

Indiana University - Purdue University Indianapolis

Faculty Council Meeting

School of Dentistry, Room S115

May 1, 1997

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

Present: Administration: Chancellor Gerald L. Bepko, William Plater. **Deans:** P. Nicholas Kellum, H. Oner Yurtseven. **Elected Faculty:** W Marshall Anderson, Susan Ball, William Blomquist, Paul Brown, Nancy Eckerman, Naomi Fineberg, Julie Fore, Karen Gable, Richard Gregory, William Hohlt, Sara Hook, Elizabeth Jones, Robert Keck, Michael Klemsz, Miriam Langsam, Rebecca Markel, Byron Olson, Richard Peterson, Richard Pflanzner, Rebecca Porter, Gerald Powers, Terry Reed, Beverly Ross, William Schneider, Erdogan Sener, Martin Spechler, Stephen Stockberger, Soren Svanum, Rosalie Vermette, Jeffery Vessely, Kathleen Warfel, Jeffrey Watt, Robert Weetman, Karen West, Harriet Wilkins, Marianne Wokeck, Charles Yokomoto. **Ex Officio Members:** Henry Besch, Dolores Hoyt, Juanita Keck, Steven Mannheimer, Carl Rothe.

Alternates Present: Deans: James Brown for Trevor Brown, Donald Tharp for Lawrence Goldblatt, J. M. Kapoor for Roberta Greene, Shirley Ross for Angela McBride, Kathryn Wilson for David Stocum. **Elected Faculty:** Jonathan R. Eller for Nathan Houser, Linda Marler for Bernadette.

Absent: Administration: Trudy Banta. **Deans:** John Barlow, A. James Barnes, Paul Bippen, Robert Holden, Continuing Studies representative, Norman Lefstein, Business representative, Robert Shay, Philip Tompkins, Donald Warren, Charles Webb.

Visitors: Erwin Boschmann (Office of Faculty Development), Mark Grove (Registrar), Vice Chancellor, Robert Martin, Carol Nathan (Dean of the Faculties Office), Richard Turner (Chair, Campus Planning Committee.)

Agenda Item I: Call to Order

Porter: I are going to call the meeting order so we can begin moving through some of the business of the Council since we have a number of interesting items to deal with at this our final meeting.

Agenda Item II: Memorial Resolution

Porter: Our first item of business is to recognize the memorial resolution for Elizabeth Navarre from the School of Social Work. Would you please stand for a moment of silence? Thank you.

Agenda Item III: Approval of Minutes

Porter: We have three sets of minutes to approve. We will address first the January 16, 1997 minutes. Are there any additions or corrections to be made to these minutes?

Langsam: I move that they be accepted. **Vessely:** I second that.

Porter: All of those in favor, say "Aye." Opposed, "No." The minutes stand approved. The minutes of February 6,

1997 are next.

Besch: I move that they be approved. **Langsam:** I second the motion.

Porter: We have a motion and a second to approve the February 6th minutes. All of those in favor, say ‘Aye.’ Opposed, ‘No.’ The February minutes stand approved. The March 6th minutes are next. Are there any additions or corrections to these minutes?

R. Keck: On page 2, the last paragraph, should be corrected as follows: ‘The following day was Father’s [Founder’s](#) Day . . .

Porter: Thank you very much. Are there any other additions or corrections? The motion is to approve as amended. Is there a second? [Second] All of those in favor, say ‘Aye.’ Opposed, ‘No.’ The March minutes are approved as amended.

Agenda Item IV: Administrative Report: Chancellor Gerald L. Bepko

Bepko: Mindful of how much progress you have made, going almost all the way through the agenda, I should be very brief. One other footnote about child care. We are going to ask the Foundation to make this a priority for private fund raising. As you know, we are going to have a Campaign for IUPUI, but some things have gone forward before the campaign. For example, fund raising for the Herron/Law project and for a couple of other charitable projects. Fund raising has gone forward for those and we think we should put the child care effort in that category to see if we can’t enhance the amount of money that we already have for child care.

Secondly, as you know the General Assembly had not reached a resolution on a budget for 1997-99 and they have adjourned. They may come back next week, but it is probably more likely that they will be back the first week of June. The budget that they had in front of them was not a bad one for Higher education. It was predicated on an assumption that we would raise undergraduate tuition by 3 percent. On that assumption, the increase in budgets across the university would have been about 3.5 percent in the first year and about 3.7 or 3.8 percent in the second year. That is based on the assumption that compensation would be increased about 4 percent and all the other expenditure lines in the university’s budgets would be increased about 3 percent. The capital projects are all in this budget. That means the Neal Marshall, Herron/Law Project, Southeast campus projects, a Business School building in Bloomington; and planning money, or architectural and engineering money for the new academic/classroom building that we have envisioned as a replacement for the Mary Cable Building. We hope that is not something they will play with in a special session because it worked out pretty well for all of Indiana University and for all of higher education. The problem had to do with the Republicans in the House not being taken into account and not being allowed to play any role in the final discussions of the budget, and because they were excluded, they refused to vote for it and that is why the budget was not approved.

The question that is most often asked is, “What does all this mean for salary increases for 1997-98?” I think we are probably in a range right now, unless there is some major changes in the budget in a special session, where salaries are probably going to be between 3 and 4 percent. That will be the range that is recommended and that schools and campuses will have to come within. You might say, “I thought I had heard that there was some extra money for technology above and beyond the 3.5 percent or 3.7 percent that was in this budget. Wouldn’t that be available later on? Wouldn’t that permit a little more flexibility for salaries? The answer is “probably not” because the technology money that was provided in the budget that died at midnight the other night was in cash. It was not in base funds. So, they would give 1 percent of the appropriation added on to the appropriation for technology, but only for two years.

It would not be continuing funding. You would have to use it only for technology and it would only be the cash for those three years.

The other question that is asked is, "Well, if the state is giving 4 as an assumed percent for compensation increases and three percent for other categories of expenditure, then shouldn't we get an average of four percent salary increases for everybody in the university?" The reason that doesn't work out is because there are costs that mush come off the top, the largest of which is the 18/20 program, which is the first thing that is deducted every time we make a budget. The increases in 18/20 costs are very substantial for every campus. So, you take a big chunk of money off the top before you start to provide regular salary increases to pay for the increased number of our colleagues who are earning interim benefits under the 18/20 program. However, all of this is subject to change in a special session, but we think that there won't be that many changes. We hope they come in right around where they were with this budget for higher education, but add back in some of what was left out at the last moment in base funds and not in cash. [Changed to side two of tape]

We have had a lot of reasons to be proud. Great things are going on all around the campus. We were reminded of the farsightedness of planning that went on 10 or 11 years ago when the Center on Philanthropy was created. The Center has gotten all sorts of recognition around the country over the years. It is really a center of excellence. This weekend in Philadelphia there was a Presidents' Summit that was focused on many of the issues that have been highlighted by people in the Center on Philanthropy, faculty members who have worked with the Center, who have created papers, articles, and books about the subject of voluntary action for the public good. The nation's attention is turning more and more to these phenomena. I think we should be very proud that a lot of this started here. There are about 30 centers on voluntary action and philanthropy around the country. Ours was the first and is the most important. It is good to see that the nation's attention is being focused on subjects that originate from IUPUI.

There is a sad note in this though. I want to mention this to explain why I was late. The Director of the Fund Raising School is Tim Seiler. He has been the director for a couple of years. He and his wife Karen have a nine-year-old daughter Emily who died on Tuesday night from cancer. This is a terrible tragedy. Several of us were at the calling this afternoon and couldn't leave before we did. I apologize for being late.

Agenda Item V: President of the Faculty Report: William Schneider

Schneider: I would like to begin by observing that it is the month May. Lots of things happen in the month of May including the last Faculty Council meeting. The last Faculty Council meeting means a year of activity that I think was quite fruitful in a number of ways: such as the vote to proceed with University College, procedures for Faculty Boards of Review. We have dealt with some things that weren't our own initiation like teaching awards and new holidays. Altogether, I think we have quite a bit to be proud of as far as what we have accomplished. There are some new things as well that are coming along which I will mention in a minute, but now I would like to take a moment to ask those for whom this will be your last meeting as a term of service to stand up, please so that we can thank you for your service for this year? [Applause]

We are going to hear more about the items that will be carried over for next year from the committee reports later in the meeting. There is one item, though, that was attached to the agenda which I wanted to make note of so that you will know what it is. The Report of the Task Force on Research and Graduate Education is an item we will take up as business next fall. The committee concluded its report a couple of months ago and we wanted to get it to you so you would have an opportunity to digest it before next fall.

As far as my report is concerned, probably the most significant thing that occurred since our last meeting was the UFC meeting. A couple of the items that we discussed at our last meeting were acted upon by the UFC.

For one thing, the UFC approved the changes that IUPUI asked for in the new Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities. The Dean of Faculties is taking the appropriate actions to make those known to the various schools so we can have them available for students on our campus.

The UFC also approved the minimum standards for Faculty Boards of Review. We are presently assessing them to make sure our policies are consistent with those minimum standards.

The UFC also approved (with a few modifications) the Intellectual Property proposal about which we had quite a lengthy discussion. It has been forwarded to the Trustees for their action at its meeting which will take place next week.

Finally, the UFC also made some changes and sent back to the Trustees the policy for Family Related Partial Leave. We hope that they will act favorably on this matter which we believe is in the interest of Indiana University. We will see how the Trustees react to that at their meeting in May.

Finally, one item that is listed on the agenda which I can formally report on is the vote on the Constitutional amendment dealing with adding language about librarians. It passed overwhelmingly.

Agenda Item VI: Election of Executive, Nominating, and Promotion and Tenure Committees

Porter: We will now move to the elections for members of the Executive Committee, the Nominating Committee and the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The ballots are being distributed.

West: I have just one clarification item to make before the election. On the circular, for the Promotion and Tenure Committee, Suzanne Steinmetz will be leaving that committee this year and Meredith Hull's term should be until 1999. This committee has a three-year membership upon election.

Porter: If you will take a moment to vote and then pass your ballots to members of the Nominating Committee.

[Following the election]

Porter: I would like to ask the Nominating Committee to report the results of the election. While Karen [West] is getting ready to give that report, on behalf of the Council, I would like to thank the members of the Nominating Committee for serving us so well this year. It is not always an easy task.

West: I would like to publicly thank my committee for meeting with me at 7:30 a.m. to accommodate my operating room schedule. Those persons were Paul Galanti, Jeff Vessely, Naomi Fineberg, Harriet Wilkins, and Sara Hook. I really appreciate their efforts. The results of the elections were:

Executive Committee: Naomi Fineberg, Juanita Keck, Carl Rothe, Rosalie Vermette.

Nominating Committee: Raymond Koleski, Karen West. (Raymond Koleski will be the chairperson during 1998-99)

Promotion and Tenure Committee: Robert Keck.

I would like to make a motion to destroy the ballots and retain the tally sheet in the Council Office.

Porter: We have a motion to destroy the ballots.

Langsam: I so move.

Porter: Thank you. Is there a second? **Besch:** Second.

Porter: All of those in favor of the motion please say "Aye." Opposed? [None] The ballots will be destroyed with the tally sheeting being retained in the Council Office.

Agenda Item VII: Bylaw Changes Regarding Faculty Boards of Review (IUPUI Circular 97-07)

Porter: Are you ready to continue with business? Hearing no objections, we will move forward to a discussion of the Bylaw changes regarding Faculty Boards of Review. Harriet Wilkins of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee will lead the discussion. Note that this is an action item. We are planning on taking a vote.

Wilkins: Attached to the agenda for last month was a complete text of the Bylaw amendment that we are proposing. We have received some, editorial mostly, comments from you and those comments were included with your agenda this month. What the committee is proposing to you for action is substitution in the Bylaws, Article IV on Faculty Grievance Procedures which is a combination of those two -- the text that was presented to you last month with the changes that were forwarded to you this month. On behalf of the committee, I move that these amendments be adopted.

Porter: We have a motion from the committee to adopt. Is there any discussion or any questions to clarify the changes?

Langsam: Call for the question.

Porter: Hearing no discussion, we will move on to a vote. All of those in favor of the changes, say "Aye." Opposed? The motion is carried.

Wilkins: At the bottom of the page that came with today's agenda we also had some enabling motions to put before you. The major change in terms of the Boards of Review is that we are increasing the number and putting them into a pool from which the Boards for particular cases will be selected; in addition, we are instituting the Mediation Committee. In order that all of this can happen next fall, we are recommending the implementation plan which you have at the bottom of the page. Let me read those proposals:

1. The Executive Committee shall nominate seven (7) members for the Mediation Committee for election by the Council at its September meeting. (In other words we are pushing the date up. Normally, that election would take place in January with three (3) members elected for a one-year term and four for a two-year term. (You will notice that we use one and two a little bit loosely here; those elected for the one year terms would serve a bit longer than a year. They would serve until the end of January of 1999. Those elected for two-year terms will serve until January, 2000.)
2. The newly elected members should obtain training in mediation, if needed, during September and take office early. (That is, they would take office in October instead of February).
3. If necessary, the Executive Committee may appoint three (3) faculty members on an ad hoc basis to a Mediation Committee for temporary service during the interim or may ask Boards of Review to

conduct informal preliminary hearings until the Mediation Committee is in place.

Essentially, what we are asking to do is to move the implementation up to September/October rather than waiting for January/February which is the normal implementation cycle. On behalf of the Committee, I move the adoption of these three steps.

Porter: Are there any questions or discussion?

Spechler: Harriet, in the discussion that we had before, which was a very good discussion, we talked about the need for discretion, for speed, for delicate handling. It was suggested at that time that perhaps in the first instance a grievance might be handled by a single person, an Ombudsman, if you like. I gather that, that was not accepted, but would it be possible under these proposed regulations, for the Mediation Committee to assign a single person to operate on behalf of the committee in the interest of taking care of the grievance as quietly and as quickly as well as justly as possible?

Wilkins: The action we just took in adopting the amendments was that the Mediation Committee would normally work in pairs. That kind of consultation would be done by two members of the Mediation Committee. So, it is not having one person that has been designated to it for everybody, but that the Mediation Committee would appoint two of its members to work with people. There is also a provision for informal consultation: if a person is not sure whether he or she really has grounds for a grievance, but just needs some informal advice, I would think one person from the Mediation Committee could be appointed by that group to talk to the person.

Rothe: There is strong emphasis on being flexible these days.

Porter: Are there any other questions? Are you ready to vote? All of those in favor of the motion, please say "Aye." Opposed? The motion is carried.

Wilkins: Thank you very much.

Powers: As a person who served on the Ad Hoc Committee, I would like to have it entered into the minutes of the meeting what seemed to me to be the incredible job that Carl Rothe did on this very difficult and complex topic. It has a great deal of importance to all of us as faculty and the welfare of this university. Also, to Harriet. This has been a joint effort between that Ad Hoc Committee and the Constitution and Bylaws Committee. As a person who had the privilege of serving on the former committee, it has been a very gratifying experience. It is nice to see experts at work processing very difficult issues.

Porter: I think all of us are delighted that this was able to moved through so rapidly. We do greatly appreciate the work of all of those who served. Thank you, Carl and Harriet and the rest of you.

Schneider: I was going to thank the whole committee. You, Jerry, as well as Paul Galanti, Dean Walter Daly, and Emily Hernandez. I think all of you did a great job.

Agenda Item VIII: Campus Campaign Report: Kathleen Warfel

Porter: Moving on to another cooperative enterprise, we are going to ask Kathy Warfel to give us an update on the Campus Campaign.

Warfel: The Campus Campaign for this year has officially come to a close. I have had a report that this year there

were 1,002 donors during the campaign and the total as of today is \$1004.57. It is difficult to compare this year's campaign to last year's because: (1) of the loss of people to Clarian, and (2) of changes in how the Campus Campaign accounting was done. But, I can say that if we tried to compare the number of potential donors, if the Campaign had gone exactly the same way, we would have expected about 700 people to make donations. So, having 1,002 people make donations from the campus, I think speaks well for the general enthusiasm for IUPUI. I also want to say that the account that got the greatest number of donations and the greatest amount of money donated was the IUPUI Child Care Center. I think that speaks to the how widely recognized the need for this is.

Porter: Thank you to all of you who donated. We look forward to participation again next year.

Agenda Item IX: Update on Campus Housing: Vice Chancellor Robert Martin

Porter: The next item on our agenda is an update on Campus Housing. Vice Chancellor Robert Martin will provide us with some information.

Martin: Thank you. I have a document that I will distribute to you. It is an executive summary of the material that will be presented to the Trustees as to the status of IUPUI housing project. We tend to forget what all the activities have been. So, this is an attempt to recapture that.

I will go over it very briefly to highlight what we have been doing. Since November 1995 we have been working on two projects: the housing project as well as the child care center project for IUPUI. We went to the Trustees asking for approval to submit RFPs (Request for Proposals) to outside contractors and developers to respond to our set of requirements for both housing and the child care center. They were evaluated. We presented that information back to the Board of Trustees in August 1996 and recommended to the Trustees that we reject all of the RFP proposals that came in because there was no distinct advantage from any one of them and that our recommendation be that we pursue further the notion that the University consider developing, financing, and constructing housing for IUPUI. The Trustees agreed with that and gave us the endorsement and approval to go forward.

What we have been doing since that time is working with an external consultant, Ernst & Young, to develop two things: a market study as well as the financial feasibility study. This came at the request of the President feeling that we needed an external consultancy to study the market and the financial feasibility of doing such a project. We had no objections to that and agreed to do that as quickly as possible. As a sidebar, Ernst & Young has been retained to do a consultancy as well for a housing project at the South Bend campus, although ours is preceding that by probably about one year. They are still engaging Ernst & Young to do that review also.

On the Bloomington campus where there has been a lot of discussion about some renovation of housing, they too have engaged a consulting firm to do a study of the housing feasibility as well for major renovations in Bloomington. The notion of getting an external consultancy is something that the President wanted and we agreed.

You can see on the handout that Ernst & Young have completed their reports. I was hopeful that would have been submitted to us by now, but I understand that we are to get it yet this week. It will be officially delivered to the President and then there will be a distribution to the rest of the Vice Presidents of the University as well as to the campus administration.

What the Ernst & Young report is going to say is first, the market does exist, and that what we are proposing to do at this stage is feasible within the market meaning that what has developed on the peripheral of IUPUI, in terms of housing that has been developed for segments of the market, as far as the student market is concerned, there is still a market and that, in fact, we would not be over extending ourselves in the marketplace.

The second component is the financial feasibility. What this study will say is that, given the set of assumptions that you are planning on, both in terms of the cost of the construction as well as what market rents and occupancy would have to be the project is financially feasible. Ernst & Young will be making that presentation for us, as they have done the work, at the next Trustees' meeting.

At the same time, as a reminder, as a part of the strategic planning process and the Strategic Directions Charter that the President had initiated several years ago, you will recall that he had designated funds for the purposes of assisting campuses in developing their child care facilities. He had a put a small group together asking for each campus to make their proposal as to what their needs were and how much money they would like. We did that on behalf of IUPUI and, of a \$2 million SDC grant, IUPUI received \$1 million. We have \$1 million already pledged for the development of a child care center. We are presenting both housing and the child care center as a singular project. We are moving both of those forward at the same time.

We also recently engaged this spring the Marriott Corporation to do a quick consultancy with respect to food service and housing. We will probably have them take a look at food service from more of a campus perspective, but we asked them to focus in initially on what they felt the trend was and would be for a new student housing on this campus and what that meant from a food service standpoint. We have their report. We will be submitting that as well as part of documentation for our recommendation. What they are saying is generally that it does warrant to have some food operation there, particularly, if you were going to be interested in using the housing units in the summertime for any kind of summer institute. That recommendation will simply be that we need to consider very strongly, as we go forward in the design of the housing operation, what the food opportunities will be for that.

That, in summary, is where we are. The next time line is that, now we have gotten the Ernst & Young report, we have all the other documentation ready to go. We have asked that we be placed on the agenda of the June Board meeting. I think there are two meetings being scheduled. One should have been dealing with the budget issues and another was to have been dealing with general business. I am not sure which of those we will be on or whether they will still continue to have two meetings in June. But, we have been assured that we will be on the agenda. We will present the material. Ernst & Young will present their study on our behalf and I will be making a recommendation to the Trustees that, based upon that information, that we be given the authority to proceed with the design and the construction of student housing and a child care center for IUPUI. I would be happy to answer any questions.

Mannheimer: This may be premature, but have there been any number of sites or general quadrans of the campus or adjacent to the campus which have been identified as optimal for a location of such facilities?

Martin: For over at least 20 years, I know that the western perimeter of the campus (where the current Wartham Townhouse is, where graduate housing is, and where the Ronald McDonald House is) that western quadray has always been designated as the residential component for IUPUI. We are following along with that. That has got the best footprint to be able to do housing if you take a look at the rest of IUPUI. Our intent is to stay with that recommendation and to focus the student housing/child care center in that western perimeter. It is a very lovely area given the development of the White River State Park and the eventual 'rehabbing' of the White River which is to occur between the park area all the way up to New York Street and then ultimately past that to 10th Street. The rehab of White River actually brings an amenity to where we are proposing to put student housing.

Spechler: As I understand the budget process, but according to the news reports, the response of the House of Representatives, at least, to our budget proposal for the university was distinctly lukewarm. As best as I understand it, the money for the Strategic Directions Charter was one-time money or maybe one-time money at the rate of one percent less than was requested. If it seems the budget environment will be less welcoming than we had hoped, can

you say something about our priority with respect to the daycare center and the student housing and whether they might be divided temporarily in order to get it started?

Martin: The implication being that the legislature is not going to approve the housing project?

Spechler: The legislature is not going to approve all the money for the Strategic Directions Charter that was requested. What is more, for the housing, I assume bonding authority would be required. As far as I know, other projects have priority, including the theatre project and the Business School project. So, in view of what I take to be a generally lukewarm budgetary situation despite the enormous surplus we have in the state, how are we going to proceed? What is our strategy? Are we going to keep these things together or are we going to proceed, as I think Kathy and many of us have said, full speed ahead with the day care and put in the student housing when we can?

Martin: First of all, the SDC \$1 million money has already been committed so it is now in anticipation of what is in front of the legislature now. This is money that came from the earlier accumulations of Strategic Directions Charter money. So, in a sense, it is banked. That is there waiting for us to proceed. The reason we tied the projects together, and they don't necessarily have to be that way, is that we viewed the bonding authority for us to proceed on housing project, to the source of revenues to supplement the child care center. The child care center project, as it stands right now, is projected to be a \$3 million project. Someplace along the line we have to fill the gap. We have either got to reduce the scope of the project or we have to find revenues. That is why we tied those projects together. We are going full steam ahead. I don't see anything that would necessarily delay either one of the projects, but should the housing project be delayed, there is no reason why we can't still proceed with the design of the child care center. That would be our recommendation should the Trustees come back and say, "We suggest you split it up." That would be my recommendation. But, I am not anticipating that. The housing project is in fact a bond revenue. It is the same way we fund parking garages. So, it is a revenue bond. We will be required to have the normal approvals outside of the university and that would be the HEC and the State Budget Agency.

Schneider: Let's be optimistic and assume the Trustees approve the housing in June. What is the timetable?

Martin: As soon as the Trustees approve it there will be a letter issued by the President asking for the approval of HEC and then through the State Budget Agency. Once we were to receive that, our next step would be to hire an architectural firm and begin design and what would normally be preschematics of the projects -- both housing and child care. At each one of those junctures you take a time out and take a snapshot of where your costs care.

Schneider: And the completion?

Martin: Everybody wants to know that and I am always hesitant to say that, but I think on the housing project you are probably looking at, at least a 14 to 16 month construction time line.

Bepko: To follow up on Martin's question, we have all year this year said we have to have definitive plans by the end of the year. If housing is not going forward for some reason, then we have to find an alternative because we cannot delay child care any longer. What those other alternatives are I think we will have to explore quickly. Some of them are subject to unknown variables right now. I just forwarded an E-mail to Kathy the other day suggesting that the State Board of Health building, if it is made available to us, might create enough new space so we could move other things from other parts of the campus and then use the \$1 million strategically to improve something else on campus that could be a very good site for a child care center. We can't wait any longer. If the housing is problematic this year, we have to go along with another plan. We have waited too long.

Baldwin: Do we have a feel at all for the Trustees are going to deal with this housing situation? I was thinking of the

NCAA situation.

Martin: I don't have a feel. I can tell you that when we presented the other piece to the Trustees, we requested at that time that we reject the RFP proposals and engage in determining whether we could do that ourselves. They were very supportive and enthusiastic of that process. They weren't voting on anything at that point, but they were very supportive of the process. I don't know of any reason to believe that it will be rejected. I want to think optimistically as well. I think we have done all of our homework. We have done all that we have been asked to do. We have had external confirmation of some of our assumptions. I don't know what else there would be. If the market substantiates it and it is financially feasible, there would have to be a whole other reason. We already have housing. It is not like we are asking for new housing. We have had housing on this campus for years. We are asking to expand our housing.

Porter: Are there any other questions? [None] Thank you.

Agenda Item X: Committee Reports

Porter: We will wait and have questions and answers during the Question and Answer Period on our agenda so we can move on to the committee reports. We felt there was important business that each of these committees needed to bring forward and report to the Council. First we will hear from Jeff Watt, Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee.

Watt: There are two handouts you need to have. There are about four things I would like to report on. The first of which is the biggest item. The Academic Affairs Committee is bringing forward a motion to the Faculty Council on the academic calendar for adoption. I believe no second is needed since that comes from a committee. The main item on there was a discussion item for the Academic Affairs Committee about the inclusion of the cancellation of classes for a day for Martin Luther King Day. Earlier Mark Grove explained his interpretation of Martin Luther King Day, but Academic Affairs also has a position.

Grove: The Calendar Committee took the Trustees' role and prepared this case for submission to Academic Affairs and to the Council. The summary of the changes made are reflected on the cover sheet. The calendar itself reflects adding the King dates here. We have done this through the year 2010 which is the calendar that this group has approved. I think the items are reasonably well covered here, but the main thing is we have been able to accommodate King Day by adding one more day to the end of term by cutting final exams by a one day without unduly impacting students.

I will make one note now. It is the fifth bullet item on the cover page. If a student has a Monday night only class and a Sunday night only class, those exams will be scheduled for the same time. We have to make an accommodation then. We found out this term there are 16 undergraduate students with that particular accommodation. That number is small enough that, we can't make everything work, but obviously it is an adjustment.

The only other thing in there is the last item which relates to courses with the growing interests in common finals. We have started the last several years using the weekend preceding and following traditional finals week for common finals. If a course meets on Monday, class meeting which would be added to the calendar if it was one of those courses which happened to have a common final on the first weekend, they would lose that one period of instruction. But, knowing that ahead of time, they would make the appropriate adjustment to their syllabus and adjust to that one, presumably 50 minute, time slot.

The holiday would be just the one missed day. The Fall semester already ends on Monday because of the nature of being able to accommodate Labor Day and Thanksgiving break. We are also doing some of this two weekend common finals and we have not had any particular concern or problems raised about this.

Yokomoto: Is the shrinking of the final exam period due to date of graduation?

Grove: The shrinking of the final examination period is to make up the date for Martin Luther King Day.

Yokomoto: Will the final exam period in the spring be one day shorter?

Grove: One day less than it is in the Fall.

Yokomoto: In talking with the person who originally designed the original final exam schedule, when you go to one day less, you increase tremendously the odds of a student having to take three exams in one day.

Grove: Actually, you don't, Charlie. There are two issues. First of all, what we have done is move the Monday morning exam to a Tuesday morning. The rest of them go to Friday which has been a previously very lightly scheduled final exam day. (Could not understand) was very small. We can't simply add a day to the end because five years out of ten that would have us having the last day of finals the day after commencement.

Watt: I will add to the discussion that Bloomington has decided to cancel classes on the third Monday of January. They voted and passed that. The Academic Affairs Committee discussed the calendar also and the implementation and drafted our comments which are shown on the blue sheet of paper which you have. This passed our committee to forward here as our comments 10-1 and the one vote against this position, which basically says we should not cancel classes. It is not in the academic interest of this campus nor of the spirit of Dr. Martin Luther King. It was more of a technicality vote against it as opposed to taking the day off or not.

Porter: We have a motion to adopt the calendar. Is there any discussion?

Spechler: I may have missed something, but these are two alternative approaches, mutually contradictory approaches. Is that right? The calendar goes along with the Trustees at Bloomington and the recommendation on the blue sheet says 'No.' Am I correct on that? And, therefore, if we adopt the recommendation on the blue sheet, we go back to our old calendar. Is that right?

Porter: What the blue sheet says is that adjusting the calendar would have a negative impact on student learning and would not be an appropriate observation of Martin Luther King.

Spechler: I would like to know where we stand as far as the vote is concerned. Is the blue sheet saying we won't do it or we object to doing it? How do these two things come together?

Watt: The Academic Affairs Committee discussed it. The calendar that Mark Grove put together implementing what the Board of Trustees wants is to suspend classes on MLK Day (the first handout) came to the Academic Affairs. We discussed it and we said it was not in the academic best interest of this campus to do it. The blue sheet is what our recommendation is. The motion before us is do we accept the calendar with no classes on MLK Day in there or do we not accept the calendar.

Spechler: It is a point of order. I am still not clear what we are doing here. Is this calendar a recommendation of a committee?

Watt: Yes, it is.

Spechler: Of which committee?

Watt: The Academic Affairs Committee.

Porter: I believe I do understand your confusion. However, the Academic Affairs Committee did bring forward the calendar for adoption and is recommending that we may not want to do that. Is that correct?

Blomquist: Let me be more blunt. If I vote 'yes,' what happens?

Porter: If you vote 'yes,' on the motion, the calendar, with Martin Luther King Day as a holiday, will be adopted.

Blomquist: Okay. So, if you support the blue sheet, you should vote 'No.'

Porter: That is correct.

Koleski: I may be in complete sympathy, but by supporting the blue page are we really telling the Board of Trustees what they are supposed to do?

N. Fineberg: I support the blue sheet also, but I guess my question is, if we vote 'No' on the calendar, is this going to put us in a really bad position with the Trustees in terms of all the other things we want to get. Are they going to look at this as open rebellion of this campus?

Watt: Some of the discussion that went on in the Academic Affairs Committee was that they were forced into making a decision, may be an inappropriate decision, and they were under heat to make a decision so they did so. If we come along and say, "Well, we respect the spirit of it and we already have a lot of activities going on and we are in the spirit of what they wanted to get at it, but we don't cancel classes," they will probably overlook it and say, "Each campus acted on it and did what they needed to do."

Warfel: I would worry that the Board of Trustees would not overlook this. They would come back in a fairly humiliating way and say, "We don't care what you voted, we are canceling your classes." We have discussed this at several forums and it is a battle we lost. So, I would say let's just modify the calendar.

Baldwin: Just reading the blue sheet, this doesn't have any force of legislation to it. It is just a gripe motion saying we don't like this. So, it doesn't matter. You could vote for both of these. This is necessary, it seems to me, considering what they have done.

Pflanzer: The Board of Trustees has not told us to cancel classes, have they?

Warfel: Yes.

Pflanzer: I don't read that this way. It says 'adjust the university calendar . . .' You can adjust it a number of ways without canceling classes.

Schneider: In the meeting that question was asked and the answer was 'No classes.'

Spechler: I think Kathy is right. I think we have to go quietly on this. We don't have to support Bloomington, we don't have to support the President, we don't have to support the Board of Trustees. Mark has done a great job in minimizing the damage. I don't think we have one leg to stand on and I think we just have to go quietly on this and

do the best we can. The President knows we are not happy with it. Chancellor Bepko knows we are not happy with it. Maybe he is not happy with it, but I think, given the political situation, we just have to go quietly and vote 'Yes.'

Rothe: I would agree. However, one of the things that bothered me, I don't know whether the Trustees approved our Constitution or not for IU. If they did, then the faculty has legislative authority to fix the academic calendar and general policies for scheduling classes. It is bothersome that they can specify that they shall fix the calendar.

Schneider: The Trustees' position is that they have not approved the Constitution, as I understand it. One solution to this might be, if this is passed and receives no action, no one really hears about it. The question is whether the Council wants to direct anything to the President or the Trustees? That might be one way that the Academic Affairs Committee's opinions might be expressed. But, that would be a separate motion and separate vote.

Warfel: I thought we had already done that.

Porter: We did, indeed, at UFC indicate . . .

Besch: What is the possibility of tabling this motion?

Porter: If we table this motion, then the existing calendar would remain in effect and we might have some problems.

Grove: One immediate problem that we would have with that, Henry, is we go to press fairly soon with the spring schedule of classes. We have the calendar published in that and that editorial date would take place prior to the first meeting in the fall term of this body.

Koleski: We may be perfectly correct in the sense of saying what our prerogatives and rights are, but it would seem to me that, if you follow the sequence of events that might occur if they say we will have the day, does anyone want to go out on strike? Do you want to do something like that? It would seem to me that you save your energy for a more significant effort.

Porter: Are there any other comments? The motion on the floor is to adopt the proposed calendar revision to accommodate Martin Luther King's Day as distributed. [the white sheet.] We are adopting the entire calendar as printed although the Council has directed the Calendar Committee to come back annually for the Council to reaffirm our advanced planning.

Rothe: Could the Chancellor give us his insights on this?

Bepko: If I had any insights, I would have offered them already. [Laughter] I don't know what question you mean.

Rothe: It is a fundamental, political question.

Bepko: I don't think I would say they would get angry, but I think that Kathy is right about the utility of framing a protest about this, once again, it has already been protested, in the form of a rejection of their conclusion or worse yet something that could be seen as an abdication of our responsibility to prudently adjust the schedule to take account of what they declared to be a holiday. I think we should do that and go on and fight about something that we have a chance to win on and that means more to us than this may.

Koleski: It seems to me we could say something to the effect that, 'we will think your actions are unfair or violate our constitution,' whatever it might be, but to make it any stronger than that I think we should think about the

sequence of events.

Watt: Bill, you sent me an E-mail about what Bloomington added to the schedule of classes. There was a statement stating that the holiday was an action of the Board of Trustees made without consultation with the faculty.

Porter: The motion on the floor is to adopt the calendar as presented on the white sheets. All of those in favor say, "Aye." Opposed say, "No." [A few] The Ayes have it and the calendar is adopted.

The Academic Affairs Committee has some additional information to report.

Spechler: I move that we place the second part of the recommendation on the table indefinitely. I think it would be a bad idea to have a vote on this because the vote would go one way or the other. It seems, I think, unnecessary. Our views are well known; to complain now looks petty. I think we have conveyed our opinion before and I think if we table it now, we won't be taking either vote "Aye" or "Nay" either which would be unwise.

Porter: My understanding is that this was a recommendation but not presented as a motion. So, it is not on the floor. It was given as information.

Watt: Another item is a request by certain faculty within the School of Nursing to consider a one-week fall break similar to what is done with the spring break. We were not given any implementation ideas as to should the start and stop date of semesters be adjusted; put all of the days off into that one week which I presume would be Thanksgiving week or should it be a different week. We had nothing to go on there. We have not heard from any other schools that want us to consider that idea. So, at the time we have tabled it for next year. If there are other groups of students, faculty, schools, etc., that have ideas in this direction, we will put it back on the table to consider but at this time we did not act on it.

In terms of University College, we will have reports at our monthly meetings from the faculty on what is going on there during the implementation period of one year. At this time, the faculty has not been appointed, but we have Scott Evenbeck and myself on the committee and we have the Academic Affairs Committee apprised of what is going on. I don't know whether Bill wants to add anything to this, but at the current time, we are in the process of bringing names forward to Chancellor Bepko to appoint the founding faculty which I assume will be within the next month or so. So, by July 1 we can take the first step forward in that direction. Do you have anything to add to that, Bill?

Plater: It is our hope that the faculty can be announced before the end of May, before people leave, so that everyone will know who the founding faculty are. This group can do some work over the summer. We understand that not all of the members may be able to participate, but we would be prepared to go in the fall and to assist the founding faculty in taking up some of the important issues. A few committees have been appointed to address particular concerns that were identified during the town meetings as being of considerable importance to the faculty. The first two that have been formed deal with advising and with service learning.

Watt: The Academic Affairs Committee has one more meeting of the year and there is one more item. That is, the Undergraduate Conflict Resolution Policy being presented from CUL to our committee on how to work out curricular disputes among departments, between schools, etc. We don't understand if it fits well within CUL or should it fit somewhere else? Is there too many loops in the diagram or that it can streamline in any sort of way? We are still discussing that trying to figure out what is going on and what the best way to solve that is. I don't think we will get that completed in our last meeting of this year. That will be something carrying over to next year.

Porter: You did say Undergraduate Course Conflict not Undergraduate Conflict Resolution, right? Are there any questions for the Academic Affairs Committee? Next, we have Bob Keck reporting from the Budgetary Affairs Committee.

R. Keck: There is an IUPUI Circular 97-11 which is a written component of the report attached to your agenda. The membership of the Budgetary Affairs Committee includes 17 active faculty from business, dentistry, education, engineering & technology, Herron, liberal arts, medicine, nursing, science, SPEA, and representatives from the library and student affairs. The committee continues to receive budgetary and fiscal information from Bob Martin's office. This information has been provided annually for many years even preceding our RCM. The committee is very appreciative of this budgetary information.

In addition to this written information, Bob Martin and Pat Rooney make their time available to the committee. Pat has joined us once this year and Bob has joined us three maybe four times this year. We will meet with people in the AO Building -- Bill and Jerry -- and other people the week after commencement activities. We routinely meet with AO personnel sometime about this time during the academic year. We appreciate meeting even after commencement.

Some of the committee's activities this year were campus review of Strategic Directions. The review process is advisory to the campus administration. Representatives of BAC were involved in the budgetary process related to TERA. The Budgetary Affairs Committee was involved in early discussions of the fiscal implications of University College. The most time consuming activity of the committee remains the representation of two Budgetary Affairs Committee at the academic and service unit, budgetary review, and long range planning. Reports are written and distributed to the Budgetary Affairs Committee and recommendations made to the administration in regard to the individual unit plans. The Budgetary Affairs Committee's review of the budget has prompted us to bring to the Council the resolution which is presented in IUPUI Circular 97-11.

In the recent past and in the planning the technology budget would have been about 20 percent of what we call 'available or flexible' funds. This has become a concern to the Budgetary Affairs Committee. We have some people on the Budgetary Affairs Committee who are experts in terms of long range planning for computing and other electronic technology. There is Ray Chin, who is the chair of Computer Information Science. We feel this is a big enough issue that we would like, as a committee, to bring this resolution to you.

Schneider: I would like to hear any initial comments or advice about this recommendation from the Budgetary Affairs Committee and then ask that the Council refer it to Executive Committee for discussion. There are a number of committees working on various aspects of technology, so it needs some looking at. There are also some things happening at the University level with technology planning which a new committee.. That is what I would propose we do with the resolution.

Porter: Is there any discussion or comments?

Wilson: What kind of discussion would you have about this committee's role in student technology funds?

R. Keck: The sentence at the bottom of the page says 'We further recommend that a method to include student and staff participation in this new committee be considered.'

Wilson: ITAC is a faculty committee that currently handles student technology funds. All the plans come up from the schools and go through this committee. Will ITAC still do that? Will those proposals still go through this committee? I think you also need to answer how the committee will relate to Integrated Technologies which really has to be a part of technology planning. Just setting up a committee and saying, 'Faculty are going to do it now,' is

not necessarily going to solve some of the problems.

R. Keck: I agree.

Schneider: That is exactly the kind of thing that the Executive Committee would do. We are going to invite Georgia Miller to come and explain the work of ITAC as well as other kinds of committees that are around.

Spehler: Bob, I couldn't find the circular, but let me call attention to what I think is one of the basic problems with planning and budgeting for technology on this campus and around Indiana University. That is the separation of budgeting for technology, whatever the limits of that concept are, and budgeting for other inputs to our research and teaching initiative. From the point of view of someone who uses technology but also other inputs regularly, I have noticed many times that money is available for technology for things that can be justified as technology, when money is not available for things which are more urgently needed for either our teaching or research functions. There doesn't seem to be a way of considering a dollar spent on technology with a dollar that might be spent on improving the condition of our classrooms or even the amount of money we spend on assistantships or mentors or even salaries. Again and again I have noticed that there is somehow an institutional distortion which is favoring hardware as against other things. I, myself, have been told a number of times, "Well, the money isn't available for anything else so just take it." On the assumption that maybe I would need it sometime and that this foolish system would be reversed, I took it and so did some of my colleagues. I think we wasted money that way because technology today that you take is not as good as the technology that you may really need in two or three years. It will be a different kind of technology. So, I would just like to call attention to what I personally perceive as a substantial defect which is leading to rather important waste around the university.

R. Keck: I don't think that money has been wasted. We have had that discussion. The perception is that this garnering of funds for technology is easier when compared to other things.

Porter: Are there other comments that you would like to direct to the Executive Committee?

Besch: It seems to me that on a number of occasions from time to time in the past we have looked around and found that there is a new activity going on that the Constitution crafters hadn't previously thought about. When we have looked at them and they are beginning to make decisions which affect all of us, we have said, "We probably ought to get in on the discussions and be shaping some of those decisions." It seems to me that this is the kind of thing that is occurring on this issue.

Koleski: This issue is going to go to the Executive Committee, is that correct?

R. Keck: That is the suggestion of our President.

Koleski: This may be another committee. There is a committee in existence at this point, is that correct? A committee for screening programs that are developed within the school at the University level is that correct? The only thing I would ask the Executive Committee to do or consider is the idea of who is on those committees, what charges they may have and what the process is.

Porter: Indeed, that has been part of the discussion in trying to make sure that we do not duplicate functions and yet have faculty in a position to provide their perspective.

Wilkins: I would like to remind the Executive Committee that, if it comes to making this a standing committee, that will have to come to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee.

Porter: We certainly look forward to the opportunity to do that. Is there anything else from Budgetary Affairs? Are there any other questions for the Budgetary Affairs Committee? Thank you, Bob and your committee members for the number of hours that include going to budget and planning meetings on Saturdays which is always one of the more fun assignments.

That allows us to move on to the Faculty Affairs Committee and Sara Hook.

Hook: Our committee of 19 members has had an extremely busy year. We looked at and reviewed the Proposed Family Leave Policy. We participated in the TERA activities, not only in shaping the TERA proposal, but also in providing two members to a implementation task force. At our meeting next Friday we will be having a debriefing of TERA to see how it went in the various schools and to see if we can provide any suggestions for improving the program next year.

I assume our work for this coming fall will concentrate on looking at our policy for merger and reduction of programs as well as looking at the issue of non-tenure track faculty. This is an issue rising out of the UFC. Bill Burgan and I will be spending our summer gathering data. We have done some preliminary data gathering, but so far haven't come up with any good way of counting. It is very difficult because everything has a slightly different title on different campuses so we want to begin gathering that data in a way that makes sense. Bill is also going to meet with some administrators again to get their expertise and their input into how we can better count and look at this issue. We presented at UFC a preliminary report and got many good questions, comments, and ideas for a direction that we should go.

Clearly, what has been most important for the last few months has been the development of a Post-Tenure Review policy. We started out with a very small subcommittee of six members that reviewed policies from throughout the country and also read articles and had a couple of meetings with philosophical discussions on what post-tenure review might look at, at Indiana University. From there, we created a policy and shared that back and forth between ourselves and from there the policy was shared with the full committee. Another draft was prepared with some changes but nothing very substantive. Dean Plater was kind enough to meet with me regarding the policy and he was able to give some very excellent suggestions that I think strengthen the policy. Our group, again, had a new draft developed incorporating some of his fine suggestions and we will be looking at this and hopefully, be able to bring it forward after our meeting next Friday. Does anyone have any questions?

Porter: What was the title of that policy?

Hook: We decided that the name Post Tenure Review was the first thing that had to go. I think that the tactic we tried to take is, instead of a broad brush rush it is a more narrowly tailored policy to assist faculty who either require some rejuvenation in their career or perhaps a faculty member who would like to seek a new direction in their career. Very closely tied to our suggested policy is the importance of faculty development and the importance of assisting faculty in preparing a plan that will help them utilize their full talents and move toward wherever they need to be in the future. In keeping with that positive spirit and the more narrowly tailored program, we came up with a title of Faculty Review and Enhancement Program which we have been referring to as FREP. I am not sure I like it too well, but I like it better than TERA.

Schneider: I have one comment. We have racing against the clock trying to get this first draft of the policy ready for this Faculty Council meeting. We came close but we are going to miss by about one week. If the committee does indeed agree on a draft at its meeting next week, what I proposed to Sara is that it be mailed out to the Faculty Council members now, in case they have some spare time in the summer. That way we can get started first thing in

the fall on this because it is something that is clearly on lots of people's minds.

Hook: Also, if you have any questions, please don't hesitate to call me.

Porter: Are there any other questions? Thank you, Sara. Thank you to all of your committee members.

Agenda Item IX: Question and Answer Period

Porter: We will move on to the Question and Answer Period. Are there any questions the members of the Council would like to address to the Chancellor or the President of the Faculty?

Reed: We have heard a lot today about administrative micromanaging, faculty establishment of academic calendars, and things of that nature and then I received the notice from Dean Plater dated April 10 concerning IUPUI policy for not giving examinations or requiring papers in the last week before finals. I have been around here longer than I would rather admit to and this is the first time I have ever heard of this policy. Was this established by the faculty or was it an administrative decision? Does this apply to all schools and includes graduate as well as professional students?

Plater: The issue of scheduling examinations during the last week of classes continues to be a problem. The Dean of the Faculties in the past has issues a prohibition against this practice and that is something that I have continued. It has been discussed at various times by both the Academic Affairs Committee and the Academic Policies and Procedures Committee and will be discussed again. I have asked them to review that policy. I would ask Charlie, and perhaps others who have views on the origins and history of this, to comment on their perspective of where it came from.

Yokomoto: I was able to find the policy statement in the 1984 IUPUI Handbook which was terminated somewhere in the late 80's.

Reed: Part of college is being able to budget one's time. I don't think you will find too many bosses in the "real world" who will tell you to take a week off and do nothing else to prepare for an important presentation the following week. As long as class requirements are given in the syllabus this policy is something else that reduces flexibility of a faculty member with regards to handling their classes and students.

Bepko: Is there a way of creating exemptions from the policy if people have a reason why they . . .

Reed: There are a lot of good things in that.

Plater: The assumption is that, if a faculty member wishes to vary from the policy, that she or he will confer with the department chair or dean.

Spechler: The policy for IUPUI is identical to the one that is in force in Bloomington. That's unlikely to have occurred in exactly identical form had there not been a decision at the University level.

Plater: If you do have thoughts on the policy, it would be appropriate to refer them either to members of the Academic Affairs Committee or to the Academic Policies and Procedures Committee because this will be on the agenda for discussion early in the fall. It would be my intent, instead of sending out a letter late in the semester, to do so early in the semester reminding faculty at the beginning of the term instead of at the very ending of the term about this policy.

Jones: It is my experience in talking with students that not many people abide by the policy on campus. You are the exception if you abide by it.

Porter: Are there any other questions?

Agenda Item XII: Unfinished Business

There was no Unfinished Business.

Agenda Item XIII: New Business

Porter: Chancellor Bepko and I had noted that this was to have been the last Faculty Council meeting Carol Nathan would be attending. She is a former leader of this body and certainly has served the faculty well in her role in the Dean of the Faculties Office. I thought we should note that she will be retiring, although a number of us have had the opportunity to celebrate with her through a variety of activities here on campus.

Bepko: This has been Carol Nathan Week, as some of you know. That is a great thing to be able to celebrate Carol's career because it is so closely parallel to the growth, development, the personality, and the love that is a part of the IUPUI community. We probably ought to, even in her absence, give her a round of applause for being a former President, a lifelong defender of the interests of faculty, a distinguished administrator, a person who contributed at much as anyone else has to the personality of IUPUI. [applause]

Porter: I would like to thank the members of the Faculty Council for making the Presiding Officer's job an easy one this year. This was a wonderful body to work with in that members came prepared and the discussions on modifying documents, etc., seemed to be taking place outside and we had very little of the discussion related to specific language within the body so we have been able to proceed through and I do appreciate that from all the members of the body.

Mannheimer: Another long time member of this body is also retiring and that is Hitwant Sidhu. He has been a serving member of the Faculty Council as long as I can remember. I think it would behoove us to acknowledge his long time term of service as well. [applause]

Bepko: Hitwant may retire but never will be forgotten. Occasionally, now I will wake up in the middle of the night and hear his unmistakable voice.

Porter: Is there any other New Business? [None]

Agenda Item XIV: Adjournment

Porter: If there is no other business, this body is adjourned. I look forward to seeing you next fall.