

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY

at

I N D I A N A P O L I S

Minutes of the Faculty Council Meeting

Thursday, September 5, 1985

Law School, Room 116

3:30 P.M. - 5:30 P.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Administration: Vice President Glenn W. Irwin, Jr., Carol Nathan, Executive Dean Howard Schaller. Deans: H. William Gilmore, Elizabeth Grossman, P. Nicholas Kellum, William M. Plater, Sheldon Siegel, William J. Voos, Jack Wentworth, Marshall Yovits. Faculty: C. Aliprantis, H. R. Besch, Jr., Jacqueline Blackwell, Patricia Blake, Frances Brahma, Edmund Byrne, Varoujan Chalian, Mervyn Cohen, David Doedens, Kenneth Dunipace, John Eble, Martin Farlow, Beverlyn Flynn, Paul J. Galanti, LaForrest Garner, Melvin Glick, Jean Gnat, Ngoan Van Hoang, Meredith Hull, Jean Hutten, Lucreda Hutton, Thomas A. Jones, Henry Karlson, Suetta Kehrein, Joseph Kuczkowski, Miriam Z. Langsam, Rebecca T. Markel, Lillie-Mae Padilla, Richard Pflanzner, Gerald Powers, Anita Proffitt, Terry Reed, Neal Rothman, Jay Simon, Ernest E. Smith, Marie Sparks, Robert B. Stonehill, Jeffery S. Vessely, Harriet Wilkins, George Willis, Kathryn Wilson, Ruth Woodham, Pao-lo Yu.

Student Body Representative: Martin Dragonette.

ALTERNATES PRESENT: Jim Bindley for Gerald L. Bepko; Daniel P. Benford for Walter J. Daly; H. Oner Yurtseven for R. Bruce Renda; Jean Hutten for Charlotte Carley; Betsy Joyce for Juanita Laidig.

Members Absent: Deans: Charles Bonser, Howard Mehlinger, James Weigand, Marshall Yovits. Faculty: Elaine Alton, Philip Bendick, Charles Blevins, Ira Brandt, Michael Burke, David Crabb, Andre DeKorvin, Joseph DiMicco, Ian Dowdeswell, James Edmondson, Charles Ellinger, Donald Ferguson, Naomi Fineberg, Michael Glant, Clifford Goodwin, Vania Goodwin, Edwin T. Harper, Robert A. Harris, Eugene Helveston, William Kulsrud, Monroe H. Little, Jr., Brenda Lyon, Onkar Markand, Gerald McHugh, Michael Mitchell, Barnett Morris, Catherine Palmer, John E. Pless, Shirley Quate, Mark Richardson, Edward Robbins, John Schmedtje, James Shanks, Rowland Sherrill, Victor Wallis, Kathleen Warfel, Lawrence Wheeler, Charles Winslow.

GUESTS: Neil Lantz, Hitwant Sidhu.

Summary of Meeting's Activities

Vice President Irwin presented recognition plaques to Professor Jan Shipps, Chancellor Emeritus Maynard Hine, and Director Neil Lantz for their leadership in the Campus Campaign phase of the Campaign for Indiana. Vice President Irwin then briefly highlighted some components of the approved operating budget and reviewed construction plans for the coming year.

Executive Dean Schaller reminded the Council members of the activities of the Task Force on University Organization, and the IUPUI Mission Statement project, reiterating prior invitations by these committees for all interested persons to contact the members with any comments or questions. He also advised the Council members of the televising of President Ryan's State of the University Address and the Trustee's Seminar on Divestiture in South Africa.

The Executive Committee report consisted of commentary about a survey instrument on promotion and tenure perceptions and practices which will soon be circulated from the Faculty Affairs Committee. Also to be considered this fall are proposed amendments to the Academic Code of Ethics.

AGENDA ITEM I

**Appreciation to IUPUI Campus Leaders in the
Campaign for Indiana - Glenn W. Irwin, Jr.**

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Good afternoon. Welcome to the new academic year. I hope each of you had a great summer and, hopefully, we will all have a great fall.

The first item on our agenda today is a note of appreciation. Chancellor Herman Wells wanted to do this personally today but was unable to. I am pinch hitting for him. There are three well-earned awards to be presented to our colleagues here at IUPUI who have accepted leading roles in our successful Campus Campaign. This effort is part of the early fund raising associated with the Campaign for Indiana and the IU Foundation's program to raise a little over \$200 million in gifts for the university. Thus far, the faculty and staff at this campus have given or pledged nearly \$700,000. The faculty participation at IUPUI has now reached 84 percent. There were three people on this campus who were in charge of the 400 faculty and staff volunteers who carried out our Campus Campaign in schools and in departments. I am honored to present these three colleagues of ours with awards of appreciation in the form of personalized plaques. I will ask these three persons to come forward now - Jan Shipps, Professor of History and Director of the Center for American Studies; Dr. Maynard K. Hine, Chancellor Emeritus of IUPUI; and Neil Lantz, Director of Administrative Affairs.

AGENDA ITEM II

Approval of Minutes - May 2, 1985 Meeting

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Item 2 will have to be deferred. The minutes were not mailed in time for this meeting.

AGENDA ITEM III

Presiding Officer's Business - Vice President Glenn W. Irwin, Jr., M.D.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: I have a few items that I would like to mention today. It is that time of year when people are asking the question, "How are we doing on enrollment?" There is nothing official since it is way too early, but it would appear that our enrollment will be quite comparable to what it was last fall. That is encouraging particularly for those of us who have to worry about the budget and income for the year. To date, it looks like we are holding well, but the official announcement of this probably won't be for three or four more weeks.

Since our last Council meeting we have entered into a new budget cycle. I don't want to go into details on this, but I think a lot of you have seen summaries of the approved budget. I think it was encouraging that, for the first time in many years that I can remember, the salaries adjustments for faculty and staff are certainly well above average. Of course, if our enrollment and other income holds well during this year, and right now I don't see any reason why it shouldn't, we should be able to make similar, if not equal, adjustments in the second year because we are in a beginning of new biennium.

We were also able to provide, in some instances, substantial increases in equipment funding to the departments. We added about \$700,000 to the equipment budgets in various schools. Not every school got an equipment allocation increase but many did. We increased the S & E which has been a nightmare for all of you for as long as you can remember by \$1.7 million this year. Hopefully, we will be in a little better shape in that category. Student aid went up about \$210,000. Library books went up about \$115,000. I think, in general, it was a better year than we have experienced for a long time. Hopefully, next year will be equally satisfactory.

The newspapers are publishing a lot about the development programs that are going to begin this fall on this campus. I will mention just a few of them. The only thing that the Indiana General Assembly approved from our capital request was the bonding authority for the Clinical Research Center. They bonded \$20 million of that \$34 million project. The School of Medicine is out there scrambling to try to identify \$14 million to bring that building on. Construction should be underway in the spring of next year. In addition, we have money in the bank for an elegant conference center which will be east of the University Hospital. It will not be a large conference center but it will high quality, with all the latest communication equipment, etc. Yesterday, those of us on the Architects Committee of the University, interviewed five developers for the building of the hotel/office complex which will be an integral part of the conference center. We have some remarkably good proposals from developers from the area and hopefully, this fall a \$30 million new hotel will start to go up. It will be integrated and be part of the conference center which should be of tremendous help to all of our schools who conduct continuing educational programs that attract distinguished educational and other groups to this campus from around the country and around the world. All of that will be under construction this fall - probably late this fall.

The National Fitness Center is in the final stages of design and will be located just south of where we are. This will be on park land basically, not university land. This, too, will be a remarkable facility, particularly for those who are interested in running and a variety of other indoor sports during the winter time. That should be under construction this fall.

You probably read in this morning's newspaper that we finally have a developer to provide a very fine housing complex in the Lockefield Gardens area. There will be renovation of apartments in the six remaining buildings. In addition, there will be about 250 new apartments across from the renovated ones, brick and Indiana limestone, with all of the amenities. It blends in well with the old Lockefield. Excellent security will be provided by brick and iron fences around it. There will be a club house and swimming pool. Prices will be comparable to suburban apartment renting. This should be under construction probably late this year or early next year.

In addition, developers were selected for the housing on the canal which is immediately east of the campus. That should be under construction this fall. Again, this will be apartment complexes and condominiums. It will be handy for those of us who work here. It will be on a beautifully redone canal. It won't be as elegant, perhaps, as the San Antonio River, but it will be very elegant.

There is one problem with all of this and that is that the coming to and leaving this campus this fall and next spring is going to be an absolute nightmare. We are trying to negotiate and arrange for street closings in an orderly manner but there is a push to do it all at once. The canal will be lowered 14 feet and widened. This requires three new bridges over the canal, the bridges of New York Street, Vermont Street, and Michigan Street. In addition, a new boulevard will be constructed leading from the interstate to the Medical Center campus. There will be a remodeling and complete resurfacing of Agnes Street from 10th Street which, when completed, will give a beautiful new entrance into primarily the Medical Center but it will flow south into Agnes Street as well. In addition, the city wants to close 10th Street from this terrible intersection by Wishard Hospital over to Wilson Street. I told people in Transportation that the only way you will be able to get here is by helicopter! I am hoping that we can program this in such a way that it won't be as bad as it sounds right now. One morning when I came down here, during registration, during the first day of classes, I was stuck on Meridian Street trying to get on to Michigan Street. Of course, we are going to lose about 1,000 parking spaces on the Medical Center side primarily. But, if you have noticed, there is a 1500 car addition to the south garage under construction right now. That should be completed by May 1 of next spring. Hopefully, that will give us some relief. In the meantime, we have temporary parking on North Street which is certainly not convenient but it will handle our desperate situation until the garage is completed.

I think that is about enough good and bad news. I will turn it over to my colleague, Howard, who has some items for you today.

PROF. BLAKE: I may have missed it being mentioned somewhere along the way, but I saw a station wagon on campus yesterday that said "Shuttle Bus" on its side.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Yes, we have a shuttle bus. Is Neil Lantz still here? Would you care to comment?

NEIL LANTZ: Thank you. Given the outlying nature of our temporary parking lots on North, California and in the Blackford Street area, we are running a continuous shuttle bus on a loop into Agnes Street all day long. It is free; subsidized by the Parking fund. It is just a matter of parking one's car, waiting about 5 minutes, at the most, for the bus to come by, getting on and riding to where you want to go.

UNKNOWN: When are they going to start construction on these three bridges?

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: I don't know for sure. We will have to get a communication to everybody regarding timetables on alternative routes.

I would also like to mention that we have two new deans here today and I would like to introduce them. William Gilmore, Dean, School of Dentistry. Bill, welcome aboard. And, we have Bill Voos, Dean, Herron School of Art. Welcome, Bill.

PROF. ALIPRANTIS: What is the status of the School of Science move?

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: The timetable for the School of Science is to move the entire 38th Street Campus to this campus as soon as possible. The request will go in to the 1987 session of the General Assembly.

DEAN SCHALLER: We have the planning underway.

You will recall that last year President Ryan appointed a Task Force on University Organization. It has been ten years since the present organization was put into place; consequently, it has been ten years since somebody has taken a concerted look at it. The President thought it was time to review once again the university organization. Therefore, he appointed a Task Force, headed by Professor Robert Bareikis, Department of Germanic Studies, in Bloomington. It is a systemwide Task Force. It includes three people from our campus: Henry Besch, School of Medicine; Miriam Langsam, Honors Program; and Jim Faris, School of Medicine. That committee has been hard at work. I know Glenn and I have talked to them several times. The chairman of the committee has talked to a group of about a dozen community leaders here in Indianapolis to get their view on things. The Task Force hopes to have, and Henry told me today he thinks will have, a draft of the report available in November. The President's timetable was to have that in November. After our study, of course, that draft will then be subject to wide discussion and, hopefully, will finally be available to the Trustees in August at their August Retreat in 1986. There is obviously still time to present any views which you might have to this committee. I would strongly recommend that any of you or your colleagues that feel that they want to communicate on any issues confronting the IU system should contact one of the members of the committee. I am sure they will be pleased to hear from you. Somewhere along the line I am sure that the draft will be made available to this group and, perhaps, will be an agenda item at some future meeting of this group. I would urge you, if you have anything that you would like to say to them or if any of your colleagues do, please don't hesitate to call one of the three members of the committee from this campus.

PROF. GALANTI: How was the Reorganization Task Force appointed? I have a list and it looks to me as though there are seven members from the faculty or administration from Bloomington and a student from Bloomington, as opposed to three from Indianapolis.

DEAN SCHALLER: The President worked with the two co-secretaries of the University Faculty Council in putting it together. Henry, do you have any other information?

PROF. BESCH: Both campus faculty councils were consulted about names of people to serve on the Organization

Task Force. The President wanted to keep the Task Force relatively small and he used names from that list plus other sources after consultation with a variety of people. Howard didn't mention it in his modest but he too was directly appointed by the President to help in the organization review. The President appointed a Resource Group consisting of Howard Schaller, Ken Gros Louis, Vice President Ed Williams, and York Wilburn, who was the Chairman of the previous organization Task Force. The Resource Group will help shape the initial draft reports. To answer your question, the balance was determined by the President and was not subject to any negotiations, after the President made his choices.

PROF. WILSON: What about the Purdue mission? Are you doing anything about the School of Science and the School of Engineering or are you just ignoring it?

PROF. BESCH: We have certainly not stopped trying to gather information from a variety of sources. The Task Force as a group spoke to representatives from Purdue, including President Beering and Bob Greenkorn, and individually with others. We invite your comments and suggestions.

DEAN SCHALLER: The committee has also met with the academic deans on this campus. The dean of Engineering and the Dean of Science were both present at those meetings and, I understand, they were quite vocal in presenting their views about the organization. The committee has met several times and I have talked a lot with Vice President Greenkorn of Purdue. I think we had a whole afternoon meeting with President Beering. I don't think it is accurate to say that that has been ignored. Are there any other questions on the organization Task Force?

Professor Galanti raised a question about the student members of the Task Force being from Bloomington. It is true that the Task Force has a Bloomington student on it, but IUPUI students are not ignored, either. As you know, a few students in Bloomington have complained about the fact that the fifth straight student Trustee appointed by the Governor to the IU Board of Trustees is from the Indianapolis Law School. Trustee Healey was an undergraduate in Bloomington. Yet, Bloomington students are raising the question down there as to why the Governor keeps appointing a student Trustee from the Indianapolis Law School.

PROF. GALANTI: Probably right and just. [Laughter]

PROF. BESCH: There is also a student from a regional campus, Mr. Kristoff. [The current Task Force membership is attached as IUPUI Circular 85-05.]

PROF. SIDHU: As a visitor may I ask a question? This Task Force is going to be very important to matters affecting this campus. Is there any possibility that you as three members of the committee can bring the things that you are discussing that are going to affect this campus to this body so that this can be put on the agenda for discussion? I think it would be a good idea to bring those items to the agenda for discussion in this Council. That would be very helpful because most of the things are going to affect this campus in a big manner.

DEAN SCHALLER: What I said was that a "draft" would be available in November. Not the report, but a draft. At some meeting of this Council, I am sure, the report will be on the agenda. It could even be that we may have some preliminary things to say about it in October. You can be assured that it will be discussed by this Faculty Council. Again, to underscore what I said was that a draft would be available in November and it will be subject to wide discussion over a period of months leading up to a final report from which the President may make the final recommendations to the Board of Trustees, who will finally decide. Those recommendations will be made, hopefully, at the August Board of Trustees meeting.

PROF. SIDHU: So it will be a draft that will be discussed in this Faculty Council?

DEAN SCHALLER: Yes.

The second thing which we have been hard at work on is a Mission Statement which we are required to take to the Higher Education Commission in December. When the Higher Education Commission did their study of the West Central districts of the state of Indiana, they concluded at the end of it that it would be helpful to them, and perhaps to us, if they were to ask the universities to deliver a Mission Statement and in our case, an evaluation of how IUPUI sees its future educational mission. So, several faculty committees have been working on that through the Spring and Summer. Carol Nathan, Associate Dean of the Faculties, has been serving as coordinator for that project. Some of you, I know, have already been involved in this but if there is anything you would like to transmit to that group, please get in touch with Carol. If you want to do it through your deans' office, that would be fine too. At some point, we will have a report to this Faculty Council on some preliminary statement on what that report is going to look like. Whether we can do that in October, I don't know, but we might try to see if we can put something on the agenda to begin a discussion in this body on that in October. Again, that has to go through the Trustees of Indiana University and, I assume, not necessarily as a decision item, but certainly for informational purposes to the Trustees of Purdue. Purdue is directly involved in that because Bob Greenkorn is a member of one of the key committees as are, of course, the deans of all the schools. I am sure some faculty members of the Purdue mission schools are involved. Again, we will hear something hopefully in October and certainly by November on that Mission Statement.

As a result of our calendar discussion, you remember last year we finally resolved the calendar by saying that we would not cancel classes on Martin Luther King Day but we, instead, would have a campuswide celebration of Martin Luther King's contribution to our society. We had the first one last year. I thought it was quite successful, although we are hoping for a little more attendance this year and no sub-zero weather. In January, once again, we will have the Martin Luther King celebration. Lincoln Lewis is in charge of the committee planning that. If you have any suggestions or any interest in that activity, please contact Lincoln. I suspect that at the next meeting or maybe the one after, Lincoln will come to this meeting and give you some description of the events that are going to happen on that day.

There are two events that are going to be televised throughout the IU system this month. The first one is on September 18 at 1:30 p.m.. From 1:30 until 2:00, President Ryan's State of the University Address will be televised systemwide and that will be received on this campus in Cavanaugh 226 and Krannert 257.

The second systemwide television event will be on September 20 beginning at 8:30 a.m. That will be the Trustees' Seminar on Divestiture in South Africa. As you will recall, there has been considerable discussion of that item and the Trustees last year proposed to hold a day long information seminar on that issue. It will be held in Bloomington but it will be televised throughout the system. It will be available on this campus. It will go all day starting at 8:30 a.m. in Lecture Hall 105. We have reserved this large room on purpose, hoping that there will be some interest, not only from the standpoint of the University community on this issue, but also from the community in Indianapolis. As I say, I hope that we have good attendance for that event. I know not all of you can go there all day. But I do hope that some people can attend. That is all I have.

AGENDA ITEM IV

Executive Committee Report - H. R. Besch, Jr.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: The next item on the agenda is the Executive Committee Report from Professor Besch.

PROF. BESCH: Thank you. I must begin by apologizing for starting this year with an incorrect announcement of the meeting time. We had announced last spring that it would begin this day, at the usual hour of 3:30 p.m. For your future planning, note that Faculty Council meetings are always at 3:30, except for two times a year. Those two times are when we have a joint meeting with the Faculty and Staff Councils and Vice President Irwin gives the State of the Campus address which will be at the December meeting this year. The other time is the

last meeting of the year at which time Vice President Irwin's recognition awards are given. Many of you apparently already knew that and, like me and others, planned to be here at 3:30. Other people actually read the agenda and came at 3:00. To those people, I apologize for that mix up.

I want to begin by mentioning three changes from last year's Faculty Council operation. First, the Faculty Council Office has moved out of the Administration Building and into the Educational/Social Work Building. If you wish to visit, come to ES 4161. The telephone number is the same one we have had.

Secondly, you may remember that Associate Dean Boaz served as an ex-officio member of the Council last year. This year we have, as our official representative Associate Dean Carol Nathan. Pat Boaz will be visiting us but will not be an official representative.

Finally, I would like to introduce Martin Dragonette who is the Student President this year and who joins us after the short tenure of Steve Akard, last year's Student President.

There are several important issues this year for the Faculty Council. We have already heard about the Task Force on University Reorganization and the IUPUI Mission Statement. I believe that it is our collective feeling as faculty that how we are organized, and especially what the educational mission of our institution is, ranks among the highest priority of items we should be concerned with. I know that I reflect Dean Carol Nathan's viewpoint in this, as well as Vice President Irwin's and Dean Schaller's. You can be sure that we all intend to seek the faculty's counsel on these matters.

The Faculty Affairs Committee of this Council, chaired by Byron Olson, has prepared a survey instrument to find how the faculty on this campus feels about promotion and tenure issues. That survey form will be going out to all the faculty in the not too distant future. They have asked questions about perceptions of facts and about opinions. I think the answers will be very helpful as we look toward trying to determine the will of the faculty on these issues. Why it is that we have such a very different philosophy for tenure decisions compared to our philosophy for promotion in rank? As you know, the campus Tenure Committee is entirely elected except for its Chair, the Dean of Faculties, Howard Schaller. So, it seems organizationally that tenure decisions at the campus level are essentially entirely in the hands of the faculty. On the other hand, the Promotions procedure may be too far toward the other end of the spectrum. None of the faculty serving on the campus Promotions Committee are elected by the faculty. We may be a mature enough organization to bring those two processes, at least structurally, a little bit closer. Some schools have already done that. We have a single Promotion and Tenure Committee in Medicine, as well as in Business. In certainly the majority of universities throughout the United States, Promotion and Tenure are very closely interweaved. Perhaps they should be brought closer here. We face in the next 10 or 15 years a national situation where the number of new tenure track positions will be small and the turnover of faculty for a while will be fairly slow. Promotion, and especially tenure, criteria will continue to be getting more and more strigent in application. This Faculty Council should be considering the issues involved.

PROF. ROTEMAN: You realize the kind of answers you are going to get from the Purdue Schools of Science and Engineering and Technology. They are going to be very different because we are a different system entirely. Does the Faculty Affairs Committee know this?

PROF. BESCH: The survey instrument does request information about your school.

PROF. ROTEMAN: Do they know what the system already is?

PROF. BESCH: I guess I shouldn't presume to speak for that committee's knowledge. I intended to address only the survey instrument that....

PROF. ROTEMAN: We are going to answer differently because we have different perceptions.

PROF. BESCH: You should. The survey instrument is designed to elicit those answers.

DEAN SCHALLER: The way in which the Promotion Committee is constituted was as a result of an action of this Council. The Council mandated that the campus Promotion Committee will be made up of a representative of each school selected by the Dean of that school. The School of Medicine has three representatives for good reason, to represent Allied Health, Basic Sciences, and the clinical fields. I think it is true that at least in some of the schools the person who comes has to be from the unit promotions committee. I think there are some cases where there is some kind of procedure whereby the unit committee is elected or established and then they elect the person. There is faculty participation rather broadly in many of the schools regarding who gets on that committee and who finally winds up on the campus committee. So, there is faculty participation. The difference is that the schools don't, in any way, participate in the way that the Tenure Committee is put together. Now, whether that is good or bad, the individual faculties from the schools have no control over who may or may not be sitting on the Tenure Committee. Neal is correct. Of course, the Tenure and Promotion papers for the two Purdue mission schools do not go through the IUPUI campus committee, but rather go through what is called Purdue Panel E which I also Chair. However, on the IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Committees, representatives from Science and Engineering serve even though none of their cases come through there. Again, I don't say that is necessarily bad.

PROF. BESCH: My comments may have come out as if I were impugning the motives of the administration or of the faculty, or their ability to judge the cases. I didn't intend to do that. I just meant to suggest that we consider closely why the processes should be so disparate in a mature organization like IUPUI. Such an important issue merits reconsideration by the faculty.

Another survey that you participated in that came from the Faculty Affairs Committee and regarded a proposed Faculty Club in one of the facilities that Vice President Irwin just spoke to you about. I don't intend here to report all of the results of that survey, but I will say that faculty and librarian responses were very favorable. Vice President Irwin's office was informed of the results, and Bob Baxter has been working to get us a Faculty Club which we can be proud of.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: I might add a footnote to that. In the presentation by the developers yesterday, they all had that facility in their plans for the hotel.

PROF. BESCH: A third issue which will come before this body in the Fall regards the Academic Code of Ethics in the Academic Handbook. At the University Faculty Council last year, at its last meeting, amendments to the Faculty Handbook were scheduled for a vote. If passed, they would have revised some statements in the Code of Ethics regarding one's interpersonal interaction with people who might work for them. The Bloomington Faculty Council had these amendments before them on at least two occasions and had a great deal of merriment discussing them. Even though they are a very serious matter, generate a lot of fun comments and double entendre. It was proposed that they be voted on by the University Faculty Council. However, they had not been discussed in many campus Faculty Councils. So, we sent them back to the Agenda Committee of the University Faculty Council, with a motion that they should be brought to the campus Faculty Councils for discussion in the Fall and returned to the University Faculty Council for a vote in the Spring.

PROF. SHERRILL: I have two questions. This isn't just by coincidence that the building of the hotel and this question came up simultaneously? The second question, for those of us who are trying to take notes on this, do you mind putting that last statement in English?

PROF. BESCH: I didn't bring the exact statements with me today. The wording is tricky. To illustrate their intent recall that the Code of Ethics has a statement that prohibits nepotism. One of the proposed amendments is to add a statement which prohibits "nepotism" by people who aren't, in fact, related by law but by cohabitation or something like that. That is another statement that says something like, if you and a student of yours are going to have romance, then you should have somebody else do the advising of that student. The amendments cover such areas of potential amorous interactions between folks.

The last news item before a few announcements is that we intended to continue the tradition established last year of having the second meeting of the Faculty Council devoted principally to socializing between members of the Council. We will have the second meeting at the Madame Walker Urban Life Center on October 3 and it will begin at 3:30. We will ask deans or faculty representatives of schools to introduce the faculty from their schools to the rest of the faculty and tell a little bit about those people. We had that last year for the first time and it seemed to be appreciated. After the meeting, there will be an open cash bar.

I do want to remind you of couple of school events that I think most of you should be aware of. The first one is that the Herron Gallery will shortly be opening an exhibit called "Indianapolis Collects". That opens on September 6 and runs through the middle of October. That will be opening tomorrow evening from 7:00 to 9:00.

The University Theater will be opening their first play of the season, a musical based on a book by Studs Turkel, called "Working". The opening night will be September 12.

I am personally also pleased to announce publicly this year's recipient of the Steven C. Beering annual prize for outstanding accomplishments in biomedical science. I say personally because I was fortunate enough to have been involved from the beginning of the fund drive to endow this visiting professorship. This year's winner is Floyd Bloom of the Salk Institute. His area of research and expertise is Neuropharmacology. He is interested in brains and alcohol, maybe not in that order. That prize is one that is endowed by funds from faculty, friends, and alumni of the School of Medicine and it carries with it a \$10,000 award. It is a significant prize in which all IUPUI faculty should take some pride. Dr. Bloom's award lecture will be on Wednesday, November 13 beginning around 8:30 a.m. The ceremonies will begin around 8:00 a.m. in Emerson Hall. It will be televised at the same time to Hurty Hall in Fesler Hall.

MARTIN DRAGONETTE: I just wanted to mention that the Fall Festival will be September 9 - 13. It would probably be an interesting idea if some of you would show up to interact with students outside of the classroom situation during the lunch hour. This will be held on the Mall in front of the Library.

ITEM V

New Business

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Does anyone have any other Old or New Business?

PROF. WILSON: I was wondering if you could inform us about the Search and Screen for your replacement?

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: I formally notified the President and the Trustees in June of my pending retirement and suggested that a Search and Screen Committee be appointed but it hasn't been appointed yet. I am hoping that some action will occur on that anytime now. There is a possibility that action will occur at the Trustee meeting that is coming tomorrow or the next day. I suspect that there will be a notice circulated when it is appointed. There will be a Purdue school representative on it. [Laughter]

ITEM VI

Adjournment

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Is there any other business? Hearing none, we are adjourned.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY

at

I N D I A N A P O L I S

Minutes of the Faculty Council Meeting

October 3, 1985 Madame Walker Urban Life Center

3:30 P.M. - 5:30 P.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Administration: Vice President Glenn W. Irwin, Jr., Carol Nathan, Executive Dean Howard Schaller. Deans: Gerald Bepko, Walter J. Daly, H. William Gilmore, Elizabeth Grossman, P. Nicholas Kellum, William Plater, Sheldon Siegel, William J. Voos; Marshall C. Yovits. Faculty: Charolambos Aliprantis, Philip Bendick, Henry R. Besch, Jr., Jacqueline Blackwell, Patricia Blake, Frances Brahma, Edmund Byrne, Varoujan Chalian, Mervyn Cohen, Andre DeKorvin, David Doedens, Ian Dowdeswell, Kenneth Dunipace, Beverly Flynn, Paul Galanti, Melvin Glick, Cliff Goodwin, Ngoan Van Hoang, Meredith T. Hull, Jean Hutten, Thomas Jones, Henry C. Karlson, Suetta Kehrein, Joseph Kuczowski, William Kulrud, Monroe Little, Brenda Lyon, Rebecca T. Markel, Lillie-Mae Padilla, Richard Pflanzner, Gerald Powers, Anita Proffitt, Terry E. Reed, Mark S. Richardson, Edward Robbins, Neal Rothman, Marie Sparks, Robert B. Stonehill, Jeffery Vessely, Harriet Wilkins, George Willis, Kathryn Wilson, Pao-lo Yu.

ALTERNATES PRESENT: Deans: Jeannette M. Matthew for Barbara Fischler; Hugh Wolf for Howard D. Mehlinger; H. Oner Yurtseven for R. Bruce Renda; Bennie Keller for James E. Weigand; W. Harvey Hegarity for Jack R. Wentworth. Faculty: Susan Zunt for Donald Ferguson; Edward Starkey for Jean Gnat; Jennifer Helmen for Vania Goodwin; Betsy Joyce for Juanita Laidig; Richard C. Rink for Michael E. Mitchell.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Deans: Charles Bonser, Trevor Brown. Faculty: Elaine Alton, Charles Blevins, Ira Brandt, Michael Burke, Charlotte Carley, David Crabb, Joseph DiMico, John Eble, James Edmondson, Charles Ellinger, Martin Farlow, Naomi Fineberg, LaForrest Garner, Michael Glant, Edwin T. Harper, Robert A. Harris, Eugene M. Helveston, Lucreda Hutton, Miriam Z. Langsam, Onkar Markand, Gerald McHugh, Barnett B. Morris, Catherine Palmer, John E. Pless, Shirley Qate, Mitchell Rhodes, John Schmedtje, James Shanks, Rowland A. Sherrill, Jay Simon, Ernest E. Smith, Victor Wallis, Kathleen A. Warfel, Lawrence Wheeler, Charles Winslow, Ruth Woodham.

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE ABSENT: Martin Dragonnette.

VISITORS: Byron Olson, IUPUI Faculty Affairs Committee.

Summary of Meeting's Activities

Executive Dean Shaller announced that the fall enrollment at IUPUI held steady, the total head count figure being 23,431. Total credit hours are 208,346, of which 30.4% are taught in the two Purdue schools. These schools enrolled 15.6% of the head count.

The Executive Committee reported on the positive results of the Faculty Affairs Committee survey on the faculty club.

The Deans or their designees introduced the Council members, after which the traditional October Faculty Council Symposium was held.

AGENDA ITEM I

Approval of the Minutes of May 2 and September 5, 1985

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Good afternoon ladies and gentlemen. The first order of business today is the approval of the minutes of our May 2 and September 5 meetings. Is there a motion to approve? [So moved] Is there a second? [Seconded]. Is there any discussion? Are there any corrections, additions, or deletions? Hearing none, all in favor of the motion, say "Aye". Opposed. Motion carried.

AGENDA ITEM II

Presiding Officer's Business - Vice President Glenn W. Irwin, Jr., M.D.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: I am going to remain speechless today because we have a big program. All members of this Faculty Council will be introduced by their respective deans or, perhaps, others. I think the tradition of this particular meeting is to get to know each other as we go into a new year as far as Faculty Council is concerned, and also to visit for a while during a reception which will follow the meeting itself. Howard Schaller has one or two announcements.

DEAN SCHALLER: I have one brief announcement that concerns the enrollment for the Fall semester. You will recall that when we met in September we did not, at that time, have final enrollment figures. We now have the final enrollment figures for this campus. The enrollment at the university is not released publicly until such time as the President presents the enrollment data to the Board of Trustees which, as I understand, will be done at the Board meeting this weekend. So, next week the figures will become official.

I can tell you today that our enrollment on this campus remained virtually unchanged from last semester. The total head count enrollment was 23,431. That was up 0.2% over last year which was a total of 58 students. The credit hours, of which there were 208,346, was down 1.2%. In other words, the enrollment remained virtually unchanged. There was a slight redistribution between the health schools, on one hand, and the non-health schools on the other in that the health school enrollments went down by 200 students and the non-health students went up by 258. Neal Rothman, Chairman of the Mathematics Department, has just nodded his head that I performed the arithmetic correctly, so that the numbers do balance at a net increase of 58 students. The decline in the health schools was distributed among the health schools fairly much in proportion to the total enrollment and, as you know, a great deal of that decline is planned decline in the health schools. So, in a sense, there were no surprises in the enrollment this fall. Incidentally, the fact that we remained practically the same, I think, indicates a strong enrollment base on this campus because from other indicators we probably should have been declining. So, the fact that we stayed where we are is encouraging.

At the last meeting of the Faculty Council a statement was made that the majority of the enrollment on this campus was in the Purdue schools. I guess that idea has circulated a little bit publicly. The actual data this Fall indicates that the two Purdue schools teach 30.4% of the credit hours and they have 15.6% of the head count enrollment. The reason, of course, that they have proportionately more credit hours than they do head count is that they provide a fairly substantial service load for the entire campus. Those are the figures on the two Purdue schools this year. If you stop and think of the number of schools we have, that is what I would consider a very healthy representation of the Purdue mission. That is my report.

AGENDA ITEM III

Executive Committee Report - H. R. Besch, Jr., Secretary

PROF. BESCH: Thank you Vice President Irwin. I too will try to keep my comments here today fairly brief in order to allow more time for the festivities.

First, I would like to publicly thank Mr. Kenny Morgan and his staff for allowing us to continue toward

establishing the tradition of holding our Annual October Faculty Council Meeting in this beautiful facility, the Madame Walker Urban Life Center. In talking with some of you about how to establish indelibly this as a tradition, I was advised that the first step is to hold a function at a place more than once and we are well on our way to doing that. The second step is to give that function a name. So I am going to try that too. It seemed to me not fitting to be too frank about the name of this particular tradition since the purpose is to party, so I rejected the name October Boozer. I also rejected Bacchanal. That is too convivial. In thrashing about for a more fitting name for this occasion, I recalled a conversation I had with Panayotis Iatridis. He reminded me of a perfect word from his native Greek tongue. The word in Latin is sumposion, meaning "a drinking together", and the Greek version is symposium. So, I welcome you all to the October Faculty Council Symposium, in its Greekest sense.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Henry, the city really needs you to name the new baseball stadium. [Laughter]

PROF. BESCH: I will talk to Panayotis about it. You have received two packets from the Council Office since our last meeting. The thicker one starts with monthly summaries of our meetings from last year to bring those who were not here last year up to date, and also because our Constitution says I am supposed to do that. It also contains a number of lists and calendars for upcoming meetings. Also in the packet is a list of the membership of the Task Force on University Organization (published as IUPUI Circular 85-05, which would be page 11 in this packet, if they were sequentially numbered).

I wanted to provide a bit of follow-up on some other items that came up at our last Faculty Council meeting. I would like to mention to the rest of you who are not in the two schools involved that, as a result of our discussions of the Task Force on University Organization, two schools have scheduled meetings with Bob Bareikis, Chair of the Task Force — Science and Liberal Arts. I think Science held one last Thursday and Liberal Arts, I believe, will be soon. Other meetings with groups or individuals are certainly welcomed. Your input is needed. I have talked to some of the people who were at the Science meeting and, perhaps, some of them might want to comment about it.

Regarding the proposed amendment to the Faculty Code of Ethics that I mentioned at our last two meetings, last Saturday I spoke with Dolores Schroeder from the Affirmative Action Committee which initiated the proposed amendments. She told me that she would send a copy of the most current versions to us for providing to the faculty not only here at IUPUI but the faculty throughout the system. We hope we will be able to circulate the latest version with the minutes of today's meeting. I did bring some copies of the version I have of the proposed amendments with me today. They are up here if anyone would like a copy, or if I am asked to translate my comments into English, I will this time be able to hand out a piece of paper.

The last item from the Executive Committee is indicated on the agenda and it is the report from the Faculty Affairs Committee. Byron Olson, the Chair of that committee, and Susan Zunt, the hard-working secretary of that committee, are here today and have said they'd be happy to answer any questions about it. The data from that survey are contained in graphical summary on sheets here at the front of the room and on the refreshments table. The data are not very complicated. I think you can follow along from the data on the sheet. You probably do not need graphs. The first figure shows the percentage of responses in favor of having a Faculty Club. There were 81% saying yes and 19% saying no. If there were such a club, the survey asked how much people would be willing to pay for it. Those data are presented in Panel B of this handout. It seems you were willing to pay, according to the nearly 500 responses, about \$50 or more in annual dues for such a Faculty Club. The average value for the data that are shown here is \$50.55 a year. That average value is skewed somewhat by a lump of persons who are willing to pay \$100 for annual dues. But, generally the data are fairly Gaussian, with a mean somewhere around \$50. Panel C shows what use people might make of the such a club in terms of eating breakfast, lunch, or dinner there. About one-half of the people wanted to have lunch there; 30% of late goers wanted to have dinner there; and, 21% of the people who responded said they would like to have breakfast there. In that half who would like to have lunch in such a facility, they responded to the question of how much they might pay for the lunch. That is shown in Panel D and the mode of the data is somewhere between \$4 and \$5, a normal sort of lunch price. For completeness sake, I have also graphed the data in terms of the numbers of responses, regarding what time people wanted it to open and close. Those are

on the sheet as well. There are clusters of responses centered around different opening times, depending upon when someone wants to go there for breakfast or lunch. Your responses to the survey are, as Vice President Irwin mentioned last time, encouraging. The facilities have space and design for such a club.

One other point that can be extracted from the survey data regards whether the data are homogenous among schools and units. The data plotted in the figures, as you can see, have not been adjusted for school sizes. We have plotted simply the number of responses for each of the optional answers on the survey form. We had about half of the respondees, a little more than 250 people, identify the optional question about what their unit is. About 40% of the responses came from School of Medicine faculty and another high group of about 15% came from the School of Liberal Arts faculty. Smaller percentages from the other units reflect both the fewer total faculty in those units, as well as, perhaps, the relative proximity of the schools to the corner of North and Agnes Streets, where the hotel will be located. I have played with the data a bit for my own amusement, "adjusting" it for school size and then comparing the adjusted figures as standard deviations from the mean value of the answers. Although it is probably of very questionable statistical validity, I came up with a sort of "school influence factor". The graphs of the data looked at in this way are here at the front table and I would be happy to go over them with anyone who wants to. But, the reasoning gets somewhat convoluted so those figures are not on your sheets. In summary, however, it appears that the group identifying their unit as Libraries had the largest influence on the survey results. Other units in order of diminishing influence factor of the total faculty are SPFA, Engineering and Technology, Liberal Arts, Law, Social Work, Science, Nursing, Medicine, and Business. I've left out some of the smaller units because the data pools are so small that the "factors" are inappropriate.

Since little of what I just said probably makes the slightest bit of sense to you, I'll tell you why I've taken your time to mention it. The purpose of that calculation of "influence factor" was to try to assess whether the data were unduly reflective of the responses from only one or two units. Put into the form of a question someone asked me: "Does the amount people are willing to pay for lunch reflect only the wishes of the nearby School of Medicine faculty?" My answer is that the responses from the Health faculty as a group, do not overwhelm the data. I caution you that my "influence factor" analysis makes no claim to be valid, since I just dreamed it up, but it is based on a statistical treatment of the numbers. The data on this handout, I think, represents the wishes of the faculty in general. Again thanks to Byron and Susan and their Faculty Affairs Committee for their work on the survey. Regarding their next survey, the one on promotion and tenure practices, I believe those data, too, will be very meaningful. I think the kind of analyses that can be done on those data will alleviate the concern that was brought up here by Neal Rothman the last time we met. He indicated that he thought the data would not be homogenous regarding people's positions on promotion and tenure issues. We don't expect them to be homogenous. We don't expect to push them all in the same pool. That survey does ask that you identify your unit because we expect the responses to be different from different units. We intend to analyze them with respect to the expected potential differences. That ends the report from the Executive Committee.

AGENDA ITEM IV

Deans' Introduction of Faculty

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: What is the choreography here for deans introducing their faculties?

PROF. BESCH: We sent a letter to the deans asking them to introduce the faculty, beginning with the smallest school first. School sizes are based on last year's numbers and not this year's. These numbers are not exact because we don't have the official counts for this year yet. They are in but not yet put into the computer.

The smallest school is Journalism and **Shirley Quate** is the representative from there. She is a member of the Executive Committee. [No one was in attendance from Journalism.]

DEAN KELLUM: I am Nick Kellum, Dean of the School of Physical Education. We have one member, **Jeff Vessely**, Associate Professor of Physical Education. He is also on the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council and he serves on the Athletic Affairs Committee and the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Faculty Council. Those

of you who are active people will recognize Jeff as Director of Intramural and Recreational Sports. He does a fantastic job in that position.

PROF. HEGARTY: I am Harvey Hegarty of the School of Business. **Bill Kulsrud**, Associate Professor of Accounting, has been a loyal servant of this group for many years.

DEAN SIEGEL: I am Sheldon Siegel, Dean of the School of Social Work. My colleague **Gerald Powers** is our representative to the Faculty Council. He also serves as an elected member of the Executive Committee. For two years, prior to my coming here, Jerry was Acting Dean of the School of Social Work.

DEAN VOOS: I am Bill Voos, Dean of the Herron School of Art. I would like to introduce **Mark Richardson** who is our representative. Mark is an Assistant Professor of Art and Ceramics. He was last year's President of Herron Faculty.

JEANNETTE MATTHEW: I am not Barbara Fischler. I am Jeannette Matthew. Barbara had to be in Bloomington at a meeting today. I am supposed to introduce our two members except they aren't here either so I brought two others with me. Jennifer Hehman is from the Herron School of Art. She is representing **Vania Goodwin**. Vania is the head of our Cataloging Department. She also had to be in Bloomington today. She is our unit representative. She is also active in the Staff Relations Committee. **Jean Gnat**, who I am sure all of you know, is our member at large. She is the head of the 38th Street Library. She serves on the Budgetary Affairs Committee and the Executive Committee of the IUPUI Faculty Council. She is also the President Elect of the Indiana Libraries Association and that is where she had to be today.

DEAN BEPKO: We have one unit representative and one special member. The special member of the Faculty Council is your Parliamentarian, **Henry Karlson**. Henry has been a member of our faculty since 1977. He teaches Criminal Law, Evidence and Dispute Resolution Skills. His recreation includes baiting Paul Galanti and reading books such as Great Parliamentary Decisions. Henry is also an ex-officio member of the Executive Committee. He is a member of the Affirmative Action Advisory Council, the ROTC Faculty Advisory Committee, and the Sabbatical Leaves Committee. Our unit representative is **Paul Galanti** who teaches business subjects, corporations, trusts, and trade regulations at the Law School. He is a member of the Athletics Advisory Committee, Commencement and Special Ceremonies Committee and the Safety Committee. His recreation includes baiting Henry Karlson.

PROF. YURTSEVEN: I am Hamit Yurtseven, Associate Dean of Engineering, here today representing Dean Renda. Our representatives to the Faculty Council are: **Kemeth Dunipace**, Professor of Engineering; **Clifford Goodwin**, Assistant Professor of Supervision; **Anita Proffitt**, Assistant Professor of Computer Technology; and **Harriet Wilkins**, Assistant Professor of Supervision. Professor Dunipace and Wilkins are our unit representatives and Professor Goodwin and Proffitt are our at-large representatives.

DEAN PLATER: I am Bill Plater, Dean of the School of Liberal Arts. I want to say, first of all, I was glad that I was here to learn about influence factors. After the meeting is over, I would like to learn more. Our representatives include **Michael Burke**, Associate Professor of Philosophy, who specializes in Analytical Philosophy. He serves on the Animal Care Committee. **Ed Byrne**, Professor of Philosophy, is also Chairman of that department. He specializes in Technology and Ethics and well as Philosophy of Work. He serves on the Committee on the Disabled. We also have with us **Monroe Little**, Professor of History. He is the Director of the Afro-American Studies Program. Monroe specializes in Art History and Afro-American History Studies. He serves on the American Studies Advisory Committee and the Educational Opportunities Committee. Other members who are not here today are **Miriam Langsam**, who has served on every committee, **Rowland Sherrill**, **Victor Wallis**, and **Charles Winslow**.

DEAN YOVITS: I am Marshall Yovits, Dean of the School of Science. I think most of our representatives are here. First of all, I want to start with **Kathryn Wilson**, Associate Professor of Biology. She is Acting Chair in the Department of Biology. Her major technical discipline is Plant Tissue Culture and she is on the Faculty Council Nominating Committee. She is has been active for some time in the Faculty Council. We don't

have a Panayotis but do we have an Aliprantis. **Charolambos Aliprantis**, also known as "Roko" since Charolambos is difficult to pronounce, is with the department of Mathematical Sciences. He is interested not only in functional analysis, which is a branch of mathematics, but he is also very active in Mathematics Economics and works closely with the Economics people. He has been on the Fringe Benefits Committee. He is a unit representative. **Andre DeKorvin**, Professor of Computer Information Science, is interested primarily in Information Science and Decision Making. He has served on the Faculty Affairs Committee. He is also a unit representative. As an extracurricular activity, he writes poetry. **Joseph Kuczowski** is a full professor in Mathematical Sciences who is also Assistant Dean for Academic Affairs in the School of Science. He is interested in abstract algebra and mathematical education. He has been on the Fringe Benefits Committee since its inception. He has served on the IUPUI Tenure Committee. He is a representative at large. Next is **Barnett B. Morris**. He is a Professor of Psychology and is interested in perception and testing. He has been on the Sabbatical Leaves Committee and the Gerontology Committee. He is also a ham radio operator and he is also a ham. He is a representative at large. **Dick Pflanzler** is from the Department of Biology and his major interest is medical physiology. He has chaired the Academic Affairs Committee for four years; he has served for four years on the Academic Coordinating Council; the Committee on Committees; and the Athletic Affairs Committee. He is interested in model railroading. He is a representative at large. Next is **Neal Rothman**, Chairman of the Department of Mathematical Sciences. He is interested in technical discipline. He has served on the Affirmative Action Committee. He is a unit representative from the School of Science. We have two others who unfortunately couldn't be here today. We have **Elaine Alton**, Department of Mathematical Sciences, who is interested in Mathematical Education, and **Lucreda Hutton**, also from the Department of Mathematical Sciences. She too is interested in mathematical education. They are both at a math education meeting in Albuquerque, New Mexico.

DEAN GILMORE: I am Bill Gilmore, Dean of the School of Dentistry. Our faculty is proud to have three unit representatives and two at-large representatives. Dr. **Varoujan Chalian** who is Chairman and Professor of Maxillofacial Prosthetics, is on the Executive Committee of this Council. His program is in Wishard Hospital, and he also has a graduate program in Prosthetics in the Dental School. Dr. **George P. Willis**, an Assistant Professor of Dental Practice Administration, teaches expanded functions to auxiliaries. He is one of our TV stars. He teaches two satellite campuses courses. Dr. **Donald Ferguson** is being represented by Dr. Susan Zunt, who is a member of your Faculty Affairs Committee. She is a dentist and an oral pathologist who has been a great support in teaching auxiliaries in general pathology. Dr. **LaForrest Garner** is a Professor and Chairman of Orthodontics. He couldn't be here today. He is a member of the Nominating and Tenure Committees. Then we have Associate Professor **Marie C. Sparks** who is our Head Librarian. She has been busy with a computer project in the school this year and isn't on any committees. She is past Chair of the Nominating Committee.

DEAN GROSSMAN: We are pleased to have three unit representatives and a number of representatives at large. **Charlotte Carley** is Director of Nursing. **Jean Hutten**, Director of our Learning Lab, is also Chairman of the President's Council of the school which represents all of the student organizations. She is on the Board of Directors of the Indianapolis Chapter of the American Red Cross and is a past President of the Sigma Beta Chi Alpha Chapter. **Pat Blake** has been on a number of committees with the Council. She is the Acting Dean of the Undergraduate Baccalaureate Programs in the school. Her particular area of interest and expertise is Pediatric Nursing. She is a Pediatric Nurse practitioner and has worked with the migrant workers. She is a consultant to the Nursing Service at Riley Hospital. She likes to quilt and is a good sports fan especially I.U. football. Betsy Joyce is here representing **Juanita Laidig**. Juanita is in Bloomington today. **Beverly Flynn** is the Chairman of our Department of Community Health Nursing. She is developing a track in our doctoral program in Health Policy. She was the first nurse Visiting Fellow Commoner at Churchill College at the University of Cambridge in England. The Mayor of Columbus has appointed her to the Bartholomew County Board of Health. She is the mother of two children and enjoys watching the children play soccer and ice hockey. **Ruth Woodham** is also a member. She is working on a special project. We call it an Earn/Learn Mobility Track project. It is a grant to help the LPNs who want to become registered nurses. **Ngoan Van Hoang** is an Associate Professor in Community Health. He is a member of the Board of the American Assembly for Men in Nursing. He is in local politics in Johnson County in Franklin, Indiana. He has run for elected office a few times and one of these days he is going to win. **Brenda Lyon** is an Associate Professor and Chairman of her Department. She is interested in nursing of adults with bioidissonance. She is also in private practice in

health and stress management and is a consultant for stress management for International Business Librarians Trade Associates and the International Association of Purchasing Management. **Rebecca Markel** is the Acting Chair of the Department of Pediatric Women and Family Health. She is on a number of committees including search and screen committees. In addition to a variety of activities in which she is involved when she is at home, she is also a reader for the blind at the Speedway Public Library and a volunteer and charter member of the Indiana Sports Corporation.

DEAN DALY: Thank you very much, Dr. Besch. It is a pleasure to come here and introduce our representatives. I would like first to introduce your Secretary, **Dr. Henry Besch**, who in real life is the Chairman of the Department of Pharmacology and Toxicology. I will rapidly mention the older members of Council and if they happen to be present, they might stand. Then I will introduce the new members. First is **Phil Bendick**, Associate Professor of Surgery. Next is **Ira Brandt**, Professor of Pediatrics, who is President of the Medical School faculty. Others include **Joseph DiMicco**, Associate Professor of Pharmacology & Toxicology; **Jim Edmondson**, Professor of Medicine and President-elect of our faculty; **Onkar Markand**, Professor of Urology; **Catherine Palmer**, Professor of Medical Genetics and Assistant Dean for Graduate Studies; **Frances Brahm**, Assistant Librarian, Medical School Library; **Mervyn Cohen**, Professor of Radiology; **David Crabb**, Assistant Professor of Medicine in Biochemistry; **Ian Dowdeswell**, Associate Professor of Medicine; **John Eble**, Associate Professor of Pathology; **Naomi Fineberg**, Assistant Professor of Medicine; **Michael Glant**, Associate Professor of Pathology; **Thomas Jones**, Assistant Professor of Family Medicine; **Lillie-Mae Padilla**, Assistant Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology; **Jim Shanks**, Professor of Otolaryngology; **Jay Simon**, Associate Professor of Psychiatry in Biochemistry; **Larry Wheeler**, Associate Professor of Pathology. Now for the new members: **Martin Farlow**, Assistant Professor of Neurology; **Robert Harris**, Professor of Biochemistry; **Eugene Helveston**, Professor of Ophthalmology; **Meredith Hull**, Professor of Pathology; **Michael Mitchell**, Associate Professor of Urology; **Terry Reed**, Associate Professor of Medical Genetics. Dr. Reed has a Ph.D. from Indiana University and has been a member of our faculty since 1972. **Ernest Smith** is Assistant Professor of Pediatrics. **Robert Stonehill**, Professor of Medicine, has an M.D. from Temple University and has been a member of our faculty since 1967 as a specialist in pulmonary diseases. **Kathleen Wafel**, Associate Professor of Pathology; **Pao-lo Yu**, Professor of Medical Genetics, has been a member of our faculty since 1964 and has a Ph.D. from North Carolina State; **Charles Blevins**, Professor and Chairman of the Department of Anatomy; **David Doedens**, Assistant Professor in Pharmacology & Toxicology has been a member of our faculty since 1970 and has a Ph.D. from the University of Illinois; **Melvin Glick**, Associate Professor of Pathology, has been with us since 1973 and has an M.D. and a Ph.D. from the University of Alabama; **Edwin Harper**, Associate Professor of Biochemistry; **Suetta Kehrein**, Assistant Professor of Allied Health Services; **John Pless**, Professor of Pathology; and **John Schmedtje**, Associate Professor of Anatomy.

BENNIE KELLER: My name is Bennie Keller, Associate Professor of Electrical Engineering and Technology. I am representing Scott Evenbeck, Director and Associate Dean of Continuing Studies, who is representing Jim Weigand who is the Dean of Continuing Studies. Our unit representative is **Charles Ellinger**, Assistant Professor of Labor Studies.

DEAN WOLF: I am Hugh Wolf, Associate Dean of Education for Indianapolis. We are pleased to be represented by two representatives on this body. Our unit representative is **Dr. Jacqueline Blackwell**. Dr. Blackwell is Associate Professor of Education and specializes in Early Childhood Education. Among her other duties, she is presently serving as a Scholar in Residence at the Lawrence Township Schools. She is also a co-recipient of a grant from Indiana Commission for Higher Education along with Mike Cohen and Ed Harper. That grant focuses on Science Curriculum for elementary students. We also have an at-large representative, **Dr. Ed Robbins**. Ed is an Associate Professor who has just returned to full time professorship after a three-year stay as Director of Undergraduate Studies. More to the point of today's meeting, Ed served as the leader of the this organization as Secretary of the IUPUI Faculty Council in 1976-77. Thank you.

[Note: No one from SPEA was in attendance. **Gerald McHugh**, Associate Professor, is the Unit representative. He is serving on the Faculty Council Nominating Committee.]

PROF. RESCH: This ends the Executive Committee Report.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Thank you, Henry.

AGENDA ITEM V
New Business

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Is there any new business?

PROF. WILSON: Has been anyone been appointed yet to serve on the Search and Screen Committee for your position?

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: As far as I know, no. The President and the Trustees are reviewing the search and screen process for Presidents, Vice Presidents and perhaps others. The Trustees meet tomorrow and I am hoping that there will be some news about that tomorrow afternoon.

PROF. WILSON: Is there any truth to the rumors that people like Bill Hudnut will have your position?

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: No. I am convinced that the Trustees have made no decisions about the new Vice President for Indianapolis. I have talked to most of them. Be patient. They will come through.

AGENDA ITEM VI
Adjournment

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: This meeting is adjourned.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY

at

INDIANAPOLIS

Minutes of the Faculty Council Meeting

Thursday, November 7, 1985

Law School, Room 116 3:30 P.M. - 5:30 P.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Administration: Vice President Glenn W. Irwin, Jr., Carol Nathan, Executive Dean Howard Schaller. Deans: Elizabeth Grossman, P. Nicholas Kellum, William M. Plater, Sheldon Siegel, William J. Voos. Director: Barbara Fischler. Faculty: Philip Bendick, Henry R. Besch, Jr., Jacqueline Blackwell, Patricia Blake, Ira Brandt, Michael Burke, Edmund Byrne, Charlotte Carlley, Andre DeKorvin, Joseph DiMicco, David Doedens, Kenneth Dunipace, James Edmondson, Charles R. Ellinger, Martin Farlow, Jeri Gruner, Naomi Fineberg, Beverly Flynn, Paul J. Galanti, LaForrest Garner, Melvin Glick, Jean Gnat, Cliff Goodwin, Vania Goodwin, Edwin T. Harper, Eugene M. Helveston, Ngoan Van Hoang, Meredith T. Hull, Jean Hutten, Lucreda Hutton, Henry Karlson, Linda Kasper, Suetta Kehrein, William Kulsrud, Rebecca T. Markel, Barnett B. Morris, Lillie-Mae Padilla, Richard Pflanzner, Gerald Powers, Anita Proffitt, Shirley Quate, Terry E. Reed, Mark S. Richardson, Edward Robbins, Neal Rothman, James Shanks, Marie Sparks, Robert B. Stonehill, Jeffery S. Vessely, Kathleen A. Warfel, Harriet Wilkins, George Willis, Kathryn Wilson, Charles Winslow, Ruth Woodham, Pao-lo Yu.

ALTERNATES PRESENT: Deans: James F. Bindley for Gerald L. Bepko; Daniel P. Benford for Walter J. Daly; Michael R. Curtis for H. William Gilmore; Hugh Wolf for Howard Mehlinger; H. Oner Yurtseven for R. Bruce Renda; Bennie Keller for James Weigand; W. Harvey Hegarty for Jack Wentworth. Faculty: Peter Loh for Elaine Alton; Betsy Joyce for Juanita Laidig.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Deans: Charles F. Bonswar, Marshall Yovits. Faculty: Charolambos Aliprantis, Charles Blevins, Frances Brahma, Varoujan Chalian, Mervyn Cohen, David Crabb, Ian Dowdeswell, John Eble, Michael Glant, Robert A. Harris, Thomas A. Jones, Joseph Kuczkowski, Miriam Z. Langsam, Monroe H. Little, Brenda Lyon, Omkar Markand, Gerald McHugh, Michael E. Mitchell, Catherine Palmer, John E. Pless, John Schmedtje, Rowland A. Sherrill, Jay Simon, Ernest B. Smith, Victor Wallis, Lawrence Wheeler.

Summary of Meeting's Activities

The Executive Committee reported that President Ryan has named a Task Force on Student Rights and Responsibilities, chaired by Dean Pat Boaz.

The Council voted to set the apportionment base, N, at 42. The total Council size is thus set at 100, including 40 unit representatives, 40 at-large representatives and 20 ex-officio members.

The Council voted to recommend to IUPUI representatives to the University Faculty Council that they oppose the resolutions from the Affirmative Action Committee.

The Council suggested some revisions to an early draft of the proposed IUPUI Mission Statement.

AGENDA ITEM I

Memorial Resolution - Professor Marilyn M Green [IUPUI Circular 85-06]

DEAN SCHALLER: Dr. Irwin is downtown this afternoon at a meeting of the Commission for Higher Education. He hopes and intends to be here before the meeting is over and, of course, at that time, he will take the

chair. We have a memorial resolution today for Professor Marilyn Green. Dean Elizabeth Grossman will present that memorial resolution. [Dean Grossman read the memorial resolution.]

DEAN SCHALLER: Let's accept this resolution by rising for a moment of silence.

AGENDA ITEM II

Approval of the Minutes of the October 3, 1985 Minutes

DEAN SCHALLER: In view of Dr. Irwin's temporary absence, I would like to request approval of a slight change in the agenda and that would be to move the Presiding Officer's Business back until he arrives. I hope we can agree on that. Secondly, if Dr. Irwin is not back by the time we reach Agenda Item V, we will reverse the order and take up the Code of Academic Ethics resolution ahead of the IUPUI Mission Statement. The reason for that is that I know that Dr. Irwin will be very anxious to hear the discussion about the Mission Statement and also be available for any comments that you might wish to elicit from him. Do I have your permission to change the agenda in that fashion? [Unanimous voice approval] Thank you.

The next item is the approval of the minutes of the October 3, 1985 meeting. Is there any discussion of those minutes?

PROF. GLICK: On page 7 near the middle of the page, my degrees should be indicated as M.S. and Ph.D. and not M.D. and Ph.D.

[Another change brought to the attention of the Faculty Council Office was that Barnett Morris should be shown as present instead of absent.]

DEAN SCHALLER: We will take you as being an authority on that matter and accept the amendment to the minutes. Are there any other comments on the minutes? Do I hear a motion to approve? [So moved] It has been moved. Is there a second? [Seconded] All of those in favor of approving the minutes, please say "Aye." Opposed? "Nay". Are there any absentions? It passes unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM III

Presiding Officer's Business

DEAN SCHALLER: I don't have any items to bring up at this time. I hardly need to draw this to your attention but the President of the United States has recognized the fact that he has a large number of faculty members on this campus eligible to serve in his cabinet and he has selected one. Professor Otis Bowen is apparently going to be nominated to be the next Secretary of Health and Human Services. I would assume that Professor Bowen will have no trouble in obtaining the concurrence of the Senate.

AGENDA ITEM IV

Executive Committee Report - H. R. Besch, Jr., Secretary

DEAN SCHALLER: The next item is the Executive Committee Report with Professor Besch.

PROF. BESCH: Thank you, Howard. The first item that I would like to bring to you regards University Faculty Council business but certainly impacts on IUPUI, much as does another agenda that will be coming up later on. The University Faculty Council resolved last March that the President of Indiana University appoint a task force on Student Rights and Responsibilities to review the various regulations under which students' rights and responsibilities are currently promulgated. You may know that IUPUI has a book like this [showing sample] on Student Rights and Responsibilities. Most of the other campuses have something similar and there are many different approaches, with a great deal of disparity in how student rights and responsibilities are written up and understood on the various campuses. The President has taken that resolution of the University Faculty Council under advisement and recently appointed that committee. As

as a special point of pride for us on this campus, he has asked Pat Boaz, who, as you know, is our Dean of Student Affairs and Associate Dean of the Faculties, to chair that committee. For the record, the other members of the committee to examine and revise the University's various statements on Student Rights and Responsibilities are:

Steven Akard, former President of the Student Government, IUPUI
 Carl M. Christenson, Professor of Biology, IUS
 Stuart M. Green, Chairperson of the Division of Liberal Studies, IUK
 Deborah Hamilton, University Director of Affirmative Action, IUB
 J. John Harris, III, Professor of Education, IUPUI
 J. Michael Hostetler, Director of Student Activities, IUSB
 William A. Kerr, Professor of Law, IUPUI
 Judith A. McCarty, Associate Professor of Nursing, IUE
 Bruce McQuigg, Associate Professor of Education, IUB
 Joseph Motherwell, Student Government President IPFW
 Joseph M. Pellicciotti, Assistant Professor of Public and Environmental Affairs, IUNW
 Roger E. Sell, former Vice President of the Student Body, IUB
 Carolyn A. Snyder, Associate Dean for Public Services and Librarian, IUB
 Cliff K. Travis, University Attorney, University Counsel, IUB
 Barbara Varchol, Assistant Dean of Students, IUB

I am sure we are all pleased to see that the President has seen fit to name our Dean of Students as the head of this committee.

Moving on to the materials that we sent before this meeting, please do note that the attachments that are listed on the cover, including the minutes, resolutions and various tables, are in fact inside the packet. I would also like to mention to you that there has been a change in the Executive Committee membership of this Council. Brenda Lyon has been unable to continue on the Executive Committee and, as the next highest vote getter in the election, Professor Eugene Helveston has agreed to serve in her place.

Before we move to the last item, the item printed here, "Vote on the Apportionment Base N," I would comment at this time on my intended participation in subsequent discussions. Our Constitution specifically permits the Secretary to participate in debates in this body. Often I refrain from putting in my two cents worth, but, since I am specifically allowed to act as a regular member, even though I sit on this side of the table instead of that side, I will advise you that when it comes time to discuss the Code of Academic Ethics resolution, I have some particular comments to bring to you. These reflect wide discussions about these resolutions. When I ask for recognition and speak at that time, I will not be out of order. The Code of Academic Ethics resolutions have been around for some time and it seems like it is high time to have a vote on these matters. We have mandated a vote at the first meeting of the University Faculty Council next spring. Before that vote is taken, we thought it ought to be discussed at the individual faculty councils before being put into effect systemwide as a result of a vote taken in the University Faculty Council.

That is the last item of Executive Committee business besides the vote on the Apportionment Base N. I think we could move right to that. As background information, I have prepared a table which, I think, with a bit of looking at, does actually make sense. It was circulated as a separate mailing (IUPUI Circular 85-08). [For use in this discussion, it is also printed with these minutes.] It shows the distribution of the numbers of unit representatives by unit, assuming various values of N. These range from a high N value of 56, which gives us the smallest council size that we could practically have with the numbers that are present now, to an N value as low as 24, which would bloat this Council to the size of 146. The Executive Committee recommends an N value of 42, which would set the total Council size for next year at 100. The distribution of unit representatives shown in this table (bolded values) would be mandated if you agree with an N value of 42. That 100 would be made up of 40 unit representatives, 40

at-large representatives, and 20 ex-officio persons. The ex-officios are mostly deans but also some of the rest of us, like myself, are included in the ex-officio head count. Since this comes as a recommendation from the Executive Committee, I think it is already considered seconded and is open for discussion.

DEAN SCHALLER: So, the recommendation is then that N be set at 42 which will set the total size of the Faculty Council for the next two years at 100. Since that is a report of the Executive Committee, we will take it as being moved and seconded and the floor is now open for discussion.

PROF. DUNIPACE: What is N?

PROF. BESCH: N is the number of faculty persons who are represented by one unit representative.

PROF. BLAKE: Would the Council size stay the same?

PROF. BESCH: No. This would decrease the Council size by two persons. Currently, the spread of persons is exactly as indicated at the center of this table, except that Medicine has 17 instead of the 16 indicated here. This would decrease the Council size to a nice round 100 which we have been trying to do for as long as I can remember. For various reasons such as overlapping terms, we have not been able to do it.

PROF. HARPER: The numbers there on that line of 100, are those numbers there because that is what the Executive Committee is recommending or because it just so happens that the units come up with "1" at that point?

PROF. BESCH: To explain the table a bit, it really contains unmarked Parts A and B. Part A is the left three columns, and Part B is all the rest to the right of that. Part B shows the distribution of representatives by unit, but in fact, most cells of the table are blank because only changes from the proposed distribution are included. If you look across the 42-40-100 line, what is shown is the distribution that would occur if we do select N at 42. That distribution is exactly the same as now except that Medicine would have 16 instead of the 17 it has now. If you move up two rows to an N value of 46 and move across, you will find the number 15. If we selected an N of 46, the School of Medicine's representatives would drop to 15, and all of the other units would stay exactly the same. If you move up one more row, such that N equals 48, all other units would stay exactly as they are now, except that Liberal Arts would drop to two representatives; Medicine would remain at 15. That same pattern continues all the way up and down the table. The distribution shown in bolded numbers is what will occur should we adopt an N value of 42.

PROF. HARPER: My question was, if we moved to 98, does that mean that all "1's" would become zeros except for one?

PROF. BESCH: No. All of those with a value of "1" would stay at "1", everywhere up and down all rows. Where there is another number in the column, it either goes smaller - one being the smallest number of representatives that any unit could have - or goes larger, depending on the value of N we select.

DEAN SCHALLER: The question has been called for. All of those in favor of the resolution, please indicate so by saying "Aye." Opposed, "Nay." Absentions? This has been passed unanimously.

PROF. BESCH: That ends the Executive Committee Report.

AGENDA ITEM V - B.

New Business - Code of Academic Ethics Resolutions

DEAN SCHALLER: We have reached Agenda Item V. We, therefore, will proceed to V. B., reserving V. A.

until later. The Code of Academic Ethics resolutions have been considered by both the Academic Affairs Committee and the Faculty Affairs Committee and I believe Byron Olson and Ed Robbins are here and will lead this discussion.

PROF. BESCH: Ed indicates I should start the discussion. We had anticipated that Delores Schroeder, who knows the history of these resolutions from the Affirmative Action Committee, would be here today when we originally sent out this material, but for health reasons she could not be here. She was involved two years ago when these resolutions were originally put forth. The two resolutions which have been circulated to you represent the remaining part of a three-part resolution from the Affirmative Action Committee. They have been discussed in the Bloomington Faculty Council and sent back from there to the Affirmative Action Committee twice. The third time they passed that body. As a result, they came to the University Faculty Council for a vote last March. Because we had not considered it in this Faculty Council and also because it had not been considered on some of the other campuses besides Bloomington, the Agenda Committee (which is the University Faculty Council's name for what we call here the Executive Committee) recommended that it be returned for consideration by the various faculty councils of the campuses throughout the system. It will come back to the floor of the University Faculty Council at our first spring meeting in February. At that time, it is likely that a vote will be taken.

I forewarned you that I would comment about these resolutions. Let me begin my remarks by being upfront. I oppose the suggested amendments in their current form, not because of there being something wrong with the intent, but because, as far as I am concerned, the wording is, at best, hard to interpret, and at worst, unconstitutional. In my judgment, passing these resolutions would not have the effect intended and the effects would certainly not be limited to what seems to be intended by the Affirmation Action Committee. Philosophically, one cannot legislate morality. Regarding both of the amendments, I might draw an analogy to the problem by reminding you that, because some people were alcoholics there was a social experiment in this country to prohibit alcohol. That was a well known attempt to legislate morals that did not work out. I would also mention some practical points that have been pointed out to me by others, regarding the particular wording in the resolution. There is a statement in the second resolution (about the students) that says even though consenting adults may consent, it still is not something that we should countenance. It has been suggested to me that this is in fact unconstitutional. In a less serious vein, it has also been suggested that IUPUI's 87-year-old student might protest that he was physically attracted to his 79-year-old teacher and was prohibited from consummating that attraction by this resolution.

I hope you will discuss these resolutions fully here. I have collected other comments, some facetious, and some not so funny. The resolutions lend themselves to such comments. The issue of sex discrimination is certainly not funny. The issue of sexual harassment is not funny. Both of these resolutions address themselves to issues that are not in the least funny. But, because of the wording, because of the content, there have been a number of wisecracks whenever the resolutions have been discussed. I think what is requested is that, after discussion of these resolutions, either as a whole (or separated, if someone moves to separate them) that we should take a vote on whether we would recommend as a Council to the University Faculty Council, through our representatives to the UFC, our approval, disapproval or some other action, amendment, or whatever of these two resolutions. I will stop there and ask for comments.

PROF. WILSON: On Part A, what are the policies of the University currently in regard to research situations where some professor working in a laboratory wants to hire his wife who has a Ph.D. as a postdoctorate?

DEAN SCHALLER: Kathryn, if I can interrupt a minute then you can come back with that question. I think we probably need to have the resolution on the floor seconded. Then we will open it for discussion, and I will recognize you first. Henry, if you would like to propose a resolution.

PROF. BESCH: Since we have discussed this at length in the Executive Committee, even though this is not

under Executive Committee business, I believe I can move approval of these resolutions, in which case your vote would be "nay" if you disapproved them. I move approval of these resolutions. [This was seconded.]

DEAN SCHALLER: The floor is now open for discussion. Kathryn you have the floor.

PROF. WILSON: On Part A, what I worry about is, I am not certain of what the policies of the University currently are in regard to research situations where you have some professor working in a laboratory who wants to hire his wife who has a Ph.D. as a postdoctorate. Is something like that already prohibited anyway?

PROF. BESCH: Yes. That is under the University's anti-nepotism policy. You are not allowed to supervise someone who is related to you by marriage or blood. Part A would extend that anti-nepotism policy to persons who are closely related by other than marriage or genes.

PROF. DUNIPACE: I haven't read all of this in great detail, but it does incorporate that anti-nepotism policy as part of the Code of Academic Ethics. Is that right? If it is not, this other policy, if adopted, should be wherever the anti-nepotism policy is. Nepotism is not part of academic ethics and this one doesn't seem to be either. They ought to both be together in our written policies, wherever that is.

PROF. BESCH: It doesn't fit any better there than it does here. That is one reason why I circulated, with these proposed amendments, the pages that describe the Code of Academic Ethics in the Academic Handbook. What appears there are such things as not impugning or denigrating your fellow faculty members. This really does not fit here at all, as far as I am concerned.

PROF. BLAKE: Is this a major problem in the University? Because, if it is, that's one thing. If it isn't, then I don't understand making such a type of policy for all of us who are abiding by such principles. Why not attack the problems where they exist?

DEAN SCHALLER: This originated on the Bloomington campus. I don't have an exact measurement, but I think there is a great deal of concern about it down there in some quarters. I think I could also say with some confidence that the majority of the faculty down there behave in such a fashion that this might not be needed. But, in the opinion of some faculty members down there, there have been enough incidents and problems that they feel that they really do need some guidance on the point. It is not totally absent from this campus. I have had a few cases referred to me, and they have been difficult to resolve. They were difficult to resolve, not because there was anything wrong with the people involved. It was simply a matter of how to proceed. So, it can be an issue on this campus. As I said, in Bloomington I know there has been more concern about it than there has been here. I think it is important to deal with because, if it does pass the University Faculty Council, it then becomes governance policy for us.

PROF. BLAKE: Thank you.

PROF. FINEBERG: I think the policy should be somewhere. It seems to me that it can't be morally proper for the University to say that you can't hire your spouse but it is okay to hire your girlfriend or your boyfriend. But, it seems to me that the Code of Ethics is not the place where it belongs; it belongs wherever the nepotism rules are. In view of the changing moral climate and changing standards of behavior, it seems to be something that might need to be down so that we can deal with the cases that arise.

PROF. GALANTI: I am assuming that the basis for the anti-nepotism policy and rules is that there are certain kinds of relationships where it is impossible to expect truly objective kinds of evaluations to occur. I would also assume that this is simply an attempt to expand that definition of the kinds of relationships that fall into that category. The only problem is whether or not you should make that more

definitive by giving these examples or whether or not it might be more appropriate, since it is a matter or judgmental fact anyway, if you simply state in some straightforward way that there ought not be those kinds of relationships and other situations where you could not expect or you would not expect purely objective kinds of interactions to occur. It just seems to me a way to avoid, by taking a more straightforward approach, the problem of defining those relationships by examples.

PROF. BYRNE: I would like to speak against the resolution for several reasons. First of all, there are no definitions of what these prohibited relationships are, nor is there any indication of procedures whereby such definitions could be arrived at theoretically or operationally. Secondly, in the prologue, the committee indicates its concern about sexual harassment. Section B, which refers to relations with students, does not in fact address sexual harassment as such. There is no indication in the language that harassment is involved. Thirdly, the level of severity of application of these rules is entirely inappropriate to the language of the Code of Academic Responsibilities. Throughout the code, the language uses terms like "will", "assumes responsibility," etc. This language reads in a very straightforward statutory fashion - "shall", "shall not", etc. It may well be that some kind of provisions need to be built into academic language somewhere, but I do not feel, as it has already been suggested, it belongs in the Code of Academic Responsibilities. As that is worded and as the whole thrust of the language is put together, I would propose, with regard to number 14, that in the first sentence, "shall" should be changed to read "should." All of this is on the assumption that this is to be built into the Code of Academic Responsibilities, to be in a context of a different sort of language from which it is written.

DEAN SCHALLER: Is there a second to that amendment? [Seconded by Prof. Blake]

PROF. KARLSON: I basically oppose the resolutions as written for similar reasons. One problem which has been pointed out is definitional, and the amendment does not solve definitional questions. For example, what do we mean by substantial financial relationships? If a chairman of a department and a member of that department had a grant together, which is not uncommon within each section of this institution, does that mean that the chairman of the department then gives up his ability to talk, as chairman of the department, to any member of that department who participates in the grant with him? That would be a substantial financial relationship in at least some cases. The issue dealing with social relationships between faculty and people whom they are supervising is not sexual harassment; it is a sexual discrimination, and those that felt that they were passed over because of this relationship would have valid suits; at least in so far as the employment is concerned - for sexual discrimination. Perhaps it is not sexual harassment that is dealt with here but sexual discrimination. We are attempting to deal with the possibility of preventing law suits. The principle is excellent, the lack of definition is dangerous, and ambiguities of this nature should not be enacted in any code which people are subject to some type of coercion or punishment for violation of, because of ambiguities like this, especially situations where people are possibly innocent.

PROF. GALANTI: As far as ambiguity is concerned, it is perhaps no more or less ambiguous than the United States Constitution. My concern was the language of the anti-nepotism policy that now applies at Indiana University. I have not seen that. I was wondering if, by any chance, the language in Paragraph 14 follows the language in the anti-nepotism policy. I think I would agree with whomever said that, perhaps this would be more appropriate as a part of the anti-nepotism section of whatever University regulations we have. I don't know whether it is involved in Trustee action or what it would entail. Basically, the problem is anti-nepotism, and I favor it as a nepotism rule. I am not as troubled by the definitional problems as my colleague. Perhaps if you get more specific then you will have the possibility of people reading into the intent simply because they escape the technical definitions. I am always a little leary of the overly definitional because it allows too many escape hatches.

UNKNOWN: To extend Professor Karlson's comments about substantial financial relationships, speaking for the School of Medicine's clinical departments, it is difficult for a division of the Medical School

functioning as it is now constituted to avoid financial relationships with the chairmen of those departments, because of patient care.

DEAN SCHALLER: Are there further comments?

PROF. HUTTON: I have heard several people say that it doesn't belong in the handbooks, it belongs with the nepotism rule. Well, what difference would that make as to where it is?

DEAN SCHALLER: I think what they are saying is that, if we are going to have it, which is to be determined, it would be better if it would be compatible with the language written near it.

PROF. HUTTON: We would still have the ruling, wouldn't we, wherever we had it in the handbook or elsewhere?

DEAN SCHALLER: Yes, we would. That is right.

PROF. BESCH: There was an unanswered, and I think not rhetorical, question asked by Paul Galanti about whether this in fact tracks the anti-nepotism wording. I didn't bring a copy of that. As I remember, however, it does not read anything at all like this. It says more frankly something about nepotism's not a being a good idea outside as well as inside of the University. Moreover, one could question whether, in fact, nepotism is not a good idea. Current thinking in the business world, as I understand it, is that nepotism is not thought to be particularly damaging to a company. In fact, a number of benefits accrue, because two employees are mutually reinforcing from the company's point of view. One may be poorly paid, for example, but nevertheless, he may remain at the company and work because the other one is staying there. Some of the ideas on nepotism as a concept, I think, have changed at least in the business community.

DEAN SCHALLER: Dr. Irwin has asked that I remain in the Chair until we dispose of this item.

PROF. BYRNE: In regard to the question of tracking the anti-nepotism language in the Academic Handbook, not only is it not tracking, but it is considerably more extensive. The language in the handbook, pages 34 and 35, refers only to the initial hiring, employment, or being transferred to a position. The language proposed here refers to employment-related decisions which would include everything up to assignments of work.

PROF. HELVESTON: There are of course practices that circumvent anti-nepotism policies. The way that it has been gotten around in the past is that a father would hire his son in a given department and then have his son have dual appointments, thereby technically having the posture of not being a direct supervisor. I think that this has occurred on at least two occasions at the Medical School. It has existed with the blessings, apparently, of the handbook and its interpreters.

PROF. BESCH: That is not the only way. It is perfectly possible to have your son or daughter work for you as long as the financial records don't indicate that they work for you. I personally know of three cases, at least, where there is that kind of bending of the rules to get around the anti-nepotism policy.

DEAN SCHALLER: Just to come back to where we are, we are considering what to recommend to the IUPUI representatives to the University Faculty Council.

PROF. BESCH: Actually, I believe we are discussing the amendment.

PROF. BYRNE: I would be glad to drop the amendment.

DEAN SCHALLER: Does the seconder agree? [Secunder agreed.] Okay. So we are back to considering whether or not to instruct our representatives to the University Faculty Council to vote yea or nay on

the two propositions that were circulated — A & B. The resolution is phrased in the affirmative; that is, it is phrased that we recommend that they vote for them. Therefore, if you are against them, you would vote, No. I will try to repeat that again. Everybody check me before we vote. Now, is there further discussion?

The question has been called for. Again, we are voting on how to instruct the IUPUI representatives to vote at the University Faculty Council deliberation of the two amendments — A & B. If you want the representatives to vote against the proposition, you will vote "No" when I call for the vote.

PROF. ROBBINS: Point of order. Is it, in fact, a case that this will constitute binding instructions to our representatives? Or are these simply instructions?

DEAN SCHALLER: Good point, Ed. Thank you. Are you prepared for the vote? All of those in favor of recommending that our representatives to the University Faculty Council vote for A & B, please signify so by saying "Aye". Those opposed, "No". The resolution fails and our representatives are, therefore, advised to vote against the two propositions.

AGENDA ITEM V - A.

New Business - IUPUI Mission Statement (First Draft)

DEAN SCHALLER: The next item is the IUPUI Mission Statement resolution and I understand that Ed Robbins and Byron Olson are expected to be here. I see Ed, so, Ed, I will ask you to come down to the front. Carol Nathan, who has been coordinating this project is also present. Carol, why don't you move down front. At this point, I will turn the chair over to Dr. Irwin.

PROF. ROBBINS: I take it that this is a discussion item only and, therefore, does not require a motion. I am reporting on behalf of the Academic Affairs Committee. A bit of background before I try to summarize very briefly the discussion of that committee when it met on the first of November. We had distributed, prior to that meeting, the initial draft, I think it is the one dated 10/10/85, and asked the members of the committee to review that and come to the meeting on November 1st prepared to discuss that in anticipation of a report to the body today on what their impressions of that document were. As it turned out, I think it was a day or so before that, we were advised by Dean Nathan that a revision had been completed and that, if possible, we ought to try to have the committee review the most recent version. We did distribute copies at the meeting; the committee members did not have an opportunity to read it prior to that. Dean Nathan and Bill Spencer did attend the meeting and summarized, very generally, what they thought some of the differences contained in the revision were, but it was on the basis of having studied the first draft, having had a overview of the change in the second draft, and very little time to read that draft that these discussions took place. What I have here are about six summary statements that we drew from those discussions. Although these statements are expressed, at least they are expressed as I have them written here, in the nature of concerns, I want it to be clear that they should not be interpreted as expressing an overall impression of concern about the document. We didn't directly deal with the question about how we felt about it overall. So, you ought not to draw that inference. I will state these briefly. If you want, I am prepared to elaborate on them somewhat but not a great deal, because, as it turned out, the discussion that we had was fairly limited.

One of the concerns that grew out of our discussion was that, while the document addresses very directly and fairly comprehensively the question of what we are, it was the feeling of the group that it at least less directly dealt with the issue of what we want to become. I guess this is just another bit of evidence that hindsight is always clearer than foresight, but nonetheless that was an impression that grew out of the discussions.

A second statement, and one which I think relates somewhat to that, is the acknowledgment in a description and a discussion of the management and organizational arrangements of IUPUI, that some "adjustments may be needed". That is a quote. Then a concern that the document didn't go on to describe

or to suggest either circumstances, the nature, or the process by which those needs might be addressed. In fact, there were observations by the committee that some of those circumstances, at least some of the procedures, already could be identified, such as the fact that there is presently a task force, the Bareikis Committee that is looking at organization. There also were previous efforts such as those of the Willbern Committee. So the university has engaged in procedures, at least, that were designed to address organizational matters, but the document just simply alluded to the fact that there may need to be adjustments. It doesn't tend to spell out the circumstances under which that these might occur and what processes it might follow.

While the document reflects in a couple of places the well-accepted fact that the missions of the programs here are local, regional, and international in scope, there were statements that tended to suggest that, at least in some respects, our missions were more local than regional or international in nature. These were discussed in the committee as to whether or not that was simply a recognition of the political environment. There were a number of persons on the committee however, who clearly identified significant dimensions of programs that range beyond the local. The numbers of students who happen to come from the area and from the state suggest that a very major part of our efforts are local and state. It would be inaccurate, however, according to the views of the committee, if we did not emphasize accurately what the national and international dimensions of our programs are.

There was, in an attempt to provide an example of types of service, a reference to those kinds of services that we provide to patients. The concern that was expressed was whether or not it ought to be reflected there as the only example. I understand that that example was added because someone had suggested that since that was a very significant part of the service mission of the University, it ought to be mentioned. There were members of the committee who said "Fine, but let's not suggest that that is the only kind of service." They identified a variety of other kinds of very important services that were not only, I would think most people would agree, as important as patient care but were different enough in kind that the use of patients only as the exemplar for services just was not quite adequate.

There then was a question about whether or not all of the publics who would read the document would clearly understand the nature and the diversity and dimensions of the professional schools that are reflected on the campus here. It was understood that the document had no intent to suggest that the professional schools are limited to those that the uninitiated or the unknowing would include, namely the Medical School, the Law School, and the Dental School. There was a concern because there was nothing in there that attempted to define or to elaborate or to explain the fact that when we talk about professional schools we also are talking about schools of Social Work, Engineering & Technology, Business, and Education. When this document is read, as we assumed and were advised that it would be, by persons other than the Commission for Higher Education, but by general publics, the broader definition of "professional" should be clarified.

Then, I think, while the committee agreed with the thrust and the suggestion that an essential nature of the campus here is very directly related to the importance and the strength of those professional programs, that those programs should not operate without very strong liberal arts and sciences programs. So, there is a need that when we talk about the essential thrust of the campus here of professional schools, we also need to recognize the role and the importance of the arts and sciences to the quality of those programs.

Those are the statements. The committee will meet again on the 15th, at which time we expect to deal in more detail with the second draft and, depending on the development of additional drafts, maybe a later draft, and as I understand it, are likely to continue this discussion at the meeting of the Council in December. We will be prepared to come back to you again with any other responses and reactions that we have.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Carol, would you like to make any comments at this time?

DEAN NATHAN: No, except that I am very glad to have the input of the committee and would be interested in any further input because we are in a draft stage and we really want your opinions. This is not carved in stone.

PROF. WILSON: I would like to see something in the statement that guarantees if it is agreed on by faculty members of this university, that what comes out in this document will, in fact, be implemented. The last time there was a mission statement, people wanted to know whatever happened to it. Was it implemented? What was implemented? What was not? Why wasn't it? Otherwise, it is a useless exercise because you are setting goals for the university, and faculty are concerned that such goals, especially if they agree with them, are actually carried out.

PROF. BENDICK: I agree that it is nice to carry these things out but it is pointless, as has been pointed out by a number of people, unless we have some kind of strategic mission, which is what a mission statement comprises. If we cannot agree, as a body, on what our mission is and where we want to go, there is no point in going through any other exercises at this facility. I think we need this first and then it is our job as faculty to implement it.

DEAN NATHAN: If I could add to that, we really have not gone through, to my knowledge and I have been here almost 20 years, a real process to create a mission statement with as many people involved as we have had in this project, and we have not brought this to the Council as I remember the situation. There have been statements written which we needed for various documents including the accreditation procedures, but this is a different process that we have been going through. I think, hopefully, it will address some of the things that have been identified here. I would say that a mission statement sets the tone but does not really identify specific activities. That would be your long range planning and strategic planning that would follow the mission statement.

Kathryn, I, too, when this is all over, would like to think that we could have some guarantees, and perhaps I should remind the Council at this point that we are not going to end debate on it today. I think, Henry, that we would return to it at the December meeting for further discussion. Is that correct? I think the Executive Committee has more or less already agreed that we would bring it back in in December. It may be revised again at that time. Of course, at that point, it has to go to the President of the University and the Trustees. They are the ones who will put the final stamp on it. At this time, I don't think we can guarantee that the Commission will necessarily accept the statement. So, trying to give guarantees here today that all of this is going to happen is rather difficult to do. Also, if you look at the Mission Statement, where it rather clearly says that the major thing that needs to be done on this campus is to strengthen the arts and sciences, not only is that going to take the endorsement of everybody that I am talking about, that is going to take subsequent action by the legislature, I think, in the form of providing resources. I would like to guarantee you that they would behave in a certain fashion in the future. I think what you are asking for is a guarantee that, once we get all of this done, that we will then move into the stage that you are talking about — the implementation. I would hope that that would be done. I think your concern about something happening after we do all of this work, is well taken. But, on the other hand, I don't see how we can set it down anywhere along the line in the form of guarantees.

DEAN SCHALLER: Mr. Chairman, if I have your permission, I would like to make one other observation. One point that Ed made there I thought was very well taken. That is, and I am not criticizing the Mission Statement, although you and I were talking about this earlier today, that we might want to take another look at this, that we be very careful when we talk about the mission of this campus. That is, we want to avoid the impression that the mission relates only to Indianapolis or only to Central Indiana. In the first place, when it goes to the Commission for Higher Education, there are only a few people on there from Indianapolis. Most of them are from the rest of the state. Dr. Irwin, Carol, and I were down there earlier today and it came to our attention that they have a strong interest in IUPUI. The facts are that a number of our programs here are designed to deliver statewide services. In other words, if we are going to carry out our mission, we have to think about the mission of IUPUI as it serves the entire

state. I might also say that, to get support from the CHE and to get support from the legislature, that is something that we always have to handle very carefully. Now having said that, we also have to make sure that we always are attentive to the fact that we are the only public institution of higher learning in central urban Indiana, and therefore, have special responsibilities. So, I am pleased, Ed, that that statement is made and, I am sure, in the revision, that we will carefully look that over. In your deliberations of this and discussions of IUPUI's mission in the future, I hope you will keep that in mind that we do have a statewide mission and it is very important for us to make sure that the state of Indiana, the citizens and the General Assembly, understand that we know that we have that mission.

PROF. REED: I was wondering why, in the document the professional and graduate students always seem to be lumped together. I know, at least in the School of Medicine, that the numbers of in-state vs. out-of-state students are considerably different between graduate and medical students. Obviously the medical students' numbers overwhelm the other. My first question is, if you separate those, more than 90% of the graduates of our Ph.D. programs would stay in Indiana. If that is true, I will quit. That is not true, and one of the questions I have is how to properly identify the students in the programs that have graduate components. These go beyond the realms of Indiana; we attract many students from outside of the state.

DEAN SCHALLER: May I make sure we understand you? I think the point is well taken. I think what you are distinguishing between post baccalaureate students seeking further degrees in the professional schools, as opposed to post baccalaureate students who are seeking degrees either from Indiana University graduate school or the Purdue University graduate school.

PROF. REED: As it reads, it isn't very clear that our graduate programs are nationally and internationally recognized.

DEAN SCHALLER: That is right. I think you are correct and I think we should change that. When we do, I think the statement would reflect just what you are saying, that even higher than 90% of the post baccalaureate professional schools students are from the state of Indiana but that regarding the doctoral graduate students in the Indiana University graduate school and the masters students in the Purdue graduate school, the geographic distribution of those would be much different. I think the point needs to be clarified.

PROF. SHERRILL: Since this campus is really made up of offshoots of two schools, does our mission statement apply as though we are an individual unit here, or do we have to tie in with mission statements from any other schools?

PROF. BESCH: Most of the discussion so far has not taken particular cognizance of history. Two histories are involved. Regarding graduate students at this institution, the basic science faculty of the medical school were awarding Ph.D.s long before IUPUI was created, and they continue to do so, under the aegis of the Graduate School of Indiana University. The other history I refer to is the immediate history surrounding the genesis of this document. That history is outlined in the first page of the draft. The history of this mission statement is, I think, significant to what the document ought to say. So far, I'm afraid it doesn't. You may recall that in this body, President Irwin last year reminded us that the Indiana Commission for Higher Education had devised a method of classifying all educational institutions in Indiana. They have become much more active in the last few years, parenthetically, than they previously had been. There were seven categories of educational institutions with a #7 being the most comprehensive, as I recall. There were two sites that were accorded Classification 7 in Indiana. Those were Purdue at West Lafayette and Indiana University at Bloomington. IUPUI was not accorded that designation and, in fact, was initially called a regional campus of IU. Dr. Irwin met with the people from the Commission and the Commissioner himself and explained to them more about what IUPUI is. He was able to convince them to change the classification from regional campus to some other category, but there is really no other category it really fits. Nevertheless, that change was an improvement, I think, from the standpoint of IUPUI and also fit the Commission on Higher Education's classification. At about that

time, as I understand it the Commission decided that, in fact, all educational institutions ought to review their mission statements and particularly IUPUI ought to tell the Higher Education Commission what, in fact, it is. If it is a 7, which a number of people believe that it is, being the only university site in Indiana that offers all higher educational programs, then it ought to have a mission statement which reflects that. If it is going to be principally an undergraduate school, or some other kind of thing other than a 7, then its mission statement ought to reflect that. So, this mission statement, I think, is unlike any other that we have ever prepared, not only in the degree to which faculty had been involved, the seriousness with which it has been taken, but also the mandate that comes from the Higher Education Commission which says, as far as I can see, "at this time we are serious."

PROF. SHERRILL: Do we then assume that we are going to present this mission statement regardless of the approval or disapproval of parent universities?

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: No. The Commission clearly in their instructions to us said that this should be developed in the manner we have done it, and I think we have done it in a good manner. But, it must have the involvement of the two Presidents and the two Boards of Trustees. As Howard said a while ago, they have to sign off on this. These are our instructions. We were down there for an hour again today. They are expecting a good mission statement and, I think basically, we have one. There still have to be a few refinements.

DEAN NATHAN: We started with reviews of the statements, purpose, and objectives of missions of both IU and Purdue but also reviewed some of our background statements prior to the writing of this.

PROF. POWERS: There is now more of a descriptive statement here than a prescriptive statement. It seems to me that the driving imperative of a mission statement is to give some ideological directions, telling what we are about and why we are about it, rather than dealing with how many students we have, how many programs we have, how many persons enrolled, etc.

DEAN NATHAN: Gerry, are you looking at the one in the yellow booklet?

PROF. POWERS: Yes.

DEAN NATHAN: Did you get the mailing of the second draft?

PROF. POWERS: I am probably looking at the wrong thing.

DEAN NATHAN: No, I didn't mean to imply that. What you received in your minutes was our first draft. You got just one page. That one page, believe it or not, we are now calling it a "Description," just exactly as you have stated. Many of the reviewers have said exactly the same thing. We then inserted a new page, which is called "Mission", which moves us forward hopefully a little bit more. The thing that I think was confusing was that the Commission asked for certain things to be included in the mission statement. Those things were included in that document that we are now calling "Description" because a mission statement should move. A mission should show some vision. It is a current description which we will need to update every year.

PROF. BENDICK: I find in paragraph two in the revision mission statement very little mission. I hope that second paragraph would be reworked and reworded extensively in particular not trying to be all things to all people.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: I don't understand what you mean.

PROF. BENDICK: I don't think paragraph two in the revised mission statement really addresses any mission. It tells us that we are a wonderful place, we are going to be all things to all people because we have a Medical School to take care of a lot of people and make them well. I don't find any mission in

that paragraph. The last two paragraphs, on the other hand, are excellent.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Are there any other comments? May I suggest that the members of the Faculty Council put down in writing, and hopefully soon, any comments that you would like to suggest and, may I have them sent to you, Carol?

DEAN NATHAN: Yes. If I could add to that, I do have a couple of people who have been taking notes today on items that have been identified today. So, I think we at least have those. Any additional comments would be welcomed.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Truly, we do want this to be a consensus document. I believe over 200 of you have worked on this or have been involved in this. I think that is very good.

AGENDA ITEM V - C.
New Business - Other

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: We have now reached 'Other'. Does anyone have any other business?

PROF. WILSON: I know I have asked this before in Council meetings, but has there been a Search & Screen Committee to find a replacement for you as yet?

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: They are working on it. As soon as I know something I will report it.

AGENDA ITEM VI
Adjournment

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: This meeting is adjourned.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY

at

INDIANAPOLIS

Minutes of the Faculty Council Meeting

Thursday, December 5, 1985

Nursing Auditorium 3:00 P.M. - 4:00 P. M.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Administration: Vice President Glenn W. Irwin, Jr., Carol Nathan, Executive Dean Howard Schaller. Deans: Gerald Bepko, H. William Gilmore, Elizabeth M. Grossman, P. Nicholas Kellum, William M. Plater, Sheldon Siegel, William J. Voos, Marshall C. Yovits. Director: Barbara Fischler. Faculty: C. Aliprantis, Philip Bendick, Henry R. Besch, Jr., Patricia Blake, Frances Brahm, Ira Brandt, Charlotte Carley, Varoujan Chalian, Mervyn Cohen, David Crabb, Andre DeKorvin, Joseph DiMicco, Kenneth Dunipace, James Edmondson, Charles Ellinger, Martin Farlow, Jeri Gruner, Naomi Fineberg, Beverly Flynn, Laforrest Garner, Melvin Glick, Jean Gnat, Clifford Goodwin, Robert A. Harris, Meredith Hull, Thomas Jones, Henry Karlson, Suetta Kehrein, Joseph Kuczkowski, Monroe Little, Rebecca T. Markel, Michael E. Mitchell, Barnett B Morris, Catherine Palmer, Richard Pflanzner, John Pless, Anita Proffitt, Terry Reed, Edward Robbins, Neal Rothman, James Shanks, Ernest E Smith, Jeffery Vessely, Kathleen Warfel, George Willis, Kathryn Wilson, Ruth Woodham, Pao-lo Yu.

ALTERNATES PRESENT: Deans: Scott Evenbeck for James E. Weigand, W. Harvey Hegarty for Jack R. Wentworth. Faculty: Betsy Joyce for Juanita Laidig, Emily Holmquist for Linda Kasper, Sara Ann Hook for Marie Sparks.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Deans: Trevor Brown, Walter J. Daly, Howard D. Mehlinger, R. Bruce Renda. Faculty: Elaine Alton, Jacqueline Blackwell, Charles Blevins, Michael Burke, Edmund Byrne, David Doedens, Ian Dowdeswell, John Eble, Paul Galanti, Michael Glant, Vania Goodwin, Edwin Harper, Eugene Helveston, Ngoan Van Hoang, Jean Hutten, Lucreda Hutton, William Kulsrud, Miriam Z. Langsam, Brenda Lyon, Onkar Markand, Gerald McHugh, Lillie-Mae Padilla, Gerald Powers, Shirley Quate, Mark Richardson, John Schmedtje, Rowland Sherrill, Jay Simon, Robert Stonehill, Victor Wallis, Lawrence Wheeler, Harriet Wilkins, Charles Winslow.

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE ABSENT: Martin Dragonnette.

VISITORS: Charles M. Coffey, Alumni Office, Dyke Wilson, Dean of the Faculties Office.

Summary of Meeting's Activities

Vice President Irwin announced that President Ryan has appointed a committee to develop a University-wide policy on AIDS.

Ken Dunipace read the Nominating Committee's slates for the Faculty Board of Review election to be held at the January Faculty Council meeting.

The Council continued discussion of the most recent draft of the IUPUI Mission Statement; Ed Robbins presented summary statements from the Academic Affairs Committee.

AGENDA ITEM I

Approval of the Minutes of November 7, 1985

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: The first item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes of our November 7

meeting. Approval will be deferred until our next meeting.

AGENDA ITEM II

Presiding Officer's Business - Vice President Glenn W. Irwin, Jr.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: There will be no Presiding Officer's Business because you will hear from me at 4:00.

AGENDA ITEM III

Executive Committee Report - H. R. Besch, Jr., Secretary

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: The next item is the Executive Committee Report with Henry Besch.

PROF. BESCH: Thank you. First of all I want to tell you why there are no minutes. There are some good reasons which don't involve chastising anyone. There are two reasons. The first is that the Thanksgiving holiday meant that we needed to adhere to a very tight schedule of copy editing to get the minutes done, and we have been unable to accomplish that adherence, because of the second reason. The second reason is that the Executive Committee is experimenting with sharing the joy of copy editing the minutes of these meetings. Copy editing is necessary since you often know that what you think you heard is really not what was meant and someone needs to make corrections so that you hear what they meant to say rather than what you heard. I would also point out that Bernice Chumley is not here with us today. She has a cold. We are, however, very fortunate to have an able recruit. Actually, she volunteered. Sharon Graves, at the end of the table, is responsible for taking care of us today. I could give you a long list of things that she has already done to even provide us with the room, etc., but all that aside, we are very, very pleased that she was able to come today and serve as Faculty Council Office Secretary. Many of you know her since she served in that capacity about five years ago. She did a superb job!

The Executive Committee has asked me to report to you briefly on some more serious issues with which we have occupied ourselves. For the first two, we have California to thank for them, namely, AIA and AIDS. AIA is the acronym, I think most of you know, for Accuracy In Academia — a witch hunt begun by a Reid Irving in California last summer. It is a campaign to solicit students to report on the left wing or supposedly left wing wild eyed radical professors' comments and instructions in their classes. I don't think this is a big problem at IUPUI. I hope it is not. But, the Executive Committee would like to know if you are, in fact, harassed in this way. Henry [Karlson] tells me that we do have information that someone has that there is a student enrolled in that course on this campus with that purpose in mind - the purpose of reporting and exposing the wild-eyed, radical views of a professor.

The next is AIDS. I think many of you may know that the campus has a committee jointly with the Board of Health persons that has been appointed by Walter Daly to examine the ways in which health services will respond to patients having Aids. There is a larger issue, namely the one of whether a student should be admitted to class or punished in other ways for having the disease. IU has no policy on that at this time. We are working with our counterparts in Bloomington at the Faculty Council there and at the University Faculty Council to try and come up with a policy that would be university wide.

Finally, on the South African issue, the Executive Committee is continuing to consider whether it might be prudent or advisable to offer further, I guess the word is guidance, to our IU Board of Trustees regarding divestiture of investments in businesses doing business in South Africa. I think it has been widely published that our Board of Trustees has adopted a new policy regarding South African investment, in fact, all of our investments. That was done at the South Bend Board of Trustees meeting in November that the new policy has been widely published and much of the controversy has diminished some. Nevertheless, there are certain groups that are still dissatisfied with the policy and the Executive Committee would like to have your input on whether you think some further advise to the Board of Trustees is or is not necessary from us as a faculty.

To end on a more frivolous note, scenes for the film 'Hoosiers' are being shot this week at the Hinkle Fieldhouse on the Butler campus. Hollywood hopefuls among you may want to go up there at 5:00 in the evening tonight through Saturday night to be an extra as a 1950s basketball fan.

Are there any questions or comments regarding the Executive Committee report?

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: I will make a comment or footnote regarding preparing a policy regarding AIDS. The President, about a week ago, appointed an all-University committee to study this. I can't give you the membership, but Ken Gros Louis, on the Bloomington campus, is to chair that. I think there are to be at least two members from this campus on that committee. That committee will be working soon and you can feed information into Ken Gros Louis if you would like.

PROF. BESCH: Thank you. That ends the Executive Committee report except for the next item on the agenda. Dr. Irwin has asked me to ask Ken Dunipace to give us a Nominating Report.

PROF. DUNIPACE: I hope this will be fairly short. Basically, it is a brief discussion of the preparation of two lists of nominees for the Boards of Review. It involves a very complicated process which I am not sure I could explain in detail but I surely wouldn't want to try here. Basically, we have three rules which we are required by the Constitution to meet: that no more than three members of either board would be of the same rank, that no more than two be from the same unit, and that no more than two be untenured, with a total of five. Assuming, as I did, that ideally we would elect the five nominees with the largest number of votes, we ran into a difficulty immediately that any method that was devised to subdivide the list would then mean a possibility that the five with the highest total votes would not be elected. For example, we have two categories, which we do in fact have, one category being 'non-tenured' and the other category being 'all the rest'. Then, if we had a total of 60 voting, which seems reasonable, the three nominees who are nontenured might wind up having 24, 20, and 16 votes, and the other five nominees might wind up with respectively 28, 12, 8, 4, and 4, in which case the top five in votes would include three non-tenured members. We would have to exclude the lowest non-tenured nominee with 16 votes and elect the third highest from the other category with 8 votes. There are all kinds of other schemes which you could use to break up the nominees but they would all have essentially the same difficulty. We would wind up with the possibility, however small, of actually having to exclude from election one of the people who had among the five highest total votes. We considered quite a few ways of breaking it up to reduce that possibility. It wasn't until today that I thought of maybe one that we didn't consider, of just putting everybody in the same batch and excluding whoever did not meet the rules if we needed to do that.

The goal was to make up two slates of Board nominees and what I started out trying to do was to make nine nominees on each Board consisting of three from each rank. That way we would take care of that problem automatically, making sure that I had one member on each nominees' list from nine different units. That could take care of that automatically. And, make sure that only two of the people on either list were untenured. As the world goes, things don't ever work out ideally. We had only 12 of the 16 units that were represented by volunteers. The School of Medicine had 17 volunteers and the other 11 units ranged from one volunteer each to four volunteers each. As it worked out, I could make up one list of nominees which satisfied all of the criteria so you can vote for any five out of the nine and you wouldn't violate any rules. That is the way that list was made up at one point. The basic problem is that there are relatively few tenured assistant professors. So, in order to get three assistant professors on each list, we use up the total of four untenured positions immediately. We also then had one unit which had only one volunteer who is an untenured associate professor. So, I wound up having to use five untenured nominees to make up the two lists and so the second board was divided into two categories. One category was comprised of untenured member nominees for that board and the instructions are to vote for no more than two of those. That still did not avoid the possibility that all three of them may get more votes than the second-highest person on the other list. I think the prospect of that is pretty unlikely and we felt, as a committee, that it was an acceptable risk. If it does happen, then we will just have to exclude that third one and take the sixth highest vote.

Are there any questions about this?

PROF. BESCH: Ken, since we are friends, I considered saying that "that is easy for you to say" but I decided that I would restrain myself. I remember last year, Pat Blake also explained it. I am so glad that we now have an engineer to get it straight for us.

PROF. DUNIPACE: I think I had it very easy. We had a lot of volunteers this year. It was relatively easy to sort things out. As I understand it, last year Pat had barely enough to make up the two boards, so she really had a difficult job of trying to sort things out. I got lucky.

The slates are, for Board #1: Zacharie Brahmi, Cyrus Behroozi, Robert Bringle, James Faris, Robert Keck, Neil Matthew, Robert Saywell, John Stevens, and Randi Stocker; and for Board #2: Janet Chorpenning, Fred Ficklin, John Hunger, Monte Juillerat, Christian Kloesel, Rebecca Markel, Hitwant Sidhu, Marie Sparks, and Marie Wright. That ends the report of the Nominating Committee.

PROF. BESCH: Thank you very much. Ken did mention to me earlier that there may be a difficulty with a couple of those names with respect to whether they will be out of the country or other kinds of things. I am just adding as a footnote that he told me that what he read might not be the final list. What appears in the minutes will be the slate as it is finally proposed, with those kinds of things taken care of. Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM IV

Discussion of the Third Draft of IUPUI Mission Statement

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: We are ready for Item IV, an important subject this afternoon: the discussion of the third draft of the IUPUI Mission Statement. I believe Ed Robbins is going to start leading us into this one.

PROF. ROBBINS: I wonder if it would be useful if we could get Carol or Bill to give us a brief overview of the latest revision of the mission statement. I don't know whether they came prepared to do that today. If they were, it might provide a context that would lead to a more useful discussion, I think.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Carol, would you like to make some comments?

DEAN NATHAN: I will do the best I can with this. First of all, I hope you have noted that, as much as possible, we did include the suggestions made in the last meeting of the Faculty Council which were very helpful to Draft 3. There was a small amount of change done in the description page. Do most of you have your document with you? If so, I am going to go through this very briefly. We did highlight some more factors on the description page but there was relatively little change there. On the page entitled "Mission" there were major changes made. You may remember that there were four paragraphs there. The second paragraph was particularly noted as being a bit too much. People were having trouble digesting that one. Also, a suggestion was made by our Mission Steering Committee that we shorten up the statement and tighten it up a little bit more. That has been done but we did try to maintain the forward movement of the Mission Statement itself. The description is what we are now. The Mission Statement expresses our aspirations and the directions in which we wish to move. That is a significant change mainly based on discussions in the Faculty Council the last time. As far as the Narrative is concerned, you, I am sure, have noted that it is now a little easier to read. We have titled the areas so that it moves from an Introduction to a History and Development and on through the document to Tenure Goals and the Future. Those were more than just placing titles in. What we did was reorganize the document so that it reads in a more logical fashion that we don't move back and forth quite as much as we did before. I would like to stop here for a minute though and tell you we are still in the review stage. We do plan to finalize this document after the Faculty Council meeting and you will be receiving copies of what we come up with finally. But we are still open for your recommendations and suggestions at this time. This is still not carved in stone. We hope that we have highlighted and brought out a little bit more significantly those

factors which you feel are significant to telling about who we are, what our image is, and generally showing the organization of IUPUI in a somewhat clearer way. That was one of the suggestions made the last time. In general, I would say that we have isolated the areas now so that you could go through the document and find where you are and get a more clear explanation in general. Do you want me to say more than that, Ed or would you like to address your points now?

PROF. ROBBINS: I thought our discussions of this document were complex. They pale in comparison with the complexities of nominating Boards of Review. The last time the Academic Affairs Committee met, and that was a special meeting of that committee called for the purpose, we discussed extensively Draft #2 of the Mission Statement. A day or so following that draft, when we thought we at least had a handle on where we were at that time, we were advised by Carol that a third draft existed. Since it was impossible for us to get the committee together again, I distributed that draft and advised them by the accompanying memo that I would contact them for their reactions. I suspect that no one can appreciate the difficulties of trying to take the views and reactions of as many different people as there are on our committee and trying to condense those in a single statement more than Bill Spencer and Carol Nathan. But, we have tried to do that. In our discussion of Draft #2, and in part by my encouragement as they reflected on Draft #3, the committee took a particular approach in which we looked at the preface that accompanied both of those drafts. We looked at the first paragraph that outlines the nature of the invitation that IUPUI received from the Commission on Higher Education to prepare this report. In our reading of it, we came away with the distinct impression that the request was for the preparation by Purdue University and Indiana University of a report on IUPUI's future development, with a kind of parenthetical dimension of that request which suggested that it clarify the organizational rationale and structure and address the plans of the universities for Indianapolis. Then, in a second statement it indicates that there ought to also be attached an updated Mission Statement. Quite frankly, we focused on the former of those two elements of that request, particularly the description of the report on future developments and the clarification of the organizational rationale and structure.

I did not get to all of the committee members. My attempts to contact them this week were fairly successful, but there are still three or four members of the committee that I have not contacted. But, of the 15 or 16 that I was able to contact, they were unanimous in their perception that this third draft did in fact constitute a considerable improvement, primarily in terms of the way in which the report was organized and the clarity with which things were brought together.

The significant concerns that had arisen from our discussion of Draft #2 became then a basis for looking at Draft #3. We wanted to know whether or not those things that we would have reported, had we been reporting on Draft #2, were addressed in any detailed and specific ways in Draft #3. The two of those were very directly related to the nature of that part of the request that we got which was a request for this statement on future development. The committee was quite mixed there. There were committee members who said, "Yes, I think the revised draft does in fact give a clarification and an outline of what our development is. It clarifies our organizational rationale and structure." There were also certainly a significant number of members of the committee who feel the document does not do that. They were clearly agreed that the description of the current status of the university was quite clear, that outlines in quite clear terms the fact that we are a function of the cooperation of Indiana University and Purdue University on the campus here, that our organizational structure internally follows a variety of patterns, including system schools, merged schools, and campus schools.

The point at which the committee tended not to agree was the extent to which the document provides any rationale for that particular organizational pattern, both in terms of the rationale for the cooperation of the two universities, but more particularly a rationale for the internal organizational patterns. The document did not speak at all to some of the specifics except to identify, in some cases, the units that were organized in those different patterns, why it turned out that they were organized that way. Nor did it at all address the question of why it turns out, at least in the view of some of the members of the committee, that units that were quite similar in every other respect, that is, they were professional schools, they seemed to be quite similar in terms of the types of missions and ways that they functioned,

and that they turned out to be, in some cases, encompassed in an organizational pattern that was a system school and in other cases they were a merged school or a campus school. Or why it turned out that, in some cases, schools that were otherwise organized in quite similar ways, reported in different directions, in some cases to the Vice President - Bloomington and in some cases to the Vice President - Indianapolis. So, I think there was still a feeling on the part of the committee that the response to the request for clarification on the organizational rationale particularly could have included those things. The committee has no way of knowing whether or not those things were considered and rejected for particular purposes, whether it is because we don't know what the rationale is or we know what it is and we don't want anybody to know, or we don't think it would be in our best interest to tell anyone. We don't know that and I think it might be useful for faculty, generally, at some point, to have some information about whether or not and to what extent those things were considered. If it turns out that there is a rationale that we simply have not included, then an explanation of why we have not included it would be useful. The faculty, and I am talking about the faculty on the Academic Affairs Committee, I think is concerned most about the potential impact that this kind of report could have on the future development here. I think it is quite clear that the faculty on that committee, and I think faculty generally, appreciate considerably the benefits that we have derived from the patterns that we have followed and are most concerned that we do nothing that would interfere or diminish in any way our potential for continuing that in the future. So, I think part of the concern could be addressed by simply an explaining why it turns out in some places things were included or not included.

One of the significant points of discussion about Draft #2, maybe both earlier drafts, was the question that was posed in the document and then subsequently answered in the document about whether or not IUPUI was a university and the answer was "emphatically" that it was not. I think I alluded to this the last time. The concern of the committee was not so much the question of whether we are or are not a university (we could accept that we are not); we felt that there was no other conclusion that could be drawn, but we thought that a significant question that we need to address one way or the other is whether or not we ought to become a university now or sometime in the future. What are the circumstances under which we might want to consider the desirability, the advisability, of some alternative status. As it turns out, in the third draft that question was dropped. So, it is unclear to the members of the committee why the question itself no longer is included. We don't know whether that means that again we don't know whether we want to be a university or not. I assume it doesn't mean because we don't know whether we are or not. I think that question was answered. In the view of the committee, that was a fairly significant change in the document or it might be. We aren't certain. It might be something that someone said "it doesn't add to the document and therefore it is superfluous and we have just taken it out." But, I think it would be useful for us to have some insights into what the logical and rationale was for that change.

Another major concern of the committee was the extent to which this request that the statement be prepared by the two universities will reflect a continuation of the commitments that we think have been in major part responsible for the kind of development that we have enjoyed; that nothing that we do would be interpreted as anything other than being a continuation of that very strong commitment. Part of our conclusion about the second draft was a request that there be attached at some point, and maybe it would be at the point at which the Trustees were to finally act upon this document, that they could insert it some place, a statement which says that "yes", in agreement to a statement that we could expect for that kind of commitment to continue. I think it is clearly our perception that the benefits that accrue to us from being a part of both Indiana University and Purdue University, is due to the kind of commitment that we have had from both universities for the operations here. And, if that commitment were not to continue, then it seems that many of those benefits would also be lost. There was a strong feeling on the part of the committee about the importance of that point. There were mixed reviews by committee members as to whether or not that statement which acknowledges the past level of commitment satisfies our desire to have a commitment for the future. I think that is an issue that the committee would like to have raised at some point. Maybe it would come at the time at which this report is transmitted to the Trustees, noting that the faculty certainly are interested in and concerned about having evidence that there will be that continued commitment.

The fact that there will be a further revision of this means that this process will go on a little while longer. In addition to these more general comments there are some more specific ones that I will share with the writers directly, but concern matters that are not nearly of the magnitude of these that I have covered here.

PROF. BESCH: As it happens, as you know, Ed, from having been Secretary of the Faculty Council, the Secretary sits on a number of the committees. I sit on the Steering Committee of the Mission Project Committee, which drafted all of the versions of the document. I also sit on the Task Force on University Organization. From the perspective of those two different committees, I think, if Carol doesn't mind, that I could make some comments relevant to what you said.

An important question that you brought up was "Is IUPUI a university?" I think that one can answer that without any emotional words by asking in parallel: "Is IUB a university?", and of course, neither alone is. Together with the regional campuses, IU is a university. Regarding the organizational structure by which some schools report to the Vice President - Indianapolis and some others report to the Vice President - Bloomington, as you know, that is a result the President's recommendations based on the report of the 1974 Task Force on Reorganization - the Willbern Report. The subsequent committee - task force - currently looking at the organization has had reason to bring up those same kinds of questions that you have alluded to. That report should be out, or an initial version of it, in the not too distant future. It will be reported to President Ryan in January, and then the subsequent disposition is as we have indicated in the minutes of this meeting. We are currently on track. So, sometime early in the year we should have that one to compare to our mission statement. One may project that there may be some reorganizational suggestions that address specifically some of the points that you have mentioned.

PROF. BOBBINS: I am glad that you raised the issue about the work of the Bareikis Committee. I didn't include that in my report but certainly the existence of that committee was discussed at our committee meeting. We see it as being somewhat awkward and difficult to try to develop a document that projects what our organization is and ought to be at the same time that there is a major undertaking of Indiana University to look at that very issue. We had suggestions from the committee that ranged from, at the very least, that the document ought to allude to the fact that one of the reasons that we may not be more specific or be able to be more specific in terms of what the future ought to be, is that we are looking at it through a process that is appropriate but we won't know whether our organizational suggestions fit until the results of that effort are completed. What might be thought of as a more radical suggestion is to try to get these things into sync so that they came out at the same time; one would in fact then be concurrent with the other one. I am not sure whether either of those are possible, but those were fairly significant aspects of discussions within the committee.

PROF. BESCH: Two people - Miriam Langsam and I - serve on both of the committees. Because of externally applied deadlines, etc., it has not been possible to make those reports concurrent but the main notions of each are shared to the extent that they are known.

DEAN SCHALLER: I might comment here that the staff of the HEC, including the Commissioner, know about the work of the Reorganization Committee. I am reasonably sure that they won't be surprised when they see that there isn't any mention of it in the report. Also, I am sure that that item will be covered in the transmittal letter that goes with this report and in verbal discussions which the President and Vice President Irwin will be having with the Commission. As Henry has just indicated, we really had no control over the dates of this. The Commission, in a public meeting, announced that this report will have to be done at a given time so that was that.

Ed, I might comment on your raising the question about the fact that the report doesn't discuss in detail the whole notion of system schools, merged schools and single campus schools. I think, with good reason, there is a variety of school organizational structures. If I understand correctly the history of the Statewide Medical Education Plan and the reason for the School of Medicine to be a statewide, system school, it was specifically drawn up to meet the needs of the profession and the people of the State of

*Replace E
IUPUI Committee 85-15
Committee Page 7.*

and that they turned out to be, in some cases, encompassed in an organizational pattern that was a system school and in other cases they were a merged school or a campus school. Or why it turned out that, in some cases, schools that were otherwise organized in quite similar ways, reported in different directions, in some cases to the Vice President - Bloomington and in some cases to the Vice President - Indianapolis. So, I think there was still a feeling on the part of the committee that the response to the request for clarification on the organizational rationale particularly could have included those things. The committee has no way of knowing whether or not those things were considered and rejected for particular purposes, whether it is because we don't know what the rationale is or we know what it is and we don't want anybody to know, or we don't think it would be in our best interest to tell anyone. We don't know that and I think it might be useful for faculty, generally, at some point, to have some information about whether or not and to what extent those things were considered. If it turns out that there is a rationale that we simply have not included, then an explanation of why we have not included it would be useful. The faculty, and I am talking about the faculty on the Academic Affairs Committee, I think is concerned most about the potential impact that this kind of report could have on the future development here. I think it is quite clear that the faculty on that committee, and I think faculty generally, appreciate considerably the benefits that we have derived from the patterns that we have followed and are most concerned that we do nothing that would interfere or diminish in any way our potential for continuing that in the future. So, I think part of the concern could be addressed by simply an explaining why it turns out in some places things were included or not included.

One of the significant points of discussion about Draft #2, maybe both earlier drafts, was the question that was posed in the document and then subsequently answered in the document about whether or not IUPUI was a university and the answer was "emphatically" that it was not. I think I alluded to this the last time. The concern of the committee was not so much the question of whether we are or are not a university (we could accept that we are not); we felt that there was no other conclusion that could be drawn, but we thought that a significant question that we need to address one way or the other is whether or not we ought to become a university now or sometime in the future. What are the circumstances under which we might want to consider the desirability, the advisability, of some alternative status. As it turns out, in the third draft that question was dropped. So, it is unclear to the members of the committee why the question itself no longer is included. We don't know whether that means that again we don't know whether we want to be a university or not. I assume it doesn't mean because we don't know whether we are or not. I think that question was answered. In the view of the committee, that was a fairly significant change in the document or it might be. We aren't certain. It might be something that someone said "it doesn't add to the document and therefore it is superfluous and we have just taken it out." But, I think it would be useful for us to have some insights into what the logical and rationale was for that change.

Another major concern of the committee was the extent to which this request that the statement be prepared by the two universities will reflect a continuation of the commitments that we think have been in major part responsible for the kind of development that we have enjoyed; that nothing that we do would be interpreted as anything other than being a continuation of that very strong commitment. Part of our conclusion about the second draft was a request that there be attached at some point, and maybe it would be at the point at which the Trustees were to finally act upon this document, that they could insert it some place, a statement which says that "yes", in agreement to a statement that we could expect for that kind of commitment to continue. I think it is clearly our perception that the benefits that accrue to us from being a part of both Indiana University and Purdue University, is due to the kind of commitment that we have had from both universities for the operations here. And, if that commitment were not to continue, then it seems that many of those benefits would also be lost. There was a strong feeling on the part of the committee about the importance of that point. There were mixed reviews by committee members as to whether or not that statement which acknowledges the past level of commitment satisfies our desire to have a commitment for the future. I think that is an issue that the committee would like to have raised at some point. Maybe it would come at the time at which this report is transmitted to the Trustees, noting that the faculty certainly are interested in and concerned about having evidence that there will be that continued commitment.

Indiana. By most counts, I understand that it has been successful. Therefore, that organization was created to meet a special need. The School of Business is a merged school. It was set up that way and should probably remain that way and here I am speaking as a faculty member of the School of Business. A lot of people, including I think some people on the Commission, urge that the School of Business be made into a system school. I would resist that as a faculty member in the school because I don't think that would meet the needs of the people of the State of Indiana. It would be better met by continuing with a merged school on the core campus, with a cooperative effort with programs at the regional campuses. I think there is some sentiment on the Commission's staff, for the sake of some kind of neatness on organization charts or something, to say that they all ought to be the same. I don't think they all ought to be the same because there are different schools dealing with different subject matters and there is a different history to these schools. I think we probably ought to not make that an issue in this report and, therefore, make it subject to their discussion. We should continue at the University to organize ourselves and do things in ways we think are best. As a matter of fact, I think the University's position is, not only ours but Purdue's, that the internal organization of the University, to some large extent, is the business of the University. That is determined by the University's faculties who, after all, are the ones who have the expertise. I wouldn't say that that is not any business at all of the HEC, but I think that has been the posture of the University. You tell us what we are supposed to do, and agree with us on what our mission is, and the when the legislature devotes the funds, we will decide how to go about it. So, for all of those reasons, I think it would be wise, in a sense, to leave the report the way it is on this issue of system and merged schools. Now, Ed, with your school, again as an example. I may be wrong about this and there may be more reason to have a system school in Education because you have a state wide plan and a state wide school system. That may not be a compelling reason. I think that would be a different set of circumstances than, say, what you deal with in Business. I think that there is no reason anybody should say that we ought to have all system schools or all this or all that. For reasons that I have indicated about the relationship between the universities and the HEC, we probably ought to leave it the way it is.

PROF. ROBBINS: Let me be the first to acknowledge that what you have done is to at least address right there in your statements at least two of the concerns that I have tried to indicate we're lacking in the committees discussions. One was to a rationale. I think you have given that. I think you have given some rationale for why were are organized that way. You also did something else. You gave an explanation of why you think it is inappropriate for that rationale to be included, which is another thing the committee said would be useful. I think your remarks were mostly directed related to the discussions that we have had. I want to make certain you understand that I was not suggesting that there was any concern about the fact that we were organized in different ways, but the with the fact of having stated that with no rationale for why it turned out that otherwise looked like similar schools were organized differently. Your rationale that you just provided clearly outlines why it is not only done that way, but it was appropriate to do it that way. You also suggested that, because this ought to be considered more of an internal issue than an external one, it also followed that we ought not to include that rationale in this kind of report. It is those kinds of explanations that I think help faculty understand the nature of the process and the nature of the document, so they can feel confident that it isn't simply something that has been missed by accident.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Are there other comments regarding the Mission Statement?

PROF. ALIPRANTIS: I have one question about the future. You say there is little sentiment for an independent university at IUPUI? On what data is that statement based?

DEAN SCHALLER: Roko, I'll explain the basis for that statement. First, it has been questioned now as to whether we even ought to bring up the issue of this because it is a matter now before the Legislature since Senator Borst has introduced his bill, and therefore, we probably ought to stay away from it. Not on any grounds other than—it is like if something is in a court, well, you wait until the court decides. So Senator Borst has already put his bill in, so there isn't any need for us to bring up the issue. I am sure that Senator Borst will bring the issue to full discussion. The basis for this statement came from

the West Central study that was made of the delivery of higher educational services in the West Central district of Indiana. They divide the state up into districts and then they study it. The last study they did was of the West Central district and as a part of that study, the Commission held open hearings and meetings all over the region, including several here in Indianapolis. They also met with groups like the Chamber of Commerce, etc. They noted in their report that they found no support in the community for making this an independent university. Of course, everyone uses the term "independent" differently — independent means private. What they mean to say is a state university not subject to control by the Board of Trustees of either Purdue or IU. Anyhow, that is what they usually mean by independent. So that statement was simply a reflection of the conclusions that were found from all of these and I would say in that sense is an accurate statement. Now, if they had said there was none, that would have been wrong but if it says little, in my opinion, that is accurate. Also, as part of the mission project committee, we contacted the community and had meetings and distributed surveys and questionnaires, etc. That drew very little attention. I think there is some basis for the statement. I think now, in my opinion, it would be wise to take that statement out of there simply because we are taking a position in what is really a formal communication to the HEC about our position. We are taking a position on a bill that is currently before the Legislature. I am sure at the appropriate time there will be people from the university opposing that bill. I am sure there will be some faculty, as you know, who will probably be supporting the bill. But that is all right at that point, when it is subject to debate but I don't think we should now in December raise the issue and take a stand on it. In my opinion, (the reason I am saying my opinion is that the final document will be subject to a lot of suggestions) that probably ought to be taken out of there. Whether it is or not, I can't alone decide. That would be my reaction to that. The basis for this statement is, as I said, that there is some basis for making this statement. We could disagree on the strength of the evidence. As to whether to include the statement, I think now that that bill is in and for other reasons, that we don't have to raise the question. Somebody else is going to raise it so why don't we just submit our report.

DEAN NATHAN: I think a positive way to address it was removal of those two paragraphs but include in the statement a continuation of commitment toward having a full academic program here. That might well be a way to handle that.

PROF. ROBBINS: We didn't address at all the advisability of suggesting or even speculating of what the level of commitment is for that. We were simply pointing out that as at least one place here where it refers to a commitment, the problem with it for some committee members was that it was weak.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: We are drawing toward the end of this hour. If any of you have comments that you want to send to Carol or to Ed, please do so soon because we do have to prepare this in final form, I assume, next week.

DEAN NATHAN: We will have to have your comments no later than Monday. We really need to move ahead to meet our deadlines.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: By telephone would be the best way then.

AGENDA ITEM V
New Business

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Is there any other business to come before us before the 4:00 meeting?

AGENDA ITEM VI
Adjournment

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Hearing none, we are adjourned for a few minutes.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY

at

INDIANAPOLIS

Minutes of the Faculty Council Meeting

January 9, 1986 Law School, Room 116

3:30 - 5:30 P.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Administration: Vice President Glenn W. Irwin, Jr., Dean Carol Nathan, Executive Dean Howard Schaller. Deans: Elizabeth Grossman, R. Bruce Renda, Sheldon Siegel, William J. Voos, Marshall C. Yovits. Director: Barbara Fischler. Faculty: Elaine Alton, Philip Bendick, Henry R. Besch, Jr., Patricia Blake, Frances Brahma, Varoujan Chalian, Mervyn Cohen, Joseph DiMicco, David Doedens, Kenneth Dumipace, John Eble, Martin Farlow, Naomi Fineberg, Beverly Flynn, LaForrest Garner, Jean Gnat, Ngoan Van Hoang, Jean Hutten, Thomas Jones, Henry Karlson, Linda Kasper, Suetta Kehrein, Joseph Kuczkowski, William Kulsrud, Miriam Z. Langsam, Michael E. Mitchell, Lillie-Mae Padilla, Richard Pfanzer, Shirley Quate, Terry E. Reed, Mark S. Richardson, Edward Robbins, James Shanks, Jay Simon, Marie Sparks, Robert B. Stonehill, Jeffery Vessely, Kathryn Wilson, Ruth Woodham.

ALTERNATES PRESENT: Administration: James Bindley for Gerald Bepko; Daniel P. Benford for Walter J. Daly; James R. Roche for H. William Gilmore; Hitwant Sidhu for P. Nicholas Kellum; Hugh A. Wolf for Howard Mehlinger; John D. Barlow for William M. Plater; Scott Evenbeck for James E. Weigand; Harvey Hegarty for Jack R. Wentworth. Faculty: Jennifer Helman for Vania Goodwin; John Bonner for Robert A. Harris; Betsy Joyce for Juanita Laidig; Linda Gilman for Rebecca T. Markel.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Administration: Charles Bonser, Trevor Brown. Faculty: Charalambos Aliprantis, Jacqueline Blackwell, Charles Blevins, Ira Brandt, Michael Burke, Edmund Byrne, Charlotte Carley, David Crabb, Andre DeKorvin, Ian Dowdeswell, James Edmondson, Charles Ellinger, Paul Galanti, Michael Glant, Melvin Glick, Clifford Goodwin, Jeri Gruner, Edwin T. Harper, Eugene M. Helveston, Meredith T. Hull, Lucreda Hutton, Monroe Little, Brenda Lyon, Omkar Markand, Gerald McHugh, Barnett B. Morris, Catherine Palmer, John E. Pless, Gerald Powers, Anita Proffit, Neal Rothman, John Schmedtje, Rowland A. Sherrill, Ernest E. Smith, Victor Wallis, Kathleen A. Warfel, Lawrence Wheeler, Harriet Wilkins, George Willis, Charles Winslow, Pao-lo Yu.

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE ABSENT: Martin Dragomette.

VISITORS: Susan Zunt, B. Keith Moore, Elton Ridley, J. Varnoy Faris, Charlotte Wright, IUPUI News Bureau.

Summary of Meeting's Activities

Vice President Irwin reported on the Indiana General Assembly short session: Senator Borst has again introduced his "autonomy for IUPUI" bills; the budget may not be opened. Executive Dean Schaller announced the membership of the Search and the Consultative Committees for the position of Vice President (Indianapolis). The Executive Committee Secretary lead a general discussion on Faculty Boards of Review. Two

new Boards were elected by the Council.

Director Lincoln Lewis presented an overview of the upcoming campus activities in recognition of Dr. Martin Luther King's birthday.

The Council passed unanimously a two-part resolution from the Fringe Benefits Committee calling for the faculty and the University administration to carry out lobbying efforts against HR 3838.

AGENDA ITEM I

Memorial Resolution - Professor Duke Baker [IUPUI Circular 85-14]

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the first 1986 meeting of this august body. The first item of business is a memorial resolution for Duke Baker. Jim Faris will present that. [Professor Faris read the memorial resolution, IUPUI Circular 85-14]. [A moment of silence was observed].

AGENDA ITEM II

Approval of the Minutes of November 7 & December 5, 1985 Meetings

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: The second item is the approval of the minutes of our meetings held November 7 and December 5. Is there a motion to approve? [So moved] Is there any discussion of these two sets of minutes?

PROF. BRESCH: We have received three comments for corrections which we will make, but do not need to point out here. I did want to mention that there is a page which is printed twice in the December minutes and called page 6 one time and page 7 one time. We have a copy of the real page 7 available at the front table and it will be inserted in the minutes. [Other changes pointed out via telephone were as follows:]

In the November 7 minutes, page 12, second paragraph should read as follows: **PROF. REED:** I was wondering why, in the document the professional and graduate students always seem to be lumped together. I know, at least in the School of Medicine, that the numbers of in-state vs. out-of-state students are considerably different between graduate and medical students. Obviously, the medical students' numbers overwhelm the other. My first question is, if you separate those, would more than 90% of the graduates of our Ph.D. programs stay from Indiana? If that is true, I will quit. If that is not true, then one of the questions I have is how to properly identify the students in the program that have graduate components? These go beyond the realms of Indiana; we attract many students from outside of the state.

In the December 5 minutes, page 1, Emily Holmquist should read Emily Hernandez as the alternate present for Linda Kasper.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Are there other comments? All in favor of the motion, say "Aye." Opposed, "Nay". Motion carried.

AGENDA ITEM III

Presiding Officer's Business - Vice President Glenn W. Irwin, Jr., M.D.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: The Indiana General Assembly is in session. This is an interesting time of each year. The time for introduction of bills has not passed but I think that date is probably Monday of next week. The two Senator Borst bills for autonomy for IUPUI are in there

again. Otherwise, there are no bills, apparently, affecting us or any university at this time.

There are conflicting reports on opening the budget. I think the consensus is that it will probably be opened fairly late in this short session, for minor adjustments. How the universities will fare on those minor adjustments, of course, is yet to be determined. I am certain that if the budget is open, there will be an opportunity to do a few things such as capture more of the quality improvement money that was sought a year ago, from the standpoint of faculty and staff salaries. Also, certain minor items, such as land acquisition, might be introduced. But, right now it is way too early to know what will happen in this short session. If nothing happens, of course, the budget will be essentially the same as we had last year for higher education. That is my State House report this afternoon. The next one will probably be a little longer.

DEAN SCHALLER: You might want to comment on the capital possibilities.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: A year from now, moving the 38th Street campus to this campus will be priority number one on the capital agenda. We have the planning money for doing that. I assume that is fairly well along at this point in time.

A second item is that the report that we were to make to the Commission for Higher Education regarding our mission and other issues has been completed. Carol Nathan tells me that it should be delivered from the printer any day now. I do want to take this opportunity again to thank members of this Council and all of your colleagues who did participate in that project in a very meaningful way. I believe over 200 IUPUI family members did participate in that; some of you at great length. I think you will find, when you see it, that it is a good report. I predict that the impact this will have upon the Commission for Higher Education will be significant, perhaps not this year but a year from now when it comes time to develop the operating and capital budget for this campus.

Another item is that budget meetings for this coming year have been scheduled with deans and directors and others. We will be discussing minor adjustments for the forthcoming year. The emphasis, however, will be on developing a major budget to be presented for the 1987-89 biennium. This should be a key year as far as IUPUI is concerned in this budget presentation. Those of you not directly involved in this should be considering what the needs are for your department, your school, your division, etc. We have been very pleased for several years that the budget committee of this Council has met with the administration and all deans and directors. I think it is fair to say that in general we have followed the Council's advice and the recommendations of the Budgetary Affairs Committee of this Council. We are not always able to do that, of course, because of usually limited funding. I also want to commend that committee for a fine job, which I am sure they will do again this year. As I indicated, there will probably not be too much freedom in what we can do in the next year other than what we attempted and did this time.

I am pleased also today to announce — this is for Kathryn Wilson's benefit primarily — that the President has appointed two committees to help select my successor. I don't know that they have met yet, but they are ready to go into action. I will call on Howard Schaller to give you a little more detail.

DEAN SCHALLER: The President of the University on December 19 did appoint, as Dr. Irwin indicated, two committees. He appointed a Search Committee and he also appointed a Consultative Committee.

The members of the Search Committee are:

W. George Pinnell, Executive Vice President (Chair); Henry R. Besch, Jr., IUPUI Faculty Council Secretary; Robert Greenkorn, Vice President of Purdue University; Judy Palmer, Special Assistant to President Ryan; Cornelius W. Pettinga, Executive Vice President, Eli Lilly Co.; and Howard Schaller, Executive Dean and Dean of Faculties.

The members of the Consultative Committee are:

William Plater, (Chair); Stephen Akard (Student); Margaret Applegate; Sue Barrett; Dean Beckman (Student); Erwin Boschmann; Charles Coffey; Gayle Cox; Scott Evenbeck; Morris Green; Edward Hicks; Lawrence Jegen; Carlyn Johnson; Thomas Lenz; Shirley Newhouse; R. Bruce Renda; Clifford Robinson; and James Roche.

The President has asked the Search Committee to submit the names of three to five persons it feels are well qualified for the post by April 1. He has asked the committee to manage the search process, to actively seek out the best candidates from the broadest possible range of sources. He also has asked the Search Committee to assure compliance with Indiana University Affirmative Action procedures and to complete other pertinent assignments that relate to this.

The Consultative Committee has been asked to forward to the Search Committee their reactions to and comments on all applications for candidates for the position. They also are to furnish counsel to the Search Committee. The President has asked the Chairmen of both committees to coordinate all of the planning, scheduling and everything that needs to be done to complete their complementary assignments. His letter was written on December 19 and, of course, in the time since then they weren't able to start much. Neither committee has met yet. The Search Committee will meet next week. They are working on schedules to get that done. Has that been finished, Henry?

PROF. BESCH: I think it is Monday for the Search Committee and tomorrow for the Consultative Committee.

DEAN SCHALLER: We have a definite date for Monday of next week. Dean Plater and Dr. Pinnell will confer tomorrow to comply with the President's request that they undertake the coordination of the activities. Meanwhile, we have started to construct some of the machinery necessary to getting the job done. Lincoln Lewis, the Affirmative Action Officer for this campus, has been designated by the President to serve as the Affirmative Action Officer for filling this position. It is, of course, a system position as well as a campus position. Lincoln has already been contacted about the matter.

Secondly, some preliminary work has been done about preparing an advertisement. Of course, that can't be completed until members of the committee have a chance to look at it. As you know, that April 1 deadline is pretty close. Obviously, it can't all be done until there are some meetings, but we are acting as quickly as possible to get the job advertised. The President made it quite clear that we should advertise this job nationally. So, it will go into whatever is considered appropriate. One obvious place seems to be The Chronicle of Higher Education as quickly as possible. There may be some others. Dr. Pinnell also has indicated that we will write letters rather widely around the country to bring the opportunity to the attention of presidents of other universities, etc., so that we are not relying simply on advertisements in order to get people to respond. The search process is to be active and broad. That isn't something that is going to be accomplished in the next couple of weeks. So, the machinery is beginning to work.

I should ask if Henry wants to add anything. I am trying to report this to you in my capacity as Executive Dean and Dean of the Faculties. I don't want to speak as a committee member since the

committees haven't met yet. There are certain kinds of things I don't think I should comment on because I am only one of the people involved in the process. Do you want to add anything, Henry?

PROF. BESCH: Nothing, thank you.

DEAN SCHALLER: I am not trying to shut off discussion; however, I do feel an obligation to my colleagues on both committees. Are there any questions or comments on the announcement?

BESCH: How about a hip hip hurray?

DEAN SCHALLER: I think everybody is excited and pleased that the effort has started. Glenn Irwin is pleased and excited that it has started; Marianna Irwin is pleased and excited that it has started. It could even be that his children are looking forward to it and his grandchildren are looking forward to seeing him more and going out for more pizza.

The floor is open now if anyone has any comments or questions.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Hearing none, I think we should move on. We have a full agenda today.

AGENDA ITEM IV

Executive Committee Report - H. R. Besch, Jr.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: The next item is the Executive Committee Report by Professor Besch.

PROF. BESCH: Thank you. The only item of business actually listed under the Executive Committee Report will be the briefest one that I will talk about today. I would like to start by beginning the election process for the Faculty Boards of Review which is listed as Agenda Item V. Hopefully, we will have the results of that election by the time we are finished today. Ken Dunipace will pass out the ballots. John Chalian agreed to help count them. Since we have both of the previous two years Nominating Committee chairs — Pat Blake and Marie Sparks — here, I wonder if we could call on them to help.

PROF. SPARKS: I don't think I am eligible since my name is on the ballot.

PROF. BESCH: In that case, could we ask Joseph DiMicco who has experience in this last year?

To follow up on some other items that carry over from previous Executive Committee Reports, we had mentioned, not only the Mission Statement, but also the Organization Task Force Report. That is in its final (first) draft and will be presented to the President at a meeting on Saturday. Bob Bareikis did report briefly on some potential things that might be included in that report when he spoke at the last meeting of the University Faculty Council. I have a copy of the statement that he made and it will also be circulated as part of the minutes of the University Faculty Council which should be arriving within a week. But, if anyone would like to have a copy of the statement that he made, I would be happy to provide you with one. I also have it here in case anyone would like to see it now. I have sent a copy to one person who had asked specifically for it earlier.

Another item regards the potential Faculty Club on this campus. Henry Wellman and Byron Olson are continuing to follow up on the initial work that Susan Zunt, Byron Olson, and Henry Wellman did. That is still in the mill. We are still hopeful that there will be a specific Faculty Club room in the new construction that will be appearing on the campus in the not too distant future. As a matter of fact, for those of you who park anywhere around here, you know that fences are up around the place where the Conference Center and hotel will be, where some of us used to park.

Because we are electing new Faculty Boards of Review today, the Executive Committee thought it

appropriate to bring up the whole issue for comment.

The Constitution and Bylaws mandate that the Faculty Boards of Review report each year to this Council on the number of cases and their dispositions. I thought it would be appropriate to do that at this time although, as you will see, it is a little bit difficult to define cases precisely. In the year and one-half that I have been in this seat, there have been 12 potential cases for Faculty Boards of Review, and, in fact, there have been seven hearings by the Boards of Review during my term. The Constitution and Bylaws indicate that the report should contain the number of cases in which the administration accepted favorably recommendations on the part of the faculty member and the number of cases where they did not accept. In fact, the administration, Dr. Irwin and Dr. Schaller, have accepted the recommendations almost exactly as they have been made, but I would like to make the point that the recommendations have been exceptionally fair. The Boards have favored neither the person bringing the grievance nor the person or group of persons against whom the grievance has been brought. We have, both on this campus and on the Bloomington campus, experienced this last year a proliferation of potential Faculty Board of Review cases for reasons that are not well explained. I want to reinforce the point that, in no case, has a Board of Review sided with either the administration or a faculty member unfairly in my unhumble judgment. There is only one person who sees most of the details of all of these cases and that's me or whoever is in this seat — not me personally. I think it important that the faculty and the administration recognize and, in fact, we should applaud, the seriousness with which the Boards of Review members take these cases. There have been very complicated cases. Several of them have involved enormous amount of documentation, long hours of hearing, one estimate in the thousands of dollars worth of time and attention given to each case, which is probably a very small amount compared to a law suit if there were not this legal alternative. There is a substantial amount of investment in the Faculty Board of Review process. I wish there were some means by which we could recognize the people that have served to consider all of the evidence, bend over backward to very fair, and then provide judgments which walk the wire exactly between interests of the various parties.

There is one case which is currently not yet resolved. There has been a recommendation made and it has not yet been resolved. That is the only one. That is probably the most complicated case we have seen. I presume that the resolution will be fairly speedy. That is the current position on Faculty Boards of Review.

DEAN YOVITS: What kinds of cases do the Boards hear?

PROF. BESCH: The Board of Review material is in the Bylaws where we moved it in 1980. They hear virtually any kind of grievance that a faculty member may have. There are several points in the process where various counseling activities occur, which have evolved in the last year and one-half. Currently, the Secretary is in a kind of counseling position although the Secretary's real role, as laid out in the Board of Review Bylaws, is essentially a facilitative one, a person to pass things on. Generally speaking, Board of Review requests regard promotion and tenure, salary, and other matters that faculty might feel they have been aggrieved by. Henry Karlson has the Constitution open to the pertinent part if you want him to read it.

DEAN YOVITS: I was just curious.

PROF. KARLSON: Basically, the main categories which we have run into in practice are non-reappointment or non-tenure situations. There have been an increasing number of claims of discrimination on salary which previously have not been dealt with, at least to the extent that they are coming up at the present time. Every once in a while, you will get a complaint dealing with academic freedom, but those are relatively rare. I would say promotion, tenure, and non-reappointment have been the traditional grievances, with an increase in salary claims in the last few years.

DEAN YOVITS: Henry, you said you started with 12 potential cases and ended up with seven. What happened to those other five?

PROF. BESCH: They were ones where Faculty Board of Review hearings did not occur because the faculty member requested that that assignment not be made or that, in two cases, were assigned but before the Board could meet and make any recommendations, the faculty member requested that it be cancelled.

PROF. VESSELY: What was the disposition of those seven?

PROF. BESCH: The disposition was as recommended by the Boards of Review. It depends on your perspective whether you judge the outcome as favorable to the faculty member or not and that is why it is difficult to discuss what is favorable or not. But the outcomes were as the Boards of Review recommended to the administration. The administration has taken those recommendations essentially to the letter.

DEAN YOVITS: More appropriately, presumably, there were some actions which the individual was aggrieved about. I guess the question should be phrased, were those actions overturned or supported?

PROF. BESCH: In general, the recommendations made by the Boards of Review considered in detail the grievance and all parties' positions. I mean they considered all components, made some recommendations to the administration and the administration considered those recommendations favorably. That perhaps means that someone got a small raise, someone else got an extension of the period during which they were being looked at for promotion, etc.

DEAN YOVITS: Some cases involved non-tenure and non-reappointment. Were those overturned and if so, in how many cases?

PROF. BESCH: I don't think that I am in a position to answer that. I know what the answer is but I don't think I am in a position to do it publicly or privately for that matter.

PROF. KARLSON: If you will look at Bylaw Article IV, Section G., it states that "The Board of Review shall report annually to the Faculty Council: (1) the number and types of cases presented to it, (2) the number of cases in which the Board of Review's recommendations were in favor of the aggrieved, (3) the number of cases in which the Board of Review's recommendations were not in favor of the aggrieved, and (4) the number of cases in which the recommendations of the Board of Review were considered favorably by the appropriate administrative officials." Boards of Review are public records and these records are required to be kept in the Faculty Council Office so actually any content...

PROF. BESCH: No, they are kept in the Dean of Faculties Office for four years and then destroyed.

PROF. KARLSON: Okay. So they are kept in the Dean of Faculties Office for four years and then destroyed. Therefore, anything in a public record would be appropriate for comment.

PROF. BESCH: Anyone can access those.

PROF. STONEHILL: According to what was just read, it said that you were to report on the number of cases which were concluded in favor (TOO MUCH NOISE - COULD NOT UNDERSTAND) were to be reported to us. Now, report it!

PROF. LANGSAM: Bob, I am sure that Henry Karlson was mumbling so that you did not hear that it said, not the Secretary of the Council, but the Boards of Review will make the report and it was

also indicated earlier that there was still a case being decided. I am sure that the heads of the Boards of Review, at the appropriate time and in the appropriate fashion, will make a report. Until such time I am sure that we can all curb our impatience about this matter.

PROF. BESCH: Miriam, I am glad to see that we are starting to disagree again. It is much more fun that way. The answer depends on how you define "in favor of the aggrieved". If you can define it, without knowing what the facts are, I would be happy to answer a definitive question.

DEAN YOVITS: Of those that were denied reappointment, how many were overturned?

PROF. BESCH: It is public record. I think there were only two in that category and again I would have to say that you can access the records and see for yourself.

PROF. QUATE: Henry, you spoke of hundreds of hours of deliberations and miles of documentation. Do people have to present their own cases and document them themselves? How readily available is the kind of information that a faculty person would need to document a case?

PROF. BESCH: That is a very good question. One of the reasons for bringing this here is to emphasize that Faculty Boards of Review are taken very seriously by all parties. The implicit assumption from the Boards of Review Bylaws is that a group of faculty members can make an appropriate decision and recommendation without knowing how any other case has been handled, whether it is similar or not, and without precedent of a long history. As we have mentioned, all Boards of Review material is destroyed — not thrown away, not archived, not anything, but destroyed at the end of four years. Even if one wanted to, one cannot find out what happened longer ago than four years. But to answer your question, which is probably more technical, I would ask Henry Karlson to comment because he has served as the legal advisor to Faculty Boards of Review for several years now and would be in a position to have more continuity than any other person. He and Paul Galanti, who is also a member of the Council, have such experience.

PROF. KARLSON: The faculty members, traditionally, have very little difficulty in obtaining the information which they desire. The administration of most schools has been quite willing to make available the information once we request it. Faculty Board of Reviews are not in any way legal proceedings, in the sense that we can require anyone to produce evidence or to come in and testify; but, in the spirit of an academic environment and the need to reach a reasonable resolution of the problem, the administration and the faculty member have usually been able to produce all of the information that the Board wants. If a person wants to, they could be represented by counsel. Since 1977 I know of only one case where an individual was represented by counsel, and the University was also represented by counsel in that case. Usually the faculty members present the case themselves and do quite a good job of it. Then the committee, as all committees, review what they have produced and determine whether or not they want some more information. If they want it, they have not been shy in asking for it. Once they get everything they want, they reach a determination. At least in my experience, the determinations reached have been very much supported by the evidence produced and I have not seen a bias either in favor of the faculty member or in favor of the administration. In answer to one question, I know of only one case, there have been others, which we had two years ago now, on non-reappointment. The Board recommended that the person be given another year because the proper procedures had not been followed. Usually, on the non-reappointment determinations, the committee looks very closely at procedural due process.

PROF. BESCH: Just on that one point, I would comment that, in the experience of these seven cases, I would say that there is essentially zero chance of getting, for example, a positive tenure decision on the basis of procedural faux pas that had occurred before this decision was made. I think there are some people who have felt that perhaps because procedural matters may have interfered with some decisions in the past, or perhaps because of the way some paperwork was

handled, they should be awarded promotion or a positive tenure decision on the sole basis that the paperwork was not handled right. The Faculty Boards of Review have not accepted that as the sole reason for recommending a positive tenure decision or a positive promotion decision.

DEAN YOVITS: Henry, some of these similar cases go through the Affirmative Action Office. Are these similar or are they tied together in any way?

PROF. BESCH: The faculty member decides where they want to start. The rules of the Faculty Boards of Review specify that, should there be an element of discrimination in any request for Faculty Board of Review consideration, that we notify Lincoln Lewis' office and bring his office and his people into the discussion. A faculty member can initiate a simple discrimination case (or a complex discrimination case) directly with the Affirmative Action Office without engaging the Faculty Board of Review procedures.

DEAN SCHALLER: May I comment here? When we talk about discrimination here, we are talking about discrimination on the basis of sex, race, age, or national origin. In other words, the protected classes which, incidentally, are about 75% of the population. When the administration receives a report dealing with the faculty in a faculty complaint, if it comes from the Affirmative Action Office, they are going to ask is the discrimination charge based on Affirmative Action concerns? If it isn't an Affirmative Action case, then we will say it should go to the Board of Review. I think faculty members should think very carefully what they are actually charging. If they are charging salary discrimination on the basis of sex, then they would go see Lincoln Lewis, who always informs us that he has the charge. If it is not on that basis, but on some other basis, on procedural grounds or something, they should go to Henry Besch. Faculty shouldn't come to see me. They can come to see me for advice but it isn't up to me to decide whether they go to the Board of Review. I have nothing to do with that. That is a question that should go to Henry. If the complaint is on some discrimination basis, then they would go to see Henry who always lets Lincoln Lewis know as to what is going on. It is pretty clear that these are two different kinds of things. Not every complaint that you have should be taken to Lincoln Lewis. On the other hand, not every complaint that you have should be taken to Henry. An effort is made to communicate to make sure we understand who is handling what. Did I state that correctly, Lincoln?

LINCOLN LEWIS: Yes.

DEAN SCHALLER: You were nodding your head. I was hoping that you were agreeing with me.

PROF. BESCH: One further comment on this issue from Henry Karlson.

PROF. KARLSON: The Constitution and Bylaws Committee is presently reviewing in totality the Boards of Review at both this level and, I have been told, at the All-University level in what their jurisdiction should be. I would point out that the Board of Review is a 'faculty' Board of Review, not an 'administrative' Board of Review. We may have overlapping jurisdiction with administrative proceedings such as Affirmative Action, but they are separate. One is considered administrative and the other one is faculty. That explains why there is overlapping jurisdiction. Whether or not we should continue this overlapping jurisdiction and exactly what the jurisdiction should be is something we are considering. If anyone has any comments, I wish they would let us know. I am chairman of the committee. If you could send them to me, I would make them available to all members of the committee.

PROF. BESCH: There is one other item on the agenda -- the proposed IU Flexible Benefits Plan. This is a pre-tax reduction in pay plan which Central Administration is giving serious consideration of introducing to the faculty. Some further details of the plan again will be in the minutes of the University Faculty Council meeting which will be coming out shortly. I wanted to bring it here so that you would know about it as soon as possible. There are a number of

provisions that are not yet finalized. Those you will see reflected in the minutes of the All-University Faculty Council meeting. I didn't want this body not to have been informed until late in the proceedings. At least I wish to have mentioned here that there is a pre-tax reduction-in-pay flexible benefits plan, often called a "cafeteria" plan, which the University is very seriously considering offering to us as part of our overall fringe benefits. We could talk much more about that without bringing much more light to it.

With that, I would just indicate that there a couple more important items on the agenda, one of which is listed next and one which will come up under New Business and also is coming from the Fringe Benefits Committee. This will end the Executive Committee Report.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Thank you, Henry.

AGENDA ITEM V

Nominating Committee Report - Ken Dunipace, Chair

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: The next item on the agenda is the Nominating Committee Report with Professor Ken Dunipace.

PROF. DUNIPACE: I will make this very brief. The top vote getters on the slate for Board 1 satisfy all the requirements of the Constitution.

[Following the Faculty Board of Review election, the results were announced as follows:]

FACULTY BOARD OF REVIEW #1

James Faris, School of Medicine
Robert Keck, School of Science
Zacharie Brahmi, School of Medicine
Robert Saywell, School of Public & Environmental Affairs
Randi Stocker, University Libraries

In the second Board of Review, the top four represented two each in the Associate and Full Professor ranks as did the fifth, so we had to go on to the sixth and that allowed us to satisfy the requirements.

FACULTY BOARD OF REVIEW #2

Rebecca Markel, School of Nursing
Christian Kloesel, School of Liberal Arts
John Hunger, School of Public & Environmental Affairs
Monte Juillerat, School of Liberal Arts
Fred Ficklin, School of Medicine

I request permission to destroy the ballots. [Seconded.]

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: There is a motion on the floor to destroy the ballots. Is there any discussion of this motion? Hearing none, all in favor say "Aye". Opposed? Motion carried.

AGENDA ITEM VI

Martin Luther King Jr. Holiday Celebration - Lincoln Lewis

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Lincoln Lewis will give us a progress report on the Martin Luther King Jr.

Holiday Celebration.

LINCOLN LEWIS: I am very happy to be able to bring you up-to-date on the program. As you came in, I noticed some of you have collected the flyers that I put on the side table. My observation also is that many of you who came in later and had to hurry to your seats didn't pick up one. There are still some there and I wish you would pick them up on your way out. Those flyers describe the program that we are having on January 20 in celebration of Martin Luther King's birthday.

You will recall that that topic was discussed here a couple of years ago at length, the notion being how you could best celebrate and recognize Martin Luther King's birthday. Short of having the whole day off, in fact, very far from having the whole day off, the decision was to have a couple of hours around the noon time so that we could have a very visible and formal tribute to Martin Luther King. The program that we have put together accomplishes that.

The program actually begins at 10:45 a.m. on January 20. We will have as the main speaker Ossie Davis, who is a black actor, author, and playwright. Many of you are familiar with him. He has had some ties with Indiana. I learned recently that he has been here several times. In fact, Dorothy Webb and Betty Solow know him personally and attest to his fine attributes. I suspect that some sort of a dramatization in his presentation would probably be part of what he will be delivering. He will actually be speaking at noon. The School of Physical Education has been very cooperative about letting us use their gymnasium for that purpose. We will be out of there shortly after 12:30.

Then we will have the 2-to-5 p.m. program which will deal with health care for minorities. The focus of that forum will be the Heckler Report which was prepared and submitted by the former Secretary of Health and Human Services who preceded Governor Bowen — Margaret Heckler. It describes the relatively poor health conditions of U. S. blacks. The mortality rate for black infants, for example, is twice the rate for whites. There is a persistent and distressing disparity between and among the health conditions for blacks and the rest of the populations. You are fortunate to have two people who are experts in this area.

Dr. Woodrow A. Myers, M.D., who is State Health Commissioner has versed himself thoroughly in this and considers it a very serious matter. The second major presentor will be Edith Irby Jones, M.D., President of the National Medical Association. This event will take place in the State Board of Health building in Rice Auditorium. We will also have, for their reaction to these two presentations, a panel of local physicians and others concerned about health care delivery. This will be moderated by Dr. George Rawles who is the President of the First Care Physician Health Plan of Indiana. The local group comprises several topics such as gaining access to health services, teenage pregnancy-infant mortality, utilization of health services by minorities, delivery of health care to minorities, and health equity for minorities in Marion County. We chose this particular topic with input from students, faculty, and staff.

Last year, if you will recall, I told you also about the evening program which is the dinner which is put on by the Black Student Union. I encouraged you to participate by purchasing tickets. This year there is no need to repeat the suggestion. It was a sell-out last year, and many of you did participate. I appreciate that and I am sure the students appreciate it. This year, I understand, the tickets have been sold up to the capacity that we have at the Madame Walker Urban Life Center.

The speaker that evening will be Wallace Terry, author of the book, "Bloods", which describes the experiences of the black soldiers in Vietnam. We did have a problem with the weather last year. I have heard Professor Besch assure us that we will have good weather, and Dean Schaller is holding him to that. We really need attendance to reflect well on IUPUI, that we are fully

celebrating this birthday celebration.

There is one other thing that I would like to mention with respect to attendance. Vice President Irwin wrote a letter to deans and directors encouraging you to permit those who are interested in attending any of these functions to have the time off and with respect to students, not to schedule any exams. Also, please avoid scheduling meetings this day, so that we can have a good turnout. This also, of course, extends to staff employees who may want to attend the program. Thank you!

PROF. ROBBINS: Considering the fact that the dinner is already sold out and I am learning about the details for the first time now, I have had no opportunity to participate. Is there a possibility that arrangements could be made to provide opportunities for others for the evening program?

LINCOLN LEWIS: Ed, I can't really give you that assurance but we did encourage the student leaders to have a few places for flexibility because of that kind of thing. You might want to contact them immediately at Ext. 2279. The office is in the Cavanaugh Hall in the basement.

PROF. ROBBINS: So, you think there is some possibility?

LINCOLN LEWIS: There may be.

DEAN SCHALLER: Another thing that might be done, but I wouldn't want to promise you could be accommodated. They might be able to make some provision for people to come in after dinner and hear the speech. Knowing the ballroom over there and knowing how crowded it was last year, I don't think there is going to be much space even for that. Of course, we run into fire regulations just as we would with any other building, but they could possibly put some extra seats in if you want to hear the speech. People have suggested moving the dinner, but I think the significance of having it in the Madame Walker Urban Life Center is such that, that is where we ought to hold it, plus the fact that that is the decision of the students not the administration or the faculty.

AGENDA ITEM VII

New Business

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Under New Business, the Fringe Benefits Committee has an item that they would like to present to us today. I believe Keith Moore will do that.

PROF. MOORE: Thank you, Dr. Irwin. I would like to thank Dr. Besch for the opportunity to speak to you on rather short notice. I would like to preface my remarks by saying that I assume that each of you received over the Christmas holiday a Christmas card from TIAA-CREF in terms of a memo which was dated December 26. The memo relates to the impact of the Tax Reform Act upon our pensions.

The Fringe Benefits Committee of the Faculty Council met on January 6 and considered the memo from TIAA-CREF regarding the Tax Reform Act (House Resolution 3838) and its impact upon the retirement income of the faculty who have TIAA contracts. The committee chairman has also consulted with Jack Hudson, who directs the Insurance Office at IU, about the significance of the proposed changes.

It appears that if the House Bill is passed into law in the present form, it will result in lower retirement incomes for present and former retirees under TIAA-CREF contracts. In addition, perhaps even more significantly, the severe reduction and the maximum allowable amounts which can be paid yearly into TIAA or CREF may result in total elimination of IRA or SRA options for many of

the IUPUI faculty. The Fringe Benefits Committees, therefore, recommends to the IUPUI Faculty Council that they pass the following resolution:

1. All faculty, active and retired, at IUPUI are strongly urged to respond to the TIAA-CREF memo of December 26, 1985 regarding HR 3838 and express opposition to those provisions of the bill which will have negative impact on TIAA-CREF.
2. The University administration should respond to the TIAA-CREF memo of December 26, 1985 regarding HR 3838, expressing serious concern about the effects this bill would have on higher education. This concern should be directed to the appropriate legislative representatives of the Federal government and also to all organizations representing higher education on a national level.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Is there any discussion of this important item?

PROF. STONEHILL: Can someone explain what they mean by reduced benefits?

DEAN SCHALLER: Bob, have you read the memo? I don't think that question can be answered completely from the information provided.

PROF. STONEHILL: We are being asked for an action when we really don't know what they are speaking about.

PROF. KARLSON: My understanding is the way this bill is drafted, since TIAA-CREF has an insurance aspect to it, that there will be a tax on the income from their trust funds. Presently, as a retirement bill, the money which you earn in that trust fund is not taxable at that time and, therefore, you have a larger base upon which to build your interest; whereas, if it is taxed each year, the amount based upon which your interest will be built is diminished. The long-term impact of such diminishment is hard to predict, but statistically it comes up quite significantly. What they have in effect done is reduce the effect of compounding.

DEAN SCHALLER: Bill Kulsrud is here. I don't know whether Bill has read the memo. He is an expert on tax accounting.

PROF. KULSRUD: The explanation which we just heard is exactly correct. The proposed legislation removes the exemption for trust funds such as TIAA-CREF and, in effect, reduces what you would have. You would be re-investing after-tax dollars rather than before-tax dollars.

DEAN SCHALLER: That is when your income would be the highest and in those years you would have to report that income on your income taxes and pay taxes on it. Right now, Bob, with the tremendous amount you personally have built up in there, that would be, in your case, a tremendous amount of money.

PROF. KARLSON: The way the bill is drafted, TIAA-CREF appears to be the only major program that it impacts upon. It is very very discriminatory in the way it is drafted.

DEAN YOVITS: In reading it I was curious as to why TIAA-CREF was specifically singled out?

PROF. KARLSON: It is that way because of the life insurance component.

PROF. KULSRUD: The life insurance industry has been treated favorably by the tax laws for many years. This is a new approach to change that.

DEAN YOVITS: But TIAA-CREF did point out in that memo that, by reorganizing they could avoid the tax.

PROF. KARLSON: It would be a significant and expensive reorganization and would within itself impact upon your retirement values.

PROF. LANGSAM: I would like to commend the committee for doing this kind of service. It certainly would not hurt for us as educators to speak up against something which is discriminatory against us. With a burdened educational system which is not very well funded to start with, this is one of the things that has made it possible for us to survive at all. To lose that benefit would be a real hardship. I would suggest that we vote in favor of this and we follow up on it.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: The question has been called for. All in favor of the motion, say "Aye". Opposed, "Nay". Motion carried. Thank you very much.

Is there other new business to come before us?

PROF. FINEBERG: I wanted to ask a question while we have the Chairman of the Fringe Benefits Committee here about a loss of fringe benefits that I, and I assume other married people whose spouse also works for IU, have suffered. When I came to work here, my husband had family health insurance. I asked, since I am entitled to health insurance with fringe benefits as a faculty member, could I use my benefits to help pay for our family plan. I was informed that I could not. So, if you are married and don't have children, you can carry two single plans, but if you want to have a family plan, one of you must give up your health benefits. I wondered if perhaps the Fringe Benefits Committee could investigate that because it doesn't seem very fair.

PROF. VESSELY: The same thing occurs if you elect not to take Blue Cross/Blue Shield, whether two of you are employed or not.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Has the Fringe Benefits Committee discussed this?

PROF. MOORE: This issue has been discussed previously. Part of the answer is simply because of the University's contract with Blue Cross/Blue Shield. However, I might point out that you still have the option as an individual of electing an individual plan with IU, in which case the University pays nearly the entire premium while your husband carries the family plan.

PROF. FINEBERG: But that won't save any money. His family plan won't be any cheaper with IU.

PROF. MOORE: It will save you money in terms of deductibles.

AGENDA ITEM VII
Adjournment

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: If there is no other business, we are adjourned.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY

at

I N D I A N A P O L I S

Minutes of the Faculty Council Meeting

February 6, 1986 Law School, Room 116

3:30 - 5:30 P.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Administration: Vice President Glenn W. Irwin, Jr., Dean Carol Nathan, Executive Dean Howard G. Schaller. Deans: Walter J. Daly, Barbara Fischler, Elizabeth M. Grossman, William M. Plater, R. Bruce Renda, Sheldon Siegel. Faculty: Charalambos Aliprantis, Elaine Alton, Philip Bendick, Henry R. Besch, Jr., Patricia Blake, Michael Burke, Edmund Byrne, Charlotte Carley, Varoujan Chalian, Ian Dowdeswell, Kenneth Dunipace, Beverly Flynn, Paul Galanti, LaForrest Garner, Melvin Glick, Jean Gnat, Vania Goodwin, Jeri Gruner, Ngoan Van Hoang, Meredith T. Hull, Jean Hutten, Thomas Jones, Henry C. Karlson, Linda Kasper, Suetta Kehrein, Joseph Kuczkowski, William Kulsrud, Juanita Laidig, Miriam Z. Langsam, Lillie-Mae Padilla, Richard Pflanzner, Gerald Powers, Shirley Quate, Terry E. Reed, Mark S. Richardson, Neal Rothman, James Shanks, Jeffery Vessely, Harriet Wilkins, George Willis, Kathryn Wilson, Pao-lo Yu, Susan Zunt.

ALTERNATES PRESENT: Deans: James F. Bindley for Gerald Bepko; Hugh A. Wolf for Howard Mehlinger; Scott Evenbeck for James E. Weigand; W. Harvey Hegarty for Jack R. Wentworth. Faculty: John F. Bonner for Edwin T. Harper; Elton Ridley for Lucreda Hutton; Sara Anne Hook for Marie Sparks.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Deans: Charles Bonser, Trevor Brown, H. William Gilmore, P. Nicholas Kellum, William J. Voos, Marshall C. Yovits. Faculty: Jacqueline Blackwell, Charles Blevins, Frances Brahma, Ira Brandt, Mervyn Cohen, David Crabb, Andre DeKorvin, Joseph DiMicco, David Doedens, John Eble, James Edmondson, Charles Ellinger, Martin Farlow, Naomi Fineberg, Michael Glant, Clifford Goodwin, Robert A. Harris, Eugene M. Helveston, Monroe Little, Onkar Markand, Rebecca T. Markel, Gerald McHugh, Michael E. Mitchell, Barnett B. Morris, Catherine Palmer, John E. Pless, Anita Proffitt, Edward Robbins, John Schmedtje, Rowland A. Sherrill, Jay Simon, Ernest E. Smith, Robert B. Stonehill, Victor Wallis, Kathleen A. Warfel, Lawrence Wheeler, Charles Winslow, Ruth Woodham.

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE PRESENT: Martin Dragonnette.

VISITORS: B. Keith Moore, Chairman - IUPUI Fringe Benefits Committee; Charlotte Wright - IUPUI News Bureau; JoEllen Myers Sharp - Indianapolis Star.

Summary of Meeting's Activities

Vice President Irwin reported on the completion of IUPUI's mission statement and commented on budgetary matters.

Executive Dean Schaller presented enrollment statistics for the second semester and called on the Secretary for comments on the recommendations in the preliminary report of the Task Force on University Organization.

Executive Committee business concerned the upcoming elections of at-large representatives to the Faculty Council and IUPUI representatives to the University Faculty Council.

Ken Dunipace, Chair of the Nominating Committee, presented the slate for Secretary of the Faculty Council: Forest Meiere, School of Science; Susan Zunt, School of Dentistry.

Gene Tempel, Vice President, IUF, gave an excellent, positive update on the Campaign for Indiana. After introductory comments by Keith Moore, Chair of the Fringe Benefits Committee, the Council approved the resolution from this committee regarding the earned income proviso of the 18/20 rule.

Under new business, Rebecca Van Voorhis reminded the Council of the Learning Resources Symposium activities on February 21st.

The Council defeated a motion regarding the constitution of the search and consultative committees for the Vice Presidency (Indianapolis).

AGENDA ITEM I

Approval of the Minutes of the January 9, 1986 Meeting

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. The first item on our agenda today is the approval of the minutes of our January 9th meeting. Is there a motion to approve? [So moved] Is there a second? [Seconded] Is there any discussion of these minutes? Hearing none, all in favor of the motion say "Aye". Opposed? Motion carried.

AGENDA ITEM II

Presiding Officer's Business - Vice President Glenn W. Irwin, Jr., M.D.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: I have a few items I would like to call to your attention today. Usually at this time there is a fairly lengthy report on the General Assembly, but, as far as those of us who follow that are concerned, there isn't very much pertaining to higher education this year. It is almost certain that the budget will not be opened for that purpose. There are a few bills there that affect some of you. There is a bill to take up the complex issue of state funding for health insurance for the indigent. I think it is not too likely that it will get very far in this short session. But, it is a major issue to the University hospitals and to the health professional schools and probably that will be a major issue at the next session of the General Assembly.

We have for you on the table copies of IUPUI's Mission, Roles, and Future Development Report, which was requested by the Indiana Commission for Higher Education. Many of you in this room spent a lot of time helping to develop this report. I believe it is a good one. There is one section that is not in this particular version, having to do with Fiscal Perspectives. We felt that that would be appropriate to present with our 1987-89 biennial budget request. It is a very interesting section and, hopefully, will mean a great deal to us when it comes to funding for the next biennium. By the way, that process is under way now and will be completed early this summer. The bottom line of the fiscal perspective is that this campus, IUPUI, is seriously underfunded from the standpoint of its base budget. That is true so far as the faculty salaries are concerned, as well as the number of full-time faculty, libraries, S&E, program improvement, new degrees, etc.

Over in my office we are about half way through the budget sessions, which deal with the forthcoming year but also deal with the next biennium. I believe every dean and every director that we have talked to today wishes to put priority number one again on faculty salaries. We have made some progress this current year in that area, but we need to make considerably more. Right now, as it appears, we will have about the same amount of money we had for this year and that is, fundamentally, a 5.2 percent appropriation increase from the General Assembly. In addition, there is a factor for retention and attraction of faculty of a little under two percent. Hopefully, the campus as a whole will be able to muster nine percent, perhaps even higher than that, for faculty salaries next year. Howard, I will call on you for your comments now.

DEAN SCHALLER: The official enrollment statistics for the second semester were released by the President to the Board of Trustees this past weekend at the Trustees' meeting and have been reported in the press. If you will recall, when we met in January, we didn't have the latest figures, but I indicated then that, when we had the final figures, they would probably show a slight decline for this campus. That, in fact, is what has happened. The total campus enrollment headcount declined by 2.6 percent. The credit hours taught declined by 2.2 percent. That is only slightly more than what we had forecasted that the decline would be. As a matter of fact, the projected credit-hour decline for the second semester was a little over a thousand credit hours out of a total of more than two hundred thousand. So, that was a very accurate forecast.

The distribution of the enrollment among the various divisions of the University remains relatively the same. Both health and non-health declined this time. You will recall in the fall there was a decline in the health enrollment and a very slight increase in the non-health. There were a few schools that experienced a slight increase and many schools and divisions which experienced a decrease. Some were bigger than others but none were significant enough in this one semester that it really changed the distribution of enrollment among the various divisions at IUPUI.

We are forecasting another decline next fall for IUPUI and the whole IU system. We haven't determined the budget yet but I am fairly certain at this time, that we will once again budget a slight decline in enrollment. As you know, we have been doing that for two or three years and we have been just about right on target. We can avoid major budget disruptions if we can continue to forecast the enrollment as well as we have been doing in the past.

I am going to turn to Henry on this point, but I think everybody knows by now that the Task Force on University Organization has delivered its report. It was delivered to the Trustees over the weekend and was released to the press. You probably read about it in the newspaper. The report now is generally available. Some of you may have seen it. Henry, as you know, served as a member of that committee along with Miriam Langsam. I was on a small resource committee that met a few times with the group. It might be better if Henry were to speak to it. I will be glad to comment, if requested.

PROF. BESCH: The Task Force preliminary report was presented to the Board of Trustees on Friday morning. The document is approximately sixty pages long and many elements were reported in the newspapers. The basic elements, I think, are available to anyone who would have sought to find out what was suggested. In addition, immediately after the report to the Trustees, copies of the report were immediately sent to each of the chairs, secretaries, and the liaisons of the standing committees of the Faculty Council. We also arranged on Friday to send a copy of the complete report to all members of the Faculty Council but I didn't feel that I could take that out of my budget. That was arranged through Bob Bareikis' office that was set up for this Task Force. Unfortunately, their printing machines broke down on Monday. It was corrected by Tuesday, but instead of you getting your copy by yesterday or today, you have had to wait.

Basic elements of the Task Force's recommendations are summarized in approximately three pages at the end of the document and have been widely quoted in the news media. What we thought would be the broadest change that we were suggesting is the creation of an office of the Provost for Indiana University. We have also suggested certain new system offices, including an Office of Research, a Graduate School which reports to the central administration, and an Office of Information Services overseeing various forms of communications, including telecommunications as well as academic and administrative computing, an Office of Student Services, and a Minority Affairs Coordinator. At the faculty level we suggested and found a lot of support for systemwide councils of faculty in the academic disciplines and professions. Miriam Langsam was in charge of the systemwide schools committee that developed the councils concept and the Task Force as a whole was very enthusiastic about it, as we find many faculty to be. She may wish to comment further in a moment.

I would like to mention a summary of the principles, or the paradigms under which most of the suggested changes can be grouped, at least as I see them. There are, perhaps, five or six basic principles. The first and most important one, to my mind, is that we wished to establish clearer lines of authority. For example, the Provost and Executive Vice President would, by organization of that office, be the University's chief academic officer. This should assert academic priorities and centralize systemwide policy formulation while decentralizing operational control. We wished, at the same time, to maintain a lean central office by redefining portfolios rather than proliferating whole new sets of offices. For example, we suggested combining the new Provost and the existing Executive Vice Presidency. Similarly suggested is the combination of duties of the Vice President for University Relations and Development. For the core campuses, Indianapolis and Bloomington, we suggested adding the title of Chancellor to the existing title of Vice President of the University.

Another principle, I would say, is that we tried to retain healthy competition within the University by carefully balancing the interests of its various parts, due consideration being given toward protecting important minority interests as best we could identify them.

We hoped to enhance communication by establishing the suggested councils by disciplines, by suggesting the University Office of Research, and by suggesting the University Office of Student Services.

Finally, rather than positing solutions to all the world's ills or even all the University's ills, we suggested further study in certain areas where it was not clear to us that a best solution was at hand at this time. One of those which made the news media, probably the main thing that has, is the suggestion that, by the year 2000, it would be reasonable that the core concept, having incubated for 25 years, could actually be achieved. We suggested that a panel or a task force be appointed to help move toward that direction. I think I should stop there and see if Miriam has additional comments or there might be some questions.

PROF. LANGSAM: I think you did an excellent job and I will not add a thing.

PROF. BESCH: Thank you, Miriam.

PROF. ALIPRANTIS: Let me ask you a question. Why did the report on the Purdue mission seem so negative?

PROF. BESCH: I don't understand the question. I didn't feel it was negative.

PROF. ALIPRANTIS: In the original report, we don't touch the Purdue Mission.

PROF. BESCH: I can respond to a non emotional word like "don't touch" but "negative" is not something that I understand in this context. I think what the report said about the Purdue mission is that the Task Force heard a number of comments that were both positive and negative. Certainly there was no overwhelming suggestions in either direction. The report suggests that there needs to be further concentrated studies on Purdue schools in Indianapolis. I think you wouldn't basically disagree with that suggestion, would you?

PROF. ALIPRANTIS: I would like to see even more in the report. Whatever happens will happen.

PROF. BESCH: I could say the same thing from my personal standpoint, wearing my hat as a member of the School of Medicine, that the Task Force Report doesn't say very much about the School of Medicine either. I also could say it from wearing my hat as a member of the graduate faculty of

the Graduate School, namely, Ph.D. granting degree programs in Indianapolis on the medical side, it doesn't say very much about us either. But, it is already 60 pages and we had to limit it somewhere.

PROF. ROTHMAN: But, Henry, specifically it says that we have to worry about these Purdue people but it never paid attention to it and worry about it now. They should have taken it up. It is a serious thing. I mentioned it to you. I mentioned it to Bareikis in the beginning and everybody just ignored it.

PROF. BESCH: I can assure you that it was not ignored.

PROF. ROTHMAN: It looks as if it is ignored.

PROF. BESCH: There are lots of things that were considered in very much less depth than that particular issue. The document may not necessarily reflect the amount of discussion, argument, and concern given any single issue. It might better be taken to reflect our ability or inability to provide some suggestions for solutions.

PROF. LANGSAM: I think one of the reasons for having a preliminary report was to allow people to express concern and to make suggestions so that the committee can re-look at some of the issues. This is not a final report and it is not intended as a final report. I would echo what Henry said that we were very much aware of the concerns and discussed a number of them. We didn't feel that there were viable solutions to all concerns. I am sure that there are a lot of people in this room and around Indiana University that will feel that, from their perspective, what they wanted to happen did not happen. What the committee tried to do was to look at some of the broader pictures. You know that not everyone is going to be happy. That is why the committee was brought together - to try to develop a sense of the big picture. I would urge anyone in this room who has concerns of a very specific nature or issues that you feel need to be looked at again, to write to anybody on the committee to raise those issues and we will look at them again.

PROF. BESCH: For those people who may not have seen the report in detail, on page 60 is the portion that is being discussed right now. It is under "Follow up Committees" and it says: "Indiana University/Purdue University...[we] recommend a committee to study their relationship with a possible agenda to include the status of Purdue faculty at IUPUI and other IU campuses, as well as IU faculty at IUPU Fort Wayne. Other agenda items would be problems associated with the state-wide technology program and areas of possible cooperation and collaboration." These are the words that we are discussing right now that don't seem to be satisfactory to certain people. I am very glad Mariam has thought to mention that this certainly is not a final report.

PROF. ALIPRANTIS: May I ask you a more specific question? In the year 2000, do you have any idea of what the status will be of the Purdue faculty - IU employees?

PROF. BESCH: You will probably be on the committee to decide that.

DEAN SCHALLER: Your idea will probably be better than mine, Roko.

PROF. ALTON: We just went through the business of making up the Mission Statement which was requested by the Higher Education Commission and then this committee report came out. Has there been any consideration of this Mission Statement. Are these two documents compatible? What is the situation here? Or are they both exercises in futility?

PROF. BESCH: I assume that the last question is rhetorical. I will try to answer the one before that. I think the two documents are compatible but they don't have an enormous area of overlap. Where there is overlap, they are compatible, yes.

PROF. ALTON: Do you think then that the Mission Statement which we came up with for the Higher Education Commission could certainly be executed under the proposed reorganization of Indiana University?

PROF. BESCH: Absolutely, with no difficulty whatsoever.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Are there other comments?

AGENDA ITEM III

Executive Committee Report - H. R. Besch, Jr., Secretary

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: The next item on the agenda is the Executive Committee Report.

PROF. BESCH: Under the Executive Committee Report I wanted to remind you that your election materials should be arriving any day now, with the return date of Valentine's Day. You can think about that in hearts and flowers for your election of the at-large members of this body and IUPUI representatives to the University Faculty Council.

In the past we have had a "Preference Sheet" in with those election ballots, on which we ask you to identify your preference for IUPUI Faculty Council committees. This year we will have that as a separate mailing. It will be added to the data base that we have from the last two years. The format is somewhat different in that we are asking at the same time that you consider not only IUPUI Faculty Council committees but also committees appointed by Dean Schaller's office. If one looks at these committees, there are areas where there is overlap in expertise necessary to serve on either an administrative committee or an IUPUI Faculty Council committee. Some people tend to have been active in one series and others in the other. We thought it might be useful to cross-fertilize those, at least to the extent that we ask at the same time which ones you might be interested in serving on. These lists which we generate do not guarantee your appointment, but they at least make the appointment process a little less random than getting a letter from either the Faculty Council or the administration saying you are on a committee unless you ask to be relieved of it. We hope that we will be able to get your interest in this kind of service focused all at once rather than having you do it several times in the year.

The other component is the Nominating Committee Report from Ken Dunipace.

PROF. DUNIPACE: I am here today to report our nominees for Secretary of the Faculty Council for the next two-year period. The nominees are Susan Zunt, School of Dentistry and Forrest Meiere, School of Science. I appreciate the effort that a lot of people have contributed to our final ballot. It has become extremely clear to me that being Secretary of the Faculty Council may be an important job but it is not a very popular one.

PROF. BESCH: That is the end of the Executive Committee Report.

AGENDA ITEM IV

Update on Campaign for Indiana - Gene Tempel, Vice President, IUF

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: The next item on the agenda is an update on the Campaign for Indiana with Gene Tempel, IU Foundation Vice President.

GENE TEMPEL: Thank you, Dr. Irwin. I am pleased to give you a brief status report on the Campaign for Indiana, with a larger emphasis on the Indianapolis portion than I gave you last year. The program is working toward the goal of \$203,000,000. We are currently at \$120,604,462 or 59.4

percent of that goal. How do these figures compare to the individual goals of the campaign? There are four sections: Endowments, Program Support, Priority Facilities, and Annual Support. There also are four sources of funds: University Personnel, Individuals, Corporations/Foundation, and Annual Support. We have determined that we must raise \$153 million in new money (not annual funds, which are continuing sources of support). We are making progress toward that target, with strong commitments from our faculty and staff and a number of large initial gifts. To be successful, we project that one gift of \$10 million will be needed, along with three \$5 million gifts (we now have four of these). We also are seeking more gifts at the \$2.5 million and \$1 million levels. Gifts of lesser amounts will be sought later in the campaign. Here in Indianapolis, we have been looking for donations of \$100,000 or more. As for our Campus Campaign, IUPUI faculty and staff have so far given or pledged more than \$1 million, and we think that total will go much higher. This internal support gives us a stronger case in appealing to external donors. We had expected to obtain \$10 million from the IU community, including the Trustees. We are now at \$10.6 million. As for corporations and foundations, we now have 87 percent of the \$48 million goal. We still have work to do in raising money from smaller companies and foundations. In the category of Individuals, we are only at 36% of the goal of \$95 million. This will require a considerable amount of personal cultivation and attention. We expect to raise \$45 million in the State of Indiana, excluding Indianapolis, and we are at 36% of that goal. We expect to raise \$65 million in Indianapolis and have obtained 80% of that total. Work on the out-of-state goal of \$43 million is yet to be undertaken in a systematic manner.

Here in Indianapolis, we have announced \$1 million gifts from American United Life Insurance Company (for a chair in business) and from Eli Lilly & Company. A gift from the Krannert Charitable Trust for the Medical School Clinical Research Center and Library is to be announced soon. Funds for cancer research are to be received by this campus, and several corporations and individuals are considering substantial contributions. We also have proposals in the hands of companies with plants here in Indiana. In some cases, IUPUI would share gifts with other IU campuses.

With that brief overview, I'll stop. I would be happy to answer any questions that you might have.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Are there any questions or comments for Gene? Thank you very much, Gene.

AGENDA ITEM V

Fringe Benefits Committee Resolution on Gainful Employment Proviso of 18/20 Rule (IUPUI Circular 85-16)

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: The next item concerns the Resolution on Gainful Employment under the 18/20 Rule. This will be presented by Professor Keith Moore.

PROF. MOORE: Thank you, Vice President Irwin. Since our resolution and a brief rationale for its presentation were distributed with the minutes under the heading IUPUI Circular 85-16, I would like to save time this afternoon by not reading that to you. Instead, I would like to very briefly add a few comments relating to some of the additional rationale for this proposal that space did not allow in terms of inclusion in the circular. In particular, I would like to address the question of why we feel that the IUPUI Faculty Council should be considering an item which obviously has a systemwide impact.

The rationale for consideration of this item has been an increasing interest on the part of faculty in retirement as the mean age of this campus' faculty is becoming higher. If you look around, I think you will see that, as the campus matures, the mean age is increasing, so questions of retirement are progressively becoming of interest to more people. We have had numerous concerns expressed to our committee in the last several years that I have been associated with it, from specific individuals concerning retirement and on specific items relating to early retirement. In this regard, I should like to remind people that the normal retirement age in the IU system, under

the TIAA/CREF plan, is age 70. However, under certain circumstances, individuals 65 years of age or older may elect to retire early under the so-called "18/20 Rule" if they meet the criteria.

I would also like to remind you that this early retirement is not part of the TIAA/CREF retirement annuity plan, but is, in fact, funded entirely from the University budget and constitutes a portion of the University payroll costs. It is for this reason that the plan as developed contains a gainful employment limitation on an individual who would elect to retire early from this institution and perhaps go to some other institution of higher learning and take a full-time faculty position. I think clearly that there would be some concern about the expenditure of state money to subsidize a productive faculty member to do so. I would like to say at this point that the committee certainly appreciates the reason behind the gainful employment limitation. However, there are some very specific problems with this restriction on gainful employment under early retirement that the present rule simply does not encompass. In the first place, the reporting of gainful employment income at the present time and the foreseeable future is strictly on an honor basis. There is no way that the University can obtain information about an individual's gainful employment after early retirement other than the quarterly reports that the individual submits to the University. This has the effect of imposing a potential penalty on those conscientious and honest individuals that report their full earned income.

In addition, full-time faculty who have significant outside income before retirement, for example, consulting or private practice income, find that the restriction on earned income has the effect of preventing them from doing something without penalty that they were able to do before they elected early retirement, because the earning restriction is calculated on the basis of the last five years base salary from the University before retirement which does not include any of these potential sources for outside income. So, if an individual would continue to do the sort of things they have been doing all along, they in effect could be penalized by having their retirement income reduced on a dollar-by-dollar basis for this outside income. This has, I think, particular impact on this campus because of the professional schools and the relatively large number of faculty members who have outside sources of income for retirement. Several individuals on the faculty who are looking at retirement or who have retired have expressed concern to our committee.

According to the Director of Insurance and Retirement Programs, this has been a significant enough problem that, in some areas to aid in recruitment and retention of faculty, exceptions have been made to this rule on a case-by-case basis and will allow certain individuals to include outside income in this base salary calculation before the earned income limitation is imposed. However, again, according to the Director, this exception is not available to just anyone.

As a consequence, the IUPUI Faculty Council Fringe Benefits Committee believes that we should retain the spirit of the earning limitations on the 18/20 early retirement; but, at the same time, we also believe that the current inequities and impossibility of its application on a fair and meaningful basis should be corrected as soon as possible. Therefore, we propose the rewording in Section II of the 18/20 Rule — interim payment conditions and procedures — as it was outlined in the Circular 85-16 which was distributed with the minutes. The Committee would like to propose to the Faculty Council that the Faculty Council support these changes and recommends to the administration that these procedures be implemented as rapidly as necessary authorization can be obtained.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Since this is a standing committee, we can assume that this motion has been moved and seconded. Therefore, we are ready for discussion.

PROF. LANGSAM: Two things. One, there is no way that Indiana University is going to change the 18/20 rule's wording for one campus. If this is approved by this body, it would definitely have to go the All University Fringe Benefits Committee because this is a University policy. As much as I appreciate the administration on this campus, I do think this is going to be a problem to implement

policy which would affect the entire University. Two, the All University Faculty Council has reported to the President for the last two years an amendment to this policy which would make this revision meaningless because, in fact, there is a revision that has already been approved and waiting for Presidential action. In fact, a year ago the University hired a company called Nyhart to do a study of the implications of the changes. One of the changes was dropping the age to 64, with a study to drop the age to even lower. Second was a change in the calculation of earned income which would substantially liberalize what would be considered earned income. So, I have some concerns about this. We are waiting to get some actions on the original proposal. I am not sure that this doesn't muddy the water. Third, I serve on the Exceptions Committee and I have heard of exceptions with regard to people's retirement being earlier than 65. I have never heard of an exception on how much income they could let in.

PROF. SHANKS: Is there any merit in the sentiments from this body to survey what is going on in the All University Council?

PROF. LANGSAM: I think that it might be most helpful if this body says that they are interested in the existing proposal with regard to liberalizing the earned income policy. It comes very close to the concerns that I think that the committee on this campus is addressing. So, it would seem to me that one would want to look at that and certainly find out what was going to happen to that before we try to change something which would already be changed if this new program goes through.

PROF. ALTON: However, it has come to my attention that at the present time there is a segment of this faculty who are allowed to use their consulting fees in figuring their base salary and that the rest of us are not allowed to do this.

PROF. KUCZKOWSKI: I have to say that this was brought to the attention of the committee by one of the members who was seeking information on this. If that is inaccurate, I think we need to be told. As we understand it, there is a segment of this faculty who are permitted to add outside income into their base income and yet no other segment is allowed that. Otherwise, we are talking about a serious condition that needs to be addressed.

PROF. LANGSAM: I think there are ways of addressing that issue separately from the other issue.

PROF. KUCZKOWSKI: Isn't that the issue?

PROF. LANGSAM: I don't know. I am not on that committee so I don't know what that issue is.

PROF. KUCZKOWSKI: Isn't it the issue that we may have the base salary that is calculated differently for one segment for this faculty and not for the rest of the faculty for the university? Isn't that part of it?

PROF. LANGSAM: My comment was strictly based on my experience on the Exceptions Committee. I have never heard this come up. Now, it may be being done, but the Exceptions Committee is not doing it. I have served on that committee for two years, and we have voted on exceptions. We have never ever discussed calculating their income in giving some people more base than others. That is what I am saying. This may go on but it is not in the Exceptions Committee that it does. I would think that it would be appropriate to raise the question.

PROF. MOORE: The question, as raised with Mr. Hudson and, in fact, the document that is contained in the circular, along with some of the additional information I presented, was given to both him and Mr. Mulholland about three weeks ago with the request that they respond if they had any particular problems with it and they haven't responded. That is about all that I can say. The information was obtained directly from the Director of Insurance and Retirement Programs. Beyond that, I cannot speak for the Exceptions Committee or anyone else.

PROF. BESCH: Before we evolve too much further into innuendos and insinuations, I would like to respond to a couple of points that Miriam brought up because I think they are important to the Council as a whole. First of all, she said some words that some Council members have misinterpreted in the past, when similar words have been spoken. I do not wish these words to be mistaken this time. I believe Miriam did not intend her remarks to be misconstrued to suggest that the University Faculty Council Committee takes care of these matters, so why don't you quit worrying about it in your local Faculty Council. I strongly feel that the University Faculty Council ought to be subservient to all of the individual councils, not the head of all the councils. Agreement on University wide changes can occur only in a university wide body like the UFC, but unless and until a campus' representatives can be said to speak for that campus' Council, local faculty voice in governance will be fractionated. Miriam, I am sure you had not intended your words to be taken to mean that the campus' perspective is too parochial to be given concern, but that is what some people hear when that kind of comment is made.

The second point is that we have, at least in this Faculty Council and in the Bloomington Faculty Council, attempted as best we possible could, to cross fertilize University Faculty Council committees with committee members serving on the corresponding campus council committee. In particular, we have tried very hard to get those people who are on the University Faculty Council's Fringe Benefits Committee to serve also on our own IUPUI Faculty Council's Fringe Benefits Committee. So, if there is a lack of communication between the people who are on those two committees, it is not because the IUPUI Faculty Council's Executive Committee has not tried to induce such cross fertilization. Instead, it's because harried faculty have declined to serve on both.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Are there other comments?

DEAN RENDA: Call for the question.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: The question has been called for. All in favor of the motion, say "Aye". Opposed, same sign. Motion carried. Thank you, Keith.

AGENDA ITEM VI

New Business

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: The next item on the agenda is New Business. Rebecca Van Voorhis has a report for you.

PROF. VAN VOORHIS: I hope by now that most of you have received in the campus mail a brochure which describes the Learning Resources Symposium for February 21. If you haven't or if you want another copy, I will leave some on the table so that when you leave you can take one. I would like to encourage you to call it to the attention of the rest of your colleagues in your areas, departments, or schools.

The keynote panel this year is a little different format than we have traditionally used. We are pretty excited about it. The panel is to include Laura Bornholdt who is in the President's Office at the University of Chicago; John Hackett, Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Cummins Engine; and Percy Clark, Superintendent, Metropolitan School District of Lawrence Township. These three panelists will be talking in each of their areas about what they perceive as the teaching needs for the immediate future, probably as far ahead as the year 2000, but at least a five-year perspective on what we as faculty should be thinking of as we design courses for students here on the IUPUI campus.

After the panel presentations, there will be a reaction panel comprised of three persons — Morton Marcus, Division of Research, School of Business; Anya Royce, Dean of Faculties, IU Bloomington; and Rowland Sherrill, Associate Professor, School of Liberal Arts, IUPUI. Those three panelists will be listening to the opening remarks and commenting as they see it for us here on the Indianapolis campus.

After the morning session, there will be a luncheon speaker who was last year's award winner for outstanding teaching. Professor Robert Harris from the School of Medicine faculty will be giving his perspective on what it takes to be good and effective in a classroom. The afternoon will comprise 12 workshops occurring in three different time segments; several at 1:00, some more at 2:00; and then the remainder at 3:00. Each of the workshops will be 50 minutes. Six of them have something to do with computers, and two of the computer sessions have to do with how we as faculty can use computing systems that are available to us for grading. One of those computer sessions is for those of us who know absolutely nothing about computers. It is a primer for those of us who are not cognizant in that area.

Another session will concern video disks, which combine computer technology and video technology and will become available to us here on the Indianapolis campus. Bloomington was the first campus to have access to that system. In addition to sections having to do with computers, there are six others of a variety of topics. One has to do with teaching needs for minority students in a classroom and another on providing a classroom climate for women students. Another will deal with academic counseling and how we as faculty members who are involved, not only in teaching in the classroom, but trying to counsel students might do that more effectively. There is a session having to do with how we might individualize and approach instruction even though we are teaching perhaps 20, 25, or 50 students. So, there are several choices. There is no charge, of course, for this symposium. There is a \$6.00 fee for the luncheon, if you choose to have the catered lunch that is available. However, you don't have to do that in order to hear the remarks at lunch time. It is February 21 starting at 9:00 for the morning session. That will begin with the presentation of this year's Edward C. Moore award winner for the outstanding teaching on this campus.

Thank you and I encourage you to attend on February 21.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Thank you very much. Is there other business to come before us?

PROF. ALIPRANTIS: Yes. I want to talk about the process being used to replace you. I would like to make a motion. It has to do with the selection of your replacement. I would like to read the statement and then I would like to make a motion.

"The small Search and Screen Committee for Dr. Irwin's replacement by Indiana University is not appropriate. It is just a continuation of the effort by Indiana and Purdue universities to slow down the professional growth of IUPUI. The result is that Indianapolis is the last major city in the United States without a respectable university.

To carry IUPUI — with possibly a new name — into the next decade (and the 21st century), we need a leader who will work for the quality growth of IUPUI — one who will be aware of the special needs of an urban university.

Our new leader will at times be at odds with the position taken by Purdue and Indiana Universities. I think that, in order to obtain such an administrator, we cannot start with a stacked deck — i.e., the present small Search and Screen Committee. It is also true that the search and screen operating time period has been shortened to about three months.

This was either done by calculation or ineptitude. In either case, it is not acceptable. To obtain the best possible applicants, we need to increase the search time and make sure that the best candidate is actually offered the post.

Thus, we need a committee with the dominant representation from IUPUI faculty members.

ACCORDINGLY, I MOVE TO PETITION THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES THAT THE PRESENT COMMITTEE FOR THE SELECTION OF THE NEW VICE PRESIDENT BE DISSOLVED AND A NEW COMMITTEE BE SELECTED WHOSE ABSOLUTE MAJORITY IS COMPRISED OF IUPUI FACULTY MEMBERS REPRESENTING EVERY UNIT OF THE UNIVERSITY.

This is my motion.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Is there a second to that motion?

PROF. ROTHMAN: For discussion purposes, I will second it.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Is there any discussion of that resolution or motion?

DEAN RENDA: I call for the question.

PROF. BESCH: I hope you will allow some discussion of the motion. I would like to comment but I won't comment from where I am sitting now because my comments do not come from under the hat I wear when I am sitting here. So, if you will permit me I will sit down here [moving into the audience]. This issue, the whole broad issue of current Search and Screen procedures at Indiana University has been brought forth to the University Faculty Council by written communications from two faculty members. I think most of you know, I serve as the Co-Secretary of the University Faculty Council, I have had a bit of time to think about the issue and time to think about what I would say if Roko or anyone else would talk to me casually about it. I certainly don't want to identify myself as speaking as Co-Secretary of the University Faculty Council or as Secretary of this Faculty Council. There will, I am sure, be ample forums for that at appropriate times.

In Bloomington, at least, this issue has been brought forth principally from one of the members of the Concerned Titled Professors. The Concerned Titled Professors is a group of faculty who have titled professorships or are distinguished professors and who have joined the group. The particular professor who brought this forward has formed a resolution and called a meeting of the Concerned Titled Professors on this campus on February 14. His principle objection as I understand it, is that "established University procedures" were not followed in appointing not only the Search and Screen Committee to find a replacement for Dr. Irwin, but also the other most recent one which is the one to replace Dean Lombardi from International Programs. His specific written comments in his call for a meeting of the Concerned Titled Professors was that the procedures outlined in a 1976 document from the University Faculty Council have not been followed [Note added: UFC Circular 12-76]. It is true that they have not been followed. That is the case, not only for the present Search and Screen Committee but for every Search and Screen Committee, as far as I can tell, for at least the last six years and probably for the entire 10 years. The reason that it is not true relates back to something that I said earlier in response to Miriam. That is that the University Faculty Council should be subservient to and not superior to the wills of the individual Faculty Councils since local control should have a very high priority. That is true, I think, of this Council too. To get quite specific, the UFC document specifies that the UFC as a whole approve a list of persons recommended to serve on each search and screen committee before that list is forwarded to the appointing officer. The University Faculty Council has not in the past been asked to approve lists of suggestions to the President about the appointment. Rather, that authority has

been delegated either passively or purposely to the individual campus Councils. In the individual campus councils, the Nominating Committees and the Executive Committees have, for as long as I know, routinely submitted lists to the appointing officer at his request for the Search and Screen Committees. I can tell you, Roko, that in fact I did submit such a list to the President. That list had not been approved by the UFC. Having been involved with such lists for many years, experience gave me no reason to seek UFC approval. I also talked about this with Jerry [Kaplan], who left messages for me about my asking him who he might suggest to be on the Search and Screen Committee for this campus.

PROF. ALIPRANTIS: Was that the large or small committee?

PROF. BESCH: Perhaps we can get to the large or small in a minute. I don't want to mix up several issues. The President did seek and was given a list of suggested names from this campus. It was discussed in the Executive Committee many many different times. It is not as though it was a surprise to us that this committee was going to be appointed but it was only in the hurried Christmas time that people thought it might be suddenly imminent. Perhaps the way in which the names were selected was strung out a little longer than it might otherwise have been, but, nevertheless, it was a collection of names that were accumulated over a long period and a letter was sent to the President.

Now the other issue that you raised, I guess the real point of your motion, was something concerning the Consultative as opposed to the Search Committee. Somehow the Consultative Committee seems to be discounted entirely when you assert that the Search and Screen Committee doesn't have enough faculty on it. The Search Committee is half faculty. The Consultative Committee is about 99.9% faculty. Taken together, faculty are clearly a majority.

The Consultative Committee, chaired by Dean Plater, is clearly a working committee. I can assure you of that. Maybe again it is a case of my own ignorance or perhaps you may be ignorant about what happens or doesn't happen in this Search and Screen Committee. I think if you understood what is in fact going on, your objections at least would be framed in different terms than what they are. Maybe you haven't asked about it.

One final bit of background: in the few past few years there has been too much screening and not enough searching, according to many of our faculty. This process that is here now, I think, tries to emphasize that we need to search as well as to screen. This is in no way to de-emphasize the importance of a wide ranging search, a long time search, looking high and low, not only plastering ads in the Chronicle of Higher Education, but calling up old friends, calling up new friends, calling up other Presidents and a variety kinds of search efforts. This is to emphasize searching, not to de-emphasize it.

PROF. ALIPRANTIS: How is the committee going to operate?

PROF. BESCH: One doesn't know what might happen exactly because the faculty are continuing to shape the process at this time, but I can assure you that I have every confidence that should it be impossible to find three to five outstanding candidates in that time, recommendations will not go forward simply to meet a deadline. I'll end there so we can go back to discussing your motion more directly.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Just a moment. I going to call on Henry our Parliamentarian for a few comments.

PROF. KARLSON: First, under Robert's Rules of Order we find that in this assembly no party can be heard twice upon a main motion without permission of the assembly. I believe both speakers have been heard more than twice now. Secondly, I would point out that technically the motion as made is

out of order because it calls upon this assembly to do something which is beyond the powers of this assembly. I believe that the exact motion was that this committee be dissolved. This assembly has no authority to dissolve the committee. It is the assembly who had the authority to appoint the committee. In fact, the only faculty right that I can see concerning this is to participate in the process of selecting candidates for major positions (which we have done) and to petition to the Board of Trustees through appropriate channels regarding use of the faculty in any matter pertaining to the conduct and welfare of the institution. The most this assembly could do is to petition the Board of Trustees to dissolve the committee and that was not the nature of your resolution. The resolution stated was out of order.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: We do have a motion and the question was called for.

PROF. KARLSON: It is out order.

PROF. ALIPRANTIS: Can I change the motion?

DEAN SCHALLER: Read the motion so that everybody can hear it.

PROF. ALIPRANTIS: I move to petition the Board of Trustees that the present committee for the selection of the new Vice President be dissolved and a new committee be selected whose absolute majority is comprised of IUPUI faculty members representing every unit of the University. Would that be in order?

PROF. KARLSON: You are moving that this assembly petition the Board of Trustees. That would be in order.

DEAN SCHALLER: You said committee. There are two committees. Do you mean both or one?

PROF. ALIPRANTIS: Both.

DEAN SCHALLER: You want to dissolve both and name one?

PROF. ALIPRANTIS: Yes.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Is there a second to that motion?

PROF. ROTHMAN: Just to keep the discussion going, I will second it.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: The question has been called for this new motion. All in favor of that motion say "Aye". Opposed, same sign. The opposed have it.

Martin Dragonnette, President of the Student Assembly, has an announcement.

MR. DRAGONNETTE: We have a problem on this campus concerning ordering of books for classes. I don't know how to approach this subject, but last night I dreamed that Woody Hayes was receiving an award which the Student Assembly gave for appreciation of service. Then I realized that Woody Hayes has never been a part of IUPUI. I also realize that we do not yet have a great sports program. I question then, well, what do we have? What we do have is a quality of education to give the students at IUPUI. In the past few years, and especially this semester, we have been sacrificing the quality education by stumbling over something that I think should go like clockwork and that is the ordering of books. Many students at this time have at least one class in which books have not yet arrived. This slows the educational process down and upsets everyone's schedule. I am asking the faculty and the deans here to make a concerted effort to turn in book orders on time. Let's make this process work like clockwork, so if there still a problem, we can

say it is not in the first step of the process, which is you the professors, but it lies somewhere else. Thank you.

BARBARA FISCHLER: I would like to ask a question. Are you talking about books in the library?

MR. DRAGONNETTE: No. I am talking about books ordered by professors.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Is there any other business?

AGENDA ITEM VII
Adjournment

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: If there is no other business, we are adjourned.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY

at

I N D I A N A P O L I S

Minutes of the Faculty Council Meeting

March 6, 1986 Law School, Room 116

3:30 - 5:30 P.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Administration: Glenn W. Irwin, Jr., Executive Dean Howard Schaller, Dean Carol Nathan. Deans: Elizabeth Grossman, P. Nicholas Kellum, William M. Plater. Director: Barbara Fischler. Faculty: Charalambos Aliprantis, Phillip Bendick, Henry R. Besch, Jr., Patricia Blake, Charles Blevins, Frances Brahma, Charlotte Carlley, Varoujan Chalian, Mervyn Cohen, David Crabb, Andre DeKorvin, David Doedens, Ian Dowdeswell, Kenneth Dunipace, John Eble, James Edmondson, Martin Farlow, Naomi Fineberg, Beverly Flynn, Paul Galanti, LaForrest Garner, Melvin Glick, Jean Gnat, Clifford Goodwin, Edwin T. Harper, Jean Hutten, Thomas Jones, Henry C. Karlson, Linda Kasper, Juanita Laidig, Miriam Z. Langsam, Onkar Markand, Rebecca T. Markel, Michael E. Mitchell, Lillie-Mae Padilla, Catherine Palmer, Edward Robbins, James Shanks, Jay Simon, Marie Sparks, Jeffery Vessely, Kathryn Wilson, Ruth Woodham, Pao-lo Yu, Susan Zunt.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Deans: Gerald Bepko, Trevor Brown, R. Bruce Renda, Sheldon Siegel, William J. Voos, James E. Weigand, Marshall C. Yovits. Faculty: Jacqueline Blackwell, Ira Brandt, Michael Burke, Edmund Byrne, Charles Ellinger, Michael Glant, Jeri Gruner, Eugene Helveston, Ngoan Van Hoang, Meredith T. Hull, William Kulsrud, Monroe Little, Richard Pflanzner, John E. Pless, Gerald Powers, Anita Proffitt, Shirley Quate, Mark S. Richardson, John Schmedtje, Rowland A. Sherrill, Ernest E. Smith, Robert B. Stonehill, Victor Wallis, Kathleen A. Warfel, Lawrence Wheeler, George Willis, Charles Winslow.

ALTERNATES PRESENT: Deans: John M. Hunger for Charles Bonser, Catherine Palmer for Walter J. Daly, Charles J. Palenik for H. William Gilmore, Hugh A. Wolf for Howard D. Mehlinger, Harvey Hegarty for Jack R. Wentworth. Faculty: Bartholomew Ng for Elaine Alton, John Fleming for Joseph DiMicco, Jennifer Hehman for Vania Goodwin, John F. Bonner for Robert A. Harris, Jerome I. Kaplan for Lucrea Hutton, William Crabtree for Suetta Kehrein, J. C. Crown for Joseph Kuczkowski, R. F. Bodonyi for Barnett B. Morris, Emily Yount for Terry Reed, Michael A. Perma for Neal Rothman, Christine Fitzpatrick for Harriet Wilkins.

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE ABSENT: Martin Dragonnette.

VISITORS: Hitwant Sidhu, School of Physical Education.

Summary of Meeting's Activities

Dean James Carter read the memorial resolution for Professor Robert Shellhamer.

Vice President Irwin indicated that the IUPUI Mission Report will be discussed at the April meeting of the ICHE.

Ken Dunipace announced the election results as follows (for at-large representatives to the IUPUI Faculty Council): Professors Andreoli, Besch, Brothers, Edmondson, Farber, Feeley, Hernandez, Kirk, Kosegi, McAteer, J. Miller, Nagy, Palmer, Pflanzner, Sharp, Sutton, Vix, Webb and Zunt; (for IUPUI representatives to the UFC): Alton, Besch, DiMicco, Fife, Gnat and Olson.

Henry Karlson read proposed amendments to the Bylaws that would increase the number of Boards of Review to three and remove a restriction from the eligibility clauses.

John Chalian reported briefly on the activities of Ad Hoc IUPUI Honors Convocation Committee.

The Council elected Professor Susan Zunt as its Secretary for 1986-88.

AGENDA ITEM I

Memorial Resolution - Robert E. Shellhamer, School of Medicine

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Good afternoon everybody. The first item on the agenda is the memorial resolution for Dr. Robert Shellhamer of the School of Medicine. This will be given by Dr. Jim Carter, Associate Dean of Medicine. [The memorial resolution, IUPUI Circular 85-17, was read by Dr. Carter.] [A moment of silence was observed.]

AGENDA ITEM II

Approval of Minutes - February 6, 1986

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: The minutes of our February 6th meeting have been mailed but I think that only a few of you have received them so we are going to ask for approval of those minutes at the next meeting.

AGENDA ITEM III

Presiding Officer's Business - Vice President Glenn W. Irwin, Jr., M.D.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: I have a few comments to make. As you all know, the Indiana General Assembly went home yesterday. They really didn't do anything that I could be certain of for higher education this time. The leadership, of course, warned us early in the game that was likely to be the case. We had hoped, perhaps at the last minute, to get approval for the purchase of the Cable Building, for example. We didn't have even the opportunity to do that. I would like to say though that we are the best prepared I can ever remember for our presentation to the next session, the 87-89 session.

The Mission Report, which is in the hands of the Commission on Higher Education, has a very important section, well documented, regarding the fiscal perspectives of this campus. I do believe at the April meeting of that Commission we will begin the dialogue early in the game to defend our operating as well as capital request for the next session. Of course, high on the priority for that request will be the move of the 38th Street campus to the main campus. That is our highest capital priority for that biennium. If we could get special consideration for our operating budget for IUPUI and get the 38th Street campus on its way, that would be a very successful session. I really do feel though that we are prepared to make our case wherever we need to make it.

Howard, do you have anything?

DEAN SCHALLER: No.

AGENDA ITEM IV**Executive Committee Report - H. R. Besch, Jr., Secretary**

PROF. BESCH: Thank you. The Executive Committee Report is fairly short today. I wanted to bring you up to date about some activities at the last University Faculty Council meeting, regarding matters previously discussed in our Faculty Council here.

In order to make sure that we have time to count ballots and to revote in case that would be necessary, I would like to begin the business by asking the Executive Committee representatives who conduct elections to begin the election of the Secretary for next year. We did circulate in time, thanks to Ken Dunipace's good organization, a revised ballot including Professors Karlson, Meiere, and Zunt who are on the slate for Council Secretary next year. John Chalian heads up the Elections subcommittee of the Executive Committee. I would ask him, Jean Gnat, and Jeff Vessely to distribute the ballots. I would ask Professor John Fleming, who is the alternate today for Joe DiMicco, to assist them.

[After the first voting]

PROF. BESCH: We have the results, at least those of the first balloting. We will have to vote again. There is not an absolute majority. Henry Karlson and Susan Zunt will be in a runoff.

PROF. KARLSON: Technically, we have to keep all three people on the ballot and vote again.

PROF. BESCH: Technically, we will keep all three people on the ballot and vote again.

PROF. VESSELY: Is that what our Constitution says?

PROF. KARLSON: That is what Robert's says and our Constitution adopts Robert's.

[Following the second voting]

PROF. BESCH: Congratulations, Professor Zunt. Susan Zunt is our next Secretary.

PROF. BLAKE: I move we destroy the ballots.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Is there a second to that? [Seconded] All in favor of that motion, say "Aye". Opposed? Motion carried.

PROF. BESCH: The University Faculty Council met on November 11. One of the items that was scheduled for discussion at that time and for a vote was Code of Academic Ethics that we had discussed in this body before. There were some minor revisions in the wording of the Code of Academic Ethics. So, after these revisions, the University Faculty Council did pass those resolutions to amend the Academic Code of Conduct.

There were also some recommendations from the Fringe Benefits Committee which suggest, in effect, what Miriam Langsam had reminded us of the last time in this Council. Further information regarding this aspect of the Fringe Benefits Committee's recommendations will be coming to you on blue sheets along with the Minutes of the University Faculty Council meeting.

The other item of University Faculty Council business which also very much impacts on us here regards the Calendar Committee. As you know, our Faculty Affairs Committee is responsible to this body for bringing forward a proposed calendar. It has been working on that as has the University Faculty Council's Calendar Committee. There will be additional information about that from Ed Robbins' committee, the Faculty Affairs Committee, with the Minutes of the meeting. We will have

slated on the next agenda a presentation and discussion of the proposed calendar. Ed, did you want to add anything to that now? [Secretary's note: As noted later, Professor Robbins chairs the Academic Affairs Committee, not the Faculty Affairs Committee].

PROF. ROBBINS: Just that our committee has acted but, because we did not have a chance to get it on this agenda, our recommendation will be circulated with the agenda for the next meeting.

PROF. BESCH: Thank you. The final item, which I have is listed as item 5 on your agenda, regards the results of the recent elections. Our Constitution and Bylaws direct that the Executive Committee will conduct the elections of the at-large representatives to this body and the representatives to the University Faculty Council. Those election results are in and I would like to ask Ken Dunipace, Chairman of the Nominating Committee, to give us a report on that.

AGENDA ITEM V

Nominating Committee Report - Ken Dunipace, Chair

PROF. DUNIPACE: My report is going to be very brief, consisting simply of telling you who got elected. For the University Faculty Council:

Elaine Alton, School of Science
Henry R. Besch, Jr., School of Medicine
Joseph DiMicco, School of Medicine
Wilmer Fife, School of Science
Jean Gnat, University Library
Byron Olson, School of Dentistry

The Faculty Council at-large representatives are:

Sharon Andreoli, School of Medicine
Henry R. Besch, Jr., School of Medicine
Linda Brothers, School of Engineering & Technology
James Edmondson, School of Medicine
Mark Farber, School of Medicine
Mary Feeley, School of Medicine
Emily Hernandez, School of Medicine
Robert J. Kirk, School of Liberal Arts
Judith Kosegi, School of Medicine
James McAteer, School of Medicine
Judy Miller, School of Medicine
Paul Nagy, School of Liberal Arts
Catherine Palmer, School of Medicine
Richard Pflanzner, School of Science
Kent Sharp, School of Engineering & Technology
Susan Sutton, School of Liberal Arts
Vernon Vix, School of Medicine
Dorothy Webb, School of Liberal Arts
Susan Zunt, School of Dentistry

AGENDA ITEM V

New Business

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Under New Business we have two items today, one by John Chalian and one by

Henry Karlson. Dr. Chalian is out of the room so Henry will report on the Constitution and Bylaws Committee.

PROF. KARLSON: The Constitution & Bylaws Committee at this time wants to give notice that at the next meeting of the Faculty Council we will bring before the Faculty Council two proposed amendments for our Bylaws. As I have stated previously in this Council, the Constitution & Bylaws Committee has been reviewing the Boards of Review. After reviewing our Bylaws dealing with Boards of Review, we have two proposals.

The first is to amend Bylaw Article IV Section A Subsection 1 by deleting "two" and substituting "three." As amended, the relevant section will read "There shall be three Faculty Boards of Review,..."

We have also recommended that we amend Bylaw Article IV Section C by deleting "At least two years shall elapse between terms of office of faculty members or librarians serving on a Board of Review" and substituting "Faculty members or librarians serving on a Board of Review shall be eligible for re-election, provided no person shall serve more than two terms consecutively."

These will be moved and voted on at the next session of the Faculty Council.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: We will now have the report from Professor Chalian on the Awards Convocation for IUPUI.

PROF. CHALIAN: A few months ago there was a suggestion to the Executive Committee that we entertain the subject of an Awards Day or an Honors Convocation for the IUPUI campus. A task force to consider this idea was nominated by the Executive Committee and has been meeting to foster the idea. The members are Paul Galanti, Chairman of the Student Affairs Committee; Miriam Langsam, Director of the Honors Program; Byron Olson, Chairman of the Faculty Affairs Committee; Ed Robbins, Chairman of the Academic Affairs Committee; and John Chalian as representative from the Executive Committee and Chairman of this task force.

At our first of three meetings, we decided to find out how many honor students there are on the IUPUI campus. Our work and investigation showed that about 330 to 340 students are honored every year on this campus. We wrote a letter to all of the deans on the IUPUI campus to get their suggestions, along with their traditions as to how they celebrated or gave recognition to their awardees as honor students. From 16 letters to the deans, we received 10 responses in a short time. The majority said that they already had traditional ways to honor their students. Most of them, the ones that had traditional ceremonies, hold them in the springtime just before the Commencement. A few of them said they had programs just prior to Commencement or after the Commencement within that day, with the justification that that is a good day to attract the students and their families, which is a major concern also.

Our task force suggested to the Executive Committee that we have some type of meritorious recognition of the students and recognition of faculty members at the same time with special awards. We suggested inviting a nationally distinguished speaker for that day and really celebrate our honor students, attracting the news media.

This was presented to the Executive Committee at its February 20th meeting. The suggestion is worded this way:

"The Executive Committee goes on record as supporting the concept of an annual Honors Day for recognition of undergraduate students at the IUPUI campus."

If you have any suggestions, or any questions, I would be happy to entertain them.

Thank you very much.

PROF. BESCH: I would like to comment on John's brief committee report. His committee has been working very hard on the details of ways to honor our students here, and we have agreed to present some of that informatio to you at our next council meeting. I would also like to give credit where credit is due, I believe, in terms of where the idea for an honors convocation came from. The idea came in writing from Deans Plater and Yovits. It came to the Executive Committee from Dean Schaller's office. It was in response to those written suggestions that we initiated this effort. I think we should go on record as thanking Bill Plater and Marshall Yovits for stimulating this effort.

Also, I was reminded in looking at my letter asking Professor Chalian to chair the Ad Hoc Honors Convocation committee, that Ed Robbins is, of course, Chairman of the Academic Affairs Committee and not the Faculty Affairs Committee, as I erroneously said earlier.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Thank you..

AGENDA ITEM VI

New Business

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Does anyone else have any New Business?

PROF. WILSON: Can you talk about what's happening to the Bareikis Report?

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Henry is on the committee. Henry, do you care to give us a progress report?

PROF. BESCH: The Board of Trustees is meeting at IU Northwest tomorrow and Saturday. Scheduled among their activities is to hear some update on the Task Force on University Reorganization. I can report that most of the correspondence we have is generally positive, although there are two letters from faculty members from Bloomington who take great exception to the notion that there should be a melding of the core campuses into a core campus by the year 2000. The Task Force force intends to continue to try and get further input until Uncle Sam's day, April 15, and even thereafter. We would like really to have the input by that time because during the last two weeks of April, we intend to incorporate what we have additionally and make a final report to the President by the end of April. We urge again, as Miriam Langsam did last time, for you to communicate with anyone you know on the committee, including certainly Miriam and myself, Jim Faris on this campus, Bob Bareikis directly, and anyone else by April 15th. The sooner the better.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Are there any other comments?

PROF. WOODHAM: Did I hear Henry's name mentioned twice for nomination to the Faculty Council in Bloomington?

PROF. BESCH: Do you mean Henry Besch?

PROF. WOODHAM: Yes.

DEAN SCHALLER: He is not eligible to be on the Faculty Council in Bloomington.

PROF. BESCH: I wasn't mentioned twice for the University Faculty Council. I was elected as an at-large representative to this body and as an IUPUI representative to the University Faculty Council.

PROF. WOODHAM: Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM VII
Adjournment

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Is there any other business to come before us? Hearing none, we are adjourned.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY

at

INDIANAPOLIS

Minutes of the Faculty Council Meeting

April 3, 1986 Law School, Room 116

3:30 - 5:30 P.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Administrative: Glenn W. Irwin, Jr., Dean Carol Nathan. Director: Barbara Fischler, Deans: H. William Gilmore, Elizabeth M. Grossman, William M. Plater, R. Bruce Renda, William J. Voos, Marshall C. Yovits. Faculty: C. D. Aliprantis, Elaine Alton, Henry R. Besch, Jr., Patricia Blake, Michael Burke, Edmund Byrne, Charlotte Carley, David Crabb, David Doedens, Kenneth Dumipace, Charles Ellinger, Martin Farlow, Naomi Fineberg, Paul Galanti, LaForrest Garner, Melvin Glick, Jean Gnat, Clifford Goodwin, Vania Goodwin, Jeri Gruner, Robert A. Harris, Ngoan Van Hoang, Jean Hutten, Thomas Jones, Henry C. Karlson, Suetta Kehrein, William Kulsrud, Juanita Laidig, Miriam Z. Langsam, Monroe Little, Michael E. Mitchell, Lillie-Mae Padilla, Catherine Palmer, Richard Pflanzner, John E. Pless, Terry E. Reed, Edward Robbins, Neal Rothman, Ernest E. Smith, Marie Sparks, Jeffery Vessely, George Willis, Kathryn Wilson, Ruth Woodham, Pao-lo Yu, Susan Zunt.

ALTERNATES PRESENT: Deans: G. Kent Frandsen for Gerald Bepko, John M. Hunger for Charles Bonser, C. G. Palmer for Walter J. Daly, Hugh Wolf for Howard D. Mehlinger, Raymond A. Kane for Sheldon Siegel, Scott Evenbeck for James E. Weigand, W. Harvey Hegarty for Jack R. Wentworth. Faculty: Mary Feeley for Linda Kasper, Carol Taylor for Rebecca Markel.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Administrative: Executive Dean Howard Schaller. Deans: Trevor Brown, P. Nicholas Kellum. Faculty: Philip Bendick, Jacqueline Blackwell, Charles Blevins, Frances Brahmi, Ira Brandt, Varoujan Chalian, Mervyn Cohen, Andre DeKorvin, Joseph DiMicco, Ian Dowdeswell, John Eble, James Edmondson, Beverly Flynn, Michael Glant, Edwin T. Harper, Eugene M. Helveston, Meredith T. Hull, Lucreda Hutton, Joseph Kuczkowski, Onkar Markand, Gerald McHugh, Barnett B. Morris, Gerald Powers, Anita Proffitt, Shirley Quate, Mark S. Richardson, John Schmedtje, James Shanks, Rowland A. Sherrill, Jay Simon, Robert B. Stonehill, Victor Wallis, Kathleen A. Warfel, Lawrence Wheeler, Harriet Wilkins, Charles Winslow.

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE ABSENT: Martin Dragomette.

VISITORS: Byron Olson, Chair, IUPUI Faculty Affairs Committee; Bob Martin, Director, Administrative Affairs (IUPUI).

Summary of Meeting's Activities

Vice President Irwin extended condolences to the families of Tom Moses and Tom Grossman. The Vice President also commented on matters related to the HEC, the upcoming Board of Trustees meeting and the desperate parking situation on this campus. Bob Martin presented an update on impending street closings on and near the campus. Henry Besch announced the all-campus recognition reception for Vice President Irwin on May 1, 1986.

Ken Dunipace announced the unit representatives for the 1986-88 term as follows: Business, Karen Becker; Continuing Studies, Charles Ellinger; Dentistry, John Chalian and Glen Segraves; Engineering and Technology, Ken Dunipace and Judith Silence; Law, William Hodes; Medicine, John Baenziger, Phil Bendick, Joe DiMicco, Mike Mitchell, Ken Ryder and Henry Wellman; Nursing, Ann Belcher; Physical Education, Jeff Vessely; Public and Environmental Affairs, Robert Mendelsohn; Science, Jerome Kaminker; University Libraries, Maudine Williams; Liberal Arts, Linda Haas.

Ed Robbins presented the proposed IUPUI academic calendar for 1987-88, which was adopted by the Council after some modification.

Byron Olson lead discussion on the preliminary report from the Task Force on University Organization. The Council adopted the previously announced amendments to the Bylaws on the Faculty Boards of Review.

AGENDA ITEM I

Approval of Minutes of February 6, and March 6, 1986

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. The first order of business is the approval of the minutes of our February 6 and March 6, 1986 meetings. Is there a motion to approve? Some of these days that's going to happen; there will not be a motion to approve the minutes. [So moved] Is there any discussion of either of these two sets of minutes? Hearing none, all in favor of the motion say, "Aye". Opposed, same sign. Motion carried.

AGENDA ITEM II

Presiding Officer's Business - Vice President Glenn W. Irwin, Jr., M.D.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: First, this afternoon I would like to mention the untimely deaths of two people who meant a great deal to IUPUI. The first is the loss of Tom Moses. Quite a few of you in this room, I know, knew Tom. He was really a true leader of this community and, I think, also education. He was President and Chairman of the Water Company. He was responsible, many say, for bringing the Hudson Institute to this campus. He was responsible for bringing the Colts to Indianapolis. He was responsible for raising the money for St. Vincent's new hospital. Many of you perhaps didn't know that he also was Chairman of the IUPUI Board of Advisors at the time of his death. Tom had a problem with cancer for six or seven years. He kept going until the very end. That is a great loss.

The second great loss was Tom Grossman. Our condolences should go out as they have from many of us to Dean Betty Grossman. He, too, had a long and tough illness. So, we are thinking about Betty and her family.

I would like to report that the IUPUI Mission Report will be going to the Commission on Higher Education early in May. We will have some informal conversations with the Commission staff and some of the Commissioners before then. That very, very important report will be presented officially for any action at the May meeting of the HEC. We hope that we have in that document the data that will stimulate interest in increasing the base funding of IUPUI. I think we have the best shot at that that we have had for a long time.

The issues of Promotion and Tenure and the budget for this coming year will be going to the Trustees at their May meeting, the first week in May. This weekend the Trustees meet here on this campus and will be considering such things as fees. If they are approved, the gap between the undergraduate fee on this campus and at Bloomington will be narrowed, the first time in several years. I hope they approve it because it is important to us in the budget process of meeting the needs that we have.

I would like to say one word about the desperate parking situation we have at IUPUI. We will not get any relief until May 1st when the South Garage opens 1,500 new spaces. We will lose about 500 spaces,

though, for another two months because we have to close the old part of that garage in order to add two additional stories. On July 1st that 2,000+ car garage should be fully opened. Hopefully, that will relieve a lot of the space around Cavanaugh and the desperate situation on the Medical Center side. I can't wait for that thing to open. Parking headaches have been enormous to you, certainly to our office, and to many of our directors.

I have asked Bob Martin to come over and give you the latest overview and update of all the changes that will occurring in bridge closings and street closings. So, at this time Bob, why don't you give us an overview? We will try and save some time for questions about this complex issue.

BOB MARTIN: Thank you, Dr. Irwin. I know some of you in the back row probably cannot pick out the details on the map I have here at the front. I will leave this up and stay around after the Council meeting is over to answer any questions that you may have. I will try to reference some of the key areas to some of the existing facilities so that you in the back row can mentally follow along with what I am going to talk about. You will notice that I am constantly referring to some notes because the latest information that we have is what we received from pre-construction hearings with D.O.T. downtown. This is our fifth revision. I fully expect some more revisions before bidding and construction actually starts. I think probably most significant is that the arrangements in terms of the timeline on it is from the perspective of D.O.T. Once a contractor is selected, the contractor may, in fact, have a different scheme in terms of how to sequence the construction on some of the streets. That may, in fact, then affect the timeline. I don't believe, however, that any sliding of the dates I give you will be much more than a couple of weeks. What I will give you will be within a reasonable time period.

I would like to start first of all with the eastern part of the campus and that is the canal closing because those will affect major arteries coming in to and leaving the campus - most notably Michigan Street and New York Street.

I will start with the Ohio Street bridge. That bridge construction has already started. It is closed off. It is anticipated to be open August 1. They are looking at typically in most of the canal reconstruction a four to five month construction period.

There will be the reconstruction of the Vermont Street bridge. That has not been let for bid yet. When they do that, it will then remain permanently closed. That particular canal bridge becomes a pedestrian bridge in the scheme of the whole canal reconstruction along that area. So, once they decide to close the Vermont Street bridge it will then remain closed and become a pedestrian bridge.

Again, the important ones, New York Street and Michigan Street, these two main ones coming in and out of the campus. They are looking at a bidding process in May, with construction starting probably in June. They may start one before the other but most important is that they won't be that far apart so that we can anticipate that the construction of those two particular bridges will be overlapping and both Michigan Street and New York Street will be closed. Please keep in mind that the north/south West Street is still the heavily used street in terms of getting into our campus off the interstate system. Moving from east to the west, downtown and the east side, etc., New York Street and Michigan Street will be closed for the canal reconstruction. The construction time again is anticipated to begin in June and we should look for a four or five month construction period on both those those.

Coming now on to our campus the major north/south artery through our campus, that being Agnes Street, will have reconstruction beginning in May. It will not start any earlier than May 8. Bidding, again, has gone out on that from D.O.T. and they are waiting for that to come back in. That's the one that is going to have as much disruption to the internal part of our campus as anything. What will happen to Agnes Street is that it will be phased so that we are maintaining traffic in some fashion all of the time. What I would like to do is describe very briefly two segments of that.

Agnes Street, between New York and Michigan Street, will begin no earlier than May 8. What will happen

there is that the first phase of that section will be the western portion of the street. What will occur along there is the removal of the whole first row of parking along that section. There will be new curb lines, new cutways into existing streets, particularly Vermont, an upgrading of the sidewalks, and they will go into a little bit more than half way of the existing street. They will maintain one-way traffic south during the first phase. Coming off Michigan Street we will maintain one-way traffic south during that first phase of the construction. That is expected to be completed by the middle of June. Then they will flip to the east side of that street and begin to work on that segment between New York and Michigan. When that is done, they will then open Agnes Street back up for two-way traffic. When we speak of two-way traffic, that is two-way traffic on one lane with a flagman. The reason they are maintaining only one-way south during that first phase is because they are going a little bit more than half-way into that street to do some repairs on city sewers. That is anticipated to be completed by the end of July. In fact, they are mentioning the date of July 21. That section, again between New York and Michigan, then will be reopened completely. During all that construction, the entry ways into Cavanaugh Hall will always be maintained. There will not be any shutting off of deliveries to the buildings, etc.

At the same time that that is beginning, north of Michigan Street all the way up to Indiana Avenue, the reconstruction and relocation of Agnes Street will begin. There will be a phasing north of Michigan Street as it goes to North Street. The landmark association with that is the large hole out there for the Convention Center. North Street runs right in behind that. That small section will be worked on first. Two-way traffic will always be maintained on that section as well as the entry way into the University Hospital. Again, two-way traffic means one lane controlled by a flagman. Once they start to move north of North Street all the way up to Indiana Avenue, the relocation of Agnes Street then cuts through former properties of the Lockefield Garden area and does not then affect any patterns as they now exist on our campus. Completion of the total Agnes Street reconstruction is set for October 17. We are looking at that section between New York and Michigan Street to begin in May and end the latter part of July with the total completion by the end of October and the total opening of it. When they open up Agnes Street it will stop at Indiana Avenue. That short little linkage between there and that major interchange probably will not occur until the Spring of 1987. That is a very important linkage because that is the section that takes all of the traffic to that major interchange there. Unfortunately, that is going to have a delay for that portion.

While I am up in the Indiana Avenue/West 10th Street area, I would like then to come on down West 10th Street. You probably know that reconstruction of that area has already begun. They are widening 10th Street between Indiana Avenue and Wilson Street to a five-lane street. They are also shoring up a portion of it that has been falling into White River for the last four or five years. The traffic movement between Indiana Avenue and Wilson Street will be two-way traffic but again on one lane. That is going to cause a tremendous amount of congestion, particularly around the emergency entrances to Wishard Hospital. There are some contingency plans that they are working on. The expected timeline on that is August 1 for that to be completed and opened. As a side note, there is a major sewer line that is coming off of that area down into the Lockefield area that is following along that area on Indiana Avenue in order to accommodate ultimately the restoration and expansion of the Lockefield Garden area as well as the apartments and condominium complexes that are going along the canal project.

One last quick note before I leave you to your more important business. Vermont Street that runs south of the new parking garage is going to be upgraded and improved. That will go along at the same time as we start the construction area of Agnes. We must be able to tie into the new lines on Agnes Street. So, we are going to improve Vermont Street from Agnes to about 115 feet west of of the Dental School. It is extremely critical that we upgrade that to accommodate the parking garage. The improvements to that street will make it three lanes. We are going to have to accommodate traffic if you are familiar with the parking lot that is west of the Cavanaugh area. Patterson Street currently runs one-way south. We will be opening that street up to run two ways because it will be the only way into the campus on New York Street to get into those parking lots. John Mulvey, Chief of Police, has been working on a traffic plan. We are coordinating signs, traffic control with D.O.T. and our own police department. We are going to try to do the best job we can during this period of time.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Thank you, Bob. Are there questions for Bob or for me?

PROF. GNAT: Is there any chance of putting lights between West Street and Agnes Street so that people going north in the evening can get across Michigan?

BOB MARTIN: We have made requests repeatedly now for two years for a traffic light on Michigan Street at Blackford, which is right around the Mary Cable Building. We have made a request for a traffic light at Vermont and Agnes. That is for the heavy pedestrian traffic that flows off the parking lots into Cavanaugh and the heavy pedestrian traffic that flows from the parking lots north of Michigan. As of this date, we have not gotten any approval of that. Traffic lights are very difficult to get in the city of Indianapolis. We have had the request in, and Dr. Irwin is helping on that. All I can say is that we are optimistic that we will get some solution to that. As a byproduct of that, we are also asking that the corner of Michigan and West Street be looked at from a traffic signal standpoint, so that there may be some modifications in the way the traffic signals are going to move traffic as it comes off the interstate onto West Street, turning onto Michigan Street and as it comes from the south going north on West Street turning onto Michigan Street. The timing on those lights from our perspective need to be altered and we have made that request to D.O.T.

PROF. VESSELY: What might help is to make that center lane a right turn lane and make the right lane a right turn only lane because everybody turns right from that center lane anyway. This way, it would keep some of them from getting killed.

BOB MARTIN: We have asked for that. D.O.T. has been out, they have monitored, they are taking more studies now on the traffic patterns on Michigan Street and New York Street. Again, we are trying our best to see that at least those two lights get in and that some attention be paid to the signal currently at West Street and Michigan Street.

PROF. PALMER: Has any attention been paid to the signals on 10th Street along by Wishard Hospital? There is a terrible problem of people turning left from Wilson onto 10th Street.

BOB MARTIN: We have asked for that to be modified also.

PROF. SPARKS: When you have these flagmen on Agnes Street, what hours are they going to be there?

BOB MARTIN: During their construction hours.

PROF. SPARKS: Just during construction hours? What happens on those streets that are supposedly dual streets when there aren't any flagmen there?

BOB MARTIN: We have taken that into consideration. John Mulvey, Chief of Police, will take up that kind of responsibility. The D.O.T., or the construction company that ultimately gets the bid on that job, is required to have the flagmen. Those times of non-construction periods, it then falls to our responsibility and that falls to our Police Department to maintain and control traffic on campus.

PROF. BESCH: As long as we are cataloging our wish list, the exit off 65 onto 10th Street, where it used to be, much as Jeff Vessely just mentioned, that the right turn lane was right only and the middle lane was right permitted, was changed some months ago. A number of people got tickets for turning incorrectly following that change. Now everybody knows what you have to do to avoid a ticket. They could switch it back and begin giving tickets again and still really improve the traffic flow. They could also generate some more money if they would change it back to how it was.

BOB MARTIN: I would be happy to forward that on. I don't mind telling you that D.O.T. certainly has a mind of its own and trying to get, from the University's perspective, the things that we think are

appropriate for our constituency we have difficulty getting that through the traps. I will see that the recommendation gets through.

PROF. BLAKE: I don't know if I am in the right territory in asking you this, but I have heard rumors that Barnhill was going to be redirected. Is that part of this?

BOB MARTIN: No. You are talking about Barnhill from basically south of Michigan Street as it winds through...

PROF. BLAKE: From Michigan to West 10th Street.

BOB MARTIN: No. There are not plans right now for anything like that.

PROF. BLAKE: Will Middle Drive be opened up outside of Riley?

BOB MARTIN: Middle Drive is the one that runs between Nursing and new Riley. I do not believe so. That, right now, is tied up into what is going to happen with the demolition of the University Services Building (the old barracks building). We have some people looking at the parking and traffic configuration around new Riley.

PROF. REED: My question relates to hers. I was wondering why you get everyone into the mind set of going south on Agnes and then you, for just a two-month period, make it two-way with flagmen. It seems like it would be just as easy to leave it south for that period. Was there a special reason?

BOB MARTIN: There was no special reason other than we felt that it was important to us to be able to maintain two-way because off New York Street for that short period of time to maintain the only way you could then get into this whole parking area off New York Street is Patterson. So, we felt that, because they were going more than half way over, once they do the flip, two-way traffic can be easily maintained on the wider section and it was to our benefit to do that.

PROF. OLSON: Will this information appear in the Green Sheet?

BOB MARTIN: Yes. Tom Henry, Director of Publications and Information, has been working on that. We are going to have a series of maps coming out much like the Indianapolis paper have done. We will try to flood as many places as we can. Tom is also working with the media to get us recognized in the morning traffic reports during this whole construction period. We are trying the best we can to disseminate the information both in printed form and media form.

PROF. KULSEUD: Bob, over the past several months, it seems like we are talking about traffic control, there seems to be an increased amount of traffic on what used to be Blake Street under the Business Building which is now a service drive. Has this been given any consideration because more and more people are using that as a street rather than a service drive?

BOB MARTIN: I wasn't aware of that. It is not a street.

PROF. KULSEUD: It is not a street; yet more and more people are driving through there and parking underneath the School of Business Building and the School of Education Building.

BOB MARTIN: What is going on there currently is our participation in emission control in Indianapolis where we are offering free testing of vehicles for the carbon monoxide. But, other than that, that should not be being used as a major thoroughfare.

PROF. KULSEUD: It just seems like, within the last few months, that more and more cars are parked in under that area and driving right through.

BOB MARTIN: I will look into that.

BARBARA FISCHLER: Also, people are driving underneath there and driving off into the parking lots as well.

BOB MARTIN: I will certainly look into that. It is not intended to be a street.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Thank you, Bob.

AGENDA ITEM III

Executive Committee Report - H. R. Besch, Jr., Secretary

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Henry, may we have the Executive Committee Report?

PROF. BESCH: Yes, thank you. I think most of you realize that this is the penultimate meeting of the Faculty Council this year. The last Faculty Council meeting has traditionally been held in the Union Building. That often results in some difficulties in starting the meeting since people forget that the last Council meeting of the year is not held in the usual place. There is another important reason to mention that the May meeting will not be held in this building, because it will also not be held in the Union Building this year. Instead, it will be held at Vice President Irwin's residence. The Faculty Council meeting will begin at 3:00 at Vice President Irwin's house on May 1 - the date for the last Faculty Council meeting. That meeting will then be followed by two events rather than one which has been the case in the past. The first event will be an event that we are now used to - the Annual Faculty/Staff Recognition Award ceremony - which will begin at approximately 4:00 at Dr. Irwin's house after the Faculty Council meeting is finished. That award ceremony will then be followed by an all campus recognition for Dr. Irwin and the awardees. The Faculty Council meeting will be the first item, then the Annual Recognition Awards by the Vice President, and then thirdly, a campus recognition of the Vice President and the awardees. I am sure you all will want to be at all of those events. There will be a map and/or directions to the Irwin's house in the Green Sheet and the Staff News. We do wish that all of you will come. We ask that you, please, in talking to other people remind them of this major event in IUPUI's history.

I have two items relative to the Board of Trustees meeting on this campus being held day after tomorrow. First is the Faculty Relations Committee meeting which as I have mentioned before is a chance for faculty to interact with a subset of the Board of Trustees. That will be at 8:30 this coming Saturday morning in the Business/SPEA Building on the third floor. We will be telling them about IUPUI's activities with respect to the Pan Am games. The material to be given to them will be led by Bill Plater. You are welcome, given the capacity of the room, to attend those sessions. They are not private. You are certainly welcome to attend.

The second item regarding the Board of Trustees meeting this weekend on this campus is really an update on an item from a previous Faculty Council meeting. That is that the modification of the 18/20 retirement plan that initially came out of the Fringe Benefits Committee of the University Faculty Council has percolated through the routes that it has to go and now is on the agenda for consideration and presumably approval of the Board of Trustees at this upcoming meeting. Briefly, the effect of that is to lower from age 65 to age 64 the time at which participants can elect retirement, provided they have been employed at IU for at least 20 years and have been enrolled in TIAA/CREF for 18 years. There are some other provisions that have been mentioned in this Council before. I see Miriam is here and she may want to answer any questions about that. That has reached the Board of Trustees and we anticipate their positive actions on Saturday.

Speaking of fringe benefits, I have been asked by Barbara Jones to remind the Faculty Council members that tomorrow morning there is a presentation from the Personnel Department on tax deferred annuities, to

be presented by the companies that are authorized to handle our tax deferred annuities. Bob Heid, from our Personnel Department, will give a lecture at 10:00 A.M. This will be held in Cavanaugh on the second floor. I would urge you, if you have any questions about tax deferred annuities or, in fact, how your own funds are going in those annuities, that you make a point to go to this open house.

The last item that I have relates to the annual mailing of committee preference forms. This year, as we have mentioned before, we are combining the preference form for Faculty Council committees with that for Administrative Committees in order to provide some input to the Vice President's office for the appointments that are made out of that office, as well as to generate the pools of persons willing to serve in various capacities. There is a specific new addition, which I would like to point out, on the form which you should be receiving in the next few days. We are requesting that those persons who might be interested in serving on Student Appeals Boards indicate their intent by checking one of the numbers on there. This is a position that we have not previously requested that you indicate your potential interest in serving in. Those persons indicating their interest in that will be in a pool of persons who might be called upon for an adhoc committee or a short term committee to consider a particular student's appeal.

Discussing the committee preference forms leads to the next item of business on the agenda which Dr. Irwin has asked that I go ahead and introduce. That is the Nominating Committee Report from Ken Dunipace. While he is coming down I will remind you of some things. Bylaws Article II, Section B, Paragraph 2, subparagraph c specifies dates by which that the Council's Secretary shall notify the Nominating Committee and the Council as a whole of the election results of at large representatives. However, there is no similar provision for mandating that the Council be informed of the persons who are elected as the unit representatives to this body. Nevertheless we have, the last few years, indicated those names to you in the minutes as well as by other means. We want to do that again today because newly-elected persons to this body form the pool of persons who are eligible for slating to the Nominating Committee and the Executive Committee ballots. The slate for the Tenure Committee is drawn from all the faculty, but for the Nominating Committee and the Executive Committee you must be serving on the Faculty Council in order to serve on those committees. You will know who the pool of persons are if you will look at the minutes of last month's meeting where all at-large members were announced and the minutes of this meeting where Ken Dunipace is getting ready to announce the results of the unit elections.

AGENDA ITEM IV

Nominating Committee Report - Ken Dunipace, Chair

PROF. DUNIPACE: Henry has done about half of my report for me. Basically, I have two things to report. First, as Henry said, is tell you who was elected as unit representatives.

School of Business	Karen Becker
School of Continuing Studies	Charles Ellinger
School of Dentistry	Varoujan Chalian, Glen Sagraves
School of Engineering & Technology	Kenneth Dunipace, Judith Silence
School of Law	William Hodes
School of Medicine	John Baenziger, Philip Bendick, Joseph DiMicco, Mike Mitchell, Ken Ryder, Henry Wellman
School of Nursing	Ann Belcher
School of Physical Education	Jeff Vessely
SPEA	Robert Mendelsohn
School of Science	Jerome Kaminker
University Libraries	Maudine Williams

We still have a vacancy from Liberal Arts. That should cover the unit representatives. Those unit

representatives plus the at large representatives announced last month are the ones eligible for election to the Nominating Committee and the Executive Committee. [Note added: School of Liberal Arts: Linda Haas.]

The second item is a report on the status of our nomination/election process which again, Henry has given some information on. Our Bylaws require that the Nominating Committee solicit the whole faculty for potential candidates. It was the interpretation of the Nominating Committee that that was done through the preference sheets. So, we have not prepared a slate awaiting the preference sheets to come back so that we can look at them.

The second thing that the Bylaws requires is that the Nominating Committee has to notify the Faculty Council seven days before the election. Therefore, you will receive the slates in the mail sometime before the May election. The current schedule is that the preference sheets are to be returned to the Executive Committee by April 14. So, the Nominating Committee has about five days to get the slate made up and get it in the mail to you so you will have it seven days in advance.

Needless to say, it is important for you as our Faculty Council representatives to make sure your unit faculties respond quickly to those preference sheets and get them back to us. The Nominating Committee is always open and anxious for your advice on people who you think would be good representatives on these committees. In case you have forgotten, the Nominating Committee consist of LaForrest Garner, William Kulsrud, Jacqueline Blackwell, Rebecca Markel, Kathryn Wilson, and myself.

AGENDA ITEM V

Academic Affairs Committee Report on Proposed IUPUI Calendar - Ed Robbins, Chair (IUPUI Circular 85-19)

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: The next agenda item is the Academic Affairs Committee Report on the proposed IUPUI calendar. Ed Robbins will report.

PROF. ROBBINS: With the agenda for this meeting you received the reports of the Academic Affairs Committee and its recommendations for the academic calendar for the year 1987-88. In addition to the list of characteristics for that calendar which were included in our report, I would add just simply that, if you have looked at this calendar and have compared it to previous calendars and are aware of the changes that are reflected there, that those changes were motivated almost entirely by a desire to facilitate those units that have clinic and laboratory classes and the need in those to have a schedule which permits full weeks of clinic and/or laboratory experiences. With that addendum to the report that is there which characterizes this calendar and the calendar itself, I will recommend from the Academic Affairs Committee the adoption of this calendar.

PROF. ALTON: Why was the beginning of Summer School I classes delayed so long? By delaying the beginning of Summer School I classes and then Summer II school, it means that classes end for Summer II on August 15th which is just one week before Fall classes begin the following year. To keep with the schedule they begin on August 23. That seems very late. We have never worried about beginning classes for Summer I after commencement and it would seem to me that the Summer I and Summer II schedules could be moved up by a week so that classes begin on May 11 and then they would finish a week earlier.

PROF. ROBBINS: There was no specific discussion of that issue in either the Calendar Committee or the Academic Affairs Committee that received this recommendation from that committee. I could only assume that it was motivated by the desire to have the summer start after commencement, but there was no discussion of that.

PROF. ALTON: It just seems to me that it would be better to have a longer break between the end of Summer II and the beginning of fall than to have the extra time between the end of Second Semester and the beginning of Summer I.

PROF. ROEBMAN: Shouldn't we have an amendment to that to change it from May 18 to May 11?

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Do you have other members of the committee here?

PROF. ROBBINS: There are other members of the committee here if you want to comment about any rationale. I just simply think that it was not otherwise discussed. I have no reason to object to a move to make that change.

PROF. ROEBMAN: We were at the Faculty Council meeting last week in Bloomington. They were talking about these. They didn't talk about the Summer except to say that they would like to be able to go one Summer Session at one of the IUPUI institutions and another Summer Session at another one. This will not allow that to happen anywhere with that late June 29 date. Concerning the Second Summer Session, the only one that wants to start that late would be the one in South Bend.

PROF. ROBBINS: If you called that out in front of me, I could report at least that the Bloomington proposed calendar — well, I am not sure whether it was proposed, I understand they have already adopted it — but there was considerable discussion about whether they will change that calendar. I am not sure whether that will include the summer. At the present time, their summer is scheduled to start on Tuesday, May 10.

PROF. ROEBMAN: Their's is only a five week summer.

PROF. ROBBINS: That's right.

PROF. WILSON: Is there enough time if we start on the 11th to process grades, etc. after the Second Semester?

PROF. ROBBINS: I had thought that Dick Slocum was going to be here to respond to questions about the administrative implications of the calendar; that is, registration and grade processing. I don't see him. I don't know whether there is anyone else here who can comment about what the implications would be for the administrative side of the calendar.

UNKNOWN: I would certainly assume that there would have to be a day of registration. If that were pushed back, then the grade processing would have to be pushed back at the same time.

PROF. ALIPRANTIS: Is this the first time for this late starting? Usually we start on the 11th. I don't understand why the change.

PROF. ROBBINS: It does turn out that, because of the calendar rotation that we start later and, therefore, end later than we have. I am looking at a proposed calendar that was presented to the Calendar Committee. It was later modified in a number of other respects but was not modified in the Summer. This came, I think, from Dick Slocum as the Chair of that committee. So, that part of the calendar simply carried through unchanged from the proposed one that was brought to the Calendar Committee by the Chair of that committee. That might suggest that that was motivated by some concerns for getting grades processed and students registered between the end of Spring semester and the beginning of Summer. I have to admit that, since we did not discuss that, I am speculating about it and don't know.

DEAN NATHAN: If you would like to postpone this for a few minutes, I could possibly make a phone call and clarify some of the questions about the dates being changed.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Why don't we put this subject on hold until Carol gets a chance to make a call. Would that be all right, Ed?

PROF. ROBBINS: That is fine with me.

DEAN NATHAN: I can check on the administrative consequences of May 11th.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Are you going to call Dick Slocum? [Indication was yes] We will come back to that, Ed.

PROF. ROBBINS: Fine.

[After Dean Nathan's call]

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Ed Robbins, would you come back again? Carol, would you tell us what you learned?

PROF. ROBBINS: The response that we received from the Registrar's Office is that they would have no difficulty of changing the beginning of the first Summer term to one week earlier, if we were then going to follow this; it certainly was implied by the suggestion of moving up the Second Summer term. There would be one other change because that would then result in the Second Summer term covering the period that includes the 4th of July recess. The logical modification for that second summer term would be to begin it on Monday, June 27 rather than Tuesday, July 5th. July 4th, a Monday, would become a recess day. Then, the calendar would end on Monday, August 8th, so that we would maintain an equal number of class days - Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, etc., by doing that. If there is enough interest in that for someone to move that change, then there is no reason from the Registrar's Office why they could not manage that.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: There has been a motion to approve. Is there a second? [Seconded] Is there any discussion of this amendment of the original calendar.

UNKNOWN: I think we need to have the dates clearly defined.

PROF. ROBBINS: For Summer I, 1988 classes begin Wednesday, May 11. Memorial Day Recess would remain on Monday, May 30; classes would end on Wednesday, June 22; and the note there would be changed to read - Monday classes meet June 22.

For the Second Summer term the calendar would read: Classes begin Monday, June 27; Fourth of July or Independence Day Recess on Monday, July 4; Classes end Monday, August 8. Hearing none, all in favor of the amendment as stated, say "Aye" Opposed? Motion carried. Now we are ready for a vote on the total calendar, as amended. Are there any questions?

PROF. KILSEUD: I was just curious. Was the change for Thanksgiving recess because we now get an equal number of days?

PROF. ROBBINS: Yes. To go those two days simply, and still maintain the notion of full weeks, meant that there were two extra days in the calendar.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Are you ready for the question on the overall calendar? All in favor of the calendar as amended, say "Aye". Opposed? Motion carried. The Ayes have it. Thank you, Ed.

AGENDA ITEM VI

Discussion on Task Force on University Organization Report - Byron Olson, Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Item VI is the discussion on the Task Force on University Organization. Byron Olson will speak to that.

PROF. OLSON: Thank you, Dr. Irwin. Our committee had a lot of discussion focused on a couple of topics. I realize that there has been a lot of work and effort that has gone into this document. The one topic that came up in particular in our meeting was the potential of having maybe an Assistant or Associate Vice President for the health area. He would be responsible for the health area as well as for the hospitals themselves. I don't know if this topic has come up in the discussion with the committee or not. Maybe Henry can speak to that.

PROF. RESCH: Maybe someone else would prefer to begin.

PROF. LANGSAM: Yes. The discussion came up quite extensively. We talked to many many people about it and there was a strong feeling among the people that we spoke to and I think a consensus opinion was that it would not be significantly more helpful than relying on the excellent deans that we have under the Vice President on this campus for taking care of those kind of concerns.

PROF. OLSON: Some of the other items that were brought up were the role of the Provost of IUPUI and the Executive Vice President of Academic Affairs. Some of the committee members were concerned about the role that he would play and possibly what the reporting lines would be as far as Vice President - Indianapolis as well as Vice President - Bloomington would be. Would they have to go through that individual to get to the President. That didn't seem to be clear to some of the members.

PROF. LANGSAM: That certainly is an issue that we spent an extensive time discussing. We certainly don't want to increase the bureaucracy so that we make a system that is awkward or clumsy for many things. One of the reasons that we continued the present reporting lines was to alleviate that kind of situation. I think, although it may not be reasonable to most people on campus, there is a tremendous amount of consultation between the Vice President and the Executive Vice President, President Williams and the President. We felt that there was a tradeoff, but in the long run, having an academic personage that was the key figure next to the President, to kind of give an academic tone and to help with system problems was worth a try to accomplish some things, including streamlining some operations which presently are not streamlined.

PROF. RESCH: To your most recent comment I would just add that, although it is not necessary for Indiana University to follow any other university in any given league in this area, Indiana University used to have a position very similar to this and in that sense it was consistent with what we judged to be about 92% of the universities in the country. We are in the 8% who do not have officially an academic officer, other than the President, at the center of our University.

PROF. OLSON: Those were the two major concerns that we had, Henry. I don't know whether anyone else has anything else they wish to discuss at this time.

PROF. RESCH: The Executive Committee was concerned and sensitive to the notion that there are some changes in the Task Force recommendations that may have a major impact on the university, as we have discussed in this Faculty Council before. Therefore, we thought we should have it scheduled for discussion on the agenda as many times as we possibly can before the Task Force meets or formalizes the final report.

I would mention, and I have permission from the author, that Ed Byrnes from Philosophy had taken a great deal of care in analyzing the Task Force on University Organization preliminary draft report. He has made some points that are contrary to some of the points that are there. The Task Force will certainly be considering his written document as well as the comments from this body. Perhaps, Ed Byrnes might want to say something about that written material. I did not bring copies for everyone here.

PROF. BYRNES: [Could not understand what was said]

PROF. LANGSAM: I think I would like to also comment on what was said in the critique by Ed Byrnes. Some of the things that Ed suggested, I think, parts of the committee might have found palatable. However, the committee tried not to — because of our charge — deal with policy but rather with structure. Some of the things that Ed was talking about were policies and I think in whatever discussion we had, we tried to remember that the original charge to the committee and what we really tried not to do was to talk about what policies should be established, insofar as you can separate that from organization itself. We didn't talk about what a Provost and a Chief Academic Officer might do but merely create that office. The development of job descriptions, etc. would follow that.

PROF. BYRNES: I can think of a response to what Miriam said but it seems entirely inappropriate to discuss in public a document which only has been referred to here and which few here have seen.

PROF. WILSON: One thing that was said by people who I had conversations with was that we don't think you can separate structure and policy. We don't understand what the implications of the structure and policy are and until we know that we don't feel very comfortable. One of the main things that I don't feel comfortable about is what does having this Chief Academic Officer mean? It seems to many people that it adds a layer of administration. I have already asked Dr. Bareikis to tell me how it does not add another layer of administration to IUPUI and how he functions. I guess the problem I have is I don't understand the reporting lines now and I don't understand... first of all we are talking about some eight-member committee that somebody reports to that I never heard of. I would really like to understand what the reporting lines are now and how this report or this reorganization changes those reporting lines.

PROF. BESCH: I was present when you asked that question of Bob and I can tell you that he thought he answered the first part; namely, that the Provost position is not a new layer in the University but rather an expansion of what we now call the Executive Vice President.

PROF. WILSON: All right. Explain to me the structure as it is now and what reorganization does to change it. It is just a simple question.

PROF. LANGSAM: First of all, do you have a copy of the total report? I think some of that is very explicitly detailed in the narrative. There are five or six broad major points. For example, the position that Ed Williams has within Central Administration has been redefined, part of the power of the budget redefined into the position of Executive Vice President and Provost. So that, more of the budgeting is tied to somebody whose clear assignment is an academic mission rather than adding a person responsible for the budget who does not have so clearly an academic mission to fulfill. Another change is the take three sort of components that are flopping around and put them together. Specifically, Alumni, the Foundation, and External Relations or what we call University Relations would be put into a single unit. Another area that has been changed is that certain system functions, such as the Library report to this academic officer. Another change would be that what is presently separate units, Telecommunications, Academic Computing, and Administrative Computing would be brought together for a more effective and cooperative attack on some technology problems that our University faces. Those are the kinds of changes within the organization. The basic reporting lines of the two Vice Presidents have remained more or less similar to the way that most of them exist. There are some of the changes.

PROF. WILSON: All right. Let's just take Computing Services, for example. If you are going to centralize it, does that mean that IUPUI no longer has computer services and Bloomington no longer does?

PROF. BESCH: They all already report ultimately to Ed Williams. There is no suggestion that that be changed except to make, if you read it carefully, the reporting lines for this campus and the reporting lines for the Bloomington campus more parallel. I think in that specific instance, for example, the only change in reporting lines for now is that the report recommends that what should be, in our view, parallel in fact be made parallel.

PROF. WILSON: How is it now?

PROF. BESCH: They go to the Vice President for Administration, who is Ed Williams, whose primary concern is with the budgets. The Task Force is not suggesting that we shouldn't be concerned with the budget but we are suggesting that our principle concern in academic institutions ought to be with the impact on academic excellence, not on how much it costs to keep it.

BARBARA FISCHLER: You mentioned reporting lines for the library system. Is it a budget for all libraries or are do we retain our budget on a campus-specific basis?

PROF. BESCH: I am not sure I can answer that. I know what the report says but rather than restate it, may I just say that we anticipate that there will be a number of changes in the preliminary document, as a result of our consultation with faculty and a whole host of people individually and in groups. We anticipate that one of those groups might be the librarians who will give us some more suggestions. I have heard that the librarians are considering, at least, responding with a written report. I have not yet seen the report but I am sure that the librarians themselves would be the best persons to suggest to us how that ought to be.

BARBARA FISCHLER: Did you have any thoughts on that?

PROF. BESCH: I have thoughts on a lot of parts I wouldn't want to bore you with.

DEAN YOVITS: The first point I want to make is that we mustn't suggest, nobody suggested, that we just conveniently forget about faculty of the Purdue schools. There is a major dual component on this campus and the only involvement in that organization report was that it was recommended that further study take place. So many of us in Purdue schools are somewhat uneasy about what effect this will have on our activities. This is a complex system to put together but our concern really has to be, not so much the system, but how does this help IUPUI? What is this really going to do for us? Will that help us somehow develop? The bottom line is that is what most of us are concerned about.

PROF. KARLSON: If I may make an addition to this rhetorical question, what is going to be the location of these new revamped offices? It appears that these officers are going to be centralized for the most part in Bloomington. We have a core campus concept, let's put the new provost up here. They have the President, we will take the Provost.

PROF. BESCH: Maybe you would rather have the President and let them take the Provost. Both of those questions, in fact, are addressed in the Task Force report as it exist now. It is not true that Purdue is not given any consideration. In fact, what it says is that given the enormity of the potential for changes that might be recommended by a group of 14 folk looking at IU, in what turned out to be essentially a very short time, we could not address and solve all problems of the universe, even of the United States, or even of IU. One of the problems which we felt would be untractable was the Purdue question. You ought to feel proud rather than humiliated that you are not in there. You are too difficult a problem for such a meager group of 14 people to consider what ought best happen to. Rather, we said this is not a thing that we can devote sufficient time to to come to a solution and still have time to address the other issues.

I think the question of where the central office of Central Administration ought to be is again addressed in the report. We don't know where it ought to be. I, for one, personally believe that Central Administration and Bloomington administration, for example, ought to be separate and distinct units for both the good of IUPUI and the good of IUB.

PROF. ALIPRANTIS: [Could not understand first part] ...I don't know where I belong. Everytime I go to a conference my name is with a different university name. We go from the same university and we are listed under a different university. Is there anyway to bring the President here to the Council to give us some answers?

PROF. BESCH: When you said President, I wasn't sure whether you meant Steve or John. I certainly believe that we could invite him after the Task Force has reported to him, as he has asked the Task Force to do.

PROF. BYRNE: I find it difficult to understand or even conceive of setting up structures that have no policies or conditions. How exactly would discipline councils — I believe that is the correct terminology — be established in such a way that would have no policy implications on how programs of one sort or another would be structured, administered, etc.?

PROF. BESCH: Perhaps we could ask someone who has a model. But I would say, first of all, in reiteration of what Miriam said, I think it is difficult to discuss anything concrete if one will not admit that the world is not all black or white. One must admit that in most complex discussions there is very little black and almost no white but there is a lot of gray. To say that a structure or an organization would have no policy implications, I think, is on its face absurd. On the other hand, I think that the intention of the committee was to follow its charge, which was to look at the structure. That is not to say that structure doesn't force some kind of policy implications. It is not to say that structure has nothing to do with policy but rather that we weren't charged to set out to find the best policies. Rather, we were asked "Can you study the organization and see if there are some organizational things that we could address to enhance IU's future"?

To answer about how discipline councils may or may not relate to policy as opposed to structure, we might ask Hugh Wolf who is sorting hiding low over there, to...

DEAN WOLF: There is no one sitting in front of me so I can't be hiding.

PROF. BESCH: I didn't mean hiding. His head was ducking down, perhaps because he was thinking. Education does have a Council which is systemwide and that Council has passed some systemwide documents. This is one of the models that was considered very favorably by the Task Force. Maybe you could say something about that Council.

DEAN WOLF: It is called an Education Council. Largely it is a curriculum governing body. It operates on all of the campuses in the Indiana University system. This council has representatives from each of those campuses. Any program that we find with a common curriculum, that is one that exists on one or more of the campuses in the system, if there are to be any changes in the curriculum or courses in that program, that must be approved by the Education Council. It has been operating for about four or five years and we think it makes sense for our school. It works pretty well.

PROF. KARLSON: I am going to ask a question because, just for example take the libraries. Their Promotion and Tenure Committee rules that are incorporated into the Library handbooks have the Vice Chair and Chair from Bloomington, which seems to be in gross violation of a concept of a core campus and parity between our campuses. What is the construction of that committee? In other words, does any one campus have a dominant membership?

DEAN WOLF: Are you talking about the Education Council?

PROF. KARLSON: Yes.

DEAN WOLF: No campus is not represented. I would say somewhat like this body, it is prorated in terms of number of faculty.

PROF. KARLSON: Which campus then has the most membership?

DEAN WOLF: Bloomington has the most faculty members so, thus has the most members. Bloomington does not have a majority on the Council.

PROF. KARLSON: The question becomes, for example, should Bloomington be able to control the content of courses in Indianapolis?

DEAN WOLF: The core campus - Bloomington/IUPUI - has the majority of members on the Council. No one campus, Bloomington or IUPUI, has the majority of members.

PROF. KARLSON: Again, not in your system but I used the Library as an example. There, Bloomington absolutely requires that Bloomington dominate. Perhaps your Council is working well. I doubt that one that you set up, like I have just described, as far as the other campuses, be it their chair or vice chair or Promotion and Tenure, of course, is going to be a very important factor.

PROF. BESCH: On the other hand, I don't believe that you are arguing that faculty or librarians ought not be represented in some way proportional to their number as they are, for example, on this body. The more faculty there are in a given school or unit, the more faculty they are allowed to elect to this Faculty Council.

PROF. KARLSON: That is part of the problem. Can a smaller faculty maintain its independence when its choices must be reviewed by the Council which, by sheer numbers at this point is going to be dominated by another campus?

PROF. BESCH: I think in Law and in our Constitution there are what are called checks and balances.

PROF. KARLSON: There is no checks and balances when one side dominates.

PROF. LANGSAM: Excuse me, but I think, while we should have some more discussion, it is important to remember that the committee has spent a lot of time in looking at many many options. For example, let's take the School of Physical Education on this campus. There is a great deal of pressure to consolidate that with the HPER school at Bloomington. I will assure you that, if that had happened, we would have had an issue of submergence. What has happened is we are asking for cooperation and interaction by colleagues and, although we took the Education model for the fact that they in their particular school choose to concentrate on the curriculum, is not necessarily implied that any other discipline's Council would necessarily have to do that. They spent two years, or a year or so, with the dean going back and forth talking to the various people in Education on all the campuses. They wrote their Constitution for their Council. The control of what the Council would do would be determined by the discipline - people themselves - not a single external model. So, although that may seem from one perspective a kind of threat, perhaps some of the other options or possibilities were even more threatening. We were trying to create an atmosphere for cooperation, not only for this campus, but for the regional campuses where in many disciplines you are talking about one or two people. You are talking about hiring an outstanding biologist and he does not have a single colleague to really interact with. I think what we might want to do is have a full meeting to discuss this where everybody has their copy and can think of their questions and we can talk about some of these things perhaps in more detail. Some people might want to make comments and write to the committee. We worked very hard for a very long time dealing with some thorny things and we, those of us on this campus, have tried to not hurt this campus in any way and to enhance the whole educational operation. This is one model. There are others but this seemed, in the long run, to resolve the most number of complex issues.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Byron, thank you very much for generating a good many questions here.

AGENDA ITEM VII

Discussion of Proposed Amendments to Bylaws on Faculty Boards of Review, Henry Karlson, Chair, Constitution and Bylaws Committee

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: The last item is the discussion of the proposed amendments to Bylaws on Faculty

Boards of Review. Henry Karlson will report.

PROF. KARLSON: As announced at our last Faculty Council meeting, there are two proposed amendments. They are on page 5 of your agenda. They are contained there as I announced them. This time it would be removed from the committee. Because they come from a standing committee there is no need for a second.

The first is to amend Bylaw Article IV Section A Subsection 1 by deleting "two" and substituting "three". As amended, the relevant section will read "There shall be three Faculty Boards of Review..." It was our analysis of the problem that, because of the increased use of Boards of Review, people on Boards of Review were having too much of their time taken by requests for cases to be reviewed. Because of the increased caseload, or the increased numbers of requests, the members of Boards of Review were rather reluctant to serve. By adding a third Board of Review the load for the Board is going to be significantly decreased. That will not only decrease the load but increase the processing time because there was some processing time backup when you had more than one case pending. As the processing time is also important, this is justice delayed is justice denied. We felt that it would be advantageous there. There was no descending opinion on this issue.

When we are creating a new Board of Review, of course we are going to have to have more people serving. We were looking at the provision that we presently had stating that a person on a Board of Review could not be re-elected for two years. This is unlike almost any other situation on the Faculty Council where a person serves only one year and cannot be re-elected. We decided to go with the position which had been used in other offices that a person can serve up to two years, in this case can be re-elected one time, then not serve more than two consecutive terms. That would be consistent with most other positions on the Faculty Council. Our second amendment is as stated that we would amend Bylaw Article IV Section C by deleting "At least two years shall elapse between terms of office of faculty members or librarians serving on a Board of Review" and substituting "Faculty members or librarians serving on a Board of Review shall be eligible for re-election, provided no person shall serve more than two terms consecutively".

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Is there discussion of the motion concerning the Bylaws? The question has been called for. All in favor of the motion, please say "Aye". Opposed? Motion carried.

AGENDA ITEM VIII

Adjournment

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Is there other business to come before this body? Hearing none, we are adjourned.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY

at

INDIANAPOLIS

Minutes of the Faculty Council Meeting

May 1, 1986 The Vice President's Home

3:00 - 4:00 P.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Administration: Vice-President (Indianapolis) Glenn W. Irwin, Jr., Executive Dean Howard G. Schaller, Dean Carol Nathan. Deans: Elizabeth Grossman, Sheldon Siegel. Director: Barbara Fischler. Faculty: Elaine Alton, Henry R. Besch, Jr., Patricia Blake, Frances Brahm, Michael Burke, Charlotte Carley, Varoujan Chalian, Joseph DiMicco, David Doedens, Naomi Fineberg, Paul Galanti, LaForrest Carner, Melvin Glick, Jean Gnat, Edwin T. Harper, Robert A. Harris, Eugene M. Helveston, Jean Hutten, Lucreda Hutton, Henry C. Karlson, Juanita Laidig, Monroe Little, Rebecca T. Markel, Catherine Palmer, Richard Pflanzler, Shirley Quate, Terry E. Reed, Edward Robbins, Neal Rothman, Marie Sparks, Robert B. Stonehill, Jeffery Vessely, Kathleen A. Warfel, Harriet Wilkins, Kathryn Wilson, Ruth Woodham, Pao-lo Yu.

ALTERNATES PRESENT: Deans: John M. Hunger for Charles Bonser, Maudine Williams for Vania Goodwin, Hitwant Sidhu for P. Nicholas Kellum, Hugh Wolf for Howard Mehlinger, John Barlow for William M. Plater, H. Oner Yurtseven for R. Bruce Renda, John Werenko for William J. Voos, Scott Evenbeck for James E. Weigand, Harvey Hegarty for Jack R. Wentworth.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Deans: Gerald Bepko, Trevor Brown, Walter J. Daly, H. William Gilmore, Marshall C. Yovits. Faculty: Charalambos Aliprantis, Philip Bendick, Jacqueline Blackwell, Charles Blevins, Ira Brandt, Edmund Byrne, Mervyn Cohen, David Crabb, Andre DeKorvin, Ian Dowdeswell, Kenneth Dunipace, John Eble, James Edmondson, Charles Ellinger, Martin Farlow, Beverly Flynn, Michael Glant, Clifford Goodwin, Jeri Gruner, Ngoan Van Hoang, Meredith T. Hull, Thomas Jones, Linda Kasper, Suetta Kehrein, Joseph Kuczkowski, William Kulsrud, Miriam Z. Langsam, Onkar Markand, Gerald McHugh, Michael E. Mitchell, Barnett B. Morris, Lillie-Mae Padilla, John E. Pless, Gerald Powers, Anita Proffitt, Mark S. Richardson, John Schmedtje, James Shanks, Rowland A. Sherrill, Jay Simon, Ernest E. Smith, Victor Wallis, Lawrence Wheeler, George Willis, Charles Winslow, Susan Zunt.

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE ABSENT: Martin Dragonnette.

VISITORS: Sherry Queener, Judith Silence.

Summary of Meeting's Activities

Vice President Irwin reported on the ICHE response to IUPUI's Mission Statement.

The Council elected, to the Nominating Committee: Linda Haas, Glen Sagraves (Chair-Elect 1987-88), Kent Sharp and Dorothy Webb; to the Executive Committee: H.R. Besch, Jr., Varoujan Chalian, Ken Dunipace and Jeff Vessely; and to the Tenure Committee: Monte Juillerat, Henry Karlson and Richard Pflanzler.

Henry Karlson presented a plaque to Vice President Irwin, on behalf of the Council and its Executive Committee.

Hugh Wolf read the Athletic Advisory Committee report for 1985-86.

AGENDA ITEM I

Memorial Resolutions for Professor Nicholas J. Kira, Dr. Raymond Paradise, and Dr. Charles Gillespie.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: May I call the meeting to order, please? We have three memorial resolutions to be read today. The first one is for Professor Nicholas Kira. Judy Silence will read this memorial resolution [IUPUI Circular 85-20]. (A moment of silence was observed.)

The second memorial resolution is for Dr. Raymond Paradise. Sherry Queener will read this memorial resolution [IUPUI Circular 85-21]. (A moment of silence was observed.)

The third memorial resolution is for Dr. Charles Gillespie. Henry Besch will read this memorial resolution [IUPUI Circular 85-22]. (A moment of silence was observed.)

AGENDA ITEM II

Approval of the Minutes of April 3, 1986 Meeting

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: The next item is the approval of the minutes of our April 3rd meeting. Is there a motion to approve? [So moved] Is there any discussion?

PROF. ROBBINS: On page 11, just below the middle of the page, the sentence that begins "For the Second Summer term the calendar..." There is some mix there between the completion of the report of the Summer calendar and the activity of the Council adopting the amendment. It runs together and obviously something is left out. Also, the word 'Augudment' doesn't make any sense.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: We will check on that.

PROF. BESCH: One of the things that should be mentioned is that we did move, as you see on that page, the comments of Dr. Irwin. He had begun his remarks when the election results were read. We can certainly accept that motion to change the word 'Augudment' to August 11.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Are there other comments? Hearing none, all in favor of the motion say, "Aye". Opposed? Motion carried.

AGENDA ITEM III

Presiding Officer's Business - Vice President Glem W. Irwin, Jr., M.D.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Since our last meeting of this Council quite a few of us presented the IUPUI Mission Report to the Commission on Higher Education. That meeting was held as an open forum on April 10. I was appreciative of the fact that many of you were there. Two days ago we finally heard from the Commission staff that they have some questions that they want us to consider between now and their July meeting. These are a variety of questions which I think we will have no trouble whatsoever in answering easily and answering well. Such things as: Are so many new graduate degrees being proposed? Why didn't we emphasize undergraduate education more? What special programs do we have for the disadvantaged? What cooperative programs do we have with other institutions in the area? One week from tomorrow the staff of the Commission at the regular meeting will discuss this meeting that we have had and raise some of these questions. We are told that we are not to respond immediately. That's always a dangerous statement. We will be there and any of you deans who feel you need to come or others to help us out, be there. On the other hand, we may be non-responsive that day particularly since we have to be responsive at the July meeting.

Most people these days want to know what I am going to do come July 1. I have, I suppose, a variety of answers that I have used. I have indicated that I will have an office on the first floor of Fesler

Hall, the office which was one of the first offices I ever had here in the early 1950s. So, I am going back to my old stomping grounds. I plan to be active for all schools in the arena of the Campaign for Indiana. I intend to be active with the community and state organizations that I belong to, particularly where I think it is helpful for IUPUI and the universities. I will probably try my hand at some history. I have been around here a long time and I am an old fixture. Nobody in some of the areas has undertaken to write anything about those days so I may try to do some of that.

Concluding my remarks for this meeting I do want to commend each member of this Faculty Council. It has been a good year in my judgment and you have provided good leadership and counsel. I want to say thanks for all of the support you have given the administration and the institution this year.

AGENDA ITEM IV

Executive Committee Report - H. R. Besch, Jr., Secretary

PROF. BESCH: Thank you, Dr. Irwin. The Executive Committee report should, I think, be initiated after we start the election procedures. The members of the Election subcommittee of the Executive Committee who will carry out the elections are Professors Quate, Hutton, Helveston and Little. If they will come forward now and get the ballots, we will pass those out. One of the ways to avoid having to participate in the counting of the ballots is to have your name on the ballot. Some of the other persons on the Executive Committee are there, so we have a different Elections Committee this time.

[After counting the ballots, the results are as follows:]

TENURE COMMITTEE

Monte Juillerat
Henry Karlson
Richard Pflanzler

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Henry R. Besch, Jr.
Varoujan Chalian
Kenneth Dunipace
Jeffery Vessely

NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Linda Haas
Glen Sagraves*
Kent Sharp
Dorothy Webb

*Chair, 1987-88

The Academic Affairs Committee has asked the Executive Committee to consider the structure, function, and guidance of the standing committees of the Faculty Council. We have agreed that that would be the single main agenda item of a joint meeting of the old and new Executive Committee members to be held next Thursday at this same time. We have sent letters to all persons who are on the ballot as well as the current Executive Committee members advising them of this meeting. For those people who get elected today to the Executive Committee, we will give you a map showing how to get to the site of that special joint Executive Committee meeting.

Another item that I want to report to you is that Fitness Day will be held May 22. It has become a big annual event on the IUPUI campus, sponsored by the Staff Council.

To round out, I want to say on behalf of the Executive Committee, it has been my duty and privilege to speak to all of you from this side of the table for almost two years now. Today is the last time I have that privilege. Let me simply say that I consider it a genuine honor to have been allowed to represent you for these two years. That has sometimes been a real challenge because we at IUPUI are a healthfully heterogenous group and sometimes stand squarely on two different sides of an issue. I have not felt the Secretary is called to solve all the problems that have stumped the one-minute managers, and puzzled the executives in search of excellence. I have welcomed the challenge of representing you, but I can truthfully say I look forward to being Secretary emeritus. Many, many people have helped me reach this point with my limbs intact, and without visible evidence of tar and feather.

My undying gratitude goes to the Executive Committee members with whom I have served. But my biggest thanks goes to our Vice President, Dr. Glenn W. Irwin, Jr., who has been presiding officer of the Council for over a decade.

It may be passé to quote from Peters' and Waterman's book "In Search of Excellence" now that Peters' second book "A Passion for Excellence" has hit the best-seller list. But I wish to remind you of two specific bits of advice contained in it, that are particularly germane to today's ceremonies. First, according to Peters' and Waterman's book, the excellent enterprises (such as IUPUI has become) have in common a propensity to bootstrap, or piggy-back to get their champions' work done. Others have termed this intrapreneurial efforts. Peters and Waterman also say in a direct quote from page 146 of "In Search of Excellence", "to find excellence, go to Indianapolis in Indiana." They don't amplify that statement but could surely have explained that one main reason for that Indianapolis excellence is IUPUI and what IUPUI has become as a result of Dr. Irwin's leadership.

IUPUI is an educational bargain. For your information, Indiana University Central Administration last year assessed from its expenditure patterns just how big of a bargain IUPUI is. As was explained in public session at the last Commission for Higher Education meeting on April 10th, the figures suggest that at IUPUI, we provide somewhere in the neighborhood of \$10 million of service to the state essentially for free, or more realistically, by intrapreneurial efforts. That, in turn, can be credited to the leadership of our Chief Executive, Dr. Glenn Irwin, Jr.

Dr. Irwin is a man who has for 13 years been less interested in appearing to do a good job than he is in getting a good job done, and who intrinsically understood the value of "managing by wandering around" long before Tom Peter's articulated (and made a fortune out of) the four letters, MBWA. Dr. Irwin is a caring man who learned at the bedside how to balance risks and rewards, how to plan ahead for the best outcome, how to allocate valuable assets; and a man who has proven that the bottom line and the recovered patient require much of the same talents: attention to detail and caring about the best outcome. After all, MBWA is just a business author's term for what docs call "Making rounds with good bedside manners".

Dr. Irwin's enormous quiet work in the trenches has made the difference for IUPUI. To mix a metaphor, that has not always been smooth sailing, but he and his first mate, Marianna, have always been steady at the helm. Dr. Irwin, it has been said, that there are two supremely happy days in the life of a sailor: the day he buys the boat and the day he sells it. Don't despair, happy days will soon be here again.

On behalf of the Executive Committee, I would like to introduce Henry Karlson for some further comments and business.

PROF. KARLSON: I have here, on behalf of the Faculty Council and the Executive Committee, a plaque which we have had prepared for Dr. Irwin. I am sure that he will receive many awards for the many hats

and offices he has performed for this University. But, I believe this one is unique because it states: **Dr. Glenn W. Irwin, Jr., M.D., Chairman, IUPUI Faculty Council, 1973-1986.** I might point out that a lesser man could not have stood the position of Chairman of the Faculty Council for that number of years.

I have had the great honor for eight of those years to function as his Parliamentarian. I must say that isn't much labor because he knows parliamentary procedure and better yet, he knows how to run a meeting to get something done. As Parliamentarian, I have had the honor of sitting here looking intelligent without having the risk of saying anything to prove my lack of intelligence.

On this plaque this reads: **Scholarship is his prescription.** It was his prescription for Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis and is one that I hope we will follow into the future.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: All I can say is that I am truly honored and I have enjoyed these 13 years. I consider one of the highlights the kind of work that this Faculty Council has done during those years. There have been some interesting meetings, let's say and spirited meetings now and then. I do believe that this Faculty Council, through the years, has been an important force in what we have accomplished here at Indianapolis. I have been to many other Faculty Council meetings but I am very proud of this one and you should be too. Thank you.

PROF. BESCH: That is the end of our Executive Committee Report.

AGENDA ITEM V

Athletic Advisory Committee Report - Dean Hugh Wolf

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: The next item is being presented by Dean Hugh Wolf and that is the Report of the Athletic Advisory Committee.

DEAN WOLF: Thank you, Dr. Irwin. I hope I won't be too anti-climatic here to these festivities. I am here for two reasons. I am here because I think all of you ought to be interested in this report and also because about three or four years ago the University Faculty Council adopted a resolution that said the athletic committees on all the campuses of Indiana University should deliver an annual report to the Faculty Council. I think this is the first year in four years I have been able to do this. I usually just hand the report to Bernice because we run out of time.

You should know that the IUPUI Athletics Advisory Committee is an administrative committee responsible to the Vice President - Indianapolis. The committee is charged with "exercising institutional control of the intercollegiate athletic program at IUPUI as outlined by the applicable national, regional, and state associations. The committee is composed of 14 faculty members, eight staff employees, and two students. All are appointed by the Vice President - Indianapolis. The 1985-86 members and their campus affiliations are:

Hugh A. Wolf, Chairman	School of Education
Sharon K. Alger	School of Nursing
Leonard W. Birdsong	Military Science
Patricia A. Boaz	Student Affairs
Dorothy A. Cheesman	Admissions Office
Charles M. Coffey	Alumni Relations
Thomas A. DeCoster	SPEA
Paul J. Galanti	School of Law
Richard O. Hope	School of Liberal Arts

Patricia Jenkins	Staff Council
William N. Kulsrud	School of Business
Neil E. Lantz	Administrative Affairs
Lincoln V. Lewis	Affirmative Action
Robert L. Lovell	School of Physical Education
Robert E. Martin	Administrative Affairs
David J. Malik	Faculty Council Athletic Affairs
James L. McDonald	School of Dentistry
Ronald L. Montgomery	School of Social Work
Dale Neuburger	Natatorium
Peter W. Rabideau	School of Science
Robert H. Shellhamer	School of Medicine
Patricia Treadwell	School of Medicine
Charles F. Yokomoto	School of Engineering & Technology
Chris Nichols	Student
Steven Brown	Student

At the varsity level, IUPUI competes in men's baseball, basketball, and tennis. Women athletes compete in basketball, volleyball, and softball. All programs are conducted under the guidelines and criteria established by the National Association Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA).

Below is a summary of the principal items which the Athletics Advisory Committee and several of its individual members have been dealing with during 1985-86.

- Work is progressing on a longitudinal study of the admission status and academic achievement of IUPUI student athletes. The project is being directed by Dr. David Bostwick of the School of Engineering and Technology.
- A seminar for academic advisors is being planned for Fall, 1986. The session will be designed to inform counselors about the intercollegiate athletic program, update them with regard to NAIA eligibility regulations, and discuss with them any special needs student-athletes have in planning their academic programs.
- The chairman has participated in several meetings with University personnel to discuss long term funding strategies for the athletics program.
- A ticket pricing plan for home athletic contests was approved in September. Included in the plan was a continuation of the policy of admitting IUPUI students free with a valid ID card.
- The AAC approved and forwarded to Vice President Irwin a recommendation that women's tennis and men's soccer be elevated from club to varsity status. Dr. Irwin gave his approval to this recommendation in November.
- The committee's annual academic achievement award was won by the Men's Tennis Team which compiled a collective grade point average of 3.1. The Women's Softball Team was runner up with a G.P.A. of 2.9. I'm very proud to say that every one of our intercollegiate teams finished with collective G.P.A.s of C or better and, in addition, we did not have a single student-athlete who was dropped from a team because of academic ineligibility this year. I think that is a tremendous statement about the quality of our young people, and their coaches.
- The committee was saddened by the loss of one of its most faithful and long-

standing members, Dr. Robert Shellhamer of the School of Medicine. Dr. Shellhamer was killed in a tragic automobile accident in December. Bob was one of the original members of the Athletics Committee and his passing was keenly felt by all those who had known and worked with him through the years.

In addition to the activities of the Advisory Committee, a number of other important events occurred on the intercollegiate athletics front during 1985-86.

- The Athletic Department instituted a mandatory drug testing program for all IUPUI student-athletes. The tests are similar to those used at IUB, Purdue, and other schools.
- A student-athlete handbook and a policy and procedure handbook for the coaches were published and distributed for the first time.
- A student athletic booster group was formed under the guidance and direction of the IUPUI Alumni Office.
- The Metro Athletic Club has provided strong support for the intercollegiate program under the leadership of its president, Mike Carroll. The group raised approximately \$8,000 for the scholarship fund through its annual golf outing.

Finally, there were some noteworthy achievements in the gymnasium and on the field of play in the year past.

- The men's tennis team tied their best previous won-lost record under new coach Tom Crawford.
- The women's volleyball team won its first-ever state championship and defeated Thomas More College of Kentucky in the Bi-district playoff. By doing so, they earned a berth in the NAIA National tournament for the first time.
- The women's basketball team finished the 1985-86 season with a record of 18-7. The team was seeded #1 in NAIA District 21 but were eliminated in the semi-final round of the state tournament. Juniors Kelly Fitzgerald and Amy Strohmeier were named to the All-District Team.
- The men's basketball team struggled to a deceiving 11-19 record. Included in the 19 games which wound up on the deficit side were 5 overtime and 1 double overtime losses! Nonetheless, the Metros managed to qualify for the district tournament but were eliminated by Marian College in yet another overtime game 74 to 72. Aldray Gibson was named to the District 21 All-Star Team for the second year in a row.
- First year coach Criag Clark has revitalized the men's baseball program. The team is currently on a three game winning streak and is striving hard to qualify for its first appearance in the District 21 playoffs.
- Coach Nick Kellum and his players have established themselves as a perennial national power in women's softball. The Lady Metros have made three consecutive appearances in the NAIA tournament and have finished in the top five each time. During this span, the team has won 175 games and lost only 32; a winning percentage of 85%! The 1986 squad has a record of 41-6 and enjoys a #4 ranking in the current national polls. They appear headed for the national tournament scheduled for San Antonio, Texas next month.

- Tim Bowman of the women's volleyball team was named Coach of the year in District 21.
- Cheryl Burris and Chris Nichols were named to the NAIA All-Tournament Softball Team and Chris received second Team All-American Honors. Cheryl is a freshman majoring in Physical Education and Chris earned her Bachelor's Degree in Physical Education last June.

I would like to conclude by trying to repeat some remarks that I made last Sunday afternoon at our Athletic Awards Banquet. Those remarks were directed to Vice President Irwin. As best that I can recall, they went something like this. There are only a handful of people — Glenn Irwin, myself, maybe Hitwant Sidhu — who remember watching IUPUI Metros Basketball games in the State Fairgrounds Coliseum. I don't know whether you have ever watched a basketball game in a basketball structure like that where there are 20 spectators; where the players on the floor and the coaches and the players on the bench almost outnumber those in the stands. But, Glenn Irwin and his good wife Marianna were there on many many occasions. As I have already, I hope, convinced you, we have come a long way since that time. There are a few of us who know how important Dr. Irwin has been to our athletic program. I am absolutely persuaded that, if it were not for him, we would not have a program because there have been any number of occasions in the past where it would have been a very easy thing to simply chuck it all and say "Well, it is really not worth it." He has stood by us and so, on behalf of our committee, on behalf of all our coaches, on behalf of all the players now and in the past, I would like to thank you again, sir.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Thank you very much, Hugh. Marianna and I did attend this awards ceremony and it is very heartwarming to see how handsome and obviously intelligent our athletes are here at IUPUI. It is just a tremendous group of young men and women who are in there giving it their all.

I will call now for any New Business or Old Business. If you have none, I will bring up some new business. Henry Besch, if you would come up here, please. It is my real pleasure to present to Henry what I consider a very handsome plaque. I will read it: To Henry R. Besch, Jr. In appreciation of your dedicated service as Secretary of the Faculty Council of Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis for the 1984-1985 and 1985-1986 academic years. Congratulations, Henry.

PROF. BESCH: Thank you, Dr. Irwin, and let me say without apologies, I happened to have liked being Secretary. Thank you.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: For those of you who have not seen our ladies fast-pitch softball team, which they will play tomorrow morning, this is really some game. I hadn't seen that game until three or four years ago and I was astounded. The quality and performance of our pitchers is amazing. I think that ball goes faster than in professional regular baseball. How they do it, I don't know.

AGENDA ITEM VI

Adjournment

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: We will take about a 15 minute break between this meeting and the faculty/staff recognition award meeting that follows.