SUMMARY
IUPUI Faculty Council Meeting
September 7, 1978

1. The minutes of the May 4, 1978 meeting were approved as distributed.

2. Memorial Resolutions
   George Garcescu, M.D., Distinguished Professor Emeritus of Orthopedic Surgery
   Lois Perkins, Ph.D., Professor of Anatomy

3. Presiding Officer's Business
   1979-81 Operating budget request
   IUPUI Capital budget request
   New faculty reception

4. Executive Committee Report
   Meeting day and time – 1st Thursday of the month from 3:30-5:30 P.M.
   Faculty Council Membership List update and corrections
   New secretary - Faculty Council Office: Pam Daupert 2215
   Updating faculty mailing list
   Calendar of Council Meetings 1978-79
   Cancellation of October 5 Council Meeting
   October 12 Faculty Council/Faculty/Staff Meeting - School of Nursing
   Auditorium - Address by Vice President Irwin at 3:30 P.M.
   Chairpersons to meet with Executive Committee
   1977-78 Annual Summary Report of Actions
   Faculty Council Procedures review
   September 1 pay-date report

5. Old Business
   Committee On Committees Report
   Committees accepted as amended

6. New Business
   Nominating Committee Report
   Question of representation to University Faculty Council
   Election of Dan Landis: School of Science and Mary Lee Seibert: Allied Health to University Faculty Council.
   Council Secretary will check further into our number of representatives.
Minutes of
IUPUI Faculty Council Meeting
September 7, 1978, 3:30 P.M., Law School, Room 116

Present: Vice President Irwin; Deans: Beering, Francois, Grossman, Kellum, Neville, Renda, Weber;
Directors: Bonner, Pierce; Presidents: Applega~e, Beck, Beach, Blake, Bond, Bonner, Brashear,
Childress, Cutshall, Daly, Fedor, Frank, Fuller, Gnat, Goldberg, Gray, Haak, Hamburger, Hendrie,
Johnson, Karlson, Kimball, Landis, Langsam, Laube, Leuer, Marketon, McLear, Meiere, Netz,
Metzger, Miller, Nathan, Penna, Riteris, Roeke, Rothe, Sartoris, Seibert, Sharp, Shellhammer,
Sherrill, Smith, Solow, Wall, Wappner, Yokomoto, McGeever.

Alternates: Lew Wagner for Dean Patricia Cunnea, Dean Hugh Wolf for Dean Richard P. Gousha, Ben Keller for
Dean Marjorie Leamnson, Robert Lewis, Jr. for Dean Schuyler Otteson, Don Bowman for David
Allmann, Billy L. Abel for Ronald E. Dehnke, Kirsten Quam for Virginia Humnicky, Margaret Pike
for Rosanne Perez.

Absent: Executive Dean Moore; Deans: Harvey, McDonald, Schneiderman; Professors: Balcanavage, Bruyn, Burt,
Chalian, Dexter, Farber, Green, Kasle, Newton, Sagraves, Shaffer, Tennant Tharp, Vargus, Wallihan,
Watanabe, Wright

Agenda Item 1: Approval of the minutes of May 4, 1978.

The minutes of May 4 were approved as distributed.

Agenda Items 2 & 3: Memorial Resolutions for Dr. George Garceau and Dr. Lois Perkins

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: I would now like to recognize Carol Nathan, Secretary of our Faculty Council at this
moment. PROFESSOR NATHAN: The Executive Committee has recommended to me that memorial resolutions be
submitted to you and the rest of the faculty in writing and that recognition of the individual or individuals
be made at the Council meeting. Reading of the resolutions will, therefore, be eliminated from the Council
proceedings. Based on this recommendation, I wish to recognize the deaths of Dr. George Garceau, Distinguished
Professor Emeritus of Orthopedic Surgery, and Dr. Lois Perkins, Professor of Anatomy. In addition,
I request these memorial resolutions be forwarded to the families of Dr. Garceau and Dr. Perkins. (A moment
of silence was observed by the Council.)

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: I would like to recognize Carl Rothe as the elected Parliamentarian for this year.
I think most of you know that, but I would like to mention it for the record.

Agenda Item 4: Presiding Officer's Business

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: As far as my business is concerned today, I am going to keep it fairly brief, al­
thought I am going to talk about some of the highlights of the budget that will be submitted to the Trustees
on Saturday of this week. The operating budget for the biennium 1979-81 is ready and has been distributed
to the Trustees. I think it is a budget that we here in Indianapolis can be very pleased with. From the
operating standpoint, the percentage increase is higher for this campus than any other campus of the IU
system. From the standpoint of program improvement in both the health and non-health areas, we have a
very substantial request. I am personally optimistic that we'll be more successful than we have been in
the past from the standpoint of program improvement. As most of you know, the base of our budget needs
to be substantially increased. It cannot be done in one biennium perhaps, but it needs to be increased
in both the non-health divisions as well as the health divisions. I presented the budget yesterday to the
IUPUI Advisory Board. They endorsed it very highly and it will, I think, be approved Saturday by the
Trustees.

From a capital standpoint in the budget request for the biennium we have three items. Item one is the
second classroom building—an $18.5 million project, a very large project, which is to extend south of the
Business School Building. By the way, we'll break ground for that on September 25, 1978. In addition
to that, there is a request for the completion of the Medical Sciences Building, which 20 years ago was
never completed—i.e., two stories on the South Wing. Also, a request is in for finishing the basement of
Engineering and Technology for the computer center for this campus. Classroom Building #2 is a key be­
because it will house the School of Education, the School of Physical Education, the School of Social Work,
and have a small theater. This will permit us to close two campus sites in Indianapolis which is very
urgently needed. It will also connect with the facility that is going up now behind us, often referred to
as the Tennis facility but really Recreational facility. That's on target, or I should say it's not
quite on target; it's two weeks late so far. The contracts are all met and that's a $7 million facility,
which should be available August 1 of next year in time for the National Clay Tournament. I think that
facility will do a great deal to clean up the southern portion of our campus which we could not have done
perhaps for a decade, otherwise.
I think I have mentioned to this group, but I'm not certain, that we received a very substantial gift from an anonymous person to build 40 apartment units on campus immediately west of the Administration Building. These buildings are two-story apartments that would be ideal for married students. They will extend from New York Street to Michigan Street and be bounded by Lansing and Limestone. That is very much on target and will be available for occupancy by next fall.

Many of you have noticed that our attempt to upgrade Michigan Street has caused a lot of traffic difficulties, but that's progress for you. We have joined with the city to put in new curbs and new sidewalks and the sidewalks will be recessed ten feet or more where possible, and there will be grass planted in between the curb and the sidewalks and later there will be trees planted. There are two areas at West Street and Michigan which will be information centers so people coming to the campus for the first time can pull off of busy Michigan Street. We hope to have appropriate signs, maybe even a telephone, to an information area for people who are coming here for the first time.

We have $11 million of bonding authority for parking garages and two of those garages are well planned now. One of them will be west of Cavanaugh Hall and south of the University Hospital with a connection across the street into the Hospital. The second garage will be west of the Union Building and will service the University as well as the State Board of Health, initially. These garages are being phased, Phase I and Phase II. A third garage is in limbo right now and that was the garage that was to be immediately north of Engineering and Technology with a second story connection into Engineering and Technology, Business, and the Library. Bonding Counsel has indicated that we can not proceed with that until we get a clarification on the Acts of '29 and during the next session, we'll attempt to update the Acts of '29 so we can build that garage. So really, there are a good many things going on.

I have been very impressed with the various sessions I have had with students and faculty and new faculty. I will announce today, however, you will receive an invitation in four or five days, that we will have our traditional Faculty Fall Reception at the Irwins' on October 1, which is a Sunday from 2 P.M. to 4 P.M. It is intended, of course, primarily for the new faculty but we would like as many of you as can come. I'll say here, too, an added attraction this year will be the Eli Lilly home will be open to the faculty. This will be the first time it will have been opened in a major way to a large group of people. That won't be on the invitation but I'm telling you that it will be open. It is a very interesting home belonging to the University. I think if there are no questions I will conclude at that point.

Agenda Item 5: Executive Committee Report

PROFESSOR NATHAN: This is our first Executive Committee report because, as you know our new Constitution calls for an Executive Committee which replaces the Agenda Committee and a number of other committees. We find that we have quite a bit of work to do. I would like to welcome you all back to the new academic year and hope that you will participate with us in trying to make these sessions as valuable as possible to all of us. This will be a short meeting because we are merely going to go over the procedures and the routine of the Council and have two committee reports.

As I said in my memo to you, the meeting day has changed in the new Constitution to the first Thursday instead of the second Thursday of the month. You need to be sure to inform an alternate or any other individual interested in coming to the Council meetings that it has changed. The Faculty Council Membership List, which was included in your mailing may have errors in some of the ranks of the various people listed. Please call our office at 2215 and let us know if you are listed incorrectly or if your rank is incorrect.

I would like to introduce once again, Pam Daupert, who is our new secretary in the Faculty Council Office and it would be best if you would contact her with updates and changes. Beyond that, there has been discussion every year about the mailing lists, who receives Faculty Council minutes, and so on. We think we finally have gotten to the bottom of some of the problems with this. The list the mailing room used for the stickers is not the same list which comes out of Dr. Moore's office. What we are going to try to do is to update our own lists routinely from Dr. Moore's office and see if we can make some impression on the mailing stickers. I do want to remind you, as was true last year, that if we do have to get a mailing out to you rapidly you may end up having two mailings because we always make sure that the Faculty Council members get their mailings on time. Then when the mass mailing is made you will get it a second time.

I'm sure most of you have received your notebooks. We are trying to come up in the world. We are also going to reproduce the minutes and other materials in the future in the reduced type, booklet form that you might have seen used for the Bloomington Faculty Council Minutes or the University Faculty Council Minutes.
In your materials you received a calendar for the Faculty Council year and now that I have told you to remember that the meeting is the first Thursday, I'm going to tell you that next month we're going to cancel the October 5 meeting of the Faculty Council. That meeting of the Faculty Council will be combined with the October 12 meeting listed on your calendar. In other words, we are combining the Fall Faculty/Staff meeting with the Faculty Council meeting at the same time. In past years, some of you may remember that we had the Faculty Council meeting first and then we had the Faculty/Staff immediately following it. That will not be the case this time. We will combine these meetings. At that time, Dr. Irwin will give his State of the University address and there will be whatever other business that needs to be conducted by the Council. The major business will be Dr. Irwin's address. That is the only change in the calendar.

PROFESSOR SHERRILL: Will that meeting be in the School of Nursing, then? PROFESSOR NATHAN: That is correct. Yes, the Faculty/Staff meeting combined with the Council meeting will be in the Nursing Auditorium. Are there any other questions about the calendar?

PROFESSOR NATHAN: The chairpersons of all the committees have been asked to meet with the Executive Committee at its next meeting, which is next Wednesday. We are going to try at that time to develop better procedures and communication between the Executive Committee and the chairs of the committees. As you all know, we hear every year from some committees that they ought to have been dissolved or that they should have had some other kind of charges. This is the kind of thing that we will be discussing with the chairs of the committees. Some of you who are assigned to committees will undoubtedly be hearing shortly from your committee chairs in relation to future meetings and the purpose of your particular committee. If you have any input you would like to have passed on to the Executive Committee concerning committee functions, you could contact either me or the particular committee chairs involved.

You will also find in your mailing an Annual Report Summary of the Actions of 1977-78. I merely draw that to your attention for your review if you wish to see what kind of actions were taken last year. I was interested in reading it myself and the fact that we did do a few other things besides pass the new Constitution—which is all I really remembered until I reviewed this. PROFESSOR BESCH: There are some resolutions that were passed that were included in here and others which I distinctly remember having been passed which are not included in the Summary. Can you tell how you came up with these? PROFESSOR NATHAN: Well, they might have been missed, Henry, it's possible. PROFESSOR BESCH: Well, I'm thinking of one that had to do with the change in the school name that was passed. PROFESSOR LANGSAM: It's on there. The September 8 meeting. It says very clearly on #5. PROFESSOR BESCH: The reason I didn't see it is because under October 13 meeting #3 there's a motion that is set off distinctly by type and by format. Whereas #5 is just the regular type, I missed it. I apologize. PROFESSOR NATHAN: If any one has any problem with that, we'd be glad to do any revision that you feel is necessary. We will be revising the Membership List as I mentioned. We can go ahead and reprocess this also, if you'd like.

In your mailing you received the IUPUI Faculty Council Procedures. This is a system that I started last year where I have an orientation to Faculty Council regarding the various mechanical procedures and process of the Faculty Council. I do not plan to read this today, but I would like to highlight a few areas. We have had some changes in procedures because of the new Constitution. One is that the minutes in the past have addressed both the members present and the members absent and excused and unexcused absences. This meant that whenever you were going to be absent you needed to call the Faculty Council Office and tell the Faculty Council secretary that you were going to be absent. That means that your were recorded as an excused absence. Now the new Constitution does state that alternates now will have a vote. So if you send someone to substitute for you, that person will carry a vote. What we have therefore decided to do is to list members present and have another category for alternates such as Smith for Neville. You would be indicated as having an alternate present at the meeting. And there would be no category of Alternates or Present. Are you following me? So there will not be a category of listed absences. Also it means that you do not need to call the Faculty Council Office to be excused from the meeting. But remember that your alternate has a vote and therefore you really need to send an alternate to the meeting. PROFESSOR WALL: How will we know who the official alternate is? PROFESSOR NATHAN: There is not an official alternate. PROFESSOR WALL: But if someone comes to take a vote for you as an alternate, how do you know they will come? PROFESSOR NATHAN: Alternates need to sign on the page and take the sign and put it in front of them. PROFESSOR RITERIS: Is it possible to be an alternate and a member at the same time? Say I'm a member of my own right and I call and say I can not make it and ask another Council member to carry my proxy. Is that legal? PROFESSOR NATHAN: There is nothing in the Constitution that calls for that so I would way no. PROFESSOR RITERIS: Is something in the Constitution that prohibits it? Because what if I signed my name twice for myself and for someone else? PROFESSOR NATHAN: You may vote twice today, John, and then we will decide. PROFESSOR RITERIS: I didn't do it today. PROFESSOR NATHAN: Oh, you didn't do it today. We'll bring it up to the Executive Committee and see what they can come up with.

PROFESSOR ROTH: I think it would be impossible that for the representatives at-large it is one thing. If the person absent is a member of a certain school, the alternate has to be from the same unit. PROFESSOR NATHAN: That would make a difference, that's correct.
PROFESSOR MEIERE: It is my personal opinion but I sort of like the idea of having the absences.

PROFESSOR NATHAN: We can indicate absences, but it's the excused and unexcused categories that are not necessary. We will list absences (without alternate). But you see what we are creating now is a category of "alternate" which identifies the name of the person being replaced and the alternate's name. Therefore, when people read the minutes they know if they had a vote. PROFESSOR MEIERE: I am impressed by all the work that went into these summaries and I don't mean to cause any more grief. I think this type of thing is helpful, though. PROFESSOR NATHAN: We will put in a category for absences.

We are continuing this year with a policy that was voted last that there will be no smoking in the meeting room.

You will receive your minutes and other mailings approximately two weeks prior to the next meeting. I am sorry about the lateness of this one but we did try to create some new things in this process including your notebooks which held us up a bit in getting the agenda to you. However, from now on, hopefully, with printing cooperating with us, we will get all written material to you two weeks prior to the next meeting.

I'd like to mention once again to you the names of the Executive Committee members if you want to make any contact with them. You will find it in the page previous to the Procedures page. The Committee members are Don Tharp, Kent Sharp, Brian Vargas, who had an emergency appointment so he was unable to come today, Dick Brashear, Pat Blake, Carlos Goldberg, and David Metzger. And the only other item that I would like to highlight on the Procedures is the information number, which we have listed on the back page of the Procedures. The Faculty Council Office number is 2215, where you will get Pam, and my own office number is 8006.

If any of you have reviewed the Constitution and By-Laws and found problems with it or amendments which need to be made this year, we would appreciate your letting us know and either informing me or informing Carl Fuller who is chairman of the Constitution and By-Laws Committee (or will be if we approve the Committee List). There have been some amendments suggested.

One other item that I would like to address is that we have been in contact with Jack Mulholland, the University Treasurer, in regard to the September 1 paydate, which some of you are wondering about. Our latest word is (Pat Blake and I discussed this just last week with Jack), that the September 1 paydate will happen next year. The mechanics of the process do not allow it to happen this year. Pat Blake is a member of your Executive Committee along with myself and we plan to follow this up with Mr. Mulholland at a strategic time in the spring so that it will be instituted in September of 1979. That is the word that we got from him the other day, personally. PROFESSOR LANGSAM: If for any strange reason it doesn't happen could we be notified a little bit ahead of time so we can make it to the bank? Expecting it and then not having it happen is even worse than not expecting it. PROFESSOR NATHAN: Yes, definitely. Pat Blake and I have appointed ourselves a committee of two to make sure that it is done, number 1, and number 2, we will let you know if by any chance it will not. It is the best we can do at this point. That is the end of my report.

Agenda Item 6: Old Business

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

PROFESSOR SHARP: As it has been distributed, the Committee On Committees reports concerning the standing committees members for the coming year. I move the adoption of the report. PROFESSOR LANGSAM: I suggest that the memorandum be changed to read Richard Fredland: School of Liberal Arts, instead of School of Science. PROFESSOR NATHAN: Did everyone get that correction? The cover memo should read Richard Fredland: School of Liberal Arts. VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Kent, you made a motion to approve this slate. PROFESSOR BOND: Joyce Bain has left the School of Nursing. PROFESSOR NATHAN: Joyce Bain on the Constitution and By-Laws Committee should be deleted. She is no longer with the School of Nursing. PROFESSOR BESCH: Tali Conline is also leaving for the deanship of a school. DEAN BEERING AND ASSOCIATE DEAN FIERCE: Not this academic year. PROFESSOR LANGSAM: Edith Sonntag on the Fringe Benefits Committee is with the Library not with Nursing. PROFESSOR NATHAN: Edith Sonntag under Fringe Benefits is with the Library. PROFESSOR NATHAN: Under Faculty Affairs, Richard Turner is on sabbatical. PROFESSOR RITERS: Richard Turner replaced Pat McGeever who was on sabbatical. So I don't think that Richard Turner should even be on the membership list. PROFESSOR NATHAN: These committees are not just Faculty Council members. PROFESSOR RITERS: I mean under the Unit Representatives Richard Turner should be removed and Patrick McGeever should be put right back in because he was elected as a unit representative. PROFESSOR NATHAN: That's correct. We received that information today and it will be corrected. PROFESSOR FULLER: Something went by me too fast about Tali Conline. PROFESSOR NATHAN: Tali Conline has accepted another job but apparently not until after this academic year so she can remain on that committee. (You almost lost your whole committee.) VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Any other comments? MOTION CARRIED.
PROFESSOR NATHAN: I'd like to remind you that this academic year we will be making the committee assignments and the decisions on the committees and voting on it in the spring, so they will be ready to start in the fall. This is by the new Constitution and will be done at a late spring meeting.

Agenda Item 7: New Business

REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE

PROFESSOR NATHAN: Last year I overlooked the fact that we needed to elect three representatives to the University Faculty Council from the IUPUI Faculty Council. I would like to explain further, however, that those members, representatives to the University Faculty Council, do not have to be members of the IUPUI Faculty Council, but they do need to be elected by this body to go to the University Faculty Council meetings. We had three positions that needed to be filled and you received a report in your mailing.

PROFESSOR BLAKE: What are the three names that were elected on the May 4, 1978 meeting - Indiana University Faculty Council? What does that mean? PROFESSOR NATHAN: Those are replacements on the Faculty Council, but we have three more positions that I did not realize needed to be filled. On the memo you received about these three nominations, the name Larry Ryan appears from the School of Dentistry and he has withdrawn his name. So we now have three nominees. Would you like to pass the ballot out? VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Are there nominations from the floor? PROFESSOR SHELLHAMER: Is there some kind of documentation on the numbers we have involved and are representatives from this campus on the University Faculty Council. What is the number? PROFESSOR NATHAN: I will have to check that, it's either six or eight members, we have a fairly good representation. I would have to check the list exactly to tell you who those people are.

PROFESSOR SHELLHAMER: The reason that I am raising a question is, when I look at the By-Laws, it relates to our representation on the University Faculty Council. I don't come up with the same number that you do. I would refer you to the By-Laws on page 10. It suggests that two be elected in the spring plus yourself as secretary and then three at a later time. PROFESSOR NATHAN: If you would like to we can postpone this and I will check on it. PROFESSOR SHELLHAMER: We need to do something in order to make sure that we are represented and not have someone shut out at the door. PROFESSOR NATHAN: This information came from the Faculty Council office in Bloomington, so I will have to check further on it, I thought we were in line. PROFESSOR SHARP: Can we at least elect two and let the third one be appointed as necessary? PROFESSOR NATHAN: The first meeting of the University Faculty Council will be the second Tuesday of October and it means we would not have all the representatives. DEAN NEVILL: Since we are doing this by secret ballot, we will get a person who is third in line and we would go ahead and elect them and if we needed three take the next one and that would save us voting again. PROFESSOR NATHAN: Did all of you hear that? The suggestion was that we go ahead and vote and keep the tally and if a third person is needed to fill the place that we use the third person in line. In other words, the vote would have already been completed. PROFESSOR LANDIS: You only have three nominees so far.

PROFESSOR HAMBURGER: I believe we have already voted for three faculty at-large in the general faculty elections, is that correct? We have those three people, we need to elect two, plus you are by definition one of the others. The Constitution says they have to be members of this body. Are we in line with these nominations? "At the last or next to last meeting, the IUPUI Faculty Council shall elect two of its continuing members as representatives to the University Faculty Council for the coming year." Then it goes through the procedures that we already did with the three members that were elected by the faculty and not by this body. PROFESSOR NATHAN: Well, it was my understanding that this was not the case with these three members, but if there is this much confusion about this why don't I check on it and we will move on it at the next meeting. PROFESSOR ROTE: We can vote for two on this list and likely we will have a chance for one, two, or three and then the decision can be made on the number. PROFESSOR BLAKE: Can we not postpone it and still vote by ballot in order to get representation before that decision? PROFESSOR NATHAN: We could, there are two members on the list that are members of the Council—Dan Landis and Mary Lee Seibert. PROFESSOR PENNA: Would it be possible to have a mail ballot and not vote but still get representation on the Council?

PROFESSOR LANGSAM: According to the By-Laws on page 10, that could not possibly be. It would have to be late in the academic year and that appears to be what we have already done. So we either do it now to get it done or we're going to have to wait until the end of the academic year. I don't know how hurried we have to be about one part and another part. I would also like to say that the faculty are not banging the door down to get on the University Faculty Council. And this procedure makes it sound as if 90 per cent of our faculty wants to make a Tuesday trip down to Bloomington. It seems to be an awkward procedure to something that is not a very popular activity. PROFESSOR GOLDBERG: That may be so, but the Constitution speaks clear as to the nominees from IUPUI. PROFESSOR MEIERE: I am very impressed at this point that we were starting a class operation to make decision. I suggest you (Professor Nathan) have the prefigative to make a ruling here.
PROFESSOR NATHAN: I would recommend that we ask for nominations from the floor and go ahead and vote on the two members who are on this ballot and legal according to our Constitution, Dan Landis and Mary Lee Seibert. We should ask for recommendations from the floor at this point. PROFESSOR GOLDBERG: Does that mean that Arthur Schultz is to be crossed off?

PROFESSOR NATHAN: According to what I am reading in the Constitution, yes. VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Are there nominations from the floor? MOTION CARRIED.

PROFESSOR MCLEAR: I move a vote by acclamation. MOTION CARRIED. PROFESSOR NATHAN: I will check further about why we were told three. PROFESSOR FULLER: The Constitution says that we are to elect at the end of the academic year. Are these people serving for the remainder of this year or for two years or what? Are we going to have another vote next spring?

PROFESSOR NATHAN: Yes we do, but this was a replacement that I did not realize needed to be made and so we are talking as if it were the end of the academic year. PROFESSOR FULLER: And these people will only serve this academic year? PROFESSOR NATHAN: I don't know that, this is what I have to check on. PROFESSOR FULLER: I am going by the literal reading of the Constitution which way that representatives of the Faculty Council on the all University Faculty Council will be elected at the end of the academic year, so that means that we will have another election at the end of the spring and that means that we will elect our own representatives that will replace the two people that we just elected. The implication is that the two people that we just elected will serve only for this academic year and not for a two year term.

PROFESSOR NATHAN: That's my understanding, but I'm going to check on it because we are told something different every year on this. PROFESSOR FULLER: Are we going by their rules or by ours? PROFESSOR NATHAN: Well, it's the University Faculty Council rules. PROFESSOR FULLER: So we would have to modify our Constitution to meet their rules. PROFESSOR NATHAN: Yes, I think that's where the inconsistency is, I think there is some inconsistency between the University Faculty Council and ours. PROFESSOR BESCH: That would not be a modification of the Constitution, it's now in the By-Laws, and that's one of the reasons we put the By-Laws out of the Constitution, so we can change that at will at one of these meetings.

The meeting was adjourned.

Carol Nathan, Secretary
TUPUI Faculty Council
SUMMARY
IUPUI Faculty Council Meeting
October 12, 1978

1. The minutes of the September 7, 1978 meeting were approved as distributed.

2. Presiding Officer's Business - Deferred due to the State of the University Address given by Vice President Irwin at the conclusion of the Faculty Council meeting.

3. Executive Committee Report: State of the IUPUI Faculty Council, Carol Nathan Secretary
   A. IUPUI's prominence in the Statewide system.
   B. Report of IUPUI Executive Committee meeting with the Faculty Relations Committee of the I.U. Board of Trustees
      1. Purpose of meeting
      2. Issue Flow Chart
      3. Issues Addressed
      4. Issues to be addressed at a future meeting
   C. Projected Goals for IUPUI Faculty Council for 1978-79
   D. Basic Content projected for IUPUI Faculty Council meetings, 1978-79
   E. Executive Committee meeting with Chairs of Standing Committees of the IUPUI Faculty Council
   F. IUPUI Faculty Handbook Draft review procedure.
   G. Subject for next IUPUI Faculty Council meeting Fringe Benefits

4. Old Business
   University Faculty Council representation - see revised chart

5. New Business
   There was no new business.

6. Following adjournment of the formal session of the IUPUI Faculty Council Vice President Irwin gave the State of the University Address. The address is appended to these minutes.
Minutes of  
IUPUI Faculty Council Meeting  
October 12, 1978, 3:30 P.M., School of Nursing Auditorium

Present: Vice President Irwin; Executive Dean Moore; Deans: Francois, Grossman, McDonald, Renda, Stonehill, Weber; Directors: Bonner, Pierce; Professors: Applegate, Beck, Besch, Blake, Bond, Bonner, Brashear, Bruyn, Burt, Childress, Cutshall, Dexter, Farber, Fuller, Gnat, Gray, Hamburger, Hendrie, Humnicky, Kase, Kimball, Langsam, Laube, Lauer, McGeever, Metz, Penna, Roeseke, Rothe, Seibert, Shaffer, Sharp, Shellhammer, Sherrill, Smith, Solow, Tennant, Tharp, Vargas, Yokomoto.

Alternates: George Lukemeyer for Dean Steven C. Beering; Dean Hugh Wolf for Dean Richard P. Gousha, Sue Barrett Schuyler F. Otteson, C. C. Johnston, for Richard Thompson for Rebecca S. Wappner.

Absent: Associate Dean of Faculties Nagy; Deans: Harvey, Nevill, Schneiderman; Professors: Abel, Allmann, Balcavage, Chalian, Frank, Goldberg, Green, Haak, Karlson, Landis, Markstone, McLeer, Metzger, Miller, Newton, Perez, Riteris, Sagraves, Sartoris, Wall, Wallihan, Watanabe, Wright.

Agenda Item 1: Approval of the Minutes of September 7, 1978.

The minutes of September 7 were approved as distributed.

Agenda Item 2: Presiding Officer's Business

The presiding officer's business was deferred due to the State of the University address to be given by Vice President Irwin at the conclusion of the IUPUI Faculty Council meeting.

Agenda Item 3: Executive Committee Report

PROFESSOR NATHAN: As your secretary, I spend many hours in various meetings representing the IUPUI faculty and the IUPUI Faculty Council. I have been increasingly impressed with the prominence of the Council and how it has achieved its place at IUPUI and in the I.U. system. IUPUI opinion and reaction to state-wide issues is now routinely sought. Our representatives on the University Faculty Council have a significant affect on actions of that Council. We, as yet, have no visible bridges across Michigan Street but I am happy to report that involvement of all schools in the IUPUI process has increased significantly over the past two years thus building the kinds of bridges that are the very foundation of the future of this complex. I have been most pleased with the guidance and assistance from the Faculty Council Executive Committee. The members of this committee are knowledgeable faculty who are helping to lead us forward. I feel privileged to be able to work with this dedicated group.

This past Saturday, six of the eight elected members of your Executive Committee met with the Faculty Relations Committee of the Indiana University Board of Trustees here in Indianapolis. Five of the nine Trustees attended this Committee meeting. The meeting was also attended by Regional Campus Chancellors, Deans, Central Administration, and staff. The meeting was a very positive experience for our Executive Committee and apparently for the Trustees as they all expressed their compliments to us following the meeting. The agenda, planned by your Executive Committee included a presentation on how IUPUI faculty issues and central system issues get to the Board of Trustees. I would like to show you some overhead transparencies now to give you some idea of how we conducted this meeting and the purpose of it and issues which were addressed. First of all, the Executive Committee established the purpose of the meeting with the Trustees as follows: "The purpose of this meeting with the Faculty Relations Committee and the Executive Committee of the IUPUI Faculty Council as seen by the Executive Committee is to become acquainted with the Trustees and exchange ideas and discuss issues and concerns which positively affect the future growth and influence of IUPUI." (That statement was read at the formal meeting of the Trustees by Trustee Long). The first item on our agenda with the Faculty Relations Committee was a brief address by your Secretary on the routes by which various faculty issues arrive at the Board of Trustees meetings. This was a schematic to show that there are various kinds of concerns that all of us have in local councils and that the routes by which these issues get to the Trustees varied.
(You will notice the chart to my right which I used in the presentation to the Trustees. I would like you to notice the yellow and red on that chart for recognition of Purdue and Indiana. I did point that out to the Trustees.) Starting with the IUPUI Faculty and moving into the standing committees of the IUPUI Faculty Council, the officers of the Council are the Vice President and the Secretary. The chart shows that issues that are of direct concern to IUPUI and do not necessarily have central system concern might go to the Trustees by route of the Secretary being charged to take an issue through the system or the Vice President
being charged to take it through his Advisory Committee and on up to the Board of Trustees. As I pointed out to the Trustees, there is also a crossing over of all of these areas because most of the meetings which Vice President Irwin attends, I also attend when it has to do with an IUPUI issue that needs to go to the Trustees.

The issues and topics which were identified by your Executive Committee were many and these issues were ones that were briefly addressed with the Trustees.

### QUESTIONS AND ISSUES FOR DISCUSSION WITH FACULTY RELATIONS COMMITTEE OF THE I.U. BOARD OF TRUSTEES OCTOBER 7, 1978

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chart 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>- What is the role and influence of the Board of Trustees on the administration and faculty of the various campuses?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- What are the constraints or rules by which the Board of Trustees are guided for budgets and expenditures throughout the I.U. system? What rules does the Board impose on the I.U. administration on this regard?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- The unique relationship between the IUPUI complex and the community. I.e., ways in which IUPUI can increase its accomplishment of its community mission.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- The executive committee wishes to support the concerns of the Board and administration on the need for more facilities at IUPUI.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- Need for the School of Science to move to the downtown campus as soon as possible.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We had approximately 50 minutes for this meeting so it was not possible to cover all the points that we wanted to. The discussion was very good but, hard to summarize. Some of you might like to come to a Trustees meeting sometime. They are open meetings and I think you would get something out of them. The Trustees do delve very deeply into any of the concerns we have.

Issues we did not get to but which we plan to address in March when we meet again with the Trustees as well as any issues which may come from you are as follows:

### Chart 3

| **- Administration and faculty are concerned about the accountability of the tenure and promotion process for system-wide schools and merged schools.** |
| **- Re-evaluation of the fringe benefit package for the I.U. system.** |
| **- Future development for graduate program in the School of Liberal Arts.** |
| **- Need for commuting system between Bloomington, and Indianapolis for faculty and students. (Bus?)** |

As I mentioned the Board will meet again in Indianapolis March 1979 and we will continue to discuss these topics and others with the Trustees. The Executive Committee encourages faculty to submit issues and questions for the Trustees. Our feeling following the meeting was that the Trustees were most interested in and knowledgeable about IUPUI, its future and its needs. Any faculty member wishing to attend a Board of Trustees meeting may contact me for information. The Board usually meets the first Saturday of each month on various campuses of the I.U. system.
With the preceding as background I want to share with you some projected goals for the IUPUI Faculty Council for 1978-79.

### CHART 4

**PROJECTED GOALS FOR 1978-79 IUPUI FACULTY COUNCIL**

I. **Streamline Council procedures such as:**
   - Communication
   - Executive Committee
   - Council Meetings
   - Standing Committees
   - Review and Revise By-Laws

II. Develop and write up procedures for automatic/regular faculty input into IUPUI policies, procedures and budgeting.

III. Make recommendations to University Faculty Council as appropriate from IUPUI Faculty Council.

IV. Address IUPUI concerns such as:
   - Fringe Benefits
   - Registration Procedures
   - Recognition of Retired Faculty
   - IUPUI Faculty Handbook
   - Other issues as identified

The Executive Committee projects the following basic content for the Council meetings for the remainder of the academic year.

### CHART 5

**MAJOR CONTENT PROJECTED FOR 1978-79 IUPUI FACULTY COUNCIL MEETINGS**

- **January**
  - Election of Boards of Review
  - I.U. Reorganization Discussion
  - Constitution and By-Laws Amendments
  - IUPUI Faculty Council Review of I.U. Reorganization
  - Fringe Benefits Discussion and Information

- **February**
  - Elect Nominating Committee
  - Standing Committee Status Reports
  - Executive Committee Report on Standing Committee Procedures

- **March**
  - Report Member At-Large Elections
  - Combined Meeting (Spring Faculty/Staff and Faculty Coun.)
  - Presentations by Vice President and President I.U.
  - Board of Trustees

- **April**
  - ELECTION: Secretary, Parliamentarian, Executive Committee, Standing Committees, Tenure Committee
  - Report Unit Elections

- **May**
  - Annual Reports-Secretary, Standing Committees
This chart shows some of the content that we see the Council addressing at the meetings starting with November and moving on through May. This does not exclude any other issues which may arise. These are just some major points that the Executive Committee has identified. You will note that in November we will be having an information and discussion meeting about the issue of fringe benefits. We will have representatives from central administration in Bloomington join us for that meeting.

The Executive Committee has met with all of the Chairs of the IUPUI Faculty Council Standing Committees. Purpose, objectives, strengths, weaknesses and methods to improve the committee structure and process were discussed. The Executive Committee will address these recommendations and plan and implement procedures to improve and assist the committees of the Council. The meeting was productive and will undoubtedly lead to making the system more efficient. The Executive Committee will meet with the committee chairs again as appropriate. The minutes of that meeting are available in the Faculty Council Office and if any of you would like to see what the committee chairs identified as what they felt was going well in the committee system and what they felt was not going well, you may stop in and read that report.

In my report to you under the area of special topics, I would like to list some things that are currently Council activities. The IUPUI Faculty Handbook is in the process of being revised. Copies of the draft have been distributed to the Executive Committee members, the members of the Faculty Affairs Committee and to all standing committee chairs. If others of the faculty wish to review the draft you may borrow a copy from the Faculty Council Office. Comments and recommendations should be placed in writing and sent to the Faculty Council Office and they will be forwarded appropriately.

Information and discussion on the issue of fringe benefits, as I mentioned before, will be the major agenda item for the November 2 meeting of the Council. Appropriate resource people will be present at that meeting and you will be receiving background information on this subject with the agenda. The University Faculty Council has postponed any action on the administration fringe benefits proposals, which you received with the University Faculty Council agenda. The administration proposals on fringe benefits will not be acted upon until the spring to allow local Council input. That is why we are having a session on this topic in November.

In summary, as you can see we have a busy year ahead. I urge you all to keep informed, ask questions, discuss concerns with the Executive Committee and, most of all, continue to help with the forward movement of IUPUI.

Agenda Item 4: Old Business

PROFESSOR NATHAN: You may remember that, at our last meeting, there was some concern about our number of representatives on the University Faculty Council.

IUPUI REPRESENTATION ON THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL

I. University Faculty Council Constitution:
University Faculty Council Representation
100 Faculty = 1 Representative
2 Year Terms

II. IUPUI By-Laws:
University Faculty Council Representation:
* Elected by IUPUI Faculty Council
2 elected each year.

In addition the IUPUI Secretary is a member of the University Faculty Council.
Elected by IUPUI Faculty At-Large:
Fill all other vacancies (limit - 2 per any one unit)
III. Present Status
January 1978 Central Administration Faculty Count for IUPUI = 1100 +

On this basis we are allowed: 11 representatives

We have:
- 4 representatives elected by the IUPUI Faculty Council (including the Sec.)
  - Margaret Applegate 1977-79
  - Dan Landis 1978-80
  - Carol Nathan 1978-79 (secretary)
  - Mary Lee Seibert 1978-80
- 6 IUPUI Faculty At-Large Representatives
  - Walter Daly 1977-79
  - Donna Dial 1977-79
  - John Doty 1978-80
  - Suetta Kehrein 1978-80
  - Joseph Kuczkowski 1977-79
  - Robert Shellhamer 1978-80

10 TOTAL

* IV. Solution: The University Faculty Council representation elected by the IUPUI Faculty Council should total 5 members including the Secretary and presently totals only 4 including the Secretary. We will be conducting an election of the additional representative at the November 2 IUPUI Faculty Council meeting.

* V. Summary: Our By-Laws will be reviewed by the Constitution and By-Laws Committee for any necessary revisions. Our representation will increase as faculty numbers increase. Any inconsistency in the records of numbers of faculty will be addressed by the IUPUI Faculty Council Secretary and the IUPUI Dean of Faculties with Central Administration.

* Items which have been revised since the report of the Secretary October 12, 1978.

Are there questions on this issue? Professor Beck: Are part-time faculty included in this count? Executive Dean Moore: Part-time faculty are not counted. What we count here is what we call the voting faculty. Any faculty member whose appointment carries with it a right to vote as a faculty is counted. I guess I should say that we protested the count of 1130 and I filed a demur which is under review and if my demur is allowed we will have one more representative. Our position is that we have over 1200 faculty members at the present time. Professor Nathan: Are there other questions on this issue?
Agenda Item 5: New Business

There was no new business.

The meeting was adjourned.

Carol Nathan, Secretary
IUPUI Faculty Council

The meeting of the Faculty Council was immediately followed by The State of the University Address by Vice President Glenn W. Irwin Jr., M.D. Dr. Irwin was introduced by Professor Nathan, Secretary of the IUPUI Faculty Council. Dr. Irwin's address is appended to these minutes.
SUMMARY
IUPUI Faculty Council Meeting
November 2, 1978

1. Approval of the October 12 minutes was deferred due to late mailing.

2. Presiding Officer's Business - Executive Dean Moore
   - Fall 1978 Enrollment and Revenue Data

3. Old Business
   Election of additional University Faculty Council representative
   - Patricia Blake - School of Nursing was elected.

4. New Business
   Fringe Benefits: Presentors and resource persons were:
   Jack Mulholland, Treasurer of Indiana University
   Jack Ray, Director of Insurance and Retirement Programs
   and Consultant for Personnel Administration
   Tom Hines, Supervisor of the Insurance Department of IUPUI
   Neil Lantz, Director of Administrative Affairs
   Miriam Langsam, Associate Professor in the School of Liberal Arts and chairman of the IUPUI Faculty Council Fringe Benefit Committee
   Presentation by Miriam Langsam
   Presentation by Jack Mulholland and Jack Ray
   Discussion, question and answer session
Minutes of
IUPUI Faculty Council Meeting
November 2, 1978, 3:30 P.M., School of Law, Room 116


Absent: Vice President Irwin; Associate Dean of Faculties Nagy; Deans: Bonser, Francois, McDonald, Schneiderman, Stonehill; Professors: Allmann, Brashear, Chalian, Farber, Fedor, Frank, Green, Haak, Hendrie, Landis, Lauer, Markstone, McLear, Metz, Metzger, Miller, Newton, Perez, Sherrill, Wallihan, Watanabe.

Agenda Item 1: Approval of the Minutes of October 12, 1978.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: The record should show that Dr. Irwin is not here today. The rest of you will have noticed it and I am presiding in his place under the provisions of the Constitution and By-Laws. Dr. Irwin is in fact in Greece and will be back on campus on Sunday or Monday if the Greek Gods are willing. I have been pointing out to people that it was in Poland the first of October and that the next week a Polish Pope was appointed. There are those who think that was a coincidence but I want you to understand that the long arm of Indiana University is working.

The minutes were not distributed in such a manner as to give you adequate opportunity to review them. Therefore, the Secretary has asked that we waive the approval of the minutes at this time and we will have two sets of minutes to be approved at our next meeting. Is there any objection to that procedure? If not, so ordered.

Agenda Item 2: Presiding Officer's Business

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: I do have some information that I wish to convey to you and I would like to use the overhead projector to do it. I think there is going to be quite a bit of use of the overhead projector today by each of us so if you are so located that you can't see, you may want to seat yourself somewhere else. I wish to say a few words to you about the enrollment situation and the fiscal implications of what is happening to us.

To begin, this chart shows the enrollment headcount, in thousands over the past six years. You will readily observe that we have had a steady increase in enrollment through 1977 and that we have a sharp drop in 1978 of 1,000 students. We did not anticipate this. We anticipated a drop next year. The drop this year was not anticipated and hence has caused us some considerable concern and some difficulty. We have made an effort to determine exactly what is happening.

We looked first at the breakdown between part-time and full-time students. This is a percentage figure, not in absolute numbers. In absolute numbers full-time students have been increasing but as a percentage of the student body there has been a slow decrease in their relation to part-time students. This does not illustrate much change.

We then asked the question about the male/female breakdown. We find there that our situation parallels the national situation. There is an increase in female students on the campus. This situation for the past year has been a continued curve that we have been on for two or three years and there is nothing unusual about that. We are going along with the national curve.

We then looked at the distinction between the degree and non-degree students and again find that there is no particular change in the pattern. The number of degree students or the ratio of degree students has been increasing and will continue to increase this year about the same as it did in the past. There is some drop in the non-degree students but not a large drop.

The chart that finally gave us some clue was this one, which is a graph showing the behavior of the undergraduate classes by class standing. If you start down here at the bottom you see that the senior class is running along about the same as what its past history has been. The junior class maintains a fairly steady profile. The sophomore class which has dropped off the last year is in fact back up this year. The only large drop is in the freshman class. This suggests that our difficulties are not as much with retention of students as they are in the recruitment of students. That is the new student that we did not attract this year to the same degree as we have in the past.
We have then looked at the situation in terms of student credit hours. The reason we have looked at it in terms of student credit hours is that we get our income from the state not by headcount but by student credit hours. Our budget request to the Legislature calls for two large classes of money. One is for general fund and the other is tuition income. Tuition income is a direct function of student credit hours, roughly $23.00 a credit hour. So if we have a drop in student credit hours we have a drop in tuition income and that drop in tuition income affects our budget.

We did here look at the difference in student credit hours in the major divisions of the University between 1977 and 1978. You will note that there is a drop of 3,500 credit hours in the health area and 12,000 in the non-health area for a total of 15,500 credit hours. The figures in the far right column indicate the percent that the 1978 figures are of the 1977 figures. You will note there is a drop of 14% in Allied Health. There is also a drop of 8% in Nursing. Dentistry and Medicine have since been corrected and there is no significant drops in either of those areas, but there is a 6% overall drop in the health fields. In the non-health fields there is a 10% drop in Business, it's not clear to me why nor to anyone else that we have talked to. This has been a very rapidly growing branch of our program and one in which you would think, at this time, would be very popular. There is a 16% drop in Education, we think we understand that. There were two programs that had a slight increase: Engineering and Technology with a 3% increase reflecting, I believe, some increase of the continued interest of students in programs which have an immediate career payoff upon graduation.

Then if you go down the 1st Herron had a drop of 4%, Law had a 2% drop, I doubt if those figures will hold up in Law. Liberal Arts is 15% and has nearly 6,000 credit hours or about half of the non-health drop. As you look at the School of Science with 2,700 nearly 2,800, those two schools together amount to nearly 3/4 of the non-health. The reason is that those schools primarily service the other programs. So where there is a drop in Nursing, then there are fewer students taking Chemistry and Biology and this is reflected in the student credit hours taught in the School of Science. So those drops do not reflect a drop in the majors, but the portion that is devoted to service courses. Overall then, the total is 12,000 credit hours with total percent loss in credit hours of 8%. We had 92% of last years credit hours and that is a loss of 8% in credit hours. You have seen other figures but those are headcount figures.

PROFESSOR GOLDBERG: What was the drop in Science again? EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: The drop in Science was 7%. DEAN HARVEY: Hold the last one up again, please Ed. PROFESSOR GOLDBERG: You did say 7% for Science. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Science was 93% of what it was last year so we have had a 7% drop. One of the important things to us is when we translate that into dollars. When we translate it into dollars we come up roughly with a situation like this. The total of 15,000 credit hours, 12,000 in non-health and 3,000 in health, reflects a drop in tuition income of $1,027,500. So we have a tuition shortfall of $1 million. Now it is true that every other campus of the University had a drop in enrollment. It's true nationwide there is a drop in enrollment. That consolation I hope to remove from you in just a few minutes, but I want to recognize the fact that Bloomington does have a $1 million tuition shortfall and I believe this is the second year that they have had to cope with this problem. A $1 million shortfall in their budget isn't quite as large a proportion of their budget as it is for us but it is significant and hard to cope with.

In our case we have determined an estimate of the amount of that income that we were short and reasonably can be attributed to the various schools and divisions in the light of their experience with enrollment. Of course, that came out to be a very disastrous set of figures, particularly for the School of Liberal Arts, $328,000 would ruin their budget and for the School of Science, $154,000. Then in the case of some of the schools Business, Education, and SPEA, they are being hit both in Bloomington and Indianapolis. In order to alleviate some of the distress that this produced we have been having conferences with the Deans and we are making some adjustments in these figures. We have adjusted the Liberal Arts figure to $190,000 and the Science figure to $115,000 and we have made some other adjustments. We are trying to recover some of those differences from support services. And so we do have an amount in escrow so to speak of $1,027,500 which we are holding. Now that figure represents the following situation: a loss of 15,000 credit hours in the fall semester and the assumption that the same thing will happen in the spring semester. That is to say there will be another 15,000 credit hour drop in the spring semester and some corresponding drop in the Summer Session.

The final point that I want to make is whether this is what we can anticipate. I have some interesting materials here, at least I find them interesting. The top line is the college going rate in Indiana. What it says is that the percentage of high school students in Indiana who are going to college is 56% and that across the country Indiana's rank ties it for 50 and 51 with New Mexico. The national average for a college-going rate is 80% and we are at 56%. We have obviously one of the lowest college going rates in the nation. This is not a new situation. It is one that can be found to be the case over quite a few years. As you can see that is 1975 data, the most recent that we have. The second one is equally mind-boggling. If you look at the population over twenty-five with 4 years or more of college, Indiana ranks 45 in the nation. Now, I conclude from these two pieces of information that Indiana does not have a large reservoir of college trained people. I also conclude that we do not have very many people in the pipeline. Now you can draw the conclusion from those premises yourself that we are indeed in this state on the brink of a shortage of trained manpower which is going to be very serious unless we can do something to correct it. The third line shows the personal income to be such that Indiana ranks 11 in the nation in wealth. It's not a poor state. We can afford higher education. So my general position these days which I wish to convey to you today is, regardless of what is
happening in other schools in the nation, there is no justification in Indiana for saying that there is no population of students out there that need higher education. There is a population. The state does need more higher education than is being provided. So in the light of that, I'm going to be working with the deans starting next week using the following scheme.

This is student credit hours by the school of enrollment, it is a little different set of figures from the earlier one but it comes out in total the same. We budgeted in the non-health area this fall 132,000 credit hours. We actually had 121,000, so we have a shortage of 10,000. In the health area, without taking the M.D. and D.D.S., we budgeted 31,500. We had 26,800 which was a shortage of 4,600. In the spring we have budgeted 122,000. We have this interesting situation, then that we have budgeted in the spring what we actually had in the fall. Now my proposal is that we look at it this way. We budgeted the spring semester at 120,000 and we just had that semester. Now we are going to get next semester up to 132,000, or in other words, what we were looking for in the fall and didn't get. If we can recover those 10,000 credit hours in the non-health area we can wipe out all those deficits. If we don't recover them, there are going to be some serious problems. There are going to be people who think they are going to have summer school appointments who are not going to because we won't have enough money to run the summer school. There are going to be part-time courses that are just not going to be offered and maybe some full-time. The problem that lies before us on the health side is less critical. We can probably take care of this problem in health if we have to, but in the non-health area there is no way that we can take that amount over. So I wanted you to know what the situation is and to say that we are organizing next week two task forces: one faculty and one of administrators. The administrators to look at the technical and mechanical sides of registration and recruitment and the faculty to look at how we can improve our recruitment procedures school by school. We are going to make a real effort in the next two months to recover those 10,000 credit hours. This means that it's not something that any one of us can do alone, it's something that each of us has to do. We are in advance registration, which is just starting today. So I would take this much time, which I did not plan to do, I know you came to discuss fringe benefits, but it seemed to Carol and me that this was important enough to bring it to you at this meeting. If there are questions, I will try to answer them.

PROFESSOR SHELLHAMER: To what extent does IUPUI officially go on record as being in the business of recruiting? EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Well, we have a pretty extensive recruitment program. We make 356 high school visitations a year, we spent nearly $25,000 this fall in advertising. We are officially in the recruitment business. PROFESSOR MOGHERI: On the figures that you showed of the class standings, I noticed a drop in the fall of 1978 very similar to a drop 4 years ago in 1974. You might point that out to the State Legislature that it is rebounding not in the spring semester by the following year and the problem with that is the report that jobs have been readily available this summer instead of a lot of students simply taking the jobs that were available. If the job market is up we might be getting them plus their younger brothers next fall. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Well, there are two or three things I'd like to comment on. I pointed out that 4 years ago we had the same number of credit hours we have this fall; we had 190,000 credit hours and that's what we have now. So in a sense we have dropped back to that level now and we did rise to the excess through recruitment. Whether we will rise again, of course, and he is a political scientist and I am not, but if there's any way to guess, I suppose, I know what the Legislature will do. They will say we'll wait and see if you get the rise, they are already talking about a 5% cut in the base budget. If we recover this in January we will not only recover our loss this year but we will put ourselves in a clean posture and ask for the continuation of our base for the next two years. If we don't we certainly do face the possibility of a drop. It is absolutely true that a major part of this has to be due to the fact that a high school graduate can go out now and get a job of $7.00 an hour. He can do this with only a high school diploma. When you add this up, look at the alternative. I had a lot of other charts that I didn't share with you because I didn't want to take too much time but one of them shows that in tuition and fees at public higher education institutions, Indiana is 5th in the nation. This is not an inexpensive state to go to school in. So students who contemplate going to college then see that they are going to have to put down $700 or $800 in tuition, they can go out and earn $7.00 an hour for a couple of years and then return to school. And as you know many of them don't.

PROFESSOR SEIBERT: On the relationship on our ranking with other states in the United States with students in college, was Ivy Tech in Indianapolis considered as a community college as in other states? EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Yes, it referred to post-secondary education, which means anything beyond the twelfth grade. That included community colleges, Ivy Tech operations, and so on. PROFESSOR SEIBERT: I wonder if states with true community colleges and community college systems on a ratio type of thing would have more or greater participation in students in college than most states would have? EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Yes, as most of you know, I was in Massachusetts. Our college going rate in Massachusetts was 90%. We were working for 93-94% and we had 22 community colleges. PROFESSOR FULLER: Do you know what accounts for the low college going rate in Indiana? EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: No, I have my own theory. Many of our students do not come from homes where college education is already a tradition in the family. It is certainly true for our students in Indianapolis, since there was no public higher education available in Indianapolis before 1960. And so there is no real tradition of college going in this state but and get a job of $7.00 an hour. He can do this with only a high school diploma. When you add this up, look at the alternative. I had a lot of other charts that I didn't share with you because I didn't want to take too much time but one of them shows that in tuition and fees at public higher education institutions, Indiana is 5th in the nation. This is not an inexpensive state to go to school in. So students who contemplate going to college then see that they are going to have to put down $700 or $800 in tuition, they can go out and earn $7.00 an hour for a couple of years and then return to school. And as you know many of them don't.
PROFESSOR NEIER: The money that you wrote up there is money that will not be recovered by the University operation if it is actually gone in the sense that it is not available. If we make up for this in the spring how long will it be before that money gets back into the system at the end of the spring registration?

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Ten minutes. It is an important point, it's not a matter of taking back money, it's a matter of taking back the right to spend because it's simply money that we don't have. It's as though we have authorized people to write checks and then found out that the bank account didn't have that much in it.

We do not at the moment have any authorization for deficit spending and with the Treasurer of the University sitting up here listening to all of this, we're not likely to get it, but at any rate, at the moment we have no way of carrying this deficit over into the next year but even if we did that would probably be a disaster any way. Because if we have this drop the second semester we can be sure that we are going to have it next year. That means that we are going to have to cut next years budget by the amount that we are going to be short next year plus the amount that we are short this year and we would be in very serious difficulty. I will be glad to talk further with you. As I said I am going to be talking to the deans next week. About this and hope that we all will be able to crank up some efforts to cope with it. But it's a very difficult problem and it's an important one in the life of the University.

Agenda Item 3: Executive Committee Report

PROFESSOR NATHAN: I have no report from the Executive Committee at this time.

Agenda Item 4: Old Business

PROFESSOR NATHAN: This item is the representation to the University Faculty Council. I think this is about our third time around on this particular issue. We are going to have an election today of another representative to the University Faculty Council. I'd like to briefly explain that following my presentation to you at the last meeting I went back and reviewed the procedure again to see where the problem was and found that we are short one member for the University Faculty Council representation as I identified at the last meeting but that the shortage is from the IUPUI Faculty Council representation. In other words, we need to vote in another representative from the Council. My brief explanation of that (you will find a more complete explanation in the minutes of the previous meeting) is that the IUPUI Faculty Council Secretary, as stated in our Constitution, is a member of the University Faculty Council. At the time that I became Secretary, I was elected to the University Faculty Council by this body. This body really should have been electing two other members and myself. As a result, we are short one member. Due to this, I have asked the Nominating Committee to proceed with a ballot and would like Henry Besch, Chairman of the Nominating Committee, to present the slate.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Why don't you make your report?

PROFESSOR BESCH: I polled the members of the Nominating Committee and also some other persons who might be willing to serve and the Nominating Committee decided that we would list one person and leave room for floor nominees. So, on the ballot there is currently listed Pat Blake from the School of Nursing who most of you know and has agreed to serve in this role.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Now the question before us is whether there are floor nominees from the floor. Are there any? Is there a motion to close the nominations? The motion carried. Pat Blake was elected.

PROFESSOR FULLER: A point of order, what will her term of office be? It is one year under the present IUPUI By-Laws.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: This is the chairman of the Constitution and By-Laws Committee, Dr. Carl Fuller and he is asking the question what will the term of office be for Pat Blake under those circumstances?

PROFESSOR NATHAN: Under our Constitution it is one year. Under the University Faculty Council Constitution it is two years. We will need to resolve that with the By-Laws Committee.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: That's why we have a By-Laws Committee, Carl!

Agenda Item 5: New Business

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: The principle item on our agenda is a discussion of fringe benefits. Professor Carol Nathan will introduce our visitors.

PROFESSOR NATHAN: With us today we have Jack Mulholland, Treasurer of Indiana University, Jack Ray, Director of Insurance and Retirement Programs and Consultant for Personnel Administration and Tom Hines, Supervisor of the Insurance Department at IUPUI. We also have Neil Lantz, Director of Administrative Affairs, sitting up in the back of the room in case there are questions for him in our discussion. In addition, we have Miriam Langsam, Associate Professor in the School of Liberal Arts and chairman of the IUPUI Faculty Council Fringe Benefit Committee. Miriam will be guiding the discussion and presentation of fringe benefits this afternoon. I would like to give you a brief outline of the procedure we suggest following after the introduction; I will turn the program over to Miriam. This will be followed by a presentation by Jack Mulholland and Jack Ray to give you background information about fringe benefits and this will be followed by a discussion, question and answer period chaired by Dr. Moore. If we could proceed Miriam with your presentation.

PROFESSOR LANGSAM: As all of you undoubtedly know, there has been a great deal of concern the last year about fringe benefits for two reasons. Because of salaries that have not been keeping up with inflation and that the costs of medical bills, etc. have become far more voluminous, more terrible, more scary, along with other things we are trying to do: eating, buying a house, and other minor matters. In addition, IU Blooming-
ton this past spring, had a series of proposals about changes in the fringe benefit package. These proposals actually have a very long history and are part of an all-university committee called the "Long Committee" which has been functioning since 1973, I do believe. Shortly thereafter this fall, the administration came up with their own set of proposals about changes. There has been a great sense of dissatisfaction within some of our faculty because some of our faculty have contact with other schools or have spouses working in other schools or in industry. There has been a great deal of dissatisfaction rumbling, rumbling, in a sense, of really not knowing what to do about the proposals of IUB or what to do about the administration's proposals. We are here today to try to clarify the whole issue, if possible.

I have a couple of things here, I'd like to show you. About 1973 the "Long Committee" set up a division of what they considered to be basic benefits the University more or less had an obligation to provide and a series of what they called peripherals or freebies or not guarantees. As you will notice on this list there are, in fact, some things that we don't exactly have such as housing. Dr. Moore assures me that we really do have parking privileges despite how much they cost us because actually the University is paying something like $200 for each of our parking spaces so actually we are getting off relatively cheaply. The fee courtesy is quite different at I.U. than it is elsewhere in the state. For instance Purdue, for some of you who used to belong to the Purdue mission, know that Purdue for years has provided 50% not only for faculty, spouses, but also children and without the limitations that our own fee courtesies entailed in terms of credit hours. Then this is the general range of benefits that we are talking about. In fact, on the original list there was something about physical well-being and I pulled it off because that's something like what they do out in California where they set up these running tracks where the faculty are allowed to run at certain hours so they stay healthy - they are trying to keep people well.

Now, last year Dorothy Medcalf of the School of Nursing put together something to show new academic appointees and we have had permission to use this to give you some idea of the various benefits, who is eligible for them, how soon you are eligible for them, what you are getting and how much you are supposed to be paying. I think it is very important at this time to note that there are a number of things that I.U. pays 100%. As you are required somethings by law, so also is the University which does not have too much choice in the matter, i.e., Workman's Compensation and Social Security, somebody has to pay it so that has to be. There is if you notice a discrepancy, I shouldn't say a discrepancy, a difference between how much is paid in on TIAA/CREF and the staff which for the most part has the PERF retirement program.

Now, I have something to show you that comes from the AAUP Bulletin of September 1978. You know those incredible little charts that they have every year showing how many women there are, how many men, the number of full professors, etc. One of those columns which you may have had noticed was on fringe benefits. These are specifically the things that they include in fringe benefits. Notice they include tuition, they include housing allowances, which we do not have. But they generally include most of the benefits that we have. This is the Indiana section of the fringe benefits. If you will go down the column with me, you will notice that with the exception of Earlham and Goshen College, which are very special kinds of schools, Indiana University has a much better rate of our percent of salary which the University gives us in fringe benefits. PROFESSOR BESCH: Would you define what these figures are again? PROFESSOR LANGSAM: This is the percentage of fringe benefits as compared to the salary for each rank. In other words, a professor at Fort Wayne receives 12% of his salary as of September 1978 in fringe benefits paid by the University. And for those of you who are interested in looking at the figures for other universities and colleges around the country, I have brought the AAUP Bulletin with me, you will discover that we do better in percentages than people like Harvard.

PROFESSOR SARTORIS: The salaries are higher at Harvard so the same dollar amount is a lower percentage. PROFESSOR LANGSAM: That's part of it, but that's not all of it. If you look at the actual breakdowns in figures for example around the country, it is true that the California professors do earn more but the living costs are significantly higher so that you have to adjust a number of factors and you will come to the point that Indiana ranks well. I'm no fink for the administration! These are the figures! There is now going to be an update on that which Ed Moore gave me that will go into effect January 1, 1979, I think that the overall percentages will be up to 23.93. I think, however, that these statistics also indicate exactly what the problem is. Because almost 15% of those fringe benefits go into TIAA/CREF retirement another 6% go into Social Security so as a result almost 20X of that nice figure in fringe benefits go into retirement and less than 3% go into health and insurance. It is for this reason that schools around the state can provide more in some of their health packages than we do. They do not, however, pay 100% TIAA/CREF and some of these other 100X figures that we saw on the original chart. Therefore, I would say that one of the questions that we want to ask these gentlemen or a question that I want to know is what would happen if I'd pay some of my TIAA/CREF? There's no cut rate for the University. I would pay the same amount and take that money that was saved and put it into Group Health, where being a group we could get more than what I as an individual could get in terms of health coverage, etc. This is also the problem and now I'd like to talk to some of our experts about what they see in the administrations proposals, etc. that would help our situation. Thank you.

MR. MULHOLLAND: Thank you for inviting us here. I don't have any jokes like Ed Moore had or Miriam had, I am the "fink" for the administration. Very seriously, we had better get that dispelled because as far as I'm concerned we all work for the same place and we have a proposal here and everybody is not going to look at it the same way. If two of you got in the same room the two of you wouldn't agree, probably. So what we are trying to do is put together some packages that we can get a reasonable concensus with. Incidentally, before I
go on, I have one of Ed Moore's horror stories too about the $7.00 an hour that people can go out and earn. I had an accounting student in my upperclass accounting class stay out a semester because he is working in a Gary steel mill. He was up to around the $9.00 an hour with 60 hour weeks and Sunday, etc. Many weeks he was pulling almost $1,000 gross and I asked him how long he was going to take to earn that kind of money when he became an accountant. So any way, it's kind of interesting and that's part of the problem, he's just bound and determined that he's going to become an accountant, he doesn't want to keep at the $1,000 a week level working 80 hour weeks.

Back to the fringe benefit part, I believe everybody here got the blue agenda: what is included in this, which was the agenda for the University Faculty Council of October 10, were a couple of proposals that I had submitted working with Jack Ray. One was on the "18-20 Rule" and the other was on the Medical Insurance Coverage. I believe additionally you have other kinds of information that was submitted to you that was some other background. What I'd like to do is, to start, we'll talk about the Health Insurance proposal. I'll ask Jack Ray to make a brief presentation with the overhead. If we have time later on we'll get to the 18-20 proposal. We'll go into the health, I know that Miriam has several questions that she asked there as she making her presentation and she has raised some other questions and I'm sure that each of you will, so let me turn this over to Jack and he'll run through with some overheads, some more depth of what the proposal is, what the printed words is, hopefully it will enlighten all of us a little bit.

MR. RAY: Let me remind you, before I make my presentation, that figures don't lie. I think that the Indianapolis Star headlines had appropriate headlines that states the essence of what's behind this proposal. One of the headlines says, "Business must cut back costs of health care says Chamber of Commerce", and the lead line is, "The Chamber of Commerce of the United States describes it's time for business in America to bring the cost of health care business under control. Dr. Paul Ellwood who was a consultant says . . . health insurance premiums doubled in five years and quadrupled in ten". They are much more willing to intervene directly in the health care system to get results. On the opposite page there was another headline that says, and I am kind of greatful this appeared at the same time, it says "I.U. studying Medical Center role in city hospital alliance". It describes the alliance of Indianapolis hospitals as a not for profit corporation being formed by all nine of the major hospitals in the Indianapolis area to share to try to hold down the cost of health care and the name of Don Franklin, Assistant Director of I.U. Hospitals was proudly displayed throughout as being an instigator of that alliance. So at least we can be glad to say that Indiana University and it's hospitals is certainly supporting the spirit of this national effort-the concern about the high cost of hospital bills. I am sure that all of you recognize these two articles as just simple illustrations of what you had been reading about many of the areas about the problem. Now before we present the actual proposal, I think it is worth a little more pace setting about some of the problems and concerns. Certainly one cannot talk about health care without mentioning our concerns for quality. As a matter of fact, it may be disputed as to whether we have the best health care in the world. But certainly we have come a long, long way from the witch doctor and we have made tremendous progression. Our nation has been liberal in its foundation money for medical research. Government has been liberal in research expenditures to improve medical technology and we are well aware of it. But one can not really talk about the quality of health care per se, that is, you can not really brag about the height or the particular achievement unless you talk about the extent to which the mass of the nation's population can be exposed to it and can benefit from it. This is the economic concern and this gets us close to the main thrust of our proposals and our discussion. I think your concern in some of the questions that I. See. And here again through the insurance mechanism in this country we have responded and made expensive health care possible and available within the budget of most everybody.

When introduced Baylor University, which has a medical center, the Vice President at one time examining their bad debts which in those days was very common and even today is the experience in hospitals that there seem to be a lot of school teachers who were unable to pay their hospital bills. The idea was conceived through some arithmetic that if all of the school teachers in that particular area would pool together 50c a month, they believed that based on experience, that could pay their hospital bills, should any of them have to go to the hospital, out of that pool. It was understood, as the program went along, that if that wasn't enough they would raise it and if 50c was too much they would cut it back. That in fact was the beginning of the Blue Cross Insurance program. The Blue Cross program has moved across the country. Every state has one now. Furthermore, it was adopted for physicians expenses - Blue Shield.

Well, this really implied the insurance mechanism. Through insurance industry then, Blue Cross/Blue Shield was an association to help solve the problem. The insurance companies, of course, became aware of this and saw in it an opportunity to create a free enterprise and they got into it. And it generally got into it at first by major medical insurance.

Major medical coverage does include major expenses but really the origin of its name is the fact that it employs the co-insurance feature - it pays a major portion of the bills. It pays, generally speaking, 80% and 20% is paid by the employee or the policyholder or the insuree. Furthermore, there is usually a deductible that goes with that. Now the insurance industry, really being experienced with the way insurance works, is well aware of what is called a dichotomy of social concerns for the prevention of loss. Now that's a long term used for insurance students. What it means if if you're insured against loss you become more careless about and your prevention measures. So co-insurance is introduced by the insurance industry for 20% to give you a stake in the doctor bill. When you go to the doctor you know you are going to have to pay 20% of the cost. Furthermore, you
are going to have to pay the first amount out of pocket. That was a restraining action but the Blue Cross/Blue Shield notion of first dollar coverage was so ingrained at that time that it was there and people wanted it and people insisted on it so even Blue Cross ultimately then began to employ the major medical concept as an ultra for those kinds of medical expenses that were not included in hospital care or physician's services as an in-patient basis, drugs, nursing, and all of that sort of thing. In fact, that is the kind of program that we have today. Now as the result of this movement by insurance, by 1975, 92% of our national hospital care costs paid through insurance companies, or paid by the federal government in Medicaid, was paid through this notion. In short, this brought medical care within the budget of every working person. Likewise, 66.6% of the physicians bills were paid. No longer does the physician have to judge each person upon their ability to pay when he determines his rates. Everyone gets paid out of the same pocket. No longer does the physician have to accept a chicken for house calls as his payment. In-hospital bad debts have reduced significantly as a result of this mechanism. In short, we have responded. We have met an economic concern in this country. But in 1975 we learned something. We were made aware of something that has disturbed us ever since and has literally rocked the nation as I have already illustrated in these headlines. We learned that the care consequences of these efforts to improve the quality of health care. The consequence was that it causes that portion of our budget to go up and it has caused it to go up.

This revelation was made in a startling fashion by the President's Council on Wages and Prices in 1975 when they revealed to us that in 1955 medical care costs took 4.6% of the national economy and by 1975 it was taking 8.3% from each person. The cost living index shows that in 1965-1975 medical care costs rose 102% while all of the other costs rose only 76%. Why did this happen?

Well the experts have figured it out. One reason is normal inflation, that happened to everybody. The cost of everything went up. Secondly, unique to this particular field, was a new medical technology. The money we spend produces new technology which every community wants their hospitals to have. Each new technology makes the old one obsolete. Malpractice insurance is a defensive mechanism. Some doctors established it in a court of law as a liability. Doctors have to prove their case and, of course, doctor rates have risen. Defensive medicine practices to try to prevent these suits is another reason. And the last one we covered here, which is back to insurance, is utilization - absent consumer restraint. Because expenses are being paid for we begin to utilize care more. It is being paid for by a third party, or prepaid, so give us the best.

Now the employees of Indiana University have not escaped the effects of these things, it's just been within the last three years. I'm sure you remember that July 1976 it increased 13% and this past year increased 14%. The President's Committee on Wage and Price Stability presented a challenge. Their mission was to put the economic concern at least equal to our concern for quality.

Now, this brings us back again to the insurance mechanism and the interesting thing about it is that it works in interesting ways and there are two notions on how it ought to be used. One way is to minimize or to maximize its use for pooling and that's what care costs. Under broad coverage concept to include everything in the coverage, of course, makes the premiums go up. That's a disadvantage. An advantage in the broad coverage, of course, is that no one is prohibited from medical care because of the lack of the ability to pay. It's first dollar coverage health orientation. So that's both its good and its bad aspects. If you're about to go into the hospital or have just been in a medical expense you are glad you had it.

The other notion is that insurance plans should not cover likely expenses nor should it cover manageable expenses fluctuations. It should only cover unlikely or unmanageable expenses. Furthermore, it suggests that the plan only cover major portions which is 80% or the annual expense until some catastrophic level is reached and then insure 100%. Now because the group is unlikely expenses only above several hundred dollars are accepted for out of pocket expenses, the cost is lower and the sharing is lower. Some people, though, feel that this is the disadvantage of a catastrophic plan because it does not cover first dollar it discourages people from going to the doctor early, quickly, promptly, and therefore ultimately it results in more expensive illnesses. The question is then how did Indiana University and our group plan respond to these two notions?

The "Long Committee" in the spring of 1976 recommended some modest modifications in our plan. The one thing they did not recommend is that the Blue Shield plan, which I am sure all of you are familiar with, their $500 schedule has a very low first dollar coverage, they recommended no changes in that. Some of the other changes they recommended we have put into effect. At that same year, we were faced with the fact that we had a 34% increase anyway. Since then we have been listening, thinking, and planning and as I indicated before, I hear two kinds of complaints. Some tell me why don't you shop around for cheaper insurance because we don't like the rising premium cost? Others say why don't you get better coverage than we have now because I have to pay some money out of pocket during my last illness?

So what we have come up with is a proposal, I hope you have read already, which is two notions. One we would call the broad coverage plan and it would provide essentially the same coverage for hospital services that we have now - what's called the Blue Cross base. It would cover all hospital services for the semi-private room up to 365 days admission. It would also include the present physicians services plan which is called the Blue Shield coverage except it would be moved into the usual and customary level. So as long as you're physician for in-patient care, surgery, is charged in the usual, customary way. This particular Blue Shield plan would pay the whole cost instead of $200 or $300 or whatever its paying right now, just a portion. Then we would have the major medical coverage for all other medical expenses which would have the typical $100 deductible
which would be out of pocket cost before it would take over, up to $100 per person then it would move into the next level of insurance or in its family plan after two persons per family have had $100 deductible. Thereafter the next level, the 80% coverage would come in. Do understand that aspect of it?

Then we move into what all of you are familiar with the level coverage of 80% insured and 20% out of our pocket until a total of $5,000 coverage expenses have been made. That means from this point here to here - from $5,000 coverage expense - it would move into 100% insured because you are moving into a definite economic catastrophe level there and the maximum on that plan is $250,000 a person. Now the only thing new in this package basically is the Blue Shield plan the usual customary instead of the scheduled. We would satisfy the deductible with two persons per family. You may not be aware of this but we have already, this July 1, lowered to $5,000, we had $10,000 before 100% insurance took over. I might also add that this July we also added extended care coverage to out Blue Cross hospital coverage. In other words, when you reach a point where the hospital when they say you don't need those expenses but you still need treatment but not here, you have to move out, to the extended care coverage. We are now insured for that. That we will call the broad coverage plan.

The alternative would be a catastrophe coverage plan. It would have exactly the same Blue Cross coverage, the notion behind this theory is that any time you have to go to the hospital then is a catastrophe at stake, economic, even a few days. The first few days are the most expensive. So it's full coverage first dollar. It contains both of these plans. In our new proposal you have the option of taking broad coverage plan which I just discussed or this catastrophe plan. In the catastrophe plan everything would jump into it. There is no physicians first dollar coverage, your surgical bills, your office calls, your drugs, everything above your hospital costs would then move into the major medical plan. No Blue Shield first dollar any more. There again you would have a $100 out of pocket cost up to $400 per person or family. It's the same membership as I discussed before - $400 for family membership. Then after $400 out of pocket it would move into the 80-20% of the $5,000 for coverage expense and then above that 100% or $250,000. Now some of these details I am giving you are only a model. Blue Cross has developed a model for us and we can change any of these things. A lot of people think that Blue Cross/Blue Shield has only one standard uniform package of benefits. They can custom design anything that is reasonable. This happens to be the model they push. We asked for the model they developed so it would be a significant difference in premium, because if there isn't going to be a significant difference in premium it isn't going to be very meaningful.

Here are the figure proposals that would go with that model, then I'm going to stop talking. You see here our present plan. We're doing this so you can relate it to our present plan. The single membership, let's only talk about the single membership because it is a little more simpler. The Blue Cross portion now as a premium is $16.92 a month, the Blue Shield and major medical put together are $10.70, so we have an average premium cost of $27.62. The University is paying half of that for PERF employees and something less than half for TIAA/CREF employees and I know some of you have a question about that and during the question, answer period we will be glad to answer that, but let's pass by that at the moment.

This is for a single employee under these proposed plans using the particular model of coverage that Blue Cross/Blue Shield has prepared for us. The Blue Cross would, of course, be the same whether its comprehensive or catastrophic. I now have two figures that I can write in here for you. This would go up to $33.42 so the pluses that would be added on this model plan would bring that $27.62 up to $33.42. In the catastrophe coverage, of course, because we are taking out the first dollar coverage in Blue Shield moving in a $400 deductible in major medical, we are taking a little more risk out of our pocket - the premium will go down because we are taking a little more risk out of our pocket - the premium will go down to $23.32. For the family coverage a similar impact takes place. The figures will go up in the comprehensive to $86.80 and go down in the catastrophe to $61.95. Now in presenting this package you can decide whether it will be popularly received. People can take their choice between these two philosophies of how the insurance mechanism should work. The University does not intend to reduce its dollar coverage. It intends to give the same dollar support for whichever plan you take. This means then that the dollar support currently will have to be identified with the Blue Cross insurance, the hospitalization portions. Then you will pay the premium that you choose for the major coverage. If we put this into effect today, if you took the catastrophe plan, your monthly costs would go down. If you took the broad coverage plan, your cost would go up because you would be getting a richer plan.

PROFESSOR GOLDBERG: I don't understand this at all. The most we would be saving would be $250 for a family member and a $400 deductible, what kind of a bargain are you giving me?

MR. RAY: Well, it depends on your fortune or your misfortune, if you're sick all year. But on the other hand, if you're not sick for a number of years that's $50 a month plus the difference, about $25 or about $300 a year you'd be saving, so a little over a year you'd be saving $400.

PROFESSOR MCGEEVER: Let's take that figure $33.42 - is that the pluses or is that the total?

MR. RAY: That's the total, the actual plus has been added. Let me tell you something about group insurance. We are experience rated which means we are going according to our experience. All Blue Cross/Blue Shield is paying is the administrative costs and a certain amount for risk. They do take risk, we are guaranteed for a year whatever our expenses are that's all we have to pay. In fact, actual premium payout is in excess of 9% of the premium. No matter what you cover it is going to be there. And there are risks, we are paying for risk, as a matter of fact we are $600,000 to the good. A few years ago when that 34% premium increase took place, they insured us for $800,000 more than our premium. Now over a period of time they got a little too careless, so they'll get that back but it will be very slow.
Professor Byrne: I understood you to say that the University would continue to pay the same dollar amount.

Mr. Ray: As inflation continues to raise, the University proportions will go up also.

Professor Byrne: The cost of living increase or constant dollars?

Mr. Ray: According to premium rates.

Professor Byrne: My question is if the University share remains a percentage or does it remain a constant dollar amount?

Mr. Ray: I think its easier to relate to percentage for the first group. The University shares amounts to about 80%, 75-80%, of Blue Cross plan, so the University will pay 75 of the 80% of the Blue Cross coverage, the employee pays the rest.

Professor Sartoris: What if Blue Cross coverage goes up?

Mr. Ray: Then the University share will go up too. Also the notion is that probably we would not continue two plans. We decided to present it this way so that you would have something concrete to go by. It might be that it goes 50% and five years from now people will switch over on December 1 and you would always be able to change plans. We have an open enrollment date for both plans. Maybe even after five years we might find that one plan washes out and the other becomes our plan. It is really kind of an experiment to see. We have 12,000 employees that are eligible for coverage and Blue Cross says that you have plenty to have two plans and be stretched to one and I think everyone is interested to see how these two plans were working.

Professor Langsam: How does the HMO fit into this whole plan?

Mr. Ray: When this argument was being conceived, I began to realize that there were a lot of herd things to satisfy. At the same time the HMO's were beginning to come along. As an administrator trying and hoping to come up with something that will satisfy everybody, I thought wouldn't it be great if on every campus of Indiana University the HMO could be introduced.

Executive Dean Moore: Jack, I don't think very many people know what a HMO is.  

Mr. Ray: Health Maintenance Organization, are you familiar with the health maintenance plan? It would be kind of nice if on every campus we had a health maintenance organization. We could have said to people okay we're going to redesign our insurance program with catastrophe protection. Those of you who want full coverage join the HMO. Those of you who want insurance to protect against catastrophe go with this plan. But the HMO is not moving that quickly. You are the only campus that has had the privilege of making this dual choice of health maintenance or metro health plan. Is there any questions about what that is?

Professor Balcavage: I guess that there have been a lot of questions about whether you have posed the question to another carrier and asked for equivalent coverages from other carriers such as Prudential?

Mr. Ray: Every time an insurance carrier comes in (Metropolitan was in my office the other day) and a group man came down, he wanted to know if he was offering good services to you. I said well it depends. We are paying out a full 90% of our premiums that are going out for health care benefits from Blue Cross/Blue Shield. Now if you can improve that margin possibly we would be interested. It's the retention that counts, do you understand that? Insurance companies cannot lose money particularly on an experience rated group.

Professor Balcavage: What I don't understand is that it's my perception that other universities in this state have pretty much the same dollar out payment that we're making and they have better coverages or that they seem to have better coverages and I don't know whether that's true.

Mr. Ray: Well, I'll tell you, unless you are an actuary you say about the same coverage.

Executive Dean Moore: Jack, I don't think he's talking about the dollars here, he's saying that they get some benefits that we don't get. 

Mr. Ray: Well, let me put it this way. Let's suppose that you have a patient type coverage. We don't have that on our major medical. Let's suppose that with Prudential instead of being insured for semi-private rooms for usual and customary for 365 days that you are insured for 60 days. Can you evaluate the difference in those? My guess is that you can't unless you know what the experience of hospital utilization is and you have the actual data to make a choice. So it is often confused. It is so nice to say the grass is greener on the other side of the fence but the only way they can have a better plan than us is if it happens to spread the benefits a particular way you like better than ours.

Executive Dean Moore: I think I am going to assert the prerogatives of the chair. I am supposed to chair the discussion period. I don't mean to shut it off, I just mean to bring some order to it. 

Mr. Ray: I do have some illustrations of actual dollars for any one who might want see those.

Executive Dean Moore: The answer to Professor Balcavage: I think the basic principle is that other plans do have things that we don't have in our plan and then again we have some things that they don't have and that's where the problem comes in comparing. You have to see what it is that our plan has that the Purdue plan does not have. There are differences. The fringe benefit committee did compare the plans and decided that they did like the plan that Indiana had. Now unless you want to comment further, I'm going to go to Jerri Laube.

Professor Laube: That's almost the same question that I was going to ask. I have sympathy with the economic concern but it is concerning me about the benefits and the psychiatric out-patient was exactly what I was going to mention.

Mr. Ray: In other words you would like to have a broad coverage plan. Broad coverage would include out-patient. It would be limited, however. I don't know a single insurance company that doesn't limit those out-patient benefits. The package that Blue Cross/Blue Shield has had the most experience with, keep in mind certain patterns are useful and adopted by insurance companies because then they know what kind of experience to expect from it and to build a basis on it, the one that they like to use is a limit of $20 per visit and then they will insure you 50% or 80% up to 52 visits per year. This particular set of figures includes out-patient care, out-patient psychiatric treatment and 50% to the maximum charge of $20 per visit for 52 visits per year. That might not seem like very much to you, they'll change that to 80% and that is the highest I think they will go.
EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: I'll take two more questions.

PROFESSOR DEXTER: I'm sorry, I suppose you have already said it but I haven't quite grasped it. Are you saying that the in-patient program will be identical in the two programs, but that the out-patient in one case you're having first dollar coverage and other one unless you have really large out-patient bills you're going to be paying it out of your own pocket? 

MR. RAY: I'm not saying quite that. The in-patient as far as hospital care, hospital protection would be the same in both programs. Now one plan, the broad one, had Blue Shield which also pays for inpatient physician, surgical and those physician charges will not be placed on what we call the $500 schedule, which means the maximum they pay for surgeon fees. Then there are some other things that are called extended. The catastrophe plan will not be first dollar on any physician or surgical charges whether it be in-patient or out-patient. Incidentally, the particular package I brought up here also there are little details that we are going to share with you so if you have a committee to study it you will have the details. It has things like broad coverage under Blue Shield which would have no maximum or minimum, laboratory. It would be fully covered under the broad coverage plan.

MR. MULHOLLAND: I think we may add something else also that we don't have in there and it is always a question that comes up, do we have dental coverage in there? The answer is no, we didn't put it in there. Could we have dental coverage in there? Yes, then you'll see that premium instead of $33.00 or whatever it was up to $48.00 or some such figure. But the idea is if your group of people that take the broad coverage and you're paying so much for it in essence you as a group could add to it, if enough of the group wanted dental coverage you can have it added to it, but we didn't put it in for openers because there are enough on the other side that said don't put it in.
EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Again, I speak because I was a member of the "Long Committee". (It don't like the name for that, it was the longest committee that I have ever been on. It met for nearly three years.) This was a very complicated subject but the dental thing was one that we looked at. We decided, in our wisdom, that the only way to put it in was to take something else out or increase the cost. We did not feel the increase cost to all of us was worth it. So we decided not to go for dental. Basically what you get for this first dental bit is you get your teeth cleaned and inspected by the dentist once a year. We did look at dental care and we looked at psychiatric care.

PROFESSOR APPLEGATE: I was wondering if at some point we were going to offer some discussion of special benefits for instructors and for part-time people, that kind of thing.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: One of the problems we have to face is how many hours you want to spend and whether this is the form that you want to spend it in to discuss fringe benefits. As I just said and I didn't mean it to seem to make that point but it seems to me it does. That fringe benefit committee met every week for 4 hours for 3 academic years to review the fringe benefit program and the options. They are very complicated issues. So you basically face the question facing most democracies, you either have to have some kind of a representative group who will look at each one of these and satisfy yourselves that they are honest and they are doing the best that they can or you have to commit your own time to it. I'm not opposed to your committing your own time but I think that is the question. Do you want to have the Faculty Council schedule meetings on each of these major fringe benefits items? If you do you're probably talking about the rest of this year's meetings. If you don't, do you want us to schedule a separate meeting for people who are concerned about these things to come to? Well all of you can write me memos if you want to and tell me what you want to do, but we're willing to do any of these things you want to do. These are not matters that can be disposed of in an hour.

PROFESSOR LANGSAM: I think this is very true. Let me share with you. Last year the fringe benefit committee didn't meet. And as of this fall I became the proud owner of the chair of the fringe benefit. One of the first things that I noticed on one of the things that they sent out was this statement that Jack referred to about this 365 day hospital coverage. In the original IUB statement they had a little note that said that the average stay in a hospital for 90% of the people was only 10 days. So I said, ah ha! We are paying for 365 days that we don't need. Even if we get sick three months that would more than take care of the other 10% we would then still be paying for 335 days more than we need. Then I called Jack and he explained to me that ratios of cost depend in part on how many people use it. Now since so few people use that coverage of the full 365 days the actual cost to us as individuals is pennies. And for those pennies to protect those 5, 6, or 8 people that need it is incredible. I didn't know that and so much talking to him on the telephone about what I very simpliciethought was the solution to the insurance problem! I was going to solve it, I was going to straighten the University out. It is a very complicated problem, I think, however, the things that are being raised are certainly very serious problems that do need to be looked into though perhaps not by the whole group and I would certainly think the committee will look into those matters for you.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: I'd like to bring this to a close, I'd like to say that we are grateful. The University Faculty Council will meet on November 14 in the Rooflounge here at IUPUI and the subject will be fringe benefits. This is a discussion so if you want to hear more about this you should feel free to come. The meeting starts at 1:30 in the afternoon and usually continues till about 4:30. The second point is that if you have questions that were not addressed today, you should send them to Miriam Langsam who chairs the Fringe Benefit Committee for this Council or the Secretary Carol Nathan who will see that they will get to the right place. She is also a co-secretary of the University Faculty Council and so she participates in all of these discussions and Miriam Langsam will be at that meeting on the 14th also. You may get a report from her later about that.

PROFESSOR HUMNICKY: Will there be any other meeting for the entire faculty to bring questions or problems?

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: There will be one if you'd like. PROFESSOR HUMNICKY: Down the line, after more decisions have been made, because I have had people address questions to me and wonder if they are going to be able to go to a meeting such as the University Faculty Council meeting next week or an open meeting for all faculty not just the Council. MR. RAY: If we offer this kind of plan I'm sure there will be group meetings to get feedback before it is decided to offer it or not I don't know, but I do know if we offer these two plans there will be plenty of opportunities to discuss it. PROFESSOR HUMNICKY: There seem to be quite a few questions have already come up on the HMO program which has to be decided in about two weeks.

MR. HINES: By November 17.

MR. RAY: But there have been a lot of meetings held on that subject.

PROFESSOR LANGSAM: Yes and no. I have a little insight on that. I have been talking to Kerry Kaplan who is with HMO and he said that although an extensive mailing was sent out that there was some kind of problem. For example, I never got the mailing and a number of other people did not get a mailing. Now in that mailing there was a listing of a series of meetings to which you could go to find out about the HMO. Furthermore, Kerry has a unit that he will show and I am going to meet with him, I was supposed to meet this week, but I won't be able to till next week and do a tour of the facilities in Indianapolis and probably will get you some information. There will be more information circulated about HMO's and more attempt to reach the faculty to let them know what is happening about that because something has happened and we don't know exactly what. MR. HINES: Can I ask in here how many actually received this package that was mailed out? You see this what we run into all the time. We hear reports that it has not been received and then we find that a good percentage does have them.

PROFESSOR LANGSAM: The actual return on the mailing in Indianapolis, now I don't know that the figures are here, the number of contacts and returns were 53 that made any contact, so that is a relatively low percentage.
MR. HINES: There were five sessions scheduled for people to attend here on campus plus three open houses, we had a total attendance at the five meetings of 60 people. I don't know how to account for this. MR. LANTZ: I also wanted to point out that in the October 11 issue of the Greensheet there was a page devoted to this including an announcement of the open houses of Metro and a reference to a home mailing being made for employees. Now if persons did not read that and did not get a home mailing of course then they have missed notification. We are inserting in the next issue of the Greensheet a reminder and encouraging those who have not heard from the Metro to contact the Personnel Office. It is my understanding from Tom that there will also be an insertion with the next bi-weekly paychecks. So I think the University has gone to considerable length to inform the rank and file, although there will always be a few missing, with the thousands that we are dealing with, that this option is available.

DEAN NEVILL: The School of Science will have a meeting about HMO with the gentlemen next Tuesday in the Faculty Lounge at 38th Street at 11:15, if anyone wants to come to a sixth meeting. MR. RAY: If you are attracted to the HMO, Metro Health Plan, but feel uncertain about joining because we have something here in our insurance plan that's pending, don't let that deter you. The normal time if you join the HMO to get back into the insurance plan is December 1, or you can go from the insurance plan to HMO on December 1 of next year. However, if we make a new contract with Blue Cross/Blue Shield with major changes then Blue Cross/Blue Shield I'm sure will allow an open enrollment date for that time for people to come back. See the open enrollment date is controlled by the insurer. They will not do it any time you want to because you could switch back and forth to where you are going to get the most benefits, if you're going to get sick you'd want to go into the broad coverage plan, if you think you are going to be well, you'd want to go into the catastrophe. But where there is a major change there will be a re-opening so it wouldn't shut you out for example in a revised one here if you plan on going in that direction.

PROFESSOR DEXTER: I gather that the HMO presentations are a sales presentation for the HMO, is there any way to get a Blue Cross/Blue Shield representative there side by side and hear a sales presentation from each? MR. HINES: We did indeed have a representative at all of these sections.

The meeting was adjourned.

Carol Nathan, Secretary
IUPUI Faculty Council
1. Approval of the October 12 and November 2 minutes as distributed.

2. Presiding Officer's Business
   - Update on IUPUI budget requests
     - Salaries
     - Quality improvement
     - Capital
     - Key legislators

3. Executive Committee Report
   - Development of Staff Council
   - Announcement of Election of Faculty Boards of Review to be held at January meeting.
   - Next meeting - January 11, 1979.
   - Discussion on setting the value of "n" (Council size for 1979-80). Motion: The Executive Committee has looked into the matter of "n" and we would like to recommend that we use the same value of "n" that we used last year (3.72).
     Motion Carried.

4. Old Business
   - There was no old business.

5. New Business
     - Draft of position paper from IUPUI Faculty Council
     - Executive Committee
     - Discussion
     - Action on motion to accept position paper was tabled until January meeting.
Minutes of
IUPUI Faculty Council Meeting
December 7, 1978, 3:30 P.M., School of Law, Room 116

Present: Vice President Irwin; Executive Dean Moore; Deans: Francois, Kellum Nevill, Weber; Director: Bonner,
Professors: Allmann, Applegate, Beck, Blake, Bonner, Bruyn, Chalian, Cutshall, Daly, Dexter, Fedor,
Frank, Gnat, Gray, Haak, Hummicky, Kasle, Kimball, Langsam, Lauer, McGeever, Metz, Metzger, Nathan,
Penna, Riteris, Roeseke, Rothe, Sagraves, Sartoris, Shaffer, Sharp, Sherrill, Smith, Solow, Tharp,
Vargus, Wappner, Wright.

Alternates: George T. Lukemeyer for Dean Steven C. Beering, Dean Hugh Wolf for Dean Richard P. Gousha,
Magdalene Fuller for Dean Elizabeth Grossman, Robert Lewis, Jr. for Dean Schuyler F. Otteson,
Billy Abel for Ronald E. Dehnke, Margaret Pike for Rosanne C. Perez, Dennis Dipert for Mary Lee Seibert.

Absent: Deans: Bonser, Harvey, McDonald, Renda, Schneiderman, Stonehill;
Director: Pierce; Professors: Balcavage, Besch, Bond, Brashear, Burt, Childress, Farber, Fuller,
Goldberg, Green, Hamburger, Hendrie, Johnson, Karlson, Landis, Laube, Markstone, Mclear, Meiere,
Miller, Newton, Shellhammer, Tennant, Wall, Wallihan, Watanabe, Yokomoto.

Agenda Item 1: Approval of the Minutes of October 12 and November 2, 1978.
The minutes of October 12 and November 2 were approved as distributed.

Agenda Item 2: Memorial Resolution for Dr. Mary Pinkerton.
A moment of silence was observed for the memorial resolution of Dr. Mary Pinkerton.

Agenda Item 3: Presiding Officer's Business

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: I thought you might be interested this afternoon in an update on the status of our
operating and our capital budget requests. They have now been through the Commission on Higher Education (HEC)
and have also been through the State Budget Committee. Some of this you have read in the paper and perhaps
some of it you have not. I have broken it down into three categories: our request, the HEC recommendations,
and the Budget Committee recommendations. Part of this I think I have covered before. For this campus for
salaries and wages, our request was for an increase of 9.44% in the health
division and 10.58% in the non-health division. The Commission on Higher Education reduced both components to
a 7% increase. A day or two later the Budget Committee reduced the salaries and wages to an increase of only
5.2% in both health and non-health. Now this is the usual story. The University's request is usually pared
some by the Commission on Higher Education, and it was for this campus, particularly this year. They used the
guidelines of the President's Wage Policy. The State Budget Committee usually reduces it from the HEC recom­
mendation but during the legislative process, we're usually able to get an increase. That was true last year
in the short session where we were finally able to get, I believe, 7.5%. Don’t be too concerned about the 5.2%
because I just can’t believe that it will stand. That is one thing that all universities will really muster
all the muscle they have to try to do something about.

Now another important item in our budget was quality improvement. They refer to this as quality change. In
the health division, we had $566,000 in our request for quality improvement. In the non-health division, we
had $1.2 million increase for each of the two years of the biennium. The Commission on Higher Education reduced
the program improvement in health to $121,000+ and reduced the non-health division to $0. Now let me explain.

I spent a great deal of last week working with the Commissioner and members of his staff on that issue and as
of Monday night we presented a modified request to him. As of yesterday, he told us personally that it would
be approved tomorrow at the Commission meeting. Now the modification in program improvement for the non-health
is $1.2 million for the biennum. This will provide, we believe, the addition of 43 new faculty persons from
the category of quality improvement. As you know sometimes we get faculty additions from a category of
salaries and wages and then of course we get faculty additions from sponsored program monies. Even though the
Commission tomorrow recommends this, it still has to pass the hurdle of the State Budget Committee. However,
one encouraging sign is that this Budget Committee did approve, to the exact dollar amount, the Commissions
recommendations on program improvement. So we feel now that we have at least partially restored an important
component of our budget.

Now a few words about the status of our capital request. As I think I said before, the Commission required
Indiana University as a system to prioritize its new facilities, new buildings. Priority #1 for I.U. was the
Classroom Office Building #2 here in Indianapolis, a $19 million project. The second priority was the addition
to the School of Business in Bloomington. The third priority was the addition of two floors to the Medical
Sciences Building in Indianapolis. The fifth priority was the addition to the School of Law Building in Bloom­
gton and the sixth priority was the completion of the basement level of our Engineering and Technology Building
so we can put our computer operation center there. Well, the Budget Committee has passed on capital, at least
round one, and they have approved the following items for Indiana University: general repair and rehabilitation of $6.67 million for all campuses. We usually get about $24 million from that. The Commission on Higher Education and the Budget Committee endorsed the concept of major renovation of buildings to try to bring buildings up to code and to spend a considerable amount of money on it. There are two buildings that are approved by the Budget Committee. One is Woodburn Hall at the Bloomington campus, that's the old Business School Building, which now houses Political Science and a few other things. They also approved the completion of the basement of the Engineering and Technology Building here in Indianapolis which is a $1.1+ million project.

For new construction, they have approved as the first priority in fourteen the Medical Sciences Building addition, two floors. The only other new facility that they have approved in the entire system is an Agricultural Research Center at the Purdue, West Lafayette campus. They did provide cash for all of these items. This is unusual. They usually provide cash for renovation and repair but they usually provide bonding authority for new construction or major rehabilitation. Now, they have put in priority order the other buildings among all of the public institutions. As I pointed out they have approved the Medical Sciences addition and the Agricultural Research Center. The next item on their priority list is the addition to the Business School at Bloomington. The next priority is an addition to the Agricultural School of Ball State University and next is the Indianapolis Classroom Building #2. I am optimistic and I have, I think, good reason to believe that as the General Assembly moves through its processes it will authorize bonding authority for additional buildings. If they authorize it for just three buildings we will be able to obtain the second classroom building which was number one priority for the I.U. system.

One other item that they have approved, the Budget Committee that is, is land acquisition, $495,000 and this is very much needed because we received no land acquisition dollars two years ago or one year ago and we have a lot of properties out there which people are really desperate to sell to us. So that was certainly welcome.

You might be interested in knowing who the key people are now in the Legislature so far as these facilities and this operating budget are concerned. There are two very important committees that we will be appearing before. One is the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the chairman of that is Bill Long of Lafayette and the assistant chairman of that is Steve Stoughton of Indianapolis a very good friend of Indiana University, not that Bill Long is not a friend of Higher Education. The Senate Finance Committee which is the other very important committee, the chairman is Larry Borst from Indianapolis and the backup man to him is John Mutz also from Indianapolis. Another committee that will play perhaps an important role this year in Higher Education is the Senate Higher Education Committee and that is headed by Horrey Mills also of Indianapolis. So Senator Mills will be an important person. Other important people, of course, are Kermit Burroughs, the speaker of the House, Ned Lampkin, physician and graduate of IU, majority floor leader of the House, and Martin Edwards of New Castle, who is Senate pro-tem. Of course, we don't overlook the Governor, who plays an important role in this process. I think I will close at that point and see if any of you have any comments or questions that I will try to answer.

There is one other item that is still open, which I forgot to mention, and that has to do with the special state appropriations. Most of these are in Medicine, some of them are not. They took a licking in the State Budget Committee process and we are now negotiating that as we did the issue of program improvement in the non-health division. We are encouraged at this point that we will be able to restore most of the line items that are in the, so-called, special state appropriations.

Agenda Item 4: Executive Committee Report

PROFESSOR NATHAN: One of the first positions that I held here in the Faculty Council was chairman of the Staff Affairs Committee and some of you may remember that I reported numerous times on the activities of the Staff Affairs Committee. I'd like to repeat that a little for you this afternoon because Dr. Irwin and I have worked closely on the issues which I will identify again. I think now we have achieved what we started out with in 1974. Now I will give you a little review on the chart which I used when I gave my report in the fall of 1976. The IUPUI Faculty Council has a committee called the Staff Affairs Committee and in 1974 when I began to chair it we tried to develop a purpose for that committee and decided that one of the issues involved was that we had no staff on the committee and therefore we really could not come up with the problems that the staff might have when they had no representation. So, in checking the Constitution and By-Laws it was found that we could ask any group to advise us so we selected a non-voting advisory committee to the Staff Affairs Committee in 1974. At that time, we had a workshop in 1974 and two in 1976. The first one and the last one were workshops that some of you may have attended. They were held in Dr. Irwin's home and they were on the subject "Knowing our University". These included background and discussion and information about IUPUI. We invited both staff and faculty to those so there was communication between staff and faculty on these issues. Suggestions were made at that time by the staff and faculty for various improvements within the IUPUI system. The second workshop was one on development on some kind of communication vehicle for staff. We had many representatives from all units of IUPUI join us. That workshop was held at the Museum of Art and I think there were close to 50 people there. We broke up into discussion groups and planned what kinds of vehicles could be used for better staff communication and for staff to be able to have input to administration on a more formal basis. So this is what happened during the period of time between the fall of 1974 and the spring of 1976.
When I reported to the Council in the fall of 1976, I came with the proposal from the Staff Affairs Committee that a Staff Council be developed. Since that time a nucleus group of this staff advisory committee that we started back in 1974 has continued to work on this issue and they have come up with a completed set of By-Laws which are being reviewed by University Counsel. Dr. Irwin has told them to move ahead towards development of this Council. Since we have come to a point now where we really have almost achieved this chart, I thought I would bring it back to you and show it to you again.

We have in the back of the room Karl Ralph from the Herron School of Art. Karl is the vice-chairman of the staff advisory group. I would like to mention, also that to get this ball rolling, Dr. Irwin appointed officially on his administrative committees a staff advisory group, this year. So there is a staff advisory committee made up of namely these same people and some additions. They are the ones that are spearheading this and are working with the administration to get it off the ground. So we may soon have parallel structure for the staff as we have for faculty. We are also hoping that this will allow communication with the Faculty Council and with administration from a representative group of staff. There will be an Executive Committee, just like there is with our Council and it will allow input from that group. If anyone has any questions or concerns about this you may address them now or you may contact Karl Ralph or Dorothy Medcalf of the School of Nursing who is chair of this committee. Karl do you have anything to add to that? I think there will be some official statement come out also from your office, Dr. Irwin, to the various deans regarding this.

PROFESSOR LANGSAM: I don't know exactly that this is the kind of thing that the Staff Council concerns itself with, but I as a faculty member was a little bit distressed last year during the snow storm when school was cancelled and faculty members were urged to but not enforced to make up classes, the staff was allowed to take vacation and then had to make up that time, if I understand that correctly, or they would lose pay. At the time it seemed a little bit unfair, if I am mistaken I stand to be corrected on this but I understood that they were then required to make up this time and I was wondering if this is the type of thing that the Staff Council has now or will have some policy, hopefully we will have a very friendly winter this year and this won't come up again, but I was wondering if an official policy has been promulgated with relationship to the staff and then again with relationship to the rest of us in terms of both crises? It seemed to me at the time we were all at kind of a loss as to what would happen. I guess that is my question.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Well, an official policy has been promulgated. The policy last year was not precisely the way our friendly local historian remembers it. It called for people to either take vacation time or to make the time up. This comes in part from the fact that in the state of Indiana as in many other states you're not allowed to pay people if they don't work. So there is no provision in state statutes for snow days and so over the last three or four years we have tried to develop an arrangement under which we can manage to let people decide more or less themselves whether they are going to try to come in or not. If they choose not to come though, they will either take a vacation day or a sick day if they have one or compassionate leave day or whatever option they have when they use those up.

The problem in part about working to make it up comes from the fact that new employees who have been on the job less than six months don't have any accrued vacation and so we have asked them to work with their supervisors and make the time up that way. The fact that we also must keep a great many of the facilities on the campus open and operating means that we can't just give part of the staff a day off and tell them to stay home without paying overtime for those who do come to work. So in some way we had to compensate and we have published an official policy on that.

PROFESSOR NATHAN: I'd like to just add to that though, Miriam, in regard to the development of the Staff Council, one of the things that we feel will really be a strength to this kind of group is that Dr. Irwin and Dr. Moore and appropriate others would have a specific group of people to call upon for their input to any kind of emergency or crisis situation or decision making rather than calling only on the Faculty Council Secretary. There hasn't been a specific group that they could call upon for staff reaction. Many of the decisions that happened last year, that would have been a very nice group of people to be able to address but yet there was no specific person that could be identified. Some of the problems might have been alleviated if that had been possible.

PROFESSOR HUMNICKY: Who is staff? Is it anybody who is not faculty? EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Well, let me speak to that. It is written in their By-Laws but the By-Laws don't leave it unilaterally and unambiguously clear. So we have in effect asked the University attorney for a ruling because of the interest in this question. It's clear that faculty are not staff and now that librarians are faculty they are not staff, but what is not clear is what the status of deans is and particularly non-academic deans like myself or associate deans and assistant deans. But at any rate there is a group on the campus that are FR's, professional category, the AD's are reasonably clear are staff but it's not so clear about the FR's. Then there are the OA's so there are a variety of categories about which it is not all that clear. What we would like, if we had our druthers, I think, is to have everybody who is not eligible for membership in the Faculty Council, be eligible for membership on the Staff Council, so that everyone would have one of the two Councils as a sounding board for his or her concerns. But as I say this is being done under a Trustee mandate, the University Trustees acted many years ago to authorize this and at that time there was only one campus and things were simpler. So we have asked Mr. Travis' office for an interpretation and that's why I can't give you a straightforward answer right now.
PROFESSOR NATHAN: It was a good question because it's one of the biggest questions that we have in the whole issue. We'll report back to you on what eventually is decided.

Just a couple of announcements. The Nominating Committee is presently working on nominations for the two Faculty Boards of Review which will be elected at the January meeting. So you might want to keep that in mind, if anyone happens to be interested in a Faculty Board of Review position you might contact Henry Besch, who is chairman of the Nominating Committee. Also as far as the January meeting is concerned, it is the date that is listed in the calendar we gave to you. Just to refresh your memory, the January meeting will be the second Thursday of the month instead of the usual first Thursday, so it's January 11. One other item of business coming from the Executive Committee is the necessity for this Council each year in the fall to designate the value of "n", which means in essence the size of this Council for the next year. I'd like to call on Kent Sharp to give you a brief background on the subject of the value of "n" and then give the Executive Committee motion on this issue.

PROFESSOR SHARP: I might review with you what the Constitution has to say about the value of "n" and how it is selected and then give you my brief interpretation of it. It says, "In the fall semester of each academic year the Faculty Council shall determine a minimum percentage "n" of the total voting faculty which entitles an academic unit to representation on the Council. Each academic unit shall be entitled to one unit representative for each full "n" percent and one additional unit representative for any fraction thereof. The number of at-large representatives on the Council shall be equal to the number of unit representatives on the Council." Back to the value of "n" and what it means and how to interpret it, I think we can say that we have a faculty of say 1200 faculty members on this campus and we select a value of "n" like 3%. Three percent times 1200 faculty members would be 36 faculty members. So each unit which has at least 36 faculty members would be entitled to one unit representative for each 36 faculty members and one additional faculty member for any fraction thereof. The Executive Committee has looked into this matter of "n" and we would like to recommend that we use the same value of "n" that we used last year. The value of "n" that we used last year was 3.72% and this was based on last years figures, we don't have this years figures and won't have them until January 15 which the Constitution calls for but if we use last years figures and 3.72%, we had 1237 faculty members last year times 3.72% that meant that 46.016 faculty required for each unit representative. That will give us a Faculty Council size of about the same size that you have this year. So I move that we use 3.72%. Seconded.

PROFESSOR MCGEEVER: Would that be the only representatives elected? PROFESSOR SHARP: No, I'll give you some additional numbers. This year's Council has 25 unit representatives going off the Faculty Council and 26 faculty at-large representatives going off the Council. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Who were also elected. PROFESSOR SHARP: Who were elected two years ago and going off now. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: No, I mean the at-large representatives, Pat's question was you have the unit representatives who are elected now are there other representatives who are also elected. PROFESSOR SHARP: Yes, I should explain that a little bit better. I would anticipate that we will be electing about 25 unit representatives and about 25 at-large representatives, making a total of 50. We have 19 returning from last year so that means a total of 69 or 70 elected representatives for next year. PROFESSOR NATHAN: Then we have 19 ex-officio. PROFESSOR SHARP: The total will be dependent upon what the January 15 faculty count is. PROFESSOR NATHAN: The total Council size right now is about 88 and 18 of those are ex-officio.

PROFESSOR DEXTER: I guess I'm asking for clarification. Last year did we not cut down the number of people we were electing for some reason and is this perpetuating a thing where we're going up to a bigger number again, is that correct for this year as compared to last year in terms of numbers being elected? I'm still not clear on that. PROFESSOR SHARP: Last year we cut about 18 or 20, we had about 105 or something like that the previous year and we are going to have to be electing the Secretary of the Faculty Council and we're going to have to be electing committee chairmen and really those 19 are the bulk and we would like to have a bigger body to work with. So I think we don't need to come down too much more. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: What Dr. Dexter's question was, are we, you said last year we went from about 105 or so to 88 and what you're proposing would put us to 88 or thereabouts again. We'd be staying at the size we're now at. I think this is partly because the Executive Committee felt that we are a pretty comfortable size. Last year it was pretty large and this seemed like a better group to get work done in. Plus the fact that when we adopted our new Constitution we enlarged the Executive Committee on the theory that it would do more of the spade work and bring things here to get a little quicker action. So we thought it had been working pretty well this year and that's why we thought we would stay with it. MOTION CARRIED.

Agenda Item 5: Old Business

There was no old business.

Agenda Item 6: New Business

PROFESSOR NATHAN: Under new business, in your agenda and minutes you received a document entitled: ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL: 1977-78 re: reorganization. You probably may have seen this document before but it did get reprinted for you in your minutes. It was stated on your agenda that we would be discussing this. An example of trying to expedite business of the Council and the use of the Executive
The Executive Committee of the IUPUI Faculty Council recommends the following motion concerning the document entitled ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL: 1977-78 re: Reorganization:

The IUPUI Faculty Council wishes to go on record in response to the actions taken by the Bloomington Faculty Council in the document entitled ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL: 1977-78 re: reorganization. In the spirit of cooperation and support of the Indiana University system we welcome the opportunity to respond to this document and feel that there are specific items that we should comment on. These items are as follows:

A. Academic Leadership Resolutions:

A.1. While we support the concept of academic leadership and the continuing development of system-wide leadership, we do not see it necessary to proliferate committees in this area as there are already three committees addressing these issues.

B. Personnel Resolutions:

B.1.-B.4. We support the development of system-wide standards to the extent that it is possible but we must also go on record as acknowledging the diversity of the missions of the various campuses. The difficulties with promotion and tenure actions and process in multi-campus schools should be further evaluated and our Faculty Council and Executive Committee and administration will work together to propose alternative methods.

C. Faculty Governance Resolutions:

C.2.a. We support the concept that issues for the University Faculty Council may come from the faculty governing bodies on each campus but we also maintain that the University Faculty Council should raise and address issues which come from its own body which obviously affect other campuses in the system. We further encourage the University Faculty Council to continue to communicate with campus councils on any issues originating in the University Faculty Council itself.

C.2.b. The IUPUI Faculty Council does not support this item as it is felt that faculty decisions concerning new programs should be made at the campus level and that the University Degree Program Proposal Review Committee should remain responsible for making recommendations to the appropriate bodies.
D. Budgetary Resolutions:

D.3. We do not support this item as most research is conducted on the Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses. If we hope to promote research throughout the system, indirect costs from research research grants should be shared throughout the system. These monies may be used to promote research on campuses where such research is minimal or non-existent.

We basically support the concepts under the area "E. Program Resolutions". All other items not specifically identified above were considered to need no comment from the IUPUI Faculty Council.

The IUPUI Faculty Council Executive Committee proposes that the above position paper constitutes the position of the IUPUI Faculty Council.

The motion was seconded.

PROFESSOR SARTORIS: I have a little trouble with two items, I guess B.3. and B.4. concerning the tenure process and whether tenure is campus specific in a multi-campus school. The statement that the Bloomington Faculty Council gives there is from a time prior to integration of, at least, the School of Business as a multi-campus school and I wonder if the Board of Trustees in fact still does have the position that it is campus specific and how can we maintain the quality of programs that we are trying to operate basically as one unit as in the School of Business and have campus specific tenure. We're using within the School, identical standards for tenure and promotion and I don't understand how we can have campus specific tenure which implies different standards perhaps and still be expected to maintain a unified operation across the campuses.

PROFESSOR SHARP: Point of information, who is the speaker and what school are you from: PROFESSOR SARTORIS:

BILL SARTORIS, School of Business. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: We are, we were at least, in the Executive Committee less adamant shall I say on this point than our recommendation might suggest. The difficulty is that what tenure, how should I put it really means "is a budget line". There is not much point to having tenure if there is nobody who is going to pay your salary. So the basic position that the Trustees have adopted is that your tenure is where your money is and if the money disappears there has either got to be new money found for a position elsewhere or there is not position elsewhere. That's what this issue has resolved into. I have personally proposed, on a few occasions at least, that we recognize that as the problem and address that by saying that if you are a faculty member in a multi-campus school and the program is closed down on your campus then you will be offered any position in that school for which you are suitable on either campus which is vacant or so to speak where there is money. Now this would not answer all the questions or settle all the concerns but it will be at least a recognition of the fact that the problem is a financial problem. It's not a serious problem in the SPEA program. It is a serious problem in the Business School because you are so much larger and it will be as SPEA gets larger. Right now we have on this campus something like 40 faculty in the School of Business if we would close down the School of Business which I am not proposing on this campus, there would suddenly be 40 positions that needed to be funded somewhere else in the system. It would be very difficult to accomodate that. So that, it seems to me, that one step at least towards recognizing the nature of the problem and trying to cope with it would be a recognition that it was campus specific only if there was no money available for the school or anywhere else in the system. But these are the kinds of concerns that people have about it and this is not only the position the Trustees adopted in 1969 but that they have since reaffirmed.

PROFESSOR SARTORIS: I have one other question, now let's pose a hypothetical situation. Since we do in the School of Business do a lot of cross campus teaching and people are originally or initially based on a certain campus according to the budget line and according to the needs of that particular campus location, let's say a situation arises that because of shifts in two faculty members interests both of whom have tenure, one in Indianapolis and one in Bloomington, there is a desire to switch those two bases and let's say the budget lines are such that it is possible to do that without any problem, does that mean then that the faculty member has to go through the tenure process again for the other campus?

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: No, it would not ordinarily mean that. You posed the hypothetical question and if there is no money available at the other end then that's the problem. If you wanted to be on the Bloomington faculty and they wanted you and you wanted your expertise but did not have any money, under these premises you would have no right to say well I'm going to go there. They might take you and say we'd be glad to have you, we just won't pay you and if you found that a reasonable description and accepted it. But we assume faculty members are not willing to move unless they are funded. So really money is at the root of this problem. There are other problems, I don't mean to act as though that's the only problem. There is also a concern about the movement of faculty from say a regional campus to IUPUI or from IUPUI to Bloomington. There does not seem to be a great deal of concern about the movement of faculty from Bloomington to the other campuses but that's also part of it. But I think that the hard core problem is the money problem. It depends largely, I think, on what the faculty finally comes down to as a position. This is certainly the position of the Bloomington campus as of today, I think. One possibility would be to hold aside a pool of money on each campus for faculty who might want to move from one campus to another. So that you would have an option that way. Another possibility, which does not
meet with a lot of enthusiasm, would be to let faculty move and to move the money with them. But unless we have some device to accommodate the financial restrictions the tenure has to be specific to the campus where the money is.

PROFESSOR ROTHÉ: Do I have the right to ask a question? EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Are you a member of this body? PROFESSOR ROTHÉ: Yes, sir. On item D.3. on Budgetary Resolutions, I'm a little bit concerned. I've had an impression without information I guess and my first question to ask would be for information. In the past, in regard to indirect costs from the research in Indianapolis a rather large proportion has gone to Bloomington than has come back. I've had the impression in Bloomington that they have had state funds in order to buy cyclotrons but in Indianapolis if you do not find research funds elsewhere you don't do research. I guess my first question is what happens to the indirect costs from research grants in Indianapolis? Do they stay here and do we keep most of them or do they go into the system and sort of get lost?

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: No, the majority of them comes back to Indianapolis. Now a certain amount of it is set aside for the University Research Operating Committee, which has for the last two years had $500,000 to provide grants to faculty members who apply to the University Research Operating Committee. PROFESSOR ROTHÉ: Since the amount of research on both campuses is in the order $20 million, as I recall, does Indianapolis get back from the Research Committee, $250,000.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: That's the point of D.3. D.3. is saying all of this money is generated at Bloomington and Indianapolis, let's spend it there. Let's be first of all clear that our money does not go to Bloomington. I don't know how to describe that phenomenon. It goes to the University, it just happens that the University is located in Bloomington and it could be located in a cornfield in Martinsville. It would be better and we would all understand it better. This money does not go to the Bloomington campus. It goes to the University system. Now the question that D.3. raises is how should it be spend by the University system? Should it be returned to the campuses that originated it. Or should some of it be made available, specifically in this case to the other six campuses, which do not have research programs to provide some seed money and encouragement for research activities? So if we do, literally, what you are saying, Carl, there wouldn't be any money to go anywhere else because it would all be coming back here.

PROFESSOR ROTHÉ: I guess my point is we don't have monies for the School of Science research now in Indianapolis, let alone some of the other campuses. So I'm concerned there and I raise the question again, what has been the distribution of funds from the University to the various campuses for indirect costs? EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Well, it's been pretty good. Let me try once more. If it all came back here there would not be any money left to go to any of the other six campuses. So you can't bring it all back here and give Bloomington all that they had, there wouldn't be any left to spread around the system. So it does not all come back. But certainly a large share of it comes back and every year that I can remember Dean Nevill has applied for and received funding on the order of $25-50,000. Isn't that right?

DEAN NEVILL: Obviously I don't have the figures at hand but I can clearly say that the amount of indirect costs that have been charged against grants that would be generated is less than the amount of money we've been able to attract through the University Research Operating Committee back into the School. So from that standpoint, thanks to the university's researchers for helping the School of Science become seeded.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: But you do have about $1 million in grants in your school now? DEAN NEVILL: About that. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: So they have been using the money well. But they have been getting money and my recollection is on the order of $25-50,000 from the University Research Operating Council which is where you make your application. PROFESSOR ROTHÉ: But we're talking about indirect costs on various grants, we're talking in the order of what? EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: You were asking about the School of Science, I thought. For this campus, generally, we get back a fairly large chunk of what we put in but we don't get it all back.

PROFESSOR ROESKE: Is there anyway to find out how exactly the indirect costs are distributed, I've never ever seen a budget anywhere? It's almost impossible to try to find that out. It goes to the Foundation and then it just seems to disappear. I've asked lots of people in the last 15 years and I've always gotten the same answer that we get our fair share. But it's not a secret is it? EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: I don't know if its a secret or not, it may be I wouldn't say it isn't. What it is is a subject over which people like to haggle, pardon me, interminably, and so once you publish that your haggling rate, the index of haggle, goes up greatly. I suppose that's why there is a reluctance to be perfectly clear and straightforward about it. But Dr. Irwin is our representative on the University Research Operating Council which has this $500,000 out of that pot and manages that. I must say that I don't know myself how the rest of it is set up because I'm not that active in the research arena, but if I wanted to find out I think I could, and if you really press me I will try to find out something for you and let you have it.

PROFESSOR ROESKE: I have another question. Are there any restrictions placed on the indirect costs by the granting agency for example. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: No. Those are not federal monies. Those are university monies. I might also say parenthetically they're not state monies. So we can do things with them that we could do with unrestricted funds. They're not tied in any- way. The position of the federal agencies is that those monies are given to us to pay for the indirect costs which we must cover. Since we do cover those indirect costs, we don't need to use this for that purpose. At one campus I was at we used to say that we used it to put the frosting on the cake. The things that you can't
get the state to support, like a University press for example, is often supported out of this money.

PROFESSOR ROTHE: Am I wrong, Ed, that the research in Indiana University system is in the order of $50 million?

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: No it's a little less than that. PROFESSOR ROTHE: All right, also is the indirect costs in the order of 30% maybe higher? We're talking in the order of $15 million. When you say $500,000 from this Research Committee that's a piddly fraction of the total. I full agree with . . .

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: The indirect cost does not approximate $15 million. It's more in the neighborhood of about $4-5 million. A lot of grants in Education and SPEA have no indirect costs. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Well, I'll see what I can find out about that. That's not really what we're raising the question here so I'll defer it if I may but I'll try to get some answers for you for another meeting.

PROFESSOR MCGEEVER: I'd like to ask a question about C.2.b. As I read through that I seem to see three different where-ass and a conclusion. One whereas is that this approval is now done by the primary administrative committee and they seem to think that it should be done by the faculty. I think I agree with that whereas. Another whereas is that you can't trust the regional campuses to do that decision. I think I disagree with that. And the third whereas is that the program should not be continued without being reviewed and I think I agree with that. So like the Executive Committee, I don't support the final conclusion that they came up with but I wouldn't want to give the impression that I disagree with all of the principles here. So I think it is unfortunate if we simply so to speak throw out the baby with the basket and say that we don't support this because I think some of the principles of this one and perhaps some of the other would support very strongly.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Well, we took the position we did because we believed in those principles. We don't think that those principles are violated by the present arrangement. The paragraph misinterprets how the present arrangement operates. At the present time, if a department, say on this campus, wishes to start a new academic program it first decides whether it wants to do it and whether it has the competence. If so it recommends that such a program be started. Then it goes up to the school level and the school and the dean take whatever action they consider appropriate. Now after that point there is very little in the way of looking at the question of whether the program is academically sound. From there on the questions are either questions of budget or of the political sagacity of this program at this time. A third question is whether or not the format in which the material is ordered and presented is the one most likely to gain approval. Now that latter is the question to which the University Degree Program Review Committee addresses itself. They are, and I've been on it for a year and a half now, they do not approve or disapprove a program because of its academic content or lack of it. That decision has already been made. They may ask some questions. A program came up at the last meeting where a regional campus was proposing to offer a new program where they already had one bachelor's program and they only had two faculty. So we asked the Dean of Faculties to take that back and see whether they really intended this kind of thing and they agreed that that wasn't the way to do it. But this is mainly looking at that sort of thing and it is not a committee of administrators anyway.

I asked the people at the last meeting, just for your information, (there were 17 members) how many of you are teaching a course either this semester or next semester and 14 of them were teaching a course. So if they are administrators they are teaching administrators. But it does not make that kind of decision. That's why if it did not exist you would have to create it.

I can tell you right now that at least half and I think more than that of the proposals that come up are badly written. They're badly structured, one for instance last time showed the same number of headcount students as it did FTE students. Now unless somebody is looking at the proposals from those points of view, if they go to the Trustees, the Trustees are in trouble. If they go to Higher Education Commission, they're in trouble. So that's what UDPFRC, as I call it, does and that's why we took the position we did. We thought there has to be something like this and it probably does have to be people of that sort to do this. It was not because we thought this committee would make any academic decisions.

PROFESSOR DALY: I have little difficulty with the proposals which the Executive Committee has put forth. I am concerned about the style about which they are put forth. My concern is more than stylistic it's deeper than that. It seems to me a bit presumptuous and certainly provocative on the part of the Bloomington Faculty Council to pass a resolution which it has which is for internal use and let it float by to other Faculty Council's to let them to react to it in detail. I guess we should react to it, but I would prefer personally that we react to it more generally rather than detail specifically that we agree or disagree. I would think a letter saying we do not appear . . . . . . . would be preferable. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Well, we can write a letter. We did talk about this problem and it's a difficult problem. As I understand it, the Bloomington Faculty Council intends to take this document to the University Faculty Council and it wished before it did that to get support from us. We felt that we ought to answer it because we did not wish to support all of it. PROFESSOR DALY: Yes, I'm agreeing with that, it's just the mode of response that I was referring to. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Would you think, I'm sorry Miriam, I didn't mean to . . .

PROFESSOR LANGSAM: I think that if we hope to cooperate rather than making a very general statement which do not really assist the Bloomington Faculty Council in perhaps modifying their proposal before presenting it, a very general statement does not help them at all and it certainly does not make clear our position. Furthermore, I think it strengthens us in most cases where we not only want to support them but in most cases we would
like for them to support us. If we establish a policy of saying well we think that's okay rather than a very clearcut position which I believe they are asking for, I think in the future we would be hurting ourselves. I do think there will come a time very shortly where we will be in a position to want to get support not only from Bloomington but also from the other campuses and if we're going to act like a system and have proposals generated at the campus level I think this is a most appropriate method of doing it. I think it raises some questions and I think this is a very positive response.

PROFESSOR NATHAN: I would say too that if our voice is to be heard in the future and be asked for in the future that what we do answer needs to be clearcut and not so general that it is very superficial.

PROFESSOR SOLOW: Under E.1., it sort of gives me the feeling that the School of Business person can not transfer from Bloomington up to the School of Business in Indianapolis. That there would be a little problem. It seems to me that it should be an easy transfer for students without loss as long as their grades were okay.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: E.1. is redundant. E.1. is already in the University policy so unless they're saying not only that, its the policy, if you think about it for a minute, its the policy of any university in the world of any college of any department. What this says is that if a student is transferring into your program that you will make the decision about what is acceptable to satisfy the requirement for your program. Now that's really all that says. The problem is if you interpret it to suggest that there would be a different treatment for a student transferring to Bloomington from IUPUI then there would be for a student transferring from Harvard to Bloomington. I don't think this would preclude that, put it that way. What this says is that it shall be the prerogative of the department to decide whether credits transferred into meet its requirements. Now in defense of the School of Business, I should say that all Business courses on the eight campuses are transferable from one campus to another. Many of the others are, some are not, but as far as I can determine no more so than they are from any other university. It's where a department looks at somebody who had a course which they require but when they look at the content of the course or the textbook or they talk to the student they decide that course did not teach what is taught in that course and they can't accept that as satisfying their requirements. So its that kind or prerogative that this resolution is intended to preserve.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Do you know the number of transfers here and across the campuses? EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: The number of transfers are much larger than people think they are. My best recollection is that there are about 3,000 who transfer here from Bloomington and about 3,000 who transfer from here to Bloomington. Another figure that I saw was that of all of the degrees given on eight campuses, four-fifths of the students have been on more than one campus in the course of earning that degree. So there is a great deal of mobility and while there are problems and you tend to hear more about the problems than the successes it's not really all that bad.

PROFESSOR ROTHE: I'd like to move the deletion of item D.3. and if I can have a second I'll explain it.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: What was it? PROFESSOR ROTHE: It's the Budgetary resolution concerning indirect costs. I'd like to stay with what the Bloomington Council had. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: He's moving to delete that and then we want to propose a substitute. PROFESSOR ROTHE: No sir. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: No, you just want to delete D.3., I'm sorry I misunderstood you. PROFESSOR ROTHE: The reason for this is that it states "If we hope to promote" it seems to me that this is so vague, "if" and "hope". That if a University does want to promote research on various campuses they should do it directly and not through this mechanism. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Well, why don't you just strike "If we hope" and say "to promote research throughout the system indirect costs from research grants should be shared throughout the system." PROFESSOR ROTHE: My motion is to delete it and stay then with what the Bloomington Faculty Council proposed. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Does the deletion, I'm sorry I'm asking for clarification, does the deletion of that item imply support for the item as it is expressed in the Bloomington document? PROFESSOR NATHAN: That means that Bloomington and Indianapolis would be the only ones receiving the indirect costs? EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Her question is that item D.3. as it is stated in the Bloomington document would return to Bloomington all the money that they generate and to us all of the money that we generate and there would be no money for the other six campuses. Is that it? PROFESSOR ROTHE: That's as near as possible.

PROFESSOR VARGUS: I'd like to speak against the gentleman's proposal for two reasons. One is quite simply a political reason. I think the Council should be aware of it. At this point in time when we go to the University Faculty Council, when we are making some sort of presentation to them, if we are there with the support of the other six campuses not counting Bloomington, quite frankly we have the votes to beat them. To the extent that we were to endorse the Bloomington position on campus specific division of indirect costs we would be essentially endorsing second class status for those other six campuses. Now I don't think it takes too much thought to realize that there is an aspect of divide and conquer behind the Bloomington motion. I don't think they necessarily sat down and planned "let's get a motion of divide and conquer" but that is what would come out of it. I think there is a broader issue in this regard to the extent that we are all professionals in our field and I know some of us have visited the regional campuses. There are institutions which do not allow the natural professional development of the faculty on those campuses at this point in time. You are essentially consigning someone to inevitable second class professional citizenship. I think that would certainly be detrimental to the development of the University as a whole. I think it would certainly hurt our faculty recruiting. It is something, in my point of view, almost morally repugnant. I would suggest that we are much better in endorsing
essentially the system concept. Most of the money is still going to return to Bloomington and Indianapolis. We are talking about those kinds of monies which become summer faculty fellowships, seed grant from small developments which may lead to larger developments on these six campuses. Some of these have some graduate work now. But they do not at this point have the physical facilities sometimes not even the personnel or the personnel is young, they're junior faculty who are just beginning their careers and do not necessarily generate large scale research operations without the support of the rest of the system. I think we owe that to them and your proposal would simply turn around and endorse second class citizenship to those people. We would continue to develop our research efforts here, Bloomington would continue there and all of the rest of those people would be left alone. They'd be cut out and I just can't see where that would be either politically wise or morally sound.

PROFESSOR DALY: I'd have to agree with that statement. This is one of the reasons that I am concerned about the style of response because the implication is that which we don't criticize we agree with. Now I don't really think we should agree with the things that are here. I think there are comments that should be disagreed with and that ought to be pointed out in a more general statement. Now by general, I don't mean wishy-washy or kind of vague. I think to produce a document which says that we agree with D.1. without commenting on it or some kind of thought is not good. PROFESSOR LANGSAM: I think you have a very good point. My concern is that if we turn over this to style and spend too much time with developing it whether in fact it will not be removing the precedence. In other words, it's such a responsive, useful mode as a positive and a negative and if we have a committee to polish it for six months and the Bloomington people go ahead introducing their proposal, not only have we wasted time but in fact it's losing its effectiveness. I think on depending how quickly they expect to bring it to the all-University Council that changes what you are suggesting to be useful. I sure wouldn't like to have a committee work two or three months on polishing it.

PROFESSOR SARTORIS: I would also like to speak against the motion to delete D.3. from the standpoint of the multi-campus schools. As of now, it's my understanding there is not this inter campus account to switch money back and forth in support of graduate students on one campus to another. A grant to the School of Business, I'm not sure how that would be handled by the proposal, if specifically go to each campus particularly where there might be one principle investigator and a couple of other investigators all in the same department. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: You have to distinguish state money which cannot be moved from one campus to another from this indirect cost money which can. It can be moved. That's the point that I was making earlier. It's not state money. PROFESSOR SARTORIS: If we adopt the Bloomington position then somehow these monies would have to be split up to the campus to which they are coming to. Is this on the basis of the principle investigator or is this on the basis of, exactly how this is going to be split up, I think it would create more problems.

PROFESSOR DALY: I'd have to agree with that statement. This is one of the reasons that I am concerned about the style of response because the implication is that which we don't criticize we agree with. Now I don't really think we should agree with the things that are here. I think there are comments that should be disagreed with and that ought to be pointed out in a more general statement. Now by general, I don't mean wishy-washy or kind of vague. I think to produce a document which says that we agree with D.1. without commenting on it or some kind of thought is not good. PROFESSOR LANGSAM: I think you have a very good point. My concern is that if we turn over this to style and spend too much time with developing it whether in fact it will not be removing the precedence. In other words, it's such a responsive, useful mode as a positive and a negative and if we have a committee to polish it for six months and the Bloomington people go ahead introducing their proposal, not only have we wasted time but in fact it's losing its effectiveness. I think on depending how quickly they expect to bring it to the all-University Council that changes what you are suggesting to be useful. I sure wouldn't like to have a committee work two or three months on polishing it.

PROFESSOR SARTORIS: I agree basically with Brian Vargus' statement but more correctly the motion said that we should delete because of lack of clarity in D.3 as proposed by the Executive Committee. It seems to me that if I understand it correctly that the lack of clarity was in a hypothetical statement in the second sentence namely the antecedent position of the second sentence "If we hope to promote research throughout the system" were deleted the lack of clarity would also be deleted. If we merely stated that "We support that indirect costs of research grants should be shared throughout the system" that would therefore delete the objection that you had initially. It seems to me whether there should or should not be other funds is not what this particular resolution addresses itself to. PROFESSOR BLAKE: Point of order, the question was called for. MOTION TO CLOSE DEBATE WAS CARRIED.

PROFESSOR SHARP: Point of information, is this the final draft? I was under the impression that we were going to bring this up next month. PROFESSOR NATHAN: All we're voting on now is Carl's motion to delete D.3., not on the whole document. So it's on deletion of D.3. THE MOTION TO DELETE D.3. NOT PASSED.

PROFESSOR NATHAN: Now, we're back to the original motion of the Executive Committee to adopt this as the position. I would like to state in regard to Dr. Daly's remarks on the form and so on. This paper because of our process will go into our minutes as I read it into the minutes. It does not mean that we need to adopt it but the fact that it is written this way and is this way will be public knowledge and I think that is important to remember that in regard to whatever our response is to Bloomington.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Well, only as coming from the Executive Committee.

PROFESSOR NATHAN: Only as coming from the Executive Committee but this would be available for their looking at.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: May I suggest two or three things? I'd first of all like to say anyone that knows Walter Daly knows that he isn't wishy-washy, he may be other things but that's not one of them. If it does not sound presumptuous of me to say that he has a good point, and I think that he does, this would be possibly better addressed in a letter format than in this format. What I was going to suggest was that we might delete most of the preamble and we might have the Secretary of the Faculty Council write a letter to the Secretary of the Bloomington Faculty Council saying that we had discussed this matter and that these items were discussed and evidenced considerable support for those positions. But in the next to the last paragraph, instead of saying all other items not specifically identified above were considered to need no comment. We might say "We reserve our position on other items".
DEAN FRANCOIS: I'd like to ask why you want to support Section E, because there is one that I am concerned about.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Which ones, Marty?

DEAN FRANCOIS: Along the same arguments to delete D.3 is E.4. the subject is internship for Bloomington students in Indianapolis. If you start to criticize and you make any statement that everything else is fine you may in fact end up cutting your own students throats, along with the other six campuses. Are Bloomington students to be favored and the only ones mentioned? EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Would the change I suggested at the end take care of that or do you want to go further with that point? DEAN FRANCOIS: I would like to see E.4. modified along the same lines as D.3. was. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Well, I should probably address E.4. then if we are going to discuss it, before we take action on it. E.4. is addressed to a specific problem. Namely that if you are in Bloomington there are not very many internships available. So if the Bloomington students are to have internships they will have to have some of them in the Indianapolis area. This is not intended to deny or to even speak to whether we have Indianapolis internships or Gary internships or anything of the sort, but we read this at least as only referring to the Bloomington campus and their need for more representation in Indianapolis. DEAN FRANCOIS: If that were clearly spelled out as in terms of our comments to this document not to exclude anyone else then I would be in favor.

PROFESSOR SARTORIS: I would like to know who hopes to promote these increased efforts for the Bloomington students? That's very unclear to me. Is it central administration or is it IUPUI faculty? EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: No, it is mainly the Bloomington people. It is McNabb's operation down there in professional practices program as much as anything that they're talking about. DEAN WOLF: Since this has come up, I guess I have to raise a question too. Why not Indianapolis or Gary internships would be very profitable? EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Well, I have a suggestion. If we strike Bloomington and put in place of it Indiana University and if we strike Indianapolis and put an "s" after area so it reads in metropolitan areas, then we're saying, "Increased efforts should be made to help Indiana University students with internships, work experiences and similar programs in metropolitan areas." Would that satisfy you? All right we accept that by consent if there is no objection. PROFESSOR PENNA: I would believe the word metropolitan could be interpreted by others as meaning Indianapolis to go to Bloomington. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Why would somebody want to?

PROFESSOR NATHAN: I'd also like to let you know that we are not really trying to necessarily push for a vote on this document at this time. If you would prefer to table this to the next meeting or have further discussion with your faculties or whatever that's all right. We really wanted to get this onto the floor and get some kind of reaction to it, we will want to vote on it at one of the next couple of meetings, but we are trying to force a vote at this time. PROFESSOR MCCEVER: Carol, do you have any idea when the Bloomington Faculty Council would want this? EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Well, I have a little different opinion about this matter from Carol. This document, this is a copy of the yellow document, which itself was a revision of an earlier document and this matter has been discussed in the Bloomington Faculty Council about a year ago and they have been pressing us so that they could move it to the University Faculty Council. I feel that if we take it up at another meeting we'll spend another hour on it and we're pretty much in agreement. We do have a motion on the floor and I'm going to call for the question and see what happens. I'd like to see it go. PROFESSOR LUKEMAYER: Point of order. Is the motion then on the floor, I don't remember the motion being made and seconded on this document here? PROFESSOR MCGEEVER: Carol, do you have any idea when the Bloomington Faculty Council would want this? EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: As modified. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Change it to a form of a letter and change the last paragraph. PROFESSOR RITTERS: Is that E.4. going to be included? EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Yes. PROFESSOR SHERRELL: And the modification of the final paragraph? EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Right. PROFESSOR NATHAN: Well, I'll disagree with you then, Ed, because I really feel that enough changes have been made that I would like to see the Executive Committee review the changes and propose a document as you have suggested. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Well, I will withdraw my call for the question.

PROFESSOR LUKEMAYER: I would like to know something about D.3. I don't mean to go back but I think it's as wishy-washy as any paragraph that you have. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Which one was that? PROFESSOR LUKEMAYER: D.3. the one that you kept in there. It leaves a lot to be desired. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Well, we didn't have much to work with so we did the best we could. PROFESSOR NATHAN: Well, we can work on revising that too. THE MOTION TO ADOPT THE POSITION PAPER WITH CHANGES WAS TABLED UNTIL THE NEXT MEETING.

PROFESSOR SHARP: The Executive Committee meets again in two weeks is that right? PROFESSOR NATHAN: No, it meets next Wednesday. PROFESSOR SHARP: I'm sure all of the members of the Executive Committee would be glad to have input on this document. PROFESSOR NATHAN: We'll bring it back to you again in January.

The meeting was adjourned.

Carol Nathan, Secretary
IUPUI Faculty Council
SUMMARY
IUPUI Faculty Council Meeting
January 11, 1979

1. Approval of the December 7, 1978 minutes as distributed. 1

2. Presiding Officer's Business
   Spring Enrollment and Budget 1
   Full-time voting faculty - 1,274 1

3. Executive Committee Report
   Executive Committee has increased their meeting to twice a month 1
   Executive Committee will meet with Chairs of standing committees - January 17 at 3:30 P.M. in AO Building, Main Conference Room 2
   Elections time line was distributed. (APPENDIX A) 2

4. Old Business
   Revised version of letter to Bloomington Faculty Council Secretary regarding the document ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL: 1977-78 was passed unanimously. (APPENDIX B) 2

5. New Business
   Report of the Nominating Committee
   The following Faculty Boards of Review were elected to take office February 1, 1979: 3
   
   BOARD I    BOARD II
   Billie Bond    Clyde Crockett
   Linda Brothers  Carlyn Johnson
   Robert Kirch    Carl Rothe
   Dan Landis    Charles Winslow
   Paul Starkey    Leslie Wood

   Report of the Constitution and By-Laws Committee
   An edited format for the By-Laws was accepted by the Council. Future amendments will be presented in this adopted format. 3
Minutes of
IUPUI Faculty Council Meeting
January 11, 1979, 3:30 P.M., School of Law, Room 116

Present: Executive Dean Moore; Deans: Francois, Grossman, Kellum, Nevill, Renda, Stonehill; Director: Pierce;
Professors: Applegate, Beach, Blake, Bond, Bonner, Brashear, Bruyn, Burt, Childress, Cutsall, Daly, Dexter, Fuller, Gnat, Hamburger, Hummicky, Johnson, Karlson, Kimball, Landis, Langsam, Lauer, McGeever, McLean, Meiere, Metz, Nathan, Penna, Riteris, Roeske, Rothe, Sartoris, Shaffer, Sharp, Shellhammer, Wapner, Wright, Yokomoto.


Absent: Vice President Irwin; Deans: Bonser, Harvey, Otteson, Schneiderman, Weber; Director: Bonner;
Professors: Balcavage, Beck, Chalian, Dehnke, Farber, Fedor, Frank, Goldberg, Gray, Green, Hendrie, Kasle, Markstone, Metzger, Miller, Newton, Perez, Sagraves, Seibert, Sherrill, Smith, Solow, Tennant, Tharp, Vargus, Wall, Wallihan, Watanabe.

Agenda Item 1: Approval of the Minutes of December 7, 1978.
The minutes of December 7 were approved as distributed.

Agenda Item 2: Presiding Officer's Business

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Dr. Irwin is not here today and I am replacing him at his request. I have a few comments to make that will pertain to matters of general interest. One is that registration for the spring semester has met our budget estimate. That's an ambiguous statement since our budget estimate was that we would have an 8% drop between the first semester and the second semester. But in fact, that means that we're not in as dramatic a set of financial difficulties as we feared we might be. So the registration picture does not look too bleak at the moment. However, we do still have the drop that we had the first semester which was, as you know, a significant one. We had a drop of nearly 1,000 students. From the fact that this was not recovered by the second semester registration it seems likely that this is a pattern which we are in for, for at least one or two years. All the evidence from other institutions suggests that that is probably the case. This drop is primarily in the non-health sector because the health programs are "capped" which means that they have more applicants than they are able to accommodate and so they set a fixed number and do not accept candidates beyond that number. Normally there will not be, for the next decade probably, any significant decrease in the health side of the campus but the non-health side will continue probably with some anomalies. We have roughly agreed that we may have as much as a 1% a year drop for the next ten years which would be something like 10% below where we are now at the end of this decade. It may go up and down a little over that time but the population figures and our best estimates of our situation would lead us to believe that that's a reasonable prognosis and we are, for such purposes where we are required to make estimates, using those kinds of estimates at this time.

We will also have to do some re-adjustment of our budget starting next year and while it's not likely that it will be drastic there will be some downward adjustment of budgets. This is primarily because we will have a decrease of about 1,000 students from what we have been operating with and this has caused, if nothing else, the tuition shortfall which I discussed with you at the beginning of the last semester. In order to avoid that tuition shortfall next year we will anticipate it. We will budget on the theory that we will not have the 20,000 or 21,000 students that we have predicted for this year but rather that we will have something on the order of 19,000 students. Under those circumstances there will be some budget reduction and it will probably be the same for everybody. I don't know exactly how much it will be. It will not affect salaries or compensation so far as individuals are concerned but it will probably affect the dollar amounts that are available for school and college uses. My best estimate at the moment is something in the order of 3 to 5% reduction will probably be the result of all of this. That's an estimate and basically means that where we have had increases in our financial well-being every year for 9 years that we will for the first time next year be having some decrease. It's not, as I say, a drastic one and it may in a sense be useful to take a hard look at some of the expenditures that we are customarily engaged in. But, however it comes out, it does not appear that it's going to be a serious problem for us and we are trying to plan to adjust to it. Are there any questions at this moment?

I have another item. I am, under the Constitution and the By-Laws, required to report to you at this time the grand total of full-time faculty for purposes of your election of representatives. I report to you that the grand total of full-time voting faculty is 1,274. I have this by schools and colleges and I will supply this to the Secretary for such purposes as are appropriate.

Agenda Item 3: Executive Committee Report

PROFESSOR NATHAN: The Executive Committee has been very busy over the past few months with all the business that has come to it this year. As a result we are going to be doing double time and the dates that we gave you
at the beginning of the fall for Executive Committee meetings have now increased. We will be having an Executive Committee meeting every other week. This is just for your information so that if you need to get some information to the Executive Committee or if you want to attend an Executive Committee meeting contact Pam and she will let you know when the next one is.

This coming Wednesday, the Executive Committee will be meeting with the chairman of the standing committees. The committee chairmen will be discussing where they are in their committee work and also going over some of the recommendations which were made at the first meeting that we had with the chairman. We are hoping that procedures will result from this so that the committee structure can be made more viable than it has been in past.

The timeline you have been given will also be published in the minutes so that all faculty will receive it. We decided that providing you with a listing of who was to be elected when as stated in the Constitution and By-Laws would be helpful. This is the kind of chart that our office follows so that we don’t miss an election. It particularly begins to set heavy in March and April as you can see on this form. I wanted to highlight just a few items for you. One is the at-large representatives item. They will be elected by March 1 according to the Constitution. All faculty will soon be receiving a list of eligible faculty for at-large membership on the Council. You will be receiving this list of faculty by rank and from that nominations will be made for members-at-large to the TUPUI Faculty Council. Later on unit representatives will need to be elected. When revised the Constitution, it was done in this way so that members-at-large would be nominated and elected prior to the elections of unit representatives so that there would not be a problem of duplication in these elections. By April 15 unit representatives will need to be elected. We will be sending each unit a list from our records of faculty presently representing the unit and how many representatives need to be elected to fulfill the number necessary from your unit. If you receive that information and have difficulties with it or feel that it is not the same figure that you have, please get in touch with me and we will see what we can do about coming to some consensus on it.

We have also indicated the election of University Faculty Council representatives on the chart. You remember that we did that at the beginning of the fall semester because we had missed the election when we should have had it in the spring. Hopefully a chart like this one will help us not miss that again. Are there any questions?

PROFESSOR BESCH: No.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Were you here at the last meeting?

PROFESSOR BESCH: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Well, we discussed the value of “n” and we decided that we would use the same “n” that we have been using which leaves us about where we are.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Right, which means that we will be electing about twice as many people this time as we did last time.

PROFESSOR NATHAN: We did discuss it further in the Executive Committee and decided to leave it at this point in time and make recommendations for the future. Are there any other questions about any of these elections? If anyone finds any errors on this chart we would appreciate your calling our office and letting us know about it, so we can keep it up to date and correct.

Agenda Item 4: Old Business

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Under Old Business is the review and action to be taken on the Secretary’s draft memorandum regarding the document ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL: 1977-78. You will recall we discussed this at some length at our last meeting. We reviewed the document and the recommendations of the Executive Committee. There were a number of suggestions made in the discussion here including the suggestion that we revise the format of the statement and put it in the form of a letter. We have done that and we have distributed to you a document, a draft document, dated January 2, 1979 and addressed to Professor James Vaughan, Secretary of the Bloomington Faculty Council and coming from Carol Nathan as Secretary of our Faculty Council. That document is before you for such action as you consider appropriate. If you're satisfied with the document a motion to approve it to be sent to Professor Vaughan would be appropriate. The motion was made, seconded and approved.

DEAN FRANCOIS: I would like to point out one thing, there is a typographical error. It's in the Personnel Resolutions, it should be "must" instead of "much".
**Agenda Item 5: New Business**

**REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE**

**ELECTION OF THE FACULTY BOARDS OF REVIEW**

**PROFESSOR BESCH:** I have copies for the two slates for the Faculty Boards of Review. While those are being passed out, I would like to state some things. On the slates, I have indicated that the same persons who are currently serving on a Board of Review are re-nominated or are suggested for nomination. We did this because the current Boards have not seen any cases. So the faculty has been calm the last year. Some of these people expressed surprise to me because they never met. They only meet when they are required to meet. As part of our nominations, the names on which I will read for the record, we also have a motion to make in regard to this process. The suggested slates for the two Boards of Review are: Board I Billie Bond, Linda Brothers, Robert Kirch, Dan Landis, and Paul Starkey and for Board II Clyde Crockett, Carlyn Johnson, Carl Rothe, Charles Winawer, and Leslie Wood. I'd like to remind you that these Boards are constituted of at least three (3) tenured members, no more than two (2) from any single unit and no more than three (3) members from any single academic rank. Both of these Boards fulfill that. To read further from this report, although some of these persons are serving this year, the current Boards of Review have not seen a case so we move suspension of the By-Laws provision prohibiting non-succession of members of the Boards of Review because they have not heard any cases. The Nominating Committee members are myself, Billie Bond, Carlos Goldberg, Myron Kasle, and Miriam Langsam. **EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE:** Since this is a motion that comes from the committee it does not require a second. I think that it might be helpful to have some explanation of this irregularity from the Parliamentarian.

**PROFESSOR ROTH:** Well, it would seem that since the committee has not served at all, the members have not served at all, if this group would agree by unanimous consent there would be no particular problem, if someone does not object. There is a little question then of whether this suspension would have to have a vote of more than 2/3. But since our By-Laws state that we can amend them with a 2/3 vote and it's about that simple and there is nothing else involved, if we had to I suppose we could just amend it temporarily. It would seem reasonable, however, to suggest that we suspend the rule and to ask for unanimous consent so that this would not be perpetuated in the future. So just ask if there is unanimous consent. **EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE:** First of all I will ask if there are any questions or comments? You understand that the Faculty Boards of Review have not been dilatory, it is not that they had business and didn't handle it. There have been no cases which have reached them. I think that it might not be inappropriate also to say that it is now about 5 years since we adopted this procedure and each year I think it has been working more smoothly so that the reason I think there are fewer cases is that the procedure is getting better understood and we are finding ways to live with it and to work with it better. But there were no cases to go to either of the Boards and so they had no business. The committee is saying, considering that, perhaps we should at this time suspend our rules that the members can not serve on successive Boards and again use some of the persons who were elected to the earlier Board. Are there any questions or comments about that?

**DEAN NEVILL:** I heard Carl, I think, say for this time only and the indication in your last remarks is permanence. **EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE:** I didn't intend it to, I'm glad you made that point. **PROFESSOR NATHAN:** This is also being looked at by the Constitution and By-Laws Committee for some kind of a statement that would be put in to cover this kind of a situation. **EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE:** Are there any other questions? Is there unanimous consent to suspending the rules for this purpose? The chair will so order. We then go to the motion, which is a motion to approve these two Boards as our Faculty Review Boards for the coming year. **SECONDED.** It is open for discussion.

**PROFESSOR MCVEEVER:** Just a point of information. Have these people been contacted and are they willing to serve? **PROFESSOR BESCH:** Yes, all of them but one has indicated positive acceptance. One of them I haven't gotten back to since December and there was some question about that. That person is Leslie Wood, and I have been unable to contact him. **EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE:** I'm sure he will serve if asked. **PROFESSOR NATHAN:** If I could point out to you in any election like this we have had people resign afterwards and we have had to refill those places and if that occurs we will have to do that. **EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE:** Are there other questions? **MOTION CARRIED.**

**REPORT OF THE CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS COMMITTEE**

**ENDORSEMENT OF PROPOSED BY-LAWS FORMAT**

**PROFESSOR FULLER:** You've had an opportunity to read what is included in the brown folder. The Committee as stated in the letter of transmittal, has organized the By-Laws into outline format and added the statements that are enclosed in parentheses to provide appropriate headings and transitions to make the thing hang together. The content, the substance of the By-Laws are copied verbatim from the existing By-Laws in the sections of this document which are not enclosed in parentheses. So, we regard these changes as editorial changes and not changes of substance. There is some reordering of the sections of the By-Laws and they don't come in the same order as our By-Laws are printed in the pink sheets. The sections of the present By-Laws which correspond to this editorial change are numbered in the left hand margin. The Committee would like your endorsement of this format.
The Committee would hope for endorsement of the format and expects amendments to the By-Laws to be identified by article and section number and proposed in the format which is presented in this edited version. It is the recommendation of the Committee that this format be adopted. **EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE:** This is a good committee and it has been working hard. I've heard Carl report on its activities at greater length and think that it is doing us a very useful service. If I understand the intent of the recommendation, it is basically that a re-ordering of the material and the information contained in the By-Laws would make it a more workable document and more useful in trying to find the information that we wish. So what the Committee is proposing here is that the items that are in parentheses are new and they would be inserted as part of the By-Laws and be used as a basic format for the ordering of the By-Laws. Are there any questions that you would like to address Professor Fuller about that matter? Do you approve with overwhelming enthusiasm? ENDORSED.

**PROFESSOR NATHAN:** Now the understanding is that when the Constitution and By-Laws Committee proposes its amendments to the By-Laws it will be in the format that you have just approved. **EXECUTIVE-DEAN MOORE:** Are there any other questions or matters to be brought before us?

I will then say one more thing. I did not want to take an undue amount of time on earlier, but there is one other matter that I'd like for you to at least know about. We have been, in our efforts to expand our enrollment to bring it back to where it was, undertaken some educational experiments. There are three in particular that I would just like to mention briefly so you would at least know about them. One is the so-called "Learn and Shop" program which consists basically of an effort to take some of our existing courses and faculty and offer the courses at shopping centers around the community. This results from the fact that a number of the larger stores have as a part of their complex what they call a training room, which is essentially a classroom where they offer courses for the benefit of their staff concerning their own businesses. They have consented to make these rooms available to us at no cost. We also get free parking by virtue of these being shopping centers and so we are offering courses at four locations. We will probably offer them at a fifth beginning this summer. I've been getting, of course, some strange memoranda from faculty members asking whether they will be paid in green stamps and interesting questions of this sort. But this has received, as some of you have noticed, very favorable comment from the local community. We had a good editorial, a favorable one at least, in the Indianapolis Star and then we had a very favorable editorial from one of the television stations saying some very nice things about us. This looks to be a program that has captured the imagination of a lot of people. We had one Ayres store manager who didn't seem enthusiastic about it and when Jim East, who is working the program along with Marge Stonehill, talked with the Vice President of Ayres up town, he said why aren't you in this particular center and we said we only have one center and he said well the manager doesn't seem to want to let us and he said why don't you plan to have a course there next fall, he will have changed his mind by then. In fact this particular Vice President said to us you ought to put this out on bid and make the stores pay to have you come in because this is a very useful thing. Jim East found out that was true. He has gone twice to see them and the first time he bought a suit and the second time a shirt. At any rate we will be offering five courses in each of those locations with about 1,500 students and it looks as though they are going to fill. We are going to finish the registration in the next week or so.

A second effort that we are structuring at the moment, and there seems to be some enthusiasm for, is to offer three or four courses in the summer session for high school students between the junior and senior year of high school. These courses will be limited to students in the upper 20% of their high school classes, who think they might be interested in college and have them come and take just one course during that three to four week period and get three college credits and a transcript for their work. We are offering W131, which is the freshman composition course and we are offering a number of others, a political science course and an engineering course. These are intended to try to attract some of the better high school students to experiment with college work to see what it's like, what instructor s are like, what the work load is like and hopefully to encourage some of them to come in.

Then, finally, Dean Bynum is developing a program to operate during the summer in some of the high schools and churches where we will offer some of the courses that we have been offering here under Guided Studies, the review English and math courses particularly. This is to try to give students who need that review work an opportunity get it before they actually start their freshman year rather than to have to take it as part of their freshman program, which is what most of them are doing right now. Some 700-800 of them do it each year.

So these are some of the things that we are doing and we want to encourage the different schools and colleges to think about new and different ways to offer their programs. It is, after all, not enough simply to be satisfied by the students who come to us, we have an obligation to any student that is educable to try to encourage him and provide an opportunity for him to come here and to profit from what higher education can do for him or her. I thought I ought to report to you that those activities are under way and they all seem to be moving very well. Are there any questions? If not, I'll remind you that a year ago today we did not meet because of the snow. So things are better than they might be.

The meeting was adjourned.

Carol Nathan, Secretary
IUPUI Faculty Council
SUMMARY
IUPUI Faculty Council Meeting
February 15, 1979

1. Approval of the January 11, 1979 minutes as distributed.

2. Presiding Officer's Business
   Enrollment Statistics (Spring, 1979)
   Legislature Matters
   Evaluation of the President

3. Executive Committee Report
   Announcement of the upcoming evaluation of the Executive
   Vice President and the Vice President, Indianapolis.
   Presentation by Dr. Lee Noel to be held February 28 on
   Student Retention - Lecture Hall 102, 9:00-10:30 A.M.
   Next Faculty Council meeting - March 15 at 2:00 P.M. in
   Emerson Hall Auditorium.
   Spring Faculty/Staff meeting - March 15 at 3:30 P.M. in
   Emerson Hall Auditorium. The agenda will include:
      Report of the Vice President
      Report of the Faculty Council Secretary
      Status of the IUPUI Staff Council
      Presentation by Mr. Donald Danielson, President of the
      I.U. Board of Trustees

   The Executive Committee is in the process of reviewing the
   charges of the standing committees of the Council.

   The I.U. Board of Trustees will meet in Indianapolis, March 3.
   Faculty are welcome to attend.

   Actions of the University Faculty Council, February 13, 1979:
      There was a vote to recommend retention of the
      "18/20 Rule".
      There was a vote to add supplement on Veterans and
      Handicapped to the Affirmative Action Plan.
      EK policy will be discussed at March 13 meeting of
      the University Faculty Council. Recommendation will
      be to continue the policy.
      1979-81 University Faculty Council representatives to
      be elected from IUPUI in March.

   Calendar, 1979-80
   Proposed Calendar accepted as follows:

   FIRST SEMESTER
   Registration
   Classes Begin (W) Aug. 22
   Labor Day (M) Sept. 1-3
   Thanksgiving Recess (after last class) (T) Nov. 20
   Classes Resume (M) Nov. 26
   Classes End (M) Dec. 10
   Exams Begin (T) Dec. 11
   Exams End (M) Dec. 17
SECOND SEMESTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>(M-F) Jan. 7-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes Begin</td>
<td>(M) Jan. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Recess</td>
<td>(M) Mar. 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes Resume</td>
<td>(M) Mar. 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes End</td>
<td>(S) May 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams Begin</td>
<td>(M) May 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams End</td>
<td>(S) May 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Old Business

There was no old business.

5. New Business

Report of the Constitution and By-Laws Committee

The proposed amendments to the Constitution were accepted as amended to be forwarded with the Council's recommendation to the general faculty for approval.

The proposed By-Laws amendments will be reviewed by the Executive Committee in consultation with the Constitution and By-Laws Committee for recommended action of the Council.
Present: Vice President Irwin; Executive Dean Moore; Deans: Grossman, Kallum, Nevill, Weber; Professors: Allmann, Balavage, Beck, Blake, Bonner, Brashear, Childress, Cutsall, Daly, Dexter, Farber, Fedor, Frank, Fuller, Gnat, Grey, Hask, Hamburg, Hendrie, Hummicky, Karlson, Kasle, Lauer, McGeever, McLean, Meiere, Metz, Nathan, Penna, Roeske, Rothe, Sagraves, Sartoris, Selbert, Shaffer, Sharp, Shellhammer, Smith, Solow, Tennant, Vargus, Wappner, Wright.


Absent: Deans: Bonser, Harvey, Schneiderman, Stonehill; Director: Bonner; Professors: Applegate, Bond, Bruyn, Burt, Chalian, Dehnke, Goldberg, Green, Johnson, Landis, Langsam, Markstone, Metzger, Miller, Newton, Riteris, Sherrill, Wall, Wallihan, Watanabe, Yokomoto.

Agenda Item 1: Approval of the Minutes of January 11, 1979.

The minutes of January 11 were approved as distributed.

Agenda Item 2: Presiding Officer's Business

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: I have some information that you may or may not be aware of which pertains to the enrollment for the spring semester. If we compare this spring semester to spring of a year ago in both health and non-health, we have five (5) less students than we did a year ago. That's a reduction of .03% and I think that's a remarkably good record. From a credit hour standpoint, it's a little different, comparing this spring, where we are now, with a year ago, it's down 3.1%. That is still less than we had projected in the budget. I think you read in the paper last night or today how the various campuses of Indiana University ranked, and I unfortunately didn't bring that. Except for IU East, which was up, we ranked very well among all of the other campuses. Northwest was down by about 3%, Bloomington was down by 2.3%. I do want to take this opportunity to thank and congratulate all deans and faculty members, who I am sure played a key role in the recruitment and retention for this second semester. I also want to thank the Recruitment and Retention Committee, chaired by Carol and I want to thank Neil Lantz, who chaired an ad hoc administrative committee. I think we have to keep at this but I do believe that it did pay off for this semester. If we had not had this kind of results, we might have had quite a serious financial picture. We do not have today and I will not have until Monday, what the actual income will be. But I am hopeful that it will be such that we can restore some of the summer sessions that have been eliminated. So either Monday or Tuesday, we hope to be back to you especially those deans who do have problems with summer sessions, particularly Summer I. Are there any questions about the enrollment?

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: I do remember that the figures that were in the paper this morning, that we both forgot to bring, were headcount figures. It's not quite as dramatic as it sounds. VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: I have it now, this is headcount comparing this spring with spring a year ago on all campuses: Bloomington is -2.6%, East is +13.7%, Fort Wayne is -2.1%, IUPUI is -0.03% or 5 students, Kokomo is -5.0%, Northwest is -7.8%, South Bend is -5.5%, and Southeast is -4.4%. Now all of these campuses had programs to try to improve their second semester as we did on this campus and I would conclude that we were a little bit more successful than some of our friends except for East.

PROFESSOR CUTSHALL: I was wondering which summer sessions had been eliminated, or what schools are involved in that, or courses or what not.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Well, we didn't eliminate any summer sessions. We have money which we are holding in escrow, as we call it, pending the figures on how our income is for the second semester and some of that money was that was allocated by the various schools for the first summer session. Once we have those figures we will be talking with those deans about what we will do in terms of Summer Session I. Mainly it is the School of Liberal Arts and to some extent I think the School of Science and the School of Education. Those are the three that come to mind off hand.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: I have only a brief report in so far as the Legislative matters are concerned. There are several bills that I think will be very important to this institution. I think you have been reading about development of the White River Project. Lilly Endowment provided a challenge grant of $5 million, by the way that is the largest single grant they have ever given, to be matched 2:1 by the State of Indiana. So there would be a fund of $13 million to develop White River probably between Road 70 on the south and 10th Street or maybe 16th Street on the north. Of course, you already know we have a lot of land that borders the White River which has been designated for our recreational and athletic outdoor as well as indoor facilities. I have met with the two House and Senate sponsors and that looks like it will have a good chance of passing. It certainly would revolutionize the southern boundary of this campus and it would revolutionize the west side of the river across from us. It would not interfere with our plans for the development of our own recreational and physical
education facilities. Another bill that is moving smoothly, we testified on this last week, is a bill to allow public universities to use private development for the construction of much needed facilities. This is a new concept in Indiana. Some states have this, but it would be new for us. The concept is mainly that we would lease land to private developers and these would have to be some with very substantial resources because we are probably talking about $15 to $20 million category on this. If that bill passes quite a few university facilities could be constructed without the use of university money or without the use of state money or endowment money. We still, as usual, have two bills creating a state university in Indianapolis and Indianapolis University. They are still in committee. The Legislature actually started very slowly because, of course, the Governor wanted to get the property and tax packages through first and it is typical that the budget comes up toward the end. I am encouraged at this point in time that there will be bonding authority for our major second classroom building for this campus, a $19+ million project. I see really very little difficulty with the projects that have already been endorsed by the HEA and the Budget Committee which includes the finishing of Engineering and Technology and adding two floors to the south wing of the Medical Sciences Building. Plus, I see little difficulty with land acquisition for a change. We have had no land acquisition money for four years and it looks like we will have it this year.

PROFESSOR KARLSON: A bill has been introduced in the State Legislature which would create a committee to control legal education in the state of Indiana giving substantial control over both faculty and curricula in all law schools in the state, both public and private. Has the University been called upon to comment upon this bill?

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Yes, we have and we have responded and at this point in time it would appear that it will not get out of committee, but I have to underline, at this point in time.

My third item, and perhaps many of you have read about this in the newspaper. At the Board of Trustees meeting, February 3 held in New Albany, the reports of the four committees that reported on the review of the presidency of Indiana University were made public. I think most of you get this newspaper. I'll just read a few highlights in case some of you have not read it. At the very beginning of the Board meeting, the open meeting, Danny Danielson, the President of the Trustees made a statement, and I'll read a few comments. "He explained the genesis of this current review and evaluation of the I.U. presidency, one that Ryan himself requested following the 1973 report filed after his first three years in office." Danielson commented on both the negative and the positive sides of the coin from the report which totals over 200 pages. "Throughout the report," Danielson stated, 'Ryan is cited for integrity, dedication, energy, farsightedness, and decisive management. As for the criticisms, Danielson said they will be taken seriously both by Ryan and the Board of Trustees. In all four reports, improved communications and higher visibility were stressed as being essential improvements in the President's performance." Following this, the President then made a few comments and I'll just read a few of them: "The reports speak for themselves; they happen to be well-written," Ryan said, 'I know that I now have to look at them, digest them, and draw conclusions as how I can move most intelligently and know what to do at them. Communication is perceived as an important problem, I accept that," said the President, 'but at this time I am not prepared to say what I will do. I hope that, in the months ahead, you will see modifications to my performance and personal activity and the ways I will allocate my time, that will reflect these evaluations. 'The committees have done a good job,' according to Ryan, 'of probing the feelings, thoughts, and opinions of the various four constituencies that were involved. Ryan did stress and said that he was not surprised that a major question was decline of faculty salary,. He agreed with this and was glad to see that that came through in these reports. I am sure by now that most of you have received this orange brochure announcing a presentation by Dr. Lee Noel on the subject of 'Student Retention - A Campus-Wide Responsibility'. As Dr. Irwin already mentioned, as a result of our decreased enrollment in the fall, 1978, Dr. Moore established a faculty committee with the charge to try to affect an increase in student enrollment in the spring of 1979. The committee includes representatives from the academic units and has met on an average of once a month with a cluster of meetings in the November, December time block related to the immediate charge of trying to affect enrollment in the spring. A report of this committee's activities has been completed by each committee member and by myself as chairman and submitted to Dr. Moore. Each committee member gave a summary report verbally to Dr. Moore and Dr. Irwin at its meeting on January 16. Any of you who are interested in seeing this report may contact me or your unit representative to the committee.

Agenda Item 3: Executive Committee Report

PROFESSOR NATHAN: To follow-up the subject that Dr. Irwin was just on. President Ryan announced at the University Faculty Council meeting that the next step in the Presidential Review process will be reviews of the Office of the Executive Vice President and the Office of the Vice President, Indianapolis. Drs. Pinnell and Irwin, as the senior vice presidents, requested that they be reviewed first and that this be done as early as possible. The University Faculty Council Nominating Committee and the Agenda Committee of the University Faculty Council will be consulting with Dr. Ryan on the implementation of this review, and will recommend faculty members to the review committees. I will keep you informed as this process develops.
In light of the efforts the faculty and staff have put into increasing enrollment and looking at the need for further work on student retention we find the presentation to be given by Dr. Noel as most appropriate and timely. There is no doubt in any of our minds that the retention of students is to whatever degree a responsibility of the faculty with which they interact. I urge you to attend Dr. Noel's presentation. Extra brochures have been distributed to each dean and director and there are some on the table. We are asking that the tear-off form be filled out and returned to the Faculty Council Office so that we may be sure that the room size is adequate. If you have any questions concerning this presentation, I will be happy to address them. I know that the Recruitment and Retention Committee particularly supports your attendance at this presentation.

PROFESSOR BECK: I was wondering why we will not have more than one presentation? Obviously there are people who have classes at that time, or do you expect people to cancel classes due to this presentation?

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Well, there are two answers to that. One is, that is left up to you whether you cancel your class. The other is that Dr. Noel is a very peculiar individual. His notion is that he is asked to do a great many more of these than he is able to accomodate and so if he comes, he comes under his arrangements not under ours. And his arrangements call for a meeting at 8:00 in the morning with Dr. Irwin and myself, then he meets with the faculty, following that he has lunch with some people, and then when he has done all of that he meets with us again and tells us how things look to him. So he is taking that general posture because he thinks that he has something to give us and he wants to give it to us in a way that seems to him most useful. We'd be glad to have him come back a second time, though I don't think that is a problem.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: One question that we might ask when he arrives is whether he would be willing to videotape the key components of this so we would have it in our library for use if that would be of interest to any of you? Carol said there is an audio on several of his presentations but I don't think there is videotape.

PROFESSOR NATHAN: I am not aware of it on videotape.

NEIL LANTZ: He is also, if anyone is interested, involved in an all day presentation with the American Association of Higher Education in April.

PROFESSOR NATHAN: Are there any other questions on this?

I'd like to remind you of the Spring Faculty/Staff meeting. On your calendars it was indicated that this would be in the Nursing School Auditorium where we have held it for the last few years, however this will not be available, we will be at Emerson Hall Auditorium March 15. In addition, the Faculty Council meeting will precede the Faculty/Staff meeting as we did for the Fall Faculty/Staff meeting. The Faculty Council meeting will be at 2:00 at Emerson Hall followed at 3:30 by the Faculty/Staff meeting. During the Faculty/Staff meeting which begins at 3:30, we will have a presentation by Dr. Irwin, myself as Secretary of the Faculty Council, a report on the status of the Staff Council, and a presentation by Donald Danielson, the President of the Indiana University Board of Trustees. Mr. Danielson's presentation will include an overview of the role of the Trustees particularly related to IUPUI. There is a possibility that we will shorten the Faculty Council meeting if we feel there is not enough business to bring you there at 2:00 and have you wait until 3:30 to go to the Faculty/Staff meeting. If that occurs, we will send a memo out to all of you so that you will have plenty of notice on the change. The earliest it would be at 2:00.

The Executive Committee has met twice this academic year with the chairmen of the IUPUI Faculty Council standing committees. We are moving toward better definition of the roles and functions of the standing committees and will be making recommendations concerning this after further evaluation by the Executive Committee. We can project at this time that we will be recommending to the Constitution and By-Laws Committee and to you, the possibility of elimination of some committees and better definition of others. We hope that this will expedite the business of the Council in the future. Such recommendations are projected at this time to be made at the May, 1979 Council meeting.

The Indiana University Board of Trustees will be meeting in the Roof Lounge of the Student Union Building on Saturday, March 3, 1979. Preceding the meeting in the Roof Lounge there will be a meeting of the Faculty Relations Committee at 8:00 or 8:30 that morning on the Mezzanine. The Executive Committee will be addressing the Trustees at that time regarding activities of the IUPUI Faculty Council and posing questions to the Trustees for their discussion. I would like to ask any of you to feel free to join the Executive Committee at the Faculty Relations Committee meeting and/or at the public session held later that morning. If you plan to attend the Faculty Relations Committee meeting, I would appreciate you notifying me at the Faculty Council Office so we are sure that we have enough room.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: I might add that at the last meeting in Indianapolis with the faculty, the Trustees, in open session commented that it was the finest faculty-Trustee meeting that they had ever had in all the years that we have had it.

PROFESSOR NATHAN: The faculty-at-large membership election to IUPUI Faculty Council is the next point I would like to bring up for just a moment in regard to the logistics. Every effort was made to have the listing of the faculty, which was sent out with the ballots for member-at-large nominations, to be accurate. As is always the case in such massive listings, there were some names inadvertently left off of the listing and we have had some telephone calls regarding this. I encourage you to continue to let us know about such deficiencies but I would also like you to realize that such errors are not intentional. All persons involved, Pam and the staff in the Academic Affairs Office make every effort to make sure that the listing is correct. We do find also that faculty are at times very quick to assume that an error has been made. An example of this is that a faculty member called and said that his friend had not received his copy of the nomination ballot and although Pam was sure that she had sent it, she sent a second one and upon receipt of that the
faculty member involved called and asked why he had received two. So you see that we have our problems also. If there are any questions or problems further with the list or the mailings, please notify me at the Faculty Council Office either in writing or by phone. I think that in checking the lists were probably the most accurate that they have been.

I would like to report to you some of the actions of the University Faculty Council which met this past Tuesday. The University Faculty Council discussed the 18-20 Rule which we had some short discussion a few months ago and acted on a recommendation by the Bloomington Faculty Council and that recommendation was to retain the current early retirement provision of the TIAA/CREF (18-20 Rule) and that was supported by the University Faculty Council. This is a recommendation to administration that the 18-20 Rule be retained at this point. Secondly, the University Faculty Council voted the inclusion of the Supplement of the Rights of Disabled Veterans, Vietnam Veterans and Handicapped Individuals to be added to the University Affirmative Action Plan. This document was brought up about eleven (11) months ago and there was some criticism about it and it was revised as well as possible within Federal guidelines and was passed at this meeting. In addition, at the University Faculty Council meeting on March 13 which is the next meeting of that Council there will be a report and discussion about the FX policy. This policy has been reviewed by the Educational Policies Committee of the University Faculty Council and there are members of each campus on that committee. According to the committee chair, the consensus throughout the campus system is that the FX policy should be continued. I would suggest to you if you have any other reactions to that you might contact me or one of the other University Faculty Council representatives prior to the March 13 meeting. In addition, it was announced that representation to the University Faculty Council for next year needs to be submitted by March 30, we therefore will need to be electing from this Council, University Faculty Council representatives at our next meeting in March. We will also be sending out ballots for nominations for the University Faculty Council representatives from the faculty at-large. Both of those activities will be going on during the month of March. One other item that you received in your mailing was the proposed calendar for the fall and spring and I would like to turn the discussion over to Professor Paul McLear, chairman of the Academic Affairs Committee for their report on the calendar. You will find it in your yellow document.

REPORT OF THE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

PROFESSOR MCLear: We did have a meeting of the Academic Affairs Committee and reviewed and discussed the proposed calendar as shown in your yellow sheets. There is one correction to be made in that, however, second semester classes end on Sunday, May 4 not Monday, May 4. It's a typo error. The committee did unanimously accept this calendar with one suggestion. We requested the Registrar, the second semester, to reduce the registration period from five (5) days to four(4). That is to leave one open day between registration and the start of classes. This would enable deans, department chairmen and so forth to make appropriate cancellations of the classes and class adjustments depending upon enrollment. The committee has had a number of requests from department chairmen to have the registration period one day and classes start the next. It becomes very difficult to arrange class schedules particularly with a large number of part-time faculty as we do have. The Registrar is currently looking into that to see if that could not be done for the second semester. Otherwise, the committee recommends that the Faculty Council accept this calendar.

PROFESSOR SEIBERT: How does the spring vacation compare with Bloomington now? Are we on the same cycle? PROFESSOR MCLear: The same cycle with Bloomington? Right! PROFESSOR METEER: Are there equal class meetings for Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday? Is that principle still a viable and acceptable thing the committee would like to see for a calendar? PROFESSOR MCLear: Yes. PROFESSOR MCGEEVER: Have you given any thought to trying to coordinate the spring semester with the spring semester of the public schools in Indianapolis? PROFESSOR MCLear: No, not as a committee.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: There are numerous spring recesses. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: No, he's talking about the second semester, you weren't talking about the spring break, you were talking about the second semester, I thought Pat. PROFESSOR MCGEEVER: No, I was referring to the spring break. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Well, that has been explored quite a few times. The problem is which spring break? The Indianapolis Public Schools have only one spring break. But the faculty for the most part do not live within the Indianapolis Public School system or at least a sizeable amount of them don't, they live in Lawrence or Carmel or other places and there is no one spring break that seemed to suit the problem very well. Then, we had the complication that we now have something on the order of 2,500 students and a fair number of faculty who are teaching both in Bloomington and Indianapolis and if we ended up with a different schedule from the Bloomington schedule as we did the first year, students either would get two spring breaks or none and it made a large number of problems.

DEAN GROSSMAN: On the request on cutting down registration, I wonder if it would affect the Recruitment Committee. Would this one day have any affect on the recruitment of students? PROFESSOR NATHAN: To have one day in between? I don't think so. THE MOTION TO ACCEPT THE CALENDAR WAS PASSED AS FOLLOWS:
I will start by expressing my thanks to the other members of the committee: Carl Rothe, for the Faculty Constitution. The report has to do with changes in the faculty as a whole. To the facalty. One of the functions of the Executive Committee was intended to be a screening detailed material in organizing it and arranging a recommendation concerning it as a way of saving time for the Council. There are two different sets of materials here: the constitutional materials which have no other comment to make at this time. The council give favorable attention to the adoption of the recommended amendments to the By-Laws, and thirdly, that the Council instruct the Executive Committee to review and revise the standing committee structure of the Faculty Council. All of that is written in the report that you have. The committee's work is not finished as the report says. We differed for the time being at least, an attempt to revise the text of the article in the By-Laws referring to the Faculty Boards of Review and the reasons are stated in the report. There may be some other actions that the committee will take as a result of your reaction to the committee report, so the committee still has some work to do to "perfect the By-Laws" - a phrase from Robert's Rules of Order. Certain provisions of the Constitution interdigitate with certain provisions of the By-Laws and the proposed amendments take this interaction into account. For example, the adoption of the constitutional amendments cited in Recommendation No. 2 in that report would make ARTICLE I in our present By-Laws superfluous. Conversely, failure to adopt amendment in Recommendation No. 2 would require that the substance of ARTICLE I of the By-Laws be restored in the By-Laws if it is not otherwise inserted in the Constitution. Members of the Council who may wish to propose other amendments to the Constitution or may wish to propose amendments to the amendments that the committee has recommended should take these interactions into account. The By-Laws provisions recommended by the Committee include a large number of textorial changes and the format of the By-Laws has been altered so that the entire text of the By-Laws in now written in outline form and, for reasons stated in the report, the ARTICLES in the By-Laws have been renumbered. Obviously, the committee would like formal approval of the Council for the changes that it has recommended. I have no other comment to make at this time.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: We might say a word, Carl, about the procedure. At this point, the report of the committee on changes in the Constitution as distinct from changes in the By-Laws is brought to you for your approval. If you approve that does not put them into effect. They must then be submitted to the faculty as a whole by a procedure prescribed in the present Constitution for amending the Constitution. First, I wanted to make the point that your action today, if you approve these changes would simply authorize their being sent to the faculty for their vote. Carl can probably tell us what that procedure is if we ask him.

PROFESSOR ROTHE: You must mail this out to the faculty. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: This must be a mail vote and thirty days are required. The reason why we would like to get that approved today is so that we can get it out and get the vote and have those changes in the Constitution available as we continue our election processes during the rest of the year. The second part of the committee report has to do with changes in the By-Laws and those are more detailed matters and we thought that it would be appropriate for them to come to you and for you to make any comments about them, but that they ought to be reviewed by the Executive Committee in some detail with the Constitution and By-Laws Committee and then brought back to you as a joint recommendation from those two groups. One of the functions of the Executive Committee was intended to be a place for screening detailed material in organizing it and arranging a recommendation concerning it as a way of saving time for the Council. There are two different sets of materials here: the constitutional materials which ought to be acted on, the By-Laws material which you are free to act on if you wish. I remind you that in the case of the By-Laws a change in the By-Laws may be made by the Council at any meeting. A two-thirds vote is needed. So if you do get impetuous and decide to act on the By-Laws in the sense of approving them, you need to understand that you may be in fact be putting into effect these changes. Those are the only comments that I have.
PROFESSOR FULLER: In the thirty day waiting period when the amendments to the Constitution are sent to faculty do you count Saturday as a class day? PROFESSOR NATHAN: We count them all now as class days.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: One way to go through this to get it moving would be to take this up one recommendation at a time. Would there be any objection to doing that? I think there are six recommendations on the Constitution. In order to get them under way, we understand that there is a motion made and seconded from the committee asking that these recommendations be approved for transmittal by vote the faculty to vote.

We will discuss, Mr. Chairman, Recommendation No. 1. As far as Recommendation No. 1 is concerned it is entirely a stylistic recommendation. The point of it is that the ARTICLES be designated as ARTICLES. That is, the simple numbers, and that all capital letter headings in the Constitution be preceded by the word "SECTION". This allows for better reference. You could refer to ARTICLE 5, SECTION B which would be an official designation. Is that correct Dr. Fuller? Recommendation No. 1 is simply a stylistic matter. Any comments on that?

Recommendation No. 2 is not new in substance. PROFESSOR FULLER: It will move it from the By-Laws to the Constitution. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Does anybody have any comments on that? It gets more controversial as we go along. PROFESSOR HAMBURGER: With all of the name changes that have occurred within the University recently has this office changed names recently? EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: No, the office is still the Office of Academic Affairs.

Recommendation No. 3, there I do have a point that I would like to ask your opinion about. C.L., which has to do with regular meetings is a change because we said in our previous statement that we would meet on the first Thursday of the month. That meant that when we couldn't manage the first Thursday because it was snowing or because there was a holiday or something we had to get some sort of a special dispensation to meet on the second Wednesday or whatever it was. So this is simply a proposal that we designate the fact that we will hold regular meetings and hold them monthly and then we can make changes without having to go through a formal process. Item 2, which is special meetings, is a little more interesting. I want to suggest something to you there. Special meetings usually occur in the heat of an issue, if you know what I'm trying to say. Some group is excited about something and they want a meeting and they don't want to wait until the regular meeting. They want it now. That's entirely proper. What I'm concerned about and I have talked with Dr. Fuller about it is the last phrase there which says, "the business of the meeting shall be restricted to the matters for which it is called." Now I have been in on some of these occasions where a petition comes in signed by twenty (20) people as this requires here. The petition says the business of the meeting shall be the firing of the dean. So you go into the meeting and you're not allowed to talk about anything relevant to the question about what the dean did or didn't do, whether the dean should or should not be fired, you are held very strictly to a rather narrow interpretation. So I would like to propose that we add here the following words, "shall be restricted to items relevant to the matters for which it is called" I don't see that as doing violence to the attempt but it seems to me a little dangerous to have the document read so narrowly that by saying that nothing but what is in the petition can be discussed. So I would like to suggest that those three words might be added at that point and Dr. Fuller seemed to find it satisfactory for the committee. Any comments about that?

PROFESSOR FULLER: As a matter of parliamentary procedure are you formally proposing an amendment to this amendment in the form of a motion? EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: I'm willing to do it. PROFESSOR ROTH: I was wondering if you would accept it and the rest of the committee accept it also. PROFESSOR FULLER: I would accept it, the committee votes unanimously.

PROFESSOR MCGEEVER: Is there any notice requirement to have special meetings of two or three days or so? PROFESSOR FULLER: Not in this statement. PROFESSOR MCGEEVER: That might present some difficulty if it was called very hastily and most people didn't have a chance to find out about it.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Let's consider that in the By-Laws. We could do that there. Unless you want it here. It is a difficult question as Pat would understand being a political scientist. Sometimes, let's say, if you have a three day waiting period or a one week waiting period, the issue is so urgent that it's a moot question by the end of three to six days. But there is also the problem that a minimum notice seems desirable. Does 48-hours sound reasonable? How would it be if we specified a 48-hour period after the petition is received? PROFESSOR HAMBURGER: It would make it very difficult to receive a petition on Friday. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Why, you don't want to meet on Sunday? Is that what you are saying? Well, we could say after a regular school day. Why don't we take Dr. Hamburger's concern into account and we'll struggle for a wording that will accommodate that problem as well as the 48-hours and leave it up to the committee. Are there any objections to that? PROFESSOR FULLER: Which committee are you talking about, the Executive Committee? EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Your committee, unless somebody wants to cope with those two issues now. Is there a census to two (2), three (3), or four (4) days? How many people would think that two (2) days would be satisfactory? Just get a straw vote. How many would prefer three (3) days? How many would prefer four (4) days? Three (3) days is clearly the majority.

PROFESSOR HUMNICK: If this has to be a mailed notice I don't know whether you could get copy work done and a mailing done in that amount of time, how long does it take Carol? PROFESSOR NATHAN: The notice of a meeting that fast would be done by phone, everyone would be called and at the same time the mailing would go out with the agenda. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Well, the majority voted for three days, let's try
that. If it turns out that it's a matter that has to be decided by tomorrow, you'll have to allow the Secretary some opportunity to use her intelligence and then you can censor her afterwards.

PROFESSOR MEIERE: I'm a bit confused, you're not planning to put that into the Constitution, are you?

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Three days, that means that there must be three days from the time that the petition is filed until the time that the meeting is held.

PROFESSOR MEIERE: I would prefer not to have any limited statement in the Constitution.

PROFESSOR NATHAN: You mean to put it in the By-Laws.

PROFESSOR SHARP: I agree with that, I don't think it should be in either one. Leave it up to the Secretary of the Faculty Council.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Don't put it in the By-Laws either?

PROFESSOR FULLER: Well, actually the By-Laws is not going to cover the general meeting of the faculty, only a meeting of the Faculty Council.

PROFESSOR NATHAN: Oh, is this the general faculty?

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: No, this is the Council. If you put it in the By-Laws it is just as binding, easier to change but you can't change it until it is put into the By-Laws.

PROFESSOR MEIERE: Could I suggest that Robert's does suggest that it be in the By-Laws and Robert's also suggests that a time be specified. So can I suggest that we put this timing part some place in the By-Laws.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Let's then refer that to the joint wisdom of the Executive Committee and the Constitution and By-Laws Committee when we meet to discuss the By-Laws.

Recommendation No. 4, I am advised by Dr. Fuller, I didn't realize it, that the present Constitution does not authorize me to serve as a substitute for Dr. Irwin when he is not here. I have been doing it but it is illegal and irregular and a number of other things and so this is an effort in part at least to correct that deficiency. The other item B as it is called here in the Discussion is a little trickier and Dr. Fuller says that we don't have to make amendments, the committee is that we presently use the verb "elect" to describe the procedures for choosing the Secretary and the Parliamentarian. As I said to Carol earlier in the day, in the event of the untimely demise of the secretary, we might want to act in a manner that would provide us with a Secretary without going through the voting procedure that the election requires, but apparently for other reasons the committee felt that if we used the word "select" that we allow ourselves in the By-Laws to prescribe the procedure and then we could then change it as emergencies might require.

Strangely enough in the last three (3) or four (4) years we have had emergencies that we couldn't cope with. Some of you will recall we had to have long discussions about how we would handle certain matters. So I don't know if you see that as a significant matter but the committee did and that's why it's here.

Then if we go to Recommendation No. 5 it is my understanding that this is not intended to provide any new procedures but to clarify and specify what we already consider ourselves to have approved in the present Constitution. Are there substantive matters here, Carl?

PROFESSOR FULLER: Read the next page, at the top of page four (4).

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Well, it says "the committee believes this to be a more explicit and a clearer statement and it contains the following substantive changes. It deletes the phrase "unless otherwise specified by the Council" from the statement "The Term of office of all elected members shall be two years unless otherwise specified by the Council." I don't know whether that is substantive. I don't think it is.

PROFESSOR SHARP: The reason for the "unless otherwise specified" is included in there because at times the at-large elections became unbalanced between one year and the following year. One example is last year we had nine (9) faculty members to elect and this time it is twenty-seven (27). But we would like to balance that at eighteen (18) and to stagger one year terms to establish that. That is the only reason that was included in that statement.

PROFESSOR FULLER: Well, the committee felt that it was paradoxical to have the Constitution specify a term of office and give the Faculty Council a blanket authority to amend the Constitution at will.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Well, you can resolve it another way, it is redundant. The Faculty Council can alter the term of years by amendment to the Constitution or proposing an amendment. But I don't have any feelings one way or another. Does anybody else have any feelings in the matter? Let's support the recommendation of the committee then if Mr. Sharp's problem comes up we'll have to form an ad hoc committee.

PROFESSOR SHARP: It usually comes during one meeting and you have to determine the answer very quickly. We didn't do it this year so I'm not strongly opposed to it.

PROFESSOR HAMBURGER: It probably will become critical next year if "n" is reduced. There were only nine (9) at-large representatives elected last year and they serve two (2) year terms and there will be twenty-seven (27) elected, so to reduce the size of the body again it does become critical.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Well, it probably does become critical at any time that you change the size of a body.

I suppose that my notion was that we're not likely to change it very often at least.

PROFESSOR HAMBURGER: The Constitution is clear-cut in its ability to change every year.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: I don't doubt that, I just thought that we're about 100 members and this seemed to be a reasonable size and that's why we're holding "n" steady. But I don't have any feelings one way or another and if anyone else does would you like to make a show of hands. Those of you who think we should eliminate the phrase "unless otherwise specified by the Council" raise their hands? Those of you who would like to leave it in, raise your hands. Well, I guess those who thought it should be left in were in the majority so we will leave it there. It will simplify other things also. The second point under Discussion is that the Secretary may, under some of the changes that have now been made, be elected from the faculty-at-large not from the Council. Under that circumstance, the Secretary ought not to be counted as a part of "n". So this excluded the Secretary from being part of "n".

PROFESSOR PENNA: Does this affect the term of the Secretary selected in that election?

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Not yet, that's addressed in the By-Laws. Item 3 specifies the date as December 15 instead of presently January 15 as the date of which the voting faculty will be certified for apportion purposes. Now that poses only the following problem, which I don't see as serious but I'm tired of being nagged by you.
about it. A roster of the faculty on December 15 is not going to be as complete as a roster on January 15 because faculty who are appointed for the first semester and whose personal action forms have to go through department chairmen, deans, dean of faculties, business offices, and finally be approved by the Board of Trustees do not always get completed by the December Trustee meeting. It's not a serious matter and, I suppose in a normal year, would not involve more than a dozen people but it does mean that there will be some discrepancies. But you're already accustomed to that so that won't be too bad. Are there any questions about that? We can handle it, it's not a serious problem. Item 4 deletes March 1 as a deadline for the at-large elections. The dates of the elections conducted by the Executive Committee will be specified in the By-Laws. Those recommendations are under Number 5.

Number 6 according to the discussion is a restatement of the current Constitutional provision regarding membership and does not involve substantive changes. Those are the recommendations. Are there any other discussions?

PROFESSOR FARBER: I am a little unclear about this two (2) year term and the Faculty Council being able to change it. You say you're going to leave it in at two (2) years with the Faculty Council being able to change it. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: That's what I thought was recommended. PROFESSOR FARBER: Now you changed the recommendation of the committee without their approval? EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Well, that was not my intention, I thought that was what the committee recommended. All right, let's go back to that item then. Do you want to take another vote or what would you like to do?

PROFESSOR ROTHE: Unless somebody moved it to be amended the committee's recommendation stands. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: The Parliamentarian in his wisdom has ruled that unless someone moved to amend the committee's recommendation stands.

PROFESSOR FARBER: I make a motion to delete the wording as it presently stands and state that the Faculty Council has the right to change the term of office. SECONDED. PROFESSOR FULLER: Then I think that the motion ought to be stated that the amendment proposed by the committee be amended to insert that phrase in paragraph B, number 2 following the word years or some such. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Are you having the same trouble I had? Under Discussion item 1 it says that your motion, your recommendation, deletes that phrase. Now the purpose of this motion is to forbid you to delete that phrase. So you don't have to add it because we're saying you can't delete.

PROFESSOR FULLER: My understanding is that we have a main motion before the House which constitutes the recommendations of the committee.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: This is an amending motion. PROFESSOR FULLER: So it amends the motion made by the committee. The motion made by the committee is the text of this recommendation. Therefore, this text must be amended by this motion. How does the amended text read? EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: "Elected members will serve a term of two years unless otherwise specified by the Council commencing . . . .", Dr. Farber, right? Dr. Fuller is that now in order. PROFESSOR FULLER: The intent is clear. THE MOTION CARRIED.

PROFESSOR CUTSHALL: I would like to make some editorial comments about this which have appeared in several places. That's why I waited until now to bring it up. On Recommendation 2 on page 1, you state the Office of Academic Affairs in Indianapolis and on page 2, Recommendation No. 3, you talk about the Chief Executive Officer-Indianapolis. Don't you think it is more appropriate to say IUPUI there? After all it was rejected to change the name to University of Indianapolis. Since we are still IUPUI, I think it is more appropriate.

PROFESSOR FULLER: It was kept that way simply because it was borrowed from our original statement.

PROFESSOR CUTSHALL: I might point out on page 4, Recommendation No. 6, you say Chief Executive Officer-IUPUI.

Shouldn't we be more consistent without a constitutional amendment? EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Where is the item, I missed it? PROFESSOR CUTSHALL: Page 4, Recommendation No. 6, under number 1, Membership, it says Chief Executive Officer-IUPUI. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Well, that's up to you. PROFESSOR CUTSHALL: I think we should be more consistent throughout the Constitution. I make a motion for editorial changes to read Chief Executive Officer of IUPUI as well as other places where this appears.

PROFESSOR FULLER: I don't know how this inconsistency appeared but if the name of this institution is going to be changed it would be easier to keep this Indianapolis which refers to any institution that we have here.

PROFESSOR SOLOW: I would think that IUPUI could be changed to Indianapolis to be more consistent. They should be the same.

PROFESSOR FULLER: Well, I will point out also that no amendment was recommended and they refer to the Chief Executive Officer-Indianapolis, so if we're going to change it to IUPUI, there are other amendments we're going to have to make.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Well, you can give a general instruction to the committee either to make its style consistent or to make its style consistent with a certain name. Either one and they can handle that. What's the motion - IUPUI is the motion. MOTION CARRIED TO CHANGE TO IUPUI.

PROFESSOR FULLER: May I ask a parliamentary question? Will the Parliamentarian please tell me whether or not this particular change requires an amendment or is it simply a stylistic change without substantive input?

PROFESSOR ROTHE: I would think that would depend upon your interpretation of how important a name is. I think it is wise to make the amendment this way.

PROFESSOR FULLER: I ask because it would lead to a whole new set of amendments to the Constitution to change that name in every ARTICLE and SECTION where it appears. But if it was considered a stylistic change, the matter is simply a matter of retyping.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: I would like to argue that it is a stylistic change. One reason that I am persuaded to that is that the title of this document is the IUPUI Faculty Constitution. And it doesn't seem unreasonable under those circumstances to use that.

PROFESSOR ROTHE: Am I right in interpreting that this motion is wherever it appears it be change stylistically?
PROFESSOR MEIERE: I have a substantive question, on the election of at-large representatives, page 3, SECTION 2, letter d - "at-large representatives must constitute less than half of the total number", memory fails me, is that what we have now? PROFESSOR FULLER: I think that is a verbatim quotation. That is quoted from the current Constitution.

PROFESSOR SHARP: I do have another question to ask, maybe it's clerical, we did add "unless specified by the Council", I don't like that and I could see where if we would specify something else, even specify a longer term. I'm wondering if we could change the word "specify" to "shortened by the Faculty Council" because we could make the term for three (3), four (4), or five (5) years according to the way we amended this. I would like it to say that we will not lengthen the terms, only shorten the terms from two (2) years to maybe one (1) year.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: That's an engineering mind at work if I ever heard one. Why do you want to constrain democratic action, if we want to make it five (5) years why can't we do it?

PROFESSOR ROTHE: I second the motion. It helps a little with the inconsistency of it all.

PROFESSOR BLAKE: A point of order, the question was called for before Professor Sharp asked to further discuss.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: The call for the question does not really close debate. There has to be a motion for the previous question to close debate. Call for question is an expression of desire on your part to get on with the show, but even an engineer has to be allowed his say. Do I understand that you are seconding the motion?

PROFESSOR MEIERE: If his motion is to change the word "specify" to "shortened", yes sir?

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Now, that's an amending motion and do you want to speak to it, because I don't understand it?

PROFESSOR ROTHE: Well, I didn't understand why it was there in the first place, except that Kent's point is well taken. We have a very uneven size of elections each year now --25 one (1) year and 9 the next for at-large representatives. The only way to change that is to change the term of office-to shorten. So that was the original reason for the Council to make it any length at all. Which means that we could say that we are going to be around here for five (5) years and we wouldn't have an election for five (5) years.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Well, are you going to be brave enough to tell half of these people who thought they were elected for two years that they are only going to be here for one year? PROFESSOR ROTHE: They will be elected for a term of one year, they would know it when they were elected. You couldn't disenfranchise it.

PROFESSOR NATHAN: I would support this too. The reason for the change that March made a while ago was for this specific thing, I think that shortening will make that clearer. MOTION CARRIED TO CHANGE "SPECIFY" TO "SHORTEN".

MOTION CARRIED TO RECOMMEND THE APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION TO THE GENERAL FACULTY.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: I forgot to state in my comments that very soon multiple copies of the report concerning the review of the presidency will be in various libraries at the President's request.

PROFESSOR MEIERE: Is it my understanding that the By-Laws will be treated by the Executive Committee and the Constitution and By-Laws Committee? I would like to have the Council have the opportunity to express their views on the By-Laws. I was worried about the fact that the standing committees will be appointed by the Committee on Committees. It seems like they should be elected by the Council and in fact are almost always 90% appointed but at least we have the opportunity to say yes or no.

PROFESSOR PENNA: Also nominations from the floor.

PROFESSOR MEIERE: The By-Laws specifies that the Committee on Committees will appoint members to the standing committees.

PROFESSOR FULLER: That's what the By-Laws provide right now. That's no change.

PROFESSOR MEIERE: Certainly at one time in my career I have voted yes or no. Now I don't know if that happened last time but for five (5) or six (6) years we elected members. PROFESSOR NATHAN: That's right, Forrest, where are you in this document.

PROFESSOR MEIERE: Page 4 of the By-Laws, ARTICLE 3, SECTION A, number 2-"the responsibility of the Committee on Committees shall determine the size, appoint the members . . . " EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Did you find it in the abstract, Carl?

PROFESSOR FULLER: Not in the abstract.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: No, but look on page 4 of the By-Laws material, not the Constitution. PROFESSOR FULLER: Where is says the Committee on Committees shall appoint the members, is that where you are talking about?

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Yes that's it.

PROFESSOR FULLER: Well, I quote from current By-Laws, the Committee on Committees shall appoint such committees. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: That's in this other document that also provides it.

PROFESSOR NATHAN: This says to appoint such committees created by the Council, it does not say it appoints its members.

PROFESSOR FULLER: Well, I don't see how you can appoint a committee if you don't appoint its members.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Well, if we can this much straight, the document that the committee is recommending on page 4 that Dr. Meiere is quoting, ARTICLE 3, SECTION A, paragraph 2, says "the Committee on Committees shall determine the size, appoint the members, and designate the chairperson of each standing committee of the faculty except as provided otherwise by the Constitution and By-Laws. So if the Constitution or By-Laws provides that membership of any standing committee shall be elected, then it will be elected but if there is no provision there this would leave an option for the Executive Committee to get the show on the road. so it does contain that qualification. I think that is a pretty stringent qualification because those matters are addressed for the standing committees. PROFESSOR MEIERE: Also, essentially we elect them now, if you look on the pink sheet on page 9, SECTION 9 it discusses the Committee on Committees recommends to the Council . . .

PROFESSOR ROTHE: As you say, we have had nominations from the floor for these committees. That part is the part that is being stricken-the option of the Council to nominate from the floor to the various standing committees.

PROFESSOR MEIERE: I just want to point out to the committee that there will be rather strong objection. Since I brought it up I would like to comment that I am very
impressed with everything that was done. This committee did an excellent job and I accept other points of views as valid.

PROFESSOR BECK: On page 5, one of the standing committees is the Resources and Planning Committee. I think that I remember that they rarely meet and this is a committee that does nothing. It has been virtually stripped of any activity and I was wondering why it was still in here if it is not considered a very viable and active committee? PROFESSOR FULLER: Well, I can answer your question I think as to why it is still in there. None of these committees, other than the Nominating Committee, none of the provisions of that section of the By-Laws relating to the standing committees has been altered in any way. The reason they haven't been altered is because the By-Laws or the Constitution says that the Executive Committee will write the charge to the standing committees, or will recommend to the Council what the charge will be. PROFESSOR BECK: The Constitution says that? PROFESSOR FULLER: The Constitution or the By-Laws, I'm not sure which one at this point. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: There is another factor in that. The Executive Committee has recommended that that committee be discontinued. The chairman of the Constitution and By-Laws Committee has asked that his committee be allowed to consider all of the standing committees not just that single committee and have a recommendation from the Executive Committee concerning all of the committees. So the discontinuance of that committee has been recommended but that action on it is in suspense pending the recommendation concerning the status the total standing committee package. PROFESSOR BECK: The reason I am bringing it up is because of the By-Laws. Perhaps we should be aware of the fact that this committee apparently is to be discontinued. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Well, there will be a recommendation that it be discontinued. PROFESSOR NATHAN: That's right it will be up to the Council to decide whether that should be the case. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: There may be a recommendation that some other committees be discontinued or that some others be added. That was the point, that we would do the whole package at one time.

The meeting was adjourned.

Carol Nathan, Secretary
IUPUI Faculty Council
SUMMARY
IUPUI Faculty Council Meeting
March 15, 1979

1. Approval of the February 15, 1979 minutes.

2. Presiding Officer's Business
   Deferred to the Faculty/Staff Meeting which followed.

3. Executive Committee Report
   In order to balance the at-large representative election numbers, the Council voted the 18 elected with highest votes be for a 2 year term and 9 be elected for a 1 year term.
   Newly elected at-large representatives (APPENDIX A)
   Announcement of unit representatives to be elected was distributed. (APPENDIX B)
   Announcement of at-large representatives to University Faculty Council was distributed. (APPENDIX C)
   The IUPUI Faculty Council elected the following 1979-80 Nominating Committee:
   - Jean Gnat, University Libraries
   - Jerri Laube, School of Nursing
   - Charles Yokomoto, School of Engineering and Technology
   The IUPUI Faculty Council elected the following Faculty Council representatives to 1979-81 University Faculty Council:
   - Richard Beck, School of Engineering and Technology
   - Richard Hamburger, School of Medicine

4. Old Business
   Action on proposed By-Laws amendments. (APPENDIX D)
   To be continued at April 5 meeting.
Minutes of
IUPUI Faculty Council Meeting
March 15, 1979, 3:30 P.M., Emerson Hall Auditorium

Present: Vice President Irwin; Deans: Francois, Grossman, McDonald, Renda, Stonehill, Weber; Director: Bonner;
Professors: Allmann, Besch, Blake, Bond, Bonner, Brashear, Bruyn, Chalian, Childress, Cutshall, Daly, Dexter, Farber, Fuller, Gnan, Haak, Hamburger, Hummicky, Kimball, Laube, Meiere, Metz, Metzger, Nathan, Pena, Riteris, Rothe, Sartoris, Shaffer, Sharp, Solow, Tharp, Vargus, Wapner, Watanabe, Wright, Yokomoto.

Alternates: Dan Benford for Dean Steven C. Beering, Dean Hugh A. Wolf for Dean Richard P. Gousha, Sue Barrett for Dean Nicholas Kellum, Robert J. Lewis, Jr. for Dean Schuyler F. Otteson, Neil Apfelbaum for Director Edward R. Pierce, Jean Hamilton for Roger Roeske.

Absent: Executive Dean Moore; Deans: Bonser, Harvey, Nevill, Schneiderman; Professors: Applegate, Balcavage, Beck, Burt, Dehnke, Fedor, Frank, Goldberg, Gray, Green, Hendrie, Johnson, Karlson, Kasle, Landis, Langsam, Lauer, Markstone, McGeever, Mclear, Miller, Newton, Perez, Sagraves, Selbert, Shellhammer, Sherrill, Smith, Tennant, Wall, Wallihan.

Agenda Item 1: Approval of the Minutes of February 15, 1979.

PROFESSOR CUTSHALL: On page 8, I thought we were using the term "IUPUI" throughout the Constitution.

PROFESSOR NATHAN: That is correct and that is what has been done.

The minutes were approved.

Agenda Item 2: Presiding Officer's Business

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: I shall reserve my remarks for the meeting which follows this one. Because of the long agenda, I think we should proceed.

Agenda Item 3: Executive Committee Report

PROFESSOR NATHAN: The first item of the Executive Committee report relates to the announcement of the elections of the members at-large to the IUPUI Faculty Council. We have those results for you today. The Executive Committee elected to not send out the results of the election at the first of the month but to wait until this meeting so that we could give you a proposal in regard into trying to straighten out the balance of elections. We want to try to correct the problem of electing 9 at-large members one year to the Council and 27 the following year. We, therefore, held the list of elected people to discuss this with you and to see what recommendation you would like to follow. The Executive Committee is making 2 recommendations neither of which we are particularly pushing one way or another. Both of these methods would straighten out the "9-27" problem. One is to take the proper proportion of elected members and ask them to run for a 2 year term and the other proportion for a 1 year term. In other words a 2:1 basis which would correct the problem in 1 year. By next year we would then have this resolved. If we move a 3:2 arrangement some of the people would be elected for a 3 year term and some for a 2 year term. This would correct it in a manner of 2 years. We, therefore, as I have said, have not announced the results of the election to discuss with you your thoughts about going to a 2:1 or 3:2 or should we leave it as it is with the list of elected people for a 2 year term. If we retain all 2 year terms we will not be able to make a correction until we have completed 2 more years. I would like to open the discussion to you.

PROFESSOR FULLER: Doesn't the Constitution already provide that the term will be two years unless shortened?

PROFESSOR NATHAN: No, the Constitutional amendment has not yet been passed and the old Constitution calls for the ability of the Council to make that decision, either direction, shortened or lengthened. There was quite a bit of discussion about this issue following our last Council meeting and we, by an oversight, did not get a motion on the floor in time to either extend the terms or to reduce them. The one option of the 2:1 was discussed by the Executive Committee from the viewpoint that all people who are being elected expect to run for a term of 2 years. This means, if we go to the "2:1", some of those people will have a reduction in the amount of time they expected to be on the Council. However, the pro of that is that we could straighten this out a little faster than with the 3:2, which extends some terms. PROFESSOR BESCH: Would it be possible in a similar motion to suspend the rule that that 1 year would not be a term therefore someone would not be penalized by it? PROFESSOR NATHAN: Thank you. That was also suggested by the Executive Committee. Yes, that could be done. Is there a motion from the floor? PROFESSOR SHARP: I move that we go the 2:1 route. PROFESSOR NATHAN: Would this include what Henry just mentioned about not counting the 1 year term? PROFESSOR SHARP: Yes. PROFESSOR NATHAN: Are you all clear about that?

PROFESSOR ROTHE: How do you decide who is a 2 and who is a 1? PROFESSOR NATHAN: It is in order of number of votes. PROFESSOR ROTHE: Was that stated before? PROFESSOR NATHAN: No, I didn't state it before but that is the way. We have this written up in three different ways which we will pass out to you once you make a decision about the 2:1 or 3:2 or nothing at all. That is the way it is determined, Carl. THE MOTION CARRIED.
PROFESSOR NATHAN: The list of elected members therefore will be distributed to you in just a few moments. You will find at the top that this is marked 3/15-C.

The next issue which I would like to discuss with you is the item of IUPUI Faculty Council unit representatives. You have received as you came in, a list of unit representation to the IUPUI Faculty Council. We will be sending a copy of this to each unit but we are giving it to you today for your information. This gives you the number of representatives that each unit may elect as unit representatives to the IUPUI Faculty Council. We would like to have the names of the elected representatives back to the Faculty Council Office by April 15. Any problems of balance within the units as was time in the at-large representatives can be straightened out within the units if you so desire. (Request from member): Would you explain that just for a minute or so.

PROFESSOR NATHAN: If you would opt to have someone stay on the Council for longer period of time then you could still be on, but we are only electing 3 at-large representatives to the University Faculty Council. The process is that the system has been notified immediately within the units if you so desire. (Request from member): Would you explain that just for a minute or so.

PROFESSOR NATHAN: April 15 is the deadline for the unit election results to the IUPUI Faculty Council elects two members and we will be doing that later in this meeting. I wanted to announce it here first. PROFESSOR CHALIAN: April 15 is the deadline for the unit election results to the IUPUI Faculty Council.

DEAN RENDA: Who should submit these names to your office? PROFESSOR NATHAN: I would suggest that they would probably come through the Deans' offices or from the chairman of the unit nominating committee. That may be by memo or by telephone. We will need these by April 1, if possible, to try to stay somewhat within our timeline. Are there other questions about this? So the units need to do two things. Are the units notified about their obligations? PROFESSOR CHALIAN: They will be notified immediately following this meeting.

PROFESSOR NITTERIS: What is the total number of at-large representatives from IUPUI that go to the University Faculty Council? PROFESSOR NATHAN: At-large or total number? PROFESSOR NITTERIS: No, at-large total number. I mean the total number of at-large representatives. PROFESSOR NATHAN: Let me explain it. The total number of people that IUPUI can send to the University Faculty Council is 11. The IUPUI Faculty Council elects two members and we will be doing that later in this meeting. The rest are at-large except for the Secretary and he or she automatically becomes a member of the University Faculty Council. So the answer to your questions is 8. Remember that this paper reflects only nominations possibilities. From that we are going to be electing only 3 people. We want nominations from your units so that we may make up a ballot to send out to the faculty at-large to elect representatives to the University Faculty Council. Alright now, counting all the people that will still be on, we will only be electing 3 at-large representatives to the University Faculty Council. We will be electing 2 IUPUI Faculty Council representatives also plus the Secretary who will automatically be a member of the University Faculty Council. If you have any further questions about this we will be glad to answer them in the office. We have gone over this many times and I know that it is confusing. We'll try to answer your questions as they come up.

DEAN WOLF: You probably said this and I just missed it. When we elect the unit representative how will I know if it is a one year or a two year term? PROFESSOR NATHAN: Those are all two year terms. If you want to change that within your unit you may. The University Faculty Council are two year terms.

PROFESSOR FULLER: I don't want to open debate on this topic at this point but the By-Laws say that the unit representatives and all members of the Council will serve terms of two years. I don't think that units have the power to change that term of office. So if the units have them for one year or two or for some other specified term, I think the Constitutional provision or By-Laws provision which authorizes them to do that ought to be reviewed. PROFESSOR NATHAN: Alright we can review that in the Executive Committee.

PROFESSOR FULLER: What in fact you're saying is that the units will have the authority to set the term of office of unit representatives. To shorten it. The By-Laws doesn't give them that authority.

PROFESSOR ROTHER: But the current Constitution that we are living under states that the term of office of all elected members of the Faculty Council shall be two years unless otherwise specified by the Council, which I presume means elected unit and at-large. PROFESSOR FULLER: That's what I am saying. I'm objecting to Carol's statement which I interpret to mean that a unit so desires. Isn't that the import of your statement?

PROFESSOR ROTHER: In other words, this Council should state that they can do that? PROFESSOR FULLER: The
Council should authorize them to do that.  

PROFESSOR NATHAN: Alright we can put it this way. If a unit so desires they may bring a motion to the Council and request Council authority to make an adjustment.

I would like to amend the agenda to move the election of the Nominating Committee and the election of the University Faculty Council representatives to the present time rather than waiting until we have reviewed the By-Laws. We will get into discussion of the By-Laws which may take us right up to and over the time that we have allotted to this meeting and I would therefore like to move to amend the agenda to move the election of the Nominating Committee and University Faculty Council representatives to the present time.  

MOTION CARRIED.

You have Document 3/15-F, which states at the top that it is to be used for the election of the Nominating Committee and IUPUI Faculty Council representatives to the University Faculty Council. I'd like to address first the election of the Nominating Committee. The By-Laws call for 3 persons to be on the Nominating Committee and those persons are to be elected only from the continuing members of the IUPUI Faculty Council. The reason for that is that the Nominating Committee starts its work immediately upon election and continues until this time the following year. Therefore, these must be members that are now on the Council and will also be continuing the next year. The list that you have before you on Document 3/15-F is the list of those persons. We would like to open the floor now to nominations for the 1979-80 Nominating Committee.

PROFESSOR RITERS: Does the current Nominating Committee have any suggestions?  

PROFESSOR BLAKE: I would like to nominate Jerri Laube.  

DEAN RENDA: I would like to nominate Charles Yokomoto.  

PROFESSOR HAMBURGER: I would like to nominate August Watanabe.  

PROFESSOR RITERS: I would like to nominate Jean Gnat, from University Libraries.  

PROFESSOR BESCH: I move that nominations cease.  

MOTION CARRIED.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Do all of you have the names? Let me repeat those names and just check them off: Jean Gnat, University Libraries; Jerri Laube, School of Nursing; Charles Yokomoto, School of Engineering and Technology; August Watanabe, School of Medicine.

PROFESSOR NATHAN: Just to confuse you a little bit more, while you are voting for this, the nominations for IUPUI Faculty Council representatives to the University Faculty Council need to be made. We need 2 representatives. We can open the floor for nominations for those positions. Nominees must also come from this continuing list.  

PROFESSOR MEIERE: Those elected as at-large representatives are not called continuing members?  

PROFESSOR NATHAN: They are not on now. No, they're not continuing members. You're talking about the new ones?  

PROFESSOR MEIERE: Some people that are on the Council now were elected as at-large representatives and are not defined as continuing members.  

PROFESSOR NATHAN: People who were re-elected, is what you're saying. Yes, that's true. We'll check this just a moment. Are there any nominations for University Faculty Council?  

PROFESSOR DEXTER: I would like to nominate Richard Hamburger.  

DEAN MCDONALD: I would like to nominate Varoujan Chalian.  

PROFESSOR BLAKE: I would like to nominate Rosanne Perez.  

DEAN RENDA: I would like to nominate Richard Beck.  

MOTION TO CLOSE THE NOMINATIONS WAS CARRIED.

PROFESSOR NATHAN: If you will pass your ballots to Pat as she is collecting them and we will be giving you another piece of paper for your second round. On the University Faculty Council vote for 2 persons.  

PROFESSOR BESCH: Does the nomination of Perez mean that we are including the continuing members who are re-elected?  

PROFESSOR NATHAN: Yes you can.  

PROFESSOR RITERS: It seems to me that nominations were closed before that point was clarified.  

PROFESSOR NATHAN: That's correct.  

PROFESSOR RITERS: I'm not sure but I think I would like to have the nominations reopened. I move that the nominations be reopened.  

MOTION TO REOPEN THE NOMINATIONS WAS DEFATED.

PROFESSOR NATHAN: Now, if you will proceed with your vote for the University Faculty Council representatives.  

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: We need 2 tellers. Bill Spencer and Pat Blake would you be willing to be tellers?  

SPENCER & BLAKE: Yes.

Agenda Item 4: Old Business

PROFESSOR NATHAN: The report of the Constitution and By-Laws Committee on the proposed By-Laws amendments is before you for your action. Also before you for your action is a second document of proposed By-Laws amendments put forth by the Executive Committee. The procedure which has been identified by the Parliamentarian is that we review the amendments to the proposed document submitted by the Executive Committee and that we move on those article by article as they are identified on the March 8 memo from the Executive Committee. Therefore, we open the floor to the article by article discussion of the proposed By-Laws amendments of the March 8 memo.  

PROFESSOR RITERS: Carol, am I correct in understanding that we will not article by article adopt these but article by article amend or reject?  

PROFESSOR NATHAN: We'd like to review each of these for any amendments to these amendments that you prefer. Then we will vote on the entire document. So, we start with ARTICLE 1 on the first page. This has been distributed to you so you should probably be familiar with it. We are saying here to insert the terms "serve as official representative of the faculty" referring to the Secretary because that is one of the major responsibilities of the Secretary of the Faculty Council. And that is therefore, recommended to be inserted, in ARTICLE 1, Section B, Number 2. Is there any discussion?  

PROFESSOR FULLER: I think, that if I recall the discussion of the Executive Committee, that you wanted that lettered "a" and the rest would follow.  

PROFESSOR NATHAN: That's correct, as it stands on the memo from the Executive Committee, the underlined portion would be the insertion which would be letter "a. serve as the official representative of the
A. SERVE AS THE OFFICIAL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE FACULTY FROM THE AMENDMENTS OF THE CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS COMMITTEE.

PROFESSOR BESCH: I'm not sure what are faculty matters that are not matters of the Faculty Council. PROFESSOR NATHAN: They can be brought to the Faculty Council but often such opinions must be given then. Otherwise my answer would constantly be "I don't know. I will have to take it back to the Faculty Council." In many instances the Secretary is asked for opinions which are not really issues which have been or will be discussed with the Council. PROFESSOR MEIERE: I don't feel comfortable with that wording but I could live with it if it is was necessary. As Secretary of the Faculty Council do you feel that that wording is necessary? Or do you feel awkward about having that wording in there or does it cause a problem not knowing? It seems to me that everything works smoothly as it is and I would feel much better not having anybody designated as the official representative of the faculty. PROFESSOR NATHAN: I'm not uncomfortable about the way it has been, no. The reality of it is however, that it is not just the Council.

PROFESSOR MEIERE: You have mentioned a number of times where that may be a problem in representation to the Board of Trustees. I would like to get all problems out of the way if possible. PROFESSOR NATHAN: I don't have a strong opinion on it, Forrest.

PROFESSOR FULLER: Is there a possibility also, that if that statement is present in a formal document, that it implies that no one else is an official representative of the faculty? Is Dr. Irwin an official representative of the faculty, for example, or Dr. Moore? So that this statement says that the Secretary is the official representative of the faculty. What is the status for other people who represent the faculty?

PROFESSOR SOLOW: Perhaps, "the" could be changed to "an" as a matter of English. PROFESSOR NATHAN: Are you making an amendment to the amendment? PROFESSOR SOLOW: If is necessary to take "the" out of it, I will.

PROFESSOR NATHAN: I'm hearing two things, I'm hearing it changed to "a representative" or I'm also hearing the deletion of this whole proposed amendment.

PROFESSOR RITTERIS: It seems to me that if you say "a representative" is to make no difference at all because in a sense we are all representatives of the faculty. I think that if more confusion is created by making you the representative, you are best to leave it as is. I'm sure that I agree with an earlier statement that I don't think that anything is added by the statement. I would urge for deletion. I move to amend the first part by deleting that statement.

PROFESSOR SHARP: I was going to agree that I don't like that wording "official" but I do like the wording "elected" in there. I think that would clarify it to say be the elected representative of the faculty. PROFESSOR RITTERIS: But that isn't true.

PROFESSOR SHARP: They aren't elected by the faculty, but they are the elected representative of the faculty.

MOTION CARRIED TO DELETE "A. SERVE AS THE OFFICIAL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE FACULTY FROM THE AMENDMENTS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

PROFESSOR NATHAN: The next section of that is part f. of that same ARTICLE 1, Section B, Number 2, this is to keep taped recordings of the proceedings rather than minutes, of the Executive Committee, and make them available to faculty upon request. The idea being here that we have tried to keep written minutes of the Executive Committee and it is extremely time consuming and has not been efficient. We do take charges off of the tape, so we can proceed with our business. But the entire tape of the Executive Committee meetings is kept as a permanent record and has been used by some of the committees to review. We do not turn the tape off, the tape is on during all Executive Committee meetings.

PROFESSOR FULLER: You refer to this as "f" but it remains "e".

PROFESSOR NATHAN: You're right, it is "e". PROFESSOR HAMBURGER: There is no specification here for how long those tapes are kept. They are of no practical value. Why keep them forever?

PROFESSOR NATHAN: The element of time was not stated in either of the documents. PROFESSOR HAMBURGER: I would like to ask you a question in order to amend. I do not know the amount of time of keeping things, if it forever?

PROFESSOR NATHAN: Well, that's interesting. Everything seems to go to the Archives these days.

PROFESSOR HAMBURGER: I would like to amend that they be retained for 3 years.

PROFESSOR FULLER: I understand the intent of the motion but I wonder how the statement would read if the motion was adopted? What exactly would be the phrase of it?

PROFESSOR NATHAN: ... these recordings be retained for 3 years.

PROFESSOR HAMBURGER: Yes, that was the intent.

DEAN RENDA: Is it clear that we are talking about audio recordings and no other kinds of recordings?

PROFESSOR RITTERIS: Without quibbling, I just wish to point out that if we follow that we would have to destroy tapes each month. PROFESSOR HAMBURGER: I don't know the amount of time that each of these occurs but 3 years longevity is the point. They do not need to be retained forever. PROFESSOR BESCH: I move to
amend the amendment to the amendment by inserting the phrase "be kept for a period of not less than 3 years".

MOTION SECONDED.

PROFESSOR SHARP: You could ask if there were no objections, if there were no objections we don't have to take a vote on it.

DEAN RENDA: I'm not very clear what the mechanism is of destroying these tapes.

PROFESSOR NATHAN: All this is telling us is that we do not need signatures on a petition is automatically put on the ballot. This allows the Nominating Committee not to manipulate is this the way to do it?

MOTION SECONDED.

PROFESSOR ROTHE: That's certainly true, the Secretary does not have to read each of these. She can say, "is there any comment about ARTICLE II, Section B". If no one opens their mouths, we move ahead.

PROFESSOR MEIERE: I would suggest that this is no an efficient way of reviewing these amendments. Can I ask the Parliamentarian, is this the way to do it?

PROFESSOR ROTHE: What is your alternative? It is one way of doing it.

PROFESSOR MEIERE: It seems to me if anyone had any comments about the document they may say so.

PROFESSOR ROTHE: That's certainly true, the Secretary does not have to read each of these. She can say, "is there any comment about ARTICLE II, Section B". If no one opens their mouths, we move ahead.

PROFESSOR MEIERE: I would suggest that the way to do it.

PROFESSOR NATHAN: ARTICLE II, Section B, Number 1b is there any comment?

PROFESSOR MEIERE: I think you should change the "than" to "as the number of persons to be elected".

PROFESSOR SHARP: Is the discussion on the nominations and elections here? I have a document that I have distributed and I would like to discuss that and maybe this is the appropriate time. Basically, I have distributed a memo of proposed By-Laws changes. I am concerned mainly on this one principle that the Constitution and By-Laws Committee has given the Nominating Committee a great deal of power and flexibility in the number of candidates for the election. So the amendment that we are discussing right now is to go back to what we have and is simply a double procedure. But what I have done is go by a different procedure than we have been using and that is simply to allow whoever wants to be a nominee, who chooses to be a nominee, to go forth and get a number of signatures and then simply use that to file a petition with the Nominating Committee. This would assure anybody who really wanted to become a nominee to become one and not allow the flexibility and power of the Nominating Committee, that is, the possibility of altering the number of nominees if they choose to do so. So what I have asked to do in this section in ARTICLE II, Section B which are paragraphs 1a and 1b is insert this following paragraph and this is straight from the elections involving the IU at-large election "Nominations may be made by filing with the Nominating Committee by February 15 a nominating petition signed by at least 10 members of the voting faculty, provided that a signature shall be declared invalid if it appears on more than one such petition. The nominee may file with the petition a written statement of not more than fifty (50) words to accompany the election ballot . . . " This would simplify the election procedure and would solve a lot of our problems.

PROFESSOR NATHAN: Kent, then you're saying that rather than having any particular number of nominees designated that anyone that is nominated be put on the ballot. Is that it?

PROFESSOR SHARP: Anyone who gets 10 signatures on a petition is automatically put on the ballot. This allows the Nominating Committee not to manipulate this. We discussed this a great deal and we didn't know how to handle it, but I feel that this is a much cleaner way of handling it. The second thing is that it allows for the candidates statements. Those who have served on the Nominating Committee know that candidates statements are a very difficult thing to get. They would submit their candidates statements at the same time as their nomination petition. Third thing that is parallel with this is the all IU Faculty Council elections would be by the same procedure. I don't think there would be a lot of confusion about this.

PROFESSOR ROTHE: It seems to me that whereas before we would propose a Nominating Committee of 7 people across all the academic units who would pick nominees you're saying any 10 faculty members can nominate a person for the Council. It seems to me that if you call the Nominating Committee dangerous in regard to power to manipulate, this procedure is fully as dangerous. I would therefore oppose it for that reason.

PROFESSOR SHARP: You still have the right to do that.

PROFESSOR MEIERE: If I understand correctly, the only way somebody could get nominated is by petition. I would speak against that.

DEAN FRANCOIS: I don't understand why one needs a Nominating Committee if this goes through.

PROFESSOR SHARP: I don't intend for this to be the only way, I think you have to find 10 faculty members who are willing to nominate an individual and if you have those 10 individuals that's all you really need.

PROFESSOR BARRETT: I have a question to direct to Kent and that is if a faculty member would sign my petition and would sign someone else's petition and we would both turn them in and the name appears on both, which petition would be called invalid?

PROFESSOR SHARP: Neither petition. Hopefully, with no more than 10 names, that would not happen.

DEAN FRANCOIS: SPEA has 10 faculty members, how would you ever get a nomination?

PROFESSOR SHARP: That's why the 10 names because we have such small schools.

PROFESSOR CHALIAN: I think that that would be very expensive. In the next few years you would see everyone getting photographed and running campaigns.

PROFESSOR BESCH: I would speak against the motion on the basis that it would be at least as a complex a problem to assure that no one's name appears on more than one petition, probably more complex in the long run.

PROFESSOR VAROOGS: I'm kind of ambivalent about which way to go but I want to point out that something exists further up in the proposed By-Laws which allows for considerable monitoring on the part of the Executive Committee. It says that the Nominating Committee "shall prepare under the supervision of the Executive Committee," that is a very ambiguous phrase but it does allow some control. On the other hand, I do agree with Kent that the document presented by the Constitution and By-Laws Committee is far as I am concerned gives a great amount of power to the Nominating Committee and they will run the nominations how they want to.

PROFESSOR FULLER: The phrase that was referred to "under the supervision of the Executive Committee" perhaps it is redundant since the Constitution already gives the Executive Committee the power to conduct the at-large elections, so this is a reference to that statement of authority. It doesn't represent anything new. Secondly, I think there is too much fear of the Nominating Committee and it doesn't run anything. It just proposes nominations. Whether the nominees are elected is another question, and
in that case the whole faculty has a voice. Then, once the people are nominated, they have to compete with the other people who were nominated before they can exert any input. I agree with the earlier speaker who said that we have a Nominating Committee but this amendment seems to represent a fear that the Nominating Committee will have work to do. It seems ridiculous to me to have a Nominating Committee and then forbid it from making nominations. 

PROFESSOR SHARP: I point out that there are two polls here, one here I believe was taken by Forrest, who feared that no one would be nominated and the fellow over here says that there will be a lot of people nominated. I think, personally, it will be some reasonable number in the middle. 

PROFESSOR FULLER: May I ask a point of information? Have we ever had an unruly number of nominations for any elections in the past? Has there been any situation in which the Nominating Committee appears to have taken actions which are contrary to the wishes of the Council? 

PROFESSOR NATHAN: No, I have no record of that and I have not been aware of it happening. 

PROFESSOR MEIERE: I'm kind of confused. It seems the Nominating Committee makes no decision whatsoever about specifying the number of people to be elected, twice that for the nomination and just count the ballots. 

PROFESSOR SOLOW: It seems to me if an individual voluntarily wants to be elected that they would make this wish known to the Nominating Committee with a number of signatures or requests. It is no reason honestly to make a provision for including that. 

PROFESSOR NATHAN: There is a motion on the floor to vote on Kent's proposal and I'm concerned also that we need to stop this meeting within just a few minutes so we can prepare for the one that follows at 3:30. I'd like to either see some action on this and then postpone the rest of our discussion until the April meeting or postpone even this motion. THE MOTION ON KENT SHARP'S PROPOSAL WAS DEFEATED. 

PROFESSOR BLAKE: I move that we postpone further discussion on this issue until the April meeting. 

THE MOTION CARRIED. 

PROFESSOR NATHAN: Now, before you leave I need to announce the results of the elections. The Nominating Committee is Jean Gnat, Jerri Laube, and Charles Yokomoto. Representatives to the University Faculty Council are Richard Beck and Richard Hamburger. 

PROFESSOR BLAKE: I make a motion to destroy the ballots. THE MOTION CARRIED. 

The meeting was adjourned. 

Carol Nathan, Secretary 
IUPUI Faculty Council
SUMMARY
IUPUI Faculty Council Meeting
April 5, 1979

1. Approval of the March 15, 1979 meeting.
   Approval of the March 15, 1979 meeting was deferred
to the next meeting May 3, 1979.  

2. Presiding Officer's Business
   Review of results of General Assembly budget approvals
   for IUPUI for the biennium.
   Personnel Compensation       6.1%
   Inflation on purchases        6.0%
   Program improvement           $200,000
   Dental School                 $100,000
   Physical Facilities:
      Classroom Building #2
      Completion of Medical Sciences Building
      Computer Center - Engineering & Technology
      Building
      Coleman Renovation
      $495,000 for land acquisition
      Three parking garages
      Construction using private development

3. Executive Committee Business
   Motion to destroy ballots of IUPUI Faculty Council at-
   large election - MOTION CARRIED.
   Motion to "approve that any unit wishing to do so be
   allowed to balance their unit elections for 1979-81
   by electing some representatives for 2 years and some
   for 1 year. The 1 year will not be considered a term,
   thus allowing the 1 year representatives to be eligible
   for 2 subsequent full terms." MOTION CARRIED.

   Report of results of amendments to IUPUI Faculty
   Constitution:
   Recommendation No. 1        AGREE  DISAGREE
   Recommendation No. 2         240     10
   Recommendation No. 3         241     10
   Recommendation No. 4         238     12
   Recommendation No. 5         237     14
   Recommendation No. 6         236     15
   The amendments which pass
   should become effective upon
   adoption by the IUPUI faculty.
   Proposal for one eight (8) week summer session - issue
   to be addressed at May 3 Council meeting.

4. Old Business
   Continued discussion and action on proposed amendments of
   IUPUI Faculty Council By-Laws.
   Constitution and By-Laws Committee Report was
   approved as amended by some proposals by the
   Executive Committee:
   ARTICLE I, Section B
   Change the semicolon after the word "designate"
to a comma and by adding the following:
   "provided that in the event of a special meeting
   of the Council the members of the Council shall
   be notified of the time, place, and agenda of the
   meeting at least three days in advance of the
   meeting date;"
ARTICLE I, Section B, Number 2
e. Keep taped recordings of the proceedings of the Executive Committee and make them available to the faculty upon request and these be retained for not less than 3 years.

ARTICLE II, Section B, Number 1b
. . . The ballot shall contain twice the number of nominees as the number of persons to be elected.

ARTICLE II, Section D, Number 4c
Add at the end of paragraph 4c - Any candidate nominated for membership on the Council shall be provided the opportunity to file a written statement of not more than fifty (50) words to accompany the ballot.

ARTICLE III, Section B, Number 12a
First sentence, change "five" to "seven".

ARTICLE III, Section C
Delete "Committee on Review of Tenure Policies and Procedures" and insert IUPUI Tenure Committee. This occurs in: Heading of Section C, and paragraphs 1 and 4.

ARTICLE III, Section C, Number 4b
Delete "when controversy arises".

5. New Business

Dr. Irwin announced a reception to be held for the Faculty Council members, spouses and friends at the Irwin's home immediately following the last meeting of the Council for the academic year - May 3, 1979.
Minutes of
IUPUI Faculty Council Meeting
April 5, 1979, 3:30 P.M., School of Law, Room 116

Present: Vice President Irwin; Executive Dean Moore; Deans: Francois, Grossman, Kellum, Renda, Weber; Professors: Applegate, Beck, Blake, Bonner, Brashhear, Bruyn, Burt, Chalian, Cutshall, Daly, Dexter, Farber, Fuller, Gnat, Grey, Haak, Hendrie, Humecky, Karlson, Langsam, Laube, Lauer, McGeever, Metz, Miller, Nathan, Penna, Riteris, Roeske, Rothe, Sagraves, Sartoris, Seibert, Shaffer, Sharp, Shellhammer, Smith, Solow, Tennant, Tharp, Wright, Yokomoto.


Absent: Deans: Bonser, Harvey, Schneiderman, Stonehill; Director: Bonner; Professors: Bond, Dehnke, Fedor, Frank, Goldberg, Johnson, Landis, McLeer, Meiere, Metzger, Newton, Sherrill, Vargus, Wall, Wallihan, Wappner.


Agenda Item 1: Approval of the Minutes of March 15, 1979.

The approval of the minutes was deferred to the May 3 meeting due to late mailing.

Agenda Item 2: Presiding Officer's Business

The Presiding Officer's Business was deferred to after the Executive Committee Report.

Agenda Item 3: Executive Committee Report

PROFESSOR NATHAN: At our last meeting, I neglected to ask for the ballots for the IUPUI Faculty Council at-large elections to be destroyed, I therefore would like to move that the ballots from the at-large elections to the Faculty Council be destroyed. MOTION CARRIED.

Secondly, to allow any unit the freedom to adjust their unit elections in the same way we adjusted the at-large elections permitting a more balanced number to be elected to the Council each year, I move that the IUPUI Faculty Council approve that any unit wishing to do so be allowed to balance their unit election for 1979-81 by electing some representatives for 2 years and some for 1 year. The 1 year will not be considered a term, thus allowing the 1 year representatives to be eligible for 2 subsequent full terms. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: You will recall that we authorized this procedure generally at our last meeting, this is to make sure that it's clear that individual units have the same option that we are exercising as a whole body. SECONDED. I also call your attention to the fact that this motion does not mandate this but simply says that any unit that wishes to do so may do so. MOTION CARRIED.

PROFESSOR NATHAN: The next item is the result of the faculty vote on Constitutional amendments. We have not finalized the tallying of this yet but I did want to report to you the unofficial count. The official count of the tally will be in the minutes of this meeting. All recommendations are for "pass" at approximately 200-for and 8-10-against. For instance, Recommendation No. 1 is 216 to 8, Recommendation No. 2, 215 to 9, and so on. They all averaged about the same. The actual figures will be in the minutes of this meeting. If any of you have any questions about that, I'd be glad to address it. PROFESSOR METZ: How many faculty will be voting on this, I'm interested in the return. PROFESSOR NATHAN: The return is low. This would be the faculty at-large here at IUPUI which is about 1200. In relation to that kind of count though, on the at-large elections which were just completed we had a 65-70% return, so it depends on the topic. People do vote if they have an interest in doing so.

PROFESSOR BLAKE: I think the Council ought to be aware that we are not all getting those ballots fast enough. My unit was delivered yesterday, which was the due date and that is the second time in a row. There is a mail problem outside the unit. PROFESSOR NATHAN: We are aware of that and that is why we are holding the count at this time.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: I'd like to exercise the prerogative of the chair to comment on a matter that the Academic Affairs Committee will have a report on for the May meeting. I'd like for you to know about it. You will remember that when this body adopted a calendar for next year we left open the Summer Session question
because we were not clear as to what might be the most likely arrangement. We are presently contemplating, instead of the 2 six-week summer sessions that we have a single eight-week summer session for 1980-81. We do have a continuing problem of rearranging our resources and by going this route we will save something around $150,000-200,000. It will be primarily in part-time faculty since the program that we will offer will continue to supply the courses that the full-time faculty would teach. It would have certain academic advantages, at least it seems so to many of the people with whom we have discussed it including the Academic Procedures Committee which contains representatives from each of the schools and all of the deans with whom I have discussed it. We would contemplate a schedule that would run something in the neighborhood of May 30 to July 25. We would teach, in that period of time, the same schedule and the same contact hours that we now teach in the six-week session. We would offer only 1 session and it would be an eight-week session. Paul McLean and his committee are considering this matter, and I understand he will have a recommendation for us in May. I would like my announcement to serve as a notice to you that we are considering it and I would like for you to do anything that you feel you have to do at your level about it and have some kind of a resolution of it at the May meeting. There are academic as well as fiscal advantages to this and I would hope that we could find some way to make it go.

Agenda Item 2: Presiding Officer's Business

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: I apologize for being late. You have all read, I think, that the Indiana General Assembly has essentially wound up. Budget bills have been passed by both Houses. The highlights of those are these: from the operating budget standpoint, the budget bill is providing 6.1% personnel compensation each of the 2 years and 6% for inflation on things that we buy such as supplies and equipment each of the 2 years. Program improvement had a rough go after it left the Senate. For the non-health division, as you will recall, we had requested about $1.5 million. For Indianapolis, $200,000 was approved for the first year with carry over to the second year but no additional money. That really means that the base can only be increased by $200,000 for this coming year. Dentistry also had a slight amount of program improvement, $100,000 for the first year and that also carries over. We did a little better on the physical facilities. We did receive approval for Classroom Building #2, which houses Education, Physical Education and Social Work. Unfortunately the theatre was cut out of it. The funding level was $16.6 million and is, I think, the largest single project in the history of the General Assembly. They also approved the completion, after some 20-plus years, of the south wing of the Medical Sciences Building by adding 2 floors. That is about $2.8 million. They finally approved, after 3 tries, completion of the Computer Center in the basement of Engineering & Technology. Also, for the first time in 4 years, we have some land acquisition money to hopefully clean up this campus, particularly between Michigan and New York Streets down to West Street. That amounted to $495,000. A second phase renovation of Coleman Hospital, which is no longer a hospital, which is used primarily by the Allied Health Sciences was approved and that amounted to $1.3 million. On Monday of this week we had a scare because our 3 parking garages were up for reconsideration even though the General Assembly had approved at least 2 of them a year ago. Many of us, including two Trustees, went to the conference committee on Monday primarily to hear the story that we did not need any parking garages right now. Parking garages would be unnecessary because of "people-movers". These would move people from various sections of the city and county to this campus. Well, we listened to that for a couple of hours and finally we were able to make our pitch and as a result we do have authorization for the 3 garages, not 2 which was approved a year ago.

We also have the bill we have tried for 3 times for construction for facilities using private development. So Monday was an important day particularly for this campus in that we salvaged our parking garages and also finally got approval of the use of private development for facilities serving the University. It will be an austere biennium from an operating budget standpoint. That is nothing new. The 3 campuses that are located at Indianapolis, Bloomington, and West Lafayette got the 6.1% increase in personnel compensation. Some of the regional campuses got 6.4%. And you've probably heard on campus and downtown that the 6.1% can be increased to 6.3% or 6.6% and only time will tell whether that is possible this year particularly on this campus. Are there any questions that anybody would like to ask about the wind up of the General Assembly?

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: It might be worth saying, since we often feel that we are the low man on the totem pole, that Bloomington did not fare nearly as well in its budget or its capital requests. It is pretty clear that we are going to have the physical growth, at least, on this campus for the next 3 or 5 years and as you all probably noticed when you came in, if you didn't you can look out the rear window, the Tennis Court is running on schedule and Classroom Office Building #1 is now well under construction over on Blake Street, so things are starting to take shape physically.

Agenda Item 4: Old Business

PROFESSOR NATHAN: I think we can begin where we left off at the last meeting which was on the document marked March 8 from the Executive Committee on the By-Laws amendments. On page 2, ARTICLE II, is where we quit.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Well, there is an item on page 2, ARTICLE II, Section B, Number 2a, where there had been a suggested recommendation from the Executive Committee to delete the phrase "and administrative title, if any". If you will recall this is where if persons were candidates to election to the Council and the Executive Committee thought that administrative titles posed a kind of a contradiction since administrators are not normally elected...
EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: There is also a converse difficulty with only 11 representatives. We do have 15 schools and colleges. Even with 2 coming from one college or 2 colleges there are still going to be colleges that are so small that they are not going to get any representative on the University Faculty Council. It does seem to me that the Council. There was subsequently an expression of opinion that there are many persons with titles of various sorts which would not preclude them from election, so this phrase ought not to be deleted but left there for the benefit of any candidate who might wish to use it. So the recommendation before us at the moment is not to delete what we recommended that you delete. PROFESSOR NATHAN: I think the Executive Committee is just withdrawing that suggestion so it needs no action.

PROFESSOR FULLER: In the meeting last month did we deal with the preceding item? PROFESSOR NATHAN: That's right we need to deal with ARTICLE II, Section B, Number 1b. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Alright, at the top of the same page then, there is a phrase from ARTICLE II, Section B, Number 1b which says "the ballot shall contain twice the number of nominees than the number of persons to be elected." and this is either a clerical error, or a typographical error, or a grammatical error depending on who you wish to give credit to for it, I wish to substitute for the word "than" the word "as". So it would read "contain twice the number of nominees as the number of persons to be elected." Are there any objections, any comments? PROFESSOR FULLER: I'm confused, but my question is was that recommendation adopted by the Council? EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: No. PROFESSOR FULLER: I should know that at this point but I don't. My recollection is that it was a point that we were debating on when we adjourned. PROFESSOR NATHAN: That's right. The other factor, however, is that we have made some amendments to these amendments but we did not adopt any of them yet. We just discussed them. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Is there any discussion on this momentous question?

PROFESSOR PENNA: Is the plural of person, "persons" or "people"? EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: "Persons". If you want a ruling you got one.

I believe that concludes the items in the document except that in the agenda as distributed to you today there are two other items which I would like to have included in this action. They refer to ARTICLE I, Section B. Change the semicolon after the word "designate" to a comma and add the following: (You will recall that this came up because we wanted at least 3 days notice of special meetings and that was not provided for.) So this basically adds a clause saying "provided that in the event of a special meeting of the Council the members of the Council shall be notified of the time, place, and agenda of the meeting at least 3 days in advance of the meeting date." Is there any discussion of that item? The last item is in ARTICLE II, Section D. To refresh your memory that has to do with the election of representatives from this campus to the Indiana University Faculty Council. To delete the following words in the second sentence of paragraph e, "40% of the total number of members may be" and insert the following: "2 members are". The 40% clause restricts the number of members from any one school to 40%. The alternative clause changes it from a percentage restriction to a number restriction and says that no more than 2 members may be elected from any unit of this campus to the University Faculty Council as representatives of this campus. That is the arrangement that we are presently operating under and it seems to work quite satisfactorily. Under the other arrangement a large school could easily have more than 2 representatives and the distribution of representatives on the campus would not be as wide spread. Are there any questions about that?

PROFESSOR DEXTER: I guess I would like to say a word in favor as it was proposed by the Constitution and By-Laws Committee. I would point out that the number of delegates we get from this campus to the University Faculty Council is based on proportion of representation and although the 40% limit does deviate from proportional representation that seems reasonable. However, there may be times that a particular unit would in fact have qualified individuals that the entire group would want beyond the number of 2 and we might be cutting off some people who would be good at serving our interests. I'm not sure, in talking to people that have gone to the University Faculty Council that there are many items which come up where one does not think of one's self as anything but a representative of IUPUI. I don't know if a strict and artificial limitation on the number of people on any particular unit is all that necessary. PROFESSOR LANGSAM: I think that you are quite right. There may be an occasion where there are more than 2 outstanding members of one unit. I'm sure we could give them a chance to serve the following year or on other equally serious matters. There is also the opposite possibility of having all from one unit. PROFESSOR DEXTER: The question is, according to this limitation, it would not be from all one unit. PROFESSOR LANGSAM: That was just an exaggeration but even at that...

PROFESSOR DEXTER: I guess at Bloomington they do not limit it such a way. I understand that it is a fully open process. They do have some provisions for committee chairman but in the one's that were voted on in general there are disproportioned units actually, there are no units as such. PROFESSOR LANGSAM: I think there is also a possibility at Bloomington that the faculty are more familiar with each other because of their situation there which we are not. In fact, most of the people here I only know because I am here and so I think that might be another reason. PROFESSOR DEXTER: I can certainly see it on both sides.

PROFESSOR MCGEEVER: Just to get this into perspective what is the size of the total delegation from here?

PROFESSOR NATHAN: Eleven. PROFESSOR MCGEEVER: So 40% of that would be 4. PROFESSOR NATHAN: Now remember what that is. That includes unit representatives, it's just not at-large. Some of those are Faculty Council representatives and they can come from any unit. The Faculty Council elects x-number and the rest are at-large. That's the way the Constitution reads. The unit representatives that come from the election of the Faculty Council are not included in that count so that you might have more than 2 from a unit if you also count the people elected from this body. It's only the at-large representatives that are under that restriction. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: There is also a converse difficulty with only 11 representatives. We do have 15 schools and colleges. Even with 2 coming from one college or 2 colleges there are still going to be colleges that are so small that they are not going to get any representative on the University Faculty Council. It does seem to me...
there are advantages to everybody every few years having a representative to that body. So that's another problem, that we do effectively close out the option for representation by some of the schools. Are there other comments?

PROFESSOR FULLER: I don't see any way of closing out any of the options at all in the system. Obviously, this does not require that you elect 40% from any unit it only sets a ceiling and it does not close out representation from any unit any more than 2 from any unit does. The provision represents a philosophy, I guess, namely does the University Faculty Council represent the campus and not the units the representatives come from? In that body they are extremely unlikely to discuss any business that is school or unit oriented. It would be university oriented. So a requirement that these people be restricted in terms of what unit they are elected from here is entirely artificial. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: I don't think that was my point. My point was that there would never by anybody at the University Faculty Council to go back to the School of Physical Education and tell them some of the things that go on there and how that body operates. Unless they have a representative of their own or unless we have a touring reporter to go around to different meetings. That was my point. It may not be an important one but it was a different point than the one that you were speaking of.

PROFESSOR LAUBE: I would like clarification on what Carol just said, as I read that we do have some members from the Faculty Council at-large and it is provided that no more than 40% of the total number of members may be from any one academic unit so that seems that those that come from the Faculty Council are still identified from their units. PROFESSOR NATHAN: If we pass this document, it eliminates the election from this Council and makes the representatives all-at-large. So as a result, what I just said would be negated if we pass this. As it presently stands we have some members from this Council and some at-large.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: It seems to me that since this is the only controversial item it would be useful to take a vote on this item separately. Then we can combine the results of that with the rest of them. Would that be satisfactory? I would like to take a vote then on the question of substituting "2 members are" for "40% of the total number of members may be". An affirmative vote is a vote to insert "2 members are" in place of "40% of the total number of members may be". A negative vote is to leave it as it presently is. PROFESSOR LUKEMEYER: Point of information, can alternates vote? EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Yes. AFFIRMATIVE VOTE: 28, NEGATIVE VOTE: 29. MOTION CARRIED TO DELETE THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Alright, we will not be considering at this time to change ARTICLE II, Section D. We will consider that withdrawn since that leaves it as it is. We will have only the change of ARTICLE I, Section B, which adds the proviso for at least 3 days notice for special meetings. We also have the changes in this document dated March 8. PROFESSOR FULLER: Point of order, I don't recall that the Council was asked to vote on the changes in this document dated March 8.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: I'm planning to ask for a vote now. I thought we would ask for the whole thing since there was no dissension. PROFESSOR ROTHE: I thought we had decided that we would go through and delete any that was appropriate and then approve.

PROFESSOR LANGSAM: Could we take a vote on whether there would be any opposition to doing them all together since there is no dissension? EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Well, there is a parliamentary rule against suppressing the rights of the minority. I'm concerned about such a vote not allowing people who wish to vote in the minority to do so on these. What do you think? PROFESSOR ROTHE: I would hardly want to be the one to suppress people from talking on these issues.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: It would seem to me if we continued as we had before, going down one at a time, asking if there are any questions, then if there isn't it stands and if there is we can discuss it and if someone moves to delete it we can delete it.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: We have discussed all of these have we not? PROFESSOR LANGSAM: I have no objection to a professional secretary. It seems to me like that is a line item and if we are going to have a professional secretary that's quite different from having a faculty member take on the rather awesome burden of being the secretary for a limited number of years. I think there is a different philosophy behind having a professional secretary and having a member of the faculty serve as a secretary and I
would like to speak in favor of the amendment to limit it. I think that is a very difficult job and I think it takes a lot out of a faculty member. **EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE**: Well, that's the way it presently is.

**PROFESSOR FULLER**: Can I hear how the motion reads? **EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE**: Well, I haven't worded it yet. To clarify the situation for purposes of voting, the present recommendation is that the Secretary of this Council be limited to two two-year periods; to have the individual then not be secretary for a two-year period and then eligible for re-election. That's the amendment proposed by the Constitution and By-Laws Committee. Those who are in favor of that provision should vote yes. I would take that as being opposition to the Executive Committee proposal. **MOTION CARRIED TO DELETE THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION.**

**EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE**: ARTICLE II, Section D, Number 4c, Add at the end of paragraph 4c - "Any candidate nominated for membership on the Council shall be provided the opportunity to file a written statement of not more than fifty (50) words to accompany the ballot." The Executive Committee feels it is important to allow faculty the opportunity to submit statements. Placing this in the By-Laws assures that the request is made. Any discussion? The burden of it is to allow each candidate for election to this august body to submit a written statement of 50 words describing the reasons and qualifications which he presents for support of his election.

**PROFESSOR APPLEGATE**: Isn't that a process? Why does it need to be in the By-Laws? We would be allowed to do this if it was or wasn't in the By-Laws. **PROFESSOR NATHAN**: It really was my suggestion that it be put in the By-Laws because as Secretary for the past two years I can tell you this is a difficult system and one which causes us a lot of hassle in the office but one that is very important. The faculty do want to submit statements. If we eliminate this from the By-Laws, the Secretary will not be mandated to ask for statements and I can assure you that it will probably be eliminated from the process. So if the faculty feels that it is important to have that opportunity I suggest it be in the By-Laws. **PROFESSOR RODHE**: My impression is that we don't have to vote unless we want to delete.

**EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE**: We then go to the next item ARTICLE II, Section B, Number 12a, in the first sentence, change "five" to "seven". The rationale is that the Nominating Committee is a very important committee and should have broad representation. The increase in proposed membership is to help accomplish this. Is there any discussion? ARTICLE III, Section C is there any discussion? ARTICLE III, Section C, Number 4b is there any discussion? Is there any discussion on the document? Are you prepared to vote on the document as a whole?

**PROFESSOR RITERIS**: Point of information on ARTICLE III, Section C on the top of page 3, are we looking at that too?

**EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE**: We are prepared to discuss it. ARTICLE III, Section C to delete "Committee on Review of Tenure Policies and Procedures" and insert "IUPUI Tenure Committee". The rationale is that the purpose of this committee is to review tenure recommendations and to review tenure policies and procedures. The title proposed seemed to limit it to only review of tenure policies and procedures. Since its primary function is, in fact, to review tenure recommendations, the Executive Committee thought that the title of the committee ought to revert to what it now is which is "Tenure Committee". **PROFESSOR RITERIS**: I think the reason for this is that we have so many tenure committees. We have departmental tenure committees, school tenure committees ... **EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE**: Well, Professor Riteris, I think the reason for this is that we have so many tenure committees. The title proposed seemed to limit it to only review of tenure policies and procedures. Since its primary function is, in fact, to review tenure recommendations, the Executive Committee thought that the title of the committee ought to revert to what it now is which is "Tenure Committee". **PROFESSOR RITERIS**: IUPUI Committee on Review of Tenure is still more eloquent than IUPUI Tenure Committee. **EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE**: Is there any further discussion on ARTICLE III, Section C?

**PROFESSOR FABER**: I'm a little confused about what schools will be covered by the IUPUI Tenure Committee.

**EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE**: All schools that report to the Vice President-Indianapolis are reviewed by that committee.

**PROFESSOR HUMNICKY**: How about librarians? **EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE**: The librarians have their own process which parallels that used by the faculty but which goes through the Dean of University Libraries, Carl Jackson. It is a different process. This does not refer to that. They are not a school or college. Are there any more comments or questions? Are you ready to vote? I'm going to take this one at a time.

**ARTICLE I, Section B, Change the semicolon after the word "designate" to a comma and by adding the following: "provided that in the event of a special meeting of the Council the members of the Council shall be notified of the time, place, and agenda of the meeting at least three days in advance of the meeting date;" APPROVED.**

**ARTICLE I, Section B, Number 2, "e. Keep taped recordings of the proceedings of the Executive Committee and make them available to the faculty upon request and these be retained for not less than three years. APPROVED.**

**ARTICLE II, Section B, Number 1b, "...The ballot shall contain twice the number of nominees as the number of persons to be elected. APPROVED.**

**PROFESSOR FULLER**: Point of order. That motion is more than a change of a word. **EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE**: That's right. **PROFESSOR FULLER**: That statement is also an amendment of the recommendation of the Constitution and By-Laws Committee. The By-Laws proposal by the committee was that the ballot shall slate at least 10 more nominees than the number of persons to be elected. **EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE**: So the underlined words, "shall contain twice the number of" is also an amendment. Since we did not discuss that I shall ask if there is any discussion of the requirement that the ballot shall contain twice the number of nominees as the number of persons to be elected? **APPROVED.**
ARTICLE II, Section D, Number 4c, "add at the end of paragraph 4c - Any candidate nominated for membership on the Council shall be provided the opportunity to file a written statement of not more than fifty (50) words to accompany the ballot." APPROVED.

ARTICLE III, Section B, Number 12a, "First sentence, change "five" to "seven". APPROVED.

ARTICLE III, Section C, "Delete "Committee on Review of Tenure Policies and Procedures" and insert IUPUI Tenure Committee. This occurs in: Heading of Section C, and paragraph 1 and 4." APPROVED.

ARTICLE III, Section C, Number 4b, "Delete 'when controversy arises'." APPROVED.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Mr. Parliamentarian, do we now need to vote on these as a whole or is that sufficient the way it was done? PROFESSOR ROTH: My impression is that you could have voted on them at one time.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Those constitute amendments to this document which you all have in your files as a report from the Constitution and By-Laws Committee and these matters which we passed today constitute amendments to them. If I understand our situation we are now ready to vote on this document as a whole having voted on each section of it separately. Are there any questions about that. Dr. Fuller do you wish to make a motion to approve this as amended? PROFESSOR FULLER: Yes, I'd be glad to but I wonder if I need to since it was a recommendation of the committee.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: You don't need to but I thought I'd give you the honor. PROFESSOR FULLER: I gratefully accept the honor and I move the adoption of the document as amended. MOTION CARRIED ON ENTIRE DOCUMENT PROPOSED BY THE CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS COMMITTEE AS AMENDED.

PROFESSOR ROTH: Am I right in assuming that this goes into effect now? The question that I am raising is this Council has now approved as its By-Laws seven members on its Nominating Committee. We've only elected three. Therefore, my question is will we be electing at the next meeting another 4 members to the Nominating Committee for next year. PROFESSOR NATHAN: We have asked on the ballot for the Constitutional amendments that the amendments in which passes become effective upon adoption of them which would be this month. I would therefore encourage us to have the By-Laws effective immediately so that the pieces of the whole puzzle fit together properly.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Can these By-Laws be effected prior to the adoption of the Constitution? PROFESSOR NATHAN: The motion can be made that way i.e., upon the adoption of the Constitution ... PROFESSOR FULLER: I'm sorry but I disagree with you. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Since this body has just expressed it's sentiment in favor of a Nominating Committee with 7 people on it and since this is the only pressing issue, I would think that common sense would rule our behavior and would suggest that we have a Nominating Committee of 7 people. Is there any objection if we do that? PROFESSOR LAUBE: We are now preparing a slate for May, do you mean that we have to stop and get some more people before we present this slate in May? PROFESSOR ROTH: I wouldn't think so. Which committee is in process? PROFESSOR NATHAN: The one just elected last month. PROFESSOR LAUBE: We have not presented a report.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Are you going to move that we elect 4 more people now to the Nominating Committee.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: So ordered.

Agenda Item 5: New Business

PROFESSOR MCGEEVER: Is there any point at which this body will be asked to recommend for or against the plan for the long session in the summer schedule? EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Yes, in May.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: I should like to invite each of you and your husband, or wife, or your friend to our residence immediately following the next meeting of the Faculty Council which is on May 3 to sort of wrap up the Faculty Council for this academic year and I hope all of you or as many of you as wish can come to that reception. You will be hearing from us by invitation.

The meeting was adjourned.

Carol Nathan, Secretary
IUPUI Faculty Council
1. Approval of the March 15 and April 5 meeting.

The minutes of March 15 and April 5 were approved as distributed.

2. Presiding Officer's Business

Ten years of accomplishments

3. Executive Committee Report

1979-81 Unit Representatives

TWO YEARS

Elaine Alton; School of Science
Leon Bourke; School of Liberal Arts
David Burnett; School of Continuing Studies
Sarah Burns; Herron School of Arts
Carol Cecere; School of Nursing
Carol Deets; School of Nursing
Ronald Dehnke; School of Education
Dennis Dipert; Division of Allied Health Sciences
James Faris; School of Medicine
Wilmer Fife; School of Science
Car! Fuller; School of Medicine
Donald Gartner; Division of Allied Health Sciences
Meredith Hull; School of Medicine
Barbara Jackson; School of Liberal Arts
Richard Lawlor; School of Medicine
Richard Lawrence; School of Social Work
Douglas Maxwell; School of Medicine
Leo McCarthy; School of Medicine
Terry Reed; School of Medicine
Fred Schoen; School of Medicine
Robert Strawbridge; School of Medicine
Donald Tharp; School of Dentistry
Kathleen Warfel; School of Medicine
Gerald Zimmerman; School of Medicine

ONE YEAR

Robert David; School of Science

University Faculty Council At-Large Representatives

Margaret Applegate; School of Nursing
Jerri Laube; School of Nursing
Carleton Nordschow; School of Medicine

Circular number for January 19, 1979 Constitution and By-Laws

Committee Report is IUPUI-119/78-79

Report of the Nominating Committee

Secretary
* Miriam Langsam; School of Liberal Arts
  Elizabeth Solow; School of Medicine

Executive Committee
* Richard Beck; School of Engineering and Technology
* Billie Bond; School of Nursing
  Ronald Dehnke; School of Education
* Jean Gnat; University Libraries
  Carlyn Johnson; School of Public and Environmental Affairs
  Kenry Karlson; School of Law
* Michael Penna; School of Science
* Robert Shellhammer; School of Medicine
* Donald Tharp; School of Dentistry
* Brian Vargus; School of Liberal Arts

* Newly elected
Report of the Nominating Committee Continued

* Newly elected

Tenure Committee

Michael Cohen; School of Education
* Barbara Fischler; University Libraries
* Hilda Frazier; School of Nursing
* Ned Hornback; School of Medicine
Walter Lienert; School of Physical Education
Harry Reichelt; School of Liberal Arts

Report of the Secretary

Recommendations:
1. That the Secretary meet with the Parliamentarian prior to each Faculty Council meeting to review the agenda, for parliamentary implications,
2. That the Council members who are on the University Faculty Council report to the IUPUI Faculty Council following each meeting of the University Faculty Council,
3. That reports of standing committees be duplicated and distributed to all faculty in a separate booklet including the annual report of the Secretary at the close of each academic year,
4. That this issue of attendance at Faculty Council meetings be addressed either by the units or the Council itself,
5. That a reciprocal liaison system between the Staff Council and the Faculty Council be established in the 1979–80 academic year.

4. Old Business

Report of results of amendments to IUPUI Faculty Constitution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation No.</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation No. 1</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation No. 2</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation No. 3</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation No. 4</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation No. 5</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation No. 6</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The amendments which pass should become effective upon adoption by the IUPUI faculty.

Motion by chair of the Constitution and By-Laws Committee (Carl Fuller) "That the Faculty Council instruct the Committee on Committees (Executive Committee) to undertake revision of the charge to each standing committee of the faculty so as to define clearly each standing committee's authority and responsibility."

Report of the Academic Affairs Committee

Motion: Reduction in part-time faculty and one 8-week summer session.

5. New Business

Executive Committee recommendations for deletion of the Resources and Planning Committee and a definition of the charge to the Fringe Benefit Committee.

The Circular IUPUI-121/78-79 was passed with the following amendment:

Section E, 5, Line 1
Delete: "the principals in any case, by"
Minutes of
IUPUI Faculty Council Meeting
May 3, 1979, 3:30 P.M., School of Law, Room 116

Present: Vice President Irwin; Executive Dean Moore; Deans: Beering, Francois, Kellum, Nevill, Renda, Weber;


Absent: Deans: Bonser, Harvey, Schneiderman, Stonehill; Professors: Applegate, Balcavage, Fedor, Frank, Metzger, Sagraves, Sartoris, Sherrill, Tennant, Wall, Wallihan.

Visitors: Kenneth Beckley, Beth Brown, Paul Schnepf, William Spencer.

Agenda Item 1: Approval of the Minutes of March 15 and April 5, 1979.

The minutes of March 15 and April 5 were approved as distributed.

Agenda Item 2: Presiding Officer's Business

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Since this is the last session of the Council for this academic year, I thought I would spend just a few minutes reminding all of us that this is the 10th anniversary of IUPUI. Things, it seems to most of us, move very slowly at this institution, but when you reflect on what has happened during those ten years it is a remarkable number of things. We had about 13,000 students ten years ago. Last year, as you know, we had 21,000 and we dropped this year to about 20,000 students. During that period of time, we have either completed or will have under construction this year about $135 million worth of new construction on this West Michigan Street campus. No other campus in Indiana totals that figure in new construction. Currently, we have about $42 million under construction.

When we start building new parking garages, you are really going to know that something is happening. That may be a problem for us this summer, but that's progress. We'll try to have the temporary lots operational as soon as possible. During the ten-year period of time, we have increased the size of the faculty. I'm sure the deans don't really believe that, but we had about 800 full-time faculty ten years ago and we have a little over 1,200 now. We have at least that many part-time people who make a very important contribution to this institution. So I think with those few highlights of what we have done, I'll conclude by saying that I am pleased with the things that we have done, such as this Council. We didn't have this Council ten years ago. I think that we have sorted out a lot of the academic missions. There always needs to be improvement. I think that this faculty has accomplished some remarkable innovations in education and every school can be complimented on what they have in this ten year period of time.

Agenda Item 3: Executive Committee Report

PROFESSOR NATHAN: First of all, I would like to announce the newly elected unit representatives to the IUPUI Faculty Council which you will find listed on the circular marked 5/3-A. If you did not receive it as you came in, pick one up on your way out of the room. The names of these individuals will be listed as a part of the minutes of this meeting.

Secondly, we had the election for University Faculty Council at-large representatives. The University Faculty Council representatives will be Margaret Applegate, School of Nursing; Carleton Nordschow, School of Medicine; Jerri Laube, School of Nursing. We have eight other representatives who will also be attending the University Faculty Council. These are the only three that we needed to elect this time.

You remember a few meetings back we received this yellow document which included the Constitution and By-Laws amendments, recommended by the Constitution and By-Laws Committee. I would like to put a Circular number on that yellow document so that any of you who did retain it can mark it for your files. It should be IUPUI-119/78-79.
If there is no objection, we would like to move the report of the Nominating Committee to this point on the agenda so that we can proceed with the elections and hopefully have the results before we leave the room. Is there any objection to moving the Nominating Committee Report? [There was no objection.]

REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE

PROFESSOR LAUBE: I think all of you received a copy of our report. We tried to run a double slate for every office and I have to tell you that it was difficult because we had to work in the constraints of continuing membership. I think all of the schools and all of the units are represented but in some cases did not have a complete double slate. For Secretary, we ran two and we elect one, for Executive Committee, we ran ten and we elect seven, and for the Tenure Committee, we have six and we elect three. I move the Nominating Committee Report be accepted. MOTION PASSED.

PROFESSOR NATHAN: I would like to have Carl Rothe explain to you what we are going to do at this point in regard to the floor nominees. Our old By-Laws allowed us to have nominations from the floor, the new By-Laws under which we are now operating, call for a different system and no nominations from the floor.

PROFESSOR ROTHE: If I read Robert’s Rules of Order correctly, they say an amendment to the By-Laws goes into effect immediately from its adoption unless the motion to adopt specifies another time for it to become effective. It did not and therefore we are to assume that our current By-Laws are in effect. This would then suggest there would not be nominations from the floor. On the other hand, it was my understanding that the Nominating Committee did not have time to solicit from the Council names of other nominees that are listed. One way out of the dilemma is to say, if there is unanimous consent, someone could make nominations from the floor. The other way out of the dilemma is that no one would make any nominations from the floor. If there is no objection, we would like to move the Nominating Committee Report. [There was no objection.]

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Does anyone wish to make any nominations from the floor? PROFESSOR SEIBERT: I would like to move that nominations be closed. Seconded. MOTION PASSED.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: The following people are tellers: Mary Kimball, Jerri Laube, Mary Lee Seibert (chair), and Charles Yokomoto. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: If you will mark your ballots and pass them all over to this end of the row, the tellers will collect them and count them. When they have completed their count, if they will notify the chairman, we will then announce the results.

PROFESSOR NATHAN: Now, if we could come back to my report for just a moment. I would just like to give you a short report from the Secretary. You may remember that during the Spring Faculty/Staff meeting I gave you a summary of some of the things that have been accomplished over the past couple of years and I do plan to submit an annual report with the committee reports in a separate binder which you will receive some time during the summer. I do not plan to go into that today but as I leave the office of Secretary, I would like to make the following recommendations to be addressed at the discretion of the new Secretary and Executive Committee: (1) that the Secretary meet with the Parliamentarian prior to each Faculty Council meeting to review the agenda, for parliamentary implications, (2) that the Council members who are on the University Faculty Council report to the IUPUI Faculty Council following each meeting of the University Faculty Council (I think there needs to be more of a relationship between the University Faculty Council and the action of this Council.) (3) that reports of standing committees be duplicated and distributed to all faculty in a separate booklet including the annual report of the Secretary at the close of each academic year, (4) that the issue of attendance at Faculty Council meetings be addressed either by the units or the Council itself (There are members who have never attended a meeting. This is too bad when there are numbers of faculty who would be most interested in being actually involved in the Council.), (5) that a reciprocal liaison system between the Staff Council and the Faculty Council be established in the 1979-80 academic year. I think there are some mutual issues which these two Councils could work on and it would be helpful to have communication between the two. I will make further recommendations about Council procedures to the new Secretary.

I want to express my thanks to the members of the Executive Committee and the chairpersons of the standing committees. My special thanks and recognition to the Constitution and By-Laws Committee and the Faculty Affairs Committee for their diligent and thorough work this year and last. At the risk of leaving someone out I wish to express my personal thanks to Pat Blake, who has acted as my unofficial assistant, Miriam Langsam for her exceptional work in the difficult area of fringe benefits, Henry Beach for his excellent, good humored assistance on the Nominating Committee, Kent Sharp for his undaunted interest, support and assistance in the work of the Council, and of course, Pam Daupert, who has provided moral support as well as efficient Faculty Council Office management. Dr. Irwin and Dr. Moore provide strong, firm support for Council activities. As you all know, Dr. Moore is an ex officio member of the Executive Committee and assists the Secretary in any way he can. I once mentioned to him that I appreciated the help and support he was providing and his answer was, "The position of Secretary of the Faculty Council is a difficult one and I try to provide as much help as I can." We are indeed fortunate to have an administration with that kind of commitment to the faculty. Thank you Ed, Glenn, and thank you all.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: I have been asked by the Executive Committee to offer the following resolution: "This resolution affirms the high regard in which Carol Nathan is held among the community of scholars at Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis where she has completed two years of service as Secretary of the Faculty Council. She has managed to cope with the eccentricities of the faculty and with the arbitrariness of the administration with remarkable patience and aplomb. She has undergone hundreds of hours of interminable meetings, involving thousands of hair-splitting debates, through all of which she has maintained commendable
Professor Nathan: First of all, I would like to announce the results of the constitutional amendments. I do not have these recommendations listed by subject so you will have to look them up. They all passed. Recommendation 1 passed at 240 to 10, Recommendation 2 passed at 241 to 10, Recommendation No. 3 passed 238 to 12, Recommendation No. 4 passed at 237 to 14, Recommendation No. 5 passed 236 to 15, Recommendation No. 6 passed 238 to 12, and the fact that the amendments which passed should become effective upon adoption by the IUPUI faculty 221 to 8.

Now, I would like to call upon Carl Fuller for restatement of a recommendation made by the Constitution and By-Laws Committee that we would like to have officially put into the minutes. Professor Fuller: In the old By-Laws, in the section that referred to the Committee On Committees, there was a statement which defined one of that committee's responsibilities as the following, "To make recommendations to the Council concerning the establishment of new committees, abolition of existing committees, or modification of the charge to any committee." Because that responsibility was stated specifically as a responsibility of the Committee On Committees, the Constitution and By-Laws Committee did not attempt to amend any portion of the By-Laws which concerns the standing committees and their charges. Instead, the committee recommended in its report to the Council among all of these amendments the following: "That the Faculty Council instruct the Committee On Committees (Executive Committee) to undertake revision of the charge to each standing committee of the faculty so as to define clearly each standing committee's authority and responsibility." That recommendation was presented as a part of the original report from the Constitution and By-Laws Committee and has not been acted on by the Council. Now the constitutional vote is before the House. Professor Nathan: I might explain that the Executive Committee has begun to work on this by reviewing all of the standing committees and their activities but to actually restate and clarify the charges, and, if you remember, that section of the By-Laws is very vague. That has not been done and I am in agreement with Carl that this needs to be addressed during the next academic year and would support this motion. Motion Passed.

Report of the Academic Affairs Committee

Professor McClear: I would like to apologize for not being here for the last meeting to give the report but I think that it was in the best interest that it was not given last month. The Academic Affairs Committee was asked by the administration to find out the feelings of the faculty concerning an 8-week summer session as opposed to two 6-week summer sessions. In so doing we found the faculty to be varied in their response over two major areas and these came out as the feelings of the faculty to present to the Faculty Council for discussion or consideration or to the administration for consideration. One was, academically many faculty felt that an 8-week summer session was much more feasible from an instructional point of view, that it was much easier to pack 16 weeks into 8-weeks than it was 6-weeks. From the academic point of view, many faculty were in favor of the 8-week summer session. However, many faculty were also concerned and equally concerned that if we move to an 8-week summer session this would be done at the expense of offering fewer courses at IUPUI in the summer sessions. Their concern in that area was that we would be attracting fewer students to our courses and hence might potentially lose student population to Lafayette and Bloomington campuses. So to summarize, those were the two major points of view of the faculty. They are concerned with lack of summer jobs and lack of summer courses on the one hand and on the other hand they wanted the 8-week summer session academically for better teaching of content. I'd say it was split about 50-50 and that basically was what we were asked to report on. At this point, where it goes, I don't know.

Executive Dean Moore: Well, normally a committee makes a recommendation, do you have one? Professor McClear: I would presume that the committee would like to recommend that we move to an 8-week summer session but offer at least as many total courses as we have been offering with the two 6-week summer sessions.

Executive Dean Moore: Well, since that is from the committee we will take that a motion and take it as seconded. I would like to comment if it is proper? I don't believe there are any serious problems with the recommendation that Mr. McClear has made but I would like to speak to the general question and say that I did ask the committee to look at this question for the following reasons: that somewhere during the next year we are going to have to make some reduction in our part-time faculty offerings. We have basically only three options: the fall semester, the spring semester, or the summer sessions. The summer sessions that we presently operate are two 6-week sessions. We are, so far as I know, the only campus in the state and the only one in the United States that I know of that does that. A normal summer session is 8-weeks. In Bloomington they have one 8-week summer session followed by a 6-week summer session. At any rate the option of condensing the two 6-week sessions into one 8-week session would make it possible for us to continue the same number of full-time faculty that we have had in the two 6-week summer sessions but would allow us to reduce the part-time faculty. We estimate a minimum saving of $200,000 and we somehow have to recover that order of magnitude and, if possible, a little more to...
balance the books for next year. I did talk to the academic deans about this and there was practically unanimous agreement that this was feasible and academically desirable. It was at that point that I asked Mr. McLear to have the committee look at it. I am not sure that we really have an option. I don't think that anybody is prepared to deny that we could take the money that we do use for a single 8-week session and spread it over two 6-week sessions, this could certainly be done. My own feeling is though, that it would leave those two 6-week sessions so lean that students would be reluctant to register for either of them because they would have difficulty getting more than one of the courses that they felt that they might need. Since there is the academic merit of having the offerings over an 8-week period rather than the 6-week, I asked the committee to look at this.

I do support the recommendation of the committee. Regarding student enrollment, of course, no one knows what will happen. In a way it is an experiment. It may be a disaster as an experiment, I don't think it would be but it may not turn out as well as we think. We have computed our situation and if we had a 20% drop in enrollment over what we would get in the two semesters or the two sessions then we still feel that it would be an economically sound proposition for us. So those are some of the points raised by Mr. McLear that I thought I might address.

PROFESSOR MEIERE: I have several unrelated things to say but they are on the subject. I greatly appreciate the comments of Professor McLear and I probably agree with him on most points but I don't consider that as a recommendation of the committee, if I understood the remarks. I thought that was a personal summary of what was discussed and I don't want to make a big stink but I would like to politely say I don't think that is the recommendation of the committee.

PROFESSOR MCLEAR: Let me respond to that. The committee has not met as a whole. Most of the members of the committee have discussed this over the phone and had brought it to their respective schools and have discussed it with their faculty. We did not go out and take votes, measure and count.

PROFESSOR MEIERE: I will probably ask the parliamentarian in a minute if that is an official report.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: I think we ought to settle that point now. Whether it is or not Mr. McLear made the motion and Miss Langsam seconded it so it is a motion before the floor and it really doesn't matter whether it comes from the committee or from him personally.

PROFESSOR MEIERE: Is that an acceptable committee report?

PROFESSOR ROTH: It has been said that it is not a committee report, it's a motion from a member of the Council and it was seconded.

PROFESSOR MEIERE: Just as long as it is not a committee report.

Second point, apparently one important issue of the finances is the part-time budget and I think the members of the faculty that I talked to and my personal opinion is that I heartedly agree with the possibility of cutting summer offerings taught by part-time faculty. I will even go stronger. Personally, I think it is really a shame if the university offers any part-time offerings when there are full-time faculty who don't have jobs in courses that students demand. I think university-wide in the summer-time we can offer courses by full-time faculty and cut out the part-time offerings. Last, but not least, I am personally in favor of the 6-week sessions. I recall a number of years ago being told that we have to go to 6-week sessions as opposed to 8-week sessions to generate a lot of money which I was not quite so sure was quite the relevant thing. I was much more concerned about academic quality. If I understand correctly there are units that are offering courses during the summer on an 8-week basis when they think that that has to be done even though the primary program is based on a 6-week session. The one thing that I was not aware of six years ago but what I am acutely aware of now is that some students take sequences of courses. They take the first course in the first session and the second course in the second session. In some cases I think that is academically viable and would assert that that would not happen in a single 8-week summer session. It would be obvious therefore that the academic quality of the program is affected.

PROFESSOR MCGEEVER: I asked people in my school about the impact of changing from two summer sessions to one particularly with respect to the sentiment that this would not reduce teaching opportunities for full-time faculty. I have been informed by several departments that at the present time they are not able to give the full-time faculty as much teaching as they would like to have or feel that they need to have. Therefore, if two sessions are going to be reduced to one I think that it is relatively clear that these opportunities are going to be reduced. So I hope that we don't go ahead on the assumption that this is not going to affect the full-time faculty because it is in some departments.

PROFESSOR MCGEEVER: If people are not able to offer courses now and . . .

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Who's going to stop them? You've got the money. If you don't use it I can't help that but nobody is taking any money away from what is available for full-time faculty. I said that.

PROFESSOR MCGEEVER: You're talking about enrollment though, aren't you Ed?

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: If there is no enrollment we shouldn't be offering the course in either session.

PROFESSOR MCGEEVER: It seems to me that if you are offering two distinct sessions, a student can take both sessions at a maximum of 12 hours and there is no way they can do that in one single session. I think that different groups of students come along at different points in the summer. It just seems obvious to me that going to a telescoped single session we are going to lose some enrollment and thereby cut back teaching opportunities. Frankly, I'm willing to support the proposal if I'm convinced that it is economically necessary if summer sessions are in fact a money loser if they are a real drain on the university and so forth but I want to be very careful that we reach that point before we make this kind of decision because I'm worried about something like a tailspin effect. We have experienced reductions in enrollment and we have a bit of a budget crunch on our hands but if our reaction to that is to reduce our offerings then enrollment goes down again, there is more of a budget crunch, and you might get into a tailspin psychology. I know that these are just small incremental changes but if that psychology begins to take over I think that it might have serious effect. But as I say if it is such a drain on the university at the present
time, maybe it is time to take this step. I don't want to push the panic button too early and regret it in a year or two years from now. PROFESSOR LANGSAM: I have a slightly different concern. One of the things that concerns me is the calendar. One of the things that many of us count on during the summer is students who are teachers during the regular year. I think that I would feel a lot less less less about an 8-week session if I were sure that our starting of the session would allow us, especially during the daytime to pick up teachers who want to take courses. Now in some of the programs that are totally full-time programs, this is not critical. For those of us who have courses or graduate programs that people who are teachers attend I think that this is very important. I do remember that just recently some school board down in southern Indiana got us to change our calendar and I would think that if we went to an 8-week session that such a factor would determine when that 8-week session started. That could put us into an unfavorable position with our constituents in the nine-county area in which we are primarily serving teachers. I would just like to register that concern.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Well, I think that I should respond to that briefly. I did talk to Paul Watson about this and he said there would be no problem. Just to give you some dates and it does not have anything to do with that school board down south, if we did do it for the summer of 1980 which is what we are talking about we would have summer registration on May 29 and the first class on Friday, May 30. This would mean that teachers who are not available at all until the first of June would still only miss one class. They would end on this schedule on the 25th of July.

PROFESSOR PENNA: As far as this is concerned, I would like to also point out that I heard the comments concerning this particular issue that there is an argument on the other side. It goes to the effect that if we play it like this that some teachers won't be able to have any summer vacation at all because of this arrangement of the summer schedule. It goes deeper than this though, I think that we are starting to argue this. The School of Science faculty had a great opportunity to discuss this and I think they came to one conclusion, that there are two different sides to this issue. One side is financial and the other side is academic. I think the academic side can be argued both ways and you could argue it endlessly. The financial side is the side that initially concerns us. The thing is that as far as so many of the faculty are concerned what Dean Moore said is that it will be primarily from the part-time faculty. Now no one was sure what primarily was supposed to mean, if it would extend over to full-time. As far as that is concerned the full-time faculty are extremely concerned about the fact that this comes down to taking the food out of the mouths of faculty and the people that they support. The people on 10-month contracts are going to realize that this is not an over exaggeration. Because that it really affects the 10-month people so drastically, I would encourage anybody who is on 12-month appointments to abstain from voting on this issue. Second of all, I would like to point out the fact that there is adequate opportunity for those who want to teach in the summer to do so is a big plus for IUPUI. The financial implications of this proposal seems to negate this. In particular, I think that this proposal would tend to point us in the direction of the junior college. Faculty who would necessarily be drawn away from their academic best interest in the summer to financially support themselves. Faculty would be drawn away from their research, which is of importance insofar as promotion and tenure are concerned. Faculty would necessarily assume that working at IUPUI is just another part-time job. The third point that I want to make is that if this plan is advisable or must be answered, from an administrative point of view, I would like to report that an overwhelming majority of the faculty that I have talked to are interested in "Why this plan?" "Why must money be saved here? Why are there no better plans, no better places, in the budget for us to save?"

PROFESSOR METZ: I find myself a little confused about the part-time and full-time. If you hire a full-time person in the summer are you paying them the full-time salary or are you paying them in part-time salary? EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Full-time. PROFESSOR METZ: Based on this full-time, isn't this one of the problems in the summer budget that often a part-time person is hired to teach a summer class because they can't afford to hire the full-time person? EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Well, the summer budget makes available certain dollars which are used for full-time faculty and other dollars that are used for part-time faculty. Now I don't think that Mr. Penna meant to question my word but if he did what I can say publicly is that it is not my expectation that any full-time faculty who have usually been teaching in the summer will fail to get teaching appointments in the summer. PROFESSOR PENNA: I apologize if it sounds as if I am questioning your word. Coming into this meeting the only thing that I had to go by was the minutes of the last meeting which used the word "primarily" and it bothered several people and nobody seemed to understand why.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Well, I'm glad you raised it because when I use primarily I mean entirely and solely and from no other source. DEAN WOLF: We looked at the calendar and we do have some concerns. What I understood was that if we move to an 8-week session there would be some flexibility with regard to beginning and ending. As far as the School of Education is concerned we would have some concerns about that because most of the school corporations in our area will run into the first week and many of them through the second week.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: There is a flexibility for evening classes. DEAN WOLF: I guess that is the kind of question that I am raising.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: But not for daytime classes. I think there is no real problem for you, but if there is we can work it out.

PROFESSOR DEHNKE: The School of Education did have some concerns. They felt that the 6-week summer sessions would affect the two of them, benefited the student. One of the them has already been mentioned, that students could complete 12-hours of course work in the summer. Some of our teachers could take the first summer session in June and have the remainder of the summer to be with their families. It is conceivable that many of the students who are undergraduates support themselves in school. With two 6-week sessions conceivably they could take one 6-week session and have a job during the other. We felt that the 8-week term would have these disadvantages. If, depending when it started, it conceivably could take up the entire summer for teachers. Our own faculty,
those who are younger and of school age, if they are teaching a summer session would have little or no time with their children. If we started an 8-week session in the middle of May, we feel that it would affect the enrollment of our graduate program as someone has already mentioned.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Well, maybe I ought to speak to one or two points. There seems to be a lot of discussion about whether we do this or not. Now I don't have any big hang up about doing it in the summer. The point is that we are $500,000 short in balancing our budget. You can't nickle-and-dime a half of a million dollars. (I'm talking about in the non-health area.) You have to find some places to take this money where you are going to pick up at least half of it and you can go out and try to find $60,000 here, and there and wind it down. Now, we have said for years on this campus that we are not in desperate straits with regard to a drop in enrollment because we have so many part-time faculty. We don't have to get hung up with getting 90% tenured faculty or 100% tenured faculty in a department. When the crunch comes we see how we can handle it. All right, ladies and gentlemen, the crunch has come. The crunch is not likely to go away. It is not likely to get any less, it is likely to get worse and you're going to have to begin to face the fact that you are going to have to do some things differently from what they have been done in the past. I hope that I am not proposing that we do things that will reduce the quality of the programs but there are going to be some things done that will reduce the quantity of the programs. They may continue. I don't know what's going to happen next fall to our enrollment. We're guessing but it's strictly a guess. Nobody among us big brains up here guessed a 5% drop in enrollment in the fall of 1978. We guessed a 5% increase. Now if that enrollment snaps back in the fall of next year as we expect then we may be able to ride the year out better but if it doesn't or if it is worse than it was this year, this cut in the summer session budget is going to look like gravy to you because we are going to have to take another and a tougher bite. So we are talking about an economic question, we're talking about how in the opinion of the faculty we can best face it. But the other thing to keep in mind is that something like 70% of our budget is in personnel. You need to be prepared to cut personnel some way. You can only cut the other 30% so much. And we have cut it, believe me we have and I'm willing to go over this with anybody. There are only personnel left really and that's why we are down to these kinds of questions. So I don't know to what extent that speaks to your concern. It's all right with me if you don't want to do it. I can spread it out evenly over the fall, spring and summer. I can take it all out of the spring, I can take it all out of the fall, or I can take it all out of the summer but those are the options. It is a dollar question but I was hoping that the question would not be decided in terms of dollars but in terms of what we could do academically to preserve as much quality as possible.

PROFESSOR METZ: I think that I agree with everything that you said. The one thing that I seemed to miss is how that has anything to do with whether we offer two 6-week sessions or one 8-week session? In the minutes of the last meeting, and I hope that I am not quoting out of context, the dollar amount savings in the summer would be $150,000-$200,000. I think that I made it quite clear that I agree wholeheartedly with the suggestion of taking the money out of part-time in the summer. Do I conclude properly that there is somewhere between $150,000 and $200,000 worth of money being paid to people who teach part-time in the summer.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: More than that.

PROFESSOR MEIERE: I say cut that out and I say let's go with the two 6-week sessions.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Well, I thought I spoke to the two 6-week summer sessions point earlier but I will repeat one thing that I said. That is the question that your offerings are so slim in both sessions that neither session is attractive to the student because he just can't get enough to make it worth his while. I'm kind of surpised at the School of Science as it seems to me that, academically, the courses that are suffering the most quality wise by having 6-week offerings are the laboratory courses in Science. It's a mistake to offer those courses in 6-weeks and the faculty ought not be proud of the fact that it is doing it. Those courses ought to be offered in no less than 8-weeks. So in that circumstance I find it strange to have this strong sentiment from the School of Science.

PROFESSOR METZ: I have taught several chemistry courses during the dummer and I find no fault with my students in the laboratory, I don't know what your argument is here. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: What is your schedule?

PROFESSOR METZ: We meet three times a week for a particular course that I involved in for 2 1/2 hours each day. The lecture section is 2 1/2 hour for 4 days a week before that.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: So students that take that course can take nothing else. They are taking nothing but chemistry, they are taking it every day either a lecture or a lab section and this is all they are doing for 6-weeks.

PROFESSOR SHARP: I have great difficulty in trying to teach lecture and laboratory courses in the period of 6-weeks in the summer. It just doesn't work out well.

PROFESSOR BLAKE: One other comment, I think there were several who spoke to sequencing courses. I think there is another side where the student might take a six or eight-week course and want to take 6 hours in that period and use the rest of the summer to have a vacation. So I think if you are in a specialty area, Liberal Arts or whatever, if you could look at your program and plan for several courses that don't conflict the majority of the students would be accommodated. I also think that if you give public notice that this is going to happen and you have better academic counseling, and I'm not saying that it isn't good now because I have no idea, but I think those things could be worked through. I have also taught a clinical course in 6-weeks and it is very difficult. The contact hours, the reading assignments, what the student can retain is very difficult.
PROFESSOR VARGUS: I just have a question of clarification. As I recall, you said something about Bloomington now has an 8-week and a 6-week. Will Bloomington continue with their second 6-week session? Is that a decision that they are to make down there?

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: We have enough trouble trying to keep the regular academic year calendars together without trying to do that in the summer session.

PROFESSOR LANGSAM: I think what is going to happen and what is happening is that each of us is arguing for our own course and from our own perspective and I think that somewhere we are going to have to stop and try to consider the total school package and the well-being of the school. I think that everybody here will say, and I think that Forrest will agree, that part-timers are not what we want. I think that I hear Forrest saying that he is trying to protect and insure the continued employment of full-timers. I think that we now get to the point where we have to get the money and I for one would say as best as we can, trust administrators and as best as they can deal it. We're just going to have take a vote and decide yes or no. It seems to me that they money issue is the issue. I hate to say this but I have served on this Council so long that I was part of the original decision group that fought against going to the 6-week sessions. I am still unhappy with the 8-week session but I think that we can live with it provided that the dates are right and provided that we get into the habit of making some changes. I think that as long as it is a more significant protection of the quality of our offerings and the protection of our jobs it should be tried. (I'm sorry that there are colleagues that can't be with their children. You should work for the state. After ten years you'll get two weeks if you're lucky. You either teach or be with your family.) I move the previous question.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: We're voting on the previous question, which is the question of closing debate. An affirmative vote means that you wish to close debate and take a vote on the issue and a negative vote means you wish the debate to continue. PROFESSOR NATHAN: Point of order. I think that the rule is that if you speak to an issue you cannot then move the previous question, so if someone else wants to move the previous question and does not speak to the issue then that's all right. PROFESSOR PEREZ: I move the previous question. PROFESSOR MEIERE: Point of order, Mr. Parliamentarian, is the person that made that motion recognized by the chair? I feel that people who wanted to say something got axed. I think that that was just yelled out. Is that in order? PROFESSOR ROTHE: Yes. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Well, we are not trying to be arbitrary, you understand Forrest that the purpose of calling for the previous question is to squelch debate? That is the point of it. That might mean that their minds are closed but whatever it means that's what it means. I'm willing to recommend to you that we extend the courtesy of one more set of remarks if you feel that if you have been unduly suppressed. Do you want to say something?

PROFESSOR MEIERE: Yes, I was going to ask the person who made the motion if he would agree to splitting it into two parts, one if the crunch comes to cut the part-time and the second part is something about the 6-week/8-week summer session? EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Well, Paul do you want to split your motion?

PROFESSOR MCLEAR: I don't mind splitting it. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Well, then the motion belongs to the House and the House needs to decide whether it wants to split the motion and it's on the floor for that decision.

PROFESSOR MCLEAR: I move the motion be split. Seconded.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: What is your sentiment? Those who wish to split the motion say yea and those who do not say nay. MOTION PASSED TO SPLIT. Vote was taken for a reduction in part-time faculty. MOTION PASSED. Vote was taken for one 8-week summer session or two 6-week summer sessions. MOTION PASSED FOR 8-WEEK SUMMER SESSION YES-38 and NO-17.

PROFESSOR DENHKE: Has the body voted in favor of an 8-week session with the exclusion of part-time faculty?

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Yes. PROFESSOR DENHKE: I think they voted themselves an impossible task.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Well, we'll have to see. That's a function of the administration to carry out impossible tasks. I'm sorry I did not answer your question properly. They did not vote it with the exclusion of part-time faculty. They voted it with the reduction that may be necessary to come from part-time faculty funds, which will still leave us with part-time faculty funds.

DEAN RENDA: Ed, are we talking about part-time faculty funds during the academic year or part-time faculty funds during the summer? EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Summer. DEAN RENDA: Now to my understanding, to my knowledge, there is no distinction in the part-time money that say that 80% is full-time faculty and 20% is part-time faculty. It's still the 'x'-amount of dollars. So it's going to be an arbitrary decision of a sort. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Not necessarily. Dean Renda, I will get together with the deans and we will work this out but I don't want to discuss this in a group this size. DEAN RENDA: When I said arbitrary I wasn't talking about the deans doing it arbitrarily. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: If we have the 8-week summer session it would start May 30 and end July 25? EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Yes. DEAN FRANCOIS: How would it be budgeted 50-50, 50% from this year's budget and 50% from next years budget?

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: That looks about right. It's a function of when the pay periods come not of when the work is done. But off hand I would assume that 50% in summer II and 50% in Summer I, 50% out of the 1979-80 budget and 50% out of next years budget.

PROFESSOR ROTHE: What is the definition of full-time and part-time particularly in terms of the 10-month appointee?

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Full-time is someone who is on 10-months full-time or 12-months full-time.

PROFESSOR ROTHE: Now if you're on full-time 10-months and they work this 8-week summer session which is two months will they receive, if they work full-time, two months of salary as they have been before?

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Yes. PROFESSOR ROTHE: So then they will be the same as the 12-month appointment.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Even better because they will get two months of vacation.
Agenda Item 5: New Business

PROFESSOR NATHAN: I would like to go to a little old business before we move on. We have the report of the tally on the vote and the chair has asked me to report this. The new Secretary of the Faculty Council will be Miriam Langsam. The new Executive Committee: Richard Beck, Billie Bond, Jean Gnatt, Michael Penna, Robert Shellymer, Don Tharp, and Brian Vargus. The new Tenure Committee will be Barbara Fischler, Hilda Frazier, and Ned Hornback. May I hear a motion to destroy the ballots? Moved and seconded. MOTION CARRIED. May I have another motion to destroy the ballots from the University Faculty Council elections. Moved and seconded. MOTION CARRIED.

Two items that I feel come under the motion that Carl Fuller made a while ago to have the Executive Committee review the charges and definitions of the standing committees are that the Executive Committee will be forwarding to the Constitution and By-Laws Committee for their review and recommendation two areas in the standing committee listing in the By-Laws. This is for your information. The Executive Committee is going to recommend the deletion of the Resources and Planning Committee at the recommendation of that committee. You have some information in your agendas regarding that. We will be asking for the deletion of ARTICLE III, Section B, Number 9. The Constitution and By-Laws Committee may act on that as they see fit and report back in the fall. The second recommendation from the Executive Committee related to the Fringe Benefits Committee which you may have noticed in the By-Laws has no definition. We are asking for it to be defined.

Under new business our next item of business is the discussion and action on the Faculty Board of Review By-Laws amendments, Circular IUPUI-120/78-79. It is my understanding that this report comes to you as is on the floor by recommendation by the Constitution and By-Laws Committee and is therefore open for discussion. We received one set of amendments to these amendments and if there is no objection we will recognize Pat McGeever for his amendments to the amendments. You will find the original document in a circular in the brown mailing that you received. Pat McGeever’s was set to you separately with his name on it.

PROFESSOR McGEEVER: I would like to thank the people for the very fine work they have done in bringing before you the proposed amendment. The spirit of my amendments is just to make some improvements here and there to make the process more explicit and in some ways more worthwhile. Carol, do you want me to explain them all at once or take them one at a time?

PROFESSOR NATHAN: Why not one at a time?

PROFESSOR McGEEVER: The first amendment refers to Section B regarding the election. The purpose is to make clear something that I think is implied that the Board of Review will always be faculty boards of review. That section begins by saying, "Members of the Faculty Boards of Review shall be elected." At that point I propose adding the words "from among faculty members or librarians, excluding those with full-time administrative assignments". That makes it explicit that all members sitting on the board will be faculty members or librarians because I didn’t see that statement anywhere in the line previous to that.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: May I ask a question? What is the status of chairpersons and assistant deans in your amendment. Are you excluding them is what I’m trying to find out?

PROFESSOR McGEEVER: I don’t mean to exclude chairpersons. We have all kinds of people around who hold assistant dean titles, and I’m not objecting Pat, I just wanted to get it straight at this point what you’re intentions are?

PROFESSOR McGEEVER: I think that I’m probably intending to exclude assistant deans.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: But not chairpersons and the record will show that so that if there is a question in the future we will have it.

PROFESSOR FULLER: May I ask a question? Why do you say faculty members or librarians. Would it not be better to say "voting faculty" which is defined in the Constitution as being both faculty and librarians?

PROFESSOR McGEEVER: It would be perfectly acceptable with me.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Well it would? It’s not quite the same. I am a member of the voting faculty, I might also add that I am a faculty member, and I’m not prepared to give that up in order to clean up the Faculty Board of Review, so I’m not sure that "voting faculty" will do the job.

PROFESSOR McGEEVER: Then the subsequent clause does kick you out?

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Yes. I would certainly accept that Carl.

PROFESSOR McGEEVER: I thought that Carl was saying to take out what you were putting in and just say voting faculty.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: No, substitute the term "the voting faculty" for the term "faculty members or librarians". But keep the exclusion.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Well, I don’t object if you don’t. PROFESSOR NATHAN: So you are willing to accept that as a friendly amendment so that it now says "from among the voting faculty, excluding those with full-time administrative assignments"?

PROFESSOR McGEEVER: That’s right.

PROFESSOR SHARP: I have no objection to Dean of Faculties and various deans having a possibility of being on this committee. I don’t think they would get elected there. I would like to leave it just as it is.

PROFESSOR BESCH: In regard to the assistant deans, there are some of the schools that are rather large and have a number of assistant deans who are very active in a number of faculty decision and discussions and so on. If you would specifically exclude assistant deans I think it is not logical.

PROFESSOR NATHAN: I would like to point out too that the membership of the Council does not exclude assistant deans and it only really excludes the deans that are listed by administrative title on this Council.

PROFESSOR GNAT: Doesn’t the term "elected members of the Faculty Council" rather make the point?

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: I doesn’t say "from", Jean, it says, "shall be elected by secret ballot of the elected members of the Faculty Council", which means that the elected members elect them.

PROFESSOR GNAT: Oh, I see.
"PROFESSOR MCGEEVER: If I could say a word in defense of the amendment. Just looking from the viewpoint of the person who does have a grievance, and perhaps feels that the administrators that he has had to deal with havenot acted fairly and therefore bringing a question like this, I think that they would feel very nervous if there was a great possibility that the Board was going to be a board of administrators of any department. So that's why I propose that this be strictly a faculty board. I certainly agree with your point but in effect you are excluding faculty whose knowledgeable by virtue of their position. It is assistantdeans who are exceptionally responsible which is why they become assistant deans. So I think that if we exclude them because they are serving in an administrators capacity it is not right.

PROFESSOR MCGEEVER: I would not exclude their information I think the process should include that but I would exclude them from voting participation on the board. PROFESSOR ROTHE: Would you define full-time administrative assignments? It seems to me that someone who is an assistant dean that functions part-time in research/teaching and part-time administrative is not included, or is it? What is the definition of full-time administrative assignments? PROFESSOR MCGEEVER: It would be one whose contract involves administrative duties exclusively and if they did teach it would not change.

DEAN NEVILL: In the School of Science they are on 12-month contracts but they do teach. They have a portion of their administrative responsibilities in order to teach. PROFESSOR MCGEEVER: A full-time administrator is one whose contract merely calls for administrative duties. DEAN NEVILL: It is not a contract, it is simply a personnel action form that gives you the additional title. PROFESSOR MILLER: It seems to me that anyone who is a member of the faculty ought to have the privilege of serving on the Faculty Board of Review and the area of disqualification could be spelled out under what circumstances a party feels that they would not get a fair hearing or the investigation would be opinionated by another faculty member who is a member of that board. In that section we ought to be able to disqualify that person. EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: There is a provision for self-disqualification. MOTION FAILED.

PROFESSOR MCGEEVER: The second proposed amendment would implicitly include associate faculty in the grievance procedure. In Section D, Line 2, where it reads "The Faculty Boards of Review shall exercise the review functions of the faculty with respect to grievances expressed by faculty members". At that point it should be added "including associate faculty". My rationale for making the proposal is that we are in a period where associate faculty are teaching on the chin. Sometimes we can't hire them as frequently as we would like and sometimes we can not pay them what we would want. One of the minimum essentials, I think, that a faculty member or a person who is going to do instructional work ought to be provided is the procedural due process and the ability to raise and have questions answered within the University. That's the rationale behind it.

PROFESSOR FULLER: I'm sorry, I don't know what the term associate faculty really includes or refers to. Who are the people who are considered associate faculty?

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: That's a euphonism for part-time faculty. We have at the present about 500 part-time each semester. So this is a sizable group of people. I suppose, Pat, that I have some doubts about this but I might point out that among the grievance procedures that we have at the university there is a grievance procedure that could be used by part-time faculty as employees. The Faculty Board of Review process concerns itself with issues, very few of which are very relevant to part-time faculty. Tenure, promotion, salary adjustment, nonappointment and dismissal seem to me not issues that a part-time faculty member could properly bring before a Faculty Board of Review. The only one that could be brought I would think could be academic freedom. PROFESSOR MCGEEVER: It seems to me about this procedure in the text that you have includes "or other conditions of work". I think that within that term are included a number of areas where people could indeed have grievances. Because the language the committee is proposing does open up new areas now I think that should be reviewed for the part-time faculty. PROFESSOR BESCH: Does that mean that if it did say "for other conditions of work" there would be no reason for your amendment? Is that the substance of your amendment?

PROFESSOR FULLER: Well, I'm sorry but that phrase is in the old By-Laws. So it is not a new addition.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: The 500 part-time faculty is not an accurate number. Steve Beering, how many part-time faculty do you have?

DEAN BEERING: 900.

DEAN MCDONALD: Dentistry has 200.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Well, I should have said in the non-health areas. I think the point is, of course, that you are starting a new ball game. I'm not trying to quarrel with Dr. McGeever about it but up to this time the Faculty Boards of Review have dealt with one set of questions which deal primarily with the concerns of the regular full-time faculty. We are now saying we're going to make this same Board or group of Boards available to part-time faculty who have quite a different set of concerns and who will indeed constitute a larger number in total than the full-time faculty. MOTION FAILED.

PROFESSOR MCGEEVER: Amendment Number 3 deals with Section E, where procedures are being discussed, part 3a. The last sentence there reads as follows "Dismissal shall occur only for reasons of (a) incompetence, (b) serious personal or professional misconduct, or (c) extraordinary financial exigencies of the University." My amendment would add a further sentence there to clarify a bit of what is meant by financial exigency and that steps ought to be taken when a tenured person is being terminated not for reasons of professional incompetence but for financial reasons within the University. The amendment would read, "In cases of extraordinary financial exigencies, the Board shall take care that the AAUP guidelines on financial exigencies (AAUP Documents and Report, 1977, pp. 48-49) are followed." I have the document but I think that it would be a little tedious to read the entire document to you, but I will read some of the highlights of
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final action of the Boards as set forth here is not an authoritative action. It is merely a recommendation. Therefore, it seems to me that our action in asking the Boards to proceed by these guidelines does not impose an obligation on the administration to do so. Administrators can violate these guidelines and then the Board may recommend that the person be retained because the administration has done that but the administration might finally say "well tough." It is only a recommendation.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Well, it is not the administration that is being judged by the Board. We don't get judged by that Board. What gets judged is the dean of the school and the department chairman. So what that board will say is they are guilty, they did not follow these procedures.

PROFESSOR FULLER: I find Professor McGeever's verb hard to live with. I would like to propose a substitute amendment which I think contains the sense of his amendment but may represent a more positive statement. If Professor McGeever accepts it then we can substitute it. As follows: In cases of extraordinary financial exigencies the Board of Review shall determine and in its statement of findings it shall report whether the university's decisions and actions are consistent with guidelines formulated by the AAUP.

PROFESSOR MCGEEVER: I would accept that.

DEAN BEERING: I would like to have a point of order not interns of this meeting but in terms of what what Dr. Moore has told us. As a dean or chairman or an administrator within this system, we are obliged to function within the structure, rules, guidelines, procedures, laws of the state, what have you, and the Faculty Boards of Review really represent an appellant system which is to judge whether or not we have been in compliance with the accepted rules and procedures under which we operate. Since our Trustees have not at this point in time accepted the AAUP guidelines and made them part of the establishment of the procedures, I think both the original amendment and Professor Fuller's substitute amendment are not in order. I would urge us to defer this until the overall Faculty Council can bring this to the attention of the administration of the system and the Trustees speak to it.

PROFESSOR NATHAN: I would agree with what Dr. Beering just said and if some of you are not familiar with the system, University Faculty Council might recommend exactly what you are saying. But they recommend it to the President and the President would take it to the Board and there would be discussion. Then the Board would take action on it. The University Faculty Council would have the final decision but they do have the direct recommending power to the President and to the Board.

PROFESSOR ROTHE: But this amendment is only to investigate and report not to make recommendations the way it has been amended. 

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: I would like to bring this into focus by moving to table this matter until six months from this session at which time we will take it off of the table and see whether any action is being taken elsewhere Seconded. This table is for both motions. MOTION CARRIED.

PROFESSOR MCGEEVER: In Section E, number 5, line 1, paragraph 5 deals with publicity. The present paragraph reads, "Public statements by the principals in any case, by members of the Board of Review, or by administrative officials about cases before the Faculty Boards of Review should be avoided." My amendment is to strike from that the mention of "the principals in any case, by". My rationale is that a person that has a grievance with the university at the same time has constitutional rights to express that grievance in whatever form they see fit. In constitutional lawyers terms what I think you would have a chilling effect on the complain­ ant. I think that if a person wants to take out an ad in the newspaper to complain about the way that he has been treated he ought to be free to do that and ought not to have to sacrifice the only way that grievance can be considered within the university in order to exercise those rights of see speech. 

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: Well, I agree with you. Seconded.
PROFESSOR LANGSAM: I have a question, Pat. The term "principals" doesn't that mean both parties of the thing? I think that in the long run if the university and the individual get into the battle of publicity how would the individual get any further ahead? I understand your concern. Perhaps changing the word "avoid" is the real issue rather the "principals." PROFESSOR ROTHE: The statement says, "that the Board of Review and the administration should be avoided." PROFESSOR LANGSAM: Well, they are by nature principals in the case. If there is a case they are two principals, the university is one of the parties of principals.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: I think that Dr. McGeever is right, Miriam. MOTION CARRIED.

PROFESSOR MCGEEVER: Earlier in the meeting my last amendment was discussed and is probably superfluous. MOTION CARRIED.

EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: I might say that is probably the most significant accomplishment of this body, in at least two years. We have been holding up the printing of the Faculty Handbook for exactly 11 months waiting for this document. So now that we have it we can put out a new Handbook.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: I hope as many of you as possible can come out to our house tonight and bring your wives, husbands, friends, and if there are alternates in the audience who did not get an invitation, feel free to come.

PROFESSOR BECK: When do we get our first paychecks? EXECUTIVE DEAN MOORE: September 1.

The meeting was adjourned.

Carol Nathan, Secretary
IUPUI Faculty Council