it also creates interest among government leaders and that it helps us in our quest for additional appropriations for the campus from the General Assembly. We would be happy to have your comments on it. We have lots of extra copies so we hope you will take one now at least and that you will feel free to ask for additional copies if you can think of places where these could be useful in helping us in our never ending quest to enhance the reputation, the image, and the confidence of the community in this campus.

Secondly, our One University With Eight Front Doors has been engaged in a planning process over the last year. Most recently, after our September 1 meeting, President Ehrlich sent a memo to each campus, which I have now distributed to all deans, explaining the next steps in the campus planning process. After Tom Ehrlich sent his memo to the campuses, we sent a memo first to the deans and then to all faculty, dated September 26, explaining the different groups that we envision working on this campus over the next year to implement the initiatives that are in the One University planning papers. The most significant of the immediate next steps will be found in the part of the One University planning paper on Undergraduate Education, and so we have asked the Council on Undergraduate Learning, which we created last year, chaired by Dean Plater, to take up a number of the initiatives that Tom Ehrlich has charged us with examining and implementing on this campus. Indeed, all of the campuses have been asked to do the same thing. On this campus, we are going to be working with the Council on Undergraduate Learning which has a representative from each school, in many cases the dean. We will be working with the Council to focus on at least four areas in the next couple of months.

We hope by the first of the year, we will have, working through the Council on Undergraduate Learning and with the deans and the faculties of the schools that are affected, some kind of agreement in principle on a threshold experience for all undergraduate students. This would not be a specifically designated course but would be some type of offering in each school for each program that would expose the student to a full-time faculty member in a small group experience. The definition

of this threshold experience has been left a little bit open so that we can take a look at how this can best be implemented in different schools and on different campuses. We are being asked to look at that threshold experience to see if we can't incorporate it into our undergraduate programs.

Secondly, we have a writing program to examine. The Council on Undergraduate Learning is going to be looking at how to establish a program by which there would be at least three different courses incorporating writing as a central part of the educational program.

We are also going to be looking at computer literacy and the use of computers in academic subjects and how to incorporate that into the undergraduate curriculum. Finally, we will be looking at a capstone experience in the students' major field. This final experience that students would be given would assume some measure of uniformity throughout the university and would provide the capstone for the major subject that the student was studying.

These things, we hope, will be discussed widely on campus and will involve a lot of input from all faculty members who are engaged in undergraduate education. Sometime around the first of the year, we expect to have at least a preliminary understanding on what would be best for this campus and what would be best in each of the individual programs that for which we are responsible.

I might also add that there are a number of other initiatives that will be going forward, but the one that comes most quickly to mind, whenever I think about these next steps in the planning process, is the charge that has been given to this campus to conduct a study and develop a pilot course or courses on ethics and values that may be proposed as a model for the rest of the eight campuses of Indiana University. There are other pilot courses under way dealing with language, and dealing with ethnic minorities, but this campus has been asked to develop a pilot course in ethics and values. Carlyn Johnson of the School of Public and Environmental Affairs will chair a group that is going to look into this and try to establish a really outstanding pilot program that may be adopted by the rest of the university.

Also, in thinking about these things, it is important to note that the President has charged us with a responsibility of implementing a campus plan for graduate education, particularly in the liberal arts. There is much much more that could be said but I think I have hit enough of the highlights. I hope that all of you have received and have taken a look at the memo that went to all faculty outlining the groups that are going to be working. The group working on undergraduate education will be the Council on Undergraduate Learning. There also will be a group that is going to work on economic development, graduate education, and research, and there is going to be a group working on access and professional education. The three groups on this campus that are going to be working this year will mirror the three groupings in the One University Planning Papers.

Finally, I would like to mention one thing that is not, at this point, a specific part of our planning. It is not a certainty and it is only a possibility at this point, but I have mentioned it to other groups and I think I should mention it here. The Indiana Sports Corporation has approached us through a committee and asked if we would be willing to consider the possibility of allowing the United States

Olympic Committee to lease the land on the very west end of the campus between New York and Michigan streets. This land right now is used by two activities. One of these is the Warthin Apartments and the other is the police roll tower on Michigan Street across from the Board of Health. They have asked if they can discuss with us the possibility of having that piece of land leased to a group to develop a United States Olympic training center like the one that is now in Colorado Springs. We have opened up discussions on this subject and there has been a proposal made to the United States Olympic Committee. The United States Olympic Committee is favorably disposed to this proposal, but no decision will be made until some time next year. Our policy has been that they would pay us for the land through a lease similar to the one that we have entered into, for example, with the hotel or with respect to Sigma Theta Tau, the international nursing organization that will be joining our campus community next year. I should say that Sigma Theta Tau has been a member of our campus community for a long time but will be rejoining us on this main campus area sometime after next year. If we could have a lease similar to those leases for this Olympic Training Center and if we could have the group that is developing the Olympic Training Center replace the Warthin Apartments for us on another part of campus, that is, rebuild the Warthin Apartments in another area or build another building similar to the Warthin Apartments in another area, then we would seriously consider their proposal. It would bring to the campus about 200 Olympic athletes, many of whom would be university students. It would bring research potential for the National Institute for Fitness and Sport as well as the School of Medicine. It would bring a good deal of international attention to the campus. We think those advantages make it worth considering the different possibilities, and so we are discussing all that with the Indiana Sports Corporation and will probably be discussing this with the United States Olympic Committee later this year. You will be informed of every significant development along the way. We will take this up with appropriate committees of the Faculty Council and keep them apprised as there are significant developments. I thought I would report that to you now. I would be happy to hear from you if you have any comments about the possibility of having the west end of the campus designated as a U. S. Olympic training center.

We don't have on the agenda today the Question and Answer Period. Maybe I could take a moment of time under Presiding Officer's Business to ask if there are any questions about these things or anything else that you may wish to ask or comment upon.

PROFESSOR KAPLAN: Could I bring up something else.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: Sure.

PROFESSOR KAPLAN: I think we all agree that our principal function is to provide an education for our students in a safe secure environment. I do not believe this goal is being carried out as it effects our students who go to classes from University-sponsored housing. Campus buses which provide transportation to these facilities during the day -- an acknowledgement that such transport is needed -- stop after 5:30, just when transport is most needed.

At the Medical School campus night transportation to the Riverpoint Apartments is obtained on request from the campus police -- we need an equivalent service at the 38th Street campus.

I have become personally involved to the extent of providing transportation this last month for students to the Shoreland Towers from the 38th Street campus. This should not be a faculty responsibility. Immediate action is requested.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: Would you like to submit that document that you have read from, Professor Kaplan. Is the author of that document named or is that you?

PROFESSOR KAPLAN: That is I.

PROFESSOR HODES: One question about the potential U.S.O.C. use of plot land, what arrangement would be made about their use of the track for training purposes? Would that be a separate lease or how would that work?

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: We haven't addressed that but I would expect that there would be some agreement on the use of the track and the Natatorium. Whether there would be a specific payment or whether it would be incorporated into the rental that they would be paying for the land on the west side of the campus hasn't been determined. We wouldn't under any circumstances agree to allow this to go forward unless we felt there was fair compensation to the University for all of the use that was made of any university land or facilities. If there aren't any other questions or comments, we will continue with our next agenda item.

AGENDA ITEM III - Executive Committee Report

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: I am pleased to introduce our Faculty Council Secretary Jeff Vessely for the Executive Committee report.

PROFESSOR VESSELY: The Executive Committee has met, discussed, and tried to respond to some concerns as well as some new items that have come up. I would like to fill you in on the two that are results of phone calls that I have received and let you know where those things stand. The first one is on the Promotion and Tenure revision documents. Currently, there is a process in place in which all of the comments that have been received from this summer's discussion have been forwarded to the Faculty Affairs Committee. If you have additional comments, I am operating under the assumption that you can continue to submit those. You can submit those to Richard Peterson, Chairman of the Faculty Affairs Committee, MS 258. The procedure is that this item has been discussed, comments have been received, and there will be continued flow of information from the Faculty Affairs Committee to the Executive Committee to the Dean of Faculties' Office. If you have comments that you would like to have included in that discussion, please submit those.

The second item is on the Health Care Task Force that was appointed with about 20 members, very few of whom were faculty and even fewer of whom were faculty from this campus. The idea at this time is for that group of many, if not mainly administrators and health care providers, to meet and provide some guidelines about a possible revision in the health care delivery system and fringe benefits that are provided in the area of health care. Sometime shortly after the first of the year those committees will have reported and that information will then be forwarded to the faculty for their comments. At this time, we have not attempted to have the President add faculty members to that Task Force but rather are

waiting for their report which is due, I think, on the second Monday in January. I can assure you that on the second Tuesday in January, we, from the Executive Committee will be looking forward to receiving that information and hope that we will have been asked at that time for our reaction. We will then query the appropriate faculty groups.

An item that is left over from the spring semester that has not been forgotten is the item of mid-term grades. If you remember, we left it in the spring that it would go back to the Academic Affairs Committee. I believe that Kathryn Wilson reported at the time that the Academic Affairs Committee really didn't need to meet again because they would probably send forth the same document. That discussion will occur again at the November meeting. You should be alerted to that and, if you have a particular concern or something that should be included, you might forward it to the Executive Committee for inclusion in our discussion next Thursday. We will then forward that information to the Academic Affairs Committee to see if they choose to send forth a different looking document or different looking proposal. That will come up at the November meeting.

The final item that I have is that those of you who are on the University Faculty Council or are on University Faculty Council committees should have received an appointment letter this week which indicated that the committees would meet following the UFC meeting. It did not give a specific time. That was purposely done so that you would come to the UFC meeting in its entirety hopefully, which begins at 1:30 or at the very least come at about 2:30 so that if that meeting would happen to end early, the committee meetings could start early and people who have to head back to Bloomington or wherever can do so. We are hoping that we will get the same consideration when we travel to Bloomington for our part of that meeting. We are guessing that somewhere in the vicinity of 2:30 to 3:00 we would hope that the committee meetings would start. I think it is probably very ambitious to think that they would start as early as 2:30 but hopefully by 3:00.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: We have a report from the Fringe Benefits Committee that is not listed on the agenda. Before the Fringe Benefits Committee makes its report, I would like to mention one thing that I told Jeff Vessely last week and that he thought would be worth repeating here. When Tom Ehrlich was appointed President, the President of the Trustees, Dick Stoner, approached him and said that there was a pending issue with respect to fringe benefits namely, the 18/20 issue which all of you I think are familiar with. President Stoner thought the 18/20 issue would be likely to create some controversy. The Trustees felt that they should take the responsibility and the initiative for making whatever changes they thought appropriate and not involve Tom Ehrlich in the process, the theory being that he was a new president and shouldn't be burdened in his first year of work with an issue like this one. The Trustees had initiated this on their own. They were the ones who thought that there should be some change in the 18/20 program. Throughout the last year the Trustees have managed the process of discussing with faculty members and with interested groups the changes that they thought were appropriate in the 18/20 interim benefit plan. I think that the assumption was, at the time that Tom Ehrlich became President, that this whole process would take only a few weeks or a month. Instead it has taken over a year. The Trustees not long ago, on their own again, presented to interested faculty leadership a proposal that they had for modifying the 18/20 interim benefit program. The faculty

leadership protested the proposal. They said that it wasn't a proposal that they thought faculty members would support. At that point the Trustees decided that at long last it would be inappropriate for them to continue to manage this process and to communicate directly with the faculty to try to avoid bringing the administration into this matter. They asked Tom Ehrlich to take steps to try to find an agreement between the faculty leadership and the Trustees which could be the basis for modifications in the 18/20 interim benefit plan. That was just after the Trustees' meeting in September. Since that time, and for the first time, the administration has taken a hand in this, and I think that the administration's work has been more responsive to faculty concerns and views than the Trustees' work had been prior to that time. I hope what has evolved in this process now is a proposal for a modification of the 18/20 plan that is, very, very similar to what this Faculty Council adopted last year, and that the faculty will be pleased with it and prepared to support it. I think that it is important to recognize though, even if you don't agree with what is being considered right now, that for the first time the administration has been involved in this process. That involvement has caused the proposal that is now being discussed to be brought dramatically closer to what the Faculty Council had thought on its own was the best approach. With that I think it would be appropriate to introduce Linda Kasper who will give the report on behalf of the Fringe Benefits Committee.

PROFESSOR KASPER: Chancellor Bepko, Dean Plater, Secretary Vessely and fellow faculty members, Chancellor Bepko has given you an excellent summation of what has gone on during the past year in an attempt to reconcile the problems with the 18/20 early retirement program as part of the TIAA annuity. To pick up where he left off, on September 29 Mr. Richard Stoner, who is President of the Indiana University Board of Trustees, and Vice President John Hackett, who is Vice President for Finance met with several members of the University Fringe Benefits Committee, with Treasurer Jack Mulholland, legal counsel Cliff Travis, and University Faculty Council's co-secretaries Chris Lohmann and Jeffery Vessely to review the alternatives that Chancellor Bepko has mentioned.

You have picked up, as you came into the room today, a copy of the document that Vice President Hackett had for us to review. You should have also received in your mail today a document from the University Faculty Council Fringe Benefits Committee, Circular U4-89. This resolution will be introduced at the University Faculty Council meeting next week which Secretary Vessely has already mentioned to you.

I would like to review the seven changes that are being proposed from the current plan from the document that you would have picked up today. I would like to make just a brief comment on Items #1 and #3 as we go through these together.

Item #1 says - The 18/20 plan will not be available to any employee with a commencement date later than December 31, 1988. The term commencement date refers to the beginning of participation in TIAA. It does not refer to the beginning of employment. It covers new employees and current employees who will begin participation in TIAA after December 31, 1988. Also, in reference to this item, Vice President Hackett has indicated that a new early retirement program will be developed for new employees and that faculty will have a chance for input prior to its presentation to the Board of Trustees.

Item #2 - All employees who qualify for TIAA benefits with a commencement date later than December 31, 1988 will receive a TIAA contribution from Indiana University equivalent to 12% of their gross salary, as compared with the current rate of 11% on the initial \$7800 and 15% on the remainder of the gross salary. Therefore, the average contribution rate will decline from the current 14.2% to 12% for all new employees. All current employees will continue to receive the 14.2% contribution, including those who are receiving 18/20 Plan benefits.

Item #3 - The premium continuation for 18/20 Plan recipients who retire after December 31, 1988 will be based on Terminal Base Salary rather than Final Base Salary. Terminal Base Salary is the average annual base salary received during the final five years of employment at Indiana University. The interim benefit will be calculated by assuming that all regular contributions were divided equally between TIAA and CREF. The assumption regarding the division of contributions, however, will not restrict the retiree from exercising options regarding actual allocation of investments between the fund options available under the TIAA system. An added note to Item #3 -- currently the interim benefit is calculated based on the historical or actual allocation of contributions to TIAA/CREF.

Item #4 - All those who retire under the 18/20 Plan after December 31, 1988 may receive no more than (maximum) 100% of their Terminal Base Salary from Indiana University (a cap). Most of the recipients will receive less than 100%. The receipt of Social Security payments will have no bearing on the amount of income they receive from Indiana University. A decision to delay the receipt of Social Security payments will not obligate Indiana University to pay more than a maximum of 100% of Terminal Base Salary.

Item #5 - Restrictions on gainful employment will be limited to employment by Indiana University or institutions, agencies, or governmental units that are funded by the State of Indiana. Under the current 18/20 Plan regulations, retirees may be denied benefits if they engage in any gainful employment.

Item #6 - All retirees will be asked to file a quarterly statement regarding gainful employment. In the event that a retiree is employed by a state supported institution or agency, the payment of all benefits, including TIAA contributions, will cease until the gainful employment procedure is complied with.

Item #7 - The President of Indiana University will appoint a committee, the Exceptions Committee, to review all applicants who request retirement under the 18/20 Plan but do not qualify under the existing rules. The Committee will be provided with a set of guidelines that outline the conditions that may qualify for exception, i.e., physical impairment, mental impairment, and unusual hardship.

Please bear in mind that these changes will affect modifications in the existing plan for current faculty whereas most of the modifications that were expressed in the Long/Lindemann Report that was published in December of 1987 would have involved a new plan. President Stoner of the Board of Trustees has indicated that he will call a special meeting of the Board of Trustees to consider this matter if Faculty Council approves it.

Thank you. That concludes my report.

PROFESSOR VESSELY: There have been clarifications since this document was printed in terms of some wording. Also, under Item #7, the group that met with Vice President Hackett asked that, regardless of any change, an Exceptions Committee be appointed immediately to handle any situation that might occur immediately so that there is not a delay. The response was that that would probably be done.

PROFESSOR KASPER: I also might add, Jeff, that he has also indicated that he would encourage faculty participation in that group also. I would like to say, on behalf of our Fringe Benefits Committee, that we really appreciate the efforts that Vice President Hackett has put into trying to resolve this problem.

PROFESSOR VESSELY: Concerning the original Board proposal of which the Chancellor spoke a few minutes ago, it didn't take great leadership to find that proposal unacceptable. It was far less than the document that you are looking at now in terms of percentages and proposed quite drastic changes. I think Vice President Hackett has brought this back to the area in which we originally agreed.

PROFESSOR MOORE: Would it be in order to present the resolution at this point or would you prefer to wait until later in the meeting?

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: I think it would be appropriate but there is consultation between the Parliamentarian and the Secretary and I will be governed by their views. This was not announced on the agenda, so I think we have some concern that if a vote is taken it could be protested and may not be binding on this Council. But, I think the most important thing that the University administration, the Trustees, and the University Faculty Council may wish to have is an expression of the views of this group -- a straw poll, instead of a binding resolution, would be very helpful to the groups that are involved in trying to bring this forward to a conclusion. I think we would welcome your resolution and, subject to contrary instructions by the Parliamentarian, I think we could vote on that resolution and offer it to the groups that are most interested in our reactions. It could be presented with a footnote that the issue was not announced on the agenda and that there may be a defect as a result in terms of this possibly not being binding vote of the Faculty Council. Nevertheless it our wish to communicate the vote as an expression of the views of the people who were here.

PROFESSOR HODES: With respect to current faculty members, which if any of these are subject to faculty elections and which go into effect without regard to the individual faculty members elected? We were wondering if the seven items that are on here and whatever is on the blue sheet are things which will go into effect or whether the current faculty members will have the option as to whether they will continue under the old 18/20 plan or whether these modifications will govern everyone automatically.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: I think it is clear that the modifications would govern everyone.

PROFESSOR HODES: It seems that it would work out differently for different people. Our understanding was that basically the trade off here, as far as individuals are concerned, is that under the new plan there will not be a cap on what the University will ever be required to pay. In effect, in exchange for that very significant factor in the other direction, is that there will be no restrictions on

outside income during the interim period other than state employment. Those are two big items that may work out differently with respect to different faculty members particularly given how they are planning that interim period of their lives. Therefore, the question is, if someone makes the judgment that the trade off is a bad one, that you would rather have uncapped income and give up outside income, will we still retain that choice?

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: It is my understanding that there will be no choice. You are raising the question about whether there is a contract between the University and each faculty member. The Trustees have looked into that issue and although I haven't seen the opinion that they have as an analysis of the legal obligations of the University, they are comfortable with making these changes. Indeed, they were comfortable making more dramatic changes and proposed more dramatic changes at one point along the way. I would assume that they would be even more comfortable with these rather modest changes and are not concerned about there being a legal obligation to maintain precisely the same benefits. I should add that do not wish to address the ultimate issue. I can only tell you what the opinion of the university counsel is.

PROFESSOR HODES: I can only speak for myself but I think a lot of people that I have talked to by a wide margin see the carrot aspect of it as outweighing the other aspect. If I had an option, I would almost certainly pick this option. My only point is that there may be a number of others who don't see it that way and will feel that they are being asked to give up something that they thought they had for the last 15 years.

PROFESSOR WELLMAN: Is the floor open for discussion of these individual items or where do we stand?

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: I think we should have the resolution first and that might help clarify what we would be talking about.

PROFESSOR ALIPRANTIS: Point of order. Is it appropriate for this resolution to come under New Business?

PROFESSOR VESSELY: There is not a New Business item on the agenda. We normally don't handle business items at this particular meeting because of the introductions; but on Tuesday, the UFC votes, Trustee President Stoner will, sometime after that meeting, call a special meeting of the Board of Trustees to make their decision on whether they want to go forward with this.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: Why don't we let Keith make his motion?

PROFESSOR MOORE: I should make it clear that I am speaking for myself as a member of the IUPUI Faculty Council rather than as a member of the Fringe Benefits Committee or anything else. I would resolve that the IUPUI Faculty Council approve those changes set forth in John Hackett's document which has been presented here and urge adoption of this proposal by the Board of Trustees.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: Henry has seconded that. Now for discussion.

PROFESSOR BESCH: I would speak in favor of the motion and point out that much

of the background information is available to anyone who can access the Computing Services. It is listed under the main menu. I did take occasion to go through a lot of the information. It is very very informative. I would perhaps just summarize that we still stand quite well among the Big Ten universities with respect to this policy compared with the retirement provisions of other universities.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: I can read those to you. At the University of Iowa, 10% is paid by the university, 5% by faculty. The same is true at Michigan, Michigan State and Northwestern. At Wisconsin there is a flat 11.3% paid by the university with no faculty contribution. At Illinois the contribution is 9.5% by the university and 8% by the faculty member, but there is no Social Security payment because there is a special state system that the University of Illinois is plugged into. So, Indiana is really at the top in terms of retirement fringe benefits.

PROFESSOR WELLMAN: On Item #2, with regard to the date of December 31, I raise the questions a date that close might jeopardize some present recruiting which is being done, whether there is a possibility that individuals who are already in advanced stages of recruiting and have been told about the 18/20, whether there might be a provision where we wouldn't lose someone good because of the need to reverse that, and whether there might be a little bit of flexibility.

PROFESSOR KASPER: That question was brought up in our discussion last week with Vice President Hackett and he has assured us that people who are negotiating with new employees and who have promised the 18/20 Plan to them, then they will indeed have the option for it.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: I think that is a good way to handle the issues that Dr. Wellman raises. However, I would note in my own experience that we have never been able to get any prospective appointees interested in retirement benefits. When we try to recruit faculty and we talk about retirement benefits, they become very disinterested. They want to know what their salary is. In fact, that is one of the things that is driving this whole effort to streamline fringe benefits. There is a firm belief that we should be putting more money into salaries, not necessarily depriving anyone of anything, but trying to get as much money as we can to invest in salaries.

PROFESSOR YOKOMOTO: Could I have a little clarification on Item #2 in the last sentence? It says "all current employees will continue to receive the 14.2% contribution...." Is that an informal way of saying we will maintain the 11/15?

PROFESSOR VESSELY: That is exactly what it means.

PROFESSOR BOSTWICK: I would like to make the motion that we table this resolution until the next meeting.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: That motion is one that preempts discussion and we have to vote on the motion to table. It does require a second. (Seconded) Can there be discussion on the motion to table?

PROFESSOR KARLSON: Yes there can be if the motion itself is debatable.

PROFESSOR BOSTWICK: I believe that we are being asked to vote on a resolution

which clearly offers a carrot but it offers an option to the current faculty members. I would feel uncomfortable casting a ballot either in favor of the resolution or in opposition of the resolution without an opportunity to fully explore it with the faculty whom I represent. I think this does represent a significant change, if you will now remove the cap on the ultimate retirement as opposed to the option we had before, where it was based on final rather than terminal salary. I believe they should have an option to be aware of this and an option to explore and establish the fact whether it may indeed be changed.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: Is there any other discussion?

PROFESSOR HODES: I am in favor of the motion to table and I would hope that if it is tabled we would have that intervening month that the administration would procure for us a copy of a memorandum of some kind addressing the question of vesting faculty rights. If it is in fact an easy legal issue, then we should assure ourselves that we are not causing problems for ourselves in the future. If it is more difficult, then we should discuss it more seriously.

PROFESSOR MOORE: We have essentially one shot at this situation. If we don't act before the next regularly scheduled Board meeting, the Board of Trustees will act. I don't think there is any question about it. We don't have the luxury of putting this off. We have the chance to speak one way or the other. To table this is to give up our opportunity to express an opinion about this. They are not going to wait on us. The Board is anxious to get this done with. They are going to act at their next regularly scheduled meeting no matter what we do. We have been given a chance to look at this. President Stoner has made a commitment to make this compromise toward a special meeting. If we don't do something now, we will, for all intents and purposes, be giving up our right to speak on the issue.

PROFESSOR WELLMAN: As you said, this is not a binding vote. I think what we are voting on would be a sense of direction and not necessarily every element that is in this. I would have concern, too, that literally the faculty have been against everything that the Board of Trustees have proposed thus far. I am afraid that tabling would be a sense that there is just no negotiating with the faculty at all. Taken that way, perhaps the Board of Trustees would act without us.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: This has been under discussion for about 14 months now. Although I do think that Dave Bostwick's point is well taken, that this particular variation may not have been available for discussion in the schools, but the general subject matter has been discussed for about 14 months or more. The views of the Board of Trustees range from very strong opposition to the 18/20 program in general a willingness to endure something that they think might have been a mistake when it was created but, because it has been in existence for a long time, it probably should be continued. So there is a lot of deep feeling on the part of the Trustees that some adjustment should be made.

PROFESSOR VESSELY: I think in line with Keith's remark that after Tuesday, after the UFC meeting, there will be a Trustees' meeting and they will decide whether we have any recourse or whether those of you who want to retain Bill Hodes' comment or some of the people Bill had lunch with today, but in fact they are going to make a decision whether or not we tell them what we think of the basic recommendations. This is probably only going to be open to us today and the

tabling will be moot come next month because we will be looking at their final document.

UNKNOWN: May I call for the question?

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: Absolutely. The motion has been called and this is the vote on the motion to table. All in favor of tabling the motion, say "Aye." Opposed? The nos have it. Are you ready to vote on the principal motion or the resolution?

PROFESSOR THARP: I have a question on the main speakers of the Long/Lindemann Report regarding early retirement options. I was wondering of those people who have been in on the discussion with the Trustees, etc., what happened to all of that? I guess I know what happened to it, but what was the thinking of the discussion?

PROFESSOR VESSELY: There has been very little reference to the Long/Lindemann report in any of the discussion.

PROFESSOR MOORE: Where the discussion has occurred is with the administration. John Hackett is a very calm administrator with a great deal of experience in business. His experience includes managing retirement and fringe benefits systems. He has some ideas that I think are going to be carried forth in terms of new plans to represent the new employees. It certainly is not against any move that won't pass. It might be an option for the existing faculty. These were all discussed and are still holding. There will be new plans developed; there is no question about that. It quite likely will be something that looks a lot more like the Long/Lindemann thing based on a rule that adds up your university service and your age and applies that to early retirement options. These are not dead issues.

UNKNOWN: Other issues related to age of retirement not touched on in this document remain as they are in current procedures?

PROFESSOR VESSELY: I believe so.

PROFESSOR HODES: Clarification, in point #3 where it says they will calculate the interim benefit by assuming an equal division between TIAA and CREF. Just as a matter of clarification, is that for all years or only the last five years?

PROFESSOR VESSELY: For that part of the computation it is going to be your terminal base salary.

PROFESSOR HODES: The terminal base salary is not handled under TIAA/CREF contribution. This is for providing the benefits.

PROFESSOR MOORE: I believe the answer to that is that it will be used 50/50 for all your Indiana University contributions. Those are the only ones included in this calculation. If you have contributions from other institutions or contributions you made yourself, they don't figure into this calculation at all. My understanding is that the 50/50 assumption will be used for all of the Indiana University contributions to your TIAA/CREF annuity in calculating your early retirement interim benefit.

PROFESSOR HODES: They will just back it up and do a calculation as if you started five years ago.

PROFESSOR MOORE: One thing is that it is going to make personnel able to do one thing they cannot do today. That is to give you a quick answer to a good estimate for interim benefits. There is no way that can be done today. It depends on getting data on TIAA. It takes a lot of calculating. Using a formula like that, they should be able to write a program to install on the PC at each personnel office. You should be able to walk in and in five minutes get a good estimate on what your retirement benefit would be. That, I think, is an advantage to all of us.

PROFESSOR BOSTWICK: I still feel that if we send the wrong signal to the Board of Trustees we adopt this resolution that we are strongly in favor of it. You cited an example that our retirement package was one of the most favorable amongst the institutions in the Big Ten. Yet, I believe all of those on your list have a more favorable basic compensation package than Indiana University or Purdue University. So, I think it is not a wise act on our part to send a message to the Board of Trustees that we are very satisfied with this until we have had more opportunity to consider it.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: We have had this discussion before in different meetings and I think that the Trustees are committed to the proposition that salaries are too low. The Trustees have adopted an appropriation request that is going to the General Assembly that contains as one of its principal features, increases in salary money to attract and retain faculty. I don't think there is any disagreement amongst Trustees about that point. Not only will you not find any disagreement but you will find enthusiastic support for that point. Our salaries are too low. In fact, one reason why it is important to look at escalating costs of this fringe benefit feature is to try to put more money back into salaries. The money that is designated for personnel compensation, whether it is in fringe benefits or salary, is going to continue to be designated for that. There will be no money lost. The question again is whether we want to have more money paid through an interim benefit of this kind or more money paid through salary.

PROFESSOR ABEL: Point of verification in Item #3. "The interim benefit will be calculated by assuming that all regular contributions were divided equally between TIAA and CREF." Would I be at a disadvantage when I figure it if I had not been 50/50? In other words, if I had been 100% TIAA and none in CREF, would they figure that?

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: It could be an advantage for you as well as a disadvantage.

PROFESSOR ABEL: I can't figure out why they were figuring 50% based on...

PROFESSOR VESSELY: Because of the computation. It will have some effect. There is no question about that.

PROFESSOR ABEL: I am not a stock market person. I put all of mine in TIAA so will I be at a disadvantage when I come to that point?

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: You will be better off. This will produce more for you than

your own selection would have produced. That is if you retire in the next couple of years with the stock market as it is now.

PROFESSOR WELLMAN: Isn't it correct that this formula is more confusing to TIAA than before?

PROFESSOR KASPER: You are confusing what your allocations are. One of the administrative problems is that it is impossible for the administrative office to calculate to try to track what your allocations are.

PROFESSOR VESSELY: You can change it on a regular basis by telephone. For them to compute that it is a nightmare.

PROFESSOR ROBBINS: Is it safe to assume that the reason they chose this particular calculation is because that is the most common option.

PROFESSOR VESSELY: They gave us a percentage of 60% of the faculty choose the 50/50 option and another 20% are within 10 percentage points either way.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: Are you ready for the question? All those in favor of the say "Aye." Opposed? The Ayes have it. Is there any other business before we begin our introductions?

AGENDA ITEM IV - Introduction of Members

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: We now come to our annual introduction of new and continuing members of the Faculty Council. Pursuant to a suggestion made last year and I think the year before as well, we have reversed the order of introductions. Ordinarily, we started with the smallest school and went to the largest school and that had an impact on who was here at what time during the introductions. Those who had to stay until the very end claimed they should be introduced first. So we are starting with the largest school and that is the School of Medicine. Dean Walter Daly is here to make the introductions.

DEAN DALY: Thank you very much. It is a pleasure to serve in this way to make these introductions for two reasons (1) I am pleased to introduce a splendid group of people who represent the School of Medicine and the Faculty Council, and (2) I am also delighted to be able to take attendance. I have no idea how it is going to come out. I will be mercifully brief. One of the instructions that I received said that I should say something in great detail about each one. I will just tell you who they are. First of all, **Henry Besch**. Dr. Besch, you have met previously. He is not a new boy on the block. He is rejoining the Faculty Council as an at-large representative this time. Henry has served in many distinctive ways including being Secretary of the Faculty Council. **Joe DiMicco**, Professor of Pharmacology and Toxicology is with us again this year. **Philip Gibbs**, Associate Professor of Anesthesia, who is serving as an at-large representative. **Narcissa Hocker**, Associate Professor Medical Technology. **Richard Kovacs**, Assistant Professor of Medicine and Cardiology, at-large representative. **Michael Kubek**, Associate Professor of Anatomy and Neurobiology, at-large representative. **Richard Lawlor**, Assistant Professor of Clinical Psychology. **Judy Miller**, Associate Professor of Medicine and Medical Genetics. **Michael Mitchell**, Professor of Urology. **Donna Marzouk**, Assistant

Professor of Physical Therapy in the Division of Allied Health Sciences. **James McAteer**. **Richard Peterson**, Professor of Anatomy. **Richard Rink**, Professor of Urology. **Henry Wellman**, Professor of Radiology. These are our new representatives. Would you like for me to introduce the holdovers?

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: I would be pleased if you introduced the holdovers.

DEAN DALY: I will just read the names and those who are here may rise. **Morris Aprison**, **Bhuwan Gary**, **Celestine Hamant**, **Robert Harris**, **Eugene Helveston**, **Dana McDonald**, **Douglas Rex**, **Aristotle Siakotos**, **Kathleen Warfel**, **Karen West**, **Mervyn Cohen**, **Dewey Conces**, **William Crabtree**, **Robert Dittus**, **John Eble**, **John Lappas**.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: Thank you. I think we should join in greeting the new and continuing representatives from the School of Medicine. Next, is the School of Liberal Arts. Dean John Barlow will introduce their representatives.

DEAN BARLOW: **Frederick Bein**, a continuing member, is out of town this weekend. He is a Professor of Geography and Chair of the Geography Department. **David Burns**, a new representative. He is an Associate Professor of Communication and Theatre and he is also in charge of the IUPUI Debate Team and a member of the Academic Affairs Committee. **Richard Fredland**, Professor of Political Science and chair of the department, as well as a member of the Nominating Committee. **Christian Kloesel** is a Professor of English and Director of the Peirce Project. **Susan Sutton**, Associate Professor of Anthropology and chair of the department. **Dean William Plater**, Dean of the Faculties and Executive Vice Chancellor, is a member of the School of Liberal Arts.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: Let's greet the representatives from the School of Liberal Arts. Dean Jim Roche will introduce those representatives from Dentistry.

DEAN ROCHE: Chancellor Bepko, it is my pleasure to present the new Faculty Council members from the School of Dentistry. **Dean Gilmore** is up for the election for President Elect of the American Dental Association this weekend. We have our fingers crossed. There are two other candidates. This is a most prestigious post in the dental profession and we hope that he wins. They will announce that next week. New members from the School of Dentistry are: **Charles Hutton**, Chairman of the Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery. Charlie has a recreational motor vehicle that he takes to all of these research meetings. **B. Keith Moore**, Professor of Dental Materials, has also served on the IUPUI Learning Resources Committee. He has a lot of energy. **Carl Newton** is not here today but he is the Chairman of the Department of Endodontics. **Byron Olson** is Associate Professor of Biochemistry in our school. **Glen Sagraves** is Assistant Dean of Clinical Affairs and Professor of Oral Diagnosis, Oral Medicine. He has served previously as Secretary of the Faculty Council.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: The holdovers for the School of Dentistry are: **Carl Andres** and **Cecil Brown**.

DEAN ROCHE: Dr. Andres is an Associate Professor of Prosthodontics and Professor Brown is an Associate Professor of Endodontics.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: Let's greet the School of Dentistry representatives. Next,

for the School of Science we have a little more elaborate procedure outlined here. Professor Roko Aliprantis will introduce Dean Robert Keck who will then introduce Professor Aliprantis. I hope this is not some mathematical game that you are playing, Roko.

PROFESSOR ALIPRANTIS: It is my pleasure to introduce as Acting Dean for the School of Science, Bob Keck. Bob received his Ph.D. from Ohio State University in 1968. He did his post doctorate research in a private lab in Dayton. He came to IUPUI in 1972 and he has served in the School of Science and IUPUI. Dean Keck enjoys sports. He is the proud father of a son at Purdue University and a daughter at IU. His wife, Juanita, is a graduate of IU and also holds an academic appointment with School of Nursing. It is our pleasure to have Dean Keck as Acting Dean of the School of Science for this year.

DEAN KECK: I would like to introduce to you Roko Aliprantis. Roko received his Ph.D. from Cal Tech in 1973. He joined the mathematics faculty in 1975. He has served on the Faculty Council before and has served as unit representative, serving on the Academic Affairs Committee and the Fringe Benefits Committee. He is currently serving on the Fringe Benefits Committee. He is a Professor of Mathematical Sciences and an Adjunct Professor of Economics. He is working on his fifth book this year. Roko has a hobby of volleyball now and is an ex-water polo player. He has a son 6 1/2 who may be a mathematician and a daughter 10 1/2 who will not be. He is a volunteer in his community most recently involved with the Greek Festival. I am proud to introduce Roko Aliprantis to you as an advocate and an example of quality at IUPUI.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: Thank you, Bob. Also, from the School of Science, continuing as members of the Faculty Council are: **Elaine Alton, Florence Juillerat, Jerry Kaplan, Bernard Morrel, and Bart Ng**, who we heard before is on leave this year. Let's greet the School of Science. Next we have representatives from the School of Nursing, to be introduced by our new Dean of Nursing, Constance Baker.

DEAN BAKER: The School of Nursing is proud to introduce two members of the Faculty Council, **Victoria Champion**, Associate Professor in the department of Community Health Services, and **Eleanor Donnelly**, Associate Professor in the department of Psychiatric Nursing. She is also an Adjunct Associate Professor in the department Anthropology. We were asked to include some unusual extra-curricular activities. I confess to you that these two representatives were hesitant to reveal these unusual activities, but I was able to extract something that may be of interest. Professor Champion admits to being a Christmas tree grower. Professor Donnelly admits to being an avid horseback rider. Our continuing members are **Margaret Applegate, Juanita Keck, Jeanne Pontious, Rebecca Markel, and Beverly Ross**.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: Let's greet the School of Nursing representatives. Dean Renda is here to introduce the representatives from the School of Engineering and Technology.

DEAN RENDA: I have the pleasure of introducing Professor **Harriet Wilkins**, Assistant Professor of Supervision. She has served as a unit representative for this body. She has also served on the Constitution and Bylaws Committee and the Metropolitan Affairs Committee. Professor **Charles Yokomoto** is joining us again

after having served in 1981-83, in 1983-85, and is presently serving with term expiring in 1990. He has also served on a number of committees including the Athletic Affairs Committee, 1980-82; 1982-84; 1985-87; 1987-89. As you can see, he has a great interest in athletics. He is an excellent tennis player. He has served on the Faculty Affairs Committee in 1986-88 and in 1988-90. He also served on the Executive Committee in 1984-85. He is presently serving as an at-large representative until 1990. Professor **Jack Zecher** is joining us for the first time as a unit representative with term expiring in 1990. He is very much involved in computer graphics.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: Thank you, Bruce. There are two continuing Faculty Council members from the School of Engineering and Technology, **Richard Beck** and **David Bostwick**. Let's welcome the representatives from the School of Engineering and Technology.

The School of Law is next. All of the deans are reviewing tapes of last night's Vice Presidential debate and were unable to be here today. I prepared a long introduction of Bill Hodes who is a new member of the Faculty Council but he left. I won't present the elaborate introduction that I had for Bill Hodes but will introduce the other member of the Law faculty whom you all know, Professor **Henry Karlson**, whom I have had the great pleasure of introducing before as a member of this body and as its Parliamentarian. The only thing I will say about Henry Karlson is that for years the students in the Law School referred to him as "Henry the Cop" for reasons that some of you may know. Henry has been an outspoken and staunch supporter of law enforcement activities. However, in the past couple of weeks Henry is getting a different reputation around the Law School. Some of you may have read in the newspapers of Henry's criticisms of the police in a case that involved the shooting of a police officer and the students now have a different appellation for Henry. I am trying to find out what it is right now. But, they dropped "Henry the Cop" altogether. Let's welcome our Parliamentarian Henry Karlson. Next, is the School of Business, and the dean for its Indianapolis programs, Tom Lenz, is here.

DEAN LENZ: Thank you. I have one individual to introduce. **Richard Rogers** came to us from Penn State University. He is an Associate Professor in the Accounting Department. Richard is serving as our unit representative with term expiring in 1990. He is also a member of the Budgetary Affairs Committee and that appointment will continue until 1989. He is a very popular member of our faculty.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: Thank you, Tom. Let's welcome Richard. Next we have the School of Education members, to be introduced by Dean Hugh Wolf.

DEAN WOLF: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The School of Education has two representatives on the Faculty Council. Both of them have been on their feet or at least have spoken during the previous meeting. Our unit representative is Billy Abel. Billy is Professor of School Administration and is Associate State Director of the North Central Association. Our at-large representative is Ed Robbins. Ed is a familiar face to any of you who have been following the Faculty Council. He is head of our Language Education faculty. He has been very active in this group. He has served on the Academic Affairs Committee and the apparently very busy Fringe Benefits Committee, and also has served as Secretary of this body at least on one occasion. Thank you.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: Thank you, Hugh. Next is the Herron School of Art and Bill Voos, Dean of the Herron School of Art, will introduce those persons.

DEAN VOOS: We have a last minute substitution for our unit representative. Our former representative Paula Differding teaches class on Thursday afternoon and in addition she is expecting her first child in December. Therefore, she is busy taking care of some other preparations. She would probably like to join us at a later time. Our new representative is Doherty Dornith who is Assistant Professor of Photography and heads our photo department. She has her undergraduate work from Rice University in French and Spanish, Literature and Language and her graduate work from Yale in photography. She was Coordinator for the Rice University Photography Media Center. She has worked as a commercial photographer and also has shown her fine arts photography at a number of exhibitions and has won many awards. She also served as the Assistant Director of the Scenic Gallery in Houston. We are very glad to have her.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: Let's welcome Dornith. The School of Social Work is hosting an accreditation visit of their baccalaureate program and so all of the deans are busy. The representative of the School of Social Work is **Gerald Powers** but I don't think he is here either. So, let's ask Barbara Fischler to introduce the representative from University Libraries.

BARBARA FISCHLER: Our unit representative is not exactly new to the body. I have been noticing that her committee work and her terms on the Faculty Council seem to parallel each other. **Vania Goodwin** is the head of cataloging at University Library. Her term will expire in 1990 but she was also with us in 1984-86; she served on the Academic Affairs Committee 1985-85; she is presently on the Student Affairs Committee with term expiring in 1990; served on the Staff Relations Committee in 1984-86; and is presently serving another term on that committee which parallels her term here. She is very, very active in the Partners of the Americas and is called upon frequently. I have given her release time for this to act as an interpreter for people. Her latest exploit, and I do mean exploit, which took in a helicopter ride and she has some surprises about helicopters. It is with the Indiana Emergency Preparedness Council. She is now prepared for many things. She happens to be a motorcycle enthusiast and I think she and her husband have covered all points of the United States. **Dolores Hoyt**, whom I introduced last year, is in her second year as an at-large representative and her second year on the Executive Committee. She was on the Academic Affairs Committee in 1979-80; and is on the Faculty Affairs Committee, which she says she has been on forever she feels. She was Secretary of the Faculty Affairs Committee 1986-87 and chair 1987-88. She also serves on a Task Force for Faculty Appointment and Advancement, which is a jointly appointed group from the Executive Committee and appointed by the Administration. Last year I talked about her problems about a gun in her hand. She has gone to something a little tamer this year. They are working at showing dogs.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: Welcome back and welcome to the University Library representatives. From the School of Public and Environmental Affairs is Dean John Hunger.

DEAN HUNGER: I am sorry that our representative could not be here today. **Robert Mendelsohn** is in Chicago delivering a paper on a very important subject,

Child Monitoring and Home Detention, which is part of a National Institute of Justice project. We are lucky to have Bob with us as our representative. He was born and raised in Ohio and educated in Ohio and Michigan, earning a Ph.D. in 1959 from Michigan State in political science. He joined IU and our school early in its history, in 1973 one of the first faculty members hired.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: Thanks. John. The School of Physical Education, Dean Sue Barrett.

DEAN BARRETT: Thank you. I am here this afternoon to introduce Karen Teeguarden, who is a member of our faculty. Karen is from the professional area growth and motor development. You might be interested to know that she is the co-director of the IUPUI Daycare Aquatics Program.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: There also are two persons who are continuing as a members of the Faculty Council from the School of Physical Education: **Elizabeth Evenbeck** and the Secretary of our Faculty Council, **Jeffery Vessely**. Let's greet these persons. From the School of Continuing Studies we have as a continuing unit representative **Louis Holtzclaw**. From the School of Journalism we have as a unit representative **Margaret Felton**. That concludes the introductions. I hope that all of you will be able to stay for the reception that follows.

PROFESSOR WELLMAN: I might call to everyone's attention the application form for the Faculty Club which is in the back of the agenda for today's meeting. Our Treasurer is right here, Henry Besch and he will be happy to accept your check.

PROFESSOR BESCH: I have the regular forms so you don't have to tear up today's agenda.

AGENDA ITEM V - Adjournment

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: If there is no other business, we are adjourned. Please try to stay for the reception.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS

**SUMMARY OF
FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING**

Thursday, November 3, 1988

Law School, Room 116

3:30 - 5:30 p.m.

Members Present: Administrative: Chancellor Gerald L. Bepko, Dean Carol Nathan, Dean William Plater. Director: Barbara Fischler. Deans: John Barlow, Robert Keck, P. Nicholas Kellum, R. Bruce Renda, Sheldon Siegel, William J. Voos. Faculty: Billy Abel, C. D. Aliprantis, Elaine Alton, Margaret Applegate, Frederick Bein, H. R. Besch, Jr., Cecil Brown, Theodore Cutshall, Eleanor Donnelly, Dornith Doherty, Elizabeth Evenbeck, Mary Feeley, Richard Fredland, Donald Gartner, Phillip Gibbs, Vania Goodwin, Narcissa Hocker, William Hodes, Dolores Hoyt, Charles Hutton, Jerome Kaplan, Henry Karlson, Juanita Keck, Christian Kloesel, Michael Kubek, John Lappas, Richard Lawlor, Rebecca Markel, Donna Marzouk, James McAteer, Dana McDonald, Judy Z Miller, Michael Mitchell, Bernard Morrel, Carl Newton, Byron Olson, Richard Peterson, Jeanne Pontious, Richard Rink, Edward Robbins, Glen Segraves, Susan Sutton, Karen Teegarden, Jeffery Vessely, Karen West, Harriet Wilkins, Charles Yokomoto, Jack Zecher.

Alternates Present: Deans: John M. Hunger for A. James Barnes, James Carter for Walter Daly, Hugh Wolf for Howard Mehlinger, Tom Lenz for Jack Wentworth. Faculty: Anne Belcher for Victoria Champion, Robert Bigsby for Richard Meiss, Douglas Heerema for Richard Rogers, Linda Nunley for Donald Tharp, Hee-Myung Park for Henry Wellman.

Members Absent: Deans: Constance Baker, Trevor Brown, H. William Gilmore, Norman Lefstein, James Weigand. Faculty: Morris Aprison, Richard Beck, Willard Bostwick, David Burns, Mervyn Cohen, Dewey Conces, William Crabtree, Joseph DiMicco, Robert Dittus, John Eble, Margaret Felton, Morris French, Bhuwan Garg, Celestine Hamant, Robert A. Harris, Eugene Helveston, Louis Holtzclaw, Lucreda Hutton, Florence Juillerat, Richard Kovacs, Robert mendelsohn, B. Keith Moore, Gerald Powers, Douglas Rex, Beverly Ross, A. N. Siakotos, Donald Tharp, Kathleen Warfel, Henry Wellman.

Ex-Officio Members Present: Shirley Newhouse, President IUPUI Staff Council.

Ex-Officio Members Absent: Glenda Smith.

Visitors: Walter Buchanan, William Cagle, Kristin Froehlke, Beverly Hill, Kim Manlove, Patrick O'Meara.

AGENDA ITEM I - Memorial Resolution - Mary Houk, School of Social Work

Dean Sheldon Siegel, School of Social Work, read the memorial resolution for Mary Houk. A moment of silence was observed.

AGENDA ITEM II - Approval of October 6, 1988 Minutes

The minutes of the October 6, 1988 Faculty Council were approved with the addition

of Theodore Cutshall's name to the School of Science representatives.

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

- A. Chancellor Bepko reported that the Board of Trustees of Indiana University adopted the recommendations which were discussed at the Faculty Council concerning the 18/20 retirement plan. The effective date of the new retirement plan is December 31, 1988. Anyone assuming an appointment after December 31 will be governed by the new retirement policy which means that there will be no 18/20 interim retirement benefits and the annual contributions of the university to the TIAA/CREF fund will be reduced from 14.7 to 12 percent. However, anyone currently in the possession of an offer letter or who has been appointed by way of an offer letter which incorporates a specific reference to retirement benefits, either incorporates those retirement benefits explicitly such as by mentioning that we currently have a retirement benefit paid each year equalling approximately 14.7 percent of annual earnings or that incorporates that fact by reference, anyone in possession of an offer letter of that kind as of this time will probably be included under the old retirement benefits as an exception of the general policy even if that person assumes his or her appointment after December 31, 1988.
- B. The Indianapolis campus has been designated as an experimental campus for Responsibility Center Budgeting. The Responsibility Center Budgeting system will go into effect July 1, 1989 for all campuses.

AGENDA ITEM IV - Executive Committee Report - Jeffery Vessely, Secretary

- A. The Executive Committee has asked the Registrar, Dr. Richard Slocum, to present information on the implementation on the mid-term grades at our Executive Committee meeting in December. It is anticipated that he might be at the December Faculty Council meeting to tell the Council how that will happen for the second semester.
- B. Several University Faculty Council committees have taken up the issue of TIAA/CREF for 10-month employees. A report will be forthcoming when those committees meet.
- C. The Student Affairs Committee has been asked to look at a policy concerning faculty dealings with students who have certain handicaps. By the December meeting there might be some preliminary report from that committee.
- D. The Executive Committee has asked Dr. Whalen to attend the January meeting to discuss faculty implications for the Responsibility Center Budgeting.

AGENDA ITEM V - Question & Answer Period - 10 Minutes

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: We have our standard question and answer period. We have received no questions or comments in advance in writing so I am not going to say anything other than respond to things that you say.

PROFESSOR KAPLAN: A day or so ago one of our colleagues brought up the fact that his daughter is applying to college and requested an application to IUPUI and never received it. What is even worse is that Chatard High School had its College Days and there were 15 representatives and IUPUI was not one of them. I think we should make ourselves known in cases like this.

Also, I wonder if it is possible for things that are brought up under this period during the meeting, such as the bussing situation after 5:30 p.m., if we could have some sort of action list to find out if these have been acted on rather than just brought up and dropped. I think this issue of the colleges advertising was brought up about a year ago.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: That is a good point. We should have a list of the things that have been mentioned so we can report back from time to time. That is an excellent suggestion. We will honor that and follow up on that. With respect to recruiting, we have done more I think this year than ever before and if we missed a high school career day, I think it was probably inadvertent. Carol Nathan is here and might be able to address this.

DEAN NATHAN: I have no comment but I will check on it. What high school was it?

PROFESSOR KAPLAN: Chatard High School.

DEAN NATHAN: We will check on that.

DEAN PLATER: I would just like to say what the Vice President's is referring to is that we do have an enrollment management committee that is trying to look very systematically at the way in which students enroll in the University and the way in which we relate to them. The high school visitations and contact with high school counselors is a very important part of that overall program. There is something systematic being done now at the campus level in response to the questions raised last year. That is the mechanism that we intend to use for at least the rest of this year to make certain that we are doing all we can to enroll students who are eligible for college.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: The one issue that is pending that has been mentioned before that I don't think we have resolved is the issue that you raised last time about the shuttle service. That is something that has been discussed for a long time. I don't know what the status of it is right now but we will certainly report at the next meeting. There has been a continuing discussion and debate about that service and how much of a shuttle service we can provide and at what hours. I will have the most up-to-the-minute report on everything that has been done for the next meeting.

PROFESSOR HODES: I have a question about the future possible development with respect to the 18/20 plan. The question merely is, now that the Trustees have taken the action that they have, I am talking about in respect to teachers who are on staff or people who are already members of the faculty, what guarantee do we have that the Trustees won't make further changes now that this precedent has been met. I am thinking particularly with respect to either lowering the cap to some number be it 80, 60, 50, 40, 30, 20 percent of funds or that the Trustees will

not unilaterally change, say for example taking the average for the last five years, that they would take the average for the last six years and base it on your entire 20 year career.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: Is there anyone from the Fringe Benefits Committee that would like to give an assessment of that?

PROFESSOR ALIPRANTIS: We wanted to get a guarantee for this time but I don't think we were able to get that.

PROFESSOR HODES: Would it be possible to put before the Trustees a resolution in which the Trustees would go on record at least as of January 1 that they now consider themselves bound by this procedure?

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: I think the adoption of this resolution makes clear what continuing employees have by way of fringe benefits. I don't think there is any uncertainty about that. What you are asking is what the Trustees may do in the future. Although I am very surprised to hear a mathematician say that there is no answer. I don't think we can speculate about what might be done in the future. My guess is though that the Trustees will not take up this issue again for a long time.

PROFESSOR HODES: I guess I am asking whether this body or some other body knows the parliamentary procedure about whether we could put before the Trustees an undertaking so that they would go on record and respond to petition or whatever you call it, that is not only clear what we have as of January 1 but that the university considers itself bound as a contractual matter with each current employee so that the university will not be able to make the argument and make it clear what you have on January 1, 1989 so that you don't unilaterally change it on January 10. As it now stands, we have no guarantee whatsoever that the Trustees will not change it. Is there any way that a body such as ours can put the question on their agenda so that they can take a stand as to whether they are willing to bind themselves after January 1 so that it cannot be modified without the consent of each individual faculty member?

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: Of course, groups of faculty can always petition the Trustees but I think this would not be a wise thing to do at this stage. I don't know what their reaction would be. I suspect that they are pleased that they have finally been able to adopt a policy at least looking to the future that address their concern that the 18/20 program was beginning to cost so much that it was unwise fringe benefit program. I don't think they wish to return to this. I think they are comfortable with the arrangements that will exist after December 1st. They are comfortable with the idea that employees who are already under appointment to Indiana University not only have the 14.7 percent contribution from the University to their retirement program but they are also comfortable with the fact that those employees will have the 18/20 benefits. The only restriction which they have placed on current employees as I read the resolution is a matter of interpretation. That is, it was always the view of many the Trustees that it was inappropriate and that the university was not committed to pay more than the terminal salary under the interim benefits of 18/20. They view that as an interpretation not a modification of the contract that may have existed between faculty members and the university. I think it is best left alone at this point.

PROFESSOR HODES: The way you phrase it makes me feel even less secure because if the Trustees next month feel that even the modified brand is too expensive what is to prevent the Trustees from here again unilaterally changing the rules of the game for people who are already here?

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: I can't answer those questions because only the Trustees can answer those. All I am saying is that while faculty members have a right to petition the Trustees at any time, I think it would be unwise to raise any further issues with respect to 18/20 at this time. I think the Trustees are comfortable with the results. I think as a Faculty Council we have expressed our approval of the result and the matter should be closed.

AGENDA ITEM VI - Lighting Up The Network - Dean R. Bruce Renda

Dean Renda, along with Chris Froehlke, Amy Warner and Beverly Hill, gave a presentation on the new system of sending and receiving information not only on the IUPUI campus but on other campuses as well. (See IUPUI Circular No. 88-03 attached). For more information, call Dean Renda at 4-0802.

AGENDA ITEM VII - Library Search & Screen Committee Report - Patrick O'Meara

Patrick O'Meara, Chair of the committee and Bill Cagle, co-chair of the committee gave a report on the Library Search and Screen Committee regarding the search which is going on for a new Dean of Libraries. Mr. O'Meara stated that a position notification has been sent out to the deans or directors of major research libraries as well as the deans of library schools all over the United States.

The search process has been aided by the assistance of Klutis Associates, a consulting firm that worked very closely with President Ehrlich for the selection of two new vice presidents.

PROFESSOR HODES: Is it contemplated that there will be any actual change in the autonomy relationship between the libraries you mentioned because of the occasion of the coming of the new dean or is it just because you need to be more alert?

MR. CAGLE: I think it is the latter. I think we have to be sensitive though that there might be valuable services on a campus such as this that might be coordinated better. In principle, the autonomy is not involved. The autonomy issue is not involved. I would say, though, as far as some of the smaller campus libraries are concerned, that there is a new trend of thinking going through this University -- the concept of One University. I think the dean is going to have to tread very softly but very forcibly to explore what that means. It is not my job to do that. Before we leave, I am sure you are all aware, budgets are campus specific. Therefore, the dean really has budgetary control only over what goes on on the Bloomington campus. As the Chief Executive Officer for that campus he or she will administer that budget. However, there is a new area in the library world called automation. There are funds now being provided by the state from the Higher Education Commission for automation that are not just Indiana University wide but, in fact, are including Purdue University and Indiana State University in an attempt to do some statewide networking into establishing an automated system.

In this area, the dean will have to take a position of leadership. This may be one area where, again, because the budget will overlap the entire umbrella of these various libraries throughout the state, that there is going to be room for negotiation and for some exploration of new relationships between the dean and the smaller campuses particularly.

PROFESSOR FREDLAND: You use the term "research librarian" in the singular then your last comment was that we have One University. Is it your thinking, that this dean will preside over one research library?

MR. O'MEARA: Dick, as you know, this is a difficult task but let me say that I regard Indiana University library as one library. That is why there is one dean for it. I think one of the lessons to me has been, for example, on the Gary Campus to hear from a faculty member that she came to Indiana University because there was a strong and accessible research collection. I think that is the philosophy that I want to focus on. That there is a strong collection. The question is, how does that more efficiently become available to people who need it? I know with the new library being built here and a quite extensive collection planned for here, that some of the perimeters of this are going to change. It will certainly be material on this campus that will be relevant so the dean will have to address modality for giving the materials to relevant borrowers in the University as efficiently and directly as possible. That is how I see the future rather than talk about a research collection on the Bloomington campus.

MR. CAGLE: Again, with reference to this, it is obviously going to be impossible to duplicate the British museum on the Bloomington campus or to duplicate the Bloomington campus library here. There are simply too many books that are no longer in print, no longer available and even with unlimited funds, you can't hope to do that. What we can do and what we are going to need to look at in the future, is better methods of accessing that resource that we have in Bloomington by the other campuses. Modern technology has gone a long way in this direction. As we know, things are changing rapidly. The methods of transmitting information or transmitting documents are changing daily. I think this is going to be a real challenge for the new dean looking at the library as a system wide research. In order to do that we need someone who is very familiar with upcoming ideas and library technology. When I suggested Fax machines at the Richmond campus, they stated they don't have a single Fax machine on the entire campus. That is the sort of thing that has to change in the world that we are moving into today. How can we take the documents that we have and the resources that we have and make them available outside of the Bloomington area? We can't do it by duplicating that library on all eight campuses. The books themselves are simply not available, but, technology is. I think that is something that is going to be very important for the new dean to understand.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: Thank you very much.

**AGENDA ITEM VIII - Metropolitan Affairs Committee Report - Walter Buchanan,
Chair**

Professor Buchanan gave an updated report on the Metropolitan Affairs Committee's survey on the name change for Indiana University. This came about as

a result of Professor Buchanan being a member of the University External Affairs Council, chaired by Gene Tempel. It became apparent that the External Affairs Council was proposing to contract to have a focus group look at the university's name change and acronym because there was some feeling that it was cumbersome and a change might enhance our image in the community.

As a result, Walker Research was contacted during the summer for focus groups on the different representatives of the university and community to see what the perception would be regarding not only the current name and acronym but also possible changes. Professor Buchanan felt that the faculty should have some input into this. Therefore the first questionnaire was sent to all faculty at IUPUI regarding the present name and acronym for IUPUI as well as suggestions for other names if the present name was not satisfactory.

Following the first survey, a list of six names was chosen and another survey was sent to the faculty asking them to rank these six names in order from one to six with one being the most desirable and six being the least desirable. At present, these results are still being tallied. The deadline for these is November 21.

Professor Buchanan stated that upon the completion of this survey the results will be brought to the Faculty Council for their action, if desired. (See IUPUI Circular 88-04 for survey results).

AGENDA ITEM IX - Unfinished Business

Professor Besch stated that, thanks to Chancellor Bepko, the President, and the member of the Faculty Club Board, the Faculty Club is now undergoing its transformation. It is anticipated that on November 21, 1988 there will be an open house for the Faculty Club. He stated that at present there are a little over 60 members.

AGENDA ITEM X - New Business

Barbara Fischler, Director the University Library, reminded people to start their Christmas shopping this Saturday, Monday and Tuesday at the IU Press book sale which is being held in the Library.

PROFESSOR ALIPRANTIS: I would like to bring to the attention of the Faculty Council the following item. The budget for the Summer Faculty Fellowship awards has had very little increase over the last ten years. In recent years, we have had several outstanding proposals from our young faculty and the Summer Faculty Fellowship Committee made some hard screening decisions. As a member of this committee, I would like to request that Chancellor Bepko give serious considerations to increasing the Summer Faculty Fellowship budget for the next academic year.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: I agree with you and we certainly will look at that. I saw something on that within the last day or two. We don't have enough support. My preference ultimately would have these things funded in the schools but one way or another there ought to be more summer support for young faculty. You are absolutely right.

Professor Cutshall mentioned that there were still some faculty who are disappointed because this will be the last year of having a full week off for Thanksgiving recess. He requested that the Secretary of the Faculty Council, aided by the Executive Committee, prepare a mail ballot to be sent to all voting faculty to resolve this issue. Chancellor Bepko stated that Brian Vargus had conducted a survey which showed a slight preference for having classes during Thanksgiving week but it was not a vote of the entire campus. Professor Fredland made a motion that this item be sent to the Academic Affairs Committee. This was seconded and voted on. Motion passed.

AGENDA ITEM XI - Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS

FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING

Thursday, December 1, 1988

University Conference Center, Room 231

3:00 - 4:00

Members Present: Administrative: Chancellor Gerald L. Bepko, Dean William Plater. Director: Barbara Fischler. Deans: Constance Baker, John Barlow, Walter J. Daly, Robert Keck, P. Nicholas Kellum, R. Bruce Renda, William J. Voos. Faculty: C. D. Aliprantis, Elaine Alton, Carl Andres, Frederick Bein, H. R. Besch, Jr., Willard Bostwick, Victoria Champion, William Crabtree, Theodore Cutshall, Joseph DiMicco, Robert Dittus, Elizabeth Evenbeck, Mary Feeley, Richard Fredland, Morris French, Vania Goodwin, William Hodes, Dolores Hoyt, Florence Juillerat, Juanita Keck, Christian Kloesel, Michael Kubek, Rebecca Markel, Donna Marzouk, James McAteer, Dana McDonald, Judy Z. Miller, B. Keith Moore, Bernard Morrel, Richard Peterson, Edward Robbins, Richard Rogers, Beverly Ross, A. N. Siakotos, Susan Sutton, Karen Teegarden, Henry Wellman, Karen West, Charles Yokomoto, Jack Zecher.

Alternates Present: Deans: James R. Roche for H. William Gilmore; Hugh Wolf for Howard Mehlinger; Scott Evenbeck for James Weigand; Tom Lenz for Jack Wentworth. Faculty: Edgar Fleenor for Richard Beck, Kichuel K. Park for Byron Olson, Mike Maxwell for Harriet Wilkins.

Members Absent: Administrative: Carol Nathan. Deans: A. James Barnes, Trevor Brown, Norman Lefstein, Sheldon Siegel. Faculty: Billy Abel, Margaret Applegate, Morris Aprison, Cecil Brown, David Burns, Mervyn Cohen, Dewey Conces, Eleanor Donnelly, Dornith Doherty, John Eble, Margaret Felton, Bhuwan Garg, Donald Gartner, Phillip Gibbs, Celestine Hamant, Robert A. Harris, Eugene Helveston, Narcissa Hocker, Louis Holtzclaw, Charles Hutton, Lucreda Hutton, Jerome Kaplan, Henry Karlson, Robert Keck, Richard Kovacs, John Lappas, Richard Lawlor, Richard Meiss, Robert Mendelsohn, Michael Mitchell, Carl Newton, Jeanne Pontious, Gerald Powers, Douglas Rex, Richard Rink, Glen Sagraves, Donald R. Tharp, Kathleen Warfel.

Ex-Officio Members Present: Shirley Newhouse, President IUPUI Staff Council.

Ex-Officio Members Absent: Glenda Smith.

Visitors: Erwin Boschmann, Walter Buchanan, Wendell McBurney, John P. Nolte.

AGENDA ITEM I - Approval of Minutes - November 3, 1988

The minutes of the November 3, 1988 meeting were approved as distributed.

AGENDA ITEM II - Executive Committee Report - Jeffery Vessely

Secretary Vessely announced that the Exceptions Committee for Retirement is being empaneled at this time and if anyone has any concerns which they would like to raise they should forward them to Ed Whalen in Bloomington, to be considered by

this committee.

The issue regarding TIAA/CREF for ten-month employees has been assigned to several UFC committees. There will probably be a report at the February 14, 1989 University Faculty Council meeting.

He also explained that the minutes of the IUPUI Faculty Council meetings will be in summary form for the rest of this academic term instead of being verbatim. The tapes will be retained in the Faculty Council Office for anyone wishing to listen to them to hear any item in its entirety.

There were concerns raised regarding the tapes being sent to the archives as well as a verbatim copy of the minutes being made for the Archives. It was explained that the tapes are sent to the Archives.

Action items and the Question and Answer agenda item will be done verbatim.

AGENDA ITEM III - Question and Answer Period

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: I would like to report on something that was raised in a previous meeting and that is the Campus Shuttle Service, which goes from the main campus to 38th with a stop at Shoreland Towers and Herron School of Art.

Bob Martin reports to me that two years ago there was a \$.50 per trip fee. There was a proposal to raise that to \$.75 per trip to cause the fee paid by riders to come closer to paying the costs of operating the shuttle. Bob says there was a very strong negative reaction from student groups and the increase was not implemented. Last year, a decision was made to drop the charge for ridership and cover the operating costs out of parking revenues. That is where the costs are absorbed right now. Bob says that decision was made to encourage good public relations.

The shuttle has a ridership of about 118 passengers per day, which averages about six passengers per trip except for the final run of the day which is less well subscribed than the general average for the day. The cost to operate the shuttle is about \$100 a day. The shuttle operates from 7:55 in the morning until 4:25 in the afternoon southbound. The last run is southbound at 4:25 Monday through Friday when classes are in session. The reason why it hasn't been allowed to operate after 4:25 is because of the expense that was gained in the experimental periods with shuttles that ran after 5:00. There was so little ridership then that it was determined that that was not sufficient reason to run the shuttle and after 5:00 p.m. bear the expense. It conjures up in my mind the sort of costs that we all have to be conscious of. If there is a subsidy, or if we have free goods, and those free goods or the subsidized activity benefits only a very few people, then it seems to me that we have reason to question whether we should provide that free service.

The best example that I know of, where we have reviewed a very heavily subsidized activity and decided to discontinue it, was the swimming pool in the Union Building. We assessed the costs of the swimming pool; we determined the use that was made of the swimming pool; and we determined, as I may have told you before, that it was costing us something like \$7.50 a stroke for everyone who swam there. We

thought that to be disproportionate and we closed the swimming pool. Of course, the reason there was such little use was because of the excellent facility that we have for recreational swimming in the Natatorium building.

I think the same thing is true of operating the shuttle after 5:00. The people who have analyzed this service concluded that it would be very expensive per trip to operate the shuttle after the regular hours it now operates, considering that there may only be, according to our experience, a very small number of students who would take advantage of the shuttle. That response is to the question that had been raised by Jerry Kaplan at a previous meeting. I have received no written questions in advance. The floor is open for other questions or comments.

DOLORES HOYT: Last year there was conversation that there was going to be some investigation about an open area on the overhead walking from the Business/-SPEA building to the parking garage. It had been causing trouble in the winter time because it builds a wind tunnel there and people have trouble walking through there. They made various attempts at putting carpets down there with bricks on them. There was supposed to be someone checking into that.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: We have been over to look at it again. They have some new ideas for this year. We don't have an easy solution. I think last year, late in the year, they put up some kind of wind screen.

BARBARA FISCHLER: It was a heavy plastic and that tore.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: This has not been a problem in warmer weather; it is only a problem in the winter. My recollection is that at the end of the winter last year, the Physical Plant people were going to try something new including, putting Visqueen there to block the wind. That is something they tried a couple of years ago. That is something that we will want to make sure is addressed right now because of the beginning of winter. I have been over to look at it and I can understand how that floor can be very slippery. I don't know why it was designed exactly that way but it is very slippery. We will report back to you on that.

PROFESSOR J. KECK: Since this portion is going to be verbatim in the minutes, the times which were stated for the shuttle are not correct. The times the shuttle bus leaves from here to 38th Street are 8:00 a.m. until 5:00 p.m. Monday through Thursday. On Friday the last run is at 4:00. Then they come south on 38th Street at 5:25 Monday through Thursday and 4:25 on Friday.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: Well, I have never been on the shuttle myself, so I am not a first-hand observer, but reading from a memo that was given to me by Bob Martin, he says that the shuttle runs from 7:55 a.m. northbound, I think that means that it leaves the campus at 7:55 and at 4:25 it is southbound Monday through Friday when classes are in session. We will reconcile these times.

PROFESSOR J. KECK: I ride it everyday. It leaves here at 8:00 and the first run back is at 8:30.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: I am glad that you pointed that out. Are there any other questions?

AGENDA ITEM IV - Survey Results - Metropolitan Affairs Committee

Professor Walter Buchanan gave a report on the survey results for the naming of IUPUI.

He explained that the last page of the attachments regarding the survey was a rough draft and he did not realize it was going to be published as is. Those were strictly the names from which the six final names were selected to be placed on the second ballot.

He stated that a copy of the results of the second survey would be made a part of the minutes of today's meeting. (See IUPUI Circular No. 88-05) He stated that the response to the second survey was much better than the response to the first. The first survey had only about a 50 percent return rate. The second survey had a 61.1 percent return rate.

The most popular choice of names, according to the survey results, was Indiana University at Indianapolis. This had a mean rank of about 2.1 The second choice was Indiana-Purdue University, Indianapolis. The mean rank for this one was 2.3. The next three choices were fairly close. Indianapolis State University had a 3.5; University of Central Indiana, 3.6 mean rank; Indiana Capitol University, 3.8 mean rank. The last choice was Hoosier State University with a 5.1 mean rank.

Professor Buchanan explained that several responses simply had a vote for first and second choice and did not indicate choices 3-6. Therefore, the first two came in quite a bit ahead of the others.

It was felt that the reason for the unpopularity of Hoosier State University was that most people wanted to have an identity with a state university.

Professor Buchanan explained that after the results of the first survey were printed in the Sagamore a couple of weeks ago, he was contacted by the Sagamore and asked if he would write an article for the point-counterpoint article which they wanted to do on the name change. He agreed to write an article for the "pro" side.

There was discussion regarding having the word "university" in the name.

The question was raised regarding the acronym for the university. Professor Buchanan explained that acronyms were not asked for in the second survey.

The question was also raised as to having the same logo for letterhead used campus wide with the individual departments indicated on the letterhead.

AGENDA ITEM V - Unfinished Business

There was no unfinished business.

AGENDA ITEM VI - New Business

There were no new business items.

AGENDA ITEM VII - Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m. [Following the regular Faculty Council meeting Chancellor Bepko gave his State of the Campus Address which is appended herewith.]

INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS

FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING

Thursday, January 5, 1989

Law School, Room 116

3:30 - 5:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Administrative: Vice Chancellor Gerald L. Bepko, Dean William M. Plater. Deans: Constance Baker, John Barlow, Walter J. Daly, Robert W. Keck, P. Nicholas Kellum, William J. Voos. Faculty: Billy Abel, C. D. Aliprantis, Carl Andres, Morris Aprison, Richard Beck, Frederick Bein, H. R. Besch, Jr., Willard Bostwick, David Burns, Victoria Champion, Mervyn Cohen, William Crabtree, Theodore Cutshall, Joseph DiMicco, Robert Dittus, Eleanor Donnelly, John Eble, Mary Feeley, Richard Fredland, Bhuwan Garg, Donald Gartner, Robert A. Harris, Narcissa Hocker, Dolores Hoyt, Charles Hutton, Lucreda Hutton, Jerome Kaplan, Henry Karlson, Juanita Keck, Christian Kloesel, Richard Kovacs, Michael Kubek, Richard Lawlor, Rebecca Markel, Donna Marzouk, James McAteer, Dana McDonald, Richard Meiss, Judy Z. Miller, Michael Mitchell, B. Keith Moore, Bernard Morrel, Carl Newton, Byron Olson, Richard Peterson, Jeanne Pontious, Edward Robbins, Beverly Ross, A. N. Siakotos, Susan Sutton, Karen Teegarden, Donald Tharp, Jeffery Vessely, Kathleen Warfel, Henry Wellman, Harriet Wilkins, Charles Yokomoto.

ALTERNATES PRESENT: Deans & Directors: Janet S. Huettner for Barbara Fischler, Hugh A. Wolf for Howard Mehlinger, Scott Evenbeck for James Weigand. Faculty: James Baldwin for Vania Goodwin, Gayle Hersch for Celestine Hamant.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Administrative: Dean Carol Nathan. Deans: A. James Barnes, Trevor Brown, H. William Gilmore, Norman Lefstein, R. Bruce Renda, Sheldon Siegel, Jack Wentworth. Faculty: Elaine Alton, Margaret Applegate, Cecil Brown, Dewey Conces, Dornith Doherty, Elizabeth Evenbeck, Margaret Felton, Morris French, Louis Holtzclaw, Florence Juillerat, Robert Mendelsohn, Gerald Powers, Douglas Rex, Richard Rink, Richard Rogers, Glen Sagraves, Karen West, Jack Zecher.

VISITORS: Erwin Boschmann, Lillian Charleston (IUPUI Affirmative Action Officer), Joe Christian, Mary Maitland Kimball (Chair, Student Affairs Committee), Robert Martin, Eugene Tempel, James Torke, Sara Wolf.

AGENDA ITEM I - Memorial Resolution - Pao-lo Yu, School of Medicine

Dr. Joe Christian read a memorial resolution for Professor Pao-lo Yu. A moment of silence was observed.

AGENDA ITEM II - Approval of Minutes - December 1, 1988

The minutes of the December 1, 1988 meeting were approved as distributed.

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

Chancellor Bepko discussed the three items which were available for pickup by the faculty if they so wished. The first item, was a brochure entitled "One University With Eight Front Doors." It contained an explanation of IU's appropriation request, based on the One University planning process but focuses on campus initiatives and university initiatives, with the campus initiatives divided into Undergraduate Education, Research and Economic Growth, and Access to Higher Education. The second item was a card entitled "Indiana University 1989-91 Operating Appropriation Request Summary (Including IUPUI Requests)." The third item was a card entitled "Facts about IUPUI." He invited the faculty to let him know of any suggestions or changes they thought might be appropriate. These are already printed up but in the next go around the changes, if appropriate, could be made at that time. He also pointed out that the logo on these items is the new logo for IUPUI for its 20th anniversary.

Chancellor Bepko asked Dean Plater to discuss the implementation phase which is taking place right now in the areas of Undergraduate Education, Research and Economic Growth, and Access to Higher Education. He explained that there are implementation efforts underway across all eight campuses. The area of most activity has been Undergraduate Education.

Dean Plater explained that the Campus Development Plan had called for the creation of a Council on Undergraduate Learning, both to work with the development of the campus and to coordinate the activities with the planning process which is unfolding for the entire eight campuses of Indiana University. The Council held its first meeting early in the fall semester. The specific purpose was to review the campus agenda and correlate it with the One University plan. The Council agreed that the best strategy would be for the representatives of all the schools with undergraduate programs to go back to the schools and review school curriculum requirements in light of the specific initiatives dealing with undergraduate education with a focus on three areas in particular -- writing, computational skills, and the senior "capstone experience," which will integrate into the undergraduate students' major all of the undergraduate learning that students have had with an emphasis on the major itself. During the remainder of the fall semester, the schools' deans and various committees within each of the schools reviewed these particular areas in light of their own school curricula with the goal of seeing how soon or how quickly we could implement what has been called for in the One University Plan. Representatives from all of the eight campuses of Indiana University met at IUPUI on November 22 to review the total planning agenda with an emphasis on the undergraduate program. Each of the schools from around the university reported including the schools from this campus. All of the schools here are very far along in the review and, most schools have adopted in principle the requirements dealing with writing, computing, and the capstone experience. The meeting also reaffirmed the significance of faculty involvement in each of the One University initiatives dealing with curriculum.

At IUPUI, Dean Plater said, we are using the Council on Undergraduate Learning as the vehicle for coordinating across all of the schools. Two members of that Council are Jeffery Vessely, liaison with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council and Becky Porter, liaison with the Academic Affairs Committee. It is understood that these two persons, through their liaison roles, will refer to Faculty Council

committees any issues that appear on the Council's agenda that would require involvement or advice of the Faculty Council committees.

The Council will meet again on January 26 to check progress on the One University agenda and to turn to our campus plan.

The Council also has created an advisory committee made up of discipline experts in related areas such as basic skills in writing and mathematics. This advisory committee is chaired by Erv Boschmann, who is also working for our campus on behalf of the University-wide attempt to develop an assessment program. The advisory committee will work with undergraduate schools to review their plans for the three areas talked about earlier, and to insure that we are following general principles that will be applied across the entire campus. The advisory committee will also develop a schedule for implementation of the assessment program, a pilot project on this campus.

AGENDA ITEM IV - Executive Committee Report - Jeffery Vessely

Professor Vessely stated that the Athletic Affairs Committee is planning a survey, although a formal request to the Executive Committee for the survey has not been made as yet. The purpose of this survey will be to survey the faculty on campus in regard to their concerns, suggestions, or comments on a variety of activities in our intramural/recreational sports area. Included in this survey will be information regarding intercollegiate athletics. Professor Vessely asked the faculty to carefully consider and return that survey and to encourage their peers to do so.

The Faculty Affairs Committee is currently reviewing dismissal procedures. Any input on this item should be directed to Dr. Richard Peterson, MS 223.

There also was a mailing as a reminder for the George W. Pinnell Award for outstanding service. Any supporting evidence or nominations should be sent to the Faculty Council Office, ES 3108A.

The Executive Committee is currently reviewing the Faculty Handbook. Any comments or suggestions should also be sent to the Faculty Council Office, ES 3108A.

The Task Force on Appointments and Advancements continues to meet and will conduct a survey very soon. Professor Vessely asked Jim Torke, co-chair of that committee, to give a brief introduction to that topic.

Professor Torke explained that he was serving as co-chair of the Task Force along with Joe Christian of the Medical School. He stated that the Task Force was appointed jointly by Dean Plater and Susan Zunt, at that time Secretary of the Faculty Council. He explained that their status is viewed properly as being an independent task force whose role is wholly advisory. They see themselves as operating in the best interest of the faculty and therefore of the University. Ultimately, when they have something to say and report, the official report will be to the Faculty Council or its Executive Committee.

The charge to this Task Force which was originally received is a very broad charge covering almost anything within the general topic of faculty appointments and advancements but the present focus, for this year at least, is upon tenure as well as early retirement insofar that it has impact on tenure. In part, their choice of focus was prompted by the fact that in 1994 the Federal Age Discrimination Act

will become applicable to university faculties and therefore a mandatory retirement age will no longer be permissible at least if the law stands until 1994. Therefore, the question of tenure becomes a particularly difficult one.

Their work to date has been, in addition to getting organized, collecting literature, reading and discussing the literature, discussing generally where they should be heading. They are in the process of putting out a survey which all faculty will be receiving no later than early February. In addition, they will hold a meeting about two weeks from today with President Ehrlich both to benefit from his general expertise on these matters as well as to share his view on the University and its future.

He stated that he had heard some unofficial rumors stating that this committee was set up to abolish tenure. This is not true. Their focus might indeed be on such matters as post tenure review and the like.

Throughout the year they would welcome such information, comments, or suggestions as any faculty member might have. They have already received quite a few such comments. They do reserve the right to set their agenda, at least in the short run.

Professor Fredland asked Professor Torke to describe the "post-tenure review." Professor Torke explained that he was referring to the years following the granting of tenure.

AGENDA ITEM V - Question and Answer Period

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: The next item is the Question and Answer Period. I have a couple of items held over from the last meeting. First, with respect to the schedule for the shuttle, we have had a discussion with Juanita Keck and I think we have worked out the times that the shuttle actually runs to everyone's satisfaction. I will ask Juanita and Bob Martin to make sure that the minutes are correct on the times that the shuttle runs just in case anyone happens to read the minutes to find out when the shuttle is running.

There are two other things, though, one of which was specifically mentioned last time and on a previous occasion and another which has been discussed in the Faculty Council I think a number of times over the years. First, the condition in the walkway above ground by the Engineering/Technology Building and, secondly, traffic lights on Michigan. Bob Martin is here and will address both of those items.

ROBERT MARTIN: Thank you, Jerry. The first one regards the connection points of the walkway from the East Garage connected to the E/T Building and another walkway connecting Education/Social Work to the School of Physical Education. Both of those locations have open areas before you actually enter another building. These have been identified as problems since way back in 1981. As a result of that question from the Faculty Council, I asked for a summary of where did all of this stands. I find that as far back at least as some of our records indicate that it was addressed back in 1981. A temporary recommendation was made at that time to put up plywood and plastic Visqueen to basically keep the elements out. The report also tells me that since 1981 we simply continued to do the temporary solution. The Faculty Senate of the School of Engineering and Technology did pass a resolution in March of 1988, which Dean Renda forwarded to me. As a result of

that resolution, we initiated the internal paperwork to the Physical Facilities department to have that looked at architecturally. We sent that request for service through shortly thereafter in March of 1988. My report also tells me that that project simply never percolated to the top of the stack. That has now moved to the top of the stack, as recently as yesterday. A meeting was held with the architect. They are looking at the alternatives. I might tell you that as a side light to that, that any solution will have other considerations with it, so this doesn't preclude us from looking at various solutions. I have asked Emily Wren, in my office, as well as Ray Casati who is the University Architect, to meet on that and investigate the various alternatives and also likewise to meet with the representatives from the schools on both areas that are affected. I will assure you that those meetings will occur.

The installation of the temporary solution, like some of our temporary buildings, has been done for the Engineering/Technology Building. Beginning next week a similar structure will be put up for the connecting area in Education/Social Work and the School of Physical Education. That is basically an update on this situation.

I will go on and state very quickly that many of us have experienced concerns, as we have for a number of years, from both a safety standpoint and just from a traffic flow standpoint, what we felt was a need for traffic lights be installed on Michigan Street at Blackford and on New York Street at Blackford. That has been a very long process, one that has been embedded in the legislative process of the City County Council and one that says that if you don't meet certain test criteria, you are not eligible for a light. Some six months ago we urged John Mulvey to initiate those tests again which the Department of Transportation did agree to do. These basically include monitoring the number of cars. What we asked them to do this time, however, was to not only monitor the number of cars but also to count pedestrians because that was again part of our concern. This was done.

I am pleased to announce to you that the word that I had yesterday was that it was the recommendation from the Department of Transportation to forward to the City County Council a recommendation to install traffic lights at both locations, Michigan and Blackford and New York and Blackford. That goes through what is the pre-reading process with the City County Council. That has cleared the first reading favorably. It went into a second reading by a subcommittee of the City County Council, which is basically their transportation committee. That went into its second reading last night. I do not have the report on that, but I have had word that there should be no problem with the second reading. It then will go back to a full City County Council for a third reading, and from there it will go to the Mayor. We are very optimistic that it will clear the Council, and we are not anticipating any problems with the Mayor's signing it. Once that process is done, it will then go to the Department of Transportation where their engineers will begin to take a look at the area and start engineering the installation and the timing of those lights. We were told unofficially that we could expect some activity on the installation site as early as this spring. I will be happy to keep the Chancellor and the Executive Vice Chancellor informed of the process on that and I will be happy to address at any time where we stand on that. We are very happy that we think we are now going to get the traffic lights that we have been asking for on those two major streets.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: Anytime that we think that our procedures in the Faculty

Council are time consuming and cumbersome, I suppose that we could take comfort from knowing that the City County Council holds three readings on a proposal for a traffic light.

PROFESSOR BECK: Before we let this go, I hear you talking about putting the Visqueen on the Engineering door that leads into the Engineering/Technology Building. That is completely open. At the present time there are two inches of melted snow and ice. At that position is also a handicapped door. There is absolutely no way that a handicapped person could get through. Let's make sure that is part of this whole thing.

ROBERT MARTIN: It is. I have asked that that be looked at specifically. The normal process is for the Building Services personnel to take care in both of those arenas where there is ice it is their responsibility to make sure that that gets treated and removed.

PROFESSOR BECK: You might report that it has not been done.

ROBERT MARTIN: That was before we got it. I will assure you, as I assured you before, that there will be a meeting taking place and I will assure you that that will be taken care of as well.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: We will assure you that we will get on it right away. Thanks, Bob. Are there any other questions? I have none in writing.

PROFESSOR ROBBINS: I don't have a question, but I would like to make an announcement about the Learning Resources Symposium. The announcement is that you should receive within the next few days the programs for this 1989 Learning Resources Symposium. As some of you know, this will be designated beginning this year, as the Edward C. Moore Learning Symposium. It is scheduled for February 10. I would like for you to place the date on your calendar now and pass the word to your colleagues so that we can have the kind of attendance we have enjoyed in the pass. We think it is again going to be a very important and impressive program. Dr. Herman Blake, whom many of you know, will be the keynote speaker. He will be addressing issues particularly about serving as atypical student population, particularly increasing their levels of aspiration and increasing prospects for success of such groups. The symposium again will include a presentation by last year's winner of the Edward C. Moore Teaching Award. The afternoon sessions will include strands related to new technology, to teaching the needs of special populations, assessment as we have been discussing it in terms of the One University Plan, and finally issues related to effective teaching. Look for that program and, in the meantime, block off Friday, February 10, on your calendars.

AGENDA ITEM VI - Faculty Boards of Review Election and Report on Number of at-large and unit representatives to be elected

Chair-elect Professor Charles Yokomoto distributed the ballots for the election of the Faculty Boards of Review.

A request was made to have the functions of these Boards of Review explained. Professor Karlson explained that the Boards of Review hear complaints from faculty

concerning administrative activities which can range from the denial of tenure to denial of a pay increase to disagreement with a reprimand which has been received in their file. They determine facts and make recommendations to the Chancellor of the campus or the Vice President of the campus involved. They have no actual authority to order that their recommendations be carried out, but traditionally their recommendations have received great consideration by the administration.

Professor Yokomoto announced that the nominees for the at-large ballot had been finalized and a list would be appended to these minutes. Also, a letter to the deans has been sent regarding the election of the Unit representatives. The return date on these is in March.

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

FACULTY BOARD OF REVIEW #1

Paul Galanti, School of Law
Vania Goodwin, University Library
Ralph Gray, School of Liberal Arts
Ingrid Ritchie, SPEA
Carl Rothe, School of Medicine

FACULTY BOARD OF REVIEW #2

Henry R. Besch, Jr., School of Medicine
Victoria Champion, School of Nursing
David Gibson, School of Medicine
Richard Pflanzner, School of Science
Merlin Whiteman, School of Law - Librarian

FACULTY BOARD OF REVIEW #3

Betsy Joyce, School of Nursing
Christian Kloesel, School of Liberal Arts
Jordan Leibman, School of Business
Arthur Mirsky, School of Science
Rebecca Porter, School of Medicine

Professor Yokomoto asked for a motion to destroy the ballots. Motion made and second. The ballots will be destroyed.

AGENDA ITEM VII - Disabled Student Report - Mary Kimball

Professor Kimball reported on the Disabled Student situation. (See IUPUI Circular #89-01 attached).

AGENDA ITEM VIII - Martin Luther King, Jr., Birthday Celebration

Lillian Charleston reported on the Martin Luther King, Jr., Birthday Celebration, to be held on January 16, 1989. Dr. David Carter, President, Eastern Connecticut State University, will be the keynote speaker. The morning session was to begin at 8:30 a.m. and the afternoon session at 1 p.m. both at the University Conference Center. The dinner was to be in The West End, 617 W. 11th Street. She also announced that Chancellor Bepko has committed to a series of events for Black History Month in February.

AGENDA ITEM IX - Responsibility Center Budgeting - Ed Whalen

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: I would like to introduce Ed Whalen, who is going to discuss Responsibility Center Budgeting. As you know, we are going to be the first campus to employ this form of budgeting starting for our schools and units on July 1, 1989. It will be experimental. I want to assure everyone that there will be no major changes brought on by beginning the system of Responsibility Center Budgeting. Everything will be kept as close as possible to the status quo carrying over from 1988-89, but we are going to be the campus that will be used as the prototype, and we will have an opportunity to experiment and make policy with respect to Responsibility Center Budgeting. The Executive Committee of the Faculty Council thought it would be very important for you hear from the person who, for the University, is doing most of the thinking and planning about Responsibility Center Budgeting and that is someone who I think all of you are familiar with, Ed Whalen who is Assistant Vice President and the Chief Budget Officer for Indiana University.

ED WHALEN: I certainly appreciate the opportunity to talk about Responsibility Center Budgeting. It is certainly something that will be occupying all of our attention as we move to implementation on the Indianapolis campus. I am sure it will occupy your concerns, and certainly the attention of the other campuses of Indiana University will be focused on Indianapolis as the system is implemented here. It is a new system for Indiana University although it isn't new for higher education.

I might say a little about the history of Responsibility Center Budgeting and how I happened to become involved in it and some of the operations where it has operated at other institutions. The first time I heard about Responsibility Center Budgeting, it wasn't called that. It was in the early 1970s and I was sort of drifting into Academic Administration when I heard about this expression of "every tub on its own bottom." That seemed like a strange expression. I inquired about it and it turned out that it emanated from Harvard University and it represented a new form of budgeting for that institution, in which each academic unit was attributed its own income. It also paid its own expenses. That was all of its own expenses, not just the direct expenses that we commonly find in our budget of salaries, wages, fringe benefits, supplies and expenses, and travel, but also indirect costs as well, such as the costs for computing, library services, physical plant, general administration, and executive management. When they talked about "tubs" they were referring to schools, and when they talked about "bottoms" they were referring to the bottom line inasmuch as each of the units was to operate as a self-sustaining financial entity and was expected to at least break even if not every year at least over a period of years. It seemed like an intriguing idea but I didn't hear very much more

about it for about a decade. The next exposure was as a result of participating in a conference that was sponsored by the National Association of College and University Business Officers. John Strauss, Vice President for Administration and Finance at the University of Southern California, was talking about a new budgeting arrangement which they were moving toward called "Revenue Center Management."

As he described it, it sounded like the Harvard version. I didn't hear about Responsibility Center Budgeting again until 1987, shortly after the appointment of Thomas Ehrlich as the 15th President of Indiana University was announced. I happened to find out that at the University of Pennsylvania, where he was Provost, they used a system called Responsibility Center Budgeting. A thought just happened to pass my mind that he might expect that kind of system here. He came to Indiana University on August 1 and in early October, I found that that was his intention because it had been his experience as Provost at the University of Pennsylvania that Responsibility Center Budgeting served well in the accomplishing the academic objectives of that institution. He felt that here at Indiana University, a multi-campus system larger than the University of Pennsylvania, that it would be equally appropriate. After discussing it with various deans and campus chancellors, we began a process of developing a system of taking the first step toward developing Responsibility Center Budgeting.

One of the first steps in that process was the establishment of an Responsibility Center Budgeting advisory group, which included among its members David Robbins and Beverly Hill from IUPUI, along with other representatives from other campuses as well. Our first task was to identify the criteria for defining Responsibility Centers. Everybody has an idea of what they are in the abstract but one needs some sort of guidelines to take a look at the organization of the institution and carve out those units which are Responsibility Centers.

Another charge or another concern that we had was a mechanism for attributing the income that these schools and their activities earn, a practice which we had not been employing in the past. A third consideration was to allocate those system standards definitions for allocating indirect costs to each of the Responsibility Centers. By middle to late January in 1987, we had completed that, and the University Budget Committee, which is composed of the chancellors from each of the campuses and chaired by the Vice President for Finance and Administration, approved those. We set out to work on providing each of the campuses with those guidelines and defining Responsibility Centers. That process was completed toward the end of February. I might say that for the Indianapolis campus there are about 20 to 25 Responsibility Centers identified; about 15 of those are the various schools and the remainder are support units like academic support, Student Services, the Physical Plant, Chancellor's Office, etc.

With that we then configured the 1987-88 budget into the Responsibility Center Budgeting mode, so that one could demonstrate that making that transition does not change the allocation decisions which have been made and which reflect the current priorities of the campus. We were able to complete that in advance of the budget preparation process for 1988-89. This gave us some experience and an opportunity for people to look at those parameters and make adjustments to them. Then there was a halt in the process because we were all engaged in the process of preparing the 1988-89 budget. The activity that we had conducted provided the basis to format the 1988-89 budget in a Responsibility Center Budgeting mode, but it has not

been implemented as yet. It is there for information purposes. People are not making decisions on that basis.

In the beginning of the fall semester, we provided all of that information to each of the campuses as well as to the deans and their staffs so they could review these parameters in great detail and make adjustments to them. We anticipate having the suggestions back and making another run at adjusting the budget base for 1988-89 into a Responsibility Center Budgeting format that represents what people feel is their reflection of reality. That may take the remainder of this month to complete that on this campus, as well as on the others. Even though they are not scheduled to implement the system, that process is occurring on other campuses as well. One other thing, by way of history, on September 1, John Hackett came to Indiana University as the Vice President for Finance and Administration. He is familiar with this process inasmuch as it has its counterpart in private industry. He had two words of advice. One is, in making this kind of transition, it would probably be difficult if we attempted to implement it on all campuses simultaneously. It would be better to select one campus and carry out the exercise there so that all the resources of the University could be focused on that. It was with the cooperation, willingness, and leadership of Vice President Bepko that the Indianapolis campus, in effect, was volunteered to be that first campus, a first for Indiana University. I am sure it will attract not only attention within the University, but also within the state and nation as well, because, although it has been a familiar method of operation among private institutions, it is unusual or uncommon among public institutions and Indiana University will be the first, or at least very close to the first, moving toward this system.

The other observation that he had was that we ought to go and see how it operates at some other institution. I had already made a pilgrimage to the University of Pennsylvania to see how Responsibility Center Budgeting operated there. But, they went to that system in 1971 or 1972. The people who had been there at the time of the transition had left the institution. Therefore, there was no one around who would say how they got the job done and why they did the things they did. That was not the case at the University of Southern California. As a matter of fact, they have been very articulate about this process and had published in their annual reports the steps they had gone through year by year. So, we had some sort of idea of where they were in the process. We called them and spoke with John Curry, Vice President for Budgeting and Planning, and asked him if he would tell us about it. He was there as a prime mover at the time they made the transition to what we call Responsibility Center Budgeting, but which they call Revenue Center Management. David Robbins and I and three other people went out there to see what we could see. Certainly when one makes a trip like that, you are a bit uncertain as to how successful it will be, but it far exceeded our expectations as to what we found there -- their cordiality and their hospitality and the kind of system that they had in place. One thing about that experience was that it was reassuring, inasmuch as it appeared that we were very much on the right track as to what we had done up to this point.

There were other insights which were provided as well as a result of that visit to the University of Southern California. I might say a little bit about the University of Southern California. There are certain parallels with the Indianapolis campus. It had only been until the early 1980s that I became aware that USC is a large private institution of higher education, with an enrollment of about 31,000. About

15,000 to 16,000 of those students are undergraduates; 14,000 to 15,000 are graduate and professional students. You can see that their commitment to post baccalaureate professional education is quite high. They have a total budget of about \$600,000,000 which is roughly in the neighborhood of but somewhat larger than the Indianapolis campus total. About \$450 million of that is general fund money earned primarily from student fees and indirect costs recovery and about \$150 million comes from grants and contracts and other restricted funds.

One of the things that we are particularly impressed about at USC was that they have a double AA bond rate, which is something that Indiana University has only recently acquired. It is not cheap to attend USC. Their tuition is about \$12,500. The total cost of attending is \$18,000 per year, in a state which has subsidized very heavily public higher education. Public higher education in California is high quality. It also is geographically accessible and expensive from the standpoint of those who have access to it. Yet, the University of Southern California is able to compete successfully in an environment which was not necessarily considered congenial for that kind of an operation. We asked them how they did it. They explained that the reason was aggressive management. They wouldn't say that it was Revenue Center Management or Responsibility Center Budgeting, but that was one manifestation of aggressive management in the way that they have been able to organize their affairs in order to carry out their programs. We managed to talk to several deans who were there and who operated under this system. The information that we gained from them was encouraging as well. I would certainly encourage any of you who know someone at the University of Southern California to ask them about it. We talked to persons they wanted us to talk to. It would be very helpful to get the insights of others. We have encouraged each of the deans on the Indianapolis campus as we met with them to talk to their counterparts to find out how they feel the system operates. Lynn Silverman, who is the dean of USC's School of Engineering, one of their large schools, was very supportive of this system because it was a logical system. There were reasons for the kind of procedures that they followed. We also talked to a dean of the School of Urban Planning, Allen Creditor. He liked it because it provided opportunities for real entrepreneurship in that he had these costs and a certain amount of income. He had a claim on that income and could advance it to meet the costs of the school.

There are a couple of things that they gave us by way of advice as well. They said that there are four things that you ought to have in place or you shouldn't move to Responsibility Center Budgeting. One of these is that you need strong academic leadership. You need an academic plan because Responsibility Center Budgeting, (they call it Revenue Center Management), is a system which is designed to get an institution from where it is to where it wants to go. Unless you have that kind of vision in place, it is better not to have this kind of system. The second consideration was that in order to pull it off and in order to maintain it, there needs to be involvement, among the deans and others who are interested in and participants in the budgeting process. At the University of Southern California they have 29 schools. In order to get participation in the process they set up a committee, a subset of the deans plus members from the Central Administration to, in effect, assess the perimeters and to consider the various options and policies that they could employ in developing the system. That tradition of involvement in the system is continued currently because as the institution changes the system has to change. You have to change various parameters. There has to be that involvement of collective judgment as to the way to go.

A third factor that they said had to be recognized is that there has to be a recognized role for Central Administration, a role for setting academic priorities for the total institution. In the case of the University of Southern California, they had certain priorities that were well identified as far as the direction that they were going. They said that, not only does there need to be a recognition of this, but also that it has to be leveraged with real resources. In their case, most of their income from the general fund comes from student fees and indirect costs recovery. In order to set aside a set of resources that were available to Central Administration to influence the direction of the institution, they in effect imposed a tax on the fee income and indirect costs recovery in the amount of 20 percent. The Central Administration then, in the budget review process, would make the judgment as to how that would be allocated among the various schools to meet their objectives. In the case of Engineering, that was one of their top objectives. They were in effect increasing the subsidy to the School of Engineering in order to improve that. It is also a school which emphasizes professional education. They also recognized that there was a need to support more heavily the arts and sciences. The 20 percent factor was the amount that collectively was needed in order to accomplish that.

In the case of Indiana University, a public institution, the tax is tax dollars, that is state appropriations which amount to about 60 percent of the general fund budget throughout the institution.

The fourth consideration was one of full disclosure. One of the buzz phrases that we heard was "information-rich environment." If you are going to decentralize the decision making, people need to know what is going on. They have to have the data and the information about the status of their school for that to occur. That is one aspect. In their financial report, they publish what the allocations are among the various schools. It is no secret that some schools are getting additional support relative to others. That information is known.

There is also another dimension of that, which goes back to the beginning to the academic plan. The academic agenda is known. When we talked to Lynn Silverman, he knew that his school was destined for additional support in the foreseeable future, which in their case was next year and four years beyond that. When we talked to Allen Creditor, he knew that his school, although it was prospering and doing very well, was not slated for additional subsidy from Central Administration because urban planning was not a priority for the institution as a whole. Yet, he was happy with that arrangement because he had gone out and increased his enrollment, gotten grants and contracts, and gotten gift income and his school was prospering. In spite of the fact that his subsidy was going down, the school was improving its status. He made the observation that he knew that he was just one school in 29 and a small school at that, but "They know I am doing a good job." Therefore, one has full disclosure not only with respect to the current status of things, but full disclosure as to what the future holds, as far as people can perceive it is expected to be. Along with those four ingredients, they felt that essential tone and aspect would have to be in place in order for Responsibility Center Budgeting to operate effectively. Certainly, one feels that as we approach this endeavor that the Indianapolis campus meets that test and elsewhere throughout Indiana University as well. Here the environment seems to be most congenial for this grand experiment. Are there any questions?

PROFESSOR ALIPRANTIS: The University of Southern California operates on a different system. IUPUI is under funded.

ED WHALEN: There is a difference between \$12,500 per student and the amount of funding that we have here.

PROFESSOR ALIPRANTIS: They also get a tremendous amount of money from private sources as well.

ED WHALEN: That is correct.

PROFESSOR ALIPRANTIS: This is only an experiment.

ED WHALEN: That is right. This is an experiment. It is a little different when you have \$12,500 per student vs \$4,000 or \$5,000 per student. But, whether it is a lot of dollars per student or relatively thinner amount, it certainly behooves us to do the best we can with the resources that we have. I think that is the expectation of this system.

PROFESSOR KARLSON: When you expand this to other campuses, it is my understanding that the state subsidizes education at different campuses at different levels per student hours. The same number of student hours at the Bloomington campus would generate significantly more than it would for that number of student hours at this campus. Is that correct? So, you then set the basis of the income generated the basis of the support that you are going to receive.

ED WHALEN: I don't think that is accurate. That is the situation now that there are different amounts of support for students now among campuses. This will not necessarily change that distribution.

PROFESSOR KARLSON: I understand that but what I am saying is if you say what you receive is based upon enrollment that favors those campuses that have a higher subsidy level. Is that correct? If you institutionalize it across the university level, if you start spreading it out to the other campuses what it does then is institutionalize those differences and use those differences as a basis of treating the campuses differently.

ED WHALEN: No more than is the current situation. It is true that there are different levels of support among all the campuses. There is nothing about Responsibility Center Budgeting which in effect will move dollars from one campus to another.

PROFESSOR YOKOMOTO: Did you check to see if each academic unit was a center on its own?

ED WHALEN: Right.

PROFESSOR YOKOMOTO: In the future, let's suppose there is a unit that is deemed highly desirable, highly necessary but can't seem to fund itself through its credit hours, could they be moved into a center with a more prosperous school?

ED WHALEN: I would anticipate that the number of Responsibility Centers will vary. One of the considerations that is going on right now is, are there Responsibility Centers that are identified for the right number for the Indianapolis campus? Should the list be expanded or contracted? I am sure that that kind of consideration will continue as well. But, one has to understand that every school is not self-sustaining in the general fund, that every schools receives income, that that many schools generate indirect costs recovery income from grants and contracts. Every school is subsidized with a state appropriation. When one looks at any one school; one will see that maybe 40 percent of this school's income, which covers not only its direct costs but indirect costs comes from state support. In another school, it may be 80 percent. It is in the variations of those proportions that the priorities of the institutions, the differences in pedagogy among the schools, and the various quality levels are going to be reflected and are reflected now.

PROFESSOR FREDLAND: This second semester I have begun to endure comforting reassurances, but I feel no more confident now than I did at the beginning of last semester. As department chairman, when I looked at this, I saw nothing but negative affects upon the quality of academic programs. Because of the One University system, we can't be entrepreneurs in the genuine sense of that word because we have to work within the budget constraints. What do I do when I think about budgeting if the of department chairman, is to find out how I can teach students as cheaply as possible and how I can get as much money as I can? Those thoughts, however meritorious they might be in other arenas in our society, don't lead necessarily to academic quality. Nothing that you have said has made me feel very good except for the 20 percent tax that was given to arts and sciences.

ED WHALEN: One of our concerns is the effect that it has on academic behavior and priorities. We went to an institution which had been operating with Responsibility Center Budgeting for some six or seven years. They had had to grapple with this issue as well. One of things that was apparent was that after all of this period of time, there had not been an effect that Responsibility Center Budgeting was percolating down to the departmental level. There was some that was operating at the school dean's level and had not affected the faculty or departmental behavior. This is why I said, if you know someone who has experienced this, you should talk to them. Lynn Silverman, for example, said that he was a faculty member when they put in Revenue Center Management. He couldn't tell us too much about what the transition was like because he was doing his thing as a faculty member. That is the way that Responsibility Center Budgeting should be. If we do the job right, it ought not to interfere with the kinds of things that faculty members are concerned about. It should provide an environment for resource allocation at the school level among schools but at the campus level it shouldn't get in the way of people getting their job done. That was one thing that we observed. There is always the other aspect, and that is will people be concerned about competition among schools? That is, schools offering courses that may belong in the jurisdiction of others. That is why they recommended the involvement of the deans in the system. They tend to monitor themselves. When that kind of behavior is manifested, corrective action is taken. So, a system of check and balances is a concern. It is one that they had. They evidently have been able to master the problems.

PROFESSOR MCATEER: Will a list of centers on our campus be generated for us?

ED WHALEN: A list of centers for the Indianapolis campus? Certainly. That is existing information and I sure that it can be made available. We were talking about full disclosure. That ought to be a fairly easy thing to disclose.

UNKNOWN: Has this ever been tried in a public institution? All of the examples that you talked about were private institutions.

ED WHALEN: The only other place where I know about of this type of approach being used by a public institution is at the University of Alabama at Birmingham. I haven't really explored it well enough to really give you the nuts and bolts of it. The University of Alabama at Birmingham started out as a School of Medicine and then other schools were added. Their legislature awarded appropriations to each of the schools. After a while, it was thought, "Here we have a collection of schools. Aren't there some of these costs that we could pool?" I have heard but haven't followed up on it, that they were actually going to moving away from that system. In other words, the legislature was no longer going to appropriate dollars. The University of Alabama at Huntsville also, I understand, has made a move toward that system. But, it is a very different kind of institution, mainly a research activity with some educational programs surrounding it. Those are the only examples that I know of where there has been a move by public institutions to this kind of arrangement.

PROFESSOR CHAMPION: As more campuses become involved, is it anticipated that Responsibility Center Budgeting can cut across campuses?

ED WHALEN: That is a possibility. It is separate from any move toward Responsibility Center Budgeting. In other words, right now, for example, the School of Medicine offers programs at Northwest, Fort Wayne, and Bloomington. There are also other schools where that is not the case. That is a question that could be addressed with or without Responsibility Center Budgeting.

PROFESSOR ABEL: What is the role of faculty in this process?

ED WHALEN: As the mechanism is put into place, there will certainly be need for advice and counsel and expressions of concern about what we need to watch and where things are getting out of control. There very well may need to be monitoring mechanisms because, if these Responsibility Centers are operating as units, and there are support units as well as academic units, there will be costs where there will have to be some sort of monitoring of that process. There is going to have to be some sort of monitoring of academic jurisdiction. Those are certainly appropriate roles for faculty input.

UNKNOWN: In some professional schools, the state contributions of salaries is minimal and there is a large portion of the salaries coming from patient income. How do you propose to handle that?

ED WHALEN: One looks at direct costs and you see what is brought in by the way of income. It appears that some units are virtually self-sustaining. That isn't the case when the indirect costs are included as well as the direct costs. In that case, everybody is getting subsidized. We have preliminary data that demonstrate

that. Everyone is participating in state support in varying degrees. In some schools it may be as high as 80 percent and others it may be as low as 40 percent, but there is that level of state support that affects them all. In the direction of setting institutional priorities or campus priorities, it is that proportion of state support which would change in response to those objectives.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: Looking at the time and the other agenda items, I think we should conclude this part of the agenda. I thank Ed Whalen for coming and discussing this with us. This is a topic that is going to be discussed over the next couple of years and we will be counting on you to bring to the attention of the people who are doing that planning and decision making some of the insights and problems that you may encounter. Responsibility Center Budgeting will work if everyone understands it and will work with us to try to make it efficient so that it serves the interest of the University. Thanks, Ed.

PROFESSOR BESCH: It was indicated how the faculty might help in Responsibility Center Budgeting, but my question would be "Why should they?" It seems to me that we should recruit the faculty rather than just saying "We might be able to help."

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: I think there is some substantial promise and opportunity in Responsibility Center Budgeting. It is very complicated but some of the advantages that we see include putting decision making -- the costs and benefits -- all in the same place so that there aren't as many free goods. Those are goods which are consumed without sufficient sensitivity to their cost. If something is free and you don't have to pay for it, then you will use more of it than you would if you had to pay for it. If you are accountable for paying for everything that you use, then you can see how you are paying for it. We will have less of the kind of excessive use of free goods than we may have from time to time now. There are opportunities for deans and faculty in Responsibility Center Budgeting to keep things that they generate for themselves which they don't get to keep now. I think that will be a wonderful incentive. I don't think we will abandon our ambitions for high academic standards in order to make money. I don't think that is what we ought to be doing. I think Responsibility Center Budgeting will present opportunities to take advantage of some of the good things that are brought into the university, and the people who are bringing them in will get more direct positive impact from them. For those reasons I think faculty members ought to make a good faith effort to see if we can work this out to make it serve all of our interests. If we give a good faith effort and it doesn't work, and we see that it is causing more problems than benefits, then I suppose that the whole thing should be reconsidered. But, we are going into it on the assumption that that won't happen and the assumption that faculty members will, in good faith, suggest to us how the system can be made to work well.

PROFESSOR BESCH: What I was trying to get at was the intended actual level of the faculty members who are generating grants, doing teaching, research, and various activities, below the level of administrative, it seems to me that those incentives are very important for the success of the Responsibility Center Budgeting. I think we all want it to be successful but what it seems we need is to understand what those incentives are at our level

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: I think that is what we will learn this next year. We don't

know right now how it will all work. I think it is too early for us to be confident that it is going to work well. When we start out with a new set of books, we will see how it looks. Then we will spend a year evaluating the new approach before anything is really done substantively. During that time, I think the Responsibility Centers will have an opportunity to evaluate it.

AGENDA ITEM X - Unfinished Business

There was no Unfinished Business.

AGENDA ITEM XI - New Business

There was no New Business.

AGENDA ITEM XII - Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS

FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING

February 2, 1989

Law School, Room 116

3:30 - 5:30 p.m.

Members Present: Administrative: Gerald L. Bepko, Carol D. Nathan, William M. Plater. Deans: John Barlow, Robert W. Keck, R. Bruce Renda, Sheldon Siegel, William J. Voos. Director: Barbara Fischler. Faculty: C. D. Aliprantis, Elaine Alton, Carl Andres, Margaret Applegate, Richard Beck, Willard Bostwick, Cecil Brown, Victoria Champion, William Crabtree, Theodore Cutshall, Eleanor Donnelly, Dornith Doherty, Elizabeth Evenbeck, Mary Feeley, Celestine Hamant, Narcissa Hocker, Dolores Hoyt, Charles Hutton, Lucreda Hutton, Jerome Kaplan, Henry Karlson, Christian Kloesel, Richard Lawlor, James McAteer, Dana McDonald, Judy Z. Miller, B. Keith Moore, Bernard Morrel, Byron Olson, Gerald Powers, Edward Robbins, Richard Rogers, Beverly Ross, A. N. Siakotos, Karen Teeguarden, Donald R. Tharp, Jeffery Vessely, Kathleen Warfel, Henry Wellman, Charles Yokomoto, Jack Zecher.

Alternates Present: Deans: James Carter for Walter J. Daly; Donald Tharp for H. William Gilmore; Hitwant Sidhu for P. Nicholas Kellum; Hugh Wolf for Howard Mehlinger, J. M. Ebbert for James Weigand; Georgia B. Miller for Jack Wentworth. Faculty: Janet Chorpenning for Juanita Keck, Janatha Ashton for Donna Marzouk, C. Subah Packer for Richard Meiss, Phyllis J. Scherle for Richard Peterson.

Members Absent: Deans: Constance Baker, A. James Barnes, Trevor Brown, Norman Lefstein. Faculty: Billy Abel, Morris Aprison, Frederick Bein, H. R. Besch, Jr., David Burns, Mervyn Cohen, Dewey Conces, Joseph DiMicco, Robert Dittus, John Eble, Richard Fredland, Morris French, Bhuwan Garg, Donald Gartner, Phillip Gibbs, Vania Goodwin, Robert A. Harris, Eugene Helveston, Louis Holtzclaw, Florence Juillerat, Richard Kovacs, Michael Kubek, John Lappas, Rebecca Markel, Robert Mendelsohn, Michael Mitchell, Carl Newton, Byron Olson, Jeanne Pontious, Douglas, Rex, Richard Rink, Glen Sagraves, Susan Sutton, Karen West, Harriet Wilkins.

Ex Officio Members Present: Glenda Smith.

Ex Officio Members Absent: Shirley Newhouse.

Visitors: Patricia Blake, School of Nursing, Susan Eastman, Co-chair, UFC Faculty Affairs Committee; Beverly Hill, Chair, IUPUI Budgetary Affairs Committee, Kim Manlove, Dean of the Faculties Office, Robert Schaible, School of Medicine.

AGENDA ITEM I - Memorial Resolution - G. Kent Frandsen, School of Law (read by Lawrence Wilkins, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs)

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: We are ready to begin today's business which begins with the reading of a memorial resolution. This resolution will make me feel more deeply than others. It is a memorial resolution for a former Associate Dean and professor in the Law School, G. Kent Frandsen. It will be read by the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs from the Law School, Larry Wilkins. [Professor Wilkins

read the memorial resolution and a moment of silence was observed.]

AGENDA ITEM II - Approval of Minutes - January 5, 1989

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: The minutes of the last meeting were distributed. Do we have a motion for the approval of the minutes? [motion made and seconded] The minutes are approved.

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

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: The only two things that I would like to mention by way of Presiding Officer's Business have to do with the Board of Trustees meeting that is coming up this Saturday. We have two appointments that will be recommended.

First, I am sure that everyone in the School of Science, as well as everyone on campus, will be pleased to know that David Stocum, a member of the faculty at the University of Illinois at Urbana, a biologist of considerable note, has agreed to become and will be recommended to our Trustees of Indiana University to become the next dean of the School of Science. We are very pleased that David is prepared to accept the appointment if it is approved by the Trustees and we have no reason to doubt that it will be. We think that he will provide outstanding leadership for the school. He is the first choice of all of the various constituencies of the school.

Secondly, we will be recommending to the Trustees a person to accept the responsibilities that we have discussed with you before under the heading of Campus Interrelations. As you recall, in the Campus Planning document there was considerable discussion of minority participation, minority recruitment, and affirmative action. In that section, we proposed that we create a position that would be known as director or Dean of Campus Interrelations. We have been recruiting for that position for several months. We have a person who will accept appointment to take those responsibilities, and others. The person who has agreed to accept the appointment, if made by the Trustees, will be a member of the faculty and will also, because of the prominence that we would like to give to this position, accept the title of Vice Chancellor. I think some of you have been involved in this process and may know who this person is, but he has asked us to not announce in public our recommendation until Saturday at the Trustees' meeting. He is in the process of contacting persons whom he knows well, and that he would like them to find out about his appointment here from him rather than to find out about it through word of mouth or from the media. Therefore, we are not in a position to announce what our recommendation will be on Saturday, but we can tell you that we will recommend one of the candidates for the position who will be a member of the faculty and Vice Chancellor. This person will have in the portfolio of responsibilities the duties in general, which we have designated in the section of the campus planning document titled campus interrelations, although I think there will be additional responsibilities associated with the position.

We did discuss this matter with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council late last week, and they were in agreement with the way in which this appointment is to be characterized as well as the appointment itself.

AGENDA ITEM IV - Executive Committee Report - Jeffery Vessely, Secretary

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: The next order of business is the Executive Committee Report from Jeff Vessely.

PROFESSOR VESSELY: I should announce that today's minutes, because of what we anticipate will be, at least for the next couple of months, an ongoing discussion of the Salary Policy, will be verbatim, by my previous definition of verbatim, for the entire meeting.

Discussion continues on the revision of the Guidelines for the preparation of Promotion and Tenure Dossiers. The Faculty Affairs Committee continues to meet and will have a report on that as soon as they have finished and we have submitted our recommended changes or revisions to the Dean of Faculties.

The UFC committees involved continue to deliberate on the policy of not having year-round TIAA/CREF for 10-month employees. We anticipate again, because of this lengthy salary policy discussion, that will not come before the UFC until the March meeting.

The Dean of Faculties and I are sending out a letter asking for nominations for a colloquium for outstanding faculty that will take place in May. Each faculty member should receive a copy of that letter or memo asking you to submit your nominations. It is important that you proceed with that very quickly because the deadline that was given to us by the FACET Committee, which Dorothy Webb and myself are members, is coming up quite soon and we have asked that the nominations be returned no later than February 15th. By the time you get this memo, (you should receive it today or tomorrow), you won't have much time and we want to get five nominees and the five best faculty members to participate in this first-time effort. Dean Plater, maybe you would like to emphasize some points here.

DEAN PLATER: The only thing that I would say is that the letter will include a two-page description of the program and instructions for the nominations. Once we have the basic nomination, we will take care of the additional paperwork. If you are nominating someone, it would be most helpful if you could determine if that person would be able to attend the workshop. If it turns out that it wouldn't fit into their time schedule, then there is no point in proceeding with the nomination. This is, I think, an important project. One of the results of the One University Planning effort is to bring faculty from all eight campuses of the University together to talk about ways in which we can improve teaching and emphasize teaching as the fundamental part of what we do as Indiana University.

PROFESSOR VESSELY: I had the opportunity to participate, as many of you did, in the first of the functions celebrating our 20th anniversary. I would hope that we would continue to see faculty support for all of these functions. Starting with the luncheon last Saturday, it has been very enjoyable for me. I think these would be exciting times at the University regardless of whether we were celebrating the 20th anniversary. That just highlights participation in those activities and I would hope to see many more of us attending those. That is all I have.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: In the emotional aftermath of the memorial resolution for Kent Frandsen, I forgot to mention two things. First, I want to say that it bothers

me a little bit, Henry (Karlson), for you to be sitting in between me and the door in the line of fire. (laughter) More seriously, I forgot to mention that we are embarking on the 20th anniversary celebrations which we hope, as we mentioned before, will take place all during this year. I have asked Gene Tempel, who is Vice Chancellor for External Affairs, to come and say a couple of words about what has already happened and what may be on the horizon.

GENE TEMPEL: Thanks, Jerry, and thanks Jeff for the comments you made. Let me say briefly that an anniversary is an occasion to reflect back and look forward. It is an occasion to draw attention to ourselves and I think we have done that well with the opening luncheon and ceremonies we had last Saturday. We had community leaders, representatives of the campus, representatives from the General Assembly in 1969, current members from the General Assembly, and people from the community and elsewhere who can help us with the students we educate, employing them, helping us with human resources and with the public and private funds we need. We used that occasion to focus attention on the campus. There was publicity in the newspapers and on the television stations, and having that happen during the General Assembly is really helpful. But now we need to move forward to the whole year. There will be two other big functions put on for the entire campus -- a family type of summer picnic, perhaps a type of tailgate party here on the campus, and a major academic symposium on the urban university in the 21st century, to take place next November. Many of the schools have planned activities and I hope you will participate in those with pride because this really is a time we can be proud of past achievements and look to a good future. The folder on the table has some of the mementos that have been designed for the 20th anniversary. I hope you will take those with you. The little pin that you see, which has the logo for the 20th anniversary, will be sent to the entire University faculty and staff here on campus.

AGENDA ITEM V - Salary Policy Discussion

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: Next we have a discussion of a proposed salary policy. Phyllis Scherle, Secretary of the Faculty Affairs Committee, will begin the discussion. There will also be a report from Budgetary Affairs, which will be presented by Beverly Hill.

PROFESSOR SCHERLE: Good afternoon. Richard Peterson, who is Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, couldn't come today; and he asked me if I, as Secretary of the Faculty Affairs Committee, would come and present a report on the responses of our committee concerning the Salary Policy, U5-89, which is dated November 18, 1988.

In general, we of the IUPUI Faculty Affairs Committee do approve of this document except for a few minor revisions. We are especially pleased with the faculty's involvement in the process. On January 17, we formally approved the following statement:

The Faculty Affairs Committee endorses the principle of the document and urges redrafting. The cost-of-living increase and remedial equity (based on cost-of-living) should be established on a University-wide basis, but the individual units should determine merit increments.

Dr. Peterson, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, and Dr. Susan Eastman, Co-chair of the Bloomington Faculty Affairs Committee, are co-chairs of the University Faculty Affairs Committee. This is the committee that is primarily responsible for the November 18th document, along with many other units within the University. There has been input from all campuses along with consideration by the Bloomington Faculty Council and the University Faculty Council.

Since Susan has worked with this document, along with other people such as Dolores Hoyt, former co-chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, Susan will present the major principles of the document at this time. Following the presentation, both she and I will be available to answer questions.

PROFESSOR EASTMAN: Thank you for letting me speak with you today. Richard was supposed to be here and give this presentation but he is out at a funeral today. Therefore, on his behalf, he wanted me to say some things that Phyllis has mentioned, but let me say them again. IUPUI has had constant input into this salary document over the two years that it has been under consideration. One version was passed in Bloomington, and even the one that you are considering now has minor changes from that, and we expect that there will be other language changes as we go into the future. As you know, any document like this comes out of various committees. We all know the story of the horse designed by a committee that came out like a camel. Well, this has a lot of camel sentences in it. We hope you will help us with those.

Nonetheless, the document does embody several large principles that both Faculty Affairs Committees on those two campuses and the Faculty Senate at Southeast have supported and we hope that you will support here today. I think they are the main things that we want to discuss. There are four fundamental concepts. In the front of your document you will see that there is a list of 10 principles, but I can cut this list down to four. The four things are:

1. Faculty Participation. Faculty should be the ones that determine who gets merit money or the class of monies that we are calling merit money.
2. Openness in the process. This presently exists in the Faculty Handbook -- that policies should be in writing, along with policies for everything including salary, and that would include merit for salary. It is explicitly stated in the handbook that the policy should be in writing and available to everyone in advance and that you should get feedback on how those policies were carried out. What we try and do in this document is go a little further and spell out more concretely how the feedback would come to you, because that has been one of the parts of the policy that has been abused in the past by some people at some levels.
3. The third fundamental consideration all the way through this document is Fairness. We started out with the idea of fairness, that we wanted to be fair during a time of limited resources. A great deal of this policy would not be necessary if we had enough money to do every-thing as well as we know we ought to. I think the first thing that we all could agree on is that we are all underpaid. If we all

could be paid a great deal more and if there were plenty of money to solve inequities out of some other pot, we wouldn't have to get into a lot of the convoluted things that are in this document. That is not a reality of life and it isn't a reality that we are going to face in the next decade. So, I think we have to deal with this and this is what all of the committees tried to address.

Concretely, what fairness means in this case is that we have to address issues of equity as well as merit. We cannot solely give the money that comes to us for salary increases to merit alone because there are just too many other inequities, and there is no other pot for those things to be solved out of. Moreover, that is the pot that has been used a long time anyway. We are not really describing something new in the sense of practice. Part of why the committees were asked to address this is because practice did not conform to what was written in the handbook. This is one of the big areas where it has never conformed. We are just facing up to that fact.

4. Flexibility is the fourth enormous area, which I want to emphasize a great deal of flexibility. This document is intended to serve the different missions of the University at all the different levels of the University at all the different campuses. Many of these things confuse people, such as fixed dollar amounts vs. percentages. Some people are passionately in favor of percentages and others are passionately in favor of fixed dollar amounts. In fact, we have to have both in the document because real dollars, fixed dollars, come to the campuses, and at the campus level certainly it is fixed dollars that are being distributed. Down at the school level, it will be up to the committee that you choose to participate in this process to determine whether they are going to talk about fixed dollars or percentages or both or set some range, however they want to handle it. We have a lot of flexibility built in here.

Then, certainly, we get down to the departmental level where this is all going to operate as well - the department, the unit and the program, the smallest units. At that level those committees will determine which way it is going to operate and what makes the most sense for you. No one is trying to lay down a new way of tackling things when many departments and many schools have handled salaries just fine up until now. We are trying to write down some of what of this is present practices.

Sometimes when people talk about the document, I know that they forget that it has to operate at three major levels at the same time and on all these different campuses. It isn't possible to make it super simple.

President Ryan directed the co-secretaries of the University Faculty Council to reconcile salary practice with salary policy during a period when there was a lot of faculty uproar about targeting and marketability in 1984, 1985, and 1986. You probably all remember that. The co-secretaries of the Faculty Council gave this charge to the University Faculty Affairs Committee and Bloomington Faculty Affairs Committee simultaneously, and we also consulted all of the other campuses' Faculty

Affairs Committees. So, this policy has been coming from a lot of places for more than two years of time.

All of the committees began by reviewing existing practices in the Big Ten, all the different campuses of IU, and several colleges and universities where we had information. We looked at school level processes and departmental level processes. We always were concerned that we had to have something that would operate at all three of those levels. We agreed that there was no policy statement possible that could reconcile what we all do because practices are just too diverse. So, we had to come up with a policy that is in fact different from what some people do but reflects what most people do and, more important than that, reflects the best of what most people do, in the sense of faculty participation, openness, fairness, and flexibility. We had to lay out some principles with these kinds of ideals. Other than looking at the University, we also looked at the AAUP Statement on Faculty Governance. That includes the fundamental provision, of course, that the faculty participate in budgetary affairs in general and in salary allocations in particular.

The AAUP recommends that participation occur at every level, from the highest to the lowest -- the department, the program, and the school as well as the campus when possible. Participation should occur through campus committees, which we have called "consultative" committees in this document. A consultative committee should not be understood as creating something new body that you don't have, at least in most departments and most units on all of the campuses. Most have them already. It is a generic name for many other committees that already exist. The document does not ask that new committees in most cases be created because almost all units have elected bodies that represent them. Your Budgetary Affairs Committee, for instance, here on the IUPUI campus, is a committee of and appointed by your elected faculty body, and that makes it a consultative committee. I think there was a fear among many people that we were going to lay another level of bureaucracy on everything. We fully intend to use the elected committees, or bodies appointed by those elected committees that already exist.

One response that we received is that some people think that deans and chairpersons are the best people to set salaries. We certainly let them always play a large role in that process because there are many considerations in salary negotiations when someone new comes in or when someone gets promoted or tenured. Nonetheless, fundamentally, at universities we are not in a hierarchial system, where someone on top is the boss and the rest of us are employees. We really are in a consultative role in universities. Most of us like working at a university because we work with colleagues and participate in decision making. That is unique at universities and part of what makes us great and different and someplace we want to be. That is fundamental to our whole hiring, promotion, and tenure decisions. The idea is that the faculty makes those decisions and they are the best people to do so. It is not someone outside your field, such as a dean who could come from quite a different field. That is not the best person to decide about the quality of your teaching, service, or tenure in the complex that you operate in because every department and every unit are different. We all know that. My operation is not like your department, and the pressures that operate on me are different from the pressures that operate on you. My colleagues are the best persons to judge how well I did, given my situation. On the other hand, all our committees listen to all our department chairman. That person has information and that person was selected by us. Chairmen may be administrators, but they also participate as faculty

members so they take part in all of this decision making.

We do recognize in this document that there are many things that chairs, deans, vice presidents, and chancellors know something about and need to participate in, too. For instance, remedial equity. That is something where, for historic tradition or whatever other kind of reason, whole departments are given different treatment. Librarians and fine arts have these problems. Those groups have spoken out publicly and talked about the problems they have had historically as being treated differently from "real" faculty. Sometimes administrators can act to create fairness in that kind of way. That is a proper role for them. But, they would still do it with the participation of faculty as far as we are concerned.

One last thing that I want to mention is that questions are always raised about what does this word "resources" mean? It is money, it is the budget that you have to spend on whatever you are supposed to spend it on. In this case, we are always talking about salaries. Anytime you run across the word "resources" in this document, you could translate it to the budget of money of real dollars that you have to spend at a given level on salaries.

I think that is all that I would like to cover at this time. I hope you will ask me questions and I will try to answer them. Thank you.

BEVERLY HILL: The Budgetary Affairs Committee was also asked to deal with this issue. We met as a committee and discussed it at length. We then asked a subcommittee of Richard Rogers and Richard Pfile to draft a report from the committee's discussion. It was then reviewed by the committee, and submitted to the Faculty Council. We are distributing our comments (single sheet statement). I would like to have Richard Rogers discuss this with you and address any questions you might have.

PROFESSOR ROGERS: What we are distributing to you now is the response of the IUPUI Budgetary Affairs Committee to the proposed Salary Policy that came out of the Faculty Council at Bloomington and which the Faculty Affairs Committee has endorsed essentially. Our response is as follows:

The IUPUI Budgetary Affairs Committee voted unanimously [the original document read 9 to 1 but should now read "unanimously" since the one dissenting member has contacted us subsequent to the drafting and said he would like to join with the majority to make this proposal unanimous] to reject the ten principles guiding the salary policy proposed by the Faculty Affairs Committee of UFC. The IUPUI Budgetary Affairs believes that the proposed salary policy constitutes a movement away from the 100 percent merit system and is not, therefore, in the best interest of Indiana University and its faculty. A merit system fosters competition and the Budgetary Affairs Committee believes that such a system will improve the quality of the institution. The Committee does endorse a few of the basic principles outlined in the November 18, 1988, document and combines those principles with others to form the following counter proposal.

This is for discussion purposes. I am not moving this but this gives you a general flavor of what Budgetary Affairs Committee believes are the principles of a salary policy.

PROPOSED PRINCIPLES FOR A SALARY POLICY FOR INDIANA UNIVERSITY

1. Salary policies should be interpreted and implemented by a reasonable administrator. Deans and Department Chairpersons are in the best position to evaluate faculty performance and should be required to do so.

We are specifically addressing Point 1 of the Salary Policy proposal and are eliminating the reference to an additional level of faculty to review such policy decisions.

The next item is verbatim out of the original proposal. It is the one we kept.

2. At all levels, allocations of resources to salaries should balance two goals: (1) rewarding comparable performance, distinction, and experience with comparable salary and (2) providing the support necessary to achieve the missions of the university.
3. The primary factor affecting the allocation of resources to salaries is merit. A true merit system should be applied across the entire campus community; i.e., to administrators, faculty, and librarians equitably.
4. Administrators must be required to disclose the minimum salary allocations made for cost of living compensation.

This is actually an important point. Fundamentally, we believe that when administrators make allocations for faculty decisions, they are in fact, making some portion of those monies available for cost of living. We believe most faculty can't tell how much of their raise was for cost of living and how much for merit. Therefore, we want it stated as a policy that the dean of a particular unit or an administrator of a particular unit announce what the minimum allocation for cost of living was. Therefore, the recipient of the raise can interpret his raise. If it was all cost of living, he received zero merit. If it was twice, he received 100% merit. It depends on your interpretation. At least the individual would know where he stood and why he was being evaluated the way he was.

The next item is more of an addendum, but the committee felt so strongly about it, they wanted to make it a principle.

5. It has been observed that sometimes the compensation package required to attract outstanding faculty into administration at Indiana University substantially exceeds faculty current compensation levels. When a former administrator returns to faculty ranks, he/she may carry an artificially high base salary resulting from the now completed administrative service. The Committee recommends that a separate administrative supplement, one which is not part of a faculty member's base salary and which ends when a faculty member leaves administration, be incorporated by the University as the mechanism used to attract the best people into administrative service.

This should be fairly self-explanatory. What we are saying is to attract people into administration there is different market, a different level of competition, so therefore the 20 percent that is given for administrative service may not be sufficient. You must artificially boost someone's compensation level. It may not be appropriate to then let that person return to the faculty three years subsequently with that artificially high base. So, I think it is an issue to be examined. We don't necessarily offer this as the only alternative but we do think that this is an important area that a lot of people felt deeply concern them. That completes my response to the Faculty Affairs Committee's recommendations. I will turn it over to Jeff to deal with questions.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: Thank you. This is a discussion item. It is not for a vote at this time. The floor is open.

PROFESSOR WELLMAN: It seems to be that this is a fundamental contradiction that was just presented. This is exactly what the UFC was trying to say, identifying specifically where there is a cost-of-living component and identifying merit specifically. You both seem to be agreeing with the fundamentals.

PROFESSOR ROGERS: When you read the proposal's guidelines they make the statement that, under cost of living, not more than 50 percent should be allocated to 50 percent. Our belief is that, as soon as you make a designation such as "not more than 50 percent should be allocated to cost-of-living", in fact what you are saying is the opposite because the interpretation of faculty is not less than 50 percent should be allocated to cost of living. We specifically disagree with that and want to eliminate any requirement that all or any designation at all that something be allocated as cost of living. We also add on to it the burden to the administrator in saying that if you are giving zero for cost of living, that it is an announced policy of that administrator for the particular unit.

PROFESSOR WELLMAN: Would you say your second sentence supporting merit is 100 percent? You say you don't want to move away from the 100 percent principle but yet down below you say that identification of the cost of living....

PROFESSOR ROGERS: As of right now, my belief is that the current state, without a salary policy, is that we are 100 percent merit. That administrators have total control as it is. Therefore, my belief, is that the recommendation of the Bloomington Faculty Council is to move away from a 100 percent merit system. So, that prompts my first sentence. I am not sure I understand the contradiction beyond that.

PROFESSOR EASTMAN: May I speak to the point? We did a lot of research across the campus and what we found the regular practice to be is that there is indeed approximately one to two percent cost-of-living already assumed, de facto, because administrators at the departmental level must justify at great length anybody who doesn't get a raise of more than that and they are challenged on it at different points in different schools. It is a de facto practice. That is really a cost-of-living raise, but we are forbidden in the Faculty Handbook to call it that.

PROFESSOR YOKOMOTO: Just for clarification, you know that the committee is against a movement away from 100 percent merit system. Does that mean that your committee is for zero percent or some small percent?

PROFESSOR ROGERS: Our committee does not endorse a requirement for cost-of-living increases. No administrator is required under our belief to make any allocation for a cost of living because that would be against a 100 percent merit system. It doesn't matter to us that, in fact, administrators announced, "I have been giving two percent cost of living because in my unit that is something that I feel is a fair adjustment for everybody." That should be in fact announced. People should in fact disclose how much they give for what. A 100 percent merit system does not state that you can't give two percent for cost of living. But they are not required to give two percent or not required to give one percent.

I am not trying to define or tell administrators that they can't make any allocation to cost of living, so if using the words '100 percent merit system' precludes any kind of cost-of-living, then they aren't good words. That is not saying it the way we mean to say it.

PROFESSOR YOKOMOTO: Not being against something may or not mean that you are for it.

PROFESSOR ROGERS: Have I clarified for you what our position is?

PROFESSOR YOKOMOTO: Yes.

PROFESSOR PFILE: It is up to the unit. We don't like a number in there like 50 percent. I have already heard faculty comments like, "Well, we get two percent cost of living.." That is not what the other document says. It says "up to 50 percent." People interpret that wrong. I think it is better to have a document that leaves it up to the unit to determine what they want to do in that unit for the cost of living.

DOLORES HOYT: Originally, we felt that the 50 percent that was put in there was exactly the opposite of what you were thinking. We wanted to be sure that merit would be paid. For example, if the Legislature gave us six percent this year for cost of living, there is no money for merit. We are trying to preclude the total pot going all to the permanent cost of living.

PROFESSOR PFILE: This says up to 50 percent. It could be two percent, it could be 10 percent, it could be 40 percent.

DOLORES HOYT: It could be anything from zero to 50 percent. But it should never be more than 50 percent.

PROFESSOR PFILE: Under some circumstances, if the raises were very minimal, the dean may want to give 80 percent cost-of-living. If the University only got one percent funds, the raise may be so minimal that the dean may say "We didn't get much this year, therefore, everything is going to be cost-of-living." There may be no merit. Your system would preclude that.

PROFESSOR J. MILLER: I want to ask about something that came out of Faculty Affairs about the cost-of-living. One of my problems is that we always think that there are people on this side of the street who are getting more than people on that side of the street, people in Bloomington are getting more than people in Indianapolis. I think we have a real opportunity here to maybe make a basic

foundation and still keep equity in decision making and leave merit raises and merit decisions on a departmental basis. I really like the idea of putting something in there about cost-of-living because the cost-of-living benefit statement is actually punitive. The fact that we want to retain people who are doing a good job they may not be recognized in order to compensate some person or if someone is trying to save a pot of money.

PROFESSOR SCHERLE: One of our recommendations was expressed here. It makes clear an ambiguous statement in the U5-89 document which states "the cost-of-living increase and remedial equity that saves on the cost-of-living shall be established on the University wide basis but the individual units shall determine merit increments." So there will be a University wide established cost-of-living increase. This is open to everyone and determined by the University. Then individual units would determine the merit increases.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: Let me make sure I understand the point. The University, meaning the University Faculty Council, or the President's Office, or the Trustees, would set a minimum cost-of-living increase. Is that what you said?

PROFESSOR SCHERLE: We didn't determine who specifically was going to do that. We had not written a complete document. We simply responded to this document much of which we do approve. But, we felt that cost-of-living should be established in some way University-wide so that all faculty would get that raise and the units would determine the merit increase.

PROFESSOR WELLMAN: It would seem to me that a look at the records of salaries at the University, would show that they haven't even kept up with average inflation. It seems to me the faculty should realize that this policy of "merit" has been used by the University so they both are rewarding people for merit and not giving them a cost-of-living. If the policy were established where the cost-of-living and merit increase were publicized, and they said "The best we can do this year is two percent and the cost-of-living increase is six percent", that at least faces the fact of what cost-of-living is vs. merit. It seems to me that the faculty should realize that the policy of merit has been used against them as a subterfuge to make it look like they are keeping up with the cost-of-living. You can't keep up with the cost-of-living and give merit too.

PROFESSOR L. HUTTON: About this cost-of-living increase, we have come to a point where new doctorate students are being hired at a higher salary than current associate professors are receiving who are considered to be doing a good job. I don't want to name names but I know of many situations where this is true. That surely would make an unhealthy situation and it is because there hasn't been a cost-of-living increase of some kind. I think it should be brought to the Legislature's or somebody's attention that the University doesn't have the funds for an adequate cost-of-living increase.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: I think it should be noted that the University, more perhaps this year than ever before, but always, has made an aggressive case for correcting the deteriorating condition of faculty salaries. I don't think that there has ever been any lack of enthusiasm among the people who represent the University in the General Assembly for making that case, which has been made very well, I think. I don't know if there is anyone who hasn't been able to get information about the

fact that University salaries have not been keeping up with inflation.

PROFESSOR L. HUTTON: I suspect that it is an undefined term in those documents. In the School of Science we are told that the only way you get promoted or raises is to get grants. If you didn't get a grant, don't ask for it. This was said in faculty meetings in the public. So, merit is an undefined term.

PROFESSOR ROGERS: In this world of Responsibility Center Budgeting a lot of the problems occurred within the individual units and their particular administrators. An administrator often can hide behind things like, "Well, my hands were tied because I had to give so much for cost-of-living" or "I was forced to do this or that." An individual faculty member is caught in this chimera where they don't really understand how they were being treated relative to the group. We believe that if you hold administrators accountable and tell them that they have the ability to give from zero to whatever the maximum raise percentage to an individual, that individual then has all the information to deal with that administrator. If the administrators are treating faculty members unfairly, then that is the problem. That administrator becomes a problem. If you superimpose a policy from the University level, you create additional shields. If you create another level of bureaucracy, and I disagree with my colleague, where you get individual faculty members, an administrator is going to say "Well, I wanted to give you a big raise but you know that faculty review committee over here didn't want you to have that large raise." And on the other hand, the Faculty Review Committee will tell you that it was the administrator and nobody will be assigned the responsibility for the individual decisions made. That is not going to allow us to solve problems and find out who is treating whom how well.

PROFESSOR WARFEL: I was having a little bit of trouble with the across the board cost-of-living. Somebody said if you don't have cost-of-living, that is punitive. We are talking about judging merit and non-meritorious faculty. I don't understand why someone shouldn't have something punitive happen to them and why the cost-of-living has to be separate from merit. If you have someone judging merit appropriately, meritorious people can all be rewarded.

PROFESSOR CHAMPION: I have a question about disclosure. You address the minimum salary allocations but you don't address maximum salary allocations. Did you mean to leave that out?

PROFESSOR PFILE: That is a good question. That is something that we should think about. It is something that we should say that an administrator should give both whatever the minimum and the maximum raise might be. And then, someone even more clearly identified how well they were being treated or what the message or signal was for review purposes.

PROFESSOR CHAMPION: I think to fully understand or make an evaluation you have to have both minimum and maximum levels of salary increases.

PROFESSOR SIDHU: I think the Budgetary Affairs Committee and Faculty Affairs Committee are agreeing in principle that cost-of-living can be considered in the salary. As far as the Faculty Affairs Committee is concerned, that recommendation was based upon only one reason and that was that if we leave it to the individual administrators, the possibility is that some may get something and others may not.

Therefore, the question has been raised as to who should decide. If some method can be used that either five percent or four percent, or whatever, can be used for the cost-of-living, that means that across everybody will get it. If that can be done, I think the Budgetary Affairs Committee, even though they vote 100 percent merit, but still they are not against someone using the cost-of-living, that that is acceptable.

PROFESSOR YOKOMOTO: I have a question about Item #1 where it says "Salary policies should be interpreted and implemented..." I thought the whole process was to come up with salary policy. Where does the salary policy come from that is to be interpreted and implemented? In bold face it says Proposed Principles for a Salary Policy which we now don't have.

DANA MCDONALD: That is meant to be an implemented policy. That was put in as a draft.

PROFESSOR YOKOMOTO: So it is not based on any published policy in the Handbook or anything, or just what?

UNKNOWN #1: One of the problems is there is no operating salary policy at the time. I believe the committee charged us to try to draft one.

PROFESSOR VESSELY: Charlie, I think what they are saying is that when it is drafted, the policy then should be implemented by the administration and not this elected committee.

PROFESSOR SCHERLE: I don't believe that the committee is to implement it except to participate in decisions.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: I can't speak for what the committee meant, but I assume that the tension here is between having the schools, and the faculties within the schools through a system that already exists, set salary policy generally or having it done at the campus level by a faculty committee constituted in a different way. I think most schools have salary policies. The schools that I am familiar with have salary policies already. Therefore, it makes sense to say that they should be interpreted and implemented by the responsible administrator - maybe a department chair or dean.

DANA MCDONALD: Just because this first paragraph says that President Ryan in 1987 accepted the policy, we are not saying that today we reaffirm the old policy. The Budgetary Affairs Committee would like to think that we go 100 percent merit. Everyone is not meritorious just because they are employed by Indiana University. Just because you are a faculty member doesn't mean that you deserve a raise every year. If everyone in here thinks everyone else is meritorious, then you have wonderful colleagues. It just doesn't happen that way. Some people don't deserve a raise. There is just not enough money to give good people the raises they should have. You shouldn't take some of that money away and give people who are just plugging along part of it.

UNKNOWN #2: I just want to make a point that, while everyone here doesn't deserve a merit raise, I think we do deserve cost-of-living. It seems to me that if someone deserves to be punished, then they really don't belong on the faculty. So,

taking away from their salary brings up another issue. So, I think we should assume that everyone who is on the faculty deserves to be on the faculty and therefore, deserves to have at least a cost-of-living.

DANA MCDONALD: There is nothing in the contract that guarantees us all anything. We never signed anything nor did the University promise anyone anything other than a salary. To get more than that salary, we have to earn it. The fact that the State of Indiana can't give us all a nice cost-of-living plus reward those of us who are better than average is too bad. Indiana doesn't have all the money to do that.

PROFESSOR PFILE: People seem to be making the statement that just because we have a salary policy now there is going to be more money for cost-of-living. It is not going to make any difference. If the University gets less money than what the cost-of-living goes up by, we are still all going to fall behind. The salary policy is not going to affect the overall picture of how people are doing against inflation.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: As I hear this, it strikes me again that the basic tension is over where the focus for these decisions should be placed. You could say it is all merit and still give two percent or three percent to everyone as a minimum because everyone has at least that much merit, unless the faculty falls below a minimum acceptable level. Some money should be allocated for the kind of merit that everyone has been talking about here. I think the tension may be over where that decision should be made. In the schools, it seems to be going on now. Although there is some discussion in the proposed salary policy on how the campus allocates, most of the discussion is about how the schools allocate. I think most schools, at least as far as I know, are developing and have developed a salary policy. That salary policy may not be to everyone's taste and I think that may cause some to want to make these decisions at a different university level. Maybe that is where it should be. Maybe there should be a campus committee that makes judgments about salary policy rather than the school's deans and advisory committees that make it now. It seems to me that is where the real tension is -- over where the decision should be made.

DOLORES HOYT: I think, too, this was done to cover systemwide campuses and to have input from all the Faculty Affairs Committees. Apparently, from the discussion there we were trying to give some protection to those people who indeed did not have a policy and trying to establish from the ground rules what would apply for those units that weren't providing their faculty with this kind of information. It is true then that it is not done the same systemwide. Many faculty felt very uneasy about the lack of information. There is always difficulty in having one document cover all situations and steer clear of specifics as much as we can to make sure that those kinds of decisions are made to encompass those unique situations with each school and at the same time trying to guarantee them minimal rights that would include the cost-of-living.

Some of this has developed because, at least it is my understanding, there were other campuses where one unit may have gotten one percent monies to disperse and another received a huge portion. I guess that is where the cost-of-living came in on a campus basis systemwide.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: You mean School A got one percent and School B got 10 percent. I think that is a different issue altogether than the one that most people speaking here today have been concerned with. Most people have been addressing specific salary decisions within a school and how much out of a pot of six or seven percent is going to be distributed to people who haven't done more than the minimum and those who are doing much better work, as judged by the ethics and the standards of that particular discipline.

I don't think, and I don't know how far back I can testify to on the basis of personal knowledge, but I don't think we have ever had that situation on this campus. We have been struggling to try to provide as much money as possible for all schools. I don't think any school has ever been short changed significantly, nor, unfortunately, have any schools been rewarded greatly. If you could cite a situation on this campus where that has happened, I would be interested.

DOLORES HOYT: That particular issue did not surface, but we did have input from all of these people and tried to assure some sort of statement to cover those same situations.

PROFESSOR EASTMAN: One thing that I would like to add to this discussion is the issue of "super" professors and what it is going to do to merit money in the future. If there are professors who come in at salaries three, four, five, and more times your salary, what effects are those people going to have if they get a percent of your merit money? Maybe they will only get a two percent raise, but if the pot is already fixed dollars, that can be the whole pot. We are going to have to have ways to protect ourselves.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: Speaking as a campus administrator, I really wish we had that problem. We don't have any super professors at the Indianapolis campus. If you would like to provide a couple for us, we would struggle with that problem, happily. [laughter]

PROFESSOR POWERS: I have served on the Faculty Affairs Committee at least during part of the period during which this was developed. I would preface what I am going to say by saying that I supported and argued in favor of the position which our present Faculty Affairs Committee supports. It seems to me that we are arguing on two opposing forces. We argue that we ought to reward merit but on the other hand there is the element of a humane environment in which we all live. I don't think any of us can remember a period where there were sufficient funds to offset the cost-of-living and simultaneously reward merit. We have a tension between the two opposing forces. It seems to me that the fundamental issue that we are struggling with is whom we trust. Do we trust the system to reward merit? I don't think many of us do think that it is a fine enough art that those who don't get it question the legitimacy of the process and those who do get it say, "Of course, I deserved it and I am meritorious."

If we all were confident that we knew what merit was and that whoever it is, whether it is the faculty or administrators, would do it in an equitable and fair and responsible manner, I suppose most of us would be willing to put our confidence in that system. But, it seems to me that what we are all struggling with here is fundamentally a question of trust and who we trust that will be the most humane and fair and equitable. Who makes those decisions and at what level they are

made, as you suggested, where are we going to put our confidence that it will, when played out, be played out in a equitable way and that whatever merit is, and I don't know that we know what that is, that it will in fact be rewarded. I would have total confidence, I think, in the Budgetary Affairs Committee's proposal if I thought the Budgetary Affairs Committee could come up with a foolproof process for rewarding merit.

On the other hand, I feel that as perceived by my colleagues or my administrator, I may be perceived as not meritorious and therefore very realistically may be punished because we were working at a deficit. We are never getting enough to offset across the board.

DANA MCDONALD: I think that everyone agrees about a lack of information on the subject. In the last year everybody's salary, those who are paid from state funds, has been everybody's favorite reading material. We all are aware of this because it is on the computer and will print out anytime you ask it as to who gets what money. I am sure that there are a lot of people who are very much interested in how that changes on July 1. People will come to conclusions on their own. It would be better for administration to say what is happening and what happens in all schools for all administrators in public raises, not salaries. I don't think salaries should be published, but I think increments should be.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: I wonder about the question of confidentiality. In my days as a faculty member, when I wanted to know salaries I went to the State Board of Accounts and got them. Sometimes, in some instances, it is complicated enough so that you have to do a little homework to get into the system far enough to know, since some salaries come from more than one place. So, you have to know about that and that may make the investigation a little more complex. Nevertheless, there is never a time when everyone can't know nearly every salary at Indiana University. Most of them are published anyway in the schools, I think. Some schools distribute information about faculty salaries.

PROFESSOR KAPLAN: Experience has shown that so-called experts make many mistakes when they are required to make decisions. To allow room for error, buildings are designed with a large safety factor and when this is not done, one has a Challenger disaster. In the best of all possible worlds, deans and chairmen would make wise and well thought out decisions concerning merit salary increases - but this is not always the case. It has been my lamentable personal experience that my past chairman, who in one year pushed me for early tenure, in the next year tried in every way to block my tenure because I did not allow him to control my grant.

The result was a prolonged tenure fight and a number of years when he gave me essentially zero salary increases. The then Vice President, Ed Moore, realized this was a case of extreme prejudice and adjusted up my salary for each of those years. The dean who replaced the outgoing dean also realized there was extreme prejudice and took away from my chairman the authority to fix my salary.

I am sure my case is not unique. An across-the-board salary increase tied in some way to the cost-of-living would help mitigate the most extreme form of biased decision making -- i.e., it would provide a safety factor. The across-the-board payment would constitute say 40 percent of the total pay package, allowing 60

percent to be distributed on "merit."

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: I think we should mention, Jerry, in all fairness that there is a Faculty Board of Review process that is a very healthy and reliable process. You have been through at least one with respect to the grievances that you had. There is recourse. There is a safety valve that can be utilized if there is arbitrary action within this process. I think it is used regularly and it is very good. Now we have a suggestion from our Secretary.

PROFESSOR VESSELY: I think that, if I can reiterate the process here, the Budgetary Affairs Committee and the Faculty Affairs Committee would present, as they did today, these reports to the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee, in their infinite wisdom, will make a decision about this and then come back at a subsequent meeting and say "This is what the Executive Committee thinks." Then you can have three things to decide on.

What I think I will propose to the Executive Committee is that we have, either within the Executive Committee, and there are many esteemed colleagues outside of the Executive Committee who might wish to participate, a small group that will somehow look at or arbitrate, if you will, the decisions, recommendations and/or suggestions of the two committees inviting participation in this process by these two committees and then come back after the UFC meeting in which there will be additional discussion, to the March meeting with some more information. What I hope we would do is meet soon enough to mail this to you so you could read it and digest it and come to that March meeting a little more prepared about what to expect. If that is agreeable, then I think that I will at least suggest those items to the Executive Committee.

PROFESSOR YOKOMOTO: What about Item #5 that addresses faculty going into administration and then coming back? How about people who come in as administrators and then become faculty members? It seems like that should be included in Item #5 also.

PROFESSOR PFILE: The intent is to treat everybody equally. Any administrator would have that portion of their salary identified as the administrative supplement. Anybody who went back would go back to a base salary.

PROFESSOR YOKOMOTO: You say "go back" but what if you never came from the faculty?

PROFESSOR PFILE: I think when you came in you would have portion of your salary identified as your base salary.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: There may be questions that should be raised about that but I don't know if this is the time to do it. There has to be some flexibility. In other words, if the faculty votes unanimously that so and so should be recruited from another university one of our deans, and you offer the appointment and state that the salary would be "x" but a percentage is an administrative supplement, then, if you go back to teaching, your salary would be reduced to "x - 10" or whatever it is, you may come to a delicate negotiating point. The person may say "Well, I don't think I really want to take the job." In such a case, a very significant question would be raised and it highlights the need for some flexibility in order to

be able to do what the faculty would like to be done. In a given case, the faculty may not wish to insist that the administrative component be identified in quite that way. The fact is that it usually works out that way anyway. But, that is something that we should probably take up at another occasion when we have more time for discussion.

AGENDA ITEM VI: Question and Answer Period

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: We do have time set aside for questions.

PROFESSOR ROBBINS: I hope you all received the program for the Learning Resources Symposium. I am sure you all saw the Indianapolis Star today and saw that Herman Blake, already on behalf of his work through the University, is making quite a reputation for himself. We all certainly should take advantage of the opportunity one week from tomorrow to hear him in person and participate in the rest of the Learning Resources Symposium. The program which you all should have received has a form for you to complete and return, but I am now told that we also will accept telephone registrations. All you have to do is call Pat Vannoy at 274-7442 and let her know of your intention and interest in participating and we will sign you up.

I also want to alert you that on Monday you should receive information about the Ethics Symposium which is scheduled for March 3. This is a very intriguing program in which two former University presidents, former President Ryan and former President Sease of the University of Indianapolis, and former Secretary of this Council Susan Zunt will form a panel and will speak to this issue of Tenure: Ethical and Moral Obligations. So, we think you will certainly want to put that on your calendar.

I guess, in keeping with the Question and Answer Period, my question is whether any of you plan not to go to both of these important events?

PROFESSOR J. MILLER: There was a meeting on January 30 concerning the Office of Information Technology and University Computing Services having to do with changes in administrative and academic procedures. As a member of the Academic Computing Advisory Committee I am concerned about the impact of the administrative changes that will affect the IUPUI campus.

DEAN PLATER: I think the meetings that we had earlier this week were the first step to involve faculty in understanding what the implications would be of any changes. I don't think there will be any immediate changes. There will be some time for insuring that there is faculty input, particularly from Bloomington and Indianapolis, where so many of the computing resources are concentrated, but from the other campuses as well. A series of committees are being formed to help look at a range of issues. As a matter of fact, the first committee has been formed and will have its first meeting tomorrow afternoon, to look at the implications of the administrative side of this merger that you are talking about. Representatives from our campus include Bob Martin and myself. I will not be able to go, so Kris Froehlke from the Computing Center will represent us in those initial discussions. I think what we will see, if I understand correctly, is a series of committees unfolding. Polly McClure has indicated that she will be very receptive to having

representatives from IUPUI on all of those committees. I can assure you that we will work to insure that there are representatives there.

PROFESSOR YOKOMOTO: Referring to the January 19 memo from Vice President Hackett about the 18/20 policy, there is a word in there that now says "completed 20 years of continuous full-time service." The word "continuous" is not in the old Handbook. I was wondering if that was a substantive change or just a cosmetic change. What does that mean for people who may have left for a few years and then come back? Maybe they were untenured and then came back on the tenure track. Would those first years not count now? How would leave of absences be counted?

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: I can't give you any drafting history of this provision. But the way I would read it is that continuous means continuous service and that would be a change. I think we should investigate that. Why don't we report back to you on that?

PROFESSOR YOKOMOTO: What about the faculty member who came in under the merger with Purdue? About a year ago, there was a lengthy discussion that went on about some of us having lost credit for those years.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: I don't think there is a problem with that anymore. There were one or two cases that precipitated that issue. It was resolved in favor of giving full credit for the time spent in the employee of Purdue University before the merger. I think that is the policy now that will be applied in every case.

PROFESSOR EVENBECK: I have a concern about the Food Court and the smoking policy. There seems to be no policy in affect for non-smoking. There is no provision for people who are non-smokers. There is no area set aside. I know this body recently set up some policies for classroom buildings, at least. How can that be addressed? I have spoken with people there and it seems to be no action on that.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: The policy covers all University buildings. Kathleen Warfel led the movement that created this policy and she may want to comment. I don't think the Food Court is part of the University. We don't have control over that property because it is leased to a private developer. A private business operates the hotel and the Food Court. If you would like, we could talk to the hotel operator. We do exert some influence with them. We could urge them to have a non-smoking area. Is there not a no-smoking area at all?

PROFESSOR EVENBECK: There is not a no-smoking area at all.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: Kathleen, when you studied this, you didn't include the Hotel or Conference Center in your assessment, did you?

PROFESSOR WARFEL: I don't think we considered it one way or another.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: We will report back on that.

PROFESSOR ALIPRANTIS: Could you give us an updated report on the negotiations between IUPUI and the Olympic Training Center?

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: Nothing of any significance has happened since the last time we reported. We should be hearing something soon because the Olympic Committee meets in February or March. They were supposed to report back. I think that may be delayed. I don't think the local organizing committee that operates out of the Indiana Sports Corporation is ready yet to make its final proposal to the U. S. Olympic Committee.

AGENDA ITEM VII - Unfinished Business

[There was no Unfinished Business]

AGENDA ITEM VIII - New Business

[There was no New Business]

AGENDA ITEM IX - Adjournment

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: We are adjourned.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS

FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING

March 2, 1989

Law School, Room 116

3:30 - 5:30 p.m.

Members Present: Administrative: Chancellor Gerald L. Bepko, Dean William Plater.
Deans: John Barlow, Robert Keck, R. Bruce Renda, Sheldon Siegel, William J. Voos.
Faculty: Billy Abel, C. D. Aliprantis, Frederick Bein, H. R. Besch, Jr., Willard Bostwick, Cecil Brown, David Burns, Theodore Cutshall, Joseph DiMicco, Robert Dittus, Eleanor Donnelly, Dornith Doherty, Mary A. Feeley, Bhuwan Garg, Phillip Gibbs, Vania Goodwin, Celestine Hamant, Robert A. Harris, Dolores J. Hoyt, Charles Hutton, Lucreda Hutton, Jerome Kaplan, Henry Karlson, Juanita Keck, Christian Kloesel, Richard Kovacs, Richard Lawlor, Rebecca Markel, Donna Marzouk, James McAteer, Dana McDonald, Richard Meiss, Judy Z. Miller, B. Keith Moore, Carl Newton, Byron Olson, Richard Peterson, Edward Robbins, Richard Rogers, Beverly Ross, Glen Sagraves, Karen Teeguarden, Donald R. Tharp, Jeffery Vessely, Kathleen Warfel, Harriet Wilkins, Charles Yokomoto, Jack Zecher.

Alternates Present: Deans & Director: James Carter for Walter J. Daly, Emily Melton for Barbara Fischler, Hitwant Sidhu for P. Nicholas Kellum, Jacqueline Blackwell for Howard Mehlinger. Faculty: Linda Kasper for Narcissa Hocker,

Members Absent: Administrative: Dean Carol Nathan. Deans: Constance Baker, A James Barnes, Trevor Brown, H. William Gilmore, Norman Lefstein, James Weigand, Jack Wentworth. Faculty: Carl Andres, Margaret Applegate, Morris Aprison, Richard Beck, Ulf Jonas Bjork, Victoria Champion, Mervyn, Dewey Conces, William Crabtree, John Eble, Elizabeth Evenbeck, Richard Fredland, Morris French, Donald Gartner, Eugene Helveston, Louis Holtzclaw, Florence Juillerat, Michael Kubek, John Lappas, Robert Mendelsohn, Michael Mitchell, Bernard Morrel, Jeanne Pontious, Gerald Powers, Douglas Rex, Richard Rink, A. N. Siakotos, Susan Sutton, Henry Wellman, Karen West.

Ex Officio Members Present: Shirley Newhouse, Glenda Smith.

Visitors: Erwin Boschmann, T. Kay Carl, Division of Allied Health Sciences, Beverly Hill, Chair, IUPUI Budgetary Affairs Committee, Rebecca Porter, Chair, IUPUI Academic Affairs Committee, JoEllen M. Sharp, The Indianapolis Star, Gretchen Wolfram, IUPUI News Bureau.

AGENDA ITEM I - Approval of Minutes - February 2, 1989

There were no minutes to approve. The minutes of the February 2, 1989 will be approved at the April meeting.

AGENDA ITEM II - Presiding Officer's Business - Chancellor Gerald L. Bepko
Commission on Higher Education: Chancellor Bepko reported that Commission for Higher Education has asked that the universities provide updated ten-year services plans, which we call our Development Plan, along with mission statements for all

campuses. This will be done during the summer. There is a revised mission statement that was distributed with the campus plan for development dated February 1, 1988. This is the unabridged version of the campus planning document, which contains the complete planning paper for the campus. At the end of this document is the Mission Statement. Anyone not having a copy of this document can obtain a copy from the Chancellor Bepko's Office. Chancellor Bepko asked the faculty to look at this document and give him any comments which they might have sometime prior to the summer.

Responsibility Center Budgeting: He also discussed Responsibility Center Budgeting. The previous Thursday and Friday, Jeffery Vessely; William Plater; Gene Tempel, Vice Chancellor for External Affairs; David Robbins, IUPUI Budget Director; Edward Whalen, IU Budget Director; and Chancellor Bepko had visited the University of Southern California, which has a system that they call "Revenue Center Management" that IUPUI is using as a model for our system of Responsibility Center Budgeting.

Chancellor Bepko stated that they are very encouraged following the visit to U.S.C. He felt that very good conditions exist at IUPUI that will permit us to move into Responsibility Center Budgeting. He stated that one reason for being optimistic is a good system of planning both at the campus level and at the school level. He felt that all of this planning will be at a healthy state of maturity by the time work actually begins in the system of Responsibility Center Budgeting. Those planning efforts will be far enough along so everyone will have confidence that we will be building on a good base of planning. That is an important ingredient because the more we learn about Responsibility Center Budgeting the more we realize that the anchor for all the activities that take place within this system will be the schools' plans and the campus planning document. We will have to have constantly refer to those planning papers, to the planning concepts and to the priorities that the schools have set for themselves. That is the anchor which keeps us from emphasizing too much the entrepreneurial aspects of Responsibility Center Budgeting.

Many people have raised questions concerning how we will deal with problems where people encouraged by Responsibility Center Budgeting will become too entrepreneurial, focused too much on maximizing revenue and too little on the academic needs of our students and our academic mission. The answer to that question, he said, is in the basics that we will have laid for all of our activities in the plans, in the schools and at the campus level.

Chancellor Bepko also reported that the budget discussions with the Responsibility Centers are just about finished. He thanked the Budgetary Affairs Committee, chaired by Beverly Hill for the excellent contributions that they made to budget discussions which have been held with all the units that have been through this to date.

He also thanked Jeffery Vessely for the fine contributions he made during the visit to the University of Southern California. "He asked all of the right questions and was an excellent representative of the Faculty Council. It made the visit much more penetrating and it opened areas of discussion which otherwise might not have been thought of."

IUPUI Name Change: Chancellor Bepko distributed a copy of the Report on a Study of Proposals to Change the Name and Initials of Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis from the External Affairs Coordinating Council dated February, 1989.

The External Affairs Coordinating Council has finished its study of this question having spent a little over a year on this project. Chancellor Bepko commended Gene Tempel and the External Affairs Coordinating Council for the first-rate work they have done in studying this issue and debating about the various merits of different identifiers that we have used to describe the campus and their recommendations for the future.

The Executive Summary answers the question of changing the name of IUPUI and the answer to that is No, we should not." We have nothing better to replace IUPUI with and for that reason the External Affairs Council has suggested that we not change the name and that we continue to use IUPUI to describe the campus. There is enough capital that has been built up in that name, enough people are familiar with it, and our reputation has grown along with the name to the point that the External Affairs Coordinating Council recommends that we not change the name.

We should, however, establish practices that make it clear to the public what IUPUI consists of and that means that we should have some symbol or descriptive statement that would go along with the names of the various parts of IUPUI and that would make it clear that, for example, the IUPUI School of Law is located on the IUPUI campus. We should also take some of the funds that would have been spent on changing the name and invest those in developing a more consistent and comprehensive policies and practices associated with communicating the IUPUI identity for the community.

He stated that he was not prepared at this point to do any more than accept the report and thank the External Affairs Coordinating Council for a job very well done. We are inclined to accept the recommendations and to go forward with what we have historically used, but we think that, before a final decision is made, that we should give a number of our constituent groups an opportunity to give us their advice in whatever way they see appropriate including, of course, the Faculty Council and the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council. Therefore, there won't be a final and formal announcement on this for probably a couple of weeks.

He also stated that he wanted to release this report because it was ready and because he wanted the people in the University community to know what progress has been made on this very important project, and as well to indicate our respect for and the appreciation we have for the work of the Council, indicating our inclination to accept and implement the recommendations of the report but waiting until we have heard from everyone who wishes to comment before the final decision is made.

PROFESSOR ALIPRANTIS: Does this mean that all of us are going to be under one headline? For example, would the School of Science would be Purdue University or IUPUI?

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: It would be the Purdue University School of Science. It may be premature to say what it will be, but my inclination at this point and I think the sense of the External Affairs Coordinating Council was to have the Purdue University School of Science and the Purdue University School of Engineering and Technology continue to be the names of those schools. I don't think we could change that because the Purdue University Board of Trustees would have to change that. But to make it clear, the Purdue University School of Science is a part of IUPUI.

GENE TEMPEL: In early discussions that we had, that issue was settled first before we even started on the study. Every school should retain its institutional identity. What this report recommends is that each school also then find some way to identify first with this institution and second with this campus. If this report is adopted, we would be going to the schools and negotiating with the deans hoping to get their cooperation so that somehow on printed materials, such as letterheads, they will identify the identity of that school with the IUPUI campus. It was our opinion that by identifying each school to the campus as a whole, we would therefore raise the level of perception of the campus.

AGENDA ITEM III - Executive Committee Report - Jeffery Vessely, Secretary

Mid-Term Grades: Secretary Vessely reported that the Faculty Council voted last year to institute a policy for mid-term grades for freshman students. That was to happen this spring semester. It didn't happen because a changeover is being made and the computer system could not handle two new things at once. Secretary Vessely has talked with Dr. Slocum and this will be instituted by the fall semester.

FACET Nominees: At the February Executive Committee meeting, nominees' names were presented for the first FACET symposium. The purpose of the symposium, to be held May 14-16, is excellence in teaching. were received and the Executive Committee met in conjunction with Dean Plater. Dean Plater was to nominate five people and the Executive Committee were to nominate five. Those ten names have been forwarded and the FACET Committee will select five. He publicly congratulated the following persons on being selected from IUPUI: Michael Balmert, Liberal Arts; Charles Barman, Education; Frances Brahmi, Medicine; Walter Buchanan, Engineering and Technology; Virginia Harvin, Education; Roger Jerman, Business; David Leonard, Law; Forrest Meiere, Science; Arthur Norins, Medicine; and Andrea Ziegert, SPEA.

Fringe Benefits Committee: There are a number of items being discussed by the Fringe Benefits Committee. This committee is currently looking at a Proposed Family Leave Policy, a Health Insurance Task Force Report, the Executive Summary which was put forth at the University Faculty Council meeting at end of February, and also the 18/20 Retirement language as was brought to our attention by Professor Yokomoto. This committee has also decided to look into the description of the Exceptions Committee in the Academic Handbook.

1991 Calendar: The 1991 calendar is still under review and therefore has not yet been given to the Academic Affairs Committee.

Faculty/Librarian Salary Policy Ad Hoc Committee: This committee has met and will meet again soon. This committee was formed by the Executive Committee at their last meeting. Members of this committee are: Henry Karlson, Convener; Beverly Hill, Budgetary Affairs Committee; Richard Peterson, Faculty Affairs Committee; Kathleen Warfel; and Juanita Keck. After their meeting they will inform the Executive Committee and hopefully there will be another report on this document at the April Faculty Council meeting.

Notes Regarding IU Tenure and Promotion Procedures: The Faculty Affairs Committee has been responding to the draft which is appended to the agenda for today's meeting on the various documents surrounding promotion and tenure. They are also looking into the dismissal procedures.

Fact Finding Trip: Regarding Secretary Vessely's trip to Southern California, he met with the Faculty Senate and several members of the Faculty Senate at USC. They asked him how he got to attend this meeting. He had been invited by Chancellor Bepko.

AGENDA ITEM IV - Question and Answer Period

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: I have two items left over from last month's Council meeting which were raised by Professor Yokomoto regarding the 18/20 Retirement Program. I think these questions are answered in the most recent memo that I recall was in the mail as we were meeting last time. There was a memo to all TIAA/CREF participants dated February 1, which I had on my desk a day or so after our last Faculty Council meeting that answers one of the questions. That question has to do with the word "continuous." Under the new policy, in order to be eligible for 18/20 benefits, there must be continuous employment. That word "continuous" I don't think was in the previous policy. It was intentionally included as the comments indicate. A qualifying period of service must be continuous after January 1, 1989. Prior to January 1, 1989 only one interruption of not more than two years will be allowed unless otherwise approved by the Board of Trustees. The word "continuous" has not been interpreted much, but there are informal interpretations of it which I can pass along to you. Continuity is not disrupted by leaves of absence, either a sabbatical leave or leaves without pay. In order for there to be a discontinuity there would have to be a resignation from the University and a re-hiring at some subsequent time. If that happens, however, the clock stops and a new clock will begin when the employee is rehired by the University, unlike what may have existed under the old TIAA/CREF policy.

The second question has to do with Purdue employees who had served accumulated years of service prior to the 1969 merger between IU and Purdue. It is my understanding that, at the time of the merger agreement, Indiana University agreed to give all Purdue University employees who were participants in the Purdue University TIAA/CREF program eligibility for 18/20 benefits under the Indiana University program and count comparable years of service that had been given for Purdue University as years served under the 18/20 plan of Indiana University. There was a list compiled at the time of the merger and I don't think that every Purdue employee who was eligible got on that list. For whatever reason, I am not sure because we have had a couple of cases where the faculty member clearly was documented as having been employed by Purdue University, as clearly contemplated

by the spirit of the agreement that was made at the time of the merger and, in our judgment, clearly should have been eligible for using the Purdue service as part of the 18/20 fulfillment under the Indiana University plan.

If those cases arise and they are well documented, Indiana University will recognize the Purdue service and will give credit toward the 18/20 retirement benefits to the faculty or staff employee even if the person was not on the list that was prepared in 1969.

PROFESSOR ALTON: The only thing is, if you call and have had Purdue service before, you should mention it.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: They won't automatically do it. It may be because some names were not on the list. They may look at the list and say the person's not on the list so they are not eligible. It is clear to us now that that list, however it was compiled, is not complete and, if we can document it, and I think it has to be documented through the personnel files or records of the two universities, if we can thus document that a person was employed before and through the merger period, then the Purdue service should count.

PROFESSOR ALTON: Even if your name is on the list, you should still mention it.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: The other issue that was raised during the last Question and Answer period had to do with a no-smoking section in the Food Court in the hotel. I think it was inadvertent that a no-smoking section had not been created. We have been informed by the hotel management that they are now devoting between 30 and 40 percent of the space in the Food Court as a smoke-free area. They will police that through their housekeeping personnel. I assume that they will also use appropriate floor signs. They will be there as soon as they are printed. So, there will be a non-smoking area in the Food Court at the hotel. Even though it is not University property, not subject to University policies, the hotel management happily agreed to have a no smoking section.

That cleans up the business left over from last month. Are there any questions today? There were no written questions submitted in advance. [There were none]

PROFESSOR ROBBINS: Reminded the faculty that on March 3, at 3:00 an Ethics Symposium will be conducted in the Conference Center.

AGENDA ITEM V - Adult Education Week - Patricia Boaz

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: Our Adult Education Coordinating Center has become a real point of pride for the University. We get a constant flow of favorable commentary from the community about the services that are provided by this adult center. In introducing Pat Boaz, I would like to thank her for the excellent work that she has done as the head of the Center.

DEAN BOAZ: The National Adult and Continuing Education Week will be observed March 12-18. The subtitle is Adult Learners: America's Future. I have given you a handout of statistics and demographic trends relating to adult learning. This information shows clearly that the subtitle is prophetic. The present and future

role of the adult learner at IUPUI is worthy of the University's thoughtful study.

With the change from a manufacturing to a service and information-based economy, the ability to acquire new knowledge and skills is critically important. Thus, the need for retraining is more urgent than ever before in U. S. history. The numbers of adults participating in learning activities of all kinds are growing, but the full benefits to individuals and society are far from being realized. Large numbers of adults who would benefit from courses still do not participate in adult continuing education. Why? Three major reasons are: (1) lack of adult learning policy incorporated into major pieces of legislation, (2) the resulting lack of public funds to support efforts to meet the need, and (3) lack of awareness among hard-to-reach groups about where to go for help.

National Adult and Continuing Education Week provides an opportunity for the many providers of adult education to draw attention to the importance of adult learning. The spotlight will not be on one level of adult education, but will play across the entire continuum from adult literacy programming, adult basic education, post-secondary programming, and retraining programs to continuing professional education.

Let me briefly summarize recent events on the legislative scene which impact adult education.

The federal government has had a long history of involvement in helping state and local agencies provide educational services to adults. However, the main focus of federal education assistance has been directed at "traditional" students in elementary, secondary, and postsecondary institutions. During the last five years, developments at the federal, state, and local levels have brought more attention to the importance of adult education and created a climate for some expansions in programming. Economic concerns have generated anxiety about the inability of a large number of adults to read, write and compute adequately. It has become an accepted truth that economic growth in America is tied to the level of education and training in the workforce. As the problems of illiteracy and under-education have become more widely recognized and understood, the business community and government have begun to see adult education programs as an economic investment. The bad news is, of course, the federal budget deficit. So, while there has been a heightened awareness and concern about adult education and the need for federal leadership, the budget problems have acted as an obstacle to increased spending.

The Adult Education Act is the single federal program specifically designed to support adult education at the state and local level. The 1988 amendments provide a new focus of attention on "educationally disadvantaged adults," who are defined as adults who are performing at the lowest ability levels. States are directed to give preference in funding to applicants who will recruit and serve educationally disadvantaged adults. Organizations other than public schools are encouraged to become service providers. This includes community-based organizations, businesses, libraries and other public and private organizations. The biggest development of the past years was the increase in funding. In 1987 the program received \$115 million. The 1988 appropriation was \$136 million -- a real victory.

Public Law 100-297, the Hawkins-Stafford Amendments, contains a new program that will provide basic educational services to parents and their young children. The

goal of Even Start is to interrupt the inter generational transfer of illiteracy. Fifteen million dollars have been provided for Even Start through the Department of Education. A variety of organizations are eligible to apply for grants along with a local education agency.

This program is aimed at providing literacy services to adults in the work setting. Applications must be submitted jointly by a partnership of a business, industry or labor organization and a state educational agency, local educational agency or community-based organization. Federal funds will pay up to 70 percent of the costs of the project, with the remainder coming from other public and private sources. Twelve million dollars have been appropriated for this program.

The English Literacy Program is another new program for adults that is targeted at individuals with limited English proficiency. Congress recognized the needs of adults who have come to this country without a command of the English language and has authorized English literacy grants to focus services on these persons. Five million dollars have been appropriated for this program. The law requires that 50 percent of the funding must flow to community-based organizations.

The year 1988 was a very active and exciting year for the adult education field at the national, state, and local levels. Locally based volunteer organizations had more volunteers and served more adults than ever before. The Ad Council, the Public Broadcasting Service, and the ABC network all contributed to raising the nation's awareness about the illiteracy problem in America. However, in reality we have just begun to meet the needs of illiterate adults, adults in need of retraining and better skills, and adults seeking to better themselves through continuing education.

Two recent developments have had great impact on adult postsecondary education:

1. Section 127 of the Internal Revenue Code expired on December 31, 1987. This is the provision in the tax code that allowed employees to receive and exclude from their income, for purposes of calculating federal tax liability, dollars provided for education. It is not at all certain that the tax break will be reinstated with or without restrictions. Therefore, unless the educational benefits meet a stringent "job relatedness" test, the benefits are taxable.
2. The House and Senate have agreed on a \$3.3 billion welfare reform bill that would shift program emphasis to job training, basic education, and work programs for welfare parents in an attempt to move them from welfare into the workplace. Money only will be provided to the states for education and job training. States are required to have seven percent of their welfare participants enrolled in programs by 1990, 20 percent by 1995. The debate over welfare reform has now been shifted to the states where most of the details will be worked out. State welfare agencies, public school systems, and higher education institutions will be faced with a number of politically charged questions.

How is IUPUI responding to the need for continuing adult education?

1. The Division of Continuing Studies offers extensive and varied non-credit courses. This is a very popular form of adult education.

2. The University has established itself as a service provider in retraining employees of local business. Continuing Studies holds a contract for this purpose with UAW-Ford. The Adult Center holds a similar contract with Communication Workers of American - AT&T.
3. IUPUI has a national reputation for providing time and place convenience to adult learners -- Weekend College, Learn and Shop, Learning Downtown, off campus credit courses in area high schools, public libraries, etc.
4. The Adult Education Coordinating Center, established by IUPUI, is unique in the State of Indiana. Its comprehensive services include preadmission counseling, admission as a temporary student, guidance in the selection of degree programs, programming and advocacy.
5. An opportunity to prepare for university studies is provided by the Access Center to adults whose earlier education does not qualify them for regular admission.

I would like to see IUPUI celebrate National Adult and Continuing Education Week by encouraging faculty discussion of several topics pertaining to adult education.

1. Some current IUPUI and IU policies disadvantage adult students. Accelerating efforts to correct this situation would be a fine way to celebrate the week.
2. The presence of adult students in the classroom challenges the effectiveness of the traditional lecture format. Faculty discussion of alternate delivery systems would be valuable.
3. Some institutions are offering special programming for adults. This might be investigated for its possible value at IUPUI.
4. As reported recently in the Chronicle of Higher Education, some universities are reconsidering their degree programs, adapting them to lifelong educational rather than to preparation of young people for the job market and graduate study. This, too, would be a fruitful topic for discussion.

Active faculty involvement with any of these issues would assure that the value of National Adult and Continuing Education Week would extend beyond the ending date of March 18.

AGENDA ITEM VI - One University Initiatives - Academic Affairs Committee

PROFESSOR PORTER: The Academic Affairs Committee requested the opportunity to report to the IUPUI Faculty Council in order to bring before the faculty discussions which have been occurring with the Academic Affairs Committee. The intent of the presentation is to ensure that the faculty are aware of concurrent processes which are shaping the implementation of the "One University Initiatives" regarding undergraduate education.

Contained within the document "IU: One University--Indiana at its Best" (August 1988) were a number of initiatives which would define the content of undergraduate education by establishing the common elements or goals of an IU baccalaureate degree. From the broad statements of initiatives 1 through 9, the discussions have focused on writing, computing competency, a threshold experience, a capstone experience, and undergraduate research as indicated by the Progress Report published in February, 1989 which gives a status report on the endorsement of various schools on each of these lines.

The Academic Affairs Committee supports the process in which the faculty of each school determine the curriculum implications of the "One University" Planning agenda. Concerns have been raised in the committee that the discussions in various academic units have been limited by shorthand references to the initiatives such as "three writing courses" and "two computer courses."

Concurrent with the discussions occurring within the schools, the Council on Undergraduate Learning, which is composed of the deans of the various schools, has met to discuss the undergraduate education initiatives. A representative from the Academic Affairs Committee is a member of the Council to serve as a liaison between the Council and the IUPUI Academic Affairs Committee and the Faculty Council. An advisory committee to the Council has been considering the interpretation of the initiatives and reported at the January meeting of the Council concerning the writing, computer competency, and capstone initiatives.

The Academic Affairs Committee felt that the faculty should be informed of these concurrent discussions so that the process of defining and implementing the initiatives can continue smoothly and expeditiously. Dean Plater has contributed to the process of disseminating information by sending to you information on the last meeting of the Council on Undergraduate Learning. Continuation of this exchange of information should assist the faculty in their deliberations. For example, at the last meeting of the Council on Undergraduate Learning, discussion of a method to assess the computer competency of entering students was discussed. The Academic Affairs Committee believes that knowledge of their discussions will assist academic unit faculty in their deliberations so that they can move beyond endorsing the initiatives to implementing the initiatives.

On behalf of the Academic Affairs Committee, I thank you for the opportunity to present this information to you. If there are further actions which you would like the Academic Affairs Committee to take, we would appreciate your directions.

PROFESSOR SIDHU: Do you have any information on implementation of the recommendations? Will the schools have flexibility as to how to implement or would those be implemented in a uniform fashion? What are the views of the Academic Affairs Committee at IUPUI?

PROFESSOR PORTER: From our discussions, the Committee felt that it was appropriate for each academic unit to discuss the initiatives and decide how those initiatives were to be implemented. The initiatives as they are stated are general goals. I suppose, if you follow that line of reasoning, the faculty within a unit are deciding how to implement them. I suppose they could decide not to implement them. Within the committee there has not been any discussion that these were not goals that we would support or that any faculty were having problems. They

seemed to be appropriate goals for us to move toward.

PROFESSOR SHARP: I believe you said that this applies to Indiana University degrees. Does it apply at all to Purdue degrees

DEAN PLATER: In the discussions that the Council on Undergraduate Learning has had, we have tried to view this as a total undergraduate experience on the IUPUI campus and have proceeded on the assumption that what we were trying to do as a campus would apply equally to Purdue schools as to the IU schools. I don't think the issue has ever come up before. The agenda for the Council, of which the One University Planning effort is only the first part, treats the total campus experience as a whole and does not differentiate by schools except when we come to points of specific school requirements. I suppose that if the Purdue schools decided they did not want to implement or adopt in principle any of the One University initiatives, it would be their prerogative to do so.

PROFESSOR SHARP: We have programs on about six or eight campuses within the Purdue University program and we try to maintain a common curricula. It seems to me that it is quite possible that this would mean that we could not maintain that common curricula.

PROFESSOR PORTER: Again, from the discussions that I have been part of which have included members from the Purdue mission schools, I think it relates to how one defines developing writing competency. If we start talking about three writing courses, then it becomes more restrictive. If we can handle the language with a broader statement of the goal, at least the discussions that I have heard, is that those faculty members said they thought that either they were already meeting the intent or that it would be fairly easy to meet the intent.

PROFESSOR ROSS: I just wanted to clarify the whole sense of the individuality of the schools. I am hearing you say that there is some leeway. Initiatives may or may not be adopted by a different unit, that we are looking at it from a broader scope rather than different directives. Would you expand on that a little?

PROFESSOR PORTER: What I am saying is that the Academic Affairs Committee, at this time, is not discussing the initiatives with the intent of bringing before the Faculty Council some kind of statement to be adopted which would mandate each school have x number of courses in a particular subject. Therefore, discussions are taking place within the schools, within their academic faculty in terms of what is happening with the curriculum. That is, unless the Faculty Council directs the Academic Affairs Committee to go back and consider bringing forward a set of statements that would be adopted by the Faculty Council and, therefore, bind all schools. I understand the history of something like that which was done in the past and was not overwhelmingly successful.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: The important thing to keep in mind is the goals that have been established as part of the planning paper that was distributed widely in several draft forms. Everyone was asked to comment on it. I think those goals are broadly agreed upon among all the schools of Indiana University. I also think that probably the Purdue schools would support those goals as well. I think the implementation phase is now under way for some of these goals. Of course, it is the philosophy of all the schools that the faculty will have to teach these under-

graduate students and the undergraduate programs within schools are going to have to be the ones who decide how we achieve the goals. There isn't any desire to impose a specific initiative on a school. I think that the process has been one that has involved broad participation. Everyone was told that these are the things that we think are important about undergraduate education. Everyone was asked to comment several times. Now those features of undergraduate education that should be emphasized are before the faculties of units, to be embraced and absorbed into the undergraduate programs as the faculty members see best. If you disagree that writing is important, if you say writing is not important, then you should have probably raised that issue before. I suppose you could still raise it and take a principled position and say undergraduate students should not have any exposure to writing while they are undergraduate students. Then you could decide to do something altogether different from the Indiana University Plan.

PROFESSOR SIDHU: If you will remember, a number of years ago we did the same thing. The Faculty Council approved some of the undergraduate requirements but they never got implemented. It is up to the units to implement them the way they want. If this is the interpretation, I think the Council has to take some action on that and state that these are the principles and have them implemented the way they want.

DEAN PLATER: From the very outset it has been a school matter. That is, when specific requirements for students are to be adopted they must be adopted within a degree-awarding unit or the schools. We are trying to have a campus-wide discussion so that we can remain coordinated and try to share ideas and share the same goals and philosophies about the meaning, purposes, and objectives of undergraduate education. That is one of the reasons that the Council was formed -- to provide a forum for the exchange of information and for a discussion of common objectives.

PROFESSOR YOKOMOTO: We need to work on our students from the point of view of professional growth, mental growth, and emotional growth. Students don't know how to negotiate, they don't know how to pose questions.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: I think that, in general, the ideas that you have just mentioned are included. I think that the people who drafted some of these things were worried about the very issues you have raised. They may have been worded in a way that is different from the way you have just articulated the concerns, but I think they are the same issues. If you will read the document carefully, I think that you will find that much of what you are concerned about is already stated.

DEAN PLATER: Additionally, if you will go back and look at the original statement of what the Council on Undergraduate Learning is to do, there is a very long agenda of items many of which touch upon the same points that you have raised. Although the Council has begun by talking about the One University Planning Initiatives, it does have these other topics clearly on its agenda and it will continue to follow through in very meaningful ways for our campus, if not for the whole university.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: I think that is a very important point. We are not limited to what we may develop in this One University agenda. In fact, I would be disappointed if we took only this as the sole basis for improving our educational programs throughout the campus. I think that we should be focusing on issues

beyond what is in the One University Planning agenda. I can think of things in the list that were made a part of our own planning document -- such as a specific list for the Council on Undergraduate Learning to consider.

GLENDIA SMITH: I would like to comment on some of the things that you just said. I am a student. Some of the objectives that you stated earlier, probably three quarters of them, speaking from a student's standpoint, are better achieved through organizations and clubs and things of that nature. In an active classroom you may not be able to reach those goals, although the University is providing for those objectives through other methods.

AGENDA ITEM VII - Unfinished Business

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: We have one last item which was not explicitly set forth in the agenda. We have a category called Unfinished Business and there is a piece of Unfinished Business which was incorporated in the document that was distributed. It is the draft of the Promotion and Tenure procedures. The Faculty Affairs Committee has a comment to make on this and then the floor will be open for discussion and comment on the materials that have been distributed.

PROFESSOR VESSELY: I am going to tell you from my perspective where the process is and has been and then ask Dean Plater if he would comment also. Currently, there has been an exchange of information through the Executive Committee to the Dean of Faculties from the Faculty Affairs Committee. The Dean of Faculties has also consulted with the Promotion Committee and with the Tenure Committee. Our intent was to hear from as many of the constituencies as we could in addition to these committees although we have asked the committees to be here and many of the members are and probably will comment also.

I would like to ask Dean Plater to give you background on how these discussions have taken place so far.

DEAN PLATER: As some of you will recall, late last spring or early in the summer I issued draft guidelines for the preparation of promotion and tenure dossiers that caused considerable concern and at the request of the Faculty Affairs Committee, withdrew those guidelines in favor of the previously existing set of documents. We had, at that time, two separate sets of procedures for the preparation of promotion dossiers and tenure dossiers. We were trying to combine these into one set of guidelines so that the dossiers could essentially serve both purposes and take into account a number of other points that have been raised during the previous year.

When we withdrew those, we had the expectation that the Faculty Affairs Committee would take the documents, review them, and make their own set of recommendations, which they did. Through the Executive Committee, they forwarded to me a combined set of guidelines that I then revised once more and took to the Tenure Committee and the Promotions Committee. The version that was distributed to you, dated February 9, reflects the suggestions and changes made by the Promotions Committee. It does not reflect the recommendations from the Tenure Committee. Our intent, following any additional comments from this body either today or through the mail if you would care to write to me, is to prepare one final draft version of these guidelines and send them back to all of the committees for one

final look with the intent of my issuing guidelines some time early in April that will go into effect for next year, so that the information will be available for faculty who are preparing their dossiers for consideration during the coming academic year.

I think that the chairs of some of the committees are here and can speak for themselves, but it is my impression that the document we have now represents a fairly high degree of consensus among all the groups that have participated, and it seems to be serving the intent that we had when we began this process. I am sure there are still a number of improvements that can be made, and there may be particular issues that you would like to talk about today. If, for whatever reason, the point that you are particularly interested in doesn't come up or you would like to communicate with me directly, I would be more than happy to have your written comments or suggestions.

PROFESSOR J. KECK: The School of Nursing's Faculty Affairs Committee was also addressing promotion and tenure policies. We were somewhat confused by Item #7 under General Summary. The draft said a minimum of three external letters and the next sentence says the Dean of Faculties recommends six external letters. Is it a minimum of six or is it a minimum of three?

DEAN PLATER: It is a minimum of three but, in the absence of any other circumstance to suggest that there should be a smaller number, it is my advice, as Dean of the Faculties, that you would be best advised to provide six letters.

PROFESSOR J. KECK: Our question is what is policy and what is advice? Is six letters pretty much going to be the minimum unless there are extenuating circumstances and if so wouldn't be appropriate to write that in and make it extremely clear?

DEAN PLATER: The intent was to be very clear that three is the minimum and that there are varying circumstances from field to field and from individual to individual. No magic number can account for all those circumstances.

PROFESSOR J. KECK: Perhaps it is the word "recommend." The word "recommend" suggests that there is something separate or different.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: I think that is the point, isn't it? There is a minimum of three, but in most cases it would probably be best to have six, unless there are reasons that are easily explained why six is not desirable or not useful to the reviewers.

DEAN PLATER: The intent is to provide as much flexibility as is necessary for the individual candidate and I don't think we want to be overly rigid. This language, as you can imagine, has been discussed at great length and thus far seems to represent a compromise among the various suggestions that have been made.

PROFESSOR BURNS: If the two sentences were reversed, it would help clarify it. It seems that the minimum comes first and the rule seems to come second.

PROFESSOR PETERSON: The only other question you might have about that is if the circumstances are explained, wouldn't that then be further challenged at

another level? For instance, if the department and the primary committee explained the circumstances, would that be challenged at the level of IUPUI or at the level of the President?

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: I don't envision that happening. I guess there is no practice with respect to this kind of thing. My reaction would be that the reviewing officers would accept the explanation unless it was implausible, I suppose.

PROFESSOR PETERSON: The reason I bring it up is because in past years, in kind of rush order, notification has come down that we need more letters.

DEAN PLATER: One of the things, obviously, that we are trying to do with these guidelines is to give as much helpful advice to faculty as possible far enough in advance. One of the intents of coming to this body today, and to all of the committees, is to make sure that we have a document that more or less represents not only what is practiced but what we want to be practiced.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: If the explanation is that only three letters are provided because that is all the candidate and the committee could get because nobody knows of this person's work, that may not be a reason. In fact, that raises questions about the quality of the dossier. If it is for lots of other reasons, which we have talked about, I think it would be accepted and there would be no question about the number of letters.

DEAN PLATER: During the current year we have not had a requirement of any specific number of letters. I think the process has worked reasonably well. When there were fewer than six letters, that usually has been explained quite satisfactorily in the dossier. The issue of the number of letters was never raised in the Promotion and Tenure process thus far this year.

PROFESSOR SIDHU: This is not a criticism of any kind but I notice on the first page of "Notes Regarding Indiana University Tenure and Promotion", that the first paragraph states the IUPUI Tenure Committee consists of six elected tenured faculty and reviews all cases. Now, in the Handbook, Section II, page 8, where the cases are referred to, the Tenure Committee hears only those which are controversial. It does not mention that all cases are heard by the Committee. My question is, if you refer back to this document either we change the IUPUI committee's performance or we should not. That is the first question.

The second question regards Item #3 on the same page which states that Indiana University's criteria for tenure state that tenure will not be The words "will not be" needs one word to be added. That word is "generally will not be conferred unless the faculty member or librarian achieves or gives strong promise of achieving promotion in rank within the University." This quote again comes from the Indiana University Handbook. Two lines which are very important have been missed. Those are "**Tenure consideration must take into account mission of the particular unit and individuals' contribution to that mission.**"

DEAN PLATER: Let me comment on the first point that you raised. What we are proposing here is not inconsistent with the IUPUI Academic Handbook. I can read it if you wish, but basically what it says is that the Dean of Faculties refers those cases that he or she believes should be considered by the Tenure Committee to the

Tenure Committee. In the past, this service has varied, I think, considerably. This year it was my decision to refer all cases to the Tenure Committee to insure that there would be some consistency and that they wouldn't only be looking at those cases that were "controversial" or problematic and that they could, in fact, consider all the cases. It would be my intent, as Dean of the Faculties, to do that in the future. I think the authority of that section that now exists in the Handbook permits the Dean of the Faculties to refer cases. The intent of saying it here is to make clear that we intend to do so in the future.

The other thing that I might add is that we do not intend for this document to replace either the IUPUI Faculty Handbook or the Academic Handbook, both of which contain the statements of criteria for promotion and tenure. These documents, of course, are widely circulated and are given to all new faculty when they join the University. In the future, as I think has been reported to this body, we are going to take the Academic Handbook and merge it with our own campus Handbook so that anything that is unique to IUPUI will be included in a separate section bound with the University Handbook, so that the faculty will now have one document that they can look at and not have to refer back and forth between the two to find if there are any differences between sections that deal with promotion in one document and the other document. It will then be very clear about what actually exists for this campus.

PROFESSOR YOKOMOTO: Who receives this document? Will this go to deans and the deans will be responsible for distributing them?

DEAN PLATER: That has been the practice in the past and we will continue to do that. It is difficult for us to identify in any centralized way, candidates for promotion, though once we have the tentative list for promotion and tenure, we can send to the candidates their own individual copies. But, that is late in the process for them to receive these guidelines.

PROFESSOR YOKOMOTO: If this goes to IU type faculty and it says Purdue people should consult their deans, if they don't get this then...

DEAN PLATER: We will try to make sure that the Purdue faculty receive a similar kind of notice, only with their particular documents.

DOLORES HOYT: This is something that you might want to give out in the packet of information to the new faculty because there are a lot of things that relate to materials that they want to be building through the years.

DEAN PLATER: It is our intention to do this at the New Faculty Orientation but not to send it to faculty as they are appointed. We don't want them to become preoccupied with procedures for tenure at that point.

There is one additional point on the routing form that I would like to call to your attention. You will see that in Section II of that form, with parts A & B, there is a provision for the Dean of the Faculties to record a vote of approval or disapproval. Although I think it has been fairly well understood, the Dean of the Faculties plays a role in the promotion and tenure processes. This has never been explicitly acknowledged in any of the previous routing forms. This represents an addition. Some members of the committees observed the change and wondered if it

was appropriate for the Dean of the Faculties to have an officially recorded vote on promotion and on tenure. My feeling is, and I did it in all innocence, that it is probably good to have the vote of the Dean of the Faculties to be explicit and accountable. The candidate ought to know where the Dean of the Faculties stands and have that vote recorded rather than wondering what role he or she is playing behind the scenes and advising the Chancellor and what role he or she has taken in the promotion or the tenure committees. There is a statement in the Handbook that says the Promotions Committee refers recommendations to the Chancellor and does not explicitly mention the Dean of the Faculties, though I think in practice the Dean of the Faculties has made recommendations to the Chancellor. The intent here is simply to acknowledge that process. As I think all of you know, the Dean of the Faculties chairs both the Promotion Committee and the Tenure Committee, but has not had voice or vote on any substantive matter; only to preside over the meetings themselves.

PROFESSOR WARFEL: In this part of the document, why are the committees given the opportunity to abstain?

PROFESSOR VESSELY: The members of the committee can abstain.

PROFESSOR PETERSON: In relationship to that question, why should anyone abstain except if he would be exempted from the committee vote? One of the comments in the report that we sent to the Dean of the Faculties and the Secretary of the Council was that we didn't see a reason why anyone should abstain. If they are taking the responsibility for being on this committee, they should either vote yes or no in relationship to the individual. If you abstain, it appears as if it is a no vote. If you are related to the individual, or you feel for some other reason you need to remove yourself from the committee, that should not show up as an abstention.

PROFESSOR VESSELY: The practice has been that if there are abstentions, that there is a statement written that explains why those abstentions were made. It may be that it gives an appearance of a no vote, but the statement generally says something to the effect that there was support for certain things in this person's dossier that the person or persons abstaining feel they should go on record as saying "This is what prevented me from giving a yes vote, but was not so negative that I felt compelled to vote no."

PROFESSOR PETERSON: If that is the intent, then we should be explicit about that and have a comment in these guidelines saying that an abstention should be explained.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: In any review that I have ever made, if the fact that there were abstentions was relevant to the review, I think it would be up to the person doing the review to find out why there were abstentions. As to regulating the abstentions, I am not so sure that we can do that. I don't know whether we can tell someone that they have to vote. If a person's conscience suggests that they cannot vote, then I don't know if we can tell them that their alternatives are to either resign from the committee or to vote one way or the other.

PROFESSOR PETERSON: That shows up as a conflict of interest.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: That is what an abstention amounts to. I have heard faculty members say that, although they do their committee work conscientiously, they haven't had a chance to do enough reading of the candidate's work to be confident one way or the other and, therefore, they would rather abstain. I don't know how you could deal with that kind of issue unless you allowed someone to abstain. As long as nobody relies on the abstention and interprets it wrongly, I don't see that we should try to limit faculty members to either a yes or no vote.

DEAN PLATER: If I recall correctly, the Purdue procedures do not allow for abstentions, but, in fact, panel members abstain by simply not voting one way or the other.

PROFESSOR PETERSON: The other issue in relationship to this form is the comment of the Dean of the Faculties. On his signature line the conflict that I have personally, and I believe other members of the Faculty Affairs Committee did, was that the Dean of the Faculties at this point has a potential of at least three levels of influence. Although, from my understanding, this Dean of the Faculties does not attempt to influence the committee which he chairs in reviewing these documents, there is the potential that his presence or his comments could prejudice the committee. He then has his own vote. Obviously, his vote and his recommendation to the Chancellor make a very strong recommendation. While this could potentially influence the vote of at least three levels, and I think in order for this to be fair to the individual and avoid prejudice on the part of the individual within the review process, that we are going to have to make some adaptations in the whole procedure in order to accommodate the signature line of the Dean of the Faculties. In other words, potentially remove the Dean of the Faculties from serving as Chair of the committee.

DEAN PLATER: I think that is something that could certainly be discussed and decided by the Faculty Council. I don't personally feel strongly about this either way. For the benefit of the faculty, I think that review ought to be done. I will say, and this is something that persons who have served on the Promotions Committee and the Tenure Committee may want to think about, that there is the difficulty of managing the administrative process of the Promotion and Tenure review without an administrative officer. There might be someone other than the Dean of the Faculties doing it. But, I think it would be very difficult to oversee anywhere from 80 to 100 cases per year without the kind of continuity that an administrative officer brings to that review.

PROFESSOR FEELEY: I would like to comment on the members of the Promotion Committee under several Deans of the Faculties I think that they have, from my personal observation, been very impartial. Whatever they may feel about an individual candidate, they have been very thorough and very impartial.

DEAN PLATER: I do think that sometime we ought to take up the issue of whether or not the promotion and tenure committees ought not be merged into a single committee, as is the case on other campuses and is the case in several of the schools, some of which have only recently adopted a single committee to consider both promotion and tenure. The intent here is not to try to predict the outcome of any such discussion.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: I should add, as a point of information, I know there is one school (and perhaps more) which selects the representative on the promotion committee in a way other than by having the Dean make the selection. In the Law School, for example, the Promotion and Tenure Committee sends its representative to the Promotion Committee and the Dean does not select.

DEAN PLATER: This is probably not the time to take up the issue of the differences between the Tenure Committee and the Promotions Committee. We have had the situation where the elected Tenure Committee had two representatives from Purdue Schools and no Purdue faculty are considered by the Tenure Committee and no representatives from the School of Medicine whose faculty are indeed considered by the Tenure Committee.

PROFESSOR PETERSON: In relationship to the composition of these committees, although I know that many of these are appointed at this point, I would be in favor of the procedures going to the point where faculty would be responsible for electing all of the peers, or at least a majority of the peers, who would be reviewing them in this process. That should ensure an even distribution across the various schools. To have administrators appoint members of these committees doesn't really allow for us to have the parallel review process that is intended by the documentation that we have.

The brings up an additional point that I would like to submit. As we look at the notes regarding for promotion and tenure procedures, there is a comment on the top of page 2, at the end of that paragraph that says "The role of faculty holding administrative appointments in departmental or school committees is a matter of school and departmental policy." If you take that sentence and say anybody can determine who is going to be on their Primary committees or on their unit committees, whether or not they are administrators takes away from the parallel review process of administrative review and peer review. In some departments, chairs sit as voting members of the peer review committees and, under those conditions, they are supposed to have their own administrative review of the faculty member but they are sitting on the committee also. In another sense, we have a double vote by that administrator. He can potentially influence that committee significantly by sitting in during the discussion and communicating with that committee during that time. Not that he shouldn't have communication with the committee, but it would influence the committee's decisions. I really feel like that, in order to separate the process of peer and administrative review, that particularly departmental chairmen should not serve on primary committees or potentially unit committees, if that is a conflict.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: We have always taken the position that each school should work out its own unit procedures. Some of the schools have adopted procedures that in some ways insulate the decision maker. In the Law School, for example, the Dean does not chair the promotion and tenure committee. The Dean is entitled to a vote but by a long standing practice, does not vote in any promotion and tenure matters because the Dean has a separate recommendation.

PROFESSOR PETERSON: There is written communication that goes back and forth. The primary committee and the unit committee write reports based on the documentation that they have reviewed. Hopefully, that is a good report that reflects their evaluation of this candidate. That report should also go to the candidate so

he knows how he was reviewed and would therefore have the option to respond to the administrator and the next level up based on an unfair review or whatever. I think the very presence of an administrator who is also going to be doing the review could slant the ways the reviews go.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: I think that the policy that we have adopted is to allow the schools to make their own decisions by the processes that have been established within the school for making those decisions. In my own experience, I don't think it is a good idea for people in one school to say what should happen in another school. Each school has its own chemistry and its own sense of democracy. I wouldn't want to see us adopt a rule that mandated how each school handled its own internal peer review.

PROFESSOR PETERSON: In relationship to that, I would request that we not include that sentence in here because I have some very strict ideas about that process. We are essentially approving of deans and saying that there is a real possibility of departmental chairs sitting on primary committees. I think it should not be put in there. I think we should go toward the notion of a separate peer review and a separate administrative review of the individuals on a parallel process.

PROFESSOR SHARP: Is this to be considered strictly an administrative document that won't be up for approval by the faculty or should we expect approval by the faculty?

DEAN PLATER: It is an administrative document issued by the Dean of the Faculties and it is being brought here for advice, comment, and hopefully to be a document that reflects as broadly as possible the will of the faculty. It is issued by the administrative officer.

PROFESSOR SHARP: I would like to make a comment on that. I think I have the consensus of the faculty that we are concerned about the outside or external evaluations. I don't think the faculty would like the outside letters of evaluation. I think that should be strictly an administrative review.

PROFESSOR ROSS: I think there is some question about the external letters. I had the question raised from our faculty. One of the questions is how did they arrive at six letters?

PROFESSOR VESSELY: In numerous discussions of this question with the President, he stated that he arrived at that number from Chancellors, Vice Chancellors, and academic officers from a number of campuses from that initial discussion. Not to be confused though with implementing what the President suggested that the number was a similar number that had been suggested to him by deans and other academic officers that that was about the number of letters that were normally received anyway. What he was trying to emphasize was the quality of the letters more than the quantity.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: Before we adjourn, I would like to remind you that there is a list of the newly elected at-large representatives and the IUPUI representatives to the University Faculty Council on the side table which you can pick up on your way out.

AGENDA ITEM VIII - New Business

[There was no new business]

AGENDA ITEM IX - Adjournment

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: We are adjourned.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS

FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING

April 6, 1989

Law School, Room 116

3:30 - 5:30 p.m.

Members Present: Administrative: Chancellor Gerald L. Bepko. Deans: John Barlow, R. Bruce Renda, Sheldon Siegel. Faculty: Billy Abel, C. D. Aliprantis, Carl Andres, Margaret Applegate, Frederick Bein, Willard Bostwick, David Burns, Victoria Champion, Theodore Cutshall, Eleanor Donnelly, Dornith Doherty, Elizabeth Evenbeck, Mary Feeley, Richard Fredland, Narcissa Hocker, Jerome Kaplan, Henry Karlson, Juanita Keck, Michael Kubek, Rebecca Markel, Dana McDonald, Judy Z. Miller, B. Keith Moore, Byron Olson, Richard Peterson, Edward Robbins, Richard Rogers, Beverly Ross, Glen Sagraves, A. N. Siakotos, Susan Sutton, Karen Teeguarden, Donald R. Tharp, Jeffery Vessely, Harriet Wilkins, Charles Yokomoto.

Alternates Present: Deans and Director: Catherine Palmer for Walter J. Daly, Janet Huettner for Barbara Fischler, John Werenko for William J. Voos, Scott Evenbeck for James Weigand. Faculty: Darrell Davidson for William Crabtree, Mary Stanley for Vania Goodwin, Monte Juillerat for Florence Juillerat, E. T. Muller, Jr. for Christian Kloesel.

Members Absent: Administrative: Carol D. Nathan, William M. Plater. Deans: Constance Baker, A. James Barnes, Trevor Brown, H. William Gilmore, Robert W. Keck, P. Nicholas Kellum, Norman Lefstein, Howard Mehlinger, Jack Wentworth. Faculty: Elaine Alton, Morris Aprison, Richard Beck, H. R. Besch, Jr., Ulf Jonas Bjork, Cecil Brown, Mervyn Cohen, Dewey Conces, Joseph DiMicco, Robert Dittus, John Eble, Morris French, Bhuwan Garg, Donald Gartner, Phillip Gibbs, Celestine Hamant, Robert A. Harris, Eugene Helveston, Louis Holtzclaw, Dolores Hoyt, Charles Hutton, Lucreda Hutton, Richard Kovacs, John Lappas, Richard Lawlor, Donna Marzouk, James McAteer, Richard Meiss, Robert Mendelsohn, Michael Mitchell, Bernard Morrel, Carl Newton, Jeanne Pontious, Gerald Powers, Douglas Rex, Richard Rink, Kathleen Warfel, Henry Wellman, Karen West, Jack Zecher.

Ex Officio Members Present: Glenda Smith.

Ex Officio Members Absent: Shirley Newhouse.

Visitors: T. Kay Carl, Beverly Hill, Samuel H. Hopper, Ph.D., Professor Emeritus of Health Administration, School of Medicine; Linda Kasper, Chair, IUPUI Fringe Benefits Committee, John Snyder, Division of Allied Health Sciences.

RECEIVED
MAY 2 1989
DIRECTOR'S OFFICE

AGENDA ITEM I - Memorial Resolution: Harold Adams, School of Medicine

Samuel H. Hopper, Professor Emeritus of Health Administration, School of Medicine read the memorial resolution for Harold Adams.

AGENDA ITEM II - Approval of Minutes: February 2, and March 2, 1989

The minutes of the February 2, and March 2, 1989 meeting were approved as distributed.

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

Chancellor Bepko reported on two calendar items. First, an Honors Convocation which is being planned for the campus for the first time, offers an opportunity for each academic unit to recognize academic achievements in the units through a campus-wide event. The event will take place on Friday, April 21. A reception will begin at 6:00 p.m. and seating in the Conference Center Auditorium will begin at 6:30 p.m. with the academic procession at 6:45 p.m. Chancellor Bepko urged everyone to participate.

Second, is a Person-to-Person Week which will be held April 25 to 27. A preview will be held on Monday, April 24, from 6:00 - 8:00 p.m. in the School of Physical Education/Natatorium lobby. This is an opportunity for the academic units, particularly at the undergraduate level, to reach out to people in the community, bringing persons to the campus to show that we have a sincere interest in informing people of our academic programs and to provide information so that people can make intelligent choices about whether IUPUI has some educational programs which would benefit them.

Chancellor Bepko next explained that there have been continuing discussions about the Olympic Training Center that may be located on or around the IUPUI campus. There is a new dimension of discussion about a different location on the perimeter of the campus in the area to the south, adjoining White River Park and the National Institute for Fitness and Sport. An Advisory Committee is being formed. Bob Baxter will be working as a liaison with the groups that are interested in creating an Olympic Training Center here, to make sure that all of the University's interests are fully protected. Secretary Jeff Vessely has been asked to participate as has Charles Yokomoto, chairman of the Athletic Affairs Committee of the Faculty Council, and Larry Ryan, who is the outgoing chairman of that committee. These people will help advise on and shape the University's responses to various suggestions about this Olympic Training Center.

AGENDA ITEM IV - Executive Committee Report - Jeffery Vessely, Secretary

Secretary Vessely reported that he had received several calls regarding the FACET Committee nominees. Those were the names of ten nominees that were forwarded in conjunction with the Dean of Faculties, to the FACET committee for a symposium to be held in Brown County on May 14-16, 1989. The committee has not made a final determination of those participants. He stated that for anyone having

to make schedule changes they might call Eileen Bender in Bloomington, who could give them an exact date as to when that announcement will be made.

Secretary Vessely also stated that he had had questions regarding the new interim retirement benefit. There was a Fringe Benefits Committee meeting held and at this point is for information only. The UFC Fringe Benefits Committee is involved in that discussion.

President Ehrlich has asked to visit with the faculty as he has done in the past. This will take place on Tuesday, May 2 from 3:30 - 4:30 p.m. in the Conference Center Auditorium. The meeting will be open to all faculty members.

Secretary Vessely also brought to the meeting information (in the forms of a model letter, maps of legislative districts, and names and addresses of the members of the Indiana House and Senate) for use by faculty members who wished to write in support of the current budget requests. He suggested indicating support for the Library, the SET building, or the operating budget generally. Secretary Vessely asked that letters be on personal stationery and that interest and concern be communicated, letting legislators know that writers reside in their districts and are faculty members at IUPUI.

Secretary Vessely next discussed the 1990-91 calendar. The recommendation of the Calendar Committee and the Academic Affairs Committee will be appended to today's minutes and will be on the agenda for discussion at the May meeting. The Academic Affairs Committee recommendation is quite a departure from any calendar that we have had in the past. There has been quite a bit of discussion regarding having a day off for Labor Day or a week off at Thanksgiving. The recommendation from the Academic Affairs Committee is to do both, which will mean starting school a couple of days earlier.

Secretary Vessely explained, regarding the Faculty Club, that there is a lease. The Board is meeting on April 12 on discuss the lease. His understanding was that as soon as names were put to that then they should be fairly close to opening possibly around the 17th.

AGENDA ITEM V - Question & Answer Period

PROFESSOR ALIPRANTIS: What is going on with the SET Building?

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: The contracts are being let, and some of the contracts were approved at the last Board meeting. Why they haven't started work, I can't tell you. I have the same sense of frustration that you do because I remember vividly the day that the bonding authority was provided for Phase II, which was almost two years ago. I am not thrilled that we haven't made more progress toward construction than we have. I think some of the delay has been caused by reconfiguration, by re-thinking of some of the uses of the building -- things that involve the faculty from the School of Science and the School of Engineering and Technology. I think some of the delays now are the result of the schedules of contractors and the fact that they didn't want to pour the foundation in the months when it was likely to be cold and we might have encountered some difficulties in having the concrete set up.

I know that at the last Board meeting there were contracts approved and there are contracts for approval on the agenda at this Board meeting. I hope that very soon we see a lot of activity.

AGENDA ITEM V Faculty/Librarian Salary Policy Ad Hoc Committee - Henry Karlson

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: Next we have a report on a faculty/librarian salary policy from an ad hoc committee that was established to coordinate views of our own Faculty Affairs Committee and Budgetary Affairs Committee of the Faculty Council. I think also, subsequently, they were to take into account recommendations from the University Faculty Council's Faculty Affairs Committee. The chair of this effort is Henry Karlson.

PROFESSOR KARLSON: Professor Karlson explained that the committee has been attempting to coordinate different positions and had held a number of meetings. He stated that in his many years of working with ad hoc committees this was the most friendly and productive committee that he has managed to work with. He thanked the members for their cooperation.

After three meetings, they drafted some of their proposals which strongly influenced the document which was distributed at the Faculty Council meeting. He explained that the proposed changes were basically adopted and will be included in the report that is going to the University Faculty Council. He explained that the committee is now down to eight policy principles to be considered in determining salaries.

The document follows:

SALARY PRINCIPLES

In recognition of differing salary conditions in various units of the University and differing conditions within units from year to year, this salary policy contains a set of principles to guide salary decision-making. These principles are intended to foster flexibility, openness, fairness, and faculty participation in unit salary policies and practices, and this policy assumes that those closest to the situation usually can make the most informed and fair salary decisions. Each unit shall adopt its own ways of implementing these principles and review local policy periodically.

1. Salary policies for all faculty, including part-time administrators, should be determined by responsible administrators with the participation of appropriate elected faculty/librarian bodies or committees appointed by the latter. Faculty/librarian bodies (a) generally participate in establishing the guidelines for allocating that year's salary increment according to the factors in #2 and (b) may, at the lowest appropriate level, choose not to participate in rating the merits of individual faculty; conversion of salary ratings to dollar amounts is normally the province of administrators.
2. Factors affecting the allocation of resources to salaries are: (1) merit and (2) adjustments for salary minima, remedial equity, inflation, recruitment, and retention. Merit has primacy among these, and not less than half of a unit's allocation for salary increments must be awarded on the basis of merit.

3. Elected faculty/librarian bodies and administrators may exercise flexibility in responding to local circumstances. At all levels, allocations of resources to salaries should balance two principles: (1) rewarding comparable performance, distinction, and experience with comparable salary and (2) providing the support necessary to achieve the missions of the University.
4. Salary resources may be used to remedy inequities resulting from (1) changing market conditions, (2) reevaluation of prior merit judgments, (3) inadequate funding, and (4) discrimination.
5. Salary decisions shall avoid inappropriate widening of the disparity between low and high salaries, especially those resulting from the use of percentage increments. Salary increments may be made in percentages or fixed dollar amounts.
6. Salary minima should increase in step with the percentage increases in salary resources distributed by the campus as a whole?
7. Salary policies at every level should be written and available for inspection and other appropriate uses. A unit's responsible administrator shall report annually on salary policy implementation to the faculty/librarians in the unit.
8. A part-time administrator's performance as a faculty member shall be judged by faculty members in accordance with the first principle, and performance as an administrator shall be judged by administrators. If the part-time administrator receives an administrative salary supplement, the supplement leaves the salary base when the administrator returns to full-time status.

PROFESSOR PETERSON: How can I interpret principle #6? Salary minima should increase in step with the percentage increases in salary resources distributed by the campus as a whole.

PROFESSOR KARLSON: What this is dealing with is the principle on some campuses that all associate professors, for example, would be paid no less than a certain amount. That is the salary minima. If the percentage increase in salaries as a whole on that campus was six percent, then salary minima would have to increase by six percent for each rank. That is what it is referring to.

PROFESSOR THARP: Where would you say your policy stands in terms of setting individual salaries?

PROFESSOR KARLSON: In what sense?

PROFESSOR THARP: Like principle #1.

PROFESSOR KARLSON: There are two things involved in the setting of salary. First, is the determination of those factors which will be used in determining faculty salary increases. The second, rating of individual faculty members. It is clear by principle #1 that the faculty should have a principal participation in setting the factors to be considered. Then the administration would apply those factors to the ranking of individuals and then apply those factors to them. However, the faculty has the right to participate, through an appropriate elected

committee, in the ranking of the faculty members unless they choose not to do so. I can see circumstances in small departments where that would be appropriate. Once the faculty members have been ranked, then the application of those ranks to salary increases is done by the administration.

Understand, ultimately salary is something to be determined by the Board of Trustees. Technically and appropriately, it is an administrative function. The recommendations that have been received, however, come through the administration and ultimately that also is an administrative function. But, if faculty participate in rating faculty members against faculty-created standards, if a faculty member feels that they have been treated unfairly, they have concrete criteria to apply in requesting a Board of Review hearing or a review by higher administration. It is the creation of these concrete factors and in many cases the ranking against these concrete factors which a faculty committee creates which creates the record that a person can use if they feel they have been treated unfairly.

This is the document which is being sent from the University Faculty Affairs Committee to the University Faculty Council. This is not an action item because no action is required by our Faculty Council unless we would like to instruct our representatives to support these principles when they are presented to the University Faculty Council. That would be appropriate.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: This is a matter of some significance and the University Faculty Council will likely act on this at its meeting later this month. This will be the last opportunity that the IUPUI Faculty Council will have to make an expression of its collective view on the issue of salary policy. That may be a factor in deciding what to do.

PROFESSOR KARLSON: At this point I would move that we, as the IUPUI Faculty Council, adopt these policies as stated as policies which are supported by the IUPUI Faculty Council in determination of faculty salaries. This is not a standing committee so therefore a second is required.

PROFESSOR PETERSON: This will be sent to the Faculty Affairs Committee of the University Faculty Council. We have an option as a committee to incorporate any additional changes that you want to make in this document at this point. We will discuss those and incorporate them before it is distributed to the University Faculty Council early next week.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: We need a second.

PROFESSOR PETERSON: I will second it.

PROFESSOR FREDLAND: Would you clarify 1B for me? Especially as to how it applies to annual review of faculty.

PROFESSOR KARLSON: I see no way that it applies in the base of that. In what way are you referring?

PROFESSOR FREDLAND: It states that the faculty/librarian body may choose not to participate... It is likely that you cannot choose to participate because the final line on the annual review form says Salary for Next Year: "Above average,"

"Average," or "Below Average." So you have to participate in that final step of the review process.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: First of all, in most schools the annual review procedure would be applicable only to people who are in the promotion and tenure process. So, it doesn't apply to everyone. People who are already tenured full professors normally are not reviewed in the promotion and tenure process. I think the annual review which you are talking about is the one that the University requires for all faculty members who are not tenured full professors. Since there are professors who are not covered by that review, I think what the committee contemplates is that there be a separate process for making salary recommendations.

This is a recommendation which could move schools in the direction of having a collegial review of everyone, including full professors on tenure. I think it makes sense to have the system that the School of Science has adopted where everyone is reviewed every year.

PROFESSOR KARLSON: I would note that it was stated by several individuals that if they were with a small department or a small school, there might be some feeling among the members that they did not choose to rate themselves for purposes of salary and to leave the individual rating, based upon the criteria which the faculty has established, to the administration. That is why we put in that they could choose not to do so if they so desired. That is different from the annual review for purposes of promotion and tenure.

DEAN RENDA: I have a problem reading the language in #1 and #2. In #1 under A we talk about "according to the factors in #2." In #2 we talk about the factors affecting the allocation of resources to salaries being merit, adjustments for salary minima, etc. Under 1B it talks about rating the merits of individual faculty. I have a problem with the word "merit."

PROFESSOR KARLSON: The other factors are adjustments for salary minima, remedial equity, inflation, recruitment, and retention. Most of those factors are factors that are not appropriate for faculty determination. Those are administrative determinations. It is the merit determination that we want to keep in the hands of faculty. That is why we drafted it in that manner.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: So that adjustments for salary minima, remedial equity, inflation, recruitment, and retention are administrative judgments? The faculty advisory group will not be giving advice on these points?

PROFESSOR KARLSON: At least not on a yearly basis. Of course, if there is a Faculty Board of Review request, that is outside of this procedure or a claim of discrimination for the appropriate faculty body, that is a different issue.

PROFESSOR KECK: I might add that at the last IU Faculty Council meeting there was general support by means of a straw vote by members of all the campuses in support of the wording exactly as you have it in front of you. The units that have smaller areas have concerns about any faculty input supported the way these two principles now are written.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: I take it that the import of this policy is that there would not be any minimum salary increase that would be required to be given unless the administrator who was responsible established such minima. Is that correct?

PROFESSOR KARLSON: That is correct.

PROFESSOR PETERSON: There still is a statement in here of the adjustment for inflation which could be interpreted as a cost of living change.

PROFESSOR KARLSON: We are merely indicating in the second principle that this is an appropriate factor to be considered in setting salaries.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: So, the responsible administrator could conclude that there is no minimum.

PROFESSOR KARLSON: The way that this is drafted, yes he could.

DANA MCDONALD: I don't think there are very many members of the Budgetary Affairs Committee who are very happy with this compromise, especially point #1. Bloomington is firm on point #1 and that it has to be all campuses.

PROFESSOR ROGERS: Who is the primary interpreter of this policy administration?

PROFESSOR KARLSON: Ultimately salary allocations are made by the University administration and the Board of Trustees. What we are doing here is setting guidelines which may be used by faculty committees.

PROFESSOR BARLOW: Will this be implemented this year?

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: I can't imagine how we could do that. It would have to be retroactive because much has already been done. It would have to be implemented at the earliest in 1989-90. I would like to make one point about this, to give you my thoughts about how we would respond. First of all, one of my concerns is that we make decisions ourselves for this campus and what is best for us and not be obliged to adopt something that we don't think is particularly good because another campus may wish to have it. I think that it is important to note that the group of committees that drafted this proposal emphasized that there are different salary conditions in different places that these principles are designed to foster flexibility, and that each unit shall adopt its own ways of implementing these principles and reviewing local policy periodically. I hope this means interpretation of the principles for each unit. The unit that most concerns me, and I guess all of us, is the Indianapolis campus. I would propose, without having a great deal of time to think about this because it is the first time that I have seen it, that we would convene an appropriate group, probably from the Council of Deans and the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council, to help us implement and interpret this salary principles. If adopted in their present form, many questions of interpretation would arise. I think we have thought of a few questions already, but if we take this document back and read it more carefully, I think we would probably have more questions. This is understandable given the method of adopting statements like this in a large group like the Bloomington Faculty Council or the IUPUI Faculty Council or even the UFC. In such large groups it is unlikely that we would be able to comb out all of the ambiguities or eliminate all of the questions. I

would suggest that it would be our intention, if this were adopted, to convene at least those two groups to help us establish implementation guidelines and also interpret the principles and review them periodically so that they didn't work a hardship and so that they weren't misused or in a manner inconsistent with the spirit of the policy.

PROFESSOR KARLSON: I would add that the keynote of this policy is flexibility.

PROFESSOR KECK: I would like to add that these are the principles upon which the policy is based and not the policy itself.

PROFESSOR MILLER: I call for the question.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: All in favor say "Aye." Any opposed? The ayes have it.

AGENDA ITEM VII - Fringe Benefits Committee Report - Linda Kasper

PROFESSOR KASPER: The IUPUI Fringe Benefits Committee has had three items referred to it since our last Council meeting. I would like to briefly tell you what we have done with these.

The first of these was a proposed family leave policy which had been recommended by the Bloomington Faculty Council. Contrary to what some of you might have read in an article that was published in the Daily Student, this is not an official fringe benefit that we have as faculty at this point. Without going into the substance of the policy today, let me say that the IUPUI Committee did look at a similar policy that was developed by the Staff Council and we recommended back to the Executive Committee two things: (1) That there be a cost analysis done to determine what the cost to the University would be. This information was not a part of the plan that we looked at. (2) That an effort be made to coordinate development so that we could establish either one plan that would apply to both faculty and staff or to at least have two equivalent plans.

The second thing that was referred to us was the Task Force Report on Health Insurance. That report went from the Task Force to President Ehrlich in January of this year. Probably, if you have read the IU Newspaper, you have noticed a series of articles in that newspaper that discussed trends and health care costs. Vice President Hackett reported on the Executive Summary from that report at the February 14 University Faculty Council meeting that was held in Indianapolis. That was an information only report. There was no discussion at that time. That Task Force Report was also published as Circular U7-89 which was attached to the minutes of the February 14 meeting. Either last week or this week you probably received a flyer on this topic from Vice President Hackett's Office entitled "We are all in this together."

The IUPUI Fringe Benefits Committee has looked at the Task Force Proposal. We had some very serious questions about the substance of that proposal, and we have made no recommendations other than addressing some of the those questions back to the Executive Committee. As Jeff indicated earlier, yesterday the UFC Fringe Benefits Committee did meet. Jack Hudson, who is Director of Insurance for those of you who don't know him, and Vice President Hackett have proposed some

changes to the initial Task Force Report. What you will have is the Executive Summary in this document which is not what we are talking about as a proposed plan at this point.

Some of the changes suggested by Mr. Hudson and Vice President Hackett would alter the substance of the Task Force Report; some would merely facilitate the administration of the plan.

The UFC meeting will be in Indianapolis on April 25. The recommendation that will go forward from the UFC Fringe Benefits Committee will be that discussion begin at the UFC level on the Task Force Report as it has been amended by Mr. Hudson and Vice President Hackett. There is a possibility that there other changes may be recommended based on our discussions yesterday. As a follow up to that, the IUPUI Fringe Benefits Committee will work with our own agenda committee to see if we can arrange a more complete report for this body at the May Council meeting. That may be a marathon session.

The last item that we have looked into is Professor Yokomoto's questions on the 18/20 changes. Chancellor Bepko responded to those at the March Council meeting. We additionally requested a definition of "20 years of full-time service" as it applies to 18/20. The intent of that, I believe, is 20 years of full-time employment, and that is not what the wording says in the Academic Handbook.

The last thing the committee has noted is that the Academic Handbook makes no mention of the Exceptions Committee. To that end, the Fringe Benefits Committee would like to offer the following resolution for Council consideration:

The IUPUI Fringe Benefits Committee recommends to the IUPUI Faculty Council that a statement be included in the Academic Handbook describing the existence and the purpose of the Exceptions Committee as it relates to the 18/20 plan.

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: That needs no second. Is there discussion?

PROFESSOR CUTSHALL: Does the Exceptions Committee consider other items rather than the 18/20?

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: I think there is only one committee, in fact, it has just been reconstituted. I think that the Exceptions Committee has as its main function determining if early retirement under the 18/20 will be allowed, that is whether a person who retires earlier than age 64 will be able to get the interim benefit. It wouldn't surprise me if other matters having to do with retirement would be referred that committee for advice. It may be a good idea to include that in the Handbook. I think that is something that you might want to get a comment from Vice President Hackett's Office on since he is the one who would be referring those other matters.

PROFESSOR PETERSON: This may be obvious but I don't see where this information exists. The committee that we are talking about here, how is that committee formulated? Is that committee formulated by University Faculty Council Executive Committee or by the President's Office or some other group?

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: I think the committee that is now in existence was appointed by Vice President Hackett as an administrative committee. It is chaired by Ed Whalen, Assistant Vice President and Director of Budgeting for the University. There are two or three other members.

Are you ready for the question? All in favor, say "Aye." Are there any opposed? Motion carries.

AGENDA ITEM VIII - Unfinished Business

CHANCELLOR BEPKO: We have one item of unfinished business and that is an item that Bev Hill is going to bring to us from the Budgetary Affairs Committee.

SECRETARY VESSELY: The Budgetary Affairs Committee has placed here for distribution the statement concerning the technology fee that was adopted by the Budgetary Affairs Committee. It is not an action item. It is just a statement that that committee forwarded and if you have some specific questions to ask Bev, she is here and she can answer them for you.

[Note: The statement is as follows:]

**TECHNOLOGY STATEMENT SUBMITTED TO IUPUI FACULTY COUNCIL
by Budgetary Affairs Committee
4/6/89**

****Technology on the Campus**

--Consistent effort ought to be made to keep abreast of necessary technological advances that enhance learning for students and research and scholarship for faculty.

--Fees or revenues ought to be collected by the University from the students for the maintenance and enhancement of technologies and should be dedicated as expenditures for such purposes.

--It seems imperative that all Schools develop plans for maintenance of existing and acquisition of new technological hardware, software and facilities and that a central technical assistance function afford support in this area to the sub-units of the University that need help in such an endeavor.

AGENDA ITEM IX - New Business

There was no new business.

AGENDA ITEM X - Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS

FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING

May 4, 1989

Law School, Room 116

3:30 - 5:30 p.m.

Members Present: Administration: Gerald L. Bepko, William M. Plater. Deans and Director: John Barlow, Barbara Fischler, Robert Keck, R. Bruce Renda, Sheldon Siegel, William Voos. Faculty: Billy Abel, Elaine Alton, Margaret Applegate, Frederick Bein, H. R. Besch, Jr., Ulf Jonas Bjork, Willard Bostwick, Victoria Champion, William Crabtree, Theodore Cutshall, Eleanor Donnelly, Donald Gartner, Vania Goodwin, Celestine Hamant, Dolores Hoyt, Kaplan, Jerome, Henry Karlson, Juanita Keck, Christian Kloesel, Richard Lawlor, Donna Marzouk, James McAteer, Dana McDonald, Richard Meiss, Robert Mendelsohn, Judy Z. Miller, B. Keith Moore, Bernard Morrel, Richard Peterson, Gerald Powers, Edward Robbins, Glen Segraves, Susan Sutton, Karen Teegarden, Jeffery Vessely, Kathleen Warfel, Henry Wellman, Karen West, Harriet Wilkins, Charles Yokomoto.

Alternates Present: Deans: Robert Mendelsohn for John Barlow, James Carter for Walter J. Daly, Hugh Wolf for Howard Mehlinger, Scott Evenbeck for James Weigand. Faculty: Robert Ryder for C. D. Aliprantis, Ray Maesaka for Carl Andres, Edgar Fleenor for Richard Beck, Linda Kasper for Narcissa Hocker, Monte Juillerat for Florence Juillerat, Jean Hutten for Rebecca Markel, Patricia Blake for Beverly Ross.

Members Absent: Administration: Carol D. Nathan. Deans: Constance Baker, Trevor Brown, H. William Gilmore, P. Nicholas Kellum, Norman Lefstein, Jack Wentworth. Faculty: Morris Aprison, Cecil Brown, David Burns, Mervyn Cohen, Dewey Conces, Joseph DiMicco, Robert Dittus, Dornith Doherty, John Eble, Elizabeth Evenbeck, Mary Feeley, Richard Fredland, Morris French, Bhuwan Garg, Phillip Gibbs, Robert A. Harris, Eugene Helveston, Louis Holtzclaw, Charles Hutton, Lucreda Hutton, Richard Kovacs, Michael Kubek, John Lappas, Michael Mitchell, Carl Newton, Jeanne Pontious, Douglas Rex, Richard Rink, Richard Rogers, A N Siakotos, Donald Tharp, Jack Zecher.

Ex Officio Members Present: Kim Wright, President, Student Assembly.

Ex Officio Members Absent: Shirley Newhouse, President, IUPUI Staff Council

Visitors: Erwin Boschmann, T. Kay Carl, Rebecca Porter (Academic Affairs Committee), Michael P. Ryan, Phyllis Scherle (Faculty Affairs Committee), John Snyder, William Spencer, Gene Tempel.

AGENDA ITEM I - Memorial Resolution: Elizabeth Elaine Helms Whiting, School of Medicine

Dana McDonald read the memorial resolution for Elizabeth Elaine Helms Whiting.

Memorial Resolution: Dr. Mildred Adams, School of Nursing

Jean Hutten read the memorial resolution for Dr. Mildred Adams. A moment of silence was observed for both.

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

BEPKO: I have a couple of items under Presiding Officer's Business. First, in May we are going to have the first Spirit of Philanthropy luncheon. This is an event which we hope will take place every year to pay tribute to those persons, companies, and organizations that have provided support to our schools and programs through their voluntary efforts or through their contributions. This is a project that was conceived by the Indianapolis Development Council which is a group that is responsible for a good deal of the fund raising that goes on for our benefit. Vice Chancellor Gene Tempel is here and will give you a few of the details on this Spirit of Philanthropy Day.

TEMPEL: Thank you very much, Mr. Chancellor. I won't add a lot more to what Jerry said because he said it very well. The purpose for our having this is that each school on the campus has agreed to participate in this. We hope to bring that function next year into the same date as the Honors Convocation. It is a way which we can pay tribute to those people who support our campus. I hope that many of you from the Faculty Council will have a chance to participate along with your deans and other people from your schools to honor those who are going to be present. This will take place on May 16 at 12:00 noon in the Lincoln Hotel Ballroom. Bob Payton will be our featured speaker. We are looking forward to having a good crowd to get this particular tradition started in the same way you helped the Honors Convocation last month.

BEPKO: Thanks, Gene. If there are any questions, Gene will be able to answer them. Each school is going to have two persons or organizations present to be recognized and each honoree will receive an autographed copy of Bob Payton's book entitled, Voluntary Action for the Public Good.

Also, we have with us today the newly-elected president of the Student Assembly. I would like to introduce Kim Wright.

Last week or the week before the University Faculty Council met and adopted by unanimous vote the salary policy that has been discussed in this forum on a couple of occasions. It was absolutely clear to me that the final product, which was adopted by the University Faculty Council, had been influenced greatly and also I think very much for the better by the activities of members of our Faculty Council. I think a special tribute goes to our Budgetary Affairs Committee and to our Faculty Affairs Committee for the work that they did in redrafting what many saw as a flawed policy statement or statement of principles to make it agreeable to everyone, to make it so good that it was unanimously adopted by the University

Faculty Council. In particular, although there is a score of people who should be mentioned, I would just mention Bev Hill and Dick Peterson as chairs of those respective committees of our Council who contributed greatly to this effort and to Jeff Vessely who was instrumental in bringing about the compromises and adjustments that made this a very successful faculty project. In fact, I would say that the whole experience that we had with this salary policy question for faculty and librarians is a good example of faculty governance working very well. I am proud of all of the contributions made by IUPUI Faculty Council members and I think you should be proud also.

Finally, very much on my mind right now is the legislative process and the budget that was adopted late last night. There is good news and some not so good news. The good news comes on the capital side. Both of the major projects that we were hoping to have approved were approved. The new main library was approved, a \$32 million project. Much of the cost of that project, as you probably know, will be borne by the private fund raising campaign that we have had underway for the last eleven months. But the \$32 million project has been approved and will go forward as soon as the planning can be completed.

Also, the third phase of the Science/Engineering/Technology complex was approved so that finally, at long last, 20 years after the commitment was made, we are going to be able to move all of the Purdue programs to the main campus. We were a little worried about the Science/Engineering/Technology complex approval, but in the final days of the session the people who were supportive of this project and our good friends in the Marion County legislative delegation managed to have it incorporated in the budget. I think it is a major vote of confidence in the campus by the state to have two major projects approved in one session of the General Assembly. I don't know that that has ever happened before for any campus. I think it is also important to note that we have also a major vote of confidence in the fact that there are so many capital projects that are now in process somewhere on the campus.

The Medical Research and Library Building is still underway. It is not ready to be occupied and isn't to be used and won't be dedicated for another two weeks and won't be fully used for sometime after that. Phase II of the Science/Engineering/Technology project is under construction. We will have Science/Engineering/Technology, Phase III, under construction in the near future. We will have the library under construction in the not too distant future. Also, we have scheduled for beginning construction later this year, (although this will be paid for through an entirely difference process, nevertheless it will be a construction project) the new ambulatory care facility for the IU Hospital. There is a tremendous amount of investment along with a tremendous amount of confidence expressed in the activities that you carry forward as faculty members wrapped up in all of these major projects. We will have to live with the inconvenience of muddy streets and construction trailers for the time being, but I think it is a very important step forward for all of us. We are really pleased about that side of the legislative session.

The side that wasn't as good is the operating side. I can give you a couple of glimpses as to what that looks like overall. We have not got all the details yet and won't have a chance to sort this out for several days, but we have a cost of living adjustment of 4.7 percent built into the budgets for the two years of the biennium.

That is 4.7 percent each year. For the first year of the biennium at least we will have a very small amount of money for attracting and retaining faculty, increased costs of health care, minority programs, and some miscellaneous items such as the funding for the addition of the second year for the Ft. Wayne Medical Center program. We will have added back in something that was taken out earlier in the session and that is the funding for the Master's Degree in Nursing.

The bad news from the standpoint of our campus is that the energy funding which we were hoping would be left in our budget, even though we didn't use it and even though we didn't need it for energy, would be made available to us, it would be left in our budget for us to use and reallocate for other purposes. That was not done and so we had a \$1.9 million reduction in the base for Indianapolis, which means that some of the new money that we are being given for these various projects and various increments in programs will be reduced by that \$1.9 million. We are committed to reallocating so that that \$1.9 million will not detract from the increases that are going to otherwise be available for other campuses, but it is not going to be, above and beyond that, a very good year in terms of overall increases. You will be hearing more in your schools about how all this plays out. We are going to set, as our highest priority, compensation for continuing personnel but recognize that we start from a very low base of only 4.7 percent provided in the legislative budget.

There is one bit of good news that I think will continue the momentum that we have tried to establish in the basic academic programs particularly in the Arts and Sciences, but also a number of the professional schools that have heavy undergraduate responsibilities and some graduate programs. In the second year of the biennium, we have a component of funding for reduction of reliance on part-time faculty. That means that we can start now planning for July 1, 1990 for new faculty positions. How many positions we will have available, we have yet to determine, but we have a fairly substantial amount of funding so that we should be creating a significant number of new faculty positions effective July 1, 1990. We will be talking to the schools about this and working with the campus plan to establish where those positions will be created and in what numbers over the next few weeks. I think it will mean that we will be able to start recruiting for these positions within the next few months leading to the fall of 1990. [NOTE: It should be noted that when the budget bill was finally received and reviewed, there was no funding for reduction of reliance on part-time faculty].

I don't know whether this would be a good time to try to field questions about the budget because it is so new and we only received word of the final decisions late last night. We have had the working papers for this budget for sometime. It isn't much different from what we had before. We haven't really started a thorough analysis of all of it and won't until we are sure of the final budget bill. I am not sure that I would be able to give a lot of specifics, but it is extremely good news on the capital side with a vote of confidence that I think is unprecedented and marginally good news or not-so-good news on the operating side where we will have to live with minimal cost-of-living increases in most of our academic programs. We hope that, through reallocations and emphasis on the personnel compensation issues, we may be able to do better than the 4.7 percent that will be average for compensation increases in many of the units.

AGENDA ITEM III - Executive Committee Report - Secretary Jeffery Vessely

VESSELY: Before I go into my formal remarks, I would like to, on behalf of all my colleagues in the School of Nursing remind you that on April 22 the School of Nursing at Indiana University began celebrating 75 years of service and scholarship. We thank all the hardworking people in Nursing and hope that we might all sometime during the year participate in their celebration.

In this, the last Executive Committee Report for the year I would like to take a few minutes to recap the status or disposition of several of the major agenda items of the past academic year.

I might say that this has been truly an education for me and I have been impressed by the amount of effort put forth by committees and well as individuals during these last ten months.

First, the report on the results of the Boards of Review. There were three.

1. The first resulted in the sustaining of an unfavorable decision against the faculty member, but the administration accepted the Board's recommendation regarding the handling of information in the faculty member's file.
2. In the second review, the Board upheld the original non-reappointment, tenure denial decision.
3. The third recommended an extension of the probationary period and the administration concurred.

Those three cases actually covered two Boards of Review elective years. If you remember, a few years back we changed the date to February. Therefore, there is a new group actually meeting.

You are all aware of the outcome of the 18/20 interim benefit changes. I can report that the UFC Fringe Benefits Committee is continuing to review a new plan and should be able to report by the fall semester. I might point out that some committee members have stated that faculty currently covered under the old 18/20 plan might opt to change to the new plan at least in this preliminary form. They indicate that it is quite attractive.

You will receive a copy of the proposed health care changes during the Fringe Benefits Committee report today. I think that you should know that Chris Lohmann and I, as co-secretaries of the UFC, lobbied long and hard to convince the President that this needed to come before the Fringe Benefits Committee and that we would not accept as a fait accompli the report of the President's own selected Task Force. In fact, the proposed implementation date for any major changes has been moved from July 1, 1989 to January 1, 1990. We should have the opportunity for further review.

Unfortunately, we were not as successful in our efforts to stop the combining of the Bloomington Affirmative Action Office with the system Affirmative Action Office. With the support of Joe DiMicco and the Affirmative Action committees we

pressed the President to reconsider this move. Those of you who were present on Tuesday heard from the President himself that he was determined to merge these offices and did so.

We have continued to hear speculation about the new University travel policy. I will be able to shed some light on this subject after tomorrow. Vice President Hackett has asked me to chair the travel policy review committee. I will be serving with Dottie Frapwell and Conrad Johnston as well as faculty members from Bloomington and a representative from the other campuses. We have our first meeting with the newly selected travel agency tomorrow morning.

Finally, I have to tell you that this body, as Chancellor Bepko pointed out earlier, had a major influence on the new faculty/librarian salary policy. Copies of the new policy are available on the side table today. My thanks go out to Dick Peterson and the Faculty Affairs Committee, to Beverly Hill and the Budgetary Affairs Committee, and especially to Henry Karlson and the Ad Hoc Committee. This policy incorporates many of the points we felt were needed while maintaining flexibility and requiring the openness that we had hoped for. This truly was a meeting of the minds.

There are many other continuing items including the review of the dismissal procedures that will be first up on the fall agenda. On behalf of the Executive Committee let me say thank you for the opportunity to serve the Council and I am looking forward to the 14 months that I have left to serve. Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM IV - Election: Executive, Tenure, Nominating Committee - Nominating Committee - Glen Sagraves

BEPKO: The election for the Election Committee, Executive Committee and Tenure Committee was held. The final results are as follows:

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

| | |
|-------------------|--------------|
| Varoujan Chalian | Dentistry |
| Theodore Cutshall | Science |
| Richard Fredland | Liberal Arts |
| Juanita Keck | Nursing |

NOMINATING COMMITTEE

| | |
|---------------|----------------|
| Ronald Dehnke | Education |
| Dolores Hoyt | Univ Libraries |
| Henry Karlson | Law |

TENURE COMMITTEE

| | |
|------------------|-----------|
| Paul Galanti | Law |
| B. Keith Moore | Dentistry |
| Richard Peterson | Medicine |

At this point, I would like to move that the ballots be destroyed and the tally sheets kept in the Faculty Council Office. [motion passed]

VESSELY: I would like to extend an invitation to the newly-elected Executive Committee to attend the next Executive Committee meeting which will be held at 4:00 p.m. next Thursday, May 11, in the Administration Building, 355 N. Lansing Street, Conference Room.

AGENDA ITEM V - Question & Answer Period - 10 minutes

BEPKO: Next is the question and answer period. Again, we have received no questions in writing.

BLAKE: I would like a clarification on the IU faculty salary statement. It says "Adopted April 25, 1989."

VESSELY: That should have said Adopted by the UFC

BEPKO: I think the administration is willing to support this and I suspect that it will become policy of the University. These principles will become a part of the University's policy.

ALTON: Is the health care plan going to be implemented as of the first of July as it was once reported?

BEPKO: The report of the Fringe Benefits Committee will probably cover that later in the session. Am I right in assuming that?

KASPER: Yes.

BEPKO: To specifically answer your question now, nothing will become effective until September 1, at which time four relatively non-intrusive, beneficial, changes will be made. Other changes will become effective January 1. So you have the summer to look at all of it. Some of those changes will be September 1 and the bulk of them (the ones of more interest) will not become effective, if at all, until January 1. I think the one thing that is important to recognize, as I am sure the Fringe Benefits Committee report will say, is that the University must take some steps to contain the increases in health care costs or we will have very serious problems sustaining the kind of operations that we have currently.

ALTON: Do you know yet what kind of increase there will be next year for health care? There always is an increase so I am just assuming that there will be additional increase.

BEPKO: Do you mean in the employee's contribution?

ALTON: Probably in both parts but certainly in the employee's contribution.

BEPKO: I think the employee's contributions will go up about eight percent but the overall cost of the program is estimated to go up eight to ten percent. You have to recognize that we are not buying insurance. We are self-insured and it comes

right out of Indiana University budgets when anyone goes into the hospital. In fact, starting right now when anyone draws on our medical programs and is reimbursed for expenses, the check will be an Indiana University check. We think that in the past when a check was written by Blue Cross, people got the impression that this money was coming from a third-party provider and that it wasn't our money. But, it is.

VESSELY: On the side table you may have picked up a document titled "A Comparison Between the IU Long-Term Disability Income Continuation Plan and the Equicor Voluntary Plan for Monthly Paid Employees. Let me shed some light on that. In a number of meetings attended by Chris Lohmann, co-secretary of the UFC, questions were asked about the mailing we received from Equicor. No one seemed to know for sure what that meant and how that effected their current long-term disability. In the bottom paragraph on the first page there is a disclaimer indicating where the information that Chris and Paul Zietlow, from English, cited came from. This is to shed some light on the decisions that you are going to make about whether to sign up for the Equicor Plan or not. It was a little confusing. I don't think some people, if they don't understand insurance generally, knew exactly what that meant. This is to provide some information. There is no misinformation in there. There are probably some opinions throughout. This should help you to at least know where to look for additional information and make an intelligent decision.

BEPKO: We had a question last time from Roko Aliprantis which was "Why isn't there any more work on the second phase of the Science/Engineering/Technology complex?" There was some construction scheduled to begin as soon as the weather was alright, but the University Physical Facilities Office was under the impression that it was best to wait until the end of the spring term because they will have to park a lot of construction equipment along the edge of the fenced area which will take up parking places. The thought was that, as long as there would only be a 30- or 45-day period involved, that it would be better to wait until the end of the spring term and not disrupt parking during the regular semester. Soon, within days, they should be doing the utilities and underground work and then starting the foundations. The June Board meeting will have in front of it the major construction contracts so that construction will actually begin in full sometime over the summer.

MCDONALD: Throughout this year, President Ehrlich and many of the leaders and administrators and faculty have spent an enormous amount of time working on a University-wide academic plan, new document that was to logically tie University planning into the budget. The budget was to, we hoped, reflect that plan. Has there been any demonstrable connection through the legislature or was it something that only then affected the University internally and had no affect on the legislature?

BEPKO: I think we did better because of the planning. Some of the money that has been allocated is a specific response to the planning effort and our requests based on planning. In general political terms It was a bad year and I think if we hadn't had the planning effort, it would have been a much worse year than it is. I don't know how I would characterize the operating budget. I said that it was not too good news and I suppose that is the best way to characterize it, but it would have been not as good as it is had we not been involved in the planning effort.

Some of the new funding will go for planning initiatives. The campus has been working with its own campus plan which is coincidental with the One-University agenda. We are going to try to do as many things on our own as we possibly can to advance this One University agenda and our campus planning because we think that our goals, as an academic institution, should be pursued no matter what the General Assembly does. We hope that they join us at some point more enthusiastically than they have so far. But I don't think we should be totally dependent on what they do.

BESCH: As a member of the University Faculty Club at Indianapolis to another, speaking as the Treasurer, I know that you have had lunch several times there. How did you enjoy your lunch?

BEPKO: It was terrific. It was one of the best lunches that I have ever had. The food was excellent and the atmosphere was even better. I would encourage everyone to start enjoying lunches in the Faculty Club and to tell all of your colleagues how good it is. I am sure all of you are members, so you can take your colleagues as guests. I hope that you not only have used the Faculty Club for lunches but that you have booked the Faculty Club for other special events as I have when we held a dinner for the management for the hotel which came in from New York and the owners of the hotel who were here from Arizona. We hosted a dinner party for them and we held it in the Faculty Club. The hotel management, which serves as the caterer, did a little extra. It was a really spectacular evening. I would encourage you to use the Faculty Club when you can for special events, receptions, dinners, and so on.

WELLMAN: Just a follow up to that, everyone should have received today's notice about the grand opening of the Faculty Club. For those of you who have not joined, you are certainly welcome to join us that evening and join as members. I also want to point out that there will be a general membership fee for that.

BEPKO: I would like to emphasize one other point about the Faculty Club. When the University Faculty Council met here at the end of April we had a reception for the members of the UFC in the Faculty Club at the conclusion of their meeting. Because the meeting ran until the last minute, some people had to leave and couldn't stay but those who did stay said that this was the best thing that they have ever seen in terms of faculty clubs. They compared it very favorably to the Tudor Room in Bloomington and said that if it was on their campus they would eat lunch there every day.

AGENDA ITEM VI - Promotion & Tenure Routing Form - 15 Minute Limit

BEPKO: We will move to our next agenda item which the Promotion and Tenure Routing Form issue which is limited to 15 minutes according to the agenda. Jeff Vessely will introduce the subject.

VESSELY: You should have picked up from the table as you came in a document with the heading "Adding the Dean of Faculties Line of Approval/Disapproval to the Routing and Action Form for Promotion and Tenure." That document was prepared in consultation with the Executive Committee and it has the Faculty Affairs Committee comments which are taken from a cover memo to their recommendations

to the document, and the Executive Committee response. Two comments and two responses. That introduces the item. The floor is open for 15 minutes of discussion, after which time we will vote.

RENDA: Is there something missing in the first paragraph? It states that ...the Dean of Faculties has too power...

BEPKO: That should read ...too much power.

PETERSON: On behalf of the Faculty Affairs Committee, I would like to make a statement regarding the proposed approval/disapproval line for the Dean of Faculties in the routing sheets which are included in the Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure documents. This change, and other issues, which are changes in the policies and procedures used in the criteria for the determination of promotion and tenure, are included in the above mentioned "guidelines." Since last summer, it has been the opinion of the Faculty Affairs Committee that this document should be discussed and approved at the Faculty Council level before it is implemented.

So that we all might have a copy, I have compiled a number of quotations from the IUPUI Faculty Handbook, 1984 which you should have picked up as you came in. Reference is made to section, page and paragraph in that document. I will be quoting only the underlined sections.

In order to understand the process of the tenure review as it is spelled out in the handbook, I believe you should have these documents available. I would like to quote part of the first paragraph. "The basic, underlying assumption of the tenure process at the primary level is that of peer evaluation. At all subsequent levels, the decision of the primary committee should be tested in terms of this principle."

The next paragraph describes the function of the primary committees, and I quote just part of this. "The purpose of these primary, peer review committees is to evaluate on a continuing, annual basis, the performance of non-tenured faculty,..."

The following paragraph discusses the unit committees, and again I quote only parts of this. "The purpose of these committees is to assist the dean or director, at his or her request, in evaluating recommendations received from departmental, primary committees for advancement to tenured status, for reappointment, or for non-reappointment. ... Any decision involving the reversal of a recommendation of a primary committee should be made only after consultation with the primary committee."

Under Responsibilities of the IUPUI Tenure Committee there are four parts. The one that relates to this process is b: "Advise the Principal Faculty Affairs Officer at IUPUI, at that officer's request, with respect to the tenure status of an individual faculty member or librarian."

Under Procedures for Faculty it states: "Recommendations for advancement to tenured status at IUPUI are developed in accordance with procedures that are described below. These recommendations are submitted to the Vice President (Indianapolis) for review and transmission to the Office of the President, which has responsibility for submission to the Board of Trustees of names of those recom-

mended for tenured status."

A similar statement relates to promotion.

These last two paragraphs in the handout specify the routing which should take place for tenure and promotion dossiers. This is the primary area where there is a difference from the proposed routing form.

As noted earlier, the tenure process should be tested in terms of the principle of peer evaluation. The ability of the candidate to fill a role in the mission of the unit is best evaluated by the faculty and administrators in the unit. There have recently been a number of scenarios where the primary and unit recommendations have been overturned by disapproval at higher levels. I do not want to question the possibility of decisions being made at these levels for a variety of reasons; but, if a faculty member is told consistently by the annual peer and administrative review process that he is doing fine and this is followed by a recommendation for tenure from the unit which is subsequently denied at higher levels, there is a problem with the process which needs to be addressed by the faculty and administration.

The effect of the proposed changes in the procedures outlined in the "guidelines" would be to make decisions of this type even more probable. This conjecture is supported by: (1) the proposed numbers of letters and way in which they are to be solicited, (2) the requirement to supply biographies of referees, and (3) the additional approval/disapproval line for the Dean of Faculties. These changes support the idea that decisions could be made at the administrative level without regard for faculty and unit recommendations which are based on peer evaluation.

For this reason the Faculty Affairs Committee recommends that the Dean of Faculties' approval/disapproval line not be added. If it is determined that it should be added to the routing sheet, it should be delayed until such a time that this is considered carefully with other changes and clarifications which are needed in the tenure and promotions process. We also recommend that these and other "guidelines" support and explain the Constitution and handbook rather than make changes in criteria, policy, procedures, and practice. To not follow policy and procedures which are published implies that these are either not understood or are being disregarded. This type of action causes confusion, particularly for faculty who are in the process of review. The effects of any changes in policy and procedure need to be considered carefully by faculty bodies and approved by Faculty Council before implementation.

Therefore, I move, on behalf of the Faculty Affairs Committee, that these documents not be implemented until they have been examined and approved by this Council.

BEPKO: I want to clarify one point just for my own information. The problem that you are having, Dick, is with the fact that this little box is on the form, not with whether the Dean of Faculties has the right or is empowered to have an opinion on whether tenure should be granted. You can't be suggesting that the Dean of Faculties has no right to make a recommendation. All you are saying is that that recommendation should be made covertly and not on the form.

PETERSON: He is a member and the chairman of the tenure committee which examines these forms and as a member of that committee he does have the right (1) to vote and (2) he has the right to vote a minority opinion that varies from the rest of the committee. That is hardly covert. He is reported for what he has done under those conditions.

VESSELY: But, in fact, the last three deans of faculties have not voted. The Executive Committee has asked the Constitution and Bylaws Committee to make that the theory instead of just the practice by adding the line that the dean of faculties is a member of the Tenure Committee **without vote**. Since it doesn't happen that way, we think that the trade-off that the Executive Committee sees is to make sure that the Dean of Faculties doesn't vote as a member of the Tenure Committee and that we do see how the Dean of Faculties' vote is recorded openly on the routing line.

BEPKO: The other thing that concerns me is a problem that is being addressed here. Is it the problem that if there are two lines for campus administration - the Dean of Faculties and the Chancellor or Vice President, that that somehow suggests that the President, in reviewing the file when he/she gets it, would be influenced by the number of lines that were weighing on one side or the other side? The case you envision is a case where there are checks of the school committee and the Dean in favor and then checks against the Dean of Faculties and Vice President/Chancellor. Is that a concern?

PETERSON: That is very much a concern. There are more votes and I think the President is going to be swayed by those votes on that form. There are three administrative votes in a row. The way the handbook specifies the way tenure is supposed to be given is by testing the process at the primary level, not at the administrative level. Although, granted, decisions can be overturned at that level and I will not take that right away from them.

BEPKO: The assumption is that the President of the University would weigh these recommendations in terms of numbers and I think that is a flawed assumption. In any case, even if the President was in doubt and said to the chief officer of the campus, "I am not sure about this case. There are a number of affirmative recommendations or maybe a number of negative recommendations, and you have disagreed. You have voted negatively or positively when the rest of the process went the other way." The discussion that would follow in response surely would include the Dean of Faculties. The Dean of Faculties' views would be a part of the President's decision. The effort that we were making was to make sure that the persons involved knew and had on the record the Dean of Faculties' vote. It was not to weight the vote, and I don't think would have an effect on weighing the decision one way or the another. Quite frankly, although I can understand how you may come to think that way, I can tell you that it is absolutely not the case.

The President, even if he were inclined to disagree with the Chief Officer of the campus' recommendation and wanted to look into it, would go directly to the Chief Officer and the Dean of Faculties to discuss and consult and would get the Dean of Faculties' vote or views at that point, although not in the form of a vote; not in the form of something that could be examined by the candidate. These comments on the file and recommendations would never be a part of the file. Incidentally, we think this is the President's right because the President can consult

with anyone he wants in making his own decision. We thought that, if that kind of thing happened, it would be better to have it on the record, that it would be better to have the candidate know the position of the Dean of Faculties.

BLAKE: I think the point is that it appeared on the document last summer without any forewarning.

PLATER: Pat, this has been discussed by the Faculty Affairs Committee, the Promotions Committee, the Tenure Committee, and the Executive Committee, and was presented to this body during the course of the year. It has been under discussion for almost 14 months by almost any deliberative body that one could imagine having an interest in discussing these documents as well as the individual schools. What is the suspicion?

BLAKE: That someone is trying to do something.

BEPKO: Someone was trying to do something. We were trying to make the process better and more open. I hope that, if there was a procedural defect in the way we presented the matter to all of the committees which were consulted, I hope that isn't mixed with the judgment about whether this is something that is not permissible. I think that the issue probably has been blown way out of proportion. I don't think that it is that important. It is something that we think is better to do than not do. It probably has engendered more discussion than we would have ever thought the case. We thought it was rather an insignificant matter that would be helpful to candidates in the process.

PETERSON: I would like to make a correction on the date that the document came out. The document came out late in June of last year. It came out simultaneously, at the time it was sent to the deans for implementation.

REND: May I make a comment here? I feel that the issue is not really the forms or format or whether the signature is on the form. I think, perhaps, the underlying concern is that there have been a number of cases where the Primary Committee and others have approved the promotions and it has been overturned. I think that is an issue that should be addressed rather than whether the Dean of Faculties should sign here or there.

PETERSON: That certainly is one of the issues that I mentioned in my discussion. I take that as a serious condition. Either there has to be coordination between how primary committees and committees of the administration feel or try to adjust for those problems. One of the difficulties that we have had with this is communication from the higher level of administration down to the local level. It recommends in the handbook which states that we must, if there is any decision involving reversal of a recommendation of the primary committee, only after consultation with the primary committee when it is the unit committee that changes the decision. If the unit committee reverses the decision, they are required to check with the primary committee. I don't know whether that happens or not. I have heard several cases where that has not happened. I think a similar type of check and balance needs to take place when the decisions are reversed at higher levels so the Primary committee knows what is going on and why it is going on and why the administration is making decisions on reversing recommendations.

BEPKO: That is something that we should work on. I think that is a substantive matter on which we can improve the communication links. That seems to me to be something that is worth trying to tackle and improve. We have had consultation in every case where we have had occasion to disagree with the primary committee. There haven't been that many cases, but where we have, most of those cases have involved disagreement at the school level, so that it wasn't a matter of the University administrations acting inconsistently with uniformly positive or negative views in the school. In all cases, where we have had disagreements with the primary committee, even if we have had negative recommendations coming from the school that disagreed with the primary committee's positive recommendation, we have consulted with the school before decisions were made.

BLAKE: You mean the Dean?

BEPKO: Yes. I think that we have a responsibility to look at this and make sure that the process works so everybody is comfortable with it. I can understand the problem of communication. Our link of communication has to be the dean at least initially and I don't think we have even thought about the possibility of communicating with anyone else directly.

We set an arbitrary time limit for this discussion. Do you want to allow one more question? Mr. Parliamentarian, where do we stand?

KARLSON: You are going to have to take a vote at this time.

BEPKO: The motion has been made by the Faculty Affairs Committee. All in favor, say "aye". Opposed, no. Motion carries. We will respond to the vote accordingly.

KLOESEL: I did not vote because frankly I did not know what the motion was.

BEPKO: The motion was stated. Maybe it should have been restated but I think that the chairman, Dick Peterson, should restate it now just for information purposes.

PETERSON: I move on behalf of the Faculty Affairs Committee that these documents not be implemented until they have been examined and approved by this Council.

BEPKO: That is "documents" which means this routing sheet and other documents?

PETERSON: Yes. It means the whole document. There are substantative changes in this document and I will quote a lot of those.

On the bottom of the first page, Indiana University criteria for tenure state that tenure will not be conferred unless the faculty member or librarian achieves, or gives strong promise of achieving promotion in rank within the University. The Faculty Handbook says something different than that. Rather than saying tenure will not be conferred the Faculty Handbook says that tenure will generally not be conferred. That is a very big change. It may be a minor wording change but it is a major substantative change in this document. It is full of those kinds of substantative changes which have not been approved by this body.

KLOESEL: I was just going to say that my vote is "nay" because I don't know what all of these documents are.

PETERSON: That is why we need to examine the documents or have the Constitution and Bylaws Committee examine the documents to make the appropriate changes in the Constitution and Bylaws before the document is implemented.

UNKNOWN #1: None of us three sitting here knows what the vote is about.

VESSELY: If there were others who were not sure how they voted they could enter a motion to reconsider.

BLAKE So moved.

MENDELSON: I second that.

KARLSON: The motion to reconsider can only be made by someone voting with the prevailing side.

VESSELY: Only someone who voted "nay" could move to reconsider.

CHAMPION: I move to reconsider.

BEPKO: There is a motion to reconsider that has been moved and seconded. Let's make absolutely sure we all understand what we are voting on. I must confess, I wasn't sure of this myself. I thought we were working only on the routing sheet and apparently we are not. We are working on the entire packet of forms including all of the documents that have been distributed for the promotion and tenure process for 1989-1990. It takes into account much more than the issue that we have been discussing for 15 minutes, which is whether the Dean of Faculties has a box on the form which he/she would check.

Honestly, I am concerned about this right now because that was the issue that was presented. That was the issue that we discussed. Now, if we vote on the entire packet, I think we are voting on a subject that is much broader than anything that has been considered. It wasn't clear to me in the original motion that that was what we were going to do. But, if the Council wants to do that, I suppose we have the motion in front of us.

KARLSON: We have a motion to reconsider in front of us. The motion to reconsider prevails. That brings it up again before the Council. It had not been voted on one way or the other.

ALTON: Point of clarification. Weren't we voting on his motion to not include this? It would be subsequent to the motion to include this. This was a subsequent motion and I thought that was the motion we were voting on.

VESSELY: The motion was to reconsider all of the documents.

PETERSON: This was originally looked at by the Faculty Affairs Committee last summer. At that time we said that this needed to be examined carefully to see if it conformed to the guidelines of the University - the Constitution and the Hand-

book. As the Faculty Affairs Committee, we worked on that document and produced that we felt conformed in every way to what the guidelines of the University specified. Subsequently, much of what pertains in these areas, particularly items we are discussing here were put back in and they are difficulties and they contradict the Constitution and the Handbook. We have, subsequently, on three additional occasions communicated with the Executive Committee related to this issue and each time (four times) we have requested that this be brought before this body to be considered. This is the first time that we have been able to get it on the floor to be considered. I really do feel that are some very substantive changes in the document that has been distributed to faculty which are going to affect criteria and the way people are considered in the tenure and promotion process.

BEPKO: If I may add, based on conversations with the leadership of the Council, it was my understanding that the matter was presented today as if it had to do only with the little box on the routing sheet that contains the Dean of Faculties' signature. No other issue seemed to be discussed.

VESSELY: In the last cover letter from these documents from the Faculty Affairs Committee, the Executive Committee looked at three changes. The Faculty Affairs Committee indicated in their cover letter that they boiled down all of the problems that had arisen in these documents to three changes. One of those changes had to do with the use of the biography for the person who writes the letter of support, the second had to do with the line of the routing form, and the third one concerned abstention, that is whether or not abstentions should be recorded. Concerning the abstentions, it was determined by the Executive Committee, in consultation with the Parliamentarian, that you could not prohibit someone from abstaining. The biography seemed to be a point that the Executive Committee, and we might have been advised to bring it to this group, but the Executive Committee felt that requiring a biography from the person writing the letter of support was not obtrusive, nor in any way problematic to the process. The third item we considered to be substantive and that was the addition of the Dean of Faculties' line to the routing form. That item we brought to you today. The cover letter clearly stated that those were the three problems that the Faculty Affairs Committee had. It probably had underlying notions that there were other problems, but we had reduced it to those three. That was the reason for bringing this one item to the group today.

WELLMAN: I think that a few other points need to be made. That document was considered by the Faculty Affairs Committee with less than 24 hours to notify the Executive Committee. As I understand it, somebody had to stay that evening in order to formulate this response. That is how close the timing was given to the Faculty Affairs Committee to go over this document and that, as far as I recall, was as immediate a response as the Faculty Affairs Committee could give, given the very short time scale that they were given to respond. I think the whole discussion reflects a lot of confusion from the beginning about these documents and the ability of the Faculty Affairs Committee to consider it, revise it, and have responses back.

VESSELY: That is not the case. The Faculty Affairs Committee fed responses to the Executive Committee. We met the second Thursday of every month and that month we met the third Thursday. So we met two weeks later than normal. I don't agree with that argument.

PLATER: This document has been issued in one form or another for years and years by the Dean of the Faculties. Fourteen months ago it was submitted to the Tenure Committee and the Promotions Committee to make revisions that would reflect both changes and practices that had gone on and to incorporate a number of suggestions that had been made during the process which I first presided over as Dean of the Faculties two years ago. During that time, after the point that Dick Peterson made when it was issued in June, the Faculty Affairs Committee requested that the document be reconsidered because of some problems that they perceived. The document was withdrawn and since that time the document has been reviewed by two years worth of Promotions Committee, the Tenure Committee, the Faculty Affairs Committee, and this body, as well as the deans and individual committees within the schools that cared to take it up. It has been, as far as I can tell, the most reviewed document by the faculty of any that I have seen in two years as Dean of the Faculties. I think there has been ample time for discussion of all of the issues. There are only, as far as I know, the three points of difference that have been raised that Jeff Vessely has indicated. It seems to me that if we were to take the advice of this body and not issue guidelines for next year, it would throw the faculty into a terrible situation of not having any advise or guidelines about how to prepare their dossiers. I don't think that is what is intended. As a consequence, I would be somewhat uncertain as to what counsel we could give to faculty who are preparing dossiers for promotion and tenure cases next year.

We have tried during the past 14 months to be as consultative as possible with all of the faculty bodies that are concerned with the matters of promotion and tenure, which include other committees beyond the Faculty Affairs Committee. I urge that these guidelines be endorsed and supported by this body, which I think has had time to consider them. If the issue is whether the Dean of Faculties' vote is recorded or not, personally it has no significance to me. I am perfectly willing to be guided by this body as to whether the Dean's vote should be recorded or not. But I urge that the entire set of guidelines which have been worked on for months not be dismissed by recommendation of this group now, at this late date.

HOYT: Is the Constitution and Bylaws Committee now considering those changes of the voting?

VESSELY: Yes. They have been formally charged with that consideration and have agreed to report at the first meeting in the fall.

PETERSON: The Faculty Affairs Committee recognizes the amount of work and the amount of input that have been put into this document and indeed the Faculty Affairs Committee has agreed with some of the changes that they feel are criteria changes, that are procedural changes, that are differences from what the Handbook states. Those are incorporated in this document. They were not commented on by us, but on four occasions, as I said earlier, we have asked that this be looked at and that it be approved as a document by this group with those changes which vary from what is stated in the Handbook. That has not been done. I would submit that we cannot just blanket accept, in a group, this whole document without examining all of the changes. Some of them are definitely of procedural and policy changes that we do need to examine to make sure that we are not going to have negative effects on faculty.

PLATER: That is precisely what I think your committee has been doing for the past year.

PETERSON: Even if we agree though to the policy and procedural changes, those policy and procedural changes need to be approved by this body. The Constitution tells us so.

PLATER: I submit that there are no policy or procedural changes that are in contradiction to either the IUPUI Faculty Handbook or the Academic Handbook of Indiana University. There are no changes. There are not changes in criteria. These are guidelines issued by the Dean of Faculties office this year. I hope they offer as much advice as possible -- from faculty -- as to what should go into a dossier to make the best case the faculty member can for advancement in rank or for tenure.

VESSELY: I would suggest to this body that a vote on a motion to reconsider to vote affirmatively to reconsider the motion and a subsequent defeat of the motion to scuttle the entire document would be in effect a vote of this body to accept all of the work done by the various committees that have worked on this document. Then, vote on the Dean of Faculties' line on the routing form as your conscience so directs.

BEPKO: We would divide this into three parts. Part one would be a vote to reconsider putting up the question again.

Part two is a vote to not scuttle, as Jeff said, the entire document because it has been the product of at least a year's work by a number of committees on the Faculty Council as well as the Dean of Faculties Office. Incidentally, as Bill says, it is not something that is intended nor does it have the effect of changing policy or criteria. It simply is a set of guidelines offered by the Dean of Faculties Office that has been issued for years in a form that probably wasn't as good as the one that it is in now. It certainly didn't have all of the participation of all of the committees before this year.

Thirdly, to take up the issue, which I thought was the one that was put on the agenda for today, which is whether there should be a separate line for the Dean of Faculties to check on the routing form.

KLOESEL: I feel that a vote on the third item might be premature before the Constitution and Bylaws Committee decides what it wants to decide. That is, if we vote in the future to make the Dean of Faculties a non-voting member of the Tenure Committee, that might have an effect on what we think about having the separate box.

BEPKO: That may be best raised when we come to the third issue. Is there any objection to approaching the issue in the way that Jeff Vessely has suggested?

ROBBINS: I want to ask the question that I was about to ask before Jeff made his proposal and that was your interpretation of whether or not the elimination of the word "generally" is substantive? Is it considered to be a substantive or non-substantive change to the criteria or the language in the Handbook. It sounds to me that that could clearly be interpreted as a substantive change in the way in

which the criteria are applied. That sounds to me like a change that most faculty might not endorse.

PLATER: The document, if you read it in its entirety, says the basic criteria for tenure and promotion within Indiana University are stipulated in the Indiana University Handbook. The document goes on to say that these are guidelines. As far as the one word, if that is a problem, I certainly have no objection to inserting "generally" to make it exactly the same as the language of the Handbook. The guidelines are not intended to replace in any way the criteria that are stated in the official documents -- that is the Handbook of this campus and the Handbook of Indiana University. These guidelines do not, by the way, apply to the Purdue promotion process. That is also noted in the introductory comments.

BEPKO: I think we have to vote. There are no objections in the way that Jeff Vessely suggested that the vote be taken. The first vote that controls all of the others is a vote on the reconsideration of the earlier vote. Are you prepared to vote on that motion? This is a vote on the motion to reconsider the earlier vote. All in favor say "Aye." Opposed? [there were a few] The floor is now open for the original discussion.

KARLSON: No it is not. We had a time limit and it automatically goes to vote.

BEPKO: The floor is now open for a vote on the original discussion. The suggestion has been made that because this issue was presented as one dealing only with the Dean of Faculties box on the routing form, that we separate that issue.

KARLSON: The motion before the floor is the motion as stated from the Faculty Affairs Committee. Why don't you have him re-read the motion?

BEPKO: Dick, would you re-read the motion?

PETERSON: I move, on behalf of the Faculty Affairs Committee, **that these documents not be implemented until they have been examined and approved by this Council.**

BEPKO: Are you ready to vote on that motion? Does everyone understand what the consequences of the vote will be? All in favor, say "Aye". Opposed? [Because of the closeness of the vote, a hand count was used.] Does anyone want to call for a count? Let's do a count. Clearly the "Ayes" have it. That is going to create an administrative problem because, if we accept that vote, there will be no packet of materials on the guidelines right now to distribute. I recommend that, since the Faculty Affairs Committee initiated this, that they as soon as possible provide us with a list of those things that they think have to be changed.

PLATER: We have the things that they have recommended.

BEPKO: I think we should just go back to the old documents. I don't think we have any choice but to go back to the old documents that were issued in previous years.

MORREL: Would it be possible to go ahead and disseminate the new guidelines with some appropriate phrase in it such as pending final approval of the IUPUI Faculty

Council?

PLATER: It is possible that this is an advisory vote to the Dean of the Faculties. I may very well issue guidelines in any case. There ought to be some guidelines that are issued by the Dean of Faculties. What the form of those is, is yet to be determined. I think in the process we have tried to be as responsive as we can to the will of the faculty in having a set of guidelines that we can all live with. I don't think it would be appropriate, given the vote here, to now send out these guidelines and say "Follow them," although they have already been distributed to faculty.

BEPKO: I don't think there is time for us to have a discussion on what the best course of action is. I think that it does create an administrative problem though, because we want to have the best promotion and tenure review every year that we can possibly have. We thought we were headed in that direction and this will change the procedures, or at least change the guidelines, that are going to be available to the academic units. We have other agenda items, however, and we probably ought to get to those.

AGENDA ITEM VII -1990-91 Calendar - Academic Affairs Committee - Rebecca Porter, ACTION ITEM

BEPKO: We have an Academic Affairs Committee report by Rebecca Porter. This is an action item. We have to take it up. It is on the 1990-91 calendar.

PORTER: You should have all received the IUPUI Circular 89-07 which contains the proposed calendar for academic year 1990-91. You will notice that there is the Calendar Committee recommendation which is the same pattern that we will be using next academic year. In the fall semester, classes begin on Wednesday, no classes meet on Labor Day, and Thanksgiving recess begins on Wednesday. In the spring semester, the spring recess is at the mid-point of the semester.

The Academic Affairs Committee is bringing forward a different pattern for the fall semester. The concern has been raised and discussed in the Academic Affairs Committee with the effects on laboratory classes. Of those weeks which do not have full Monday through Friday sessions, the Calendar Committee calendar contains three such weeks -- the first week, the week of Labor Day, and the week of Thanksgiving. The problem is that if a laboratory course has one section that meets on Monday, a second section which meets on Tuesday, and a third lab section which meets on Thursday, these three weeks may be lost if it is the pattern within that academic unit to set up for labs Monday morning, with teardown on Friday. If you don't have the full week to run all the labs, then they effectively cannot have the laboratory sections doing the same kind of work that they would prefer having them doing.

Therefore, the Academic Affairs Committee investigated the possibility of preparing a calendar which would maximize the number of full weeks while maintaining the Labor Day recess. This is the calendar that is recommended to you by the Academic Affairs Committee.

Classes begin on a Monday. No classes are held on Labor Day and no classes are held the week of Thanksgiving. I do not believe that this is a pattern that we have used in our recent history here at IUPUI. On behalf of the Academic Affairs Committee I request your adoption of the calendar presented to you.

PORTER: The Calendar Committee recommendation has three partial weeks -- the first week, the week of Labor Day and the week of Thanksgiving.

PORTER: I am not in that situation so I can't answer that but it was a concern than has been raised within the Academic Affairs Committee's discussions.

J. MILLER: What affect would this have on ten-month faculty?

PORTER: We did consult the Registrar. Dr. Slocum said that there were no problems with the Academic Affairs Committee's recommendation, based on days for registration, etc.

J. MILLER: What about the ten-month faculty?

PORTER: Based on the schedule that we have used previously, we would have started on the same Monday. It is two days earlier than Wednesday but it is not a large change.

BEPKO: Is there any other discussion or are you ready to vote?

BESCH: I just wanted to ask if this puts us closer to the calendar for the rest of the campuses or further from it?

PORTER: I suppose it depends on whom you compare us to.

BEPKO: Bloomington is the natural one. We have joint programs with Bloomington. In fact, we have no students or faculty that are commuting to the other campuses. So, I think we have to use Bloomington. How does it relate to Bloomington? Are we getting closer or going further away?

PORTER: My understanding is that they are moving back to three days during Thanksgiving break rather than a full week. So, it would be moving us away. However, we are not consistent with them during the spring semester either.

KECK: Some of us, however, even though we don't commute to other campuses teach routinely on other campuses and the Academic Affairs Committee's recommendations will make that process more difficult. They already don't have the same days on campus that we have.

PORTER: The major difference has always been in the Spring semester with Spring recess. We haven't been able to resolve that problem. I don't know the Bloomington starting date. They have traditionally held classes on Labor Day where we have not. It does create problems if you are to be at a number of different places, which speaks to again to perhaps the all-campus calendar committee trying to resolve the differences. We felt this was the best calendar for the needs on this campus.

BEPKO: Are you ready for the question? The proposal is to adopt the calendar that is set forth in the first column on Circular 89-07. This is with a full week off at Thanksgiving. Are you ready for the vote? All in favor, say "Aye". Opposed? The "nos" have it. Do you have a substitute recommendation?

PORTER: Yes we do. We would like to recommend the calendar that is presented under Calendar Committee recommendation.

BEPKO: Is there any discussion? Are you ready for the question? All in favor, say "Aye". Opposed? [there were a few] The Calendar Committee's recommendation is adopted.

AGENDA ITEM VIII - Fringe Benefits Committee Report - Linda Kasper

BEPKO: The next item is the Fringe Benefits Committee Report with Linda Kasper.

KASPER: In the interest of time and because some of the points which were included in my report have already been covered by Jeff, I am going to make this very abbreviated. Some of you are probably wondering when you are going to get to see this magic health care proposal. Keith Moore and I will be passing out copies of this after I finish my report and while Dean Wolf is giving the Athletic Affairs Advisory Committee report.

Because of some of the work that has been done at the UFC Fringe Benefits Committee level, and as Chancellor Bepko mentioned earlier, there are four provisions for benefits that will be implemented on September 1 of this year. Those are Well Baby Care which covers check ups and immunizations to age seven, the Start Smart Program which is a program to monitor prenatal care, a Preferred Pharmacy Network which will provide savings for prescription drugs, and a change in chiropractic benefits from the current coverage. These changes were viewed as having no impact on the rates that would be paid by the employee, nor would they have a measurable impact on the benefits received.

Secondly, the remainder of the proposal that you will receive will be placed on the UFC agenda for the first fall meeting with full discussion by the Faculty Council at that time. If the plan is approved by the Faculty Council in the fall, the complete plan will be implemented January 1, 1990. President Ehrlich has agreed that full implementation will not occur until that time.

Basically, the new plan will provide major medical coverage on a preferred-provider basis. Employees also will have a choice of the amount of deductible that they choose to pay, four tiers of coverage in comparison to the two tiers that we currently have. The document that you will receive will show you what is proposed in comparison to what is currently covered under the traditional plan or the preferred care plan, whichever you have opted for. There is also an estimate of employee premium rates on the back section of what you will receive. There will be some educational opportunities over the summer for you to learn more about the plan. I would encourage you to take the opportunity to attend those. The IUPUI Fringe Benefits Committee will meet at least one more time before this academic year is over to discuss the plan. We have also asked to be placed on the agenda for the first fall meeting to give you a complete report at that time and we

will request that someone from the Insurance Office be present to answer your questions.

As Jeff mentioned, one other quick thing. The Early Retirement Plan is still very much in the developmental stage. In its present form, it is very similar to what was approved by this body in the Long-Lindemann Report a couple of years ago. Vice President Hackett was asked at the last UFC meeting to also consider as part of that development the Phased Early Retirement Program that was approved a couple of years ago. He has indicated that he will be working with the UFC Fringe Benefits Committee over the summer to develop a plan that will be brought in the fall for discussion.

VESSELY: We will have the opportunity to lead the way since in the fall we will meet on September 7 to receive the next level of reports from Linda's group and the UFC will meet on September 12. We will be able to go to that meeting with some recommendations from our group.

AGENDA ITEM IX - Athletic Advisory Committee Report - Dean Hugh Wolf

BEPKO: Last but certainly not least, Dean Wolf will give his annual Athletic Advisory Committee Report.

WOLF: Following is the report of the IUPUI Athletics Advisory Committee.

**IUPUI ATHLETICS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
ANNUAL REPORT
1988-1989**

The Athletics Advisory Committee (AAC) is an administrative committee responsible to the Chancellor of the IUPUI campus. The committee is charged with "exercising institutional control of the intercollegiate athletic program at IUPUI as outlined by the applicable national, regional, and state associations." The committee is composed of fourteen faculty and eight staff members. The 1988-89 members and their campus affiliations are:

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Hugh A. Wolf, Chairman | School of Education |
| Sharon K. Alger | School of Nursing |
| C. D. Aliprantis | School of Science |
| LTC James C. Brandon | Military Science |
| Dorothy A. Cheesman | Admissions Office |
| William N. Kulsrud | School of Business |
| Timothy Langston | Dean of Students |
| Timothy Lemon | Alumni Relations |
| Robert L. Lovell | School of Physical Education |
| Robert E. Martin | Administrative Affairs |
| James L. McDonald | School of Dentistry |
| Norman L. Merkler | University Division |
| Dale Neuburger | Natatorium |
| Marsha Porter-Gary | Staff Council |
| Edmund Schilling | School of Physical Education |
| Phillip Tennant | Herron School of Art |
| Jeffery Vessely | Faculty Council |
| Charles F. Yokomoto | School of Engineering/Technology |

There are seven varsity sports at IUPUI: baseball, basketball, soccer, and tennis for men and basketball, softball, and volleyball for women. All programs are conducted under guidelines and eligibility criteria established by the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA).

The following is a summary of the principal items the committee and its individual members dealt with during 1988-89.

The committee approved a ticket price increase for single events raising the cost from \$2.00 to \$3.00 per person/per event.

The committee endorsed the concept of keeping the name IUPUI and directed a letter to Chancellor Bepko to that effect.

The committee discussed recent efforts on the part of the student body to enhance school spirit by creating a fight song and mascot for the campus. The Chairman and Dr. Langston met with one of the student representatives to clarify procedures and responsibilities.

In December, Chairman Hugh Wolf, Athletic Director Robert Lovell and Dean Nick Kellum attended a meeting of the IUPUI Board of Advisors and briefed the members about the intercollegiate athletic program. The presentation was well received by the Advisory Board.

The Chairman and Mr. Lovell also attended the state meeting of NAIA schools and subsequently updated the committee on a set of new academic regulations instituted by the NAIA. These will go into effect in the fall of 1989.

The committee devoted several hours to discussion of The Long Range Plan for Intercollegiate Athletics prepared by the Athletic Department. The plan is the first of its kind and includes information on the history of athletics at IUPUI, rationale for the program, a financial plan, and recommendations for the future. One feature of the plan is a recommendation that consideration be given to seeking an affiliation with The National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA). The committee has also been working on a strategy for implementation of the plan once it has been approved by the campus administration.

In addition to the activities of the Athletics Advisory Committee, attention should be called to some of the highlights of the 1988-89 season.

- Joe Ramierez was named head coach of the men's tennis team and Chad Cunningham replaced Craig Clark as head coach of the men's baseball team.
- The men's tennis team finished fourth in District 21 in spite of a coaching change and very young players.
- A gift of \$5,000 was received from an anonymous donor to assist in starting a women's tennis team. The program was initiated this spring on a limited schedule basis. Full scale competition in women's tennis is scheduled to begin next fall.

- The men's soccer team posted a 12-8-1 record in its second season of action. The Metro booters lost to Earlham College 4-3 in the semi-finals of the District 21 playoffs. The match lasted through two regulation periods, two overtimes, and two sudden death periods.
- Women's volleyball team was ranked #5 in the nation by the NAIA and finished the season with a 29-9 record. Senior Marcy Bixler, an accounting major in The School of Business was named NAIA Player-of-the-Week in September, the first IUPUI student-athlete to be so honored. Marcy was subsequently named District 21 Player-of-the-Year and was an NAIA first team All-American selection. Tim Brown was honored as District 21 Coach-of-the-Year.
- The women's basketball team completed its season with a mark of 15 wins and 14 losses. Kristen Pritchett, a freshman from Indianapolis Ben Davis High School, was selected for first team All District 21 honors.
- The men's basketball team had a record of 19-18 and was defeated in the second round of the District 21 playoffs. Jesse Bingham was named to the All-District 21 first team. Todd Schabel received honorable mention.
- The men's baseball team was qualified for the NAIA District 21 Tournament which will be played at Anderson University on May 10-13.
- The women's softball squad finished the regular season with a won/lost record of 40-16 and was ranked 8th in the latest NAIA national poll. The team will begin its quest for a seventh consecutive appearance in the NAIA national tournament this weekend when they host the District 21 playoffs.

The committee also wishes to acknowledge the accomplishments of our student-athletes in the classroom. For the fourth consecutive year, each of our seven intercollegiate teams had collective grade point averages of C or better. For fall, 1988, the overall GPA for all student-athletes was 2.59. The committee's Academic Achievement Award, which is given annually to the team with the highest collective GPA, was won by the men's tennis team which posted a mark of 2.79.

Hugh A. Wolf, Chairman
IUPUI Athletics Advisory Committee

VESSELY: This weekend IUPUI is hosting the district women's softball tournament. I am sure that was in Hugh's report and won't get to you until afterward. I think you would be quite impressed to come out and watch these ladies play.

BEPKO: I would like to add to that that this weekend the women's softball is going to win the district softball tournament.

AGENDA ITEM X - Unfinished Business

There was no unfinished business.

AGENDA ITEM XI - New Business

There was no new business.

AGENDA ITEM XII - Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.