

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY

at

INDIANAPOLIS

Minutes of the Faculty Council Meeting

September 4, 1986 Law School, Room 116
3:30 - 4:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Administration: Vice President Gerald L. Bepko, Executive Dean Howard Schaller; Dean Patricia Boaz. Deans: Elizabeth Grossman, P. Nicholas Kellum, William M. Plater, R. Bruce Renda, Marshall C. Yovits. Director: Barbara Fischler. Faculty: Sharon Andreoli, Anne Belcher, Jacqueline Blackwell, Henry R. Besch, Jr., Patricia Blake, Charles Blevins, Michael Burke, Edmund Byrne, Varoujan Chalian, Andre DeKorvin, David Doedens, Martin Farlow, Mary Feeley, Beverly Flynn, Jeri Francis, Melvin Glick, Jean Gnat, Clifford Goodwin, Emily Hernandez, Ngoan Van Hoang, Meredith Hull, Jerome Kaminker, Henry Karlson, Linda Kasper, Suetta Kehrein, Robert J. Kirk, Judith Kosegi, Joseph Kuczkowski, Monroe Little, Rebecca Markel, Judy Z. Miller, Barnett B Morris, Catherine Palmer, Richard Pflanzner, John Pless, Gerald Powers, Shirley Quate, Terry Reed, Edward Robbins, Glen Sagraves, P. Kent Sharp, Ernest E. Smith, Robert Stonehill, Jeffery Vessely, Vernon Vix, Kathleen Warfel, Dorothy Webb, Maudine Williams, Kathryn Wilson, Pao-lo Yu, Susan Zunt.

ALTERNATES PRESENT: Deans: John M. Hunger for Charles Bonser; George T. Lukemeyer for Walter J. Daly; Hugh A. Wolf for Howard D. Mehlinger; Scott Evenbeck for James E. Weigand; Harvey Hegarty for Jack R. Wentworth. Faculty: B. S. Ng for C. Aliprantis; J. Kapoor for Elaine Alton; John F. Bonner for Edwin T. Harper; John F. Bonner for Robert Harris; Richard Nickolson for Mark Richardson.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Deans: Trevor Brown, H. William Gilmore, Law School (rep for Dean), Sheldon Siegel, William J. Voos. Faculty: John Baenziger, Karen Becker, Linda Brothers, Robert Colyer, Joseph DiMicco, Kenneth Dunipace, James Edmondson, Charles Ellinger, Mark Farber, Linda Haas, Eugene Helveston, William Hodes, Miriam Langsam, James McAteer, Robert Mendelsohn, Michael E. Mitchell, Paul Nagy, Anita Proffitt, Kenneth Ryder, John Schmedtje, Rowland Sherrill, Judith Silence, Susan Sutton, Henry Wellman, Charles Winslow.

VISITORS: William Chumley, Purchasing Department; Sharon Graves, (Secretary, Dean Carol Nathan); Jeff Grove, School of Law; B. Keith Moore (Chair), IUPUI Fringe Benefits Committee; Jans Muller, M.D., School of Medicine; Hitwant Sidhu, School of Physical Education; Charlotte H. Wright, IUPUI News Bureau.

AGENDA ITEM I

Memorial Resolutions

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: The first item on the agenda today consists of two Memorial Resolutions. The first is for Dr. Harold Raymond Hulpieu, School of Medicine.

This will be read by the immediate past Faculty Council Secretary Henry R. Besch. (Dr. Besch read the memorial resolution and a moment of silence was observed.)

The next memorial resolution is for Dr. Nancy Arnold Roeske, School of Medicine. This will be read by Professor John I. Nurnberger. In the absence of Professor Nurnberger, perhaps Dean Lukemeyer would volunteer to read this memorial resolution.

DEAN LUKEMEYER: Thank you, Vice President Bepko. I am sure that Dr. Nurnberger would have wanted to do this and I am flattered to be able to represent the School of Medicine in reading this memorial resolution. (Dean Lukemeyer read the memorial resolution and a moment of silence was observed.)

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Both of these memorial resolutions will be part of the minutes of the IUPUI Faculty Council and copies will be sent to the respective families.

AGENDA ITEM II

Approval of May 1, 1986 Minutes

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: The next order of business is the approval of the minutes of the meeting of May 1, 1986. Is there a motion to approve the minutes as distributed? The motion has been made and seconded. Is there any discussion of the motion? If not, all in favor, say "aye". Opposed? Motion carried.

AGENDA ITEM III

Presiding Officer's Business - Vice President Gerald L. Bepko

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Under Presiding Officer's Business I would like to move over to the podium. I want to say that I am very pleased, extraordinarily proud, and profoundly honored to be here presiding at this meeting as your new Vice President. I am particularly committed to my new role and I look forward to working with you and devoting all my energy to advancing our shared missions, but I can't stand here in this room, especially at this podium from which I have done so much teaching, without feeling a trace of ambivalence. If you will allow me to touch on a personal note, I will explain.

I have always thought of myself first and foremost as a law teacher. Some of my most fulfilled moments have come from working with students, challenging them to probe the limits of their understanding and trying to encourage their curiosity. I have always believed that this is the most important work that I've ever done.

In recent years, of course, I have seen myself as a law teacher temporarily in service to the University as an administrator. That administrative work began a little over seven years ago when the Law School recruited Tom Reed from the University of Tulsa Law School where he was dean to become dean of our Law School. Tom asked me to be the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and I accepted.

As Associate Dean, I took on some new duties, one of which was to attend Faculty Council meetings as Tom's alternate. At the same time, I gave up some of my teaching work, part of which was a course offered in this very room. So I came to this room several times that year, not as a classroom teacher but as

a member of the Faculty Council. While I was sitting here, it came home to me how my work life was changing.

Let me hasten to say that I have been pleased to serve as a member of this Council, knowing that the work of faculty governance is central to the University's mission. I didn't want to change anything but I felt a sense of loss when my teaching role was reduced.

In 1981 Tom Reed left us to become dean at the University of Florida Law School in Gainesville and I became Acting Dean. At that point, I gave up more of my teaching load, including another course scheduled to be taught in this room. Of course, as Acting Dean, I started attending all Faculty Council meetings, a practice I have happily continued over the last five years. Again, I was pleased with my work. I didn't want to change anything, but, as I sat more frequently in Faculty Council meetings in this room, I felt even more intensely the same sense of loss.

A few weeks ago I gave up my only remaining course, which I believe was scheduled to be taught in this very room. Now, I am here presiding at this meeting as a full-time, 100 percent administrator with no teaching portfolio. Again, I am happy with my new role. I don't wish to change anything right now, but I can't stand at this podium without feeling very deeply about the changes that have taken place in my work life.

I wanted to say this, not only to tell you something about me on a personal level, but I also wanted to explain some things which may happen when I sit at this table during the year. I hope you will understand and won't mind if, overcome by nostalgia, I lapse into my teaching mode and call on some of you from time to time.

I have only been on this job since September 1 and I am not ready to offer any definitive statement about the work of the Vice President's Office. But I did want to take this opportunity to say a couple of things. Before I can build up any thoughts that I would want to bring to you in formal fashion, I want to get the benefit of your views. Today I would like to mention very briefly a few somewhat overlapping thoughts which are dear to my heart and which may, in the future, find their way into policies or programs of the University.

The growth and achievements of IUPUI have been very impressive. All of you have contributed to this development. We can all take pride in your achievements. The senior management of Indiana University, led by President John Ryan, has worked hard to fulfill the dreams of this campus amidst a range of competing priorities within the Indiana University system. Purdue University, now led by our colleague Steve Beering, has made major contributions and commitment to our development. Maynard Hine occupies a very special place in the history of this campus as its pioneering Chancellor. We are also deeply in the debt of Howard Schaller, as Executive Dean for the strong, positive imprints he has left and continues to make, and I hope for several more years will continue to make on this institution.

But, most important of all, Dr. Glenn Irwin, Jr., who served as Chancellor and then as Vice President for 13 years, has left us with a tremendous legacy of institutional advancement on which we can now continue to build. I would like to thank Glenn publicly for his great work and recognize the outstanding achievements that came during his time here.

We now, after the era of Glenn Irwin, have this extraordinary complex of programs and schools known as IUPUI, linked in thousands of ways to the city, to the state, and to the nation. These links, which are most numerous and intense in our metropolitan region, also extend around the world and touch nearly every aspect of life. They contribute to our health, to the strength of our economy, to our understanding of our culture and other cultures, to our ability to appreciate the beauty of the world and its creative people, and to the overall quality of life of the citizens of Indiana. Our contributions in all of these areas should continue to increase in the future, and IUPUI should continue to enhance its role as a key engine for cultivating human resources in our state.

IUPUI's key role suggests for us a heavy responsibility -- one I propose that will be linked by, among other things, renewing our commitment to excellence every year. The faculties of each school have their own agenda for excellence. Some of our schools have won international acclaim, while others have not yet had an opportunity to become fully developed. It is the role of our campus administration to assist all of our schools and programs in focusing their aspirations and in fulfilling their potential.

We should be eager to further advance those schools which are leaders in their fields and, at the same time, to work hard to bring those schools which have not yet realized their full potential up to their highest and their best.

On this latter point, we must begin by trying to bring the expenditures per student for a number of schools up to appropriate levels. We should re-dedicate ourselves to providing broad access to opportunities for higher education including graduate studies where the demand exists or where the use of resources unique to the area can be demonstrated. We should continue to emphasize special understanding and services to our many non-traditional students. In short, we should continue to strive to be the very best in all of the very many things we do. I believe the leaders of Indiana University and Purdue University are committed to our quest for this higher achievement, particularly with respect to those schools that are not thus fully developed.

In this regard, I am pleased to call your attention to the recent approval by the Indiana University Board of Trustees of an operating budget request for the 1987-89 biennium that would substantially enhance our funding. These added funds would help to attract and retain faculty, to replace part-time instructors with full-time faculty, to upgrade teaching and research equipment, and to computerize our libraries. The details of this budget will be provided at the October Faculty Council meeting. I know that you will join me in urging the members of the General Assembly and other state officials to give their most serious consideration to this budget request.

Not only must we renew our commitment to excellence but we must project the high quality of our work so the community better understands us and our role at Indiana University and Purdue universities. This leads me to think that we should ask ourselves, "How can we develop a better sense of campus-wide identity, community, and cohesiveness?" We will have some new opportunities to do just that in the near future. We will be a host institution to the Pan American Games in 1987. The venues for many of the Games will be here on this campus. We should look forward to these Games as a way of providing a sense of community and a shared challenge. The Games will also provide for millions of

people an opportunity to become more aware of and to identify more with IUPUI, a phenomenon which I trust will aid our recruitment and our entire academic mission.

Moreover, we have in our midst growing a new conference center and hotel which should be completed next year. These new buildings should serve as a focal point, especially if they incorporate some form of gathering place for faculty and students.

Finally, IUPUI will be 20 years old in 1989. Perhaps we should begin now to plan how to mark that anniversary and call attention to our growth and achievements as a nationally distinctive center for urban higher education.

Our sense of community will, of course, be greatly strengthened when we bring all of IUPUI's Indianapolis programs to the main campus. We hope that next year the General Assembly will authorize construction of the Science and Engineering BUILDING, so that our colleagues at 38th Street can join us here on campus. We also look forward after that to building a new home for the Herron School of Art and a new library building between West Michigan and New York streets. There is already a planning committee at work on this new library building, as well as some private fund raising activity.

Our sense of community will also be better projected in the future if we consider some new ways to present ourselves. We can draw upon the expertise of marketing experts and other professional communicators on our staff, our faculty, and among our alumni to develop new publications, special events, and other means of telling our institutional story. This could give us even better opportunities to communicate with the 60,000 alumni of IUPUI and the public in general.

We can't do any of these things in isolation from our parent institutions. In fact, in thinking about a sense of community, it is important that we include the Bloomington and West Lafayette campuses. Since 1974, within the IU statewide system, we have had a special relationship with Bloomington. We and they are both parts of the core campus -- a fact that offers opportunities for mutual benefits from outstanding faculty and programs at both locations. We can also benefit from developing further links with Bloomington and West Lafayette that will enhance our library and computing resources. The technology, I think, already exists. What we need do is make the connections.

In the broadest perspective, however, I think the State of Indiana can benefit enormously from having a unique corridor of core campuses from West Lafayette on the north to Bloomington in the south, with IUPUI in the center. For me that is a particularly intriguing vision for the future -- one that I hope can provide an institutional framework to identify for all of us the greatness which I am confident is our campus's destiny.

I hope you will join me and those of us who will labor in campus administration by giving us your advice, ideas, and support, so we can all move on to the next stage of our development, to new levels of achievement, and continue to increase the important role we play in this state and the positive impact we have on the constituencies we serve. In the process, I hope I get to know all of you. I hope I get to know better those who of you who are already friends

and I am looking forward to working with each and everyone of you to advance our corporate mission.

I have one more practical and perhaps pertinent item of Vice President's business that I will take up from this chair. The last day for drop-and-add was yesterday. As yet, we do not have a final count for registration. Estimates are that the headcount for campus is about the same as last year. Our credit hours may be down about one percent. If these estimates turn out to be accurate, the picture will remain bright, since a greater than one percent decrease in credit hours has been forecast. This, of course, is information that must be kept within our family because the President's Office will release the official data for all IU campuses at the October meeting of the Board of Trustees. It is, I think, in the nature of good news at this stage.

Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM IV

Executive Committee Report - Susan L. Zunt, Secretary

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: The next order of business is a pleasure for me, as I introduce your new Faculty Council Secretary. She is a member of the faculty in the School of Dentistry and a person whom I have had only a limited opportunity to get to know. In that limited time, I have come to have a very high regard for her. I think she will serve in excellent fashion as Secretary of the Faculty Council. It is my pleasure to introduce Susan Zunt.

PROF. ZUNT: I would like to begin with introducing your Executive Committee. The Executive Committee has been very busy this summer. They met four times to fulfill the requirements of Faculty Council business. They are: Henry Besch, School of Medicine; Varoujan Chalian, School of Dentistry; Kenneth Dunipace, School of Engineering & Technology; Jean Gnat, University Library; Henry Karlson, School of Law; Monroe Little, School of Liberal Arts; Gerald Powers, School of Social Work; Shirley Quate, School of Journalism; and Jeffery Vessely, School of Physical Education.

In mid June, the Faculty Council, by way of the University Faculty Council, received a request from the IU Board of Trustees to submit nominations for faculty members to serve on the Presidential Search Committee. As you know, we informed all of you of the nomination process and asked you to submit names. The Trustees' request was for a total of six IU faculty. This was to be proportioned three from IU Bloomington; two from IUPUI; and one from the regional campuses. We wrote to the Board immediately and requested a uniform 2:2:2 ratio. The outcome was three from IU Bloomington; two from IUPUI (+ Dean Schaller, giving us three) and two from the regional campuses. Professor Rebecca Markel, chair, and her Nominating Committee did an outstanding job of collecting, organizing, and selecting our nominees for the Presidential Search Committee. The Executive Committee also selected nominees and then sent the names to the University Faculty Council. The documentation is on file in the IUPUI Faculty Council Office, ES 4161. Please call Mrs. Bernice Chumley at 4-2215 if you are interested in examining this documentation.

The IUPUI Faculty Council standing committee members have all been informed of their appointments. The entire committee roster will be published with the minutes of today's meeting. If you need information regarding the standing committees before we get this information published, please call the Faculty Council Office.

Dean Schaller, as you know, has named a Library Planning Committee this summer. Our representatives from the Faculty Council include: Professor Monroe Little, Jean Gnat, and Gerald Powers.

Concerning Boards of Review, we have had two Board of Review cases called. There has been one assigned to each Board. The election of the third board, which this body approved in the spring, will not take place until our regularly scheduled election in January, 1987. We didn't make a provision to do that any sooner.

The Board of Trustees will meet on this campus September 5-6. I invite you to attend the Faculty Relations Committee Meeting at 8:30 a.m. Saturday on the third floor of the Business/SPEA Building (BS 3018). The Executive Committee has developed a program for the Trustees. Professors James R. East, Barbara Fischler, and Christine Y. Fitzpatrick will speak on the "Hugh O'Brian Youth Foundation at IUPUI," "Growth of the Libraries at IUPUI," and the "Minority Engineering Advancement Program" respectively. All of you are most welcome to attend this meeting. The next Board of Trustees Faculty Relations Committee meeting on this campus is scheduled for December 4-5, 1986. If any of you have ideas or would like to make a presentation to the Trustees, please call Bernice, myself, or someone on the Executive Committee.

The Executive Committee has written to President Stoner of the Board of Trustees asking the Board to consider holding their 1987 Summer Seminar at IUPUI in the new IU Conference Center. The seminar is scheduled for the week prior to the opening of the Pan Am Games.

An ad hoc committee on Faculty Deliberations has been named by the Executive Committee. This committee, chaired by Professor Ed Robbins, is made up of the current chairs of all the standing committees and the past Secretaries of the Faculty Council. This committee will examine the role of faculty deliberations in the Council and in committees, including how issues are assigned, means by which committee actions are channeled, manner in which committee decisions are handled, and implementation of decisions.

I'll take this opportunity to remind you that next month's Faculty Council meeting will be held in the Madame Walker Urban Life Center. There will be a cash bar available. At that meeting, we plan on introductions of the members, and we hope to have a report from the Faculty Affairs Committee on their Promotion and Tenure survey that we completed this past spring.

One other thing I need to inform you of is that there are some conflicts of our Faculty Council meeting dates in the future with Board of Trustees meeting dates. It is necessary for Vice President Bepko to attend the Board of Trustee meetings. It, therefore, may be necessary to change meeting times or meeting dates from those that we have published. I would caution you to look at the agenda when you get it and please note the time, place, and date of the meeting.

That is the end of my report. At this time I would like to introduce Professor B. Keith Moore, Chairman of the Fringe Benefits Committee.

PROF. MOORE: Thank you, Dr. Zunt, Vice President Bepko, and Dean Schaller. I would like to assure you that my report this afternoon is strictly informational. It is more of an update than anything and, as a consequence, I hope I don't take up very much of your time. However, for the sake of those of you who are new on the Faculty Council, I think I have to give you just a brief background on the situation that essentially this report updates. On January 9 the IUPUI Faculty Council heard a resolution from my committee relating to the potential impact that House Bill HR 3838, sometimes referred to as the Tax Reform Act, would have upon our TIAA/CREF retirement plan, both for those of us who haven't retired and for those of us who have already retired.

The potential impact of this was really rather severe and, as a result, the Faculty Council passed a resolution urging both the faculty and the administration of the University to communicate to the appropriate legislative members our concern about the impact of this legislation upon our pension plan. This resolution was passed by the Faculty Council on January 9th.

Those of you who have been keeping track of what has been happening might be aware that, perhaps as a result of our efforts or perhaps not, the version of the Bill that came out of the Senate was quite different in relation to its impact upon our retirement system. It was in fact much more favorable. Most of the provisions that would have impacted most heavily were removed from the Senate Bill. Late in the summer session, each of us received a memo from TIAA/CREF administration reminding us that at this point a Senate-House Conference Committee was being structured to consider the two versions of this Act that had been passed by the House and Senate. They will come up with a compromise bill that will then be submitted to the House and Senate. This essentially was the last opportunity that any of us would have to impact the contents of this Bill, since once the compromised Bill was passed by the conference committee, that Bill cannot be further amended by either the House or the Senate. Since the summer session was nearly over and action was needed immediately to have any effect, I took the TIAA/CREF memo to Dr. Zunt and indicated that I felt that some further action on the part of the University committee would be called for.

As a consequence, we drafted a letter which we sent to President Ryan and Dean Schaller signed by Dr. Zunt, as Secretary of this body and myself, as Chair of the Fringe Benefits Committee. A copy of this letter is on file in the Faculty Council Office. Basically, we reviewed the brief history that I have related to you, along with our concerns that the University should take this opportunity to react to this in whatever fashion was possible, considering the timing. I would like to say that we received from Dean Schaller a very prompt reply. I think it was a very appropriate response indicating that the University was aware of the situation. The administration was taking what appears to me to be the only steps that were available and the very appropriate steps and were, indeed.

Of course, the House-Senate Conference Committee did meet and drafted a compromise act. The full details of what happened are being dribbled out through the newspapers. Very little of what I have seen relates to our situation directly. I did call Jack Hudson, who is director of our Insurance Office and the individual who is most closely in touch with this sort of thing. He had a copy of the Compromise Bill and said he had read through it very

briefly. As far as he could see, the provisions in the Senate bill were retained. This means that we probably came out about as well as we could given the situation.

This basically concludes my report. I would be happy to answer any questions, but I don't really know too much more about the Compromise Bill than I suppose most of you do. Are there any questions?

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: There is a program scheduled for tomorrow in the Law School on the Tax Reform Act. It is part of the Law School's Alumni Day activities.

AGENDA ITEM VI
New Business

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Do we have any New Business? Any Old Business?

DEAN SCHALLER: I would like to remind everyone that immediately following the Faculty Council meeting, at 4:30, there will be a reception in honor of Vice President and Mrs. Bepko. I hope you will avail yourself the opportunity to meet a wonderful person in Jean Bepko.

AGENDA ITEM VII
Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY

at

INDIANAPOLIS

Minutes of the Faculty Council Meeting

October 2, 1986

Madame Walker Urban Life Center

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

Members Present: Administration: Vice President Gerald L. Bepko, Executive Dean Howard Schaller, Dean Patricia Boaz. Deans: H. William Gilmore, Elizabeth Grossman, P. Nicholas Kellum, Jeffery Grove, William M. Plater, Sheldon Siegel, William J. Voos, Marshall C. Yovits. Director: Barbara Fischler. Faculty: John Baenziger, Anne Belcher, Jacqueline Blackwell, Henry R. Besch, Jr., Patricia Blake, Charles Blevins, Michael Burke, Varoujan Chalian, Robert Colyer, Andre DeKorvin, Joseph DiMicco, David Doedens, James Edmondson, Charles Ellinger, Mark Farber, Martin Farlow, Mary Feeley, Melvin Glick, Jean Gnat, Clifford Goodwin, Edwin T. Harper, Robert Harris, Emily Hernandez, William Hodes, Meredith Hull, Jerome Kaminker, Henry Karlson, Linda Kasper, Suetta Kehrein, Robert J. Kirk, Judith Kosegi, Joseph Kuczkowski, Miriam Langsam, Monroe Little, Rebecca Markel, James McAteer, Judy Z. Miller, Barnett B. Morris, Richard Pflanzner, Gerald Powers, Shirley Quate, Mark Richardson, Edward Robbins, Glen Sagraves, John Schmedtje, P Kent Sharp, Judith Silence, Robert Stonehill, Susan Sutton, Jeffery Vessely, Kathleen Warfel, Dorothy Webb, Henry Wellman, Maudine Williams, Kathryn Wilson, Susan Zunt.

Alternates Present: Deans: Carlyn Johnson for Charles Bonser; James Carter for Walter J. Daly, Hugh A. Wolf for Howard Mehlinger, Scott Evenbeck for James E. Weigand, Georgia B. Miller for Jack R. Wentworth. Faculty: Bart Ng for C. Aliprantis, Jerome Kaplan for Elaine Alton.

Members Absent: Deans: Trevor Brown, R. Bruce Renda. Faculty: Sharon Andreoli, Karen Becker, Linda Brothers, Edmund Byrne, Kenneth Dunipace, Beverly Flynn, Jeri Francis, Linda Haas, Eugene Helveston, Ngoan Van Hoang, Robert Mendelsohn, Michael E. Mitchell, Paul Nagy, Catherine Palmer, John Pless, Anita Proffitt, Terry Reed, Kenneth Ryder, Rowland Sherrill, Ernest E. Smith, Vernon Vix, Charles Winslow, Pao-lo Yu.

AGENDA ITEM I

Approval of the Minutes of September 4, 1986

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: The first item of business is the approval of the minutes of the September 4th meeting. Do we have a motion for the approval of those minutes? (So moved) Do we have a second? (Seconded). All in favor say "Aye." Are there any opposed? The minutes are approved as published. (Note: Professor William Hodes and Dean William Voos were marked absent and should have been marked present.)

AGENDA ITEM II

Presiding Officer's Business - Vice President Gerald L. Bepko

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: The next item is Presiding Officer's Business. I have two items that I would like to report on briefly and then ask Dean Schaller for a report on two other items.

The first item concerns the 1987-89 Operating Appropriation Request of Indiana University, which was approved at the August meeting of the Board of Trustees. There are copies of the three-page handout which is being distributed. By way of introduction let me say that I think the Operating Budget Request is quite favorable to the Indianapolis campus. In particular it is favorable to the non-health schools in that it recognizes some of the funding deficiencies that have been observed on this campus for many years. Contributing to the success of the Indianapolis campus in having this Operating Appropriation Request made by the Trustees is the work that was done on the Mission Statement which I will talk about in a moment.

Now that everyone has a copy of the handout, I will talk about the figures. These break down into two basic categories. The first is the Operating Request, which is shown on the first of these three pages by campus. Bloomington is listed at the top. The left column is the 1986-87 base-year amount. The next three columns are the 1987-88 recommended increases. The final set of three columns on the right side of the page show the 1988-89 recommended increase reflecting both years of the biennium.

After the Bloomington campus budget, there are the five regional campuses. Then we come to IUPUI health and non-health. I would like to focus on the total IUPUI figures. The total operating budget for 1986-87, as shown in the column that is the farthest to the left, was \$90,741,328. The recommended increase was \$11,125,265, a percentage increase of 12.3 in the first year of the biennium. That would mean that, if the legislature agrees and appropriates the funds necessary to bring out budget up to that level, it would be \$101,866,593.

For the second year of the biennium there is a recommendation of an increase of \$11,021,344. This would be an increase of 10.8 percent over the \$101,866,593, bringing the Indianapolis campus budget up for 1988-89 to \$112,887,937. The 12.3 percent increase of the first year of the biennium and the 10.8 percent increase of the second year of the biennium are among the highest, if not the highest, increases for any of the campuses in the system. I might call particular attention, though, to the non-health component of that total IUPUI budget. The Trustees have recognized the relative underfunding in the non-health schools and have requested much higher increases in the base budget for the non-health schools. The increase, in terms of percentage, from 1986-87 to 1987-88 would be 18.2 percent and from 1987-88 to 1988-89 would be 14.6 percent; the highest in the entire IU system.

I might add one thing for the health schools, recognizing that the percentage increases for the health schools are not as high as the non-health schools. There has been an effort to work through the special appropriations that are made to the health schools each biennium to bring more funding into the health schools. The special appropriation requests, such as the one for the statewide Medical Education Program just as an example, would be increases of 11 and 11.5

percent, which makes up for some of the difference between the health and non-health as shown in this Operating Appropriation Request.

The second page is just a little different way of looking at the Operating Request for the IUPUI campus. You can see how the Operating Request has been developed. The Maintenance of Operations has to do with a continuation of personnel and activities. The second category is probably the most important. It includes quality recovery money, part-time faculty replacement money, a major increase in equipment replacement and enhancement, and some funding for the libraries.

If you want to tie these figures on the second page to the figures on the first page, you can look about two-thirds of the way down the column of figures where it says "Total Change in Operating Expenditures", \$12,437,080. Subtract the offsetting Student Fee Income of \$1,311,815 and the resulting figure is \$11,125,265, which is the increase that I mentioned when we were looking at the first page. The increase then would bring our \$90,741,328 up to \$101,866,593. The same is true, of course, for the second year of the biennium. That is the Operating Request that I said is favorable to the Indianapolis campus.

The Capital Request also should be viewed as favorable to the Indianapolis campus. The Capital Request is reflected on the last page, ranked by priority. The first priority is the Chemistry facility at Bloomington. But that is Phase II of a project that is already under way. I think construction is already partially completed, so this is not a first priority in terms of projects. The second priority, which is really the first priority in terms of new construction, is our S.E.T. building. As you can see, it is carried in two parts. The request in this legislative session will be for authorization to complete the cost for the total cost of \$38,762,000. Bonding authority will be requested in this biennium but for only part of that \$38,762,000, or \$20,000,000. According to the architects, that is all we think we could spend in this biennium even if construction began at the earliest possible date. The remainder of that amount, the \$18,762,000, would be requested and, I suppose, committed by the General Assembly in this session but would be actually approved in terms of bonding authority in 1989-1991.

There is one other capital item for the Indianapolis campus. Some land acquisition remains, as does acquisition of at the Mary Cable Building. We hope that that is included in the appropriations of the approvals of the General Assembly in 1987-89, but our main emphasis will be on the Science, Engineering, and Technology Building, so that our 38th Street colleagues can join us on this campus.

I would be happy to answer questions about either the Operating or the Capital Requests. If there are no questions, I would like to spend another moment or two talking about the Mission Statement which has been discussed, I think, on campus quite a bit in the last month. A number of you, I suppose, read about the Higher Education Commission's action in the newspaper and also have seen a copy of the Mission Statement which was adopted in principle by the Higher Education Commission at its meeting early in September only a week or so after our last Council meeting.

The first thing that I would like to say is that very shortly a letter will go out thanking all of those who worked on the projects that led to our

preparation of our own Mission Statement and who have contributed so much to this entire effort. I would like to say here a word of thanks to all of those hundreds of persons, many of whom are in this room, who worked on the various committees, Carol Nathan's overarching committee, and the many task forces that operated and worked on preparing different parts of the Mission Statement. I think it was their excellent work that made our Mission Statement a first-rate one.

In particular, in this forum, I would like to thank the Faculty Council Academic Affairs Committee, which reviewed, commented on, and contributed greatly to the Mission Statement that our campus submitted. I think that this project has had a number of benefits. The statement contributed to the Trustees' treatment of the Indianapolis campus in their budget requests for 1987-89. Its preparation was an excellent internal process which gave us an opportunity to learn more about ourselves. It also gave us an opportunity to clarify some of our thinking and our goals for campus. It also helped shape the discussions that took place in the Higher Education Commission, which had requested this Mission Statement. I think that the Mission Statement that we filed moved that discussion, at least from our standpoint, to a much higher ground. It should be clear to all of you who have seen the Mission Statement that the Higher Education Commission adopted in principle is not the same as the one we submitted. The one that was finally adopted was a product largely of the Higher Education Commission's own drafting work and contributions from the University based on, of course, our Mission Statement. They revised what we did and discussions which took place between the President's Office and the Commission staff which resulted in the Statement that was approved.

As you may know, some of us spoke at the Higher Education Commission meeting in which the Mission Statement was discussed. We thought it was too restrictive, that it inhibited campus development. In some ways, we regret that. But, we also thought that it was better to put the Mission Statement into the file. We thought that, as a campus, we got substantial benefit out of the process of preparing it. We were prepared to go on to proposals for the development of the campus that we would ask of the Higher Education Commission. We didn't think that it was useful to go back and try to negotiate and debate various terms, various sentences, or various passages of the Mission Statement that the Higher Education Commission was prepared to approve. That was something that we believed, not only because we wanted to get on to these other things, but we also think that mission statements are not statements that are binding and static. They can be amended. Indeed, they are often amended. They are living documents. They can be revised. In fact, at the same Higher Education Commission meeting in September, there was a mission statement which was revised to reflect the activities that were taking place on another state university campus. We lawyers call that "making a motion to have the pleadings conform to the truth." At any rate, that is one thing that everyone should recognize about mission statements. The other thing is that the statement that is now in our files is subject to interpretation. We think that our interpretation of that document can be positive for us.

We would like to move ahead with proposals for development of the campus and make our interpretation of that document the interpretation that will be followed by others. We would like to move ahead with the very first part of those plans for development of the campus, the University's operating and capital requests for 1987-89. Rather than worry about the Mission Statement,

we would like to go ahead with the proposals that are now pending in front of the Higher Education Commission and get their support on those. If we continue to discuss the Mission Statement, it might inhibit our ability to get their support for both the operating request and the S.E.T. Building. We think that is where our emphasis should be and that is where our labors will go.

I would be happy to answer questions or discuss the Mission Statement if anyone is interested.

PROF. ROBBINS: Will we get a copy of this revised Mission Statement any time soon?

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Yes. The letters are in the process right now and a copy of the Mission Statement will be distributed. Copies of the Mission Statement have been distributed but not to everyone. It is not that we have selected only certain people to distribute to, it's just that we have given copies to everyone we have seen or who has asked. But, the formal distribution is yet to come.

PROF. WILSON: The criticisms that you made that were reported in the newspaper referred to the treatment by the Mission Statement of graduate programs. Could you tell us what your restrictions were for reconciliation between what is in that statement and what we should look forward to?

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: I think that the restrictiveness that I saw as being a problem had to do with the mission's efforts to tell us how we should deliver graduate education on this campus. That seems to me to be management function of the University and not something that is in the jurisdiction of the Commission. Our graduate educational programs should be based on demonstrated needs in the community, demands for graduate education, and should not be restricted or inhibited by some organizational concept established in advance by the Higher Education Commission. We should deliver those programs the best we can here on the Indianapolis campus. It would be better for us to talk about those programs and how we are going to offer them here than it is to worry about the Mission Statement. What specific programs and what graduate programs will be created here in the immediate future I am not sure at this point. I think that is something that we should discuss and that we will be eager to propose to the University for its approval and to the Higher Education Commission when those programs are ready to go.

If there are no other comments, Dean Schaller has two items.

DEAN SCHALLER: First is the enrollment. The final enrollment report for the fall semester showed that total credit hours for IUPUI, compared to last fall, declined from approximately 208,300 to 206,200 or a decrease of about 2,100 or one percent. Most of that fall decline was in the health schools. The headcount increased from 23,431 to 23,470 or about 0.2 percent. A headcount decline of 213 in the health schools was offset by an increase of about 252 in the non-health areas. I guess, in short, we could say that the enrollment remained about the same as last year. We consider that a healthy situation because the enrollment was predicted to decline. I believe that is the fourth straight year a decline was predicted and it held about the same or increased slightly. Given what is being said nationally about university enrollments, I think that we should continue to feel encouraged by a rather strong enrollment

base for this campus. I might add that some of the decline in the health schools, as many of you know, is a planned decline. Again, I want to emphasize that these data are unofficial and not to be published, although they will be in our minutes, until the President of the University releases them to the Board of Trustees. I think if everything is in order and all of the computers have been working, that that might be done this weekend in Bloomington. Those are the figures as they now stand. Are there any questions about the enrollment?

PROF. WILSON: In what areas in the health programs were there decreases?

DEAN SCHALLER: The decreases were 46 in Allied Health; 19 in Dentistry; 24 in Medicine; and 124 in Nursing. That is headcount. Of course, credit hours also went down in those. Are there any other questions about the enrollment?

The second item is that Vice President Bepko has appointed a Search and Screen Committee to assist in recommending persons to be considered for appointment to the position of Dean of Student Affairs effective next July 1. I would like to read two paragraphs from the memorandum that Vice President Bepko sent out appointing that group.

"In accordance with University personnel policy, Dr. Patricia A. Boaz, will relinquish her position as Dean of Student Affairs effective June 30, 1987. Dean Boaz has served the campus extremely well in this capacity" (since I work closely with Pat, I would like to underscore that "extremely well.") "We need to assure continued excellent performance in this important position. I am writing to ask you to assist in this important task by serving on the search and screen committee which will recommend names of persons to be considered for the appointment."

"I request that the committee send to me by March 16, 1987, a list of three to five names in alphabetical order of persons that it considers qualified for the position. The committee is to consider persons from both inside and outside the Indiana University and Purdue University systems. In considering your search and screen, you are expected to assure conformity with the University's equal employment policies and procedures."

This is a fairly large committee as you can well imagine for a position like that, to make sure of appropriate representation. It is to be chaired by Professor Sue Barrett of the School of Physical Education. I won't read off all the names, but we will have the letter appended to the minutes of the Faculty Council. I hope everyone will take a strong interest on this because it is a position which does affect every single school. As we have said, Pat had done extremely well at it and we want to do the best we can to assure continued strong performance in that area. I am also happy to tell you that Pat is not going to retire. We are not going to permit her to do that. She will remain on the faculty. I can assure you that she will continue to contribute in many ways. I wanted to share that good news with you.

AGENDA ITEM III

Executive Committee Report - Susan L. Zunt, Secretary

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Our next item of business is the Executive Committee Report. It is my pleasure to introduce our Secretary of the Faculty Council who, from my perspective and I hope yours, has been doing an excellent job, Susan Zunt.

PROF. ZUNT: Thank you. The Executive Committee has reviewed Dr. Martin Estay's Faculty Grievance Procedures Outside of Collective Bargaining: The Experience at AAU Campuses, 1986. The consensus of the Executive Committee was that the IUPUI faculty grievance procedures are in line with members of the American Association of Universities. One significant difference was noted in regard to system and/or merged schools that have IUPUI-based missions, but with the final administrative authority for promotion and tenure decisions on another campus. The Executive Committee suggested that the Faculty Board of Review should report to the Vice President having administrative authority over the grievant's school. The report was forwarded to Dr. Schaller who sent it to Bloomington.

The Faculty Relations Committee of the IU Board of Trustees met at IUPUI on Saturday, September 6, 1986. Professors James East, Barbara Fischler, and Christine Fitzpatrick gave excellent presentations that were warmly received by the Trustees. The Faculty Relations Committee will meet with our faculty on this campus in early December. Our tentative program includes presentations from faculty from the schools of Liberal Arts, Dentistry, and Nursing. Our first Faculty Relations Committee meeting, which we will host in 1987, will be in April. The Executive Committee is open to any and all suggestions from you as to the content of that meeting.

You may remember that last year at the opening Faculty Council meeting, Professor Henry Besch presented the Faculty Affairs Committee Report on their Faculty Club Survey. This survey indicated positive faculty and librarian support for such a venture. In September, 1985, all the developers were reported to have included plans for a faculty facility. The preview of the new Conference Center was held last month. The Conference Center does not appear to include any plans for a Faculty Club. The Executive Committee and the Faculty Affairs Committee will continue to work for a Faculty Club option. Vice President Bepko is working toward the identification of such an area within the Conference Center.

A recent report in the Sagamore (Vol. 16(2):1,6, Sept. 8, 1986) featured the problems caused to students by the many late faculty orders for books. The Executive Committee is concerned about the role of faculty in this problem. Mr. Joseph Fulmer, Director of the IUPUI Bookstores, met with the Executive Committee last Thursday. He reported on a number of problems that exist and develop, some of which are unavoidable and that cause stress to students and faculty. Mr. Fulmer indicated that the plan of the Bookstore is to meet with small groups of faculty and staff to eliminate problems and to improve communication. The Executive Committee suggested that faculty be informed if the ordered texts will not be available for the start of classes.

The Executive Committee is continuing to assess ongoing parking problems on this campus, including access to parking and fee schedules. Presently, there

are 53 different rates for parking in effect on this campus. A number of faculty and administrative committees are evaluating the problem. I hope to be able to report some positive progress on this situation soon.

In access to parking problems, access to the campus on weekends when civic/sporting events are scheduled by the city, may be difficult. This results in a serious problem for students, faculty, and staff attempting to attend scheduled classes on this campus. In general, it will always be possible to approach the campus from the north. It may be necessary, though, to park north of Michigan and walk to the rest of the campus.

Chief Mulvey of the IUPUI Police has specific information on access to the campus during a marathon scheduled for Saturday, November 8, 1986. This race may cause a short (five minutes) delay to individuals attempting to reach the campus. New York Street will be closed. One lane will be maintained on West Street and Michigan Street. Chief Mulvey is preparing communications to notify affected students, staff, and faculty before future scheduled events.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: May I add one thing here Susan? Chief Mulvey has also recommended as a solution to this problem that I run in these races because he says that I run so slowly that I will slow the whole thing down and they will be able to bring traffic through.

PROF. KARLSON: I would like to add one thing here and I will be bringing this up under New Business. Last week, at least one instructor that I am aware of from the Law School, was refused access to the Law School by barricades. They would not let him through because he might interfere with runners. They have had a severe problem with this in the past. It appears that they are giving much more freedom to the necessity of people running than the necessity of higher education of this community.

PROF. ZUNT: The cornerstone for the National Institute for Fitness and Sport was unveiled at the Sports Center, rather than the building site because of rain on September 11, 1986. This National Institute should be of tremendous benefit to the University and the community. It represents the culmination of efforts of the private and public sectors, working together for the enrichment of all. The Center offers health and fitness services including fitness evaluation, a physical fitness program, nutritional analysis, individual consultations, and health risk appraisals. More information is available by calling 274-3432. The building will not be completed for the Pan Am games but the indoor track facility will be.

The UFC received a proposal for creating non-tenure-track faculty ranks at the Indiana University School of Medicine for individuals that primarily provide patient services and teaching as it relates to that service. Our IUPUI Faculty Affairs Committee is preparing a report to bring to you in November and then forward to the UFC November 11 meeting in Bloomington. The proposal will be published with the November 6, 1986 IUPUI agenda for your review prior to the November meeting.

The 1986 Steven C. Beering Award Committee has announced the upcoming visit of Dr. Robert J. Lefkowitz, the 1986 recipient of the Steven C. Beering Award. Dr. Lefkowitz is the James B. Duke Professor of Medicine at Duke University, and an investigator at the Howard Hughes Medical Institute at Durham, North

Carolina. His lecture will be presented in Emerson Hall Auditorium at 8:30 a.m., Wednesday, October 29, 1986. The title of his presentation will be: **"Receptors and Rhodopsin: Shedding New Light on an Old Subject"**.

Following the lecture, Dr. Lefkowitz will receive the 1986 Steven C. Beering Award for Advancement of Biomedical Science and a substantial honorarium from an endowment created in 1983 by faculty, alumni and friends of the School of Medicine.

Dr. Lefkowitz is an outstanding speaker and a leader in his field. All faculty will be invited to the reception to be held in honor of Dr. Lefkowitz and President Beering at the Indianapolis Museum of Art from 4:30 to 6:30 p.m. on October 27, 1986.

That concludes my report.

AGENDA ITEM IV

The Adult Education Center - Scott Evenbeck, Director, IUPUI Continuing Studies

PROF. ZUNT: At this time I would like to introduce Dr. Scott Evenbeck. Scott is the Director of the IUPUI Division of Continuing Studies. In September on this campus, the IU Board of Trustees approved a new development of the Adult Education Center. Dr. Evenbeck has agreed to acquaint us with this exciting new concept. Dr. Evenbeck is also Chair of our Staff Relations Committee.

PROF. EVENBECK: Thank you, Susan.

The Division of Continuing Studies of IUPUI serves some 20,000 people a year. The IUPUI Division is one of four units of the Indiana University School of Continuing Studies whose dean is Jim Weigand. Another division is the Extended Studies Division, which is headed by Larry Keller and is responsible not only for independent study and the general studies degree program on a system wide basis, but now also the Malaysia Program and other overseas programs of the School. The Labor Studies Division is headed by Lee Balliet and offers a wide variety of credit and non-credit courses in Labor Education across the state. The fourth division, headed by Gus Mueller, has increasing ties to IUPUI because that division works with us in meeting special program needs, such as the possible incorporation of the Fund Raising School within the University.

Our fall catalog featured doors as a symbol for the IUPUI Division of Continuing Studies. Doors are appropriate symbols. The returning adult students use Continuing Studies as their door to enter the University. Next year we may use bridges in the senses of both metaphor and driving access.

The demographic data shows the aging of our population. Though IUPUI has always served adult students, we will be serving increasing numbers of adults simply because our population is getting older. The college board estimates that 46 million adults are being educated outside higher education, with approximately 5 million enrolled in colleges and universities. Over half of those attending college by 1993 will be age 25 and older. Many of these returning adult students already have degrees. Many do not initially plan to seek degrees. The Adult Education Coordinating Center is a positive step for IUPUI in serving these returning adults.

This chart shows the number of persons by age groups. You can see the baby boom moving up in years. The persons, now ranging in age from about 25-40, will make up an increasingly large proportion IUPUI's enrollment over the coming years. Technological change, the increasing number of career changes for U.S. citizens, and increased interest in personal development are all trends consistent with the need to better serve returning adults.

In the past IUPUI has not specifically targeted returning adult students in having an office for them or having much special marketing for adults. Though we have perceived a great deal of positive international attention for Jim East's Learn & Shop and Weekend College programs, designed primarily for returning adult students, we have not designated a specific department to serve this expanding segment of IUPUI's actual and potential enrollments. Beginning this fall, IUPUI will have the Adult Education Coordinating Center for returning adults. We define them as non-degree students. IUPUI has had three units serving such students in the past.

The Continuing Education Center for Women, now ten years old, has been a national leader of serving women in the community who have an interest in returning to school. We have a wide variety of non-credit programs supplemented by counseling and testing services designed to help women return to school. We will continue to offer special programs for women, in concert now with the Women's Studies Program.

We will, however, not limit our services to returning women students in the Adult Education Coordinating Center. We will also include men. A second unit joining forces to create this office is the Graduate Affairs Office. A major portion of the workload for that office, coordinated by Judy Lovejoy for a number of years, has been the advising of graduate non-degree students.

Education is one of those things that the more you get the more you want. A typical semester at IUPUI will see approximately 1,400 students enrolled in non-degree status. Of these, fully 1,000 are people who already have degrees. They are back on campus to meet specific educational needs or aspirations. We see major effort required to make certain that any students with degrees whose intent is to seek a graduate degree at IUPUI are served in ways deemed appropriate by the individual schools.

A third unit serving non-degree students has been the University Division. Since the mission of University Division is to serve degree-seeking students, we will over the course of the fall be making arrangements with Dean Bynum and his staff to make certain that the Adult Education Coordinating Center is prepared to accept enrollments from adult non-degree students served now by University Division. A study by Barbara Metzner of that unit affirms the validity of IUPUI's adult non-degree classification. Fully 75 percent of the students registered under this program in one semester are not back on campus the following semester. These students are here to meet their specific educational needs. The Adult Education Coordinating Center is being formed to serve such students.

We expect a grand opening with an open house for the new office in the basement of Cavanaugh sometime this winter. You will be hearing more about this important project. I want to add a footnote. Dean Boaz will be serving as Acting Director. She and I will appreciate your suggestions as we prepare for

the opening of the center.

Another footnote is that Dean Boaz has added a student research component to Student Affairs. Mike Wince, Director of that Office, has already begun working closely with the Adult Education Coordinating Center.

I have talked about a new mission for the Division of Continuing Studies. A second key component of the Division represents an important consolidation of effort for the campus. Jim East now serves as Associate Director of Credit Programs for the Division, in addition to serving as Associate Dean of the School of Liberal Arts. I am not sure if the IUPUI campus community realizes the extent to which Weekend College and Learn & Shop serve as national models of Continuing Education. I had the opportunity hear Jim give a presentation at an Association for Continuing Higher Education meeting. What we may have taken for granted on this campus are rightfully viewed nationally as innovative model programs involving the delivery of credit programs for returning adult students. University faculty and administrators across the country often know that IUPUI is the place where Jim East developed Weekend College and Learn & Shop.

For years, the Division has also offered off campus credit courses in area high schools and at specialized location such as business and industry, where in-plant courses are needed. Jim has now taken these programs under his wing as well. You may be interested in our enrollments. Preliminary data reveal nearly 6,000 enrollment this semester in these programs. We are geared up for doing the mechanics of taking registration off campus, thanks to Pat Boaz, Dick Slocum, John Krivacs, and Mike Cozmanoff, who registered adults at a shopping center this fall for the first time in several years. We have a special registration period on campus on weekends.

A third unit of the Division is also ten years old. That is the General Studies Degree Program. You may have served, as I did, on one of the early faculty committees charged with implementing what was first called the Indiana University External Degree. That degree, whose curriculum was and is controlled by a systemwide council of faculty members, was designed to meet the educational needs of returning adult students. Students often take courses on campus along with all of our other students, but they have some options geared to returning adults. There is the possibility of credit for life experience. This is a very careful procedure controlled by the faculty. You may have been involved yourself evaluating a portfolio, documenting experiences of the General Studies Degree Program students. These students also have more options for taking independent study courses. They have the possibility of earning credit for a wide variety of educational programs evaluated by the American Council on Education. This fall nearly 500 students at IUPUI are enrolled in the General Studies Degree Program. The program has grown in recent years.

The final unit of the division is the one that most people think of in connection with Continuing Studies at IUPUI. It's the non-credit area. In earlier years, this unit accounted for most of activity of the Division. Though that is no longer the case, the non-credit offerings of the Division are an important means of taking the University to the people.

The non-credit programs offered by the Division have shown the steady growth. One especially important addition to this area in the past year is our adding a half-time person whose primary responsibility is helping other schools handle arrangements for conferences and institutes. Another important responsibility this year has been serving as the administrative unit working under the direction of a steering committee, headed by Dean Plater, with IUPUI's office that is coordinating activities for the Pan Am Games. The interest within the community in preparing for the games is reflected in the enrollment in non-credit Spanish courses. You may be interested in enrolling in such a course yourself.

The Division seeks to work with the other schools of IUPUI to identify and meet community needs in the non-credit area. Even though we have the largest campus-based continuing education program in the state, colleagues around the country tell me that Indianapolis is the most underdeveloped, urban market for non-credit continuing education in the country. Even though that program has gone from deficit to a small surplus in the past year, we have the proverbial many miles to go in our non-credit program.

Teaching community education courses is an important means for you to be able to take the initiative for a new course. It is a place to try things out. It is a place where people are because they want to be there. In the non-credit area, people are there who have identified what they want to do and are offered coursework that meets their interest.

I thought you would be interested in who is taking non-credit coursework at IUPUI. The Division has emphasized the importance of knowing who takes its courses. The shaded areas of this slide are the areas of heavy enrollments in non-credit courses. Enrollees come from much of the north side Indianapolis and a segment of the south side. I will note that high income, married women constitutes the largest number of enrollment in the non-credit areas. A high proportion of enrollees also have college degrees. In fact, three-fourths of our enrollees have at least some college or university education.

A group that has been valuable during the past year is the Continuing Studies Advisory Council. Members of this Council are Pat Boaz, Bill Plater, Bob Davis, Marge Applegate, Sue Barrett, Oner Yurtseven, Jim Hertling, and Barbara Metzner. I would like to thank them. I also want to report that the Council has targeted relationships with the other schools as its top priority for the coming year.

I have had a chance to talk with many faculty this past year. I will be around this year on behalf of, or with the Council, to identify ways in which the Division can help your school open doors and bridges to IUPUI.

I wanted to mention one special course that we are doing in conjunction with Herron this year. (Dean Evenbeck distributed posters announcing a jointly developed course on contemporary art.)

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Thank you, Scott. Scott has done an excellent job in his new role as Associate Dean for Continuing Studies. This presentation is an example of his high quality work. He has put a program that had not been operating in the black, in the black and everyone is very pleased about that.

AGENDA ITEM V

Deans' Introduction of Faculty

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: The next item of business is the introduction of members of the Faculty Council. Historically, the deans of the schools have made these introductions and we have introduced the deans in order of smallest schools go first and the largest school goes last. I think we should follow that same procedure in this meeting. The smallest school is the School of Journalism. Jim Brown will make the introductions.

DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Vice President Bepko. It is a pleasure to introduce Shirley Quate who has been teaching at Indianapolis for some 22 years. Her teaching here pre-dates the existence of IUPUI. She taught first for Purdue-Indianapolis, then was a faculty member in Liberal Arts with IUPUI in English and journalism. She developed journalism courses here to the point that it was a minor and had a substantial student enrollment in some 13 sections of journalism courses. She started not one but two student newspapers, one a Purdue newspaper and then later the Sagamore. As a sidebar note, the Sagamore is the number-one weekly student newspaper in the state of Indiana this year. That development has been quite productive. Her teaching specialty is Ethics of Journalism. It is really our capstone senior level course. Her students, both graduate and undergraduate, have won the prestigious Muller Paper National Competition, and we are very pleased with her teaching efforts in Ethics. Her research has been in the area of two-way communications from corporate publications using letters to the editor and the like as a means of feedback to corporate management. This is a recent, innovative, and productive area of research in public relations. The faculty of the School of Journalism is very pleased to have Shirley Quate as our representative on the Faculty Council.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Dean Schaller tells me that Journalism is also the newest of our schools. Second, we have the School of Continuing Studies. Scott Evenbeck will make the introductions.

DEAN EVENBECK: The faculty representative is Charles Ellinger. Chuck has been with Indiana University for 16 years and runs credit and non-credit programs in Labor Education. I think you would all be amazed at how much he travels. There are many months when he travels back and forth from Indianapolis to Bloomington, but the Labor Education people go where the plants are in Indiana and that is all over. Chuck has spent a great deal of time working in Labor Education, giving on-site credit and non-credit courses to help develop union leadership. He and I had a chance to visit the other day and I feel that he really has the pulse of what is going on in the factories in terms of all the people who aren't there.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Our next school is Physical Education and the person who will introduce the representatives from that school is someone I expect to see written up in the paper, not because of his excellent work as dean but because the Colts have lost so many quarterbacks this year that we are expecting Nick Kellum to be assigned as a back up any day.

DEAN KELLUM: If the Packers don't get me first. I would like to introduce our unit representative Jeff Vessely. Jeff is an Associate Professor of Physical Education and the director of our Department of Intramural Recreational Sports.

His teaching responsibilities are in the area of bioMechanics. He has served as a representative to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council for two years.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: The next school is Public and Environmental Affairs. I don't think Chuck Bonser or John Hunger is here but I do see one of our distinguished alumni from the Law School, Carlyn Johnson.

CARLYN JOHNSON: I am here to introduce Robert Mendelsohn, who is in Chicago presenting a paper today. His field is political science and his interest is in criminal justice where he does most of his teaching. You may have seen him recently on television and in the newspapers. He also is president of a newly-formed consumer group concerned with liability insurance. He and another member of our faculty, Terry Baumer, are recent recipients of a \$200,000+ grant from the National Institute of Justice to do an evaluation of the study of electronic monitoring of non-violent, convicted felons. This is a program that involves putting an electronic monitor device around wrists or ankles and keep track of such persons by computers and telephones.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: The next members come from the University Library and Barbara Fischler is here to introduce them.

BARBARA FISCHLER: We have two representatives on the Council. Our unit representative is Maudine Williams, Associate Librarian and head of the Herron School of Art Library. She also serves on the Faculty Council Library Affairs Committee as Secretary. Maudine was elected this last year as president of the Mid-State Chapter of the Art and Library Association in North America.

The other representative is Jean Gnat who is an elected at-large representative of this body. Jean has served on the Executive Committee for several years as well as the Budgetary Affairs Committee and the Constitution and Bylaws Committee. We elected her to the University Faculty Council this past year. Jean has enough to do within the University as head of the Science and Engineering library, but the librarians in the state of Indiana managed to elect her President of their organization this past year.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Thank you, Barbara. Next is the School of Business, with Georgia Miller representing the school.

GEORGIA MILLER: I am representing Dean Wentworth and our representative Harvey Hegarty. They regretted that they could not be here because they are visiting some alumni in Chicago. Our representative is also not here today, but I will tell you a little bit about her. Karen Becker is a professor of management and is a relative newcomer. She has been here for two years, but in that time has become very active in both the school and the community. She teaches management in the undergraduate and graduate programs. She is not here because she was already scheduled to teach a class in Bloomington on Thursday afternoons before she became a member of this group. She is looking forward to participating actively with you in January.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Our next school is Social Work. Dean Sheldon Siegel is here to make the introductions.

DEAN SIEGEL: Before introducing our unit representative I would like to introduce to you the school's new Associate Dean. She comes to us from West Virginia University where she was a professor of Social Work and the Coordinator of their West Virginia School of Social Work - Charleston Center. She has a Ph.D. from Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland. Her research interests will probably relate to some of SPEA's interest. It is my pleasure to introduce Creasie Hairston.

Our two unit representatives are the two Jerry Powers. The first Jerry Powers is a man around the state. You may have seen him in Danville, Richmond, Zionsville, or other small towns. The second Jerry Powers is soft spoken but articulate. He is interested in three patterns. He has taught at IUPUI for 10 years. He teaches in research and has served very ably for a year and one-half as the Acting Dean of the School of Social Work. One of the problems that we have is that sometimes the first Jerry Powers and the second Jerry Powers get confused and we find him running around the halls of the Education/Social Work Building running either a 10K or the Marathon. Jerry has been very active on the Faculty Council. He is a member of the Executive Committee and has served as well on Faculty Affairs, Metropolitan Affairs and this year is a member of the Library Development Committee.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Thanks, Sheldon. Next is the Herron School of Art. Dean Bill Voos is here.

DEAN VOOS: I am happy to introduce Mark Richardson who is professor of ceramics. Mark is now in his seventh year and serves on the Budgetary Affairs Committee. At Herron he is a former president of faculty and currently has difficult job of being the chairman of our ad hoc Curriculum Committee. Many of you, by the time you reach Mark's age, have stopped playing with mud pies. Mark continued to play and he continues to create with these materials. Seriously, he creates some tremendous works of ceramic art. I hope you get a chance to see some of the work that he creates in exhibits and I hope some of you will get a chance to own some of his work.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Our next school is Education. Hugh Wolf will introduce the faculty from Education.

DEAN WOLF: I am pleased to have you meet two of our faculty. First our unit representative, Jacqueline Blackwell. Jackie is professor of early childhood education. She is active here on campus with the Day Care Center. In fact, she was successful in gaining a grant in the amount of about \$50,000 to buy much needed equipment for that facility, which is located in the Mary Cable Building. Jacqueline serves on the Nominating Committee of this group, and is currently serving as a Scholar in Residence in the Lawrence Township schools. If the idea of being a Scholar in Residence in the local school system is intriguing to any of you, I would suggest that you talk to Jacqueline because she would be more than happy to tell you all of the exciting things that happen to her when she goes to the third grade classroom at Lawrence Township.

We also have our at-large representative Ed Robbins. Ed is Professor of Language Education; reading is his particular area. Ed just finished a three-year stint as Director of Undergraduate Studies in the School of Education. He also directs the Center for Measurement and Evaluation Reading Education. Ed is a member of our Tenure Committee of the Faculty Council. He

is well known, I suspect, to most of you because he served as your Secretary on one occasion. Thank you.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Thanks, Hugh. It is a pleasure to introduce the next person. A person I have had the pleasure of working very closely with the last five years. He is the new Acting Dean of the School of Law, Jeff Grove.

DEAN GROVE: Thank you, Jerry. I am happy to introduce to the Council our unit representative Bill Hodes. Bill is a tenured professor of law, who has been here since 1979. He did his undergraduate work at Harvard College and has a law degree from Rutgers Law School. Before coming to us, he worked as a Bigelow Fellow at the University of Chicago Law School. He is a member of the Bar of the states of Louisiana and New Jersey and has practiced law in New Orleans and New York. His areas of specialty are civil procedure, constitutional law, and professional responsibility. Bill is emerging as one of the best known young scholars in our business. I can say "young" because I think Bill and I are the same age. Recently he co-authored a book with Jeffery Hazzard of the Yale Law School, which has been very very well received.

Perhaps I should also introduce Henry Karlson although it may be presumptuous for me to do so since he is already well known to most people here as the Parliamentarian of the Council. Let me just acknowledge Henry as one of our valued colleagues.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Next is the School of Engineering & Technology. (Kent Sharp made the introductions.)

PROF. SHARP: Our representatives are Linda Brothers, Kenneth Dunipace, Clifford Goodwin, Anita Proffitt, myself, and Judith Silence.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Next is the School of Science. Marshall Yovits will make the introductions.

DEAN YOVITS: Thank you. I am delighted to introduce our various representatives and some of the individuals who have agreed to sit in for our representatives simply because they had classes at this time.

I will do this alphabetically rather than by either unit or at-large. Our first representative is Roko Aliprantis. Unfortunately, Roko has a class at this time. I did ask everyone to provide me with a few well chosen words which I would say about them. Roko insisted that I say the following. Roko says, "I look forward to seeing IUPUI become a first-rate university. We should always look to advance our graduate programs and in general to pursue excellence in our educational programs." Roko is a well known mathematician on our staff. Lately, he has been doing work jointly with various faculty in the department of economics in mathematical economics. However, since he is teaching at this time, he has asked Bart Ng to replace him for this semester. Bart is chairman of the department of mathematics. He himself is an applied mathematician. He is an airplane enthusiast who owns an old airplane which he likes to fly on weekends.

As an at-large representative, we have Elaine Alton who also is teaching at this time. Her major interest is mathematics education at all levels. She works very closely with the Indianapolis Public Schools and frequently gets

invited to give talks and workshops about mathematics education. Replacing her is Jerry Kaplan, a physicist. He has very wide sense of interest both in applied physics and medical physics. He works primarily, however, in medical physics and biophysics and has a national reputation in these areas.

The next person I have the pleasure of introducing is Jerry Kaminker from our department of mathematics, a unit representative. Jerry is interested in C Star Algebra and has a world wide reputation on much of the research which he has done in C Star Algebra.

Our next unit representative is Andre DeKorvin who is acting chairman of the department of computer and information science. Andre tells me that his outside interests are poetry and fiction. He has an enormous publication record in mathematics and computer science but he also indicated that in poetry and fiction his first published work has appeared in Indiana Annual '84, a literary magazine that publishes poetry and fiction by Indiana writers. He won first prize in poetry that year. He has just completed a novel, "Stripes of the Tiger in the Winter Sky."

As an at-large representative, Joe Kuczkowski who is a mathematician, primarily interested in mathematics education, but his full-time job at this time is as assistant dean in the school of science primarily concerned with students. Joe has been with the university 20 years now. He has served the Faculty Council on a variety of committees. In particular he has previously chaired and has been a member of the fringe benefits committee since it was established.

Our next at-large representative is Barnett Morris, affectionately known as Bernie. Bernie is a psychologist and, among other things, he is a member of the Red Cross Disaster Service. He is also very active as a ham radio operator.

I am pleased to introduce as a unit representative Dick Pflanzner. Dick is an associate professor of biology primarily interested in physiology. He is on the following committees: Tenure Committee, Student Affairs Committee, and the Parking Advisory Committee. This will be his seventh year of service as a Faculty Council member. He is interested in model railroading, hunting, fishing, and oil painting.

Our final introduction is our at-large representative Kathryn Wilson. I am sure Kathryn needs no introduction. Kathryn is a very active and well thought of botanist in the department of biology. Last year she was good enough to take on the responsibility of being acting chairperson of the department of biology. She knows better than anyone else that it is a thankless job. Thanks.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Thank you, Marshall. Next we have the School of Liberal Arts. Dean Bill Plater will make the introductions.

DEAN PLATER: Thank you. First I would like to observe how informative and useful the meetings are. I picked up a lot of things I could use, like the electronic monitoring devices. I also am especially interested in the concept of making the pleadings conform to the truth.

The School of Liberal Arts is represented by 10 members of our faculty. I think most of them are here today. Our delegation can be introduced first with two philosophers which is appropriate given the expertise they can bring to the Faculty Council. Michael Burke is an expert in the area of philosophical problems. Michael is developing quite a national reputation through his publications in quite a few journals in the last few years. He has also developed an innovative, first, entirely computer-based course in elementary symbolic logic. It is a free standing course that has grown from, I think the first time it was offered, 9 students to something like 75 in its most recent offering.

Ed Byrne is also a philosopher and is the chairman of the department. He has been on the faculty for many years and works in the area of technology and its effects on work and society and also on the philosophy of work. Ed is a poet of long standing and has a number of published works. He is working on a collection of poems right now that hopefully will be published this year called "Machines and Our Gardens," which brings together both his philosophical interest and his political interest.

The third member of our delegation is Robert J. Kirk from the department of economics. Bob is known for his work in urban economics and regional business analysis. In addition to the many reports that you may read by Bob in the Indianapolis Business Journal, I think his primary job is to keep Morton Marcus in line when the School of Business goes out on its annual Business Outlook Panels which travel all over the state. Bob has made a contribution to that group for many years.

Next in our group is Miriam Langsam. Miriam also needs no introduction in this assembly, having also served as your Secretary and in many other capacities. I am pleased to inform you that she has added a new responsibility to her long list this year. She is serving as the associate dean of student affairs in the School of Liberal Arts. We are just delighted that she is willing to take on that responsibility in addition to being a professor of history and the director of the campus Honors Program. Miriam, as you know, has had a long standing commitment to young people and to the way in which they can relate to the University. She has developed the Young Scholars Program and SPAN Program and is now working on the statewide program for gifted and talented. It is by no coincidence the Smithsonian Magazine discovered that Miriam has this interest and found out that she is quite an expert on the subject of orphan trends which many of you probably didn't even know existed. In the 19th century it was common for orphaned children in eastern cities to be sent out to the great Midwest and beyond in a, perhaps humane and perhaps inhumane, way. In any event, I am sure that Miriam's researches in those areas led her to look for more humane ways of serving our young people.

The next member of the Liberal Arts contingent is Monroe Little who is a member of the Executive Committee of the Council. He is a professor of history and directs the Afro American Studies Program. Monroe has been doing research and has completed a book manuscript on black higher education in the United States and is moving on to another topic having to do with social justice - civil rights in particular. Monroe also has been very active in bringing together the resources of the University and to collaborate in joint projects with the community. One of these will be an exciting program, an interactive satellite link interview with Alice Walker, author of the book, "The Color Purple," which

we hope will be broadcast on cable television in the Indianapolis region.

Paul Nagy is another member of the Council. Paul has just returned from two years in Hungary, where he was the first occupant of the Salvo Professorship of American Studies in Budapest. Paul intends to use his experience in Hungary the past two years and a prior sojourn in Warsaw to develop new programs leading to the study of American Studies from the international perspective.

Tony Sherrill is another member of this Council. Unlike many others here who apparently are runners, Tony is well known for his tennis. Tony chairs the Department of Religious Studies and is a highly regarded authority in literature and religion. I think aside from Tony's well known research interest, we are particularly proud that he was the 1986 winner of the Indiana University systemwide University Amoco Teaching Award for Outstanding Excellence. It is a pleasure to have a faculty member like Tony who can be both an outstanding scholar and a recognized excellent teacher.

It is appropriate that he be followed by Susan Sutton, who is here. Susan, chairs the department of anthropology. She is particularly interested in migration studies and in Greece, where she has been doing field research for the past several summers. She was able to field test our first portable computer. She tells us that it works very well. Susan is also interested in volunteer associations. I believe she is working on a project now to study volunteer associations in the third world. I said it was appropriate that she followed Tony because Susan was the 1985 Amoco Foundation award winner for teaching excellence.

She is followed by Dorothy Webb. Dorothy is well known to most of you in a variety of capacities, primarily, perhaps through the University Theatre. She has been very active in the work of this body. Dorothy has particular expertise in the area of childrens theatre. Three years ago, she launched the National Children's Play Writing contest with the help of Bob Keeshan, Captain Kangaroo. We are pleased to say that Dorothy is willing, based on that success, to continue the playwriting contest and again has a contest under way this year, with a production scheduled for late spring. I hope all of you will make an effort to see some of the results of her fine work. Again, I am particularly pleased to say that not only does Dorothy have an outstanding record in research and service to the University and community, but she was the 1984 winner Amoco Outstanding Award for Teaching Excellence.

The last person who is a member of the Liberal Arts delegation is Charles Winslow. He is Assistant Professor of Political Science and studies faculty assemblies, though not this one. Charles has been very active in the faculty affairs in the School of Liberal Arts, with a particular interest in students and serving students better.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: That you, Bill. Next is the School of Nursing and Dean Betty Grossman will make the introductions.

DEAN GROSSMAN: I am pleased to introduce the first member who is an at-large member Dr. Patricia Blake. She has been with the University since 1970. This is her sixth term on the Faculty Council. She is associate professor, whose clinical area is pediatric nursing. She is also Assistant Dean and doing a marvelous job of leadership in the implementation of a new curriculum in the

baccalaureate program. She is a member of the IUPUI Faculty Affairs Committee and the Tenure Committee and in the past has been part of the Executive Committee, Faculty Board of Review, and Fringe Benefits Committee. She was elected to the IUPUI Faculty Council in the past. She also has extracurricular activities involved in traveling, boating, and reading.

Anne Belcher is also in pediatric nursing certified and is an Assistant Professor in the Baccalaureate Program. She is a unit representative and is a member of the Faculty Relations Committee. Her extracurricular activities involve jogging, antiquing, touring Civil War battlefields with her husband, and IU sports.

Dr. Rebecca Markel is also a unit representative. She has been with the University since 1968 and is Associate Professor. Her area is also pediatric nursing. She is Chairman of the IUPUI Nominating Committee, Chairman of the IUPUI Faculty Board of Review, member of the IUPUI Metropolitan Affairs Committee, and a member of the IUPUI Calendar Committee. She is active professionally in many organizations, but especially the honorary in nursing Sigma Theta Tau International, where she is an officer and is involved in establishing chapters throughout the country. She also is a very avid IU sports fan. She is also a member of the Woodburn Guild and a volunteer for the Pam American Games.

Another unit representative, Dr. Beverly Flynn, is professor and chairperson of the Department of Community Health Nursing in our Graduate Program. Professionally, she has many international linkages with nursing and health organizations throughout the world -- Australia, Canada, the West Bank, and Israel, to name a few.

The last faculty member is an at-large member, Ngoan Van Hoang, who is teaching. This is one of our clinical teaching days. Van is an Assistant Professor of the Baccalaureate Program in the School of Nursing. His extracurricular activities include being a member of the American Assembly for Men in Nursing and serving in local politics as a precinct committeeman.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Thanks, Betty. Our next school is Dentistry. Bill Gilmore will make the introductions.

DEAN GILMORE: Thank you, Vice President Bepko. In the hobby area, I don't think anyone on the faculty of the School of Dentistry is a poet, but we have a lot of philosophers wanting to promote a new policy. By seniority, I would like to introduce Dr. Varoujan Chalian, who is professor and chairman of the Maxilloprosthetics area. He is a member of the Executive Committee of the Council and has served for many years. If you are unhappy with any part of you from the neck up, size, shape or color, he can make you another one. His textbook is one of the few in the world and it results in the highest sale in his cooperation with a number of medical departments. He is one of the few maxillofacial prosthodontists in the world.

Next we have Professor Jeri Francis. You knew her as Jeri Gruner. She is our television star. She is in administration and teaching in dental assisting and appears on the IHETS network to teach expanded duties in the dental assisting and dental hygiene areas.

Another senior member is Dr. Glen Sagraves who is professor of oral diagnosis and is active in curriculum development. He is helping us finish a huge computer project in our clinical program. We are very happy that he serves here. He is a member of many scholarly organizations in Dentistry.

Our last by alphabet is someone you know, Dr. Susan Zunt. She was trained as a dentist at Case Western Reserve and received her oral pathology graduate training program here. She is a unique scholar and teacher in that she teaches the pre-doctoral students and the auxilliary students but also works with the Pathology Department in the Medical School in teaching General Pathology. We are proud that all of you elected her the Secretary of the Council in that her department chairman of the department didn't realize how much time the new assignment was going to take, but he is proud of her also.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Thanks, Bill. Finally, last but certainly not least, is the School of Medicine. Dr. James Carter, Associate Dean for Student Affairs, will make the introductions.

DEAN CARTER: Thank you, Vice President Bepko. It is a pleasure to introduce the members from the School of Medicine to you. When I introduce them, I will mention to you the department which the member is from. My remarks otherwise will be brief for time. I hope that by the brevity of my remarks you will not feel that that reflects on the very distinguished careers which all of our members have and are contributing to our school. I am not sure who is here and who is not here, so I would ask those that are here to stand momentarily as I introduce them.

Dr. Sharon P. Andreoli is an Assistant Professor from the department of Pediatrics.

Dr. John C. Baenziger is an Assistant Professor from the department of Pathology.

Dr. Henry R. Besch, Jr. I think is well known to all of you. He is Chairman of the department of Pharmacology and Toxicology. He is the Showalter Professor of Pharmacology and also Professor of Medicine. With the Faculty Council, he is on the Budgetary Affairs Committee, the Executive Committee, and a representative to the University Faculty Council.

Dr. Charles E. Blevins is Chairman and Professor of Anatomy in the School of Medicine. He also serves as a representative to the University Faculty Council.

Dr. Robert A. Colyer is Associate Professor or Orthopaedic Surgery.

Dr. Joseph A. DiMicco is Associate Professor of Pharmacology and Toxicology. Dr. Besch informs me that today is Dr. DiMicco's wedding anniversary.

Dr. David J. Doedens is Professor of Assistant Pharmacology and Toxicology.

Dr. James W. Edmondson is Professor of Medicine and also this year is President of the School of Medicine faculty.

Dr. Mark O. Farber is Associate Professor of Medicine.

Dr. Martin R. Farlow is Assistant Professor of Neurology.

Mary A. Feeley is Professor and Associate Director of the Medical Technology Program, Division of Allied Health Sciences.

Dr. Melvin R. Glick is Associate Professor of Pathology.

Dr. Edwin T. Harper is Associate Professor of Biochemistry.

Dr. Robert A. Harris is Associate Chairman and Professor of Biochemistry.

Dr. Eugene M. Helveston is Professor of Ophthalmology.

Emily M. Hernandez is Assistant Professor and Director Radiologic Sciences, Division of Allied Health Sciences.

Dr. Meredith T. Hull is Associate Professor of Pathology.

Linda M. Kasper is Associate Professor of Medical Technology, Division of Allied Health Sciences.

Suetta Kehrein is Assistant Professor of Radiologic Sciences, Division of Allied Health Sciences.

Judith E. Kosegi is Assistant Professor or Radiologic Sciences, Division of Allied Health Sciences.

Dr. James A. McAteer is Associate Professor, Department of Anatomy.

Dr. Judy Z. Miller is Assistant Professor of Medicine and in the Department of Medical Genetics also.

Dr. Michael E. Mitchell is Associate Professor of Urology.

Dr. Catherine G. Palmer is Assistant Dean for Graduate Studies and Professor of Medical Genetics, School of Medicine.

Dr. John E. Pless is Professor of Pathology.

Terry E. Reed is Associate Professor of Medical Genetics. Dr. Reed is a member of the Athletics Affairs Committee of this Council.

Dr. Kenneth W. Ryder, Jr. is Associate Professor of Pathology. Dr. Ryder is also a member of the Athletic Affairs Committee and the Fringe Benefits Committee of this Council.

Dr. John F. Schmedtje is Associate Professor of Anatomy.

Dr. Ernest E. Smith is Assistant Professor of Pediatrics.

Dr. Robert B. Stonehill is Professor of Medicine, School of Medicine.

Dr. Vernon A. Vix is Professor of Radiology and Professor of Medicine.

Dr. Kathleen A. Warfel is Associate Professor of Pathology.

Dr. Henry N. Wellman is Professor of Radiology and Professor of Medicine.

Dr. Pao-lo Yu is Professor of Medical Genetics.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Thank you, Dean Carter. In fairness to the School of Medicine and to give an opportunity to highlight some of the distinguished careers of members of the Faculty Council, maybe we should put the School of Medicine first next year. That will be taken up by the appropriate Faculty Council committee.

AGENDA ITEM VI

New Business

We have one item left on the agenda and that is New Business. Is there any new business. (none) I would like to mention that there is a reception out in the lounge. You will see it if you walk out the door and turn right.

AGENDA ITEM VII

Adjournment

If there is no other business, then we are adjourned.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY

at

INDIANAPOLIS

Minutes of the Faculty Council Meeting

November 6, 1986
Law School, Room 116
3:30 p.m. - 5:30 p.m.

Members Present: Administration: Vice President Gerald L. Bepko, Executive Dean Howard Schaller, Dean Patricia Boaz. Deans: Elizabeth Grossman, Jeffrey Grove, P. Nicholas Kellum, William M. Plater, Sheldon Siegel, William J. Voos. Faculty: Anne Belcher, H. R. Besch, Jr., Patricia Blake, Charles Blevins, Edmund Byrne, Andre DeKorvin, David Doedens, Kenneth Dunipace, Charles Ellinger, Martin Farlow, Mary Feeley, Beverly Flynn, Jeri Francis, Melvin Glick, Jean Gnat, Emily Hernandez, Ngoan Van Hoang, William Hodes, Jerome Kaminker, Henry Karlson, Linda Kasper, Robert J. Kirk, Judith Kosegi, Joseph Kuczkowski, Miriam Langsam, Rebecca Markel, James McAteer, Robert Mendelsohn, Judy Miller, John Pless, Shirley Quate, Terry Reed, Edward Robbins, Glen Sagraves, P. Kent Sharp, Judith Silence, Ernest E. Smith, Robert Stonehill, Susan Sutton, Jeffery Vessely, Vernon Vix, Dorothy Webb, Maudine Williams, Kathryn Wilson, Pao-Lo Yu, Susan Zunt.

Alternates Present: Deans: John Hunger for Charles Bonser; Fred Ficklin for Walter J. Daly; Edward Starkey for Barbara Fischler; James Roche for H. William Gilmore; Hugh A. Wolf for Howard Mehlinger; Christine Fitzpatrick for R. Bruce Renda; Scott Evenbeck for James E. Weigand; Harv Hegarty for Jack R. Wentworth. Faculty: Bart Ng for Roko Aliprantis; Jerome Kaplan for Elaine Alton; John Fleming for Joseph DiMicco; Chris Wiese for Richard Pflanzler; Hee-Mung Park, M.D. for Henry Wellman.

Members Absent: Deans: Trevor Brown, Marshall Yovits. Faculty: Sharon Andreoli, John Baenziger, Karen Becker, Jacqueline Blackwell, Linda Brothers, Michael Burke, Varoujan Chalian, Robert Colyer, James Edmondson, Mark Farber, Clifford Goodwin, Linda Haas, Edwin T. Harper, Robert Harris, Eugene Helveston, Meredith Hull, Suetta Kehrein, Monroe Little, Michael E. Mitchell, Barnett B. Morris, Paul Nagy, Catherine Palmer, Gerald Powers, Anita Proffitt, Mark Richardson, Kenneth Ryder, John Schmedtje, Rowland Sherrill, Kathleen Warfel, Charles Winslow.

Ex-Officio Student Members Present: Martin Dragonette, Kathy Shlimgen

AGENDA ITEM I

Approval of the Minutes of October 2, 1986

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: The first item of business is approval of the minutes of the October 2nd meeting. Do we have a motion for the approval of those minutes? (So moved) Do we have a second? (Seconded). All in favor, say "Aye". Are there any opposed? [Note: There was one correction in the minutes

of the October 2 meeting:] Page 15, paragraph 2 should read as follows:

Our two unit representatives are the two Jerry Powers. The first Jerry Powers is a man around the state. You may have seen him in Danville, Richmond, Zionsville, or other small towns running 5K races. The second Jerry Powers is soft spoken but articulate. He has taught at IUPUI for 10 years. He teaches in research and has served very ably for a year and one-half as the Acting Dean of the School of Social Work. One of the problems that we have is that sometimes the first Jerry Powers and the second Jerry Powers get confused and we find him running around the halls of the Education/Social Work Building running either a 10K or the Marathon. Jerry has been very active on the Faculty Council. He is a member of the Executive Committee and has served as well on the Faculty Affairs Committee, Metropolitan Affairs Committee, and this year is a member of the Library Development Committee.

The minutes were approved with this correction.

AGENDA ITEM II

Presiding Officer's Business - Vice President Bepko

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: I have two very brief items of business. First, an announcement for your information. There has been a Search & Screen Committee established for the deanship of the Law School. The search is under way for a permanent dean. The Chair of the committee is Professor Debra Falendar from the Law School.

Secondly, as I reported at the last meeting, the outgrowth of the Commission for Higher Education's adoption in principle of a mission statement for IUPUI was a request that the campus file a development plan covering the next ten years, beginning with the 1987-89 biennium. I want to report to you that we are in the process of preparing a development plan. Because of the limited time involved, we have taken the documents that are already on file in campus administration and merged those documents, all of which have some planning components in them. The merger of those documents is the preliminary discussion draft of the development plan. That draft will be distributed for discussion to the Faculty Council and all the academic units in the near future. We would like to have your comments on it. We will; however, have to make the discussion draft available to the Commission along the way because we are under severe time constraints in terms of the approval process and the recommendation process for the 1987-89 biennium budgets. The Commission has told us they want to see a draft of this development plan before they make their recommendations on the 1987-89 operating and capital requests submitted by Indiana University. Given these time problems, we are going to do this in a way that is different from what we would have done it otherwise. There will be ample time for discussion and input as this document matures. If there are any questions about it, I will be happy to answer them. We will keep you posted and I will have a full report, I hope, at the December Faculty Council meeting.

PROF. ROBBINS: I have a question about the faculty input. Is that for us individually, or do you anticipate there would be some discussion of the draft document by the Faculty Council?

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: I think both, but I think a Faculty Council committee may be involved too. We anticipate a great deal of discussion. We will adopt whatever form seems, appropriate including these sessions of the Faculty Council, through the academic unit, and perhaps, depending on the decision of your Secretary of the Executive Committee, perhaps then a committee of the Faculty Council.

AGENDA ITEM III

Executive Committee Report - Susan L. Zunt, Secretary

PROF. ZUNT: You may remember that in our last meeting there was some discussion about the difficulty in getting to the campus when there are civic programs, sports events, and marathons. These can present problems in parking. The Executive Committee met on October 16 with IUPUI Police Chief John Mulvey and John Gilbert, who is the Assistant Director of Parking and Transportation Services. They were very gracious and spent a generous amount of time with us in discussing some of the problems that they had. They agreed that this was an issue that needed to be addressed. You probably have noticed that there has been quite a bit of publicity about the marathon that will involve this campus this Saturday. There has been detailed information published in our minutes, the Sagamore, and in the Green Sheet. The campus police will be helping people. One open lane will be maintained wherever possible, and the campus police will be helping to direct faculty and staff, if necessary. There shouldn't be a major problem with this event, which is the last of the semester. Chief Mulvey is working with the people at the Natatorium and other sports areas of the University to develop a route that will eliminate access problems in the future. Essentially, what they will be doing is saying, "If you want to use our facilities such as the track, we need to have you start here and you can finish at the track." This will help to eliminate some problems.

One thing that Chief Mulvey and Assistant Director Gilbert said would be helpful is if faculty would fill out Special Events Forms when they are having an event. I brought some forms with me today. If you have an event, a number of offices will be notified and they will be sure that there is adequate parking and the police will be alerted to provide access. Evidently, some of the problems that we have had have resulted from the police and parking people not knowing to expect people. I have some of the forms here in the front. If you need some, please help yourself. They are also working with the Faculty Council to keep us informed, so, we will have fewer problems with parking on campus in the future.

In February of 1986 Dean Schaller appointed a committee to review the academic policies and procedures as they applied to IUPUI faculty based at Columbus. Professor John Barlow from Liberal Arts was the Chair. On September 10, the committee made a report that included recommendations. The recommendations do not require IUPUI Faculty Council action because they do not require changes in any of the basic conditions that surround our faculty status at IUPUI. Dean Schaller did ask that your Executive Committee review the recommendations for comments. The Executive Committee considered this at two meetings and the consensus was to support the document. We did not suggest any change. We were only concerned about representation of IUPUI faculty from the Columbus campus in this body. These people are counted in their units, but it is very rare that they actually are appointed or elected to serve in this body. Therefore,

the Executive Committee suggested in our response to Dean Schaller that it might be helpful to extend to the Columbus faculty an invitation to select an ongoing representative and alternate to the IUPUI Faculty Council. This would facilitate communication and strengthen the relationship between our two campuses. That is just for your information.

The Executive Committee received a proposal from Dean Langsam and Dean Schaller concerning undergraduate research opportunities at IUPUI. The document has been reviewed by the Executive Committee and forwarded to the Academic Affairs Committee for their information and response, if there is any. Dean Langsam will be present at our January 8th Faculty Council meeting at which time she will make a detailed presentation of this new opportunities for the undergraduate students to have some sponsored research.

The Ad Hoc Committee of Faculty Deliberations, chaired by Professor Robbins, had its first meeting. As they were directed by this body, they are looking at a number of problems, including committee membership and attendance and assignment of issues to committees. If you have comments or questions, please direct these to Professor Robbins. They probably will need four or five meetings to look through that.

Dr. Robbins, would you like to add anything to that?

PROF. ROBBINS: We are on a course now of meeting every other week. We would appreciate any comments or concerns that people might have.

PROF. ZUNT: Dr. Zacharie Brahmi has agreed to be our representative to the IUPUI Affirmative Action Advisory Council. We appreciate his taking on that responsibility.

The next thing I want to bring you up to date on are the standing committee activities.

The Budgetary Affairs Committee has met, and they are meeting with the administration. They seem to be well organized and making normal progress for this time of the year.

The Faculty Affairs Committee has had several meetings this semester and, as you know, reported to you last month that they would be making a report concerning the Indiana University School of Medicine Non-tenure Faculty Proposal. They have finished their deliberations but, at the time we submitted the agenda two weeks ago, their deliberations were not completed. The Chair, Byron Olson, will be bringing this response to you at the beginning of December. I was concerned that there would be some urgency about this because this had been sent initially to the University Faculty Council; but, as you know, you have received your agenda for the November 11 UFC meeting and this proposal is not on the agenda. I think the report and discussion by this body, if any, will take place at our December meeting. I am tentatively considering republishing that proposal to facilitate discussion.

The Library Affairs Committee has met. At their meeting, Director Barbara Fischler made a presentation concerning the Library Planning Committee. Director Fischler will be coming before this body, I believe, in December to talk about the plan of the Library Planning Committee. I should tell you that

there are a few units who do not have direct representation on this committee, but people in the the School of Medicine and the School of Nursing can have their comments and concerns directed toward Dana McDonald. Marie Sparks is the representative for the School of Dentistry. For Herron School of Art it will be Maudine Williams. Even though they are not directly on this Library Planning Committee, these people will make sure that your comments and concerns get to Director Fischler.

The other standing committees may have met very recently or may be planning to meet in the near future. One issue that I might point out to you that is going to be considered in our Fringe Benefits Committee is the Phased Early Retirement Program. It came from the Bloomington Council directly to UFC. This will be discussed at the UFC meeting on November 11. If you have any comments or concerns about that issue, you might want to talk to our UFC representatives directly.

Last month the Hoosier Travel Service had a reception for IUPUI faculty. For some reason or another it was very poorly attended. I don't know whether it was because of weather, the time of day, or what, but it was a very nice reception. I did attend. I thought I was representing all of you but, as it turned out, the reception was for all of you. Since there was such a low turnout, I suggested that perhaps they might be able to reach all of you by giving me some materials to bring to you. There are some cards on the table as well as a paper for a free mug. I have brought a sample to show you. It has their phone number on it as well as a picture of Monument Circle. If you will take this paper and present it to them, they will be happy to give you a free mug. They are eager to get to know you and to be able to facilitate your business.

The last item that I need to mention is that the Trustees' meeting tomorrow is in Kokomo. I will be present at their meeting of the Faculty Relations Committee to represent you. On December 6, we host the Faculty Relations Committee of the Board of Trustees on this campus. I think that I have reported to you before that we do have a program scheduled. The representatives from the School of Nursing, School of Dentistry, and the School of Liberal Arts (concentrating on the Honors Program) will present a program at the December meeting. They will be meeting at 8:30 a.m. on December 6 in the Business/Spec Building. I do not have a room number as yet. You are all welcome to attend. I hope that you will be thinking about items of business issues or program for the April meeting with the Trustees. We have nothing on our schedule at this time for that meeting.

I wrote to President Stoner again, asking if the Board of Trustees had made any decision about possibly scheduling their 1987 Summer Seminar here in Indianapolis. I have not had a response to either letter.

This completes my report.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Thank you, Susan. Are there any questions or comments?

AGENDA ITEM IV

Nominating Committee Report - Rebecca Markel, Chair, IUPUI Nominating Committee

The next item on the agenda is a report from the Nominating Committee, Rebecca Markel.

PROF. MARKEL: Thank you, Vice President Bepko. The structure for our process in electing at-large representatives is in the Bylaws Article II, Section B. Two elections are required to choose at-large representatives to the IUPUI Faculty Council. The first is for nominating candidates for these available at-large representative positions, and a second to elect the at-large representatives from that nominated group.

For the first ballot, the slate of candidates consists of all eligible voting faculty members of IUPUI. In the subsequent voting, at-large representatives will be elected, from a slate resulting from the popular vote in the first election.

In the first election, each voting member of the IUPUI faculty will vote for up to three for nomination. The ballots will be in the mail to you. Some of you may have received them already. They will be returned to the Faculty Council Office by December 8. I will then present them to the Executive Committee on December 18.

That concludes my report.

AGENDA ITEM V
New Business

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Thank you. We are about to set a record for this campus. Is there any new business?

PROF. KAPLAN: I have noticed downtown, that as buildings go up there are signs up saying what each building is all about. On this campus there is a very large building going up on Michigan Street and there is no sign to say what the building is. One can interpret this in many ways. One possibility is the reluctance on the part of the people to put a name on the building now because of a conflict with the students. If this not so, then I would like to see a sign put up telling the people in the city what is going on on campus.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: I think that Dean Schaller is correct in pointing out that one of the buildings is being constructed and developed by a private developer so we don't have the same opportunity for designating that building as we might for the other building which is a university building. As for the university building, I think it is perhaps true, although I can't be sure of this because I am not privy to their discussions on this subject, but it may true that there has been some delay in announcing the official name of that building because of the concerns that have been expressed by various groups including students. I think the Trustees are probably going to take special care to develop a name that will be satisfactory, if not pleasing, to everyone. They are working hard on it right now. We are trying to contribute to that process.

DEAN SCHALLER: We had some discussions last summer with the hotel people. We perhaps intimidated them a little too much telling them that we didn't want a lot of golden arches and flashing neon signs in the middle of the campus. We were trying to establish a signage policy. It could be that, as a result of all of that, they have been reluctant to put signs out there. Maybe we can discuss it with them and see if they want to put a sign there. I think you can

appreciate, the University has reserved some rights about the kinds of signs that will be on that hotel. We could ask them or inquire from them if they would like to put a sign up saying that that is going to be the hotel. There is a sign there that says University Conference Center. That is the name of the project and not the name of the building. I don't know what the name of the building is finally going to be.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: I do know that the Trustees are sensitive to the various concerns. I think they will take them into account in finally naming the building. For those who may not know, the Trustees at their September meeting named the block on which both the hotel and conference center are located "University Place", so the address of the hotel will be Lincoln Hotel at University Place. Is there any other business?

PROF. BYRNE: Assuming the question is not new business, I believe the question should be directed to the presiding officer. It has to do with the recent tax reform legislation. Is there any plan that you know of to delay the December check to January 1st in order to take advantage of the lower tax rates?

DEAN SCHALLER: Ed, you do receive your December check on January 1. Remember, we changed that a couple of years ago. It was changed so that everybody would get a one-time advantage on the tax because for that tax year, you only had to report on 11 months. You will get a check dated January 1 although, since that is a holiday, you will receive it the next day.

PROF. QUATE: When is the check dated? Is it dated December 31 or January 1?

DEAN SCHALLER: It is dated January.

AGENDA ITEM VI
Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.



INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY

at

INDIANAPOLIS

FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING

Thursday, December 4, 1986

Law School, Room 116, 3:00 - 4:00 p. m.

Members Present: Administration: Vice President Gerald L. Bepko, Executive Dean Howard Schaller, Dean Patricia Boaz. Director: Barbara Fischler. Deans: H. William Gilmore, Elizabeth M. Grossman, P. Nicholas Kellum, William M. Plater, R. Bruce Renda, Sheldon Siegel, William J. Voos, Marshall C. Yovits. Faculty: Roko Aliprantis, Sharon Andreoli, Anne Belcher, Jacqueline Blackwell, H. R. Besch, Jr., Patricia Blake, Charles Blevins, Linda Brothers, Michael Burke, Edmund Byrne, Varoujan Chalian, Robert Colyer, Andre DeKorvin, Joseph DiMicco, David Doedens, James Edmondson, Mary Feeley, Beverly Flynn, Melvin Glick, Jean Gnat, Emily Hernandez, Ngoan Van Hoang, William Hodes, Jerome Kaminker, Henry Karlson, Robert J. Kirk, Miriam Langsam, Monroe Little, Rebecca Markel, Judy Miller, Catherine Palmer, Richard Pflanzner, John Pless, Gerald Powers, Shirley Quate, Terry Reed, Mark Richardson, Edward Robbins, P. Kent Sharp, Judith Silence, Ernest E. Smith, Robert Stonehill, Jeffery Vessely, Dorothy Webb, Henry Wellman, Maudine Williams, Kathryn Wilson, Pao-Lo Yu, Susan Zunt.

Alternates Present: Deans: John M. Hunger for Charles Bonser; James Carter for Walter J. Daly; G. Kent Frandsen for Jeffery Grove, Hugh Wolf for Howard Mehlinger; Scott Evenbeck for James Weigand; Georgia Miller for Jack R. Wentworth. Faculty: J. Kaplan for Elaine Alton; Harv Hegarty for Karen Becker; Bruce Long for Linda Kasper; Jan Bruckner for Judith Kosegi.

Members Absent: Deans: Trevor Brown. Faculty: John Baenziger, Kenneth Dunipace, Charles Ellinger, Mark Farber, Martin Farlow, Jeri Francis, Clifford Goodwin, Linda Haas, Edwin T. Harper, Robert Harris, Eugene Helveston, Meredith Hull, Barbara Jackson, Suetta Kehrein, Joseph Kuczkowski, James McAteer, Robert Mendelsohn, Michael E. Mitchell, Barnett B. Morris, Paul Nagy, Anita Proffitt, Kenneth Ryder, Glen Sagraves, John Schmedtje, Rowland Sherrill, Susan Sutton, Vernon Vix, Victor Wallis, Charles Winslow.

Ex-Officio Student Members Present: Kathy Schlimgen, Student Assembly; Martin Dragonette, Student Assembly.

Visitors: C. Hughes Wright, IUPUI News Bureau.

AGENDA ITEM I

Approval of the Minutes of November

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. The first item of business is the Approval of the Minutes of the November 6th meeting. Is there

a motion for the approval of these minutes? (Dean Renda moved for the approval and Professor Besch seconded.) All in favor, say "Aye". Are there any opposed? (None) The minutes are approved.

First, there is no Presiding Officer's Business at this session today because of the session that will follow. I would like to mention one thing. I have been asked questions about the Faculty Club that has been envisioned for this campus. There is a committee in existence, chaired by Dr. Wellman, which has been considering different possibilities for a Faculty Club. We don't have anything specific to report at this time other than to say that I am personally interested in trying to help create a Faculty Club. We are going to look at a number of different possibilities to try to bring one into existence next year. There is some movement on campus associated with new space in some new buildings. I don't think that we can expect the new buildings will be the site for a Faculty Club, but this movement may give us other opportunities. We will report fully to you on a subsequent occasion, and I hope that we can report that we have achieved this objective.

AGENDA ITEM II

Executive Committee Report - Susan L. Zunt, Secretary

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: The next item of business is the Executive Committee Report with Susan Zunt.

PROF. ZUNT: I have a number of items to report to you. First of all, the Bookstore has published a list of telephone numbers which should be very helpful to faculty in solving problems concerning textbook orders, special orders, and special supplies. This list will be appended to the minutes of today's meeting.

The next item concerns the notification that the Faculty Council received concerning Dean Yovits' announcing that he will be stepping down from his position of the Dean of the School of Science. We received this notification from Vice President Bepko, and a Search and Screen Committee will be appointed in January. If any of you, as members of the faculty and Faculty Council, have suggestions, please send these directly to Dean Schaller's office.

The third item concerns the nominations for individuals for the position of Dean of Student Affairs. The names of nominees should be sent, with as complete biographical information as possible, to Marcia Free in the Personnel Department in the Union Building, Room 358. It is anticipated by Sue Barrett, Chair of the Search and Screen Committee, that the search will be completed by the end of this year. Please forward these to Marcia Free as soon as possible.

Concerning the IU Board of Trustees, at the November 7th meeting which was held in Kokomo, where I was there to represent you, it was announced that the time of the Indianapolis meeting was going to be changed. The entire agenda will be held on this Friday, December 5. At the Agenda Committee Meeting in Bloomington, which was held November 21, the time for the Faculty Relations Committee was set for 11:00 a.m. to noon. This will be held in the IUPUI Business/SPEA Building, Room 3018. The agenda includes presentations by Deans Grossman and Gilmore, and Professor Miriam Langsam.

An additional Board of Trustees matter concerns an item that I reported to you earlier this semester. The Executive Committee had written to the Board of Trustees', President Stoner and suggested that they consider holding their 1987 Summer Session in Indianapolis just before the Pan Am Games. However, I have received a letter from Bob Burton, who is Secretary to the Board of Trustees, that they will be unable to do this. They will consider utilizing our new Conference Center/Lincoln Hotel at some future meeting, possibly in September or November of 1987.

I need to report to you a few items from our standing committees. Two items come from the Fringe Benefits Committee. You may remember that in February of 1986 this body passed a resolution concerning the income restrictions aspect of the 18/20 Early Retirement Rule (IUPUI Circular 85-16). This resolution recommended significant changes in the 18/20 application of this particular item for individuals who retire under the 18/20 rule and work part-time, their retirement pay plus their part-time salary cannot exceed their salaried income during the last year of employment. Earned income in excess of that amount is to be paid back to IU. The rule is not easily or fairly enforced and makes compliance voluntary. The IUPUI Fringe Benefits Committee recommended last year, (February 1986) that the rule be eliminated and the IUPUI Faculty Council agreed. It has been brought to the Executive Committee's attention again in that this was not pursued, and we need to send this resolution on to the University Faculty Council Fringe Benefits Committee. This will be done. This is a policy which will affect the entire University if enacted, and it is necessary that it have systemwide support.

You have probably received in the campus mail a survey from our Fringe Benefits Committee, done in conjunction with the Staff Council. This was a questionnaire concerning the addition of Vision Coverage to our basic health insurance coverage. The Executive Committee felt that the Faculty Council would want to support distributing this questionnaire. We understand we can't have a large number of surveys, but we did support the Staff Council on this. The Fringe Benefits Committee did not express strong feelings for or against Vision Coverage as an additional fringe benefit.

I have a few items to report from our Staff Relations Committee, which meets jointly with the Staff Council's Faculty Relations Committee. The Chair of the Faculty Relations Committee is Scott Evenbeck, and the Chair of the Staff Relations Committee is Shirley Newhouse. In October of this year that joint committee presented an excellent workshop on IUPUI: Visions for the Future. In February of 1987 they will present the results of that workshop to you.

In addition to that, the Council have received from Scott Evenbeck a request concerning the appointment of a liaison person from the Faculty Council to the Staff Council who would be required to attend Faculty Council meetings, Staff Council meetings, and all of the meetings of the joint standing committees. The Executive Committee only had a few minutes to work on this proposal at our last meeting. I think it was supported in spirit. The problem, as I see it, is that this individual would need to attend many meetings. If there is someone in this Council who has that kind of time, I would be delighted to sponsor you in this position. I suspect we won't be able to do that so, while I think we can support it in spirit and would like to do as much as possible to aid the Staff Council, it may be necessary to perhaps have someone review the minutes or something like that. We will continue working on that because I

think it is important for us to foster good relations with the Staff Council and not ignore this request which comes as a directive from our standing committee.

The Academic Affairs Committee reported that they are working on a number of items. One that they have forwarded to the Executive Committee is a proposal that the Academic Handbook be updated and revised. We are not sure yet which Academic Handbook they are talking about, whether it is the one produced in Bloomington or the one produced at IUPUI. Perhaps it is both. But, this is something that will be addressed shortly. If you have concerns, I suggest that you direct them to Kathryn Wilson, who is the Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee. Also, you can send them to me. We will be working on that in the future.

Other items that the Academic Affairs Committee are working on include deadlines from the Admissions Office, credit transfer policy (students transferring from outside the IU system), and discussion of grade inflation.

The University Faculty Council met in Bloomington on November 11. I want to report to you what occurred because our next University Faculty Council meeting is not until February. You may not get those minutes until a week or two before the meeting. You received agendas that included a proposal on university organization involving two new vice presidencies. Also on that agenda was an item on a phased early retirement program. At that meeting, the agenda was amended to include a report from the Faculty Affairs Committee. That report concerned the non-tenured faculty proposal which came from the School of Medicine. I am going to tell you a little more about that before Byron Olson gives you his report. I can say that the Faculty Affairs Committee of the University Faculty Council did not support that proposal. They will be transmitting this information to the School of Medicine.

As to the proposal for University Organization, as you probably know, there were vacancies for three vice-presidencies, and two people were nominated and approved by the Board of Trustees on November 7. The University Faculty Council sent a recommendation to the Board of Trustees and President Ryan saying that the University Faculty Council was deeply concerned by the recent decision of the Board of Trustees to create new vice presidencies of the University and to appoint two new vice presidents and that these actions make the task of the Presidential Search Committee more difficult and will unnecessarily constrain the ability of the new President to shape the administrative structure of the University. They urged President Ryan and the Board of Trustees explicitly to define all the new offices and appointments as tentative, pending the appoint of a new president. As you know, these were not tentative appointments. I have received notification from President Ryan that he intends to initiate the search process for the Vice Presidency for Academic Affairs in due course. He says, "Therefore, I will be wanting the University Faculty Council to nominate persons to appoint to a committee. In this case, I presume, that my successor will decide on a recommendation for appointment." That is where we stand at this time on the vice presidencies that have been formed and/or are vacant. It is not known whether or not tomorrow at the Board of Trustees an Acting Vice President will be appointed.

The Phased Early Retirement Program (PERP) (IUPUI Circular No. 86-12) is another issue that was covered at the last University Faculty Council meeting.

More work needs to be done on this proposal. Our Fringe Benefits Committee, chaired by Keith Moore, is working on it and he hopes to bring you this proposal for your opinions and discussion in January.

Yesterday, Mr. Rick Callahan, who is the editor of the Sagamore, called me and asked if the Faculty Council would please help in his mission in getting faculty members to submit information or articles to the Sagamore. I said that I would do that. He is interested in columns related to current events on a national or local level, but also other topics including University-related concerns. He said that the columns are due by 5:00 on the Wednesday preceding the date of publication. They should be sent to him at the Sagamore in campus mail. If you need more information, his number is 274-3455.

The last thing I would like to mention concerns our agenda for the January meeting. Miriam Langsam will be joining us to discuss funding for undergraduate research, a program which I mentioned to you at our last meeting. Dr. Keith Moore, School of Dentistry, Chairman of the Fringe Benefits Committee, will be bringing forward a report on the Early Retirement Program. Also, we will be bringing directly to you concerns by faculty about smoking at IUPUI and the possibility of developing a smoking policy. The Executive Committee felt that it would be best to have the Council as a whole involved from the beginning, before we set up an ad hoc committee or send it somewhere else. We will be doing that in January.

That concludes my report.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Thank you, Susan. I would just like to comment very briefly on two things. First, although Susan stated it correctly and carefully, I would like to state for emphasis that Dean Yovits' announced retirement is effective in June, 1988, not at the end of this academic year. But because he was thoughtful from the standpoint of the School to announce his retirement at a fairly early stage, the Search and Screen process will have a longer time to operate. It is likely that the Search and Screen Committee will be appointed during this academic year, even though Dean Yovits won't have his retirement become effective until June of 1988.

The other thing was with respect to the Academic Affairs Vice Presidency, I don't think, unless there has been some change of heart, that there will be a recommendation at the Trustees' meeting tomorrow for an acting appointment. The president at the Coordinating Committee meeting last week, asked that Vice President Gros Louis and I discuss, between the two of us, the relationship between the Academic Affairs vice presidency and the Campus vice presidencies and report back to the President so that he could discuss this with the Trustees at their retreat meeting in late January or early February. I think it is his intention to discuss it further with the Trustees before making a recommendation. I say "I think" because I am not authorized to speak for him on this issue, but he is asking for further advice on the issue before he takes any action or makes any recommendations.

ITEM III

Nominating Committee Report - Rebecca Markel, Chair

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: The next item on the agenda is a report from the Nominating Committee by Rebecca Markel.

PROF. MARKEL: Article V, Section a, b, and c defines the composition, election, and term of office for the Faculty Boards of Review. In January this IUPUI Faculty Council will, for the first time, elect three Faculty Boards of Review consisting of five members each. The Nominating Committee is pleased to present the three ballots for those boards. Seven candidates will appear on each ballot and five are to be elected. I would like to enter those into the minutes.

BOARD OF REVIEW #1 SLATE

Patricia Blake	T	Nursing	Associate Professor
Sally Bowman	T	Medicine	Associate Professor
Zacharie Brahmi	T	Medicine	Professor
Robert C. Dick	T	Liberal Arts	Professor
Adolfo Doddoli	T	Herron	Associate Professor
Monte Juillerat	T	Liberal Arts	Professor
Juanita Keck	Non-Tenure	Nursing	Assistant Professor

BOARD OF REVIEW #2 SLATE

William Bryan	T	Medicine	Associate Professor
Charlotte Carlley	T	Nursing	Associate Professor
William Crabtree	T	Medicine	Assistant Professor
Henry Karlson	T	Law	Professor
Gerald Powers	T	Social Work	Professor
J. K. Stevens	T	Liberal Arts	Associate Professor
Randi Stocker	Non-Tenure	Library	Assistant Librarian

BOARD OF REVIEW #3 SLATE

Doris Froebe	T	Nursing	Professor
Jean Gnat	T	Library	Associate Librarian
Eugene Helveston	T	Medicine	Professor
Emily Hernandez	T	Medicine/AHS	Assistant Professor
Harry W. Jarrett	Non-Tenure	Science	Assistant Professor
Bennie Keller	T	Eng/Tech	Associate Professor
Myron Weinberger	T	Medicine	Professor

The Nominating Committee wishes to sincerely thank those members of the faculty who have consented to be candidates on our Boards of Review. This concludes my report.

(Secretary's Note: Bylaw Article III, Section B, Subsection c (6): Distribute to the Faculty Council a completed list of nominees at least 7 days prior to the date on which the Council will hold an election.)

AGENDA ITEM IV

Report from Faculty Affairs Committee - Byron Olson, Chair

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: The next item is the report from the Faculty Affairs Committee. Professor Byron Olson will make that report.

PROF. ZUNT: Just to bring you up to date and remind you of the history of this proposal before Dr. Olson begins, in August the University Faculty Council and this Faculty Council received a proposal from the Medical School for the establishment of a non-tenure-track system. This would be for full-time faculty in the clinical areas. It came from the Medical School but the proposal, as you know, is written for any health school. A copy of the proposal was published last month with the minutes, and you have a copy with today's minutes (Circular 86-09) so you should have had ample time to review this proposal.

The Faculty Affairs Committee met with Dean Daly in November when he presented the need for this type of clinical faculty member. He said that the need has arisen, in part, to provide more than 500,000 out-patient and 50,000 in-patient services each year in the hospitals of Indiana University. Of the approximately 575 Medical School faculty, about 400 are involved in patient care. Dean Daly has estimated that to allow all the Medical School faculty to pursue the established tenure track involving teaching, service and research of the quantity and quality acceptable to the IU School of Medicine's Promotion and Tenure Committees would require 40 percent additional faculty. Individuals who might be interested in a non-tenure-track appointments are primarily physicians providing excellent patient care and increased preceptor type bedside teaching to medical students, interns, and residents. Income from these patient services is crucial to the IUPUI budgets; in fact, 27 percent of the IUPUI income results from the hospital system. The question arises: 'Why would professionals select a non-tenure option?' The hospital environment is stimulating and a salaried position offers some financial security and benefits. These people often have multiple offers from other health care institutions, and we need to be able to compete for them and attract them to IU to maintain the highest quality in patient care and innovation. This is, I believe, the Executive Committee's understanding of this proposal. We have worked on this for many months and now we are ready to hear the report from our Faculty Affairs Committee.

PROF. OLSON: Thank you, Vice President Bepko and Susan. Our committee met more than once on this particular proposal. As far as the proposal from the Medical School is concerned, we decided that, as written, we could not accept the proposal. Instead, we have proposed an alternate proposal to the Dean of the School of Medicine. I would like to read that proposal to you:

The School of Medicine might consider the appointment of paid full-time clinical professors to satisfy their requirements for professional educators. These clinical faculty appointments would not be eligible for tenure, sabbatical leave, or voting rights and would be handled administratively. These paid, full-time clinical appointments may have titles similar to the recognized, part-time clinical ranks, i.e., Clinical Lecturer, full-time; Assistant Clinical Professor, full-time; Associate Clinical Professor, full-time; and Clinical Professor, full-time.

The conditions of appointment should parallel those conditions for non-tenured, non-probationary instructional appointments and part-time academic appointees as published in the Indiana University Academic Handbook, 1985 edition.

We realize that the School of Medicine has a problem. We have proposed this proposal as an alternate solution. I received notification from Dean Daly that he has received a very similar proposal from Dean Schaller which he is considering also. It is my understanding that this has been presented to their committees and that they are at this particular point considering this proposal as well as Dean Schaller's.

This concludes my report.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Thank you. Are there any questions for Professor Olson?

PROF. BYRNE: For the sake of clarification, could you perhaps indicate a little more as to how your proposal is, in fact, an alternative to the proposal as it was submitted from the School of Medicine?

PROF. OLSON: The proposal, as we have presented it, can be readily inserted into the present handbook as it is written. There is already a track system in there for Clinical Professors but in a part-time role. If you change the wording of some of the diagrams that are in there to full-time, this would satisfy the requirement. As far as their fringe benefits go, with TIAA/CREF, that could be taken care of as well.

PROF. EDMONDSON: As the president of the School of Medicine faculty, I have reviewed this alternative suggestion with our deans as well as a number of committees. I think the School of Medicine finds this a satisfactory proposal that would meet our needs very well. I would like to also express my thanks to the Faculty Affairs Committee because I know they have worked very diligently on this proposal. Thank you.

DEAN GILMORE: Mr. Chairman, there was some discussion previously about this type of appointment being available to other professional schools. A later resolution report is that it is strictly for the School of Medicine, or am I misunderstanding the report? Will we, if that is so, have a chance to amend that to include other schools?

DEAN SCHALLER: The proposal that I made to Dean Daly, came after discussions of this in the Executive Committee of the IUPUI Faculty Council, re-discussions that were going on in the IUPUI Faculty Council Faculty Affairs Committee, and a suggestion made by Dean Anya Royce, Dean of Faculties in Bloomington. We have to remember that there are a number of clinical faculty in Bloomington. She, along with our committee, opposed the proposition, as written by the Medical School, but she also recognized the need for something to be done. She made a proposal somewhat similar to ours. After looking at the Academic Handbook and the existing structure that is in there, it appeared to me that it would take only a very slight alterations of the present system to accommodate much of what the Medical School wants and needs. Now there are some things in their proposal which, in affect, they would be giving up by taking this route, but I think your suggestion can meet the heart of their need. The language in the Handbook says that these ranks are available primarily for the health-care schools. There will be no tampering with the language in the Handbook other than the insertion of the term "full-time", in addition to existing part-time and volunteer positions. There and back in the Fringe Benefits section we will insert "full-time" so that these people, who would be full time employees of the University, would be entitled to participate in TIAA/CREF. I don't think

anybody can be against that because non-faculty, full-time people of certain administrative and professional ranks are entitled to participate in the retirement system. We obviously are not going to hire anybody if we can't offer them some retirement benefits. It is going to be a very simple change in the Handbook in order to accomplish this. Professor Edmondson, if I heard you correctly, you feel that this would, and I know that Dean Daly feels this would accomplish much of what the Medical School would like. There are some other things in their original proposal which, of course, they will be giving up. I have heard, incidentally from Dean Daly officially, now that he has consulted with his colleagues. He would like to go forward. So, I will now send a proposal back through the whole mechanism so it can all go back through the Faculty Council and the appropriate administrative groups.

These ranks are described both in the IUPUI Faculty Handbook and in the IU Academic Handbook. This will be a very simple alteration.

PROF. HODES: A point of information. Is it correct then to conclude that the Circular 86-09 is not, in fact, before the Faculty Council?

DEAN SCHALLER: Dean Daly's language is that he requested that consideration of it be suspended. He has not withdrawn it because obviously if this next thing doesn't get through, he has got to have something. And, I might add, he is dealing with a very difficult problem. But, he has suspended the proposal. I might say, incidentally, Professor Edmondson, referring to your generous comments about the Faculty Council which everybody appreciates, I think we also ought to appreciate the spirit in which the Medical School has received the discussion and has been willing to alter their proposal.

PROF. HODES: Other than questions about where it fits in the Handbook, how do you set up the language, etc.? What kind of arguments have been made against this proposal? In other words, what really is at stake here other than this change?

DEAN SCHALLER: One of the arguments made was that, in the first place, people didn't know that we already had a system of clinical professors and have had it for years. They thought it was something completely new. It might threaten the whole tenure system. We have had it for years and it hasn't obviously threatened the tenure system. Also, incidentally, it is in affect in something like 60 percent of the accredited medical schools and hasn't threatened anybody's tenure system.

I think we have gotten beyond that. A major consideration concerned voting rights of the faculty and the right to sabbaticals. After all, the right to sabbaticals draws on resources of the University that are available only to tenured members of the faculty. The way we are going to go now the possibility of sabbatical of this group is being withdrawn and also voting rights will not be attributable to this group other than, like any other school, the Medical School can decide what kind of faculty participation they will have on issues within the Medical School. They will not have voting rights as faculty members as a whole or to the Faculty Council. Many people felt that the way the proposal was drawn, it was extending these kinds of faculty rights to a group who perhaps it wasn't appropriate to extend them to. Those were the major considerations.

PROF. HODES: Will they engage in their teaching functions under the supervision of tenured professors? What are their relationships with students and to other faculty?

DEAN SCHALLER: I suppose representatives from the Medical School ought to speak to that. But, what they are primarily engaged for is patient care in the hospitals. Out of that patient care grows a teaching function of the students who observe and participate in patient care with them. In fact, one of the major things about health care education, is that the usual classes and contact hours are almost meaningless propositions because so much of the teaching goes on in clinical, non-classroom settings. We have 450 residents who aren't even classified as students, but in many ways are the recipients of instruction. People in this full-time classification will have primary responsibility for patient care. Out of that, not in a classroom setting, but out of that activity, grows a teaching function. Obviously, it is carried on under the jurisdiction of the tenured members of the faculty. Incidentally, maybe somebody in the Medical School wants to correct what I have said.

PROF. EDMONDSON: I don't think that could be amplified any better than you have stated it. Part of our mission is patient care. There will be some teaching activity, but it is likely to be very much different than our tenured faculty's teaching activities, even though qualitatively they are comparable.

DEAN SCHALLER: Incidentally, many tenured members of the faculty also engage in patient care and do some teaching.

PROF. KAMINKER: Just a point of information. In this proposal, would it matter if you were a full-time employee of the University for seven years, even if it wasn't a tenure-track position?

DEAN SCHALLER: No. You have to officially be on the tenure track for seven years. The decision, of course, is made in the sixth year. Incidentally, the University's legal counsel has checked all of this. It was said that we would have a legal problem. That is not the case here.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: This issue is not being presented for a vote at this time and a proposal will ultimately come to the Faculty Council for its consideration. I suppose such a proposal could incorporate an exclusion or special provisions, so you have an opportunity within the School of Medicine to work with the people who will be making the proposal.

PROF. BLEVINS: Would not the health care professions also include Allied Health, Medicine, and Dentistry, those schools offering clinical services?

DEAN SCHALLER: Again, the Handbook has a statement regarding this. What I am saying is that the new proposal, if I may call it that, will be a simple insertion of the term "full time" in two different places in the Handbook and will disturb nothing else.

PROF. WILSON: I don't see how you have answered the concern that there are Allied Health people in that school who might be replaced now by non-full-time, non-tenured people. Since these people aren't going to vote in the Faculty Council, it is not a matter of diluting any power here, but if this means that the Medical School now can hire people to replace faculty members who are

already regular faculty, then this is not a good proposal.

DEAN SCHALLER: Let me read something that has been passed over to me. This is about the existing system. It says here:

"These appointees usually do not enjoy all the rights and privileges of full-time faculty or librarians, such as voting rights, eligibility for Faculty Council membership, sabbatical leave, and access to research travel and other special funds reserved for regular full time employees."

By suspending the original proposal and going to the new ones, in affect, what the Medical School is giving up out of their original proposal are these special rights and privileges that are reserved only for regular faculty members. That was a big bone of contention to the original proposal.

PROF. FLYNN: Do you think another thing is related to how long they are appointed? In the School of Medicine proposal there was a statement about these being for three years. That is not in our Handbook is it?

DEAN SCHALLER: There is no description about what the length of appointment could be. It could be annual, subject to renewal. They also could have five-year contracts, three-year contracts, etc.

PROF. FLYNN: Then that is not up to the school?

DEAN SCHALLER: Yes. There are many personnel at the University on annual appointments. We have people who hold lectureships over a long period of years who are subject to annual reappointment.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: I think that we probably shouldn't continue this discussion indefinitely because there is no item on the floor for a vote. The proposal will come back to the Faculty Council. I think those who have questions ought to raise them in the process that will follow this meeting. I think the questions that I have heard are easily resolved. It is probably well to go on to the other items of business which we have on the agenda.

PROF. LANGSAM: That was exactly what I was going to suggest. I would like a copy that we have in our minutes and questions can be raised in the faculty committee that is dealing with this.

PROF. BESCH: This is related to the committee but not to the topic. We participated in a survey about tenure mechanisms and experiences last year and I just wondered if the committee chair could give us any idea about when we might be hearing some results of this survey.

PROF. OLSON: Hopefully, in January or February.

DEAN SCHALLER: This is in general, not just relating to this proposal.

PROF. BESCH: Yes.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Thank you, Professor Olson.

DEAN SCHALLER: Incidentally, I might say that we have the IU Academic Handbook, which is a systemwide one. The pages, if you are interested, that describe the present system under the Part-Time category, which would be changed to Full Time, are pages 19-20.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Maybe this should be appended to the minutes.

AGENDA ITEM V

Library Planning Committee - Barbara Fischler, Chair

BARBARA FISCHLER: Would you want to postpone this since you are running short on time?

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Can you make a brief report and come back for an encore at a later meeting?

BARBARA FISCHLER: Thank you. On August 7th Dean Schaller established the Library Planning Committee. It is a group of 26 faculty, students, and librarians who provide advice in the programming of the new University Library.

Each school that will have its collection housed in the building has at least one representative on the committee. A separate working committee has been formed also.

The plan which we are working on now is the design of the building, which will house most of the collections of present University Libraries and a part of the School of Law Library. These collections will be administered separately and shelved separately but we are trying to provide the users the greatest possible access by placing those collections which are very important to each other side by side.

The present plan for the building is on New York Street across from the School of Law with the other wing of it probably joining the Business/SPEA and Education/Social Work Buildings.

The committees have met four times so far, and we have asked for input from the rest of you. If there are any of you who have not responded to us and would like to give us input on the size of the collections, although we have that pretty well established, facilities, or any of the services, we would like to hear from you as soon as possible.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Are there any questions for Barbara Fischer?

PROF. HODES: What is your plan for the connection of the building if the Law School participates the connection across the New York Street to the Law School?

BARBARA FISCHLER: This is speculative right now. It was an idea that Raymond Casati had which he has seen in operation at other places. There would be an actual overhead walkway passage from the Law School across into the Law Wing. You would have offices and various services located so you could come from your office into this area and receive services and find the necessary materials located in this part.

PROF. HODES: That would be a building on stilts.

BARBARA FISCHLER: Probably pretty much like the Business/SPEA situation. On the one that Ray had seen, they had actually lowered the street. I don't think that we are going to touch New York Street again.

PROF. HODES: I don't know whether this is the appropriate forum for this or whether this eventually comes to this body for a vote at any time or not, but to what extent has your committee given thought to the possibility of what the Library would look like if the Law School does not participate. As you know, there is much dissension in the Law School on this configuration.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: I think the Law School can withdraw from the project at any time.

DEAN SCHALLER: Professor Hodes, remember I met with the Law School faculty and you were there. We discussed all of those possibilities of expanding the Law School building. All of that is under consideration. As you know, some technical difficulties would have to be resolved as to whether that could be done. It is not just a financial problem. The architect, following that meeting, is looking into those possibilities. He described limitations involving the water table, insufficient room, and the next-door tennis facility. I don't think anybody is willing to invade the sacrosanct Military Park, and there are problems in expanding the other way. All of that is being looked into. We have not asked this committee to look in it.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: I think we should also recognize the fact that no one in the University administration is trying to force the Law School into participating in this project. If the Law School is interested in not participating, I think the project can go forward without the Law School's participation. I think that issue should be resolved quickly, however, because the more talk there is about disagreement the more likely there is that at some later time, perhaps when the matter goes to the General Assembly and the question of how much money is needed to build a Library is considered, someone will cite disagreement as a reason for chopping things out. If there is substantial disagreement about whether the Law School should be included, I think it will be easy for someone to say, "Drop the Law School. It will be a much cheaper project without it." I think the Law School should either decide if it wants to be in or out and be united on this issue. Your statements today, I think, suggest that the Law School may not be interested and that ought to be resolved. I thought it was, but if it isn't, it ought to be resolved soon.

PROF. HODES: That is the only reason I raised that. If we keep on talking about the joint project and details on it, we lose sight at least of the possibility that at some point they may, in fact, be two projects or one project.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: I just want to emphasize that no one is trying to talk the Law School into participating. This is something the Law School has to decide as a school. In fact I think it is just the other way around. I think the Law School has to urge that it be included in this project. That's the posture of the project now.

BARBARA FISCHLER: Certainly it will make a great deal of difference on how we plan the building functionally. If we are going to try to bring sections such as the documents close to each other, if the Law School is not going to be with us, we would be inclined to locate them in a different area in the University Library with some other functions.

PROF. WELLMAN: I was just wondering about the location. Since the criticality of the Library be as centrally located as possible on campus, has everybody agreed that that is the best central location? We look at the Student Union, way over to the west, it ends up being in albatross instead of being centered on campus where it should be. What was the basis for that site?

DEAN SCHALLER: In that area of the campus there are two sites left, that will accommodate this. One is where the Science/Engineering/Technology addition is going to go. It logically will be connected to the present Engineering/Technology building. This is the only site left. Of course, the plan is to use much, not necessarily all, that hasn't been decided yet, of the present building housing the University Library for a student center. I just don't know any place else it could be located in the center campus area.

PROF. WELLMAN: The site immediately west and on the other side of the street from Cavanaugh Hall, is that totally out of the question?

BARBARA FISCHLER: That would make it even farther removed from the mainstream of campus activities. The campus plan puts the Science/Engineering and the fine arts complexes where the library will be right in the main circle of the campus.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: It is primarily planned as a Library to serve the basic academic units and those are the units that Barbara described. I also think that this location is a part of a plan that was conceived sometime ago and that the architects and other planners have thought about it a great deal. I think the reasoning is basically as Barbara described it. There also has been much study of traffic patterns, and long range plans for other construction have been taken into account.

DEAN RENDA: Speaking of dissension, this document refers to IUPUI as Indianapolis University - Purdue University. Was that a slip or what? (Laughter)

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: That is one of the three best points I have ever heard made at a Faculty Council meeting. We will entertain a motion, or maybe we will take it as accepted, that that will be corrected in the official and final version of the minutes.

Thank you, Barbara.

AGENDA ITEM VI

Martin Luther King, Jr. Birthday Celebration - Dr. Lincoln Lewis

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: We have one other item on the agenda. That is an important report from Lincoln Lewis on the Martin Luther King, Jr., Birthday celebration.

DR.. LEWIS: Thank you, Vice President Bepko. The Planning Committee for the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Birthday Celebration has been working under the direction of the Form on Campus Interrelations Committee. This committee, which we call FOCI, and which I chair, has the overall purpose of promoting respect for the diverse population of our faculty, staff, and student body at IUPUI.

We have on the committee representatives from the Faculty Council and the Staff Council, as well as the Black Faculty and Staff Council, the Student Assembly and the Black Student Union. We have undertaken the program as a major project that fits in with the FOCI statement of purpose.

Your December meeting date has served as a deadline for us to have our program schedule and informational materials ready for distribution. I have distributed some of the flyers that we have. After this session there will be more copies available at the table. Please feel free to take them with you.

As you know, January 19, the third Monday in January, is a national holiday. It is also a state holiday in Indiana and many other states. This is our third year with this event; we started a year before the rest of the nation. The format will be in the same as it has been in past years in that there will be three sessions as indicated on the flyer.

The morning session will be held in the School of Physical Education gymnasium, with Congressman Walter E. Fauntroy as the speaker. In the afternoon session, Professor J. P. Lisack from Purdue will speak on "The Implications of Changing Ethnic Group Representation in Indiana's Population," which will be the basis for the forum topic as shown. We believe this will be a great session. We expect about 40 - 50 students to be involved in the forum along with faculty, some politicians, and individuals from a variety of professions. The afternoon session will be held in the Union Building.

The evening session -- the piece de resistance -- will be the Black Student Union dinner. It will be held this year in the Indiana Roof ballroom. The speaker is Yvonne Braithwaite-Burke -- a former U.S. representative. Ticket prices for the dinner are \$14 for students and \$17.50 for all others.

I wanted to give you this program information today for two principal reasons. First, the Faculty Council has shown strong interest and involvement. Our initial observance of Dr. King's birthday was a topic of lengthy discussion by the Faculty Council. As a result of these discussions, and with the input of various other constituencies, the University administration's decision was that, short of having a campus holiday, we would hold this program as a significant commemoration. Second, we would like to see increased faculty attendance, particularly in the morning session. We feel that your participation will be an important expression of our admiration for the remarkable achievements of Dr. King in the area of civil rights and for all humanity.

So, on behalf of the Planning Committee and as a personal appeal, I invite you all to join in our celebration. More information will be appearing in the Green Sheet, we will have additional posters, and, as you notice on the flyer, if you would like to have an early copy of the program/brochure, you may do so by calling 274-5528.

If you have any questions, I would be happy to answer them.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Thank you, Lincoln.

AGENDA ITEM VII

New Business

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Is there any New Business?

BARBARA FISCHLER: May I make a quick announcement? A committee to undertake the five-year review of the performance of Dean Gene Faris has been appointed. There are three representatives on this campus on the committee: Dr. Marvin Ebbert, Dr. George Lukemeyer, and I. We will be contacting a number of you, but for any of you who we do not contact, and would like to have input into this review, would you please contact one of three of us. Write to us or call us. I left a slip of paper on the table with our phone numbers and addresses.

AGENDA ITEM VIII

Adjournment

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: We will adjourn for a few minutes until we are ready to start the second part of our meeting today.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY

at

INDIANAPOLIS

FALL FACULTY MEETING

The State of the Campus, 1986
Vice President Gerald L. Bepko

This part of the meeting is to be devoted to the Presiding Officer's Business. It is the tradition for the Presiding Officer to give a report on the affairs of the campus titled the State of the Campus Review.

To begin my first State of the Campus Review, I would like to say, with pleasure, that we survived the closing of the New York and Michigan Street canal bridges. As of last Wednesday, we have re-established contact with the downtown area and the rest of the world. We are still here and still operating.

I never thought I would ever be so concerned about access to our campus and construction work as I have been in the last couple of months, in part, at least, because of the closing of those bridges. But over the last 10 years, the face and personality of our campus have been changed dramatically by major construction projects. This year, as you all know, is no exception. I can make this report to you without outlining our current construction activities. We have completed major construction work this year. Major construction projects are now under way, some will begin soon, and some major construction projects are in various stages of planning.

The most important project completed this year is the new wing of the Riley Hospital for Children. I hope that all of you were able to participate in some part of the dedication ceremonies which took place on October 7, the birthday of James Whitcomb Riley. These ceremonies were spectacular events highlighted by a dedicatory address by Health and Human Services Secretary Otis Bowen. The new addition to Riley Hospital was constructed at a cost of over \$56 million, none of which came from tax revenues. It is one of the finest facilities in the world for pediatric care and teaching.

Construction was also completed on what is sometimes called the new South Garage. I suppose the garage was named because it is on the south side of Michigan Street. When garages were first built here on campus they were named, I suppose, in relationship to the Medical Center (as we were reminded by what Dr. Wellman said in our last hour.) The South Garage is really on the north side of much of the campus. Nevertheless, we still call it the South Garage. This means that when we build the proposed garage east of the Natatorium, we will probably have to call it the Extreme South Garage. The South Garage has 2,000 spaces, only 1,000 of which have been occupied on the average day. We

have to encourage more of our faculty, and particularly our staff, to use the garage. I hope this will happen when the yet colder weather begins. Also, we may be offering a new pricing system to provide further encouragement. More news about that later.

Under construction now are three buildings. First, there is the National Institute for Fitness and Sport, being constructed on the south edge of the campus, between the Natatorium and the White River Park. The Institute will have 120,000 square feet of space and will house a 200-meter track, a gymnastic area, an aerobics room, a large weight training room, treadmill rooms, examination rooms, a biochemistry lab, an environmental chamber, and an hydrostatic weighing room. Parenthetically, let me mention that, in the spirit of fitness, we are initiating a health and wellness program for all employees called "Max-well", for maximum wellness, which you'll hear more about soon.

On West Michigan Street, just east of the IU Hospital, are the new hotel and conference center. The exterior of the hotel is now nearing completion and the internal finishing work will be completed during the winter. It will be ready next summer for the Pan American Games on campus.

The hotel will have 278 rooms, a food court, a full service restaurant, a sports tavern, and related services. It will be operated by the Lincoln Hotels Corporation, which operates 13 other hotels around the country, including the Embassy Row in Washington, D.C., and one at Vanderbilt University in Nashville.

The Conference Center is also on schedule and will be ready for conference activity next summer. It has 75,000 square feet of area and will be outfitted with a 325-seat auditorium, teleconference capability, a media center, a TV studio, and 26,000 square feet of meeting space to make it a state-of-the-art facility. Its first major occupant will probably be CBS Television, which will be here to cover the Pan American Games next August.

The construction projects which will begin this year start with the new \$34 million Medical Research and Library building next to the Medical Science Building. This is a long awaited addition to the campus and will house varied clinical research activities that are now scattered across the campus, including -- on the top floor -- the Walther Oncology Center, a world-class cancer research center. The Trustees are expected to approve the construction contracts at their meeting here tomorrow, and groundbreaking should take place in the spring.

Also, construction work probably will begin within the next year or two on an office tower at the southwest corner of Agnes and Michigan streets, where the Bowers Building is now located. This office tower is to be part of the hotel-conference center complex and is to be constructed by the same private developers as the hotel's. This building is to house those private organizations and agencies of government which desire office space in proximity to the University for research and other purposes. In addition, the tower may include some office space for the campus.

Additional projects which will be started this year include the Herman B Wells Center for Pediatric Research, which involves renovation of 20,000 square feet of space in the old Riley Hospital, where important research on immunology, molecular biology, and cancer will be conducted. This Center was

made possible by an anonymous major bequest, and we are proud that the Chancellor of the University permitted this Center to be named in his honor.

Finally, a number of projects are ready to move from the drawing board to reality. The most important and urgent of those projects is the Science, Engineering, and Technology Center. This has been the subject of extensive planning. The Indiana University Board of Trustees, at their August retreat, made it their highest priority behind the chemistry building in Bloomington which, of course, is a continuing project, initial funding for which was received in 1985-87.

The SET project will be composed of two new buildings connected to the existing Engineering and Technology Building. It will contain 202,000 assignable square feet and bears an estimated cost of \$38 million. It will be the new home for all of the programs that now reside at 38th Street.

Unfortunately, the Commission for Higher Education did not classify the SET Project in its "highest priority" category -- a factor which could make our work in the General Assembly more difficult. However, on the brighter side, I believe the Commission is recommending funding of all projects in the top two priority categories, which includes the SET Building.

Although the Commission's recommendation could have been better on this point, we are undeterred. We will seek funding for the SET Building in the upcoming session of the General Assembly and hope that the leadership of our State agrees with our assessment of the importance of the project and the priorities established by the University.

Other major projects which are under study include a new ambulatory care wing of the I.U. Hospital. This construction should be funded, at least in part, from outside sources, however, and should not be part of the funnel of state priorities which could slow other building projects. This is an important project, which will make it possible for us to provide instruction in the many new out-patient surgical techniques which are now employed in our national health care system.

In addition, the study of the new General Library building needs of the campus is well under way. A committee, chaired by Director of IUPUI Libraries Barbara Fischler, is preparing a program which can be used as a basis for subsequent architectural planning. Our current general library building was designed in the 1960s to serve only two-year academic programs. The collection it houses is woefully inadequate for our current needs. A new library building will make it possible for us to expand library services to acceptable levels and provide much needed space for the Law School's library collection.

And there also are major renovations which must be undertaken at the Medical Science Building, a facility which has been in service since 1958. This is an urgent matter to which we must attend to in the near future.

Finally, there has been considerable planning and a committee continues to function to prepare for a new home for the Herron School of Art, as well as our programs in theatre, music, and dance. This new Center for the Visual and Performing Arts will be located just north of Military Park, across the park from the soon-to-be-constructed Eiteljorg Museum of American Indian and Western

Art.

In the very preliminary planning stages is an addition to the complex of buildings in the Agnes Street Corridor. The campus needs some additional faculty and academic space around Cavanaugh Hall. It may be several years before this addition to our inventory of buildings will become a reality, but the preliminary thinking for this additional space should begin in the near future.

A moment ago I mentioned the Eiteljorg Museum. This is one of the many projects which is to be constructed on the periphery of the campus. On that subject, I am pleased to report that the White River State Park Commission is close to settling the School 5 issue, and the hope is that the plan for the area adjoining the campus on the south will move forward in the near future. Construction of the Eiteljorg Museum should begin in the summer of 1987. When completed, this museum will house a \$40 million collection of Western and Indian Art and artifacts in its 75,000-square-foot quarters. The museum also will serve as a gateway to White River Park.

As for the north periphery of the campus, I am pleased to report that all necessary approvals for the Lockefield Gardens project are now complete. Construction has been under way since the summer on the buildings and, recently, the renovation of the old Lockefield Gardens buildings began. The entire project should be finished by next April.

But bricks and mortar do not represent the heart and spirit of our campus. By far our most important ingredient is the people who work and study here.

In my first few months in this new job, I have been impressed by our students across the disciplines. In formal and informal meeting with our student representatives--undergraduate, graduate, and professional--they have impressed me as alert, articulate, intelligent, caring, serious individuals, who identify with our programs and educational missions. They deserve our best efforts in helping them to grow in their scholarship and in their personal lives.

During the current fall term, we have a total headcount enrollment of 23,468, which is slightly more than last fall's total. They are, however, taking one percent fewer credit hours than were taken last fall. That credit hour total, I am glad to report, is within our budget projections.

Our Student Affairs office, headed by Pat Boaz, who I regret to say is retiring from her position as Student Affairs Dean at the end of this year, incorporates more than a dozen different administrative, academic, and life services. We invest more than \$3 million a year in making these services available. In spite of this substantial commitment, we are stretched thin in delivering adequate services to a very diverse student body.

And there are many services to perform. The Office of Scholarships and Financial Aids, for example, serves more than 12,000 students annually, responding to more than 400 phone calls a day in busy seasons. The Office administers eleven federal and six state programs of financial aid. Its staff oversees some 25,000 awards that represent expenditures of more than \$29 million a year.

To meet special needs, we also provide a child care center and offices that assist disabled, international, and minority students. There's also a recent staff addition, a coordinator of orientation, who develops programs to acquaint new students with our very complex campus.

One of the new programs with which we are experimenting this year is an all-night study facility to be available during final exam week. The study area will be in the Union Building cafeteria, which will be available to students who are preparing for finals the following day. Because 98 percent of our students commute, and not all of them have ideal conditions for studying at home, we hope that this experiment will be helpful.

Through the Division of Continuing Studies, a new Adult Education Coordinating Center has been put in place this fall. The Center is now open in refurbished quarters in the basement of Cavanaugh Hall. It will serve returning non-degree adults, combining several existing programs.

We should all be proud of the panoply of academic activity which has taken place on this campus during the past year. We believe that there is continuing progress in all of our academic units and that we have established excellence in programs across the range of disciplines. There are too many examples of good work to permit enumeration of all, but let me cite a few highlights.

Our teaching program has continued to flower and some of our faculty members, representing the overall high quality of our teaching, have been recognized here on campus and throughout the University. Ann Marriner, Professor of Nursing in the School of Nursing, was the 1986 recipient of the Edward C. Moore Award for Outstanding Teaching. Professor Marriner also received the All University 1986 Herman F. Lieber Teaching Award; and Rowland A. Sherrill, chairman and associate professor of religious studies in the School of Liberal Arts, was a recipient of the University's 1986 Amoco Foundation Award.

Research activities have continued to flourish. The international recognition of the Medical Center has been enhanced as its research programs have increased. Under Walter Daly's able leadership, the School of Medicine has increased its support from outside sources for research from approximately \$21 million in 1982-83 to approximately \$31 million in 1985-86, an increase of nearly 50 percent.

But the new research initiatives are not confined to the Medical Center. For example, Marshall Yovits tells me that in the School of Science total funded research exceeded \$1 million for 1985-86. In the School of Liberal Arts, the per capita funding from outside sources for research now exceeds the level for comparable departments at some other Big Ten universities.

The service activities of our faculty on this campus also have continued to be profound. I believe no campus in the State has stronger bonds of service with its community than IUPUI.

It would be uplifting to only examine the achievements and successes of our campus, but I must turn to the important work yet to be done. We must constantly renew our commitment to first rate teaching, and I invite all of you

to join me in a continuous renaissance for teaching. We should let no students leave us without deep affection and appreciation for our contribution to their lives. Of course, a commensurate renewal should exist in research and service.

However, the primary program need of our campus was identified in the Mission Statement project completed in December, 1985. The fiscal perspectives provided in that report gave us, for the first time in bold relief, a view of the underfunding of the basic academic programs on the Indianapolis campus. When the health schools and the older professional schools are removed from a fiscal analysis of the campus, and when the analysis includes only the basic academic programs, it becomes apparent that our per student funding is significantly lower than for comparable programs on the regional campuses of Indiana and Purdue universities.

This is true despite the fact that we have a substantial number of graduate degrees offered in these basic academic subjects, such as the MBA, master's degrees in the School of Science, a master's degree in history from the School of Liberal Arts, masters and doctorates in Education, and a master's degree in Public Administration.

This underfunding was addressed by the Trustees in their budget request for 1987-89. The I.U. request included a special enhancement of the non-health budget at Indianapolis, what we sometimes call "catch-up" funding. I reported on this at this October meeting of the Faculty Council.

The special enhancement of funding for IUPUI includes four components: quality recovery; part-time faculty replacement; equipment replacement; and library improvements. The request for quality recovery is to attract and retain key faculty; it is to bring Health Division salaries to parity with peer schools and salary levels in non-health schools in competition with comparable institutions, nationally and regionally. In the short run it is to bring non-health faculty salaries up to averages at the University of Alabama at Birmingham, the University of Cincinnati, the University of Illinois at Chicago, and the University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee. The long-range plan is to bring all Indianapolis non-health units (along with Bloomington faculty salaries) to fourth in the Big Ten.

The Commission for Higher Education has now reviewed these requests and made its own recommendations for the General Assembly. The Commission rates requests in one of three categories: highest priority, high priority, and programs of importance. Generally, only requests in the highest priority category receive funding. Unfortunately, the Commission has not classified all the catch-up funds for the Indianapolis campus in the highest priority category, but has rated some of the requests in the category known as "high priority" or, in one case, in the category known as "programs of importance."

On the positive side, the Commission has recommended funding of all operating requests in the top two categories, which includes most of the recommended catch-up funding. Also, it should be noted that our total IUPUI budget request included a substantial increase for energy costs. These extra costs will be incurred because of rate increases and additional buildings which will come on line, such as the Medical Research and Library Building. The Commission has recommended full funding in its highest priority category for these items -- a factor which makes our total campus budget increase, at least

in the Commission's view, appear larger than other campuses.

Also, we are continuing our discussion with the Commission and it is possible, although not likely, that the Commission may change its recommendations before the General Assembly concludes its work. Moreover, under the leadership of John Ryan and J. A. Franklin, we will continue to press for adoption of the IU Budget Request in the General Assembly.

Our continuing discussions with the Commission are an outgrowth of the Mission Statement project. As I reported to you at the November meeting, we were asked to file a ten-year Development Plan. A draft of a Development Plan was submitted for discussion purposes to the Commission on November 6 and copies are available here today. On November 26, some questions concerning the plan were communicated to us by the Commission staff. We are in the process of responding to those questions.

This draft of the Development Plan was designed to address questions raised by the Commission Staff and was written, as I described to you last month, by merging the planning documents filed by the schools which we had on file at campus administration. It was to be a rough outline of the step-by-step process which may be followed in further development of the campus.

The draft of the Development Plan contains four strategies. These strategies may be useful in directing further thought about campus development and in creating a strategic plan. I'd like to spend a moment on these four strategies and invite your comments on them and on the process of strategic planning in general.

The four strategies are: continuation, completion, consolidation, and cooperation.

Continuation describes the process by which our established professional schools will continue to grow as statewide or nationally significant academic divisions. These professional schools include the health schools and several others such as law, social work, physical education, and art. We must recognize that the general level of funding in these professional schools is low when they are compared to peer schools in other parts of the country. Nevertheless, these schools have had substantial periods of growth and development and many of their programs are nationally recognized. The future development of these schools should be viewed as a continuation of efforts which has already achieved these varying levels of distinction. Let me hasten to say that in some of these professional schools the development process is less mature and there may still be some fundamental needs which have not been addressed.

Completion refers to investments which are yet to be made in creating a full range of first rate programs of higher education in Indianapolis -- in other words to complete the creation of a reasonably comprehensive university.

We need to complete the process of building faculties, libraries, and support services, particularly in the basic academic programs where the underfunding is most acute, to ensure that the programs of instruction are offered in quantity and levels of quality that are consistent with the size of our student body, the need to complement and support the older established professional schools,

the public's expectations, and the degree and quality of investment in or around IUPUI by other institutions in the community and the state. At a minimum, we should think of completion as working toward program parity with urban universities with comparable characteristics such as the University of Illinois at Chicago, the University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee, and the University of Alabama - Birmingham.

In the long run, because of our special relationships with Indiana and Purdue universities, and our intimate relationship with the Bloomington campus as part of the University's core, we should establish our own unique identity. We may be the one AAU university campus in a major industrial state which is simultaneously in the capitol city and the major metropolitan area of the state. These natural strengths could be translated into a new model of service and excellence for urban campuses.

Consolidation will bring about the physical unification of our campus. In 1969 when IUPUI was created, its programs were spread throughout the city. At that time, a commitment was made to bring all of the programs to the West Michigan Street campus. Progress has been made but several steps remain in this process of consolidation.

Finally, cooperation means the enhancement of the relationship between IUPUI and a number of important constituencies. It means joint ventures with other educational institutions in the region, both public and private. It means much closer working relationships among faculties at Bloomington and West Lafayette and IUPUI, and further development of the core campus concept. Within IUPUI, cooperation means the establishment of more teaching and research ties between schools, particularly between the professional schools and the core disciplines. In the broadest context, cooperation means providing support and leadership for the Indiana economy and tailoring IUPUI's educational, research, and service activities so that they meet current and future needs of the state's citizens and employers.

Finally, in summary, I think that the state of our campus is very good. We have the support of a broad cross section of our community and state and we have translated this support into increased private and public funding for our activities. I believe we have shown through out activities that we deserve this support and more.

We have come a long way since 1969, under the leadership of Doctors Maynard Hine and Glenn Irwin. In particular, the more I work in this job the more I realize what a profound positive impact Glenn Irwin has had on Indiana University, this campus, and the community. With the support of Presidents Ryan and Beering, and the Trustees of Indiana University, the campus and its programs have grown both in quality and quantity. I hope we can work together to continue this process.

And we will be aided in our tasks by some new IU System officers. New Vice Presidents Judy Palmer for planning and Terry Clapacs for facilities have been and will continue to be important sources of insight and management skills for IUPUI.

And the tone of our work may be set by something President Ryan said in his address to the University in September. He said that "Indiana higher

education has developed into the most complete, mutually reinforcing system of cooperation in the nation. This system reflects the diligent efforts of many Indiana independent and public college and university leaders. It includes a partnership with Purdue University and university leaders. It includes a partnership with Purdue University which features the most extensive complementarity in programs and campuses ever achieved. . . ."

I believe this cooperation, and the high achievement it has produced, is most manifest here at IUPUI. Our campus is a symbol of important accomplishments and a threshold of opportunity for the future -- for gaining greater national and international stature, as a new urban university known for its excellence and intellectual eminence spawned by the support and cooperation of its two great parent universities.

Thank you and best wishes for the Holiday Season.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY

at

INDIANAPOLIS

FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING

Thursday, January 8, 1987

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

Members Present: Administration: Vice President Gerald L. Bepko, Executive Dean Howard Schaller, Dean Patricia Boaz. Deans: Walter Daly, P. Nicholas Kellum, William M. Plater, R. Bruce Renda, Sheldon Siegel, William J. Voos, Marshall C. Yovits. Faculty: C. D. Aliprantis, Elaine Alton, Anne Belcher, Jacqueline Blackwell, H. R. Besch, Jr., Patricia Blake, Varoujan Chalian, Andre DeKorvin, David Doedens, Kenneth Dunipace, Mark Farber, Mary Feeley, Beverly Flynn, Jeri Francis, Melvin Glick, Jean Gnat, Clifford Goodwin, Emily Hernandez, Ngoan Van Hoang, William Hodes, Jerome Kaminker, Henry Karlson, Linda Kasper, Robert J. Kirk, Judith Kosegi, Joseph Kuczkowski, Miriam Langsam, Rebecca Markel, James McAteer, Robert Mendelsohn, Judy Miller, Michael E. Mitchell, Catherine Palmer, Richard Pflanzner, John Pless, Gerald Powers, Terry Reed, Mark Richardson, Edward Robbins, P. Kent Sharp, Ernest E. Smith, Susan Sutton, Jeffery Vessely, Vernon Vix, Henry Wellman, Maudine Williams, Kathryn Wilson, Pao-lo Yu, Susan Zunt.

Alternates Present: Deans: Robert Mendelsohn for Charles Bonser; Doris Froebe for Elizabeth Grossman; James Bindley for Jeffery Grove; Hugh Wolf for Howard Mehlinger; Bennie Keller for James E. Weigand; Harv Hegarty for Jack R. Wentworth.

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

Members Absent: Deans: Trevor Brown, H. William Gilmore. Faculty: Sharon Andreoli, John Baenziger, Karen Becker, Charles Blevins, Linda Brothers, Michael Burke, Edmund Byrne, Robert Colyer, Joseph DiMicco, James Edmondson, Charles Ellinger, Martin Farlow, Linda Haas, Edwin T. Harper, Robert Harris, Eugene Helveston, Meredith Hull, Barbara Jackson, Suetta Kehrein, Monroe Little, Barnett B. Morris, Paul Nagy, Anita Proffitt, Shirley Quate, Kenneth Ryder, Glen Sagraves, John Schmedtje, Rowland Sherrill, Judith Silence, Robert Stonehill, Victor Wallis, Dorothy Webb, Charles Winslow.

AGENDA ITEM I

Approval of Minutes of December 4, 1986

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Let's begin our meeting. As always, the first agenda item is the approval of the minutes of our last meeting which was held on December 4. Is there a motion for approval? (Motion made by Professor Langsam). (Seconded by Dean Renda). The motion to approve has been made and seconded. All in favor say "Aye." Any opposed? (The motion carried.)

AGENDA ITEM II

Presiding Officer's Business - Vice President Gerald L. Bepko

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: The next item is the Presiding Officer's Business. I spoke so much last time that I won't say anything this time. However, I would like Dean Schaller to give you a few comments on the enrollment data.

DEAN SCHALLER: Thank you. I would like to issue my usual caveat that the enrollment figures for the University are released only by the President's Office after they are presented to the Board of Trustees. Presumably, they will be presented either at the Board meeting at the end of this month or at the next Board meeting.

At this time, of course, all we have are very unofficial estimates for this semester. Classes just started on Wednesday and the reports are not final. The informal, unofficial estimates at this time indicate that we probably are going to follow the same pattern in the spring semester that we have followed the last few semesters. That is, the headcount will be up and the credit hours will be about the same as they were last year. There is a possibility that the headcount will be up a little more than it was during the fall semester. It could be up around three percent. There is a chance that the credit hours could go up slightly or down slightly, but I think they probably are going to stay about the same.

Another way we are following the pattern is that the health enrollment, both headcount and credit hours, will be down again but will be offset by increases in the non-health credit hours and headcount enrollment. You will recall that has been going on for a couple of semesters. The view I take on this is, if all this holds, and I think that there is a reasonable chance that it will, that this continues to present a rather strong enrollment picture for this campus. We consistently inch up in headcount and our credit hour base remains firm. That continues to counter the forecasts that have been made over the past few years, and I am happy to say, it continues to counter very slightly the budget estimates that we have made. If all this holds one more semester, it looks as if our fee income will equal what we had projected in the budget. I think that continues to remain a strong enrollment situation. At the next Faculty Council meeting we will have more concrete data for you. As of an hour or two ago, the picture, I think, continues to look favorable.

AGENDA ITEM III

Executive Committee Report - Susan L. Zunt, Secretary

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Next we have the Executive Committee Report from our Council Secretary Susan Zunt.

PROF. ZUNT: I have a number of items to report to you today. The first one concerns the Preference Form. The form is used to document individual members' interests in membership on committees. These committees are the elected committees on this campus, standing committees for the Faculty Council, and administrative committees. This will be mailed on January 20. We hope that all faculty members will take a look at this material. It is for both the IUPUI and University faculty councils. The data from these preference forms are used and depended upon heavily in making committee

assignments. In the areas of Boards of Review and the Staff Relations Committee, we need more people to volunteer. There is more work that needs to be done, and we need more people to volunteer in those areas.

Last time I reported to you concerning the liaison between the Staff Council and the Faculty Council. I would like to introduce to you today Mrs. Shirley Newhouse who is the President of the Staff Council. She is our liaison from the Staff Council. She will be working with us for the next year, attending as an ex-officio member. This will work much the same as our student representative functions. Martin Dragonette represents the Student Assembly and also serves as an ex-officio member. Jeff Vessely of this Council has graciously agreed to represent us for the next semester in the Staff Council. At that time we are going to assess schedules and see if we can't make a more permanent assignment.

I think I reported to you last time that we would be having a report shortly from the Staff Relations Committee concerning their October workshop entitled "IUPUI: Visions of the Future." That now has been scheduled for March 5. At that time Mrs. Newhouse will make a report giving the results of that workshop.

I want to make a short report on the status of the Boards of Review. As dictated by Article IV in the Bylaws, there are certain facts that can be reported about the Boards of Review to the Council. This fall we had two cases that were initiated. One of these cases is finished. One is still ongoing. The Board of Review recommendation in the completed case was not in favor of the aggrieved faculty member. When the Faculty Board of Review's recommendation was reviewed by the administration, this recommendation, essentially not in favor of the faculty member, was again supported by the administration. The other case is ongoing. We also have received a third case, which has not yet been assigned. It will probably be assigned to one of the Boards that we elect today, if it goes that far.

I want to bring you up to date on the status of the Clinical Ranks Proposal. This Council will have an opportunity to vote for or against the recommendation at our next meeting which is February 5. As you know, Byron Olson reported on this last time. Attached to your minutes are the pertinent pages of the Academic Handbook. I am going to tell you exactly what the changes of the proposal are. You might want to look at IUPUI Circular 86-14. I am going to read this to you, you will have it published with today's minutes, and we will vote on it at our next year.

To enable the School of Medicine to employ full-time positions to provide patient services and related teaching, the following changes in the Indiana University Academic Handbook, 1985, are recommended:

1. Insert a heading reading **Clinical Appointees** in between the fifth and sixth paragraphs on page 19. Then insert the words and comma "full-time salaried" prior to the words "part-time salaried" in the sixth paragraph.

So, there are two changes there after the two additions. Now we look at page 51. There the change is to insert the words "full-time clinical rank employees" in the first sentence of the fifth paragraph on page 51.

With these three additions to what we already have in the Academic Handbook, these employees would be eligible for TIAA/CREF benefits. These individuals would not be eligible for tenure or sabbatical leaves and any voting rights would be within the school, not in this governing body. As I said, these changes will come before you and they will be published so you can see them and study them. The same proposal will be looked at by the UFC on February 10. Your 12 University Faculty Council representatives will be voting on the 10th of February for this same proposal.

PROF. BLAKE: I thought in the discussion that Dean Schaller said that health schools would be carried over and at the time Dean Grossman and the Dean of Dentistry also spoke to the issue that we weren't interested.

DEAN SCHALLER: All the changes do is exactly what is said there.

PROF. BLAKE: She prefaced her comments by saying "in order to allow the Medical School." I just wanted that clarified.

PROF. ZUNT: We are addressing the urgent request of the Medical School and that is why we are doing this at all.

PROF. BLAKE: Thank you.

PROF. WILSON: When you talk about the voting rights, how are you going to count the number of faculty in any given unit? Will you count those Clinical ranks?

DEAN SCHALLER: No.

PROF. WILSON: They won't be counted for N?

DEAN SCHALLER: No.

PROF. HODES: If there is going to be a debate on the pros and cons, will that be at the next meeting or will there be more discussion at this meeting?

PROF. ZUNT: That is up to you.

PROF. HODES: The last time Dean Schaller said that this kind of arrangement is in effect in about 60 percent of the medical schools, but I was curious about what the other 40 percent are doing, which is a pretty substantial number.

DEAN SCHALLER: We will have to ask someone at the Medical School.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: I think that it is envisional that discussion would take place at the next meeting but I don't see any reason why, if there are questions that can be answered today, we couldn't take them up today. I don't know whether that particular issue is one that we ought to address today.

DEAN SCHALLER: He is asking for information and I think Dean Daly could address that.

DEAN DALY: The American Association of Medical Colleges has studied this issue and has produced an analysis of national behavior on this matter. I don't know whether the Council has gotten that information or not. It has been provided to the Faculty Affairs Committee as well as a number of others. This is the tabulation on the almost some 120 schools in the country and by name which ones have done what sorts of things. The figures, we were told, were approximately correct. I don't remember off the top of my head what the number was. I would have to say that the schools which are conventionally thought of as the better schools are the ones which follow this practice.

Your question is "What do the others do?" The report was silent on that, so I presume they may be doing a number of things. This doesn't really answer your question and I can't answer your question.

PROF. KAMINKER: Can you tell me what the urgency is and why this is an important issue?

PROF. ZUNT: It is my understanding that we need to hire people to provide patient services. I don't have the figures with me today but thousands of patient services have to be rendered and we need people to do this and under some of these people, we want them to provide patient services. They will be teaching as a secondary role is a preceptor role. They may not be doing any research at all, not within the conditional missions of faculty.

PROF. KAMINKER: Are these new appointments or just changes in status?

PROF. ZUNT: I believe we are talking most about bringing new people on. There may be some people who weren't about to achieve tenure. As I understand it, it is because of the nature of their assignments that we might be able to offer them a non-tenured track position.

DEAN DALY: I would not describe this as an urgent problem in the sense that the world will come to an end if it is not dealt with yesterday. It is a problem that has festering for quite a long time. The festering nature is the central part. This is a problem that the faculty committees in the School of Medicine has considered a number of refinements in the tenure and promotion practice of the School. The other changes recommended by the committee were ones which I would describe as either editorial, or ones which could be dealt with within the school. This one, of course, has more significance requiring broader considerations.

The real problem which we have had to deal with is how to deal constructively with the service requirements which we have on our campus, in a way which permits individuals to properly grow and develop as faculty people. We find we have a number of individuals who simply are not provided that opportunity. They then progress through the probationary period for tenure and we find that they have been put into positions required by the service requirements of the institution which do not do that. A much more straightforward way to deal with that, to deal with others in the future, is simply to have people whose job is to take care of patients and act as preceptors for our students. Then we don't have these problems.

If we look at it another way and say, "Well, let's make them all forever and ever in the future conventional positions", it would require an expansion of

the staff severalfold what we currently would accomplish and take care of these things. We then would be asking individuals to provide the service function and also be required to give them other time off to develop in other manners which, frankly, I think the institution could not afford. This seems like a logical and perfectly straightforward way of doing it. It is not one which would cost the institution more money because we are not asking for an increase in the budget. It is not a proposal which would have an adverse impact on other parts of the institution. I think it treats people in a perfectly straightforward manner from the beginning. The impact on other aspects of the institution would affect people currently here who might be transferred. First of all, we could not and would not even attempt to transfer current tenure track individuals to such an appointment status unless they asked to be so transferred. That might help. But we would not ask them to do that. I would view this as something which, in due course of time, will end up affecting people who are initially appointed in this manner. There might be some shifts during the transition period, but that would be very short.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Is it true that there are persons who we hired to do primarily patient service work, but who do have some teaching responsibilities arising out of patient care?

DEAN DALY: The teaching activities of the Medical School are in part very similar to those of other schools and in part very different. We, indeed, have a number of courses that are taught as a professor of history would teach a history course. What we have particularly for third- and fourth-year medical students are courses which are in the catalog but which are really not classroom courses. These are courses where a professional takes a medical student, intern, or a resident at the bedside and works with them, almost on a one-to-one basis. The student grows directly out of professional activity as a physician under those circumstances. That is a different type of teaching obviously and is very important. It's essential. It's the role model in the form of teaching which is essential to developing this kind of professional. It is not something that we normally think of as classroom teaching.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: The person that does this sort of work would not have an opportunity to conduct research during the six-year probation to build the portfolio of research and publication that would qualify him for tenure. So, a person in this position would probably not get tenure if he were in the regular tenure track?

DEAN DALY: That is right.

PROF. ALTON: The person in this position is classified as a full-time, clinical employee?

DEAN DALY: At the moment we do not have this option.

PROF. ALTON: You aren't talking about someone who comes in and gives an occasional lecture or is part-time on the staff?

DEAN DALY: What we are, at this time, wanting to do is to utilize the titles which we currently have on the books. The School of Medicine currently has approximately 1,000 people in the State of Indiana who are titled "clinical

assistant professor," "clinical associate professor," "clinical professor." These people are volunteers and provide their time for nothing. They do this at various sites all around the state, some here, some in Gary, and some somewhere else. They do their teaching functions without pay but they earn their livelihood elsewhere. What we would like to do is have people with the same titles on our payroll with fringe benefits; namely TIAA/CREF, which, of course, would be paid for out of their various service accounts which support the staff.

PROF. DEKORVIN: Is there going to be a ceiling on the percentage of this kind of people hired? If not, the School of Medicine could end up with a dominance of people who don't do research and who do patient services.

DEAN DALY: We have not contemplated a ceiling for this. Those who have made this proposal view this as a small number. I think your question is understandable, but it, forms our School of Medicine's environment. I think our greatest danger, at least today and in the future, is that we are too far away from that. I can't tell you what the appropriate number will be in the future. It depends on part on how strong our clinical programs at the Wishard Hospital and other outpatient facilities which we may develop will come to be. I would see this forever as a minority because of funding relationships.

PROF. FLYNN: I am on the IU Faculty Council and I have a question. Where does the funding come from? Do I understand that it comes from patient services or from a University budget?

DEAN DALY: First of all, as I have indicated, this proposal has nothing to do with asking for additional funds. I will steadfastly ask for additional funds at every opportunity (laughter), but it has nothing to do with this proposal. We would not expect this to be derived from increased general fund money. Currently, these people receive their funds, in some cases, from research grants, where there are research grants that require certain kinds of clinical services. They receive this money from Wishard Hospital by a contract with Wishard Hospital. The hospital at Wishard pays the University for physician services. Then, our patient billing services is piled back into the University accounts which pays for physician services. Those are our primary resources.

Most of the Medical School faculty are split funded. We have people right now who are on tenure track, somewhat to their disadvantage, performing some of these functions who receive funding from research grants, from the accounts I was just describing, and from the other sources.

DEAN SCHALLER: Walter, what is the percentage of the School of Medicine's budgets supported by the General fund?

DEAN DALY: Somewhere around 30 percent.

DEAN SCHALLER: Incidentally, it is a matter of fact of tenuring a lot of people in the School of Medicine.

DEAN DALY: About 16 percent of our people are supported by the general fund.

DEAN SCHALLER: It is a question of what tenure means once you get it?

PROF. ZUNT: That will come to you next month for action. The proposal will be coming from the Faculty Affairs Committee. They are currently meeting and voting and their recommendation will come to you. You do know what the proposal is. It will be published with the minutes of today's meeting.

The next issue concerns the IUPUI policy on sexual harassment. Based on a June, 1986, Supreme Court decision, the American Council on Education released sexual harassment policy guidelines in December, 1986. These were published in the Chronicle of Higher Education. The Supreme Court unanimously ruled that businesses may become liable for sexual harassment by supervisors, even when the company has not been informed of the conduct. The American Council on Education felt that there was a warning in this for higher education and faculty governance. These should be apprised of the situation and make sure the policy that they supported was up to date. In 1982, IUPU and IU adopted a policy-and-procedures document related to sexual harassment. IUPUI and IU documents are almost identical. Basically, spacing and a few x's here and there make it different. They were based on guidelines from the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, which defines sexual harassment and considered it as a violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Acts of 1964. Many colleges and universities have based their policies on these guidelines.

Your Executive Committee is examining the IUPUI policy in light of the American Council on Education guidelines. We will forward any comments to the IUPUI Affirmative Action Committee, which is an administrative committee. We will also bring our recommendations or comments back to you. In addition, we will publish the current IU and IUPUI policy regarding sexual harassment with the minutes of this meeting so you can view it. It is currently not published with the handbook so the Executive Committee plans to make the recommendation that it be included in the next edition of the IU and IUPUI Academic Handbook. The Executive Committee will meet with Dr. Lincoln Lewis on January 15, at the regularly scheduled Executive Committee meeting to discuss this issue in detail. If you have any comments, please send them to me or to the Council Office so we can discuss them.

DEAN BOAZ: For your information, the revised Student Rights and Responsibilities document, which is now on the President's desk, does have a section on sexual harassment as it applies to students, with a procedure for implementation. It also has general directions which are dealt with somewhat distinctively.

PROF. HODES: Just as a matter of information, are the documents you are speaking of limited to employer/employee relationships or are do they include faculty/students?

PROF. ZUNT: It includes faculty, staff, and students.

PROF. HODES: Was that contemplated in the Supreme Court's opinion or was it done here?

PROF. ZUNT: That is addressed in the American Council on Education guidelines.

PROF. HODES: It is the opinion of the Council that they translate on a

one-to-one basis, faculty to students? Is that the proposition or do we have separate policies?

PROF. ZUNT: These are questions that we probably should look at again. I have reviewed the policy and it is my opinion that the IUPUI policy and IU policy which are identical, seem to handle everything that the American Council on Education has pointed out as potential problems. I think it is going to be appropriate for a number of people to review this. Certainly, since it is not published anywhere that we all have easy access to. I think it is appropriate to publish it with the minutes, so we can all review this policy. I wouldn't be surprised if we recommend no changes at all, except to make sure that it is available to everyone.

I received a notice that the parking garages are going to be made available to staff, faculty, and students for a \$10 per month fee. People who pay this fee would only be allowed to use the parking garages. They would not be able to use the surface areas. I was pleased that the Council received this information. All IUPUI permit holders will be receiving the details of this in the near future.

PROF. ROBBINS: I have received an announcement about that being available. One of the problems, though, that it appears to present is that people opting who have the use of parking garages on this campus, when I asked whether the reciprocal agreements that exist between Bloomington and Indianapolis and other campuses would be covered by that, the answer was "No." So, that meant that the person who needed to travel between campuses would, by necessity, would have to have both parking and the surface permits which offers no particular advantage. Is there any way that it would be possible somehow, at least make that provide for surface parking on the other campuses?

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: We will note that concern.

PROF. KELLER: I think the Parking Advisory Committee was approached and said that they would stay within the \$18 per month fee to cover all these other situations.

PROF. ZUNT: If you want to park on surfaces and also the garages, it was recommended that you purchase the \$18-per-month permit. Your comment, Dr. Robbins, I will forward to Mr. Martin. I didn't know everyone had received this.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: I think we should note, in connection with that announcement on the new rate for parking in the garages, that we are likely to lose some parking places. I think it is on January 19 that one of the parking lots will be closed down for construction of the new Medical Research and Library Building. I don't know the number of the lot, but those of you who are familiar with that part of the campus know which one it is. There may be some who will want to take very seriously this new opportunity to park in the garage because some surface parking is going to be eliminated.

PROF. ZUNT: Early in the fall of 1986 I reported to you that the Executive Committee had met and forwarded faculty nominations to Dean Pat Boaz to serve on an ad hoc, all-campus joint faculty and student academic review board to hear student appeals. Our faculty representatives were Francis Rhome, Carlyn

Johnson, and Jeff Vessely, who chaired the committee. The committee has finished their deliberations and submitted a written report. On behalf of the IUPUI Faculty Council and the Executive Committee, I express our appreciation for the faculty and the administration to work together in solving these problems.

The last item I need to remind you about is the birthday celebration on Monday, January 19, honoring Martin Luther King, Jr. This is the third annual IUPUI celebration. There are three sessions. In the morning it will be held at the School of Physical Education in the gymnasium; in the afternoon in the Union Building; and, in the evening, at the Indiana Roof Ballroom. That is a dinner program to be sponsored by the Black Student Union. If you need more information or tickets for any part of this program, you can call 274-5528. There are more details in the minutes appended to today's agenda on page 15.

That concludes my report.

AGENDA ITEM IV

Nominating Committee Report - Professor Rebecca T. Markel

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Thanks, Susan. Next we have the Faculty Board of Review elections with Professor Rebecca Markel presiding.

PROF. MARKEL: Thank you, Vice President Bepko. Today we will conduct the election for three Faculty Boards of Review. You will be receiving three ballots. There are seven names on each ballot. You will vote for five on each ballot. Members of the Nominating Committee will assist me in delivering these ballots to you.

AGENDA ITEM V

Funding for Undergraduate Research - Professor Miriam Langsam

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: The next agenda item is "Funding for Undergraduate Research" to be presented by Miriam Langsam.

PROF. LANGSAM: Thank you. The Honors Program has a new program which we are hoping to initiate this fall. Specifically, the program will be open to all undergraduates on our campus. This kind of program exists in most of the major universities within the state and elsewhere. For example, a similar program in the University of Minnesota spends about \$100,000 a year. We have \$5,000 to get started, but we are very excited about it.

Basically, what will happen and especially why I am interested in speaking to all of you is that we will send around a form asking whether anyone is interested in sponsoring an undergraduate in doing research. Most of the time this research will be the research that faculty members themselves are working on. Under very very rare circumstances, with some really exceptional undergraduates they may be doing their own projects. But in general, this is viewed as assisting with a faculty member's current research. By the way, most of the units that have this program include professional schools, graduate schools, and faculty members who work with undergraduates. What we will be doing is sending around a request that anyone in your school who would be willing to work with a student, submit their name and the items or areas in which they would be willing to have students working.

We will then publish this directory and make it available for undergraduates sometime this spring. Included in the material that we will make available to undergraduates will be an application form and a form requiring a faculty member sponsor. The faculty member is under no obligation to agree to do this. All they are saying is that they would be willing to see the student and to talk to the student and review their qualifications.

We will then bring all of these applications together and, for the present at least, the Honors Council which represents all these schools on campus, will review them and make awards to five undergraduate students. Each of these students will receive up to \$1,000. That \$1,000 will be divided in the following way: \$750 of it toward a stipend and \$250 toward supplies and equipment.

Why would any faculty member want to do this? There are three or four reasons. One, for some faculty who do not yet have grants but would like some student assistance, this is one way of getting it. Two, we have some very good undergraduates and people who are doing research, some of them with funding of their own, might like to, in fact, use a bright and capable undergraduate; and three, it is probably the most rewarding way of introducing undergraduate students to the reality of our world. We have some undergraduate students who think they would like to be political scientists, or medical people, who really have no idea of what we do. This is one way of mentoring bright students to introduce them to the world of research.

It has been a very successful program. Some schools already have an opportunity for students to do a semester of research for credit. This is also a non-credit opportunity. It is a work experience for these students. We are pleased about getting started on this project and we would like your support. We would encourage you to tell your colleagues about it and perhaps to encourage them to take a chance with some really outstanding undergraduates. These students do not have to be involved in the Honors Programs though we would like to see as many of them from the Honors Program as possible. Do you have any questions?

DEAN YOVITS: From the material that I saw on this it said that you were going to give preference to students who were in the Honors Program.

PROF. LANGSAM: That is correct.

DEAN YOVITS: Doesn't that seem a little bit unfair?

PROF. LANGSAM: No. It is an Honors Program.

DEAN YOVITS: That serves a different function. It may very well be that there are students who are very able who, for one reason or another, were not able to get into the Honors Program. I would like to encourage you to consider all students perhaps equally considering abilities on the basis of background.

PROF. LANGSAM: Since the School of Science has several members on the Honors Council, I am sure that opinion will carry some weight. Are there any other questions or comments? We will hopefully be making our first round selection

this summer. These students can get started in the fall working. We will keep you up to date on what happens with this proposal. Again, I would appreciate whatever support and assistance you can provide. Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM VI

Fringe Benefits Committee Report - Phased Early Retirement Program (PERP)

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: The Fringe Benefits Committee Report which was on the agenda is going to be rescheduled and will be made at the meeting of our Faculty Council on March 5.

AGENDA ITEM VII

Learning Resources Symposium - Rebecca Van Voorhis and Jeffery Vessely

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: The next item is a report on the Learning Resources Symposium which will be given by Rebecca Van Voorhis and Jeff Vessely.

PROF. VAN VOORHIS: We just got some posters from the Printing Department for the symposium. We will leave some of these posters if you would be willing to post one somewhere in your building. Please feel free to take one. In addition, we have a brochure which will be mailed to every faculty member within the next few days. Again, feel free to take one or more if you would like to do that.

The symposium's theme this year is "Teaching for the Fun of it." I understand that, when Dean Schaller heard that that was the topic theme that we had chosen, he said something like, "Why else?" The theme each year is to focus on how to further our excellence in a classroom in teaching capacities, so this year we selected something with a twist to convey the message that, in order to be effective, you really have to enjoy what you are doing. We are pretty excited about the keynoter who has the incentive to start off the symposium.

The key presenter is Sheila Murray Bethel, who is president of her own company, Getting Control, Inc. We thought that would provide us some inspiration about how to have more control over our professional lives as well. She is a much-in-demand public speaker. She has knowledge in both the management and the leadership skills areas. She said that she would try to focus her presentation as keynote speaker around the personal leadership qualities that faculty need to exhibit both in the classroom and out of the classroom. She also said that she would spend some time looking at the balance between professional career aspects of our lives and our personal lives. She is the keynote speaker. Her topic that she sent to you is called "Leadership in Teaching: A Time For Renewal and Recommitment".

After her morning presentation, which gets under way at 9:00, the luncheon speaker will be continuing our tradition of the last few years. It will feature last year's Edward C. Moore Award winner for Outstanding Teaching. That person was Dr. Ann Marriner. She will speak on "Motivation Puts Fun in Learning". Dr. Marriner will speak after the luncheon, drawing from the literature about the characteristics of effective teachers and how they use their knowledge to inspire and generate enthusiasm among students in the classroom. Faculty are encouraged to attend and participate. Whether or not you choose to buy lunch is up to the individual.

That is our morning and luncheon speaker. Jeff is going to talk more about the afternoon workshops which are available as choices. I would appreciate any encouragement you can give your colleagues to come and participate in any part or all of the day's events because I think it will prove to be fruitful and rewarding for each of us.

PROF. VESSELY: I will put the brochures on the table along with the posters. I will not read the topics to you today. I am sure the time is drawing near for us to want to adjourn, but there are a couple of highlights. There are some sessions that are in the not-so-traditional learning resources areas. One is the use of humor in the classroom. There are some that fall into the traditional pattern: using overhead transparencies; using the computer; using the video disc. There is one that sounds like a commercial for something that the Learning Resources Committee also does, called "Rejuvenating Introductory Courses". There has been a mailing to you periodically asking if you are interested in applying for a grant, to work in the summer to rejuvenate a course that you now teach. The people who did this last summer will make presentations to show what they did and maybe to encourage some others of us to get involved in that method also.

There are 15 concurrent sessions, five in a 45-minute time block, followed by another five in about one-hour-and-15-minute time block, and then finishing with another five in a 45-minute time block. That is the reason for the 8:00 a.m. to 4:20 p.m. time. If you have any questions while going over this brochure and want to contact either Becky or myself to fill you in on what might be in store, you may, but I think the paragraphs for each of these topics explain them very well.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM VIII

Smoking Policy for IUPUI - Discussion

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: The next agenda item is a discussion of the Smoking Policy for IUPUI. This will be presented by our Council Secretary Susan Zunt.

PROF. ZUNT: A faculty member, working through Dean Schaller's office, has requested that we review and revise the current smoking policy taking more aggressive stands in banning smoking in the hallways. The current IUPUI policy is attached to today's agenda. I asked Mrs. Chumley to call all the units on this campus and determine and collect any other smoking policies that were in existence. We found two: Those of the School of Medicine and the School of Dentistry. We have appended these so that you can see a range of policies that we have in effect on this campus.

The current policy, dated 1985, is found in the Administrative Policies Manual. This does not allow smoking in the classrooms. Smoking is permitted in hallways, lounges, and offices except in hazardous areas where "No Smoking" signs should be posted by the responsible officer. Violations are reportable to the office of dean of the school for appropriate action.

The School of Medicine adopted a more restrictive policy in 1984 to promote an environment of non-smoking, specifically in the University hospitals.

In 1986 the School of Dentistry adopted a fairly restrictive smoking policy, volunteering quit-smoking programs for smokers who wish to try to stop. Vending machines containing tobacco products are not allowed in the Dental School proper.

As I said, the actual documents are attached to today's agenda. The Executive Committee feels that this issue is of general concern to all members of the University and brings this issue to the floor of the Council for comment and discussion and direction. One opinion is that the current IUPUI policy allows for poorly ventilated hallways to be designated as hazardous. These poorly ventilated hallways could be posted "No Smoking" by the individual school directed by the dean or other designated officer. There is a precedent, based on the IU School of Medicine and the School of Dentistry policies, to encourage more restrictive policies to come out of individual schools, units, or buildings, rather than adopting a more restrictive, all-campus policy. We are concerned about this issue and we are interested in hearing your comments and suggestions.

DEAN YOVITS: Susan, this administrative policy says "Violations should be reported to the Office of the Dean of the School for appropriate action." What is appropriate action?

DEAN SCHALLER: Most of our deans are wise enough to figure that out, Marshall. I am sure you would have no trouble.

DEAN DALY: Indiana University hospitals have recently adopted a more restrictive policy than that. There is one out now that would make this look very liberal, and I will see to it that you get a copy of that.

PROF. ROBBINS: One of the questions that relate to developing policies for buildings just had to do with those buildings that are not in affect controlled by any single academic unit. It seems to me that if you were there, there would have to be action taken at some other level.

DEAN SCHALLER: We could probably work out something where an academic official would be responsible for that. I understand what you are saying. All of the School of Medicine buildings and all of the hospitals come under the direction of Dean Daly since he is also the Director of the Medical Center. We might be able to work out something like that if there are buildings that fall between the cracks. Your observation is a very good one.

PROF. HODES: Sooner or later we obviously are going to get to the point of, whether there is a policy or not, the question is going to be how to enforce it, who is enforcing it, and how it is interpreted? This one line out of the present Dental School policy says: "Smoking will be permitted...only to the extent that it does not endanger life or property, or risk impairing non-smokers' health." In the hands of somebody who took the Surgeon General's reports seriously, he would take the view that all smoking has an inherent danger to life, to not just the smoker but from second hand smoke, and therefore would ban smoking in the whole building. So, it seems to me that ultimately, we are not going to be able to duck what is the critical issue, which is in whose hands are we are going to entrust the interpretation of the policy?

PROF. ALIPRANTIS: Have we had any problems with smokers in buildings or any incidents where something has happened?

DEAN SCHALLER: I had a faculty member write to me expressing a concern about the general issue and also indicating that he personally had problems with this. He requested that I initiate legislation. Of course, I don't initiate legislation. That is why I turned it over to the Faculty Council. I have had a number of people talk to me about this, expressing increasing concerns. With respect to the classrooms, I might take this opportunity to say that the policy of this campus is, and I think of Indiana University, there is to be no smoking in classrooms. That also includes the instructor. It is not just the students who are not allowed to smoke; the instructor is not allowed to smoke. I have had some reported incidents of this that I have had to deal with. If you will recall a few years ago, I put out a memorandum indicating that that was the policy and I can assure you that if instructors do smoke in the classroom and encourage their students to light up, there will be appropriate action taken. That is a flat violation of a regulation. Some of these incidents came about because some students experienced a great deal of distress, almost of an emergency nature, because of the smoking that was going on in the classroom. That is not subject to interpretation. That is just flatly against the regulations to smoke in the classroom.

PROF. STARKEY: It seems that there is a range of policies here. The Surgeon General has come out with a very strong report on the dangers of smoking. It has gotten to point where one could make the argument that the smoker doesn't actually have any rights anymore. It isn't like the motorcycle helmets where an individual might destroy himself. There is a dialogue of debate within the state concerning public buildings as to whether, as a recipient of state benefits, we should have uniform policies for the entire campus. Not just for ourselves, but for the state. For example, other public buildings, other public institutions, etc.

DEAN DALY: That thought is what has led to increasingly stringent policies in the Medical School with respect to smoking. We have two sets of problems. One is as a health institution I think we have a responsibility to set ourselves as an example. To have a hospital filled with smoke is not exactly the kind of image we would like to project. There is the additional problem that hospitals have special accreditation, which are becoming increasingly stringent. Those are really safety oriented.

My professional life and career are really centered around patients with lung disease. For personal and professional reasons, I can't think of a worse habit or worse health problem than smoking.

PROF. LANGSAM: A concern that I had about our policy is that there is one space which has been left out. That is the elevator. I guess you could read between the lines that smoking is banned in elevators. We used to have signs in Cavanaugh but those signs are no longer up in Cavanaugh and two or three other buildings on campus. In fact, one of the most dangerous places people smoke is in elevators. I would certainly like to add that as an area where no smoking is permitted.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: It may even be against the law to smoke in elevators. There may be statutes.

PROF. LANGSAM: There is nothing that addresses the issue. There used to be a sign in Cavanaugh stating "No Smoking in Elevators" but that is no longer there. People just take that as a sign that they can smoke in elevators. I have on several occasions told people to put out cigarettes. Most of the time I win, but not always.

PROF. HODES: I am pretty sure that none of the policies have any kind of exceptions for exam periods. However, since this is a classroom that we use as an examination room, there should be no smoking. But, I know the Law School routinely sets aside smoking. But it seems that that is probably wrong under the policy that we now define. A classroom is a classroom, even if it is being used for an exam room.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Are you reporting a violation? (Laughter)

PROF. HODES: I am reporting a widespread pattern of practices.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: The violation needs to be reported to the dean of the school. (laughter)

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Is it fair to say that the Surgeon General's new report and the activities which have taken place at the hospitals, Medical School, and the Dental School, (which created more restrictive rules than what are now in force for the campus as a whole) should cause us to consider this issue through a committee to review and recommend, some possible changes of the IUPUI policy?

PROF. WELLMAN: With regard to the Medical Center and the new policies, one of the policies I think will be no smoking in private offices. I just wonder how this group feels about that if that were applied throughout the campus. By the way, Dr. French who is on that committee for the Medical Center, is here if you want to ask him more specifically about some of the policies.

DEAN BOAZ: I have regular complaints from students, particularly about eating areas. At the end of last semester, we provided an all-night study area for the students. Smoking was totally banned and we had absolutely no complaints.

DEAN SCHALLER: They should be able to get up and walk out if they wished.

DEAN BOAZ: That was allowed.

PROF. ZUNT: The Executive Committee will form an ad hoc committee and it will include staff and students as well as faculty.

PROF. WILSON: I didn't quite hear what Professor Wellman said about smoking in private offices. I was wondering how you were going to enforce that. There would be faculty members who would quit their job if that were enforced.

PROF. FRENCH: I am the representative from the Medical School and we have addressed some of these issues. I would be willing to talk to some of these people if you didn't want to take up the entire group's time on this issue.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: I think it would be a good idea for those comments to be made to the committee that works on this problem. I think that the work that the Medical School has done would be very helpful and constructive for the committee. It may be, with some minor adjustments, that the Faculty Council as a whole might want to embrace the work that the Medical School has done.

PROF. FRENCH: We went through the same thing. Perhaps something that your committee is going to have to attend to is that it is so easy to suddenly incorporate everything. If we are going to stop smoking, does this mean that we are going to stop spitting on the sidewalks? What does this mean about food displays, trash, etc.? I think very definitely the Smoking Committee, whoever it is, finally has to realize that all of these are ways to keep from dealing with the real issue. Finally, they have to decide that they are dealing with smoking and someone else can deal with beer cans and the other kinds of things.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: I might mention also, although it is not directly related but it is at least closely related to this discussion, there is a program that you should be hearing about called "Max-well" for maximum wellness. It is a campus-wide Personnel program for fitness and health. One of the components of this program will be a forum for quitting smoking. Those who don't like the restrictive policies on smoking can take advantage of the Max-well program and try to quit.

PROF. FLYNN: A few years ago we tried to do something in the School of Nursing about this issue. We got a lot of support from the American Lung Association. I don't know if you have had any contact with them, but they will come and participate in any way that they can. They are very helpful.

AGENDA ITEM IX
New Business

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: We have one other matter on the agenda and that is New Business. Under that heading, we will hear the results of the election.

PROF. MARKEL: Thank you. The results of the Faculty Boards of Review election are:

	BOARD OF REVIEW #1:
Patricia Blake	School of Nursing
Robert D. Dick	School of Liberal Arts
Adolfo Doddoli	Herron School of Art
Monte Juillerat	Liberal Arts
Juanita Keck	School of Nursing

	BOARD OF REVIEW #2:
Charlotte Carley	School of Nursing
Henry Karlson	School of Law
Gerald Powers	School of Social Work
J. K. Stevens	School of Liberal Arts
Randi Stocker	University Libraries

BOARD OF REVIEW #3:

Doris Froebe	School of Nursing
Jean Gnat	University Libraries
Emily Hernandez	School of Medicine
Harry W. Jarrett	School of Science
Bennie Keller	School of Engineering & Technology

I move that the ballots be destroyed.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: We have a motion and a second that the ballots be destroyed. If there is no discussion, all in favor say "Aye." Any opposed? This motion is carried. Thank you for the report.

AGENDA ITEM X
Adjournment

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Is there any other business that should come before the Council? If not, we are adjourned.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY

at

INDIANAPOLIS

FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING

Thursday, February 5, 1987

Law School, Room 116, 3:30 - 5:30 p.m.

Members Present: Vice President Gerald L. Bepko, Executive Dean Howard G. Schaller, Dean Patricia Boaz. Deans: Walter J. Daly, H. William Gilmore, Elizabeth Grossman, R. Bruce Renda, William J. Voos. Director: Barbara Fischler. Faculty: Roko Aliprantis, Elaine Alton, Sharon Andreoli, John Baenziger, Karen Becker, Anne Belcher, H. R. Besch, Jr., Jacqueline Blackwell, Patricia Blake, Charles Blevins, Linda Brothers, Michael Burke, Varoujan Chalian, Joseph DiMicco, David Doedens, Kenneth Dunipace, James Edmondson, Charles Ellinger, Mark Farber, Martin Farlow, Mary Feeley, Beverly Flynn, Melvin Glick, Clifford Goodwin, Edwin T. Harper, Robert Harris, Emily Hernandez, Ngoan Van Hoang, Meredith Hull, Jerome Kaminker, Henry Karlson, Linda Kasper, Suetta Kehrein, Judith Kosegi, Joseph Kuczkowski, Rebecca T. Markel, Judy Miller, Michael E. Mitchell, Catherine Palmer, Richard Pflanze, John Pless, Shirley Quate, Terry Reed, Mark Richardson, Edward Robbins, Glen Sagraves, Ernest E. Smith, Robert Stonehill, Susan Sutton, Jeffery Vessley, Vernon Vix, Kathleen Warfel, Dorothy Webb, Henry Wellman, Maudine Williams, Kathryn Wilson, Pao-lo Yu, Susan Zunt.

Alternates Present: James F. Bindley for Jeffery Grove; Maudine Williams for Jean Gnat; Sue Barrett for P. Nicholas Kellum, Hugh Wolf for Howard D. Mehlinger, John Barlow for William M. Plater, Creasie Hairston for Sheldon Siegel, Louis Holtzclaw for James E. Weigand. Faculty: Patrick McGeever for Edmund Byrne, George Willis for Jeri Francis.

Members Absent: Deans: Charles Bonser, Trevor Brown, Jack Wentworth, Marshall Yovits. Faculty: Richard Beck, Robert Colyer, Andre DeKorvin, Linda Haas, Eugene Helveston, William Hodes, Barbara Jackson, Robert J. Kirk, Miriam Langsam, Monroe Little, James McAteer, Robert Mendelsohn, Barnett B. Morris, Paul Nagy, Gerald Powers, Kenneth Ryder, John Schmedtje, P. Kent Sharp, Rowland Sherrill, Judith Silence, Victor Wallis, Charles Winslow.

Ex-Officio Members Present: Martin Dragonette, Shirley Newhouse.

Visitors: B. Keith Moore, Chairman, IUPUI Fringe Benefits Committee.

AGENDA ITEM I

Memorial Resolution - Dr. Jack Carr, School of Dentistry, (Read by Dean H. William Gilmore

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: I think we are ready to begin. We will call the meeting to order and take up our first agenda item which is a memorial resolution for Dr. Jack Carr, read by Dean Bill Gilmore from the School of Dentistry.

[The memorial resolution was read by Dean Gilmore.]

AGENDA ITEM II

Approval of Minutes - January 8, 1987

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: The next item of business is the approval of the minutes of the January 8 meeting. Do we have a motion? Motion made by Dean Renda. Seconded by Professor Vessely.

[There were two earlier changes to be made in the January 8, 1987 minutes. The minutes should have shown Ed Starkey as being an alternate for Director Barbara Fischler. Also, Professor Blake pointed out that on page 5, second paragraph, which read:

PROF. BLAKE: I thought in the discussion that Dean Schaller said that health schools would be carried over and at the time Dean Grossman and the Dean of Dentistry also spoke to the issue that we weren't interested.

should have read:

PROF. BLAKE: I thought in the discussion that Dean Schaller said that health schools would be carried over and at the time Dean Grossman and the Dean of Dentistry also spoke to the issue that we were interested.

If there is no discussion, all in favor say "Aye." Any opposed? [none] The minutes are approved.

AGENDA ITEM III

Presiding Officer's Business - Vice President Gerald L. Bepko

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: I have two brief items of Presiding Officer's Business. First, there is a matter which has been discussed in previous meetings of the Faculty Council. Dean Marshall Yovits has announced that he will leave the deanship in June of 1988. We indicated that we would go forward and appoint a Search and Screen Committee at this time. We have asked the faculty of the School of Science for suggestions for membership on the Committee and have talked to the senior administrators of Purdue University. We also have talked to your Faculty Council Secretary and are now prepared to appoint the Search and Screen Committee. A letter will be in the mail tonight with the appointments. I just thought I would mention it today. The chairman of the Committee will be Bill Plater, Dean of the School of Liberal Arts.

The second item is related, in the sense that it has to do with appointments. Those of us who work in campus administration have lamented the fact that we don't have enough people working on our team to do all of the things that ought to be done. Our span of control is very great, with so many reporting lines with all of the new things that are happening on campus that we feel that we are too thin in terms of personnel. Also, we would like to place a little more focus on Academic Affairs. That is the area in which we think we need some additional personnel. We have regretted the fact that we haven't had more of an opportunity to take the initiative with outside organizations such as the Higher Education Commission and that we haven't had enough time to do some of the planning work that we would like to do. We also have a very high volume of regular academic activities involving academic support for

faculty and promotion and tenure, etc. To cover all our responsibilities we have employed a team concept in campus administration. It is just that we don't have enough people on our team.

To address the problem we would like to explore a suggestion that was originally made by Executive Dean Schaller. We are proposing to divide the office of Executive Dean and Dean of the Faculties into two offices. One office would continue to be the office of Executive Dean. The new office would be the office of Dean of Faculties. We would divide up the work according to the tastes and interests of the persons involved, but, generally speaking, the Executive Dean, who would continue to be Dean Schaller, would have his reporting lines from the schools and the new Dean of Faculties would, among other things, deal with academic administration, faculty personnel, Columbus Center, Computing Services, Learning Resources, Libraries, Student Affairs, University Division, and perhaps other things. I should emphasize that, because we have a team concept at work, all of us do things in all of the areas. This departmentalization might not be crisply defined.

We thought that this is something that should be done now. First of all, the need is great and we don't think there is any reason to postpone acting. Secondly, if we are to bring someone on from outside of the campus administration, it will be important to have that person on board as soon as possible, hopefully, for the 1987-88 academic year, because that will give the new person, whoever it may be, an opportunity to work with Dean Schaller. Dean Schaller has indicated that he plans to retire at the end of the 1987-88 academic year. This would give a new person an opportunity to tap the extraordinary lode of information that Dean Schaller possesses. This is something that has helped me greatly and something that will help anyone who is going to be involved in campus administration here.

We think that this person, whoever may be selected for this new position, should be a tenured member of the Indiana University faculty or the faculty of this campus. We think that most of the searches for Deans of Faculties result in the appointment of a person who is already on the faculty. We also think that the timing is such that it would be somewhat difficult for us to conduct a national search and have the search completed in time to consider the possibility of having someone on board for 1987-88.

We plan to appoint a small advisory committee to evaluate applicants and to make recommendations as to who should fill this new position of Dean of Faculties. We hope to go ahead with the appointment of that committee in the next couple of days.

I report this matter, not just because it is our intention to go ahead, but I want your comments and reactions. We want to make sure that the major decisions that we make have broad support in the faculty. Therefore, I invite your comments or your questions either here, briefly, or at another time. If there are no questions, that will conclude my Presiding Officer's Business.

AGENDA ITEM IV

Executive Committee Report - Susan L. Zunt, Secretary

SECRETARY ZUNT: I have a number of items to report to you of Executive Committee business. First of all, as you came in you should have picked up a

copy of the amended Clinical Ranks Proposal. I know with the agenda today we circulated a proposal as we had it at mid-month. Because of the delay in printing, the proposal has now had an opportunity to be reviewed on all campuses including a University Faculty Council committee. You will see that this proposal has now been amended. What you have before you today on the white piece of paper is the proposal as it will be presented at the University Faculty Council next week on Tuesday, the 10th. It is important that we let our representatives know how we would like them to vote at that meeting.

The Faculty Council Office has received the new Students Rights and Responsibilities document written by the task force, chaired by Dean Boaz. This document has been sent to the Student Affairs Committee, chaired by Dr. McAteer. We hope to have an update for you as the committee reviews the document. We will bring that before you for your endorsement probably early in the fall.

The Board of Trustees met this last weekend in Bloomington where a number of faculty members represented us in different presentations and different arenas. Vice President Judith Palmer and Vice President Bepko discussed the Mission Statement and the IUPUI Ten Year Development Plan. Also, Dean East gave a presentation about IUPUI's plans to attract traditional and non-traditional students. There also was a faculty panel on which two of the three members were from this campus. Dr. Michael Conneally discussed Huntington's Chorea in a presentation to the Board of Trustees and also Dr. Rowland Sherrill who is the Chair and Associate Professor of Religious Studies in the School of Liberal Arts. All of these presentations were excellent and very well received by the Trustees.

I have a comment about UFC representation. In some of the rosters that you might have received, one of our representatives had been deleted: Byron Olson. This is because of my election as Secretary. I was not counted when we elected UFC representatives, so we had 13 people elected for 12 positions and inadvertently Dr. Olson was omitted. He is a full member of the UFC, so we have straightened out that problem. Dr. Markel who is the Chair of the Nominating Committee, has made a change this time, so when you get your ballot information for UFC, you will probably notice you are electing five people instead of the six that we usually do. That is to compensate for what happened last year.

The Executive Committee has received the All-University New Admissions Policy. This policy was developed by a special task force appointed by President Ryan and has had systemwide involvement in its development. From this campus Mr. Krivacs, Dean Schaller, and Dean Plater had additional input with the development of the admissions criteria. We received this policy last month and it is now going to the Academic Affairs Committee. Dr. Wilson, who chairs that committee, will bring the report to you at our next meeting on March 5. That is the All-University Admissions Policy. Professor Wilson is also reviewing the IUPUI policy which is in effect or going into effect very soon.

The Executive Committee and the Budgetary Affairs Committee were invited to participate in an IU Foundation Investment Program, which was presented by one of the Vice Presidents of the IU Foundation, Mr. James Elliott. Many people from the Executive Committee and the Budgetary Affairs Committee, including your chair Beverly Hill, attended that meeting and hoped for additional

information about especially the campus budget.

At our last meeting I reported to you that the Executive Committee was looking at the IUPUI Sexual Harassment policy. That policy, as it was approved and accepted in 1982, is printed and attached to today's agenda. The Executive Committee made several recommendations which were positively received by Dr. Lincoln Lewis, Director of our Affirmation Office. He is in the process now of evaluating that policy and making some changes in hopes in the near future to have the new, revised policy available for everyone. He will mail it, I understand, to all faculty. The things that the Executive Committee recommended were positive introductory statements and also a warning against retaliation. Also, the Executive Committee wanted to include in the definition of sexual harassment the "filing of false claims of sexual harassment." These are the recommendations which have been made by the Executive Committee to the Affirmative Action Office. We should be seeing a new, revised policy coming shortly from that office. If you have additional comments, please send them to me and we will get them to Dr. Lewis or send them directly to Dr. Lewis.

You have a piece of paper which you picked up as you came in which is an attempt to find out who is interested in participating either in the symposium that we will present in the fall, co-sponsored by student, staff, and faculty to look at sexual harassment, taking an educational approach to heighten awareness of this issue. If you are interested in participating, I would like for you to tear off that half of the paper and please give it to Mrs. Chumley so that we can make sure that we have Faculty Council representation on that committee. The other half of the paper is to assess interest for the smoking policy committee. I received a letter today from a student at IUPUI, who is very concerned about the no smoking policy that is put into affect for individual classrooms, yet not in the hallways outside of classrooms. I will respond to her. I have already informed Mr. Dragonette who is the President of the Student Assembly here. This is someone who would like to participate in the planning of this symposium.

On February 12 I will be attending a conference in Bloomington on the impact of recent immigration legislation in institutional hiring practices. If we have questions in this area from working with foreign students or are interested in hiring foreign faculty members, we should contact Dr. Burdellis Carter in the International Student Services Office. Even though it is called Student Services, it does handle faculty concerns. Her telephone number, for your convenience, is 4-7294. I will make a complete report to you at the next meeting after I attend that conference.

The last time I reported to you that the Executive Committee was developing a response to the Vice President's Ten Year Development Plan for IUPUI. Since that time the Executive Committee as a whole has worked on the plan and we are formulating a response. There has been a sub-committee appointed: Professor Jerry Powers, Professor Jeff Vessely, and Professor Monroe Little. That sub-committee will present the Executive Committee response to you on March 5.

The last item of Executive Committee business is a report about the Pan Am Games. Dr. Chalian is here from the Executive Committee to make that report to you.

PROF. CHALIAN: As you know, we will host the Pan American Games in our city in August. Being a metropolitan university, we are making an effort to not be deprived of our contribution to the activities. As you know, as citizens of the IUPUI campus, we have a major concern about parking. There are a lot of rumors and reactions about parking and our daily obligations to our students, patients, and faculty. This concern was reported to the committee of our campus which is named the American Games Information Committee, chaired by Mr. Robert Baxter. He is surrounded by powerful and able politicians and administrators. Our Vice President was nice enough to ask our Executive Committee to participate. That way, if something goes wrong, he will know whom to blame. (laughter)

They had their meeting and I was the representative of the Executive Committee. The main conversation was about an emergency plan. The definition of "emergency" was tricky. We had labeled two kinds of emergencies, "catastrophic emergencies" for which the city will be responsible. The second one is "health" which might be related to the first. If we have problems, who is going to take care of it? The city will join us, but we won't be left out. We won't be bypassed. That's why our three deans - Dean Daly from the Medical School, Dean Gilmore from the School of Dentistry; and Dean Grossman from the School of Nursing - will be active and will be notified with a few minutes of how they can provide health care for these game activities.

Parking is a major problem. I am just passing on the assurance of others that you will have parking places; however, that does not mean that you are not going to have problems. When you are playing host to the Pan American Games in your city and you are labeled as a metropolitan university, you will have problems in parking. I was told that a few parking garages on the south side of West Michigan will be mobilized for this activity. But there will be exchange of your decals. Those exchanges might be on the grass or on the ground, but you won't be charged extra for it. This is just to convince you that there will be some area available for you to park in. Now, how do you get this information? I was told that there will be at least three or four information centers. One will be on New York Street, and another will be on West Michigan Street. If you don't know where to park, you can go to one of these information booths and they will tell you immediately the closest area to your daily activities. They will guide you to those parking areas. It may be a parking lot or it may be parking areas.

There also will be a master calendar of on-campus events. I look for this to stay from now on. This is a benefit of our Pan American Games. We will have a yearly master calendar to tell everybody what is expected for social or city activities or University activities on this campus. Everyone of us will be notified. I am just conveying the promises to you.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: He told me to write down the promises he made to you. [laughter]

PROF. CHALIAN: The master calendar will be distributed to all the deans, faculty, staff, and students late in April. That way, you will know which day you are having traffic in the Center. You will have some feeling that you might have problems in parking. It is like the weather. Sometimes you leave your house a little earlier and allow extra time for parking.

We will have the isolation of two buildings. Be aware of it and don't feel bad. This is because of security, the security for the members of the Pan Am group and the security of our own IUPUI family. We are concerned about our own family also. In order to control this, I was promised that we will have new identification means. They will detect from this means that you are an IUPUI member and they will assist you. You will have easier access to your office.

The new IU Conference Center will be in use for the Games, I am told.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: It is not the IU Conference Center. It is the University Conference Center at IUPUI.

PROF. CHALIAN: Sorry. Thank you for correcting my terminology. In health care delivery for emergencies, Wishard Hospital is going to cooperate with us. We have excellent promises from them for real emergencies.

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

SECRETARY ZUNT: That concludes the Executive Committee report.

AGENDA ITEM V

Report from Fringe Benefits Committee - Phased Early Retirement Program (PERP), B. Keith Moore, Chair

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: We have, as our next item of business, a report from the Fringe Benefits Committee that was held over from last month because the person who was to present it was ill. I am glad to see that he is feeling well today. Dr. Keith Moore.

PROF. MOORE: Vice President Bepko, Secretary Zunt, and members of the Faculty Council, I would like to present today an update on some of the activities of the Fringe Benefits Committee from the last several months. I am not presenting anything that should require action unless you feel it is necessary. I have two issues that I would like to address. The first is the Phased Early Retirement Program document which was developed by the Bloomington Faculty Affairs Committee and adopted by the Bloomington Faculty Council. This document was attached to the agenda for today's meeting as IUPUI Circular No. 86-12.

The IUPUI Faculty Council Fringe Benefits Committee reviewed this proposal at meetings on November 12 and on January 14. In addition, the chairman of the IUPUI committee has consulted with Michael Downs, the co-chair of the All University Fringe Benefits Committee and with Mr. Jack Hudson, Director of Indiana University Insurance and Retirement programs. The IUPUI committee was also represented at two meetings of the All University Fringe Benefits Committee at which the Phased Early Retirement program was considered.

The IUPUI Fringe Benefits Committee has agreed to "support in principle the concept of faculty members being able to continue full fringe benefits while on part-time assignment phasing into full retirement." The committee feels, however, that the PERP proposal, as submitted, has serious drawbacks and would need major revisions before such a plan could be implemented in a manner that would be equitable to all faculty members. A similar conclusion was reached

by the All University Fringe Benefits Committee.

The other major issue that should be of interest to the faculty is the question of an insurance-based, long-term disability plan. The question of long-term disability protection has been one of the most heavily discussed issues over the last 10 years and appears to be perceived by most faculty members as a major defect in the Indiana University fringe benefits package for faculty members.

The current long-term disability plan is not insurance-based and is both an uncontrolled expense to the University and potentially damaging to the faculty member since it relies in part on the individual's accumulated TIAA-CREF retirement funds.

The IU Office of Insurance has solicited proposals for an insurance-based long-term disability plan and has obtained three proposals. These appear to meet most of the criteria set down by the University Faculty Council three years ago and still come in below 0.6% of total payroll. The plans appear quite attractive compared to long-term disability plans available at other educational facilities both Midwest and nationwide. The UFC Fringe Benefits Committee is meeting February 10 to go over details with providers and plans to make a presentation at the UFC meeting on February 10. It appears that chances for an insurance-based, long-term disability plan at IU are encouraging. My committee will be considering the final proposal and will hopefully have a recommendation to the IUPUI Faculty Council this spring.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Thank you. Are there any questions or comments for Dr. Moore?

AGENDA ITEM VI

Report from Faculty Affairs Committee - Clinical Ranks Proposal, Byron Olson, Chair, (Action Required by the Council)

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: To complete the School of Dentistry day at the Faculty Council, we have yet another presenter from the School of Dentistry. The next item on the agenda is a report from the Faculty Affairs Committee from Dr. Byron Olson.

PROF. OLSON: Thank you Vice President Bepko, Secretary Zunt, and members of the Faculty Council. I didn't realize today was Dental day. The Faculty Affairs Committee of IUPUI would like to bring a proposal to you today on Amended Clinical Ranks Proposal.

If you will follow along with me, I would like to read:

To enable the School of Medicine and other health schools to employ full-time clinicians to provide patient services and related teaching, the following changes in Indiana University Academic Handbook, 1985 are recommended:

- 1) Insert a heading reading Clinical Appointees between the fifth and sixth paragraphs on page 19 and insert "full-time salaried physicians, dentists, nurses, optometrists, audiologists and speech

pathologists primarily providing patient-related services" prior to the words "part-time salaried" in the sixth paragraph.

- 2) Add to the sixth paragraph "Full-time salaried clinical faculty (physicians, dentists, nurses, optometrists, audiologists, and speech pathologists primarily providing patient-related services) shall represent no more than 15% of the total full-time faculty of each school", and
- 3) Insert the words "full-time clinical rank employees" in the first sentence of the fifth paragraph on page 51.

These employees would be eligible for TIAA-CREF benefits. Such individuals would not be eligible for tenure or sabbatical leave and voting rights, outside of the School of Medicine or other health schools.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Is there any discussion?

PROF. WILSON: What percentage of the faculty would this represent if this went into effect right now?

DEAN SCHALLER: At the beginning, of course, it would be zero because nobody has been appointed to it.

PROF. WILSON: Presumably, there are a number of people right now that we employ that would fall into this category immediately.

DEAN SCHALLER: There is nobody currently that is a full-time, clinical rank employee.

PROF. WILSON: Then why are you doing this? There are people who are going to be in this rank...

DEAN SCHALLER: "Going to be", you asked how many were in this classification now.

PROF. WILSON: How many people would it affect if it went into effect right now and you could appoint everyone who would qualify, how many would there be? The only reason I ask this is because it is a question I asked before. Is this proposal going to displace any current tenured faculty members?

DEAN SCHALLER: That is a different question.

PROF. WILSON: It is related because when you say it is limited to 15%, would that mean it is going to rise to 15% and you are going to displace so many people who are tenured faculty members?

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: My understanding is that the percentage was included to place a maximum on the number that could be appointed in this category. It was not designed to reflect approximately the number of people who are currently employed who might, over the next ten years, change their appointment status. New people would be brought on. They could rise to 15%. I don't think that was the reasoning that led to the choice of that percentage. It was just to have some proper limit of the number of persons

that could be appointed now into this new category.

PROF. WILSON: I am just surprised that there isn't a concern among some of the Allied Health people of this displacement. There may be a limit placed on it, but if it is only going to represent five percent now and bring it up to 15%.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: My understanding is that the people who would be appointed into jobs like this might prefer this system because, if they were appointed into a tenure-track slot, they probably wouldn't get tenure. In fact, in doing a little reading on the subject, I discovered that many of the schools that don't have a clinical track simply allow the medical school clinical faculty to reach the "up or out" stage, deny tenure, and then continue some of them on after that. That puts the people in those positions in a very undesirable spot. In the case of this proposal I don't think anyone is being displaced. No one is being told "You are a faculty member now, but you are going to all of a sudden be given a different rank." It will probably be an advantage to the people who are going to be performing patient care to have this track available.

DEAN SCHALLER: For anybody who is currently on the faculty and is tenured, obviously there are certain procedures that have to go through. If you are full-time on the tenure track but not tenured, that then becomes a matter of non-reappointment. There are certain procedures that have to be gone through. A faculty member has certain rights to appeal. If you are asking if there is an intent here to take people out of those two classifications, let me say that all of that is protected by procedures that have to be followed. I don't of any dean of one of these schools who expressed any desire of replacing faculty members who are tenured or non-tenured but on the tenure track. I don't think that is the issue at all. I think the issue that you are raising, is asking for a forecast as to how many there might be in the future. I suppose somebody could voluntarily give up tenured status or voluntarily give up their place on the tenure track...

PROF. WILSON: I am talking about a dean saying, "Now, we are going to replace this tenure-track position with one of these people."

DEAN SCHALLER: I understand now what you are asking. We are still talking about the future.

PROF. VESSELY: It seems to me that Dean Daly suggested that the same people might compete for either position; one that was on tenure-track or not but some of them, and I think you referred to this, might prefer to be on the non-tenure track. The person who got that position wouldn't be any less qualified, and in some cases might be more qualified because the non-tenure-track position was desirable. Is that a fair assessment or not?

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: I am not sure I should answer that question. Maybe somebody from the Medical School could answer that.

DEAN DALY: I think I can respond to both of these questions. First of all, this was proposed nationally in response to some faculty interest in the position. The committee of the School of Medicine considered this in a broader issue and forwarded this proposal, which was in process, to a number

of levels of the School of Medicine faculty. There certainly is no intent to manipulate the existing faculty lines and certainly not as it relates to Allied Health. First of all, the Allied Health positions are general fund positions. This would be a position primarily to be or positions who are funded by a variety of other sources. I don't think that is a concern that needs to be a concern.

The other question which was raised, the problem that we have is that we have a number of individuals who are appointed and have been traditionally appointed to the faculty primarily to do preceptorial teaching as well as clinical jobs. Those people are having increasing difficulty with the traditional process that leads to tenure and promotion. We also have a large number of individuals who are totally volunteers and part-time people who provide, on an isolated basis here and who are certainly heavily involved in activities elsewhere, the same kind of functions. They are well received and viewed as valuable part-time or voluntary faculty members. We need a way to employ such people and to provide fringe benefits for them. In a sense, I would have to say this is a fringe benefit issue. We currently have approximately 1,000 people who bear the titles which are an issue here. They are totally volunteers. We cannot employ them on our campus and provide them fringe benefits. What is being addressed is the possibility of adding these people without asking for additional general fund money for this purpose -- adding these people to provide these services full-time and yet providing them some job security for a contract or periods of time and provide them TIAA-CREF. As you know, TIAA-CREF at Indiana University is not available for individuals other than full-time employees. That is a major issue.

UNKNOWN: There must have been a misunderstanding about the concern of Allied Health representatives. A few are from Allied Health and are not concerned. I don't where Kathryn got that information.

PROF. ELLINGER: I don't know about the intent except that you are talking in the future. The reading of this proposal could take on a different meaning. I think it should be examined.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: I think it has been examined. I think it has been before this body on prior occasions in a slightly different form, but the same proposal has been here and it has been under discussion for quite some time. I am not sure if you are raising an issue that should be examined in particular. But, if it is a call for just general examination...

PROF. ELLINGER: It is an issue of displacement. By tracing other factors down, "in the future" could be an increase in the number of part-time faculty, simply put.

DEAN SCHALLER: These would be full-time. What we are dealing with here is appointing full-time people.

PROF. ELLINGER: How can they be full-time and get partial benefits?

DEAN SCHALLER: That is the issue. We want them to get full benefits so that they will take the job. They would not be part-time faculty. I might say that that is an issue in the academic world generally, the use of part-time people vs. full-time people.

PROF. ELLINGER: The issue is TIAA-CREF?

DEAN SCHALLER: This is correct. Under the University regulations you can't pay these people TIAA-CREF if they were employed on a part-time basis. We want to employ some of them full-time and we want to give them TIAA-CREF. We have to do this in order to accomplish that. It has nothing to do with part-time faculty.

PROF. BELCHER: Could you give us a date for implementation for the policy?

PROF. OLSON: We would like to try to approve it today and, of course, it will be taken to the University Faculty Council next week and voted on there as far as I know.

PROF. ZUNT: From there it would have to be ultimately approved by the Board of Trustees before it could be implemented.

DEAN SCHALLER: The target, I think, is to try to have it ready to go by July 1st for the new year.

PROF. QUATE: I am looking at last month's minutes and Dean Daly said that "We have thousands of volunteers who earn their livelihood outside of the University and are simply volunteers who hold these titles. Now we would like to be able to actually hire people and give them these titles." Are we talking about hiring someone full-time who also has a full-time outside...

DEAN SCHALLER: No. Of course not.

PROF. KAMINKER: Am I right that there are no guarantees that there wouldn't be a drain on the general fund in the future?

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Of course that is true of a thousand other things that we are not considering today -- things which may have a greater potential for draining on the general fund.

PROF. CHALIAN: I am concerned about where the funds come from. We are in the teaching business and we are taking care of sickness here. This is an access to attract clinical faculty. If we take them towards a true tenure-track, we would ask for research and papers. They don't have the time to do that. I don't know why people are concerned that much. It is physicians, dentists, nurses, optometrists, audiologists and speech pathologists. It is well spelled out. It is not a competitive position.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Dr. Chalian, I think this being Dental Health Month, there couldn't be anything more fitting than you having the last word on this subject. Somebody called for the question. The question has been called. All in favor say "Aye." Any opposed? Motion passed unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM VII
New Business

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Is there any New Business?

AGENDA ITEM VIII
Adjournment

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: If there is no New Business, then we are adjourned.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY

at

INDIANAPOLIS

Faculty Council Meeting

Thursday, March 5, 1987

Law School, Room 116, 3:30 p.m. - 5:30 p.m.

Members Present: Vice President Gerald L. Bepko. Deans: Walter J. Daly, Elizabeth Grossman, William M. Plater, William J. Voos. Director: Barbara Fischler. Faculty: Roko Aliprantis, Karen Becker, Anne Belcher, H. R. Besch, Jr., Jacqueline Blackwell, Patricia Blake, Willard Bostwick, Linda Brothers, Michael Burke, Varoujan Chalian, Robert Colyer, David Doedens, Kenneth Dunipace, Martin Farlow, Mary Feeley, Beverly Flynn, Jeri Francis, Melvin Glick, Jean Gnat, Clifford Goodwin, Emily Hernandez, Ngoan Van Hoang, William Hodes, Henry Karlson, Linda Kasper, Robert J. Kirk, Judith Kosegi, Joseph Kuczkowski, Rebecca Markel, James McAteer, Robert Mendelsohn, Judy Miller, Catherine Palmer, Richard Pflanzner, Gerald Powers, Shirley Quate, Terry Reed, Mark Richardson, Edward Robbins, Glen Segraves, P. Kent Sharp, Robert Stonehill, Jeffery Vessely, Dorothy Webb, Maudine Williams, Kathryn Wilson, Pao-lo Yu, Susan Zunt.

Alternates Present: Robert Mendelsohn for Charles Bonser; Jim Bindley for Jeffrey Grove; Sue Barrett for P. Nicholas Kellum; Hugh Wolf for Howard Mehlinger; Christine Fitzpatrick for R. Bruce Renda; Howard Hess for Sheldon Siegel; Scott Evenbeck for James E. Weigand; Harvey Hegarty for Jack R. Wentworth. Faculty: Jerome Kaplan for Elaine Alton; Phyllis Scherle for Edmund Byrne.

Members Absent: Dean Howard Schaller, Patricia Boaz. Deans: Trevor Brown, H. William Gilmore, Marshall C. Yovits. Faculty: Sharon Andreoli, John Baenziger, Richard Beck, Charles Blevins, Andre DeKorvin, Joseph DiMicco, James Edmondson, Charles Ellinger, Mark Farber, Linda Haas, Edwin Harper, Robert Harris, Eugene Helveston, Meredith Hull, Barbara Jackson, Jerome Kaminker, Suetta Kehrein, Miriam Langsam, Monroe Little, Michael E. Mitchell, Barnett B. Morris, Paul Nagy, John Pless, Kenneth Ryder, John Schmedtje, Rowland Sherrill, Judith Silence, Ernest E. Smith, Susan Sutton, Vernon Vix, Victor Wallis, Kathleen Warfel, Henry Wellman, Charles Winslow.

Ex Officio Members Present: Shirley Newhouse.

Ex Officio Members Absent: Martin Dragonette.

Visitors: David Leonard, Law School; Sara McNabb, University Registrar and Admissions Office (Bloomington); Sudha S. Saksena, School of Dentistry.

AGENDA ITEM I

Approval of Minutes - February 5, 1987

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: We have a full agenda so I think we should start our meeting. The first item is the approval of the minutes from the last meeting.

Is there a motion to approve the minutes of the last meeting? It was moved and seconded that the minutes be approved. All in favor, say "Aye". Opposed? [None] The minutes are approved.

AGENDA ITEM II

Presiding Officer's Business - Vice President Gerald L. Bepko

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: I have one announcement under Presiding Officer's Business. You may have already received an invitation. If not, you will be receiving an invitation today or tomorrow to a reception which will be held this Sunday afternoon from 4 - 5:30 at the Riley Hospital in the lobby and in the cafeteria. The purpose of the reception is to introduce and give you an opportunity to meet the next President of Indiana University.

We are not yet ready for our next agenda item because the person who will make the presentation is not here yet. Let me use this moment while we are waiting for him to introduce a person who will give us comments, advice, and an explanation of the all University admissions policy. She is our special guest today. She is the University Registrar, Sara McNabb.

AGENDA ITEM III

Legislative Issues - Mr. J. A. Franklin, Director, Governmental Relations

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: The next agenda item concerns legislative issues to be presented by Mr. J. A. Franklin, who is the Director of Governmental Relations for IU.

I think that an introduction may not be necessary because some of you know Joe. For those of you who don't and those of you who know him and don't know all that he does, you should know that he does excellent work as Director of Governmental Relations for Indiana University. He carries operating and capital requests that are made by Indiana University to the General Assembly. He spends countless hours in discussions and conversations with members of the General Assembly and State government. He works around the clock this time of the year. He does that not only on behalf of Indiana University, Bloomington but he does it on our behalf and, I think, quite effectively. He is a person that we should all be very interested in at this time of year. With that, let me introduce J. A. Franklin, our Director of Governmental Relations.

MR. FRANKLIN: Thank you. I will be happy to respond to any questions after I give you a brief overview of where I think we are in the legislature this year. I preface that by saying that I am not really sure where we are because we are right now in the first phase of a five-phase process to receive our budget. By that I mean we are in committee action in the first House. The committee has been behind closed doors until this noon. The Republication Caucus of the Ways and Means Committee has thus formulated their package. They will have to add a few things to it to secure the votes of the Democrats and then that bill will probably be kicked out of committee late tonight. We will have a committee of the whole next Tuesday, in which the House will work its desires on the Bill and then, of course, it will go on to the Senate. We are in the middle of something that we don't know a lot about, but I think we can give you some rough ideas where we are.

First, our requests as it pertains to this campus. You should know that, in an attempt to address the inequality of funding between our various campuses for as many bienniums as I have been connected with it, we have been asking for additional funds for this campus. It has not been heeded. The Higher Education Commission has recognized that this campus and our Southeast campus are underfunded in comparison with the other campuses. This session IU has asked for the largest percentage increase for the non-health section of the Indianapolis campus -- in the neighborhood of 18 percent for the first year and 15 percent for the second year. That compares rather favorably with the overall average of 11 and 10 percent for all campuses.

To obtain that goal of bringing this campus more in line in funding per student with other IU campuses we have to review what the Higher Education Commission did with our request. Essentially, they have four categories: A Maintenance category which is the cost-of-living funds; Highest Priority Category; High Category; and a Projects of Importance Category (which really means not very important at all because they don't recommend funding those projects). To get where we want to go with this campus we have to get both Highest and High categories funded. To date, and now here I am getting into what I think is going on in the committee, the committee has taken the Budget Committee's budget, which is based on existing revenues and as you know there is not a lot of those out there, and given us two percent increases in our Maintenance funds or our cost of living funds for the first year and three percent for the second year. That is considerably less than the 3.5 and 4 percent that the Commission recommended or, of course, the 4 and 5 percent which we requested. They have only picked up the Highest Category of the HEC's priorities. That would mean that this campus still has another \$2.3 million of the Quality Improvement monies that haven't been picked up by the committee to date.

There is one improvement since yesterday. Last night they raised the level of funding for the cost-of-living, Maintenance fund from two and three to three and four. That is a helpful addition at this stage.

We are, of course, hopeful that somewhere along the line there will be more revenue placed in the pie. That is a subtle message to all that support is limited out there. If they don't get the revenue, obviously, there are no more funds available. What I think they are going to do is, as anyone knows who has read the newspaper or watched television, there is a big debate on about funding for education. It principally centers around secondary education but there is no question that we are part of that continuum. Legislators have a concern about credibility and accountability, so I think they will put all of the funding for secondary education in one bill, not only new funding but existing funding. They also will attach their accountability measures and then put that up on the board and say, "Vote for it or close the schools." That is a potential, interesting power play. I don't know if it will work, but I think that is what you may see in your morning paper.

Regarding higher education, we, of course, will be removed from that and we will be in the general budget bill along with all the other state agencies. We will be looking at funds from increased revenue sources for our funding.

On to the Capital Budget, the news isn't all that great there either. What they did in the first instance is to say "We will take the Highest Priority

categories of the Higher Education Commission and fund those." That is not very many for projects for IU, that is the completion of the Chemistry Building in Bloomington. Actually, it is not completion, it is bonding approval for \$11 million of a \$21 million completion project. That obviously does not include the S.E.T. Building on this campus which was at the bottom of the High Priority category list. There is a \$38 million project, of which we have requested bonding approval in this biennium of \$21 million. It also does not include the Land Acquisition Funds for this campus and the purchase of the Mary Cable School in the neighborhood of \$4.3 million, which is in the Projects of Importance category. That is somewhat bad news, but we have got to be realists. We have got to look at the political realities. This is the first phase and several very influential members of the Legislature on the Senate side have strong Indianapolis connections. Your support is requested, desired, and needed. If you have contacts, you can help us present our case for the need for any of these projects.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: We have a fairly full agenda today, but Joe was nice enough to take time out of a very busy schedule to come over so, if there are any questions, I think we should allow a couple of minutes. I would like to emphasize what Joe said about this being fairly early in the process so there isn't anything that could be reported definitively today, but we thought it might be useful to keep you posted on where we do stand in this critical biennium.

DEAN GROSSMAN: As a system School, we are interested in what happens to our other campuses.

MR. FRANKLIN: Would you like for me to talk about nursing in South Bend, Betty? As some may know, there is a need for a nursing program in South Bend. That is not part of the Commission's recommendations, nor is it part of the Budget Committee's original budget, nor is it part of the budget that the House Republicans put together last night and this morning. However, the ranking member of the minority party is from South Bend and he sits on that committee and you are going to need some votes from his delegation. I think that has a very strong change for inclusion.

I don't know what is going to be included. We also are interested in plant expansion funds for the library at South Bend. That is about one-half million dollar tag that the Commission did not recommend that we desperately have to have. There are several other things like that that we are hoping some of our friends on the other side of the aisle will work for.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: In view of our heavy agenda, I would like to say thanks to Joe. No one knows more about this process than J. A. Franklin. I have seen him work personally on our behalf a number of times. I think it was really very nice of him to take time out from an extraordinarily busy schedule at the State House to come over and give us this thumbnail report. I think we should thank him and wish him God speed.

AGENDA ITEM IV

Executive Committee Report - Susan L. Zunt, Secretary

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Next we have an Executive Committee Report from our Secretary Susan Zunt.

PROF. ZUNT: I have quite a few things to report to you today. First of all our Clinical Ranks Proposal went to the University Faculty Council, which met on this campus five days after we approved that proposal. It was unanimously approved. There was one change. "Faculty" was changed to "Appointee." We did forward to President Ryan and it is placed on the agenda for the Board of Trustees meeting, which takes place this weekend in Bloomington. We should have an answer shortly on that.

The University Faculty Council was scheduled to meet next week on March 10. That has been cancelled. All of you should have received notification. I wanted to mention it just in case, so you don't show up at that meeting in Bloomington. Our next and last University Faculty Council meeting for the year will be April 28. It will take place here in Indianapolis. Two agenda items which will be of interest to you, and that we will be probably voting on the are the All University Admissions Policy and, at least, a preliminary report on the Students Rights and Responsibilities.

The last month on the 12th I attended a program put on by the International Programs Department in Bloomington which involved looking at the impact of recent immigration legislation on hiring practices -- specifically, hiring foreign nationalists. Evidently, in IU system four out of every ten finalists for positions are foreign nationalists. The salaries of these people come close to \$1 million per year. Another tidbit, if we had to pay for off-campus legal services for these aliens in order to hire them to work for us, it would cost us greater than \$50,000 in legal fees. They didn't say what it actually costs us to do it ourselves.

This is a very complicated area and I want to emphasize that, even though I spent over one-half of a day there listening to all of this information, faculty, chairmen, and deans should not attempt to counsel new faculty or students. We should call Dr. Burdellis Carter to let her set up the interviews and counseling for these people. Dr. Carter has agreed to come before you next month, April 2, and speak a little more about this so that you have some idea about hiring foreign nationalists for our positions.

On the 19th of February, I attended a Council of Deans meeting that had as the featured guest the Master Planner for the IUPUI campus. I was not here when this was put into place in 1975-76. The Master Planner from New York City is Edward Larrabee Barnes. He was there to explain his Master Plan. He listed some of the goals that he attempted to incorporate in our master plan, such as maintaining architectural integrity, keeping all buildings, if possible, less than two stories, and trying to get parking underground. Another goal was to mitigate the effects of Michigan Street and New York Street cutting the campus into separate major parts. Also, he talked about the desire to maintain as much green space as possible. Some of the comments that came from the people attending this meeting were very interesting. These master planners who were there did hear that location for developing buildings and programs is very important. Parking was the number two item on all campuses' minds. Signage was another issue that people who attended that meeting wanted these master planners to consider as they finish up their plan in the next five to ten years.

Vice President Bepko has appointed a Child Abuse Coordinating Committee, with Miriam Langsam as the chair. She has been working to determine what problems are present on the campus, what kinds of resources we have and what types of external funding. There were eight or ten people appointed to that committee. If you have any information or if you are involved in child abuse programs, you might want to give Miriam a call and let her know what your interests or concerns are because not every unit is represented on that committee.

On the next item, the Executive Committee has received a request for faculty members to serve on a Student Appeals Committee. We are in the process of compiling the preference forms which you just filled out. This section was completed so I had Mrs. Chumley forward that to Dean Boaz. Dean Boaz will be sending us information to let us know the outcome of that board. This particular board concerns an international student, charged with academic misconduct, who has lost funding because of the grade and the academic misconduct charge. I hope to be able to report to you later on the outcome of that committee.

We have made some progress on the IUPUI Faculty Council ad hoc Smoking Policy Committee, which Professor Kathleen Warfel from the School of Medicine has graciously agreed to chair. This committee is composed of six faculty members, five of whom are Faculty Council members. There are also five staff members and five student members. The letters to those individuals will be going out this afternoon. I have asked that Professor Warfel, with this committee, review the current campus wide policies that were approved in 1975. I have also told her that the Executive Committee anticipates that the ad hoc committee may recommend changes in our existing campus wide policies. We hope that their report will be completed on September 11. We have tentatively placed this on the Faculty Council agenda for October 1.

The Executive Committee has also recognized that there is a need, based on the comments from faculty, administrators, and the Nominating Committee, to generate more faculty to be involved in the Faculty Boards of Review process. In fact, we went from having two Boards of Review to having three. We did ask for people to indicate a preference to work in this area on the Preference Forms, so we have a pool there. But, we simply don't have enough names to fill three Boards of Review and the Tenure Committee. We are writing to the faculty leaders of every unit asking for the faculty government body or system, whatever you have in your unit, to identify one, two, or three people who would be interested in working on the Boards of Review or the Tenure Committee. Those letters should be received either tomorrow or Monday.

The Board of Review requires that the individual be tenured or on tenure-track and that they be at any rank. For the Tenure Committee, these people must be tenured faculty members.

We did receive a request from Mary Remley who is the President of the Bloomington Faculty Council concerning dollars for higher education. I am going to read you a little bit of her memo:

Recently the Bloomington Faculty Council met with State legislators representing the Bloomington area. At this time, the state budget picture becomes crystal clear. Unless there

is a state tax increase, the Indiana budget for Higher Education cannot be significantly increased and may have to be reduced below the almost disastrous level as recommended by the State Budget Committee.

Our local legislators representing both parties know what the impact of this would be on higher education in the state. They are committed to increasing taxes to prevent this. There is, though, some disagreement as to which taxes should be increased. The importance of convincing other legislators around the state to support higher education adequately cannot be overstated.

We here at IUPUI are in a much better position to present a convincing case for our representatives and senators than the people at Bloomington. IU administrators have made the effort but they need our help. Please take some time for appropriate letters and phone calls. It is not easy to ask representatives to raise taxes, but in this case it seems essential.

We all know that, if we don't get a tax increase this year, there will be none for the biennium because next year is an election year. The immediate future of higher education in the state is on the line.

This is a request from Bloomington asking us to support that tax increase.

The Executive Committee has approved a committee membership roster to develop a Symposium on Sexual Harassment. As you recall, this is going to be a symposium that will be supported by the IUPUI administration and co-sponsored by faculty, staff, and students. I had hoped to be able to announce a chair for this committee today, but I don't have one yet. I hope to have one by Monday or Tuesday. At that time I will let you know who that is.

An organizational meeting for that Sexual Harassment Symposium has been scheduled for April 7 from 3:00 - 4:00 p.m. in the School of Dentistry, Room S105. We hope to be able to do the planning for that in the spring and summer and present that in the fall.

I have received a number of requests from Bloomington concerning the University salary policy. These now are going to the University Faculty Council. I am bringing this to you as co-secretary of the University Faculty Council. I just wanted to report to you that we have received information asking for our support to examine our existing salary policy and to determine if it is appropriate in today's world. After all, the salary policy is a system policy. I have forwarded all of this documentation to our Faculty Affairs Committee, chaired by Byron Olson. Dr. Olson has indicated that he will distribute this to the committee and let us know whether or not the committee is going to take this up as an issue on this campus. I will report on that next month.

The statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities has been received by our Student Affairs Committee, chaired by Dr. McAteer. He has indicated that he will be able to bring to you a tentative report from that committee on April 2, our next meeting.

Next month, April 2, we will also be looking at the 1988-89 calendar. That will be published. You will need to look at that before our next meeting.

We may have the report of the Promotion and Tenure report from the Faculty Affairs Committee next month at the April 2nd meeting. That is also tentative.

We have finalized our agenda for the Board of Trustees meeting that occurs on this campus on April 4. As you know, when it is on this campus we host the Faculty Relations Committee. That is a committee composed of four of the Trustees -- Robert Gates, Ann Swedeen, Emerson Kampen, and James Dye. These Trustees meet and listen to our faculty concerns. We use this as an educational process.

The agenda for the April 4th meeting will focus on the School of Physical Education, the School of Liberal Arts, and the School of Continuing Studies. The next time that we have a Board of Trustees meeting on this campus will be in the fall, September and December. At that time, the Executive Committee is looking into developing a different kind of program. They are considering looking at the precedents which have been set by IUPUI in education of women and minorities, from a historical perspective. We are going to talk to Jeannette Matthew of the Libraries and Dr. Irwin on the possibilities of participating in this. Of course, if you as Faculty Council members have ideas or want to participate, please contact the Executive Committee. We have three or four programs to put on their agenda. There will be an opportunity to incorporate what you would like to present to the Trustees.

We have received a request from a faculty member asking the Faculty Council to look at TIAA-CREF benefits for non-health people who have 10-month appointments. We are in the process of investigating this, getting documentation and, I hope, at our April meeting to bring some information to you. Once we get the documentation we will assign it to a standing committee.

It has come to the attention of the Executive Committee that there were some people who were Purdue faculty members that came with IUPUI when that school was established in 1969-70. These people are having difficulty with their retirement benefits. We are in the process (and we do have the support of the administration) of establishing who these people are. We are establishing the list and getting all of the documentation. This will be forwarded to the Benefits Department in Bloomington.

I have two items which I have received from Dean Boaz's office. The first of these concerns Midterm Grade Reports for the University Division. This item and the following item will be going to the Executive Committee at their meeting March 19, and from there we hope to assign them to standing committees. The second item concerns Faculty Governance of the University Division. As soon as I have more to report to you on that, I will tell you where these go. We anticipate they will be assigned to standing committees.

Unless there are questions, that concludes my report.

PROF. BESCH: Susan, you reported that, although the Board of Trustees was invited to have their summer seminar on this campus, that that was not

possible. Is it possible to find their reactions to having their Winter Retreat on this campus instead of once again on the Bloomington campus?

PROF. ZUNT: I have not done that. I will be happy to forward that specific request when I talk to them about the Summer Seminar. The feeling is that they are on the Indianapolis campus three or four times a year anyhow and it wasn't felt that they needed to spend that extended period of time. I will be happy to forward that request to the President of the Board of Trustees.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: I think that is a good idea and we should ask about it and press the issue.

UNKNOWN: I want to report that the Bloomington Faculty Council met this morning to discuss the calendar. The two fifteen-week proposal was unanimously accepted which will balance the first semesters. They did add a day at the beginning and cut the Thanksgiving vacation from a full week to the traditional three days for the Fall Semester, after much debate and discussion. They have yet to tackle the Spring Semester. There is an agreement that the length of time that the Bloomington campus is off is four weeks at Christmas and there is an agreement that there should not be more than three weeks. That will hopefully balance the Spring Semester.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: It is a special problem with the Business School, isn't it? Are there any other comments or questions?

AGENDA ITEM V

Teaching of Ethics, March 27, 1987, 9:00 a.m. - 1:00

Co-sponsored by the Learning Resources Committee and the IUPUI Faculty Council

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: We have a report on the program, "Teaching of Ethics," that will be held on March 27. The report will be given by Becky Van Voorhis. Carlyn Johnson is the co-chair with Becky.

PROF. VAN VOORHIS: Carlyn is teaching a class, which is why she isn't here. To give you some information about the plans for this symposium on March 27th. The keynote presenter will be Richard Morrill, who is the President of Centre College in Danville, Kentucky. His background is in the area of philosophy, particularly ethics. His presentation will focus on several of the recent contemporary theorists who have been looking at how people reach ethical decisions.

Following his opening presentation, there will be two panels. The first panel will focus upon issues of truth-telling because it is hard to pick up a copy of a newspaper or a copy of a current news magazine without seeing yet the latest scandal, if you will, of the whole area of what is our responsibility in various professions and disciplines for being truthful. The panelists on this will be Dr. Charles Bonsett from the School of Medicine, Associate Dean James Brown from the School of Journalism, and Professor Wilmer Fife from the School of Science. That panel will be moderated by Jim Smurl, School of Liberal Arts.

The other panel, which will immediately follow the one on truth-telling, will be looking more specifically at "What are the specific responsibilities of us as faculty, how to go about teaching ethics, and how to incorporate it in the

instruction of students." Are there some particular techniques as well as contexts we need to be looking at when we are approaching the instruction of our students that could carry them through the dilemmas which will face them when they enter the career world so that they will be better able to make those decisions. We are well aware now, particularly with the current scandals, that some of the brightest and best people become those who ultimately are involved. It does not seem to be a question of a student who may make a fairly poor or marginable student during the course of the time that they were in academia. It seems to include some of our very brightest students.

Those are the plans and we will conclude, over lunch, with roundtable discussions so that people who are in attendance can share with people whom they may not see very often in other schools and discuss what are some of their ideas. It's the wish of this very hard working group that put this together to keep it going; that it won't be just something for 1987 but that there will be other efforts on this campus to keep us looking at what are the ethical issues that we face.

In Learning Resources, we were delighted that the Faculty Council agreed to co-sponsor this. I am going to pass a paper around because attendance is going to be limited to this. Since it is intended to be a very active and inter-active morning, if you would like to receive an invitation and a copy of the program, please put your name on this paper. We want to make sure that you do get a program and that is one way to insure that. In addition, a letter has been sent to each dean inviting the deans to suggest the names of faculty that were perceived to be particularly interested in this whole area.

Again, this will be Friday, March 27, beginning at 9:00 and ending about 1:00 or 1:15.

Thank you.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Thank you, Becky. Are there any questions?

AGENDA ITEM VI

Staff Relations/Faculty Relations Joint Committee Report - Shirley Newhouse, President, IUPUI Staff Council; Scott Evenbeck, Chair, Staff Relations Committee, IUPUI Faculty Council

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Next we have a report on a Staff Relations/Faculty Relations Joint Committee. Scott Evenbeck and Shirley Newhouse are both here. I understand that Shirley Newhouse will make the report.

MRS. NEWHOUSE: Vice President Bepko, Secretary Zunt, and members of the Faculty Council, we thank you for including us on your agenda today. I would like to introduce my two silent partners -- Scott Evenbeck, Continuing Studies, and Dorothy Medcalf, School of Nursing. Dorothy co-chaired the workshop with Bennie Keller. We owe a lot to Dorothy and the Nursing staff. Dorothy graciously put together the wonderful proceedings that we had. Carol Nathan did the editing and also arranged for us to have this wonderful book with the Purdue and IUPUI colors.

I will make my report very brief. The report speaks for itself. We thought it was a very successful workshop and we are looking forward to another one in the fall.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Thank you, Shirley.

AGENDA ITEM VII

Academic Affairs Committee Report - Kathryn Wilson, Chair New All-University Admissions Policy

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: The next agenda item is a report from the Academic Affairs Committee to be given by its Chair Kathryn Wilson.

PROF. WILSON: In August, 1984, President Ryan appointed a special task force to review systemwide admissions standards, policies, and procedures for Indiana University. This task force was chaired by the University Registrar and Director Sara McNabb, who is here today. This task force prepared a recommendation to the faculty for an undergraduate admissions policy. This policy was reproduced for you in your set of minutes of today's meeting.

The undergraduate admissions policy has not been reviewed since 1960. The existing policy, approved by the IU board of trustees on June 4, 1960, was also duplicated for you as a handout today.

The new admissions policy, proposed by the task force, incorporates the following major changes from the existing policy:

1. The minimum number of semesters of college preparatory courses for high school students is increased from 26 to 28.
2. The course requirements, other than English, such as mathematics, social sciences, etc., are specified. The distribution of courses in each area is stated clearly.
3. The general admissions policy for transfer students is included in the new policy.

The Task Force also discussed three other issues, as I understand them, but did not recommend changes in current policy. The issue of **the use of standardized test scores** for admission was opposed by most task force members, but use of scores was retained because scores may be useful for advanced placement and because they are used by the public as a rough estimate of the quality of our admitted students. Second, the need for **better writing skills** in students was recognized by Committee members, but a composition course in high school was left as an encouraged, but not required, course. Finally, the issue of a **foreign language requirement** was discussed, but it was felt that it should not be required at this time.

The Academic Affairs Committee of this Faculty Council was asked to look at the Task Force recommendation and to present our opinion of the proposal to this body. A copy of the Committee's recommendation has been duplicated for you today. First, the Academic Affairs Committee has not made any changes in the stated admission requirements drafted by the Task Force. However, the Committee has made several substantial changes in the organization and wording

of the draft which we believe improved the document. We have prepared detailed comments explaining our own recommendations and have forwarded these to the Chairman of the Educational Policies Committee of the University Faculty Council, which is now also examining the Task Force recommendations.

I would like to highlight the changes the Academic Affairs Committee has suggested for your comment, discussion, and/or approval.

1. The Committee felt that the document actually concerns three groups of admissions criteria; (a) admission to freshman status; (b) admission of transfer students; and (c) admission to programs stating additional requirements. Thus, it redrafted the document to create a separate section for each group. All provisions of the original draft that relate to these three groups have been placed under the appropriate headings. You will note there are **"flexibility provisions"** in the task force draft in paragraph 4 that accommodate students who do not meet stated requirements for admissions but who may be admitted with special consideration. The Committee has assumed these provisions apply only to the group of applicants for Freshman status.
2. Paragraph 1 of the task force document states that a minimum of 28 semesters of college preparatory work must be completed. However, parts 'a-g' list only 26 semesters of courses. Thus, the Committee changed the reference in part 'e' to ten semesters.
3. The Committee has altered the task force document language of paragraph 1b, under "Freshman Students", to make it clear that four semesters of social science should be selected from the five subject areas listed in parentheses. This requirement is retained in Part A, section 1b, of the Committee's recommendation. Other social sciences taken in high school can be used to satisfy the ten additional semester requirement in section 1e.

The same points apply to the Committee's rewording of section 1c, which refers to geometry and algebra, and to 1d, which refers to laboratory sciences.
4. The Committee was somewhat concerned about the order of the subjects listed in section 1e. It changed the order only slightly. To some extent, readers of the document might feel that items mentioned earlier in this section are more important than items which appear later in the list. The Committee leaves open the question, for instance, of whether foreign language or writing skills should be first.
5. The task force draft requires graduation from high school without specifying whether the school need be accredited. The 1960 policy requires graduation from a "commissioned" high school. The Committee was uncertain whether there still exists a procedure for "commissioning" high schools, but believes that the ordinary criteria for admission of freshmen should require that they have attended a school that has received accreditation from an appropriate accrediting body. In the event that a particular

applicant has gone to an unaccredited school, has studied at home, or has completed his or her education in another manner, that applicant can be considered under the previously mentioned "flexibility provisions" that follow the normal admission criteria.

6. Several paragraphs in the beginning of the task force document were placed at the end of the document by the Committee. The affirmative action language was placed at the end because, while the Committee understands and is committed to the importance of this language, and believes the University's commitment to affirmative action should be clearly stated, it believes that placing it at the beginning of the document might create the impression the mission of Indiana University is to comply with regulations rather than to provide education. The reference to the effective date of the policy, which is rather technical, also was moved to the end.

Now, that completes my report and I will be happy to answer any questions I can and would, at this time ask for your comments, discussion, and/or approval of our recommendations, all of which will be forwarded to the University Faculty Council for final approval.

PROF. HODES: I was able to follow most of what you were saying. Will we get a copy of your proposed rewrites?

PROF. WILSON: There was a copy which you were to pick up as you came in.

PROF. BLAKE: I have a question from one of the deans in the School of Nursing regarding associate degree programs. Number one, she said that she is not sure that every high school in the state of Indiana, she stands to be corrected, has advanced algebra classes. Would that handicap students?

PROF. WILSON: In that case, they wouldn't have taken the minimum requirements and would have to fall into the special consideration.

PROF. BLAKE: Everything that she raised to me really could be mitigated by the top of the second page where it says . . . "applicants who are deficient"... that really takes care of any concern we would have.

PROF. WILSON: That is a catch-all phrase in order to take care of students who come from such places.

PROF. BLAKE: What if the median S.A.T. scores were below what we require?

PROF. WILSON: The criteria set out here are minimal requirements. Any program or school can put into effect more stringent requirements on applicants into their programs.

PROF. KUCZKOWSKI: Kathryn, I am wondering what advanced algebra means? Is that the technical term for courses in the high schools?

SARA MCNABB: Typically, the confusion comes in the area of regular algebra, as opposed to the advanced algebra courses. Some math courses taught in high school include a component with algebra. Some students feel that because they were at least exposed to the concept, therefore they have completed a first

year of algebra. The task force spent a great deal of time trying to figure out how to get this impression across to the students. We felt that the best way to do it was to specify advanced algebra because that is the least confusing of regular algebra, introductory algebra, first algebra or whatever you want to call it. We felt that by specifying two semesters of advanced algebra then that would force the student into the correct first year of algebra.

PROF. WILSON: This only refers to people in high school. These are high school courses we are talking about.

PROF. KARLSON: Just to give an example, North Central High School has Algebra I and II, Algebra III and IV, and Algebra V and VI. Which one is the advanced algebra? They are all algebra courses. Each one is a semester. Algebra I, one semester; Algebra II, second semester; Algebra III, third semester, Algebra IV... and usually you will take Algebra III and IV after you have completed geometry.

SARA MCNABB: I would have to say that I am not familiar with the high school courses at North Central, but based on what you have said, I would say that III and IV would be the advanced algebra.

PROF. KARLSON: Let me confuse the issue. How would you deal with a student that is permitted to start out in the freshman year in geometry because they earned credit for algebra completed earlier? Two algebra courses then go into an advanced algebra course before in the second year opposed to their third which would be the normal sequence.

SARA MCNABB: I would think it would be a safe assumption that if that happened, the student might likely take algebra V and VI.

PROF. KARLSON: What happens if they don't?

SARA MCNABB: If they don't, then that student would fall under the exception, the catch-all phrase, as Kathryn referred to it. If the student is advanced, then obviously there would not be any problem. If there is a special circumstance like that, it will be explained either on the student's high school transcript or through communication between the University and the high school counselor.

PROF. HODES: I am troubled by the failure to include a course involving writing skills or composition as a mandatory requirement. Looking at them from the vantage point of the professional schools, we have a hard enough time with the products either of IU or any other college because people are able to take fairly difficult majors and get through without having to write a term paper or other writing. It seems to me that if we are going to take a stand early that we should prepare college students to do significant written work by making sure that they are already in the habit long before that. To overstate the case a bit, I would gladly trade all these for a three or four hour requirement in writing because all the rest will follow.

PROF. WILSON: When the committee looked at this they made a presumption that when the task force worked on this, they looked at what types of courses are normally taught in high schools. It was our guess, obviously correct, that

writing courses are not taught in high schools. So, if they are not taught, we won't be able to admit anyone except under our catch-all phrase.

PROF. HODES: I would still make the same point and say, if we are the ones who are going to be the leaders, we have to make that kind of statement to the high schools and then have the high schools measure up so that their products will be worthy of **entering IU**.

PROF. WILSON: One of the things that is in this document is that writing skills are strongly recommended, number one. And, number two, any program in the university can require such a course for entrance into their program because you can make more stringent requirements if you wish.

PROF. BESCH: To what is a student admitted who meets the basic criteria but doesn't meet the criteria of any other program, such as was mentioned earlier about nursing?

PROF. WILSON: They are admitted to University Division.

PROF. BESCH: The second part of the question is, is this expected to affect the enrollment?

PROF. WILSON: I think these requirements are so minimal that probably most of the applicants today would meet them. Am I right?

SARA MCNABB: No. The increase in the two semesters is significant and the specification of the courses is very significant in terms of high schools.

DEAN PLATER: With having lobbied the task force for something like an hour, I won't take it up again, but on the writing skills course that is now listed under A 1e, I do think there would be some value in putting that notice about courses Section 1A where it would have the most impact - reinforce the notion of what we are after. English courses do emphasize writing skills even if they are not specific composition courses, but I think there are some which are related exclusively to writing.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Is this a matter of sufficient complexity so that the approval should come at the next meeting?

PROF. WILSON: The problem is that it has to go to the University Faculty Council for approval, I believe, and there is not another meeting of this body between when they would consider it and this meeting.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: The next University Faculty Council meeting is late April. There will be another IUPUI Faculty Council meeting before the next University Faculty Council meeting.

PROF. WILSON: I would like a sense of what you would like our committee to do about the writing skills requirement. We can re-word our document to include it in a stronger place or require it.

PROF. HODES: Is this procedurally correct? Since we do have the time, may I suggest that the committee bring to this body next time with one or two alternative wordings based on some of the comments that were made here.

PROF. BLAKE: I think it is important for us to wait and see. I think we have to take this back and discuss it and, if you are getting more stringent, what that effect will have on our members. Even if we have the catch-all phrase, I think we need to discuss this.

PROF. MENDELSON: I just wanted to say that I supported Dean Plater. It seems to me that if we place the statement at the top rather than at the bottom, that would make the point, that is added under 1A.

PROF. DUNIPACE: One thing that I would like to point out is that the view that I had working on this is the list of things under Admission of Freshmen Students, 1, 2, and 3 represent the things which guarantee the students that they will automatically be accepted but it doesn't mean that other students will automatically be rejected. I think if you compared the requirements of this document with the old document, you will find that many of the students who were admitted to IU or to IUPUI were deficient. A lot of these students who were accepted in school, do not automatically satisfy the requirements but they got in as exceptions. We are making a dramatic change in that sense. I think that a lot of the conversation that has gone on here is taken in the sense that category A is a mostly restrictive clause. I think it is sort of another way around, this is the guarantee clause. If the student does that, they are in. If they are not, then they have to be considered as an exception.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Kathryn, do you have the sense of the Council? Will there be a report again at the next meeting for approval?

PROF. WILSON: Yes.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Are there any other questions or comments?

SARA MCNABB: I would like to offer three comments. First, as it relates to the accreditation. Very specifically, the word "commissioned" was deleted from the former policy primarily because there is no such list as a list of commissioned high schools in the state. "Commissioned" is an older word for accredited. We chose not to put accredited in because there are a variety of accreditation organizations. Some of them, especially as it relates to some of the first affiliated schools, may be accredited by a church but that does not really mean that much. Rather than to give an endorsement in the admissions policy itself, to an accrediting agency, we chose not to make any mention of accreditation, thinking that through the strength of the high school program that would be accommodated. We have several schools in the state right now that do not hold accreditation that the admission directors feel are required. Those students are reviewed in light of an exceptional basis. That is why there is no mention made of accreditation.

The other comment that I would like to make is that I will ask that the committee carefully count how many semesters of courses are included because I believe that your recommendation does include 30 now instead of 28. The area of confusion may be under point C where there are two semesters of geometry and four semesters of English. I believe that this does come up to 30. I would ask that you either address whether you want to make it 30 semester courses for the admission requirement or whether you want to go back

to the 28. I would be happy to have another talk to you about it.

PROF. WILSON: All we are trying to do is to be consistent and several members of the committee counted that several times.

DEAN DALY: As I read these requirements, they seem not excessive to what I would tend to expect but I would be curious if you have any information what fraction of currently admitted freshmen don't meet these standards.

SARA MCNABB: Unfortunately, I do not have that information so I cannot address that. I will be happy to go back and attempt to come up with some idea, maybe take a random sample of the entering requirements and provide that information to you.

PROF. ALIPRANTIS: I think there are 10,000 in University Division.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: How many did you say?

PROF. ALIPRANTIS: I think around 10,000.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: I thought it would be more like 1,000. I am quite sure it is not 10,000. If it is, then our enrollment should be a lot higher.
[laughter]

PROF. KUCZOWSKI: Sara, I gather the choice for the 1990-91 year is to cover the 1987-88 class so that they won't be affected?

SARA MCNABB: I appreciate your bring that up. When the task force forwarded this, it was about one and one-half years ago. I personally believe that consideration should be given to moving the effective date further into the future because we will have a very large job on our hands disseminating this information to the schools within the state and those schools that simply send us students from other states. In fairness to the high schools, I think we should give them four years to prepare their students. As the students enter high school they should know at that time what the admission requirements are. I think that the 1990 should probably be adjusted accordingly.

AGENDA ITEM VIII

Response to the IUPUI 10-Year Development Plan - Gerald Powers, Chair

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Our last agenda item has to do with the 10-Year Development Plan that the Campus Administration prepared from documents that schools had submitted over the past few years, which we submitted, in turn, to the Higher Education Commission. We distributed copies of that 10-Year Development Plan and asked for comments from all of you and in particular from the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council. We have received a number of responses from a variety of sources. This agenda item has to do with the response of the Executive Committee. Professor Jerry Powers is going to report.

PROF. POWERS: Vice President Bepko, Secretary Zunt, and members of the Council, the Executive Committee has asked me to report on their behalf. At the onset I would like to recognize the fact that Jeff Vessely and Monroe Little had substantial input into this report which was prepared in a very

short time frame.

The report represents a general response by the IUPUI Faculty Council Executive Committee to a request by Vice President Bepko to critically review a draft of the IUPUI Report on a Ten-Year Plan for Campus Development. The original draft of the Ten-Year plan was distributed at the Fall Faculty meeting of December 4, 1986. A January 24, 1987 revision of the original report was forwarded to the Executive Committee on February 12, 1987.

The Executive Committee appreciates the opportunity to provide input into the development of this very important document, and appreciates the fact that, in its present form, it reflects primarily the viewpoint of the campus administration at IUPUI. We also would like to make clear that, given the time frame within which we were asked to provide feedback, it was not possible to solicit the input of the entire Faculty Council, nor was it possible for the Executive Committee to review the document at a level warranted by its significance. We offer our comments, therefore, as preliminary in nature and as an initial reaction to what we view as a beginning phase in a continuing process in which all relevant constituencies in the University community will be afforded ample time and opportunity to provide input.

The Executive Committee recognizes the considerable effort that has already gone into the development of the Ten-Year Plan prior to our receiving it. It applauds its general thrust as a macro vision of the campus development for the coming decade. It was felt, however, that many of the specifics, of the type identified in the preliminary comments of the staff of the Commission for Higher Education, can be addressed effectively only at the micro level by the schools and departments directly effected. On the most recent revision of it there was attached a number of appendices, one of which consisted of comments from the Commission for Higher Education which raised a number of questions which they in turn asked the University to respond to. It was our opinion that on many of the questions that were raised, they couldn't be answered directly by administration. It would have to filter down at the local level to address the specificity that was called for.

To help facilitate the process described above, the Executive Committee believes that the Ten-Year Plan for Campus Development should be communicated to as many members of the IUPUI community as possible, which has already taken place as Vice President Bepko pointed out. We believe that the best way to achieve this is by holding town-meeting-type discussions on campus to discuss the implications of the plan for students, faculty, and staff of the various schools that comprise IUPUI. It is our conviction that such an approach would not only encourage the development of a shared purpose among competing campus groups, but also develop campus-wide support for the Ten-Year Plan.

University systems exist for the purpose of educating students. Students and faculty may be viewed as the only essential components necessary for the achievement of that purpose. Nevertheless, the development and appropriate management of resources are necessary, if not sufficient, requisites for the development of quality education. For that reason, the Executive Committee applauds the administration's statements concerning the IUPUI deficiency in the area of per student expenditures.

This deficiency may have been created, in part, because of a reputation of being able to do more for less, but there is a need for an infusion of additional funds to correct that problem. Examples of doing more for less might include the fact that it is common for IUPUI facilities, equipment, and even staff to be provided, at no cost, for seminars and subsequent examinations for various state and national governing bodies. Many "special" events require support from the campus with little or no remuneration.

Secondly, it is agreed that the ratio of part-time and full-time faculty needs to change. In conjunction with this change is the need to provide additional staff support. One method of accomplishing these changes might be to provide more flexibility to the managers of the funds, so that allocation of resources could conform to local priorities. Certain controls appear to be levied as if irresponsibility were the expected behavior at the school or department levels. Some incentives might be provided to deans and department chairs alike with the expectation that savings will take place.

Policies and guidelines must still reside in the highest academic offices, with the decisions about expenditures within the guidelines being delegated to the lowest possible level.

With respect to capital improvement, the Executive Committee concurs with the administration's dual commitment to the construction of the new University Library facility including adequate collections and access to emerging technologies, as well as with the goal of consolidating the School of Science and the Herron School of Art with the Michigan Street campus via the construction of a new S.E.T. facility and Visual/Performing Arts Center. In the absence of adequate library facilities with direct access by all components of the University system, IUPUI can never hope to achieve its mandate as a first-rate, world-class university.

The observations contained in this brief Executive Committee response are preliminary and global in nature. They are intended not as a criticism of the Draft Report, but as a general statement of the committee's reaction to those components of the report which it feels deserve special attention and primary emphasis. We appreciate the fact that the development of a Ten-Year Plan for Campus Development, together with a strategic plan for its implementation, is a complex and demanding undertaking. It is in a spirit of cooperation and mutual commitment to excellence that we welcome this opportunity to participate in the planning process. Undoubtedly, there are many difficult issues around which we are likely to disagree, but in the words of the late John Cardinal Newman, "Nothing would ever be accomplished if an individual waited so long as to do it so well that no other individual could find fault with it."

I would be glad to answer any questions that you may have or direct them to other members of the Executive Committee who participated extensively in our original discussions of the Ten-Year Report.

PROF. ROBBINS: I have a question of Vice President Bepko. You announced the development of this plan, I think it was at the November 6 Council meeting. I asked the question then about the level of Faculty Council involvement in the process and your response led me to anticipate something more than, it has occurred to me now, has happened. Would you comment on what you anticipated at that time and whether or not you feel that the level of discussion at the

Faculty Council meeting has met what you anticipated.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Given that it is such a preliminary, early stage, yes, it has been what I anticipated. You have to understand that this was a document that we prepared at the direction of the Commission for Higher Education. It was especially apt that Jerry closed with that quote because we were told that we had to have a development plan on, I think, September 11. The Commission said that they would like to have it by mid-October so that they could consider it and have it on the agenda for their November meeting. That gave us a grand total of about 45 days. I was brand new at this job at that point, so we thought it was a very very short deadline.

We thought that what we would do is to put together something that was based on what we had in our files already. We did some research in our files and found documents that the schools had provided, found insights and ideas in the Mission Statement project that had gone on for the 18 months prior to that and on this basis, put together the first draft. Since then, all we have really done is to respond to the Commission's inquiries about the development plan. As Jerry suggested, the inquiries that we have had from them have led us into very specific matters that probably are best addressed at the school level. We did discuss these issues with the schools that were affected and responded to the Commission's inquiries but that is all we have done at this stage. We thought, at this stage, we should, however, distribute this document widely and ask for comments and ask the Executive Committee in particular, to take it up and examine it and give us their comments. But, we see this as a much longer process and dialogue which will result in much more discussion in the Faculty Council. That discussion will, I hope, result over time in a strategic plan for the campus, a plan that we can publish for general consumption and one that is a bit more detailed that we can use for our own internal decision making purposes. The result would be a plan that is carefully crafted in cooperation with the schools and that involves substantial Faculty Council discussion and input in the future.

PROF. ROBBINS: I would like to put a question to the Executive Committee as to whether or not they have discussed any plans to follow this portion of the more complete draft. Is that on the agenda of the Executive Committee or do you anticipate it will be?

PROF. ZUNT: When we hear that there will be further development, we would be interested in being involved. The whole Council would be. The Executive Committee, when this issue came to us, because of the deadline, we had six or seven weeks, the Executive Committee actually voted to determine whether this should go to the Faculty Council or should the Executive Committee do this themselves. Because it is an elected body by the Faculty Council, the Executive Committee decided they would be an appropriate body and would be able to accomplish this task in the very short time that they had. But, yes, when we hear that there will be further plans, we will be interested.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: We haven't established the procedure for that yet because at the December meeting and in subsequent conversations with Susan and the Executive Committee we have invited commentary not only on the document but on the process which we should use. I think we are still in a position to want comment on the process that should be used. One thing that we did not want to do (without thinking carefully about it) was to create, on the heels

of the Mission task force project, another project of that kind with a hierarchy of committees that involved 100 or so faculty members. We thought that there might be a more direct way; perhaps town meetings, perhaps discussion in the Faculty Council sitting as a committee of the whole, but a more direct way than to have that large apparatus we created for the Mission project. Also, we thought that faculty wouldn't relish the idea of having another project with that kind of broad effort right on the heels of the Mission Statement project. Maybe now that people are rested we can start another project like that, but we had hoped that we would be able to do this a little differently and we are interested in comments to that end.

PROF. WILSON: This is a type of philosophical issue that bothers many of us in the School of Science. That is that there seems to be a gap between goals of the University, and I mean Indiana University as a system, and the Higher Education Commission. I will give one example. Indiana University submitted the budget this year for quality improvement in the salary line. The Higher Education Commission increased the Bloomington line by five percent and decreased the non-health line to 25 percent of what Indiana University asked for. This sent a message to us that the Higher Education Commission doesn't think much of our goals. That is, we have a strong faculty and we need graduate programs and a whole gamut of additions but we can't get them to be committed to quality improvement of our salaries. We have the impression, many of us, that what happened is that the University gives the Higher Education Commission a budget which reflects their goals. They put it on the table and then they shrug their shoulders and walk out of the room. The Higher Education Commission comes in and they say "We don't believe, for instance, that we should build graduate programs in Indianapolis or that that faculty is really worth preserving or improving the quality." Then they cut the budget in their own way. The goals don't seem to mesh. We can present all these goals forever and Higher Education Commission is never going to be happy until somehow what we request does not conflict with what they assume.

I would like to see a clear statement of what the Higher Education Commission sees for this campus because I think we would be mortified to look at the numbers that they present in the budget. You can't help but think they want us to be a high quality, undergraduate institution and they don't want graduate programs here and they don't want quality faculty. Someone has to be telling them that the two have to go together.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: There are a lot of questions wrapped up in what you said. I don't know whether I can sort them all out in the short time available except to say that the University, and officials of the University, have worked hard to try to convince the Higher Education Commission of the wisdom of the University's recommendations especially with respect to catch-up money for this campus. I think that what the Higher Education Commission did this year was not to look askance at the Indianapolis campus or to denigrate it with their recommendations. They simply took a formula and said quality improvement funding would be given on the basis of that formula to everyone. It just happened this year that the University had requested more for the Indianapolis campus and less for other campuses. When that formula was applied across the board, it made it look as if Indianapolis was being cut while others were being increased. But, it really wasn't that way at all. It is just that the Higher Education Commission used a standard formula, a standard percentage of the base, in making their recommendations with respect

to quality improvement. I don't think that the Commission for Higher Education has a dislike or any bad opinions of this campus. I think that there are some points on which we may not be in perfect agreement, especially with respect to graduate education. I don't think that they have the opinion that there shouldn't be graduate education. I think that their thought is that we have argued that we need funding to replace part-time faculty members, and to raise salaries, and to improve undergraduate education in that way. They say "Well, if that is true then we ought to focus mostly on undergraduate education right now until we have settled most of those problems." We should not launch a major effort to build graduate programs at this stage. I think that is where the disagreement may come. We may want to go a little faster than they do in building up graduate programs. We have to be very careful not to undercut our own arguments which, in the past, have been based primarily on the needs of undergraduate education. We have argued that we need more teachers because we are offering too many courses through part-time faculty. We have argued that point principally in the context of undergraduate education. If we now say that the real issues are with respect to graduate education, it will undercut our requests. At a minimum that is what they have pointed out to us.

I don't think there is any kind of impasse and we are working with the Commission staff right now to try to reach some agreement on a development plan to satisfy them and also satisfy our aspirations. That development plan won't probably please us very much when we look at it. It won't be the kind of strategic document that we would like to have to sit and read that made us feel good at night or to show to our colleagues at other universities. It is going to be a document that is worked out through discussions that has things in it that the Commission wants us to have in it; it will contain disproportionate detail in some areas in which the Commission has an interest and will be in the form of a progression of biennia.

The other document that will evolve out of this whole process, I hope, will be a strategic plan that we can use for our own planning and we will be proud to show the people in the community. It also will be something that will please us to send colleagues at other universities. It will contain the same information, but will be in a different form.

PROF. HODES: Is the contemplation that each of us here or each of the schools will get copies of the draft and that we will put them on our own agendas and our own faculty meetings and come back with suggested amendments? Exactly, how will, from the bottom up, the flow of information come?

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: This is something that we haven't decided on. We don't know what to recommend at this point. Everyone has copies of this draft of the Plan. They have been distributed here, they have been sent to all academic units. We didn't send one to everyone on the faculty although we could do that. What ever people do with it is up to them. We think within the next couple of months we will have a better idea of what kind of procedure we could use and recommend to the academic units, but the academic units are free to do whatever they like right now. If you think it would be appropriate in a given school to take it up at a faculty meeting, I think that is perfectly fine. We are interested in getting as much commentary as we possibly can. We would like to hear from everybody. If we did though, it would be hard to manage all of that. We are not prepared at this time to

suggest a specific procedure that everyone should adopt or that we will use in putting the finishing touches on this project.

Thank you, Jerry (Powers).

I have one other item which I wanted to mention. I have brought copies for those who haven't seen this. It is an article that appeared in the Wall Street Journal on January 27, written by the President of York College, a man named Robert Iosue. It was intended, at least in the author's mind, as a thoughtprovoking piece on How Colleges Can Cut Costs. It contains a couple of things that are applicable to faculty. This article has been discussed a lot in the community. In fact, I am told that the Governor has sent this article to the Presidents and Boards of Trustees of the public universities in Indiana. I don't think this fellow, Iosue, knows much about what he is talking about. But, given the wide distribution that has been made of this article, you might want to take a copy of it and read it yourself. There are responses, going back to the Governor, to explain why this fellow who wrote this doesn't really know what he is talking about. I think the important thing to recognize is not that some small college president has run amuck; it is that there is a lot of discussion about this article in the community and we ought to be aware of that. I think, in the long run, we ought to be prepared to be on the offensive with respect to the kinds of things that have been raised in this article. We should be out in front pointing out, in other words, how we as faculty members constantly strive to increase our productivity just the way everyone else is trying to do in all of the other walks of life that we hear so much about in the news media. At any rate, you can pick up a copy of this article as you leave today.

PROF. ZUNT: Bloomington Faculty Council has received a charge from the Board of Trustees to look at this article and answer the questions raised in this article. Their responses have been requested on this Saturday morning in Bloomington. Any of you are invited if you would like to hear that response from the Bloomington Faculty Council to the Board of Trustees on these issues.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: I think if the Trustees had been meeting here they might have asked us to do the same thing. Fortunately, they are meeting in Bloomington. Nevertheless, I believe it is something that we should be thinking about. It may be that this body should take up this kind of issue, if you could call this an issue; at least we might address the question of productivity and how we constantly strive to improve. That should be something that we are prepared to address and be on the offensive when we do so, rather than be on the defensive, which is the posture that we are in right now.

AGENDA ITEM IX
New Business

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Is there any New Business? [None]

AGENDA ITEM X
Adjournment

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: If there is no new business, we are adjourned.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY

at

INDIANAPOLIS

Faculty Council Meeting

Thursday, April 2, 1987

Law School, Room 116, 3:30 p.m. - 5:30 p.m.

Members Present: Vice President Gerald L. Bepko, Dean Howard Schaller, Dean Patricia Boaz. **Director:** Barbara Fischler. **Deans:** H. William Gilmore, William M. Plater, R. Bruce Renda, Sheldon Siegel, Marshall Yovits. **Faculty:** Roko Aliprantis, John Baenziger, Anne Belcher, Patricia Blake, Charles Blevins, Willard Bostwick, Linda Brothers, Michael Burke, Edmund Byrne, Varoujan Chalian, Joseph DiMicco, David Doedens, Kenneth Dunipace, Martin Farlow, Mary Feeley, Jeri Francis, Melvin Glick, Jean Gnat, Edwin Harper, Robert A. Harris, Emily Hernandez, William Hodes, Henry Karlson, Linda Kasper, Suetta Kehrein, Robert J. Kirk, Judith Kosegi, Joseph Kuczkowski, Miriam Langsam, Monroe Little, Rebecca Markel, James McAteer, Michael Mitchell, Gerald Powers, Shirley Quate, Terry E. Reed, Glen Sagraves, Kent Sharp, Jeffery Vessely, Dorothy Webb, Henry Wellman, Maudine Williams, Kathryn Wilson, Susan Zunt.

Alternates Present: Deans: James Carter for Walter Daly; Jim Bindley for Jeffery Grove; Hitwant Sidhu for P. Nicholas Kellum; John J. Cooney for William J. Voos; Scott Evenbeck for James E. Weigand; Harv Hegarty for Jack R. Wentworth. Faculty: Ronald E. Dehnke for Edward Robbins; Robert Crozier for Judith Silence.

Members Absent: Deans: Charles Bonser, Trevor Brown, Elizabeth Grossman. Faculty: Elaine Alton, Sharon Andreoli, Richard Beck, Karen Becker, H. R. Besch, Jr., Jacqueline Blackwell, Robert Colyer, Andre DeKorvin, James Edmondson, Charles Ellinger, Mark Farber, Beverly Flynn, Clifford Goodwin, Linda Haas, Eugene Helveston, Ngoan Van Hoang, Meredith Hull, Barbara Jackson, Jerome Kaminker, Robert Mendelsohn, Judy Miller, Barnett B. Morris, Paul Nagy, Catherine Palmer, Richard Pflanzner, John Pless, Mark Richardson, Kenneth Ryder, John Schmedtje, Rowland Sherrill, Ernest E. Smith, Robert Stonehill, Susan Sutton, Vernon Vix, Victor Wallis, Kathleen Warfel, Charles Winslow, Pao-Lo Yu.

Ex Officio Members Present: Martin Dragonnette, Shirley Newhouse.

Visitors: Robert Baxter, Vice President's Office; Burdellis Carter, International Student Services; Robert Heid, Personnel; Beverly Hill, MERP; Jack Hudson, Insurance/Retirement - Central Administration; Chris Keeley, Director, IUPUI Personnel; Robert Martin, Administrative Affairs, IUPUI; B. Keith Moore, Chair, Fringe Benefits Committee.

AGENDA ITEM I

Approval of Minutes - March 5, 1987

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: I think we are ready to begin. Our first agenda item is the approval of the minutes from the March 5 meeting. Is there a motion to approve? (moved) Is there a second? [seconded] All in favor of the motion, say "Aye". Are there any opposed? The minutes are approved.

AGENDA ITEM II

Presiding Officer's Business - Vice President Gerald L. Bepko

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: I would like to make a couple of brief announcements under the heading of Presiding Officer's Business. We have a very full agenda so I don't want to take up too much time. I would just like to refer to a couple of things that we have discussed in previous meetings.

First, we have had some discussion of the legislative session and the progress of the University's budget requests. As you may know, after our last meeting, the House finally voted a budget which did not include any of the things which we had hoped would be included for the Indianapolis campus such as the Science / Engineering / Technology complex or the catch-up funding for this campus. The matter is now in the Senate and there is still some hope that some of these things will be included.

The Senate Finance Committee is meeting tonight. A number of decisions will be made. I suspect that in the next couple of weeks we will know what the budget is going to be. All I can tell you at this point is that we don't have much to report and we are still somewhat hopeful that some of the things that we planned as part of the campus budget will be incorporated in the Senate and then will survive in the Conference Committee which comes at the very end of the legislative session.

Secondly, I would like to report that we have a couple of searches that are in various stages of completion for campus offices. The Search and Screen Committee for the office of Dean of Student Affairs has filed its report with us. There are four recommended candidates. We are now in the process of re-interviewing some of those candidates. There should be something to report to you within the next 30 days.

Also we have approached the end of the period for persons to make application for the new position, Dean of Faculties. We already have a number of outstanding candidates. That process should be completed within the next 30 days.

Finally, with respect to something that I have talked to you about before, we have continued our discussions with the Commission for Higher Education about the development plan. I attended a meeting of the Academic Program and Policy Committee (APPC) of the university and Ken Sauer was present to talk about the Commission's plans for the use of the ten-year services plan format for all of the campuses in the state to initiate and complete their development plans for the Commission. He referred to our development plan as a model and said that we would be the first campus, probably, to finish the whole process of having a mission statement and a development plan that was agreed to by the Commission. I take it that he was referring to the documents that have been

distributed to you. I would like to not only report that discussion we had with Commission staff, but I would like to emphasize that we envision doing more planning, in that this entire project will grow into a strategic plan for the campus. This is something you will be involved in along the way. We think that that is something that is going to be postponed for a short while. As you know, we have a new President coming aboard. I have already talked to him about this process. He would like to be involved in it, and I think it only fair that we wait until he has had a few months in office. I expect that we will begin the process of preparing our campus strategic plan sometime in the middle or late fall term of 1987-1988 with Tom Ehrlich's full participation.

Those are the only matters that I have to report on.

AGENDA ITEM III

Executive Committee Report - Susan L. Zunt, Secretary

PROF. ZUNT: I am going to try to keep my comments very brief today. As you know from looking at your agenda, a number of the things that I would typically include in my report will be given by the people who are actually participating in these activities. The Constitution and Bylaws direct me as Secretary to give you the report from the results of the at-large election and unit election that was held. I have delegated that responsibility to the Chair of our Nominating Committee Dr. Markel. When she reports to you about our upcoming elections, she will also give you the results of those elections.

Last month I reported that the Executive Committee had received some documents. The first of these documents concerned Midterm Grade Reports for University Division. The Executive Committee has directed me to forward this to Kathryn Wilson, the Chair of our Academic Affairs Committee. We have asked that committee to complete their deliberations and present their findings to you in September, 1987 at our first Faculty Council meeting.

The second document concerned Faculty Governance of University Division. The Executive Committee felt that this was also best handled by Academic Affairs. This is a little bit more involved document and a little bit more involved process in view of the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee hopes that the Academic Affairs Committee will be able to establish how members are elected or appointed for Faculty Governance of University Division and establish the reporting line. We hope to have a recommendation from the Academic Affairs Committee in September or October of 1987.

The Executive Committee has received a number of concerns from our elected Tenure Committee. This is a committee which is composed of elected representatives from the Faculty Council and is chaired by Dean Schaller, Executive Dean and Dean of the Faculties. The concerns involve annual reviews first of all. This concern was sent to all deans at IUPUI, asking that annual reviews be realistic appraisals of the faculty member's progress towards tenure. The IUPUI Tenure Committee is going to begin a process of looking very closely at the tenure process. Any recommendations that they would have should be presented to the IUPUI Faculty Council Faculty Affairs Committee which has discretion in the area of tenure.

The second concern which we received from the IUPUI Tenure Committee concerns the IUPUI Library Tenure process. This letter is just to inform us that there is interest in the library tenure and promotion procedures which are currently under review and that the IUPUI Tenure Committee requests that they have an opportunity to review the revised document when it is finished.

These are presented to you for your information so that you are aware that these things are in progress. I am sure that we will be bringing the results of these reviews to you at a later time.

As Vice President Bepko mentioned, Dean Daly is chairing the small advisory committee that is assisting the Vice President's Office in identifying candidates for the IUPUI Dean of Faculties. There is one more day that we have as faculty members to notify Dean Daly if we have people that we would like the small advisory committee to consider. I would urge you to do that.

The Executive Committee is in the process of developing our standing committees' membership. We have 40 percent of that accomplished and I fully anticipate that we will complete that process at our April 9 meeting. The Chairs, Secretaries, and Liaisons of the current committees are working very hard with the preference form information to establish these standing committees.

Last month I reported to you that the Executive Committee had sent to each faculty leader that we could identify a request for faculty nominations either elected or appointed to flesh out our slates for Faculty Boards of Review and the Tenure Committee. The response to this has been, in my opinion, very disappointing. We have heard from two schools. The closing date on that was March 31. So, I ask you as elected members of the Faculty Council, members of the units, to please go back to your units and ask whoever that elected individual is, your faculty leader, to please go ahead and finish this up and send these through to Mrs. Chumley because, even though it is now too late to use this in the process for this year, at least for the Tenure Committee process, we can use this for the next go round. It is very important. If there is anything I can do to facilitate this, please call me and I will be happy to do that.

I have reported to you previously on the status of Faculty Boards of Review. Since our last meeting, our second and final 1986 Faculty Board of Review has completed its deliberations and recommendations have been sent to the Vice President's Office. I hope in May to be able to report to you the results of that Faculty Board of Review.

I want to remind you that the Board of Trustees is meeting on this campus this weekend. Our Faculty Relations Committee meeting is going to be held at 8:30 Saturday morning in BS 3018. You are all welcome to attend this meeting. We are represented by Dean Plater, Director Scott Evenbeck, and Dean Nick Kellum. They will be describing the programs they are using at their schools in an attempt to educate the Trustees about what faculty are doing. I urge you all to attend if it is at all possible.

The Executive Committee is looking at committee membership. We are considering doing something a little bit different. In the past faculty were given a two-year appointment to a standing committee. Whether or not you attend that

first year, your appointment goes on. The Executive Committee is deliberating now and will conclude their deliberations on April 9th as to whether or not these terms should be rescinded in the second year if a faculty member does not participate or indicate to the Secretary or Chair of the standing committee that they won't be there. Some of these people receive standing committee appointments and never show up. We have preference lists where hundreds of faculty members would like to participate and we don't feel that it is fair anymore to carry these people over for two years. In our experience some of these people don't show up the second year. If you have strong feelings about that, I suggest that you either let me know or let one of the Executive Committee members know because we will be discussing that and voting on it at our April 9th Executive Committee meeting.

I want to remind you about what is going to happen next month. In May we have a different format for our Faculty Council meeting. It will be held at 3:00 - 4:00, a different time, and it will be held at the Union Building in the cafeteria. We have a very short meeting. It is an important meeting because we will be electing our Tenure, Executive, and the Nominating Committees. This meeting is short because it precedes a joint faculty and staff meeting where we recognize our faculty and staff members that have given outstanding service to the community and university. These are the Glenn W. Irwin, Jr., M.D., Experience Excellence Recognition Awards. At that time, we hope to be able to present to President Ryan or his representative some sort of plaque and a resolution thanking him for his leadership in the last 16 or 17 years. I hope to have this resolution out of the April 9th Executive Committee meeting and have it appended to the minutes and agenda for the next meeting.

One last item. We hope to invite the new President of the University to one of our first Fall meetings in 1987. This will give the Faculty Council an opportunity to meet him.

That concludes my report.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Thank you, Susan.

AGENDA ITEM IV

Music for Indianapolis - Mr. Jack Cooney

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Our next agenda item is a report on a forthcoming event. The person who will present the report is the Development Director for the Arts at IUPUI and a member of the staff at the Herron School of Art, Jack Cooney.

MR. COONEY: Good afternoon. I am here representing the Music for Indianapolis Committee. I want to begin by telling you that most of us remember how a few years ago a TV host used to welcome his audience by telling them they could look forward to "a really big show." I would like to borrow this line as I tell you about our next Music for Indianapolis Committee event which is the Big Bands Concert on April 12, Palm Sunday in the evening. Most of you have probably seen this brochure. It went out to the Green Sheet mailing list. Some of you may be wondering what is Music for Indianapolis. If you have not attended some of the events before, let me tell you that it is an ongoing series to showcase the University here in the state capital. Last year we had a Gingold concert in November. In February the School of Music

Opera Company presented Don Giovanni in Clowes Hall. We had the Big Bands in April. This year we had the Madrigal in December and in two weeks we will have the Big Bands -- 60 musicians from the School of Music under the direction of David Baker and Dominic Spera at the Indiana Roof. Next year we are looking at having the Madrigal again in December and the Beatrice and Benedict opera from Bloomington in March. Then, probably in the spring, we will do either the Big Bands or another School of Music event.

This particular concert will be held at the Indiana Roof which has been recently restored. Some of you have probably been in it and some not. This will be an outstanding opportunity to see the Ballroom with the atmosphere for which it was recreated. In other words, we have the Big Band musicians for whom a ballroom like that was first built in the '20s. We feature in tunes from the 30's and 40's, music that made the Big Bands famous and made a place like the Indiana Roof a showplace in the city.

We still have tickets available and I would like to urge all of the members of the IUPUI community to take a advantage of this opportunity to see our campus arts perform in the city. We have made special arrangements for the next week where any of the deans or faculty members who would like to take advantage of getting tickets through the University system can call Amy Warner at the Campaign Office at 274-5511. We can arrange to get the tickets to you in a more convenient way than through the Ticket Master outlet.

I might just say a few words about my position. I am the campus Development Director for the Arts, representing the visual and the performing arts. I work primarily for Bill Voos at Herron but also for Dean Kellum with the dance at the School of Physical Education and for Dean Plater with the Theatre Department in the School of Liberal Arts. I work with the program director for the Music Program Charles Manning in our music area. I am really glad to be a part of the IUPUI team and have been here for five months. I am looking forward to a number of good years of working for the arts on the campus and how they fit in with the community. Thank you.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Thank you, Jack.

AGENDA ITEM V

Financial Planning Seminar for Faculty

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Next we have a report on a Financial Planning Seminar. Your agenda shows that Barbara Jones will make the report. Barbara could not be here. The report is going to be made by Chris Keeley, who is the Director of Personnel at IUPUI, and Bob Heid, who is Manager of Personnel Records.

CHRIS KEELEY: Bob is passing out to you a brochure announcing the program describing some of the topics and the times. Since this seems to be an opportunity for show and tell, we will also be posting throughout the campus posters to announce the planned events. It is targeted primarily to employees, faculty, and staff who are 55 or older. However, if you look at the content, you will see that the topics should be of interest to all employees because they do deal with the financial aspects of planning how to use your well-earned salary dollars and perhaps make them go a little further if we plan a little better.

What we have done in putting the program together is to recognize that for many of our faculty at the time of retirement they tend to be quite distressed when they realize that perhaps they have not devoted as much time as they could have or should have in preparing for the event of retirement. We try to get to them a little bit earlier to indicate things that they need to consider in preparing for retirement.

The program which you have outlined has two parts. There are some set presentations throughout the day which are scheduled. There are also continuing and ongoing presentations. There will be presentors or experts available to answer questions. The program is not meant to answer every question in the greatest amount of detail, but it is meant to at least raise questions that individuals need to consider when thinking about retirement or thinking about planning their financial future.

I was very anxious to come before this group to announce this program because one of the difficulties that we experience in the Personnel office is the difficulty of communicating, especially with faculty, when it comes to the benefits package. So, I am very pleased to be here and I would ask that you share the information that we are passing out. Also recognize that we will be sending out individual invitations to all employees who are 55 years of age and over to attend this particular program. We also ask that if their spouses or significant others are available, that they are most welcome to attend the event as well. We also extend the invitation for, as I said, to employees who are younger than 55 because the topics and issues that will be discussed or raised should be of interest to all of us.

That is my word of the day and I appreciate the air time.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Thanks Chris. Are there any questions?

AGENDA ITEM VI

Impact of Recent Immigration Legislation on IUPUI - Burdellis Carter

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Our next agenda item has to do with the recently-enacted legislation dealing with immigration and immigrants. We are going to be required to have new documentation for employees hired after November of last year. Dr. Burdellis Carter is here to tell us about it.

DR. CARTER: It is always a privilege for me to talk about our international community here at IUPUI. It is probably much larger than any of us realize. November 6, 1986 is the magic date. For everyone in the United States it was the implementation date of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986. Beginning with that date, all people who are being employed will have to be documented regarding their eligibility for employment. The burden of this is placed on the employers. Indiana University, IUPUI to be specific, being an employer, has a large task ahead of us. Each person who is employed will have to have their documents examined and forms completed. We are in the education phase of this now and that will run until June 1. No documents are being examined presently. The Immigration and Naturalization Service was commissioned to implement this program, as you might guess, without additional staff or money, and so they are getting geared up at this time.

Before or around June 1, every employer will have to document all the employees who came on board from November 6 to June 1. Thereafter, all new employees will, within three days of their employment, will need to have their documents examined. All of us who have been employed before November 6, 1986 are grandfathered into this process. But, if any of us go for new employment, we will have to present our documents.

The University procedures have not been put into place as of yet. When that is ready, information and training sessions will be established. I think it is rather frightening to know the penalties for not complying. For failure for an institution or employer to not maintain the proper records, the fine is from \$100 to \$1,000 per employee. So, if you have five employees for whom you have failed to maintain documents, you can see that you are going to have a sizeable bill to pay. If you are found to be hiring illegal or unauthorized aliens, the fine runs from \$250 to \$10,000 per individual illegal person employed. Our office, International Student Services, will not be involved as far as we know at this point in this process. All American citizens, permanent residents, and non-immigrant aliens will be needing to do their documents. I will not go into all the process or all of the documents that can be submitted. That will come later when the procedures are established.

We have at IUPUI at any given time approximately 300 non-immigrant aliens either in the form of students or visiting faculty and researchers. It is those people I would like to speak to you about. My office is the only office at IUPUI that is officially recognized to issue the documents for these people to either remain on our campus or to be invited to come to our campus. Departments do not need to hire a lawyer outside of the institution to do this. In fact, they can get us into some rather difficult situations because they do not know the information about the University to place on the documents. Probably the most simple employment is the student who is here on an immigration document, a visa, who wants to work part-time. They do have to have a work permit. We use a wallet-size blue card. It does have an expiration date on it. I will give it to your secretary. Perhaps it can be reproduced in the minutes.

IUPUI
INTERNATIONAL STUDENT SERVICES

NAME SAMPLE

ID NUMBER _____

VISA _____ EXP. DATE _____

has permission to work on-campus. Employment is limited to 20 hours per week except during vacation periods when full time work is permitted. Student is not eligible for work-study.

DATE _____

Assoc. Dean, Student Affairs

The students are told (and it is also on the card) the limitations of their employment according to the number of hours they may work per week. We also have people in practical training which Immigration allows a period of time,

depending upon their visa status from 12 to 18 months, for graduates to actually put into practice in a work situation the knowledge and skills they have learned. These may be either IUPUI graduates or come from other institutions.

If anyone approaches you about employment, that is the first signal to think, "I must either examine their documents" or, better yet, check with our office. Graduate assistants and fellows are an employees of the type but are looked upon by Immigration as a part of their educational program and they still need the proper documents.

Postdoctoral fellows, again, are a type of a student visa. If you are inviting someone to stay for a period of time, they do need special documents.

Exchange researchers, scholars, and faculty are usually invited on a J visa for a maximum of three years. They may stay for less. It is our office that you must contact for the necessary information forms and applying of the information so that we can issue the documents to be sent to them to get the proper papers to enter the United States.

The temporary worker or the H visa, which many people call the working visa, is a maximum of five years. It is a temporary position. Much more documentation is needed for these people, and again, our office is the one that helps you to assemble the materials and then processes it to send to the Immigration office. I am the official affixer of the signature for this campus. A person cannot be offered a tenure position. This is a temporary and it must be in some type of a temporary title and position.

A person whom you wish to offer a tenure position or a tenure-track position and want them to become a permanent resident of the United States requires labor certification even before we can go to Immigration requesting permission for them to enter the United States. It takes a considerable amount of time and, even after all papers are approved, they may wait for at least as much as one year and sometimes longer for a quota of numbers for them to enter the United States.

You may also get inquiries about spouses and children wanting to either be employed or in some fashion do something for your department. Some people can do this by legal definition and some cannot, depending upon their visa status. Again, a red flag. Check with us. The people will tell you anything, so don't depend upon what they tell you for any of these categories. I don't expect you to be experts in reading immigration documents and knowing all of these rules and regulations. We would much rather you would call us immediately to ask about it. It is important that you do this as soon as you have that first inkling that somebody may not be a U.S. citizen or a permanent resident, because some people's documents do not allow them to continue employment or to become employed. For instance, many of their requirements are placed by the particular skills they have been doing in the United States and their studies because they are needed in their home country or because of their funding. They must return to their home country for at least two years before they can come back to the United States. Even if you are not sure about reading permanent resident documents, please call us and we sometimes can help you on the phone. Other times, you may have to send the person to us.

A permanent resident is also called a resident alien or the age-old term is the Green Card. It is no longer green. It is plastic, laminated, wallet-size, with a picture identification information and thumb print on it, but it is still called the Green Card.

I was asked to also say something about the International Programs Office. Both of our offices are located on the fifth floor of the north wing of the Union Building. International Student Services actually serves not only students but faculty also. We provide assistance of a variety of kinds to people coming from other countries. I might say that Canada is another country. Many people think that they are the same as U.S. citizens because we can travel back and forth so easily, but they have to meet all of these requirements too. The International Programs Office is much more concerned with Americans, students, and faculty going abroad for experiences and the internationalization of the curriculum, bringing speakers, and other programs here to our campus.

Are there any questions?

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Thank you, Burdellis.

AGENDA ITEM VII

Budgetary Affairs Committee - Beverly Hill, Chair

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: We have next a report from the Budgetary Affairs Committee from Bev Hill.

BEVERLY HILL: Thank you for this opportunity to share some of the information for the Budgetary Affairs Committee. I have never been in this room and giving a budget report, in fact being in the business that I am, in Media Services, I admire the fact that there are no corners in this room. For me, that is a wonderful kind of situation to be in. You can't be cornered in this room, if you will notice.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: There is one corner back there.

BEVERLY HILL: I noticed that. I like this corner right here. The Budgetary Affairs Committee does, as you know, sit through the budget hearings of the deans of the various schools. We give a report and recommendations to the Chief Executive Officer, and in doing so we divide them into two parts. One is the immediate budget for the fiscal year. The other is administrative considerations. What we try to do is recognize in the administrative considerations that there are some long-term goals. We recognize there are no budgets for these identified but we would like to draw attention and to discuss with the Chief Executive Officer what the impacts will be and the considerations of those. We like to separate those out of our recommendations on the budgets for those for those of you who plan for a budget year.

I would very quickly like to read some of the headings for those two categories. The report is finalized now and we will be arranging a meeting time that is convenient with the administration. What happens in that formal report is put together and a summary which is submitted to the Council. Again, reading these headlines, in the budget report we discussed and took a

posture on salary, recommendations on the library needs, capital needs of the campus, services on the campus, and instructional equipment needs. Those are not only audio visual but they are also equipment in laboratories and computers and micro-clusters. We took a posture on those recommendations.

In the administrative considerations, we did address long-term goals now and recommendations on salaries and student needs. We broke those down into scholarships, marketing for IUPUI related to the student, equipment needs, and space. Coming again with the headline addressed New Programs, professional growth and development of faculty, library needs, long-term goals, and instructional services. That will make up the body of the report which will be presented officially to the administration.

Thank you. Are there any questions?

DEAN YOVITS: Is the summary statement generally available?

BEVERLY HILL: The summary statement is through the Council.

DEAN YOVITS: So we will all see copies of it?

PROF. ZUNT: Yes.

BEVERLY HILL: We appreciate the support of the administration and its officers. David Robbins has been very supportive to us in documentation, as Vice President Bepko and Dean Schaller have. The statement of our appreciation is in the first paragraph that they will see on their text.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: We won't be filing a report with the Budgetary Affairs Committee, in which we can thank them, so I would like to thank them here. I think the representatives of the Faculty Council, namely the members of the Budgetary Affairs Committee, that participated in our budget hearings over the last few months have represented you very well. They have been excellent participants in the process. They asked a lot of very good questions and made very good comments. We are looking forward to seeing the report. I think it is a very good process.

AGENDA ITEM VIII

Academic Affairs Committee, Kathryn Wilson, Chair

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: The next item on our agenda is something which will require action of the Council. It is a report of the Academic Affairs Committee by Professor Kathryn Wilson on two subjects: the new proposed All University Admissions Policy and the 1988-1989 Academic Calendar.

PROF. WILSON: First I would like to do the calendar. The calendar is reproduced for you in your minutes under the title IUPUI Calendar Committee. Our committee met on this calendar and also approved it. We made absolutely no changes. I would like to recommend that you accept it.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Is there discussion?

PROF. HODES: How does this compare to the calendar we have now?

PROF. WILSON: Next year the calendar will change from the current year. It remains a 15-week calendar for each semester. However, in the fall semester we begin classes on Monday rather than on Wednesday. We go until Thanksgiving week which we have entirely off. So we have one entire week off over Thanksgiving, then we go until Christmas break. We still have 15 weeks, however. The other difference is we have classes on Labor Day.

PROF. HODES: Does that start in the fall of 1987 or 1988?

PROF. WILSON: That is starting in fall 1987. We have never been through this calendar yet. This calendar that I am presenting is for the following year and it is identical to what we proposed last year for next year. We are always one year ahead. We decided not to change anything since we haven't tried it yet. The only comments people on my committee had about this calendar is that we go for a very long time in the fall without any break. It is really not really significantly different by very many days than it is right now.

PROF. HODES: Why the difference from Bloomington calendar? I have been hearing for years that we have been trying to unify the calendars. Secondly, it says on the top of this that this is a recommended academic calendar. To what extent are the individuals schools free to deviate from this calendar?

PROF. WILSON: As far as I know the schools cannot deviate from this, except for professional schools that have particular requirements.

DEAN SCHALLER: I think the calendar is meant to be adopted by all schools. Sometimes there are variations because of peculiar requirements. Once you start any kind of major alteration in the calendar for a particular school then there are all kinds of difficulties with the registration process and other items which make that very difficult to do. That doesn't mean that it can't be done. I think there would have to be a pressing reason why a school wouldn't follow the general calendar.

PROF. WILSON: To answer your question about Bloomington, at the time this calendar was put together the Bloomington calendar was a 14-week semester. They have had a lot of criticisms about that. Since we worked out our calendar, they evidently have changed their fall semester to a 15-week semester. I don't know what they have done with their spring semester.

PROF. WELLMAN: Is that reflected here because Bloomington gets everything done almost one week shorter than IUPUI?

PROF. WILSON: Right now they get done earlier because they only have a 14-week semester. We have a 15-week semester, they have a 14-week semester.

DEAN SCHALLER: They recently adopted a new calendar, as you may, in which they are lengthening their calendar again.

PROF. WILSON: They lengthened their calendar, though in a different way than we have. They have lengthened by adding days here and there so that they don't have full weeks, Monday through Friday, as we have. They don't have the same problem we have with Weekend College or weekend classes either. We have classes that we have to consider that occur on Saturday and Sunday. We have

to keep our days all even. We have to have the same number of days in every week.

DEAN SCHALLER: Another thing they did, is to go back to having classes the first part of Thanksgiving week. They no longer take the whole Thanksgiving week off. We are going to, by this proposal, take a week off at Thanksgiving, whereas they tried this for a couple of years but they are going to give that up. I should say they are going to schedule classes the early part of Thanksgiving week.

PROF. WILSON: While they do that, they are having a 15-week schedule but so are we. They have as long a week as we do.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: What is the reasoning that leads to not having classes at all during Thanksgiving week? I think I know, but I wasn't privy to these discussions.

PROF. WILSON: There are a number of reasons. One of the reasons was the obvious one that students don't come to class that Monday and Tuesday anyway, so why bother. That's a terrible argument. The other reason is that you can have 15 weeks without meeting during that week. You can have full weeks of classes. For units that have laboratories, there is an advantage to having classes Monday through Friday. If you have, for instance, classes only Monday and Tuesday, you can't have any laboratories in that week for many of your classes that have labs. You have to just cancel them, whereas, if you can work out your schedule having 15-weeks with Monday through Friday, you can have labs all week long. You don't have to cancel them. The way we had it before, there was a big difference between the number of labs that you could hold in the fall and the number of labs you could hold in the spring because the spring had more Monday through Friday weeks than the fall did because we started on a Wednesday in the fall. Then we had Monday and Tuesday over Thanksgiving. We didn't have Labor Day. Those three weeks you can't have laboratories.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: What is it about the short week that prevents you from scheduling laboratory sessions?

PROF. WILSON: In a large class you schedule labs Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays. If you can't meet your Monday lab, you can't meet any of the labs because of set up times.

DEAN SCHALLER: One of the things this does is get us back to the old criticism that we had of the semester system back in what I call the "old calendar" where you would take the break at the end of December (which used to be called Christmas vacation), and then came back for a couple of weeks and finished it up and had exams. That was considered to be pedagogically highly undesirable. So, here we are with a full week off: then we come back two weeks and have exams. You are right back in that same situation.

PROF. WILSON: It is not quite the same because we used to have three weeks off and come back. This time we only have a week off. So the idea is to assign lots of papers and faculty can work in their labs. You can look at it both ways.

DEAN SCHALLER: It is not a vacation.

PROF. WILSON: That's right. You can look at it that way.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: If we couldn't get students to come to class on Monday and Tuesday, how are we getting them to write the papers?

DEAN SCHALLER: We will have to check on that because there is more of a demand to go to Florida.

PROF. LITTLE: What was the extent of student input into the calendar?

PROF. WILSON: None.

PROF. WELLMAN: This year will be the first time they started classes in the third week of August, which hasn't been tried yet?

PROF. WILSON: The only difference in the starting date is two days. It will start on Monday instead of Wednesday.

PROF. WELLMAN: I have heard of some instances where people say they can't get back by the start and it is all right to start after Labor Day.

PROF. WILSON: There are only two days difference. I don't understand that argument.

PROF. WELLMAN: You are really beginning to cut into time when some of the kids will be out of school.

PROF. WILSON: You are cutting into the summer by two days.

PROF. WELLMAN: We have more of an adult population of students. I think that is a serious inconvenience. I suspect that you are going to have poor attendance at the beginning of the first few days.

DEAN YOVITS: I just wanted to point out that this issue has been discussed at considerable length in the Calendar Committee and the argument about students not coming to school on Monday and Tuesday during the Thanksgiving week is absolutely correct elsewhere, but it is not correct here. However, the point that Kathryn raised with regard to laboratories is a most sufficient one for those of us in Science and, I assume, in Medicine as well. It really is hard if you break up weeks; but, in response to your question, the students in Indianapolis will, I believe, in fact come to class on Monday and Tuesday.

PROF. WEBB: I would like to affirm what you have said and that is that it has been our experience that, when the computer broke down and things were delayed, and we had to keep our classes open longer, then suddenly our enrollment enlarged here in the city. I do think, whether we like it or not, there is a factor that many of our students who, with families and so on, look upon that week of August as still part of the vacation and they have been able to come in and maybe miss a day or two of classes and survive. What we are saying now is that there is a full week of school and that simply will not happen, whereas it can happen at Bloomington where they start a full week later. I think it would behoove the University to make certain that this is

advertised very loudly throughout. I think it will impact upon the enrollment because I saw its impact last year and the year before when we had the computer breakdown. An amazing number of people who were able to get enrolled and who somehow did not perceive that our enrollment time was that much different from the other universities. Since we are so far ahead, I think we need to make sure that it is advertised well.

PROF. WILSON: If you are going by the numbers that are written in the right-hand column for Bloomington, I would not trust them. I don't think they are true anymore.

PROF. WEBB: I am just saying what it has been in the past. We have already started it.

PROF. WILSON: I don't think that we are vastly different anymore because they had to move up their dates in order to have a 15-week semester.

PROF. WEBB: I still think it is worth advertising and making sure that it is known because all of those people who work registration and who work at counseling have felt that pressure. I certainly have.

PROF. HODES: Along the line of advertising, I would suggest that you start advertising now about classes on Labor Day this year. I guarantee you that there are virtually no faculty members who know. In addition, at least in our school, we have an orientation program that lasts two and one-half or three or so days before this for our first-year students, so we are pushing it well into the summer. Has your committee given any thought to starting the whole thing the day after Labor Day, picking up the Monday at some other point and coming back immediately for exams.

PROF. WILSON: You mean the way we used to? When I went to college, you went for Christmas vacation for three weeks and then went back and took the exams. Is that what you want to do?

PROF. HODES: Was that considered?

PROF. WILSON: No. The problem is fitting 15 weeks in.

PROF. HODES: What is done nationally nowadays?

PROF. WILSON: The 14-week semester is one of the shorter semesters. That is why Bloomington has gone back to the 15-week semester.

PROF. HODES: If you have a 15-week semester, is it true nationally that that is when everyone starts on August 27?

PROF. WILSON: I don't know. Lot of schools are on quarter systems.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Somebody asked the question whether students were involved in this. We have a student here, Martin Dragonette, that we haven't heard from.

MR. DRAGONETTE: The only thing that I was going to bring up concerning the calendar was that it is better this year than years past because the

"Christmas break" is much closer than this year's was and that is appreciated. In the five years that I have been here, the spring break has been the biggest calendar item for students. They like the chance to coordinate with their friends and family in Bloomington. We have students whose families are split. Some are here and some are in Bloomington and they want to take a vacation together. Some of the faculty have the same problem. The students would like to see having a spring break that is coordinated closer with Bloomington. If we could make a concerted effort and have student input from here on out on this calendar, it would be helpful.

PROF. WILSON: My comment there is that coordinating a calendar with Bloomington is very difficult. For one thing they tend to coordinate their calendar with the Monroe County school system. To ask Indianapolis to do that is not quite fair. Also, we have in the past tried to coordinate our calendar with Bloomington. We get it down as they have it, we approve it, we publish it, and then they change it.

MR. DRAGONETTE: Perhaps we could have our approval dates worked out so that they are the same time also, or something to that effect. Is there a chance that students could have input in the future into this process? I don't think they have input, at least this year I don't know of any student on that committee.

PROF. WILSON: Well, the way this works is there is an Administrative Calendar Committee. I don't think there is a student on that. The Academic Affairs Committee does not have a student either.

DEAN SCHALLER: With respect to spring break that Martin's bringing up, what would be wrong with simply, where it says Spring Recess Begins, Monday, March 6, to put down there March 11?

PROF. WILSON: Because there is absolutely no guarantee that what is down on this paper is what is in Bloomington. That's why. We could put it down and find out that it doesn't mean anything. What we have always done is try to split the semester in half. That is what the faculty would like. They would like to see the semester break be half way along in the semester.

DEAN YOVITS: The discussion in the Calendar Committee has always evolved around how you schedule spring break, and most of the argument is whether it ought to be scheduled around the school vacations. But, in this particular case, school vacations are all over the place.

DEAN SCHALLER: I don't think that it is coordinated with Monroe County Schools because it comes too early.

DEAN YOVITS: Well, the sign that was put on was to do it logically to schedule the seventh or eighth week.

PROF. VESSELY: In deference to the Calendar Committee who have probably debated this forever and a day, I would like to call for the question.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: That takes precedence and suspends the discussion. Are you ready to vote? All in favor of adopting this calendar, say "Aye." Opposed? [There were some opposed.] The ayes have it.

PROF. WILSON: On the next page of your minutes is the last recommendation for the Undergraduate Admissions Policy that I presented from my committee to you at our last meeting. You requested that we go back and make some changes, especially with respect to English writing skills. My committee met Wednesday after work and came up with the document that is represented by the handout that you should have picked up when you walked in the door. This represents the new document from my committee.

The changes in the document are as follows:

In Part A, No. 1, part a we have struck out what was in parentheses (~~one semester each of speech and journalism may be included~~). We added two parts beneath section A.

- i. Courses which develop writing skills are strongly recommended.
- ii. One semester each of speech and journalism may be included in the eight semesters.

We hope that that answers the need to put a desire to see more English writing skills in new admittances.

In Part E under No. 1, the committee recognizes that it made an error when it counted up the number of courses and changed ~~ten~~ back to **eight** additional semesters and added in the following way the following phrases:

- e. **Eight additional semesters of some combination of courses which develop writing skills, foreign language, mathematics, social science, laboratory science, computer science, and other courses of a college preparatory nature. Four semesters of foreign language are strongly recommended.**

We struck out the two parts below that were in the original document. Other changes that we made are fairly minor on the second page. They simply have to do with what we feel is good writing which we feel should be reflected in this document.

4. In the first paragraph we struck out ~~for persons~~ and said **persons who do not meet the above requirement...** Going on in that same sentence, in the middle of the first paragraph, we struck out ~~admission can be~~ and added **may be admitted based** and we struck out one of the ~~ons~~ and we struck out a ~~General Educational Development (GED) diploma~~ and put it at the end of that set of factors **having earned a General Educational Development (GED) diploma...**

Going down to Part B, we changed an **and** to an **or** in 1 b. Going down to C, we said such qualifications are **listed** instead of **identified**.

Those are all of the changes that we made. I would like now to ask for your approval of this document so that it can be passed on to the University Faculty Council.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: This was discussed at some length at our last meeting

and the changes in response to that discussion have been explained. Is there any discussion.

PROF. BYRNE: I didn't feel that your observation indicated a strong desire for discussion. I would like to ask a question for information purposes, on No. A1 and A2, I realize that this is not a new item, but for purpose of information, why is the difference between the class rank between in-state and out-of-state students, and, somewhat tongue-in-cheek, does this regularly apply to applicants?

PROF. WILSON: Why is there a difference? Because it is taxpayers' money. That's why. The taxpayers of Indiana are subsidizing Indiana University.

PROF. BYRNE: I understand, but there is a difference in the tuition also.

PROF. WILSON: Right.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: It is not unusual to favor resident applicants. Most state universities have some form of preference for in-state resident applicants. It just reflects the political dynamics of state universities. There was something mentioned at last month's meeting that I thought was helpful in understanding the nature of this document and I would like to repeat it to make sure it is correct. These standards will ensure the admission of a student, if met, but students can be admitted, and are admitted, that don't meet these standards, it is just that they are reviewed individually to determine if their admission is warranted or desirable from the standpoint of the university. What this, in other words, sets is an automatic admission threshold. If you meet it, you're in. If you don't meet it, you still may be admitted but you don't have a guarantee. Is that correct?

PROF. WILSON: That is right.

PROF. KUCZKOWSKI: In our last discussion, Sara McNabb answered a question which I proposed about the effective date. According to the minutes, "I think that the 1990 should probably be adjusted accordingly." There is great concern of disseminating this information in time for the high schools to adjust. I don't know fully what she meant by that but she indicated here that she thought that that date should not be 1990.

DEAN SCHALLER: Joe, this will have to go to the University Faculty Council as Kathryn just suggested. It will also have to go to the Trustees because the existing admissions policy for the IU system was adopted by the Trustees some 25 years ago. Therefore, it will also have to go through Trustee action. I assume, whenever that occurs, part of that final action, somebody will put down an appropriate date. I think your point is well taken. They will have to give sufficient warning to the schools. I think it might be hard for us right now to say what that date ought to be.

PROF. HARPER: Our recommendations could say four years from the day of adoption.

DEAN SCHALLER: Something like that.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Is the committee prepared to accept that and modify their proposal accordingly?

PROF. WILSON: I am sure they are. The thing is, we are not the final acceptors of this document. All you are doing is accepting this document to go on to the University Faculty Council, my point being I don't think the date really matters.

DEAN PLATER: It is a small matter, but I wondered if you would consider relabeling item D to something other than "Miscellaneous." Perhaps "Additional Policy Considerations." It seems to me that we don't want to indicate that matters as important as complying with Affirmative Action are miscellaneous.

PROF. QUATE: How about Other?

PROF. WILSON: What was your suggestion? "Additional Policy Considerations" or "Other" is fine.

DEAN SCHALLER: How about "Additional Considerations"?

PROF. SHARP: Does this document apply to Purdue programs?

PROF. WILSON: Yes. The thing is, what this does is admit students into the University. If they are qualified to enter a Purdue program and its possibly additional requirements, they would admitted.

PROF. SHARP: How about less requirements?

PROF. WILSON: Then they would not be admitted. They would be admitted to University Division until they did meet the requirements.

DEAN SCHALLER: Kent, you are talking about 1C?

PROF. SHARP: I am going to quote the agreement between Boards of Trustees of Purdue University and Indiana University and I would wonder how you would interpret this because in Section 6 of three agreement, which is about 15 years old, it says "All students shall be admitted and enrolled by Indiana University as students of IUPUI. Those who elect to pursue Purdue programs shall be admitted in accordance to standards established by Purdue University." We are not establishing these standards, as I interpret this document. I see us going against the Trustees of both Indiana University and Purdue University and for that reason I think this is a poor document.

PROF. LANGSAM: I think it talks about admission to the University. It does not talk about admission to particular schools.

PROF. SHARP: I said programs.

PROF. WILSON: It doesn't talk about admission to programs.

PROF. SHARP: If Purdue programs state that we would like a certain set of admissions, would we get that?

PROF. WILSON: If you will look at C, it does speak to Admission to Specific Academic Programs. "Some academic programs specify additional qualifications for admission. Such qualifications are listed in the appropriate school bulletins."

PROF. SHARP: How about less qualifications? You said No to that.

PROF. LANGSAM: No. It speaks to the discretion of the admission process on a probationary basis. If Purdue wants to have a lower standard, there is a way in which they can get students admitted directly into their programs.

PROF. SHARP: I simply would like to have the same thing here as we have on the rest of the campuses of Purdue University.

PROF. WILSON: Are these standards higher?

PROF. SHARP: These standards are higher.

DEAN SCHALLER: 1C particularly is in conflict with admission to the Technology Program. Is that correct, Kent?

PROF. SHARP: That is right.

DEAN SCHALLER: You can still use the Purdue criteria for admission to the Technology programs on this campus by simply invoking Number 3. There is nothing inconsistent with adopting this policy with the admissions we have for both the Purdue School of Engineering and the Purdue School of Science. Your point is well taken about that agreement. We can't differ from the agreement and I don't think this would because the policy here does permit us to use the Purdue admissions standards for the two Purdue schools here.

PROF. WILSON: In other words, there is a catchall phrase here, at the bottom on page 1 that would allow students to enter into the program.

PROF. SHARP: Is that the first sentence or the second sentence?

PROF. WILSON: If you look on page 2 at the top "Applicants who are deficient in the above criteria may be accepted based on evidence such as" whatever evidence you want to accept, namely, Purdue standards.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Are you ready for the question? All in favor, say "Aye." Opposed? [There were some opposed] The ayes have it. Thank you Kathryn. That was a good report.

AGENDA ITEM IX

Fringe Benefits Committee - B. Keith Moore - Long Term Disability Proposal

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Next, we have another action item. A report on Long Term Disability by Keith Moore from the Fringe Benefits Committee.

PROF. MOORE: Before I report on the Long Term Disability proposal I would like to make a brief announcement about another long standing issue that has just been clarified.

The University Controller's Office has issued a memorandum stating that:

"University schools or departments that offer non-credit, continuing education courses, programs, seminars, workshops, and conferences may elect at the expense of the program to offer discounts to employees of Indiana University who are appointed as 100% FTE and to retirees of the University who have retired under the University retirement provisions."

This memorandum essentially restores the situation to what existed six years ago and was discontinued because of a ruling that it had not been approved on a system wide basis.

I think we owe thanks to the administration for pursuing this and finding a remedy that offers flexibility to the various schools and departments and offers to the faculty and staff a rather attractive benefit. We also owe a vote of thanks to Continuing Studies who have pursued this issue with the Fringe Benefits Committee for the last six years to a successful conclusion.

My second item this afternoon relates to the proposal for an insurance-based, long-term disability plan that was included with today's agenda as Circular 86-22. This proposal was developed in response to a request by the University Office of Insurance which in turn was pursuing a mandate from the University Faculty Council that dates back to 1984.

This might be an appropriate time to introduce to you Mr. Jack Hudson who is the Director of Insurance and Retirement Programs. Jack tells me that this is the first occasion he has had to be present with our Faculty Council. Jack is here today to answer any of the technical questions that might arise relating to this proposal. Jack's office, and Jack to be specific, has done the work in developing this.

The specific proposal in Circular 86-22 was developed by TIAA. I would like to make it clear that our interest is not in whether TIAA should be the carrier for such coverage, but rather in whether we feel this plan, as presented, is desirable for IUPUI and the IU system. As I noted in my memo to Secretary Zunt, this proposal has already been endorsed by the All University Fringe Benefits Committee and the University Faculty Council.

It is the feeling of our committee that insurance-based, long-term disability protection is a vital missing link in what is otherwise a strong and attractive package of benefits at Indiana University. I also believe that it is important for this campus to be heard and to demonstrate to the administration that our campus is solidly in favor of action on this issue as soon as possible.

The IUPUI Fringe Benefits Committee, therefore, recommends that the IUPUI Faculty Council endorse the Long-Term Disability Benefits Insurance Proposal as presented in Circular 86-22 with the understanding that it will replace the existing plan for all employees who participate in the TIAA-CREF retirement program and who are not currently receiving disability benefits under the existing plan. In addition, the cost of the Long-Term Disability coverage is to be part of the fringe benefits compensation and the program is non-contributory for the participants.

I therefore move that the IUPUI Faculty Council endorse the long-term disability plan as presented in Circular 86-22 and urge its implementation as rapidly as possible.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Are there any questions?

PROF. BYRNE: On page 8, it reads like a narrative. Perhaps you can clarify it. Under the Heading No Medical Examination, there are alternative possibilities and under Contributions it is assumed that the University will pay. Is the latter the one to take seriously or are the alternatives still under consideration, or what?

PROF. MOORE: I tried to make it clear that it is the intention of this committee and of the all University committee that, if the plan was adopted, it be a non-contributory plan. The University is paying the cost of the long-term disability. Is that the question?

PROF. BYRNE: Yes.

PROF. MOORE: This was the assumption that was made for supporting the plan.

PROF. WELLMAN:: I wonder if Mr. Hudson would contrast this with what we presently do or don't have.

MR. HUDSON: I tried to do that on the next to last page where it says LTD PLAN COMPARISON. It covers state employees, mainly those on TIAA-CREF. The current plan only covers people who have been here five years with tenure or seven years without tenure. All current employees with one year or more of service would be covered the day the plan goes into effect. New employees would be covered after one year of service. That is a big improvement.

The record shows the various replacement percentages provided by the current plan. The replacement amount varies based upon whether you qualify for Social Security, or have any dependents who qualify for Social Security, or whether one would choose to begin their TIAA/CREF annuities at the time of disability.

The problem with the current plan is, you must start drawing your TIAA/CREF annuities for the rest of your life when you become disabled. If you find you are able to return to work, those annuities cannot be stopped.

The equity would remain intact and the insurance plan would continue to make contributions to TIAA/CREF until age 65. Disability income from the proposed plan would stop at age 65 at which time one would begin the TIAA/CREF regular full retirement.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Are there any other questions? If not, are you ready to vote? All in favor of endorsing this proposal, say "Aye." Opposed. Thank you Keith.

PROF. WELLMAN: Will the records show that this was passed with the assumption that this is going to be non-contributory?

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: That was the assumption on which the vote was taken. Yes. It should be reflected in the minutes of the meeting.

AGENDA ITEM X

Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities - Student Affairs Committee - James McAteer, Chair

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Next, we have a report from the Student Affairs Committee on the Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities. Jim McAteer, Chair of that committee, will make the report.

PROF. MCATEER: The Student Affairs Committee was asked by the Executive Committee to undertake a review of the Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities, the revised document, prepared by the University Task Force on Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities, chaired by Dean Boaz.

Our committee has completed its review of the document and is prepared to make two recommendations in the form of motions. First, however, we would like to acknowledge the work of Dean Boaz and the members of the Task Force. They took on an incredibly difficult task, that of preparing a document that will serve as the primary reference of University policy in the area of student rights, the code of student conduct, student responsibilities, student complaints, and disciplinary procedures. The Task Force has made a superb contribution toward improving our existing Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities. The revised document does a great deal to define student rights and clarify University policies in language that is understandable to all.

The Student Affairs Committee, however, is concerned that the document in its current form does not fully meet the needs of students (and faculty) as a complete resource document, nor does it meet the needs of the University as a correct and unambiguous legal document.

In our review, we compiled a list of about 70 points of concern regarding form and presentation of information, meaning and clarity of statements, as well as accuracy and completeness in documentation of policy and procedures distributed throughout all six major sections of the document.

Let me give you a couple of examples:

1. Under the heading Academic Misconduct within the section on STUDENT DISCIPLINARY PROCEDURES, the term "academic bankruptcy" is used in a discussion of procedures that can be used to prevent a grade of F from appearing on a student's transcript. An academic bankruptcy policy does not exist on our campus. This statement may lead a student to believe that it does.
2. Within the section entitled STUDENT RIGHTS under the heading On The Campus is a discussion of censorship. That discussion does not adequately clarify the issue for students nor protect the University. It implies that any and all student-generated publications are entirely free from censorship and that students are immune from university action against them. In addition, the term "publication" is not defined within this context, and one does not know if this

includes film, video, and audio. A broad interpretation of this section might, for example, lead a student to feel protected in his or her right to maliciously slander an individual.

These are just two examples of areas where the revised document is incomplete. Our committee feels that if the document is published in its current form we run the risk of creating difficulties for interpretation and implementation of policy.

It is our feeling that now is the time not only to make corrections, but to make the document more complete, more comprehensive. We must realize that we will likely live with the next edition of the Student Rights and Responsibilities for many years since the current document was originated in the '70s.

The Student Affairs Committee recommends that the Faculty Council not approve the Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities (Revised Document) until the document has received thorough review and has been rewritten to incorporate needed changes. To help direct an appropriate review of the document we wish to make the following motion, I will present a second motion if the first is passed:

FIRST MOTION:

As Chairman of the Student Affairs Committee, I move that the IUPUI Faculty Council ask the University Faculty Council to establish a committee to conduct a thorough review and revision of the Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities (Revised Document). That the review committee have university-wide representation and include faculty, undergraduate, graduate and professional school students, deans of students or student affairs include representation of the graduate school and professional schools, and university legal counsel. The University Faculty Council may use an existing standing committee for this purpose so long as the committee takes into account the concerns of the aforementioned constituencies. That the document generated by this review committee be made available to the IUPUI Faculty Council for subsequent review.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: The motion has been made. I take it, since it comes from a committee, it needs no second. Is there discussion? Questions?

PROF. SIDHU: Dean Boaz, the committee appointed by any appropriate party, is it a reasonable assumption that such consideration must be given? I would like to know who appointed that committee, what the formation was. Dean Boaz is here and she might have some background to that.

DEAN BOAZ: The Task Force was appointed by President Ryan. It included one member from each regional campus, four from Indianapolis, four from Bloomington, the University Counsel, and the Affirmative Action Officer. The Task Force made its report directly to President Ryan.

DEAN SCHALLER: The committee that Pat is describing was requested by the University Faculty Council. What this does is say to request another committee.

PROF. HARPER: Jim, did you make two motions?

PROF. MCATEER: I made one motion.

PROF. HARPER: Wasn't your first motion to recommend that the IUPUI Faculty Council not adopt the statement?

PROF. MCATEER: That is a recommendation. That is not a motion.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: It is a recommendation, not a motion. I take it that there would be no need for a motion to not adopt something.

PROF. SIDHU: If that is the case, and the committee was appointed by President Ryan and the committee was a comprehensive committee representing other campus councils, I would like to know the basis of the Student Affairs Committee that they came to this conclusion. There must be some reason for it.

PROF. KARLSON: If I might respond to this because I sit on the Student Affairs Committee, we gave it quite a bit of consideration. There were over 70 concerns listed by members of the Committee. I could tell you that this was also discussed by the Executive Committee, and they had concerns very similar to those voiced by the Student Affairs Committee. The recommendation, if you had listened carefully, is not to have a new committee write a new document. It is to have the existing document reviewed to correct the discrepancies. We are not asking for a new committee to draft a new document, we are asking them for the existing document to be made even more perfect before it is finally approved.

PROF. SIDHU: Henry, when the committee was appointed it must have given others the opportunity to respond, didn't they? Didn't the committee participate in that?

PROF. KARLSON: No.

PROF. SIDHU: Why not?

PROF. KARLSON: Because they weren't given adequate time to do it. How can you respond to something you don't have? It is rather difficult to respond to something that you don't have.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Would it be fair to say that what is being requested is in the nature of an opportunity to make contributions to the document? To work with the committee that is already in existence, if that committee would consider continuing its work, so that it would be simply a review of the committee's work, an opportunity to comment on the draft that has been circulated with the idea that the committee would take into account the recommendations that would be made and incorporate them, if desired, to make a better document.

PROF. MCATEER: The revised document, as it stands, is in very good form. It, however, is not in what we consider to be appropriate final form. It is truly in need of additional work.

DEAN BOAZ: The original mandate was that this document return to the University Faculty Council. So I assume the recommendation that you are making

is to the University Faculty Council to appoint such a review committee.

PROF. MCATEER: That is as the motion reads.

DEAN BOAZ: This body does not have that authority.

PROF. KARLSON: That is exactly what it says. It recommends that we not approve...

DEAN BOAZ: To the University Faculty Council.

PROF. KARLSON: But also that this Council not approve it until such action is taken. We can do that too.

PROF. ZUNT: This was sent originally from President Ryan. I received it as co-secretary of the University Faculty Council. In order to determine what the IUPUI faculty opinion was concerning the document, the Executive Committee and I elected to send it to our standing Student Affairs Committee for discussion and recommendations to have that come back to you so that we could better direct our University Faculty Council elected representatives to reflect, in fact, what the IUPUI opinion is. They will be voting on this on April 28 on this campus.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Were there discussions between the Task Force that was appointed by President Ryan and the Student Affairs Committee here about these 70 areas of concern?

PROF. MCATEER: Not concerning our specific 70 points, no. A discussion did take place but not concerning those 70 points.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: And in that discussion there was no agreement reached on what would be the best way to use all the faculty energy that is poised and ready to be used to create a better document?

PROF. MCATEER: No. A Task Force has been developed. I had a discussion with Dean Boaz concerning our charge by the Executive Committee.

PROF. MARKEL: Did I understand you to say that the Task Force has been dissolved?

PROF. MCATEER: That is my understanding from my discussion with Dean Boaz.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: If the Task Force has been dissolved, I don't know what that means exactly, but then the Task Force can't do any more work. Is that the problem?

PROF. BYRNE: My understanding from Susan's remarks is that the University Faculty Council is to vote on this document at the next meeting. Picking up on Henry's comments, "One cannot respond to a document which one does not have," I might alternatively recommend to the University Faculty Council that the vote be tabled until the Fall semester and in the interim that copies be distributed appropriately through the University so that the kind of input that you seek can be developed in an orderly fashion.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: We have a motion that has been made on the floor already. Ed, are you making another motion or a motion to amend?

PROF. BYRNE: I was feeling my way to a substitute motion. Another procedural thing of an elaborate committee seemed rather awesome to me. I saw all kinds of changes in the highest level of administration that perhaps there might be some reasonability to this kind of delay.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: One thing that you said in your working toward a recommendation or motion was the word "table". If that is a motion, that takes precedence.

PROF. KARLSON: He is not moving that this be tabled. He is saying that they would recommend to the University Faculty Council that the University Faculty Council table this document. So, he is not moving that this motion be tabled.

PROF. VESSELY: Could we hear the substance of the motion that is on the floor?

PROF. MCATEER: Before I restate this, just let me mention that what we are attempting to do is work toward a vehicle for appropriate review. Let me restate the motion:

That the IUPUI Faculty Council ask the University Faculty Council to establish a committee to conduct a thorough review and revision of the Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities (Revised Document). That the review committee have University-wide representation and include faculty, undergraduate, graduate and professional school students, deans of students or student affairs including representation of the graduate school and professional schools, and University legal counsel. The University Faculty Council may use an existing standing committee for this purpose so long as the committee takes into account the concerns of the aforementioned constituencies. That the document generated by this review committee be made available to the IUPUI Faculty Council for subsequent review.

PROF. SIDHU: Henry, this item came up for discussion. So, this item has been sent to the University Faculty Council for discussion. How this item has come to the IUPUI Faculty Council, that is what I would like to know.

PROF. ZUNT: As secretary of your Council and co-secretary of the University Faculty Council, I felt that this was something that affected all faculty and IUPUI should have an opportunity to have input into the University Faculty Council.

PROF. SIDHU: Therefore, this item has to be discussed by this Faculty Council. Is that correct?

PROF. ZUNT: No. It doesn't have to be.

PROF. SIDHU: I can accept it or reject it?

PROF. VESSELY: Don't we have a committee...

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: We have a motion that has been made on the floor already. Ed, are you making another motion or a motion to amend?

PROF. BYRNE: I was feeling my way to a substitute motion. Another procedural thing of an elaborate committee seemed rather awesome to me. I saw all kinds of changes in the highest level of administration that perhaps there might be some reasonability to this kind of delay.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: One thing that you said in your working toward a recommendation or motion was the word "table". If that is a motion, that takes precedence.

PROF. KARLSON: He is not moving that this be tabled. He is saying that they would recommend to the University Faculty Council that the University Faculty Council table this document. So, he is not moving that this motion be tabled.

PROF. VESSELY: Could we hear the substance of the motion that is on the floor?

PROF. MCATEER: Before I restate this, just let me mention that what we are attempting to do is work toward a vehicle for appropriate review. Let me restate the motion:

That the IUPUI Faculty Council ask the University Faculty Council to establish a committee to conduct a thorough review and revision of the Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities (Revised Document). That the review committee have University-wide representation and include faculty, undergraduate, graduate and professional school students, deans of students or student affairs including representation of the graduate school and professional schools, and University legal counsel. The University Faculty Council may use an existing standing committee for this purpose so long as the committee takes into account the concerns of the aforementioned constituencies. That the document generated by this review committee be made available to the IUPUI Faculty Council for subsequent review.

PROF. SIDHU: Henry, this item came up for discussion. So, this item has been sent to the University Faculty Council for discussion. How this item has come to the IUPUI Faculty Council, that is what I would like to know.

PROF. ZUNT: As secretary of your Council and co-secretary of the University Faculty Council, I felt that this was something that affected all faculty and IUPUI should have an opportunity to have input into the University Faculty Council.

PROF. SIDHU: Therefore, this item has to be discussed by this Faculty Council. Is that correct?

PROF. ZUNT: No. It doesn't have to be.

PROF. SIDHU: I can accept it or reject it?

PROF. VESSELY: Don't we have a committee...

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: The committee has made a proposal.

PROF. HARPER: I have an amendment.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: The call for the question has already been made. Henry, there is someone who wants to offer an amendment. The question has already been called.

PROF. KARLSON: It takes a two-thirds vote to call for the question.

DEAN SCHALLER: We didn't do that before.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Let's take Ed Harper's motion.

UNKNOWN: He asked if there were any objections.

PROF. HARPER: It seems to be that we must first ask the University Faculty Council to disapprove the document as it is presently constituted before we propose how they can modify it. I would offer as an amendment that we add that as a statement to the motion.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Will you accept that amendment?

PROF. MCATEER: I don't.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: There is a motion to amend the motion that is on the floor. Is there a second to that?

PROF. WILSON: I second it.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: The motion has been made and seconded. The principal motion has been stated twice. I don't think we have to restate that. Ed Harper's motion to amend would add to the main motion that **we recommend to the University Faculty that they disapprove the proposed Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities.** Then, what would follow would be the rest of your main motion. A motion to amend is made and seconded. Are you ready to vote on that? All in favor of the motion to amend the main motion, say "Aye." Opposed? [There were some opposed] The ayes have it. The motion is amended.

Now we must vote on the main motion which is modified in the way that was suggested by Ed Harper's motion. I hope the minutes are being carefully taken. Are you ready to vote on the main motion? All in favor, say "Aye." Any opposed? The main motion carries. Now, you have a second motion?

PROF. MCATEER: The second motion is:

I move that the Secretary of the IUPUI Faculty Council convey to President Ryan our concern that the Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities (Revised Document) is in need of revision, and request that the President delay further action on the document until additional revisions can be made.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: The motion has been made. Is there discussion?

DEAN SCHALLER: I would like to ask a question. How does the proposed statement compare with the existing one? Is it worse or better?

PROF. MCATEER: The revised document?

DEAN SCHALLER: Yes.

PROF. MCATEER: It is a considerable improvement over the existing document.

DEAN SCHALLER: The reason for getting into this was two years ago. We are already two years into this. The present document that we are working with, and there are people in this room who will attest to this, is severely deficient. It constitutes enormous problems. At the rate we are going we are going to delay action on this. We are going to request another committee which will be appointed probably late next Fall. We will meet sometime, probably in January, and it will be two years before it's back here. So, what we are talking about here is at least four years that it will take the faculty of the University to do anything about a relatively serious problem. I am just wondering if there is some kind of interim thing that can be done to correct some of the worst of the problems that we struggle with and incorporate some of the best things in here as opposed to going another two years with this. What we are dealing with here is process rather than trying to reach some kind of goal to deal with a problem that is considered rather an immediate problem. This is two years later.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: The main problem is the fact that the Task Force that was appointed by President Ryan considers itself to be dissolved. It can't operate any more. I think that is what you ran into as a problem, didn't you?

PROF. MCATEER: I think that is a problem.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: If they decided they were finished and can't do anymore work, then...

DEAN SCHALLER: I am not saying that that has to be done but I am just pointing out the situation we've gotten ourselves into here.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: It is not the best way to handle it but I don't know how else to resolve the issue except to ask for a vote on the motion that has been made. We have one other item of business that we have to take up today. We only have six minutes to do it in. Are you prepared to vote on this motion? If so, all in favor say "Aye." Any opposed? The motion carries.

Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM XI

Nominating Committee Report - Rebecca Markel, Chair - Election Results

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: We have a report of the Nominating Committee that has to be cleared in today's meeting. Becky Markel will do it in six minutes.

PROF. MARKEL: Vice President Bepko and Secretary Zunt, in accordance with the Constitution and Bylaws of this governing body the following proposed slates are being read. Voting will occur at the May IUPUI Faculty Council meeting.

I refer you to our Constitution and Bylaws for the construct of the proposed committees. Employing its best collective wisdom, the Nominating Committee proposes the following slates:

For the Executive Committee, two-year term of office. Five names are being proposed and in May you will vote for four. I will read the name, rank, and school.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (Vote for four (4))

<u>Name</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>School</u>
Billy Abel	Associate Professor	Education
Frederick Bein	Associate Professor	Liberal Arts
Dolores Hoyt	Associate Librarian	University Library
Florence Juillerat	Associate Professor	Science
Rebecca Markel	Associate Professor	Nursing

For the Nominations Committee, five are being proposed, you will vote for four.

NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE (Vote for four (4))

Janice Bruckner	Assistant Professor	Medicine
Scott Evenbeck	Associate Professor	Science
Jean Gnat	Associate Librarian	University Library
Charles Palenik	Associate Professor	Dentistry
Edward Robbins	Associate Professor	Education

For the Tenure Committee, five are being proposed, you will vote for three.

TENURE COMMITTEE (Vote for three (3))

Edmund Byrne	Professor	Liberal Arts
Charlotte Carley	Associate Professor	Nursing
Edgar Fleenor	Professor	Eng/Tech
Robert Nevin	Associate Professor	Social Work
Pao-lo Yu	Professor	Medicine

My second item to report. The at-large election is complete. We have those results. The unit representation election remains to be completed. There are some units who have not reported their unit representatives. Mrs. Chumley and I have been in contact with those and hopefully in the next few days or weeks, can get those completed. (The list of newly-elected at-large and unit representatives are appended to these minutes under IUPUI Circular No. 86-23)

The newly elected at-large representatives have received letters congratulating them upon their election from me. This concludes my report.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Thank you, Becky. She did it in three minutes. We have some other agenda items, but due to the time and the fact that there is a class being held in here in about four minutes, and the fact that our Constitution requires that we adjourn by 5:30, I propose that we adjourn right now. We will take up the two items that have not yet been considered at the

May 7 meeting of the Faculty Council.

AGENDA ITEM XII

**Faculty Affairs Committee Report - Byron Olson, Chair
Report on Promotion and Tenure Survey**

Deferred until May meeting.

AGENDA ITEM XIII

Pan Am Games and IUPUI - Robert Baxter and Robert Martin

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Let me mention one thing though. In connection with Agenda Item XIII on your agenda, the Pan Am Games and IUPUI, we are going to consider, perhaps during the month of April, having an open faculty meeting to which everyone will be invited where we can explain some of the same things that would have been explained here today. That will give you an opportunity to get the briefing that you would have gotten here before the May meeting. We will repeat that at the May meeting as well.

AGENDA ITEM XIV

New Business

Deferred until May meeting.

AGENDA ITEM XV

Adjournment

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: If there are no other matters, we stand adjourned.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY

at

INDIANAPOLIS

Faculty Council Meeting

Thursday, May 7, 1987

Union Building Cafeteria, 3:00 - 4:00 p.m.

Members Present: Administrative Members: Vice President Gerald Bepko, Dean Howard Schaller. Deans: H. William Gilmore, Elizabeth Grossman, P. Nicholas Kellum, William M. Plater, R. Bruce Renda, Sheldon Siegel, William J. Voos. Faculty: C. D. Aliprantis, Elaine Alton, Sharon Andreoli, Anne Belcher, Jacqueline Blackwell, Patricia Blake, Willard Bostwick, Edmund Byrne, Varoujan Chalian, David Doedens, Charles Ellinger, Mary Feeley, Melvin Glick, Jean Gnat, Robert Harris, Meredith Hull, Henry Karlson, Linda Kasper, Suetta Kehrein, Judith Kosegi, Miriam Langsam, Monroe Little, Rebecca Markel, James McAteer, Judy Miller, Catherine Palmer, John Pless, Terry Reed, Edward Robbins, Glen Sagraves, P Kent Sharp, Judith Silence, Robert Stonehill, Susan Sutton, Jeffery Vessely, Kathleen Warfel, Dorothy Webb, Kathryn Wilson, Pao-lo Yu, Susan Zunt.

Members Absent: Deans: Patricia Boaz, Trevor Brown, Jack Wentworth, Marshall Yovits. Director: Barbara Fischler. Faculty: John Baenziger, Richard Beck, Karen Becker, H. R. Besch, Jr., Charles Blevins, Linda Brothers, Michael Burke, Robert Colyer, Andre DeKorvin, Joseph DiMicco, Kenneth Dunipace, James Edmondson, Mark Farber, Martin Farlow, Beverly Flynn, Jeri Francis, Clifford Goodwin, Linda Haas, Edwin Harper, Eugene Helveston, Emily Hernandez, Ngoan Van Hoang, William Hodes, Barbara Jackson, Jerome Kaminker, Joseph Kuczkowski, Robert Mendelsohn, Michael E. Mitchell, Barnett B. Morris, Paul Nagy, Richard Pflanzner, Gerald Powers, Shirley Quate, Mark Richardson, Kenneth Ryder, John Schmedtje, Rowland Sherrill, Ernest E. Smith, Vernon Vix, Victor Wallis, Henry Wellman, Maudine Williams, Charles Winslow.

Alternates Present: Deans: John Hunger for Charles Bonser; George Lukemeyer for Walter Daly; Jim Bindley for Jeffery Grove; Hugh A. Wolf for Howard Mehlinger; Scott Evenbeck for James E. Weigand. Faculty: David Bivin for Richard J. Kirk.

Ex Officio Members Present: Shirley Newhouse.

Ex Officio Members Absent: Martin Dragonette

Visitors: Hitwant Sidhu, School of Physical Education.

AGENDA ITEM I

Approval of Minutes - April 2, 1987

Vice President Bepko: We have a busy agenda so I think we should begin. We have no sound system up here so I hope everyone can hear. As always, our first order of business is the approval of the minutes of the last meeting, in this case, the April 2nd meeting. Do we have a motion to approve? [Motion made] Is there a second? [second made] All in favor, say "Aye." Opposed? [None] The motion is carried. The minutes are approved.

AGENDA ITEM II

Presiding Officer's Business - Vice President Gerald L. Bepko

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: In view of the heavy agenda we have today, I will just make two very brief announcements, one of which, and perhaps both of which, you have already heard about; but let me just quickly restate them.

First, we were, of course, pleased by at least some of the activity of the General Assembly which met last week. The part that we are pleased about had to do with the capital budget that the legislature approved. Part of that capital budget authorized the construction of the Science/Engineering/Technology complex, at least the part we had requested during this biennium. I am pleased to report that we have crossed another hurdle. We are that much closer to the realization of the Science / Engineering / Technology complex.

The other very brief announcement I would like to make is that, as you know, we have been working with an advisory committee, chaired by Walter Daly, Dean of the School of Medicine, to find a person on our faculty who would be appointed as Dean of Faculties. Dean Schaller, as you know, is going to continue as Executive Dean, but we have decided to divide the position and create a new position entitled Dean of Faculties. Dean Daly's committee reported that there were a number of outstanding candidates. We wish that we could have hired several of the really outstanding people that expressed an interest in the position, but we could only pick one. We thought that the person, of all those with these outstanding credentials, who is the best suited for the position at this time is Dean William Plater from the School of Liberal Arts. Tomorrow at the Trustees meeting in Bloomington we will recommend that Bill be appointed Dean of Faculties effective July 1, 1987. Those are the two announcements that I would like to make at this point.

As you may know, President John Ryan will be here at 4:00 at the beginning of our Recognition Awards Ceremony. There are a couple of gifts that are going to be presented to him at that time, in recognition of his 16 years as President of the University and the fine work that he has done.

One of the things which we have proposed to give to him is a resolution

which is recommended by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council and I think it has been adopted by the Staff Council. I will read it:

Whereas, John W. Ryan has provided outstanding leadership during the remarkable advancement of Indiana University since he became its President in 1971;

And Whereas, President Ryan has contributed significantly to the institutional and physical growth of the Indianapolis Campus since 1971;

And Whereas, he has strongly supported achievement of the unique mission of this urban partnership between Indiana's two Big Ten universities, for the lasting benefit of the citizens of our community and our state;

Be It Hereby Resolved, that the faculty and staff of Indiana University - Purdue University at Indianapolis commend his performance in the Presidency, thank him for his recognition of our special needs and hopes, and extend to him our sincerest best wishes for continued success in service to Indiana University and the State of Indiana.

PROF. ZUNT: The Executive Committee moves the adoption of this resolution.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: The resolution has been offered and moved for adoption. It has been seconded. All in favor, say "Aye." Are there any opposed? We will record a unanimous vote.

AGENDA ITEM III

Executive Committee Report - Susan L. Zunt, Secretary

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Because of the heavy agenda, I would like to ask the Secretary to proceed.

PROF. ZUNT: Thank you very much. I am going to give you a few items of business of the Executive Committee.

Rebecca Markel, who is chairman of the Nominating Committee, is distributing ballots right now. You will be receiving the ballots now for the election of the Nominating Committee, the Tenure Committee, and the Executive Committee. You can be filling out those ballots so we can announce the results to you today before we adjourn at 4:00.

Professor Dunipace, an Executive Committee member, who attended the IUPUI Enrollment Trend seminar, made a report to the Executive Committee last week. He recommended that the Faculty Council be brought up to date on what is available and the information that we know at the moment on enrollment at IUPUI. I will be contacting Dean Nathan to see if we can't schedule that information be brought forward to the Council in the fall in a summary.

At the last Executive Committee meeting, the members looked at policies for Advanced Placement. It was recommended that this issue be discussed and evaluated by Kathryn Wilson's committee, Academic Affairs. We will be forwarding the issue of Advanced Placement at IUPUI to her committee. She is probably getting tired of hearing this, with everything we send to her.

The standing committee membership have been completed. I have a few more phone calls to complete to have secretaries and chairs for all of the committees, but when we publish the minutes from today's meeting, you will receive complete rosters of our standing committees.

Earlier this year I reported to you that some individuals who had been part of the Purdue Mission and were now members of the IUPUI faculty were having some difficulty with obtaining their retirement benefits. Assistant Dean Shirley Nusbaum has contacted me and indicated that the administration is aware of this problem and has taken steps to insure that individuals from the Purdue mission merging with IUPUI should not have further difficulties with obtaining retirement benefits in the future. We would like to express our appreciation for her taking care of that. It wasn't even necessary for the Executive Committee to contact her. We thank her for that.

Dean Schaller has announced the membership of an ad hoc committee to evaluate and revise guidelines for sabbatical leaves. We did submit nominations to him of Faculty Council members that could be represented on that committee. Professors Michael Cohen, Rebecca Markel, Theodore Mullen, and Shirley Quate were selected to represent not only their disciplines but Faculty Council on that sabbatical leave committee.

The last thing I want to report to you concerns the agenda for our September 3rd meeting. President-elect Ehrlich has agreed to be with us at that meeting. I think we should be pleased that we are one of the few appointments he has confirmed. Since it was a faculty request, he felt that this was something that was very important. I have had the privilege of speaking with him on two occasions to bring forward faculty issues. I look forward to having him here at our meeting in September. Remember, it will be held in the Conference Center. We should express our appreciation to Vice President Bepko who is arranging for that meeting to be held at the Conference Center. That completes my report.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Thank you for your report, Susan.

AGENDA ITEM IV

Election: Tenure, Nominating, and Executive Committees

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Next we have the election which is taking place right now.

PROF. MARKEL: Vice President Bepko, Secretary Zunt, on behalf of the

Nominating Committee, I declare the following duly elected.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE: Frederick Bein, Associate Professor, School of Liberal Arts; Dolores Hoyt, Associate Librarian, University Library; Florence Juillerat, Associate Professor, School of Science; Rebecca Markel, Associate Professor, School of Nursing.

NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE: Janice Bruckner, Assistant Professor, School of Medicine; Scott Evenbeck (Chair-elect), Associate Professor, School of Science; Jean Gnat, Associate Librarian, University Library; Edward Robbins, Associate Professor, School of Education.

TENURE COMMITTEE: Edmund Byrne, Professor, School of Liberal Arts; Charlotte Carley, Associate Professor, School of Nursing; Edgar Fleenor, Professor, School of Engineering & Technology. Congratulations to all!

Mr. Vice President, may I have a motion for destroying the ballots?

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Is there a motion? Is there a second? [seconded] All in favor say "Aye." Are there any opposed? The motion carries. Thank you very much, Becky.

PROF. MARKEL: That concludes my report.

AGENDA ITEM V

Pan Am Games - Robert R. Baxter and Robert E. Martin

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Next we have a report on the Pan Am Games preparation by Bob Martin and Bob Baxter.

While Bob Baxter is coming up here, I notice that Dean Plater has arrived. Why don't you join me in congratulating him on our recommendation for Dean of the Faculties. [applause]

MR. BAXTER: Thank you, Vice President Bepko. We would like to answer any questions that you have concerning the Games and how they will impact our campus. Let me tell you a few things about it so that we will increase at least your comfort level on what is going to happen here. We can take advantage of the world-wide exposure to the IUPUI campus. It was announced yesterday at noon at a Press Conference that CBS will, of course, be at the new Conference Center to take over the entire Conference Center for their televising not only to the western hemisphere, but now they are covering all of Europe and, I think, part of the East. This is the first time the Games have had the opportunity to reach out that far. That tells us, too, that IUPUI is going to be very much at the front of all of the television work that is going to take place and the exposure we are going to have going throughout the world. We had better put on our best suit if we are going to go to this party. I think we are going to. We are going to have a good event. We have had two and one-half years on this campus to get ready for it. The rest of the PAX-I organization is as prepared as any Pan

American organization has ever been and we have had half the length of time to get there.

We have in our city a good volunteer corps of about 24,000 people who are signed up, credentialed, and ready to go for the visitors coming to our campus and coming to the city of Indianapolis to stay. The big advantage of having this take place is that a major portion of it is taking place on our campus; in the School of Physical Education, in the gymnasium, we will have taekwondo and judo; in the Natatorium we will have all four aquatic sports, water polo, diving, swimming, and synchronized swimming; softball, soccer, and track, which will be the largest single event for the Pan American Games.

To give you a little bit of an idea, because of all these events happening here, we had this type of thing happen in 1982. The National Sports Festival took place in six days. We had more events on this campus than we are planning to have for the Pan American Games, which will last for 17 days on this campus. We did not have traffic problems during the 1982 games. We did not have any parking problems. We did not have any security problems. It was very festive. Everybody had a great time. We exposed this campus to 100,000+ people and a lot of them didn't even know we existed. They sure do now. I expect, with the spreading out of all these events, that we are going to have even less problems than we did in 1982. We just can't find anything that was a particular problem in 1982.

The precautions will be a little bit different this time, in that we have 38 countries that are involved and 18 of them are Spanish-speaking countries. One Portuguese, one Dutch, and one French. The balance of them are English-speaking countries. So, we do have a little bit of a language barrier, but we also have the interpreter corps that will be in evidence every place you go. We will have people at all the various venues to help anybody who is not fluent in the English language. Of course, the Games themselves, and the officials, and all the rest. We have a very fine interpreter corps of about 2,000 people, who have been certified on this campus as part of our campus responsibility for the Games. One of our volunteer efforts was the certification of these interpreters.

This Saturday we are having 1,200 high school students on our campus for a Mini Pan Am Games throughout the state of Indiana. These are high school students who are going to go to college some place and we are hoping that the exposure that they get here this Saturday will convince them that IUPUI is a good place to go to college.

Those are some of the good things. The difficult things I am going to leave for Bob Martin. There are some other aspects of the Games that I think you should all be aware of, and that is there are going to be a few places that are called "security areas." These areas are going to take a pass to get into or a tag that will be worn. The main areas will be, probably the most public areas, the venue sites themselves; the Natatorium, the Track and Field Stadium, the tennis facility, and

one wing of the Educational/Social Work Building, using ten classrooms on the second floor where the walkway goes across and turns north. If you do work in that area, you will be contacted. This includes all of the janitorial services and anybody who has to cross through that area. Anybody working in that area during the time of the Games will be asked to fill out a form, be thumb printed, and be issued a tag so that you can go through that particular area.

The Conference Center also will be a secured area. If you have to go into the Conference Center, then you will have to have a pass to get in there. There also is one certain area of the drug testing that will take place on our campus and that will be secured.

At one time a small portion of the Law School was going to be used for a media center. That will not happen. All of the media will be in the Conference Center. What we are going to do is contact each of the deans or department chairmen that are directly affected by a secured site, and they will then tell us who has to go through to that area. It is a very simple process. You give me a list of people who have to be certified. We will come to your area, do the thumb printing there and no one will have to go to the Vantage Point PAX-I office or be put out of your way at all to get this accomplished.

I think we will have a minimum amount of disruption. There will be some inconveniences. We hope that parking is not one of them. Everyone can park where they do right now unless we have a huge track meet going on, and then you may be a couple of spots away from where you are used to parking. The credentialing should bother very few people. We do not have students on campus to any great degree during that time, particularly when we are talking about south of Michigan Street.

It is a great opportunity and I hope everybody takes advantage of it. We have done a lot of things on this campus to take advantage of it to date, and we are going to be doing more.

IUPUI is responsible for all the traffic control and for the security except for the federal security people who will be here. Are there any questions on this part of it before we get into parking? If not, Bob, do you want to talk about parking?

MR. ROBERT MARTIN: Thank you. Parking is always everyone's favorite subject, I know. The parking plan for the Pan Am Games, we are not going to do too much differently than was done in 1982. Our model for coming up with a parking plan is pretty much what we have done over the years at the 38th Street campus with the State Fair.

That involves two significant things. One, we will be charging spectators for parking. That implies that we are going to be controlling the traffic in and out of these lots. That is something that we have not done up to this point on this campus for a lot of the special events. Two, and probably more significantly than that, is that we have always allowed in that model for the faculty, staff, and students

who have valid parking permits, to park free. We are doing those two things with the Pan Am parking. So, when we outline what the boundaries are on the Pan Am parking for the spectators, we want to reinforce, and I will repeat maybe several times, that for the faculty, staff, and students at IUPUI you will be permitted to park in those controlled lots and will not be charged.

One of the fortunate things, I think, when we start to take a look at the Pan American events and the way they are scheduled, is that over the course of that 17 days, it tends to, in fact, spread out the crowd volume that you normally would think of. The tendency up to this point is to think that all of these events are going to be occurring at the same time and we are going to have 25,000 people on campus. That will not be the case by virtue of the way they are scheduled. In fact, as we look at that scheduling, we really only end up with a couple of conflicts in that whole 17-day period. Other than that, the way the events are scheduled out, we feel very confident that we will be able to control the traffic and be able to control the spectator parking.

A couple of conflicts come at the very beginning, around August 9, where we are still in the last two days of Summer Session II. The Pan Am Games on our campus will kick off on Monday, August 9. We are still in the last official two days of Summer Session II. The way that is staggered with those beginning events we are not anticipating any parking problems for our constituencies. Then later on, I believe in the second week, it is the high volume of several events where there are some Natatorium, track, and softball events going on at the same time. Most of the final dates, and at this juncture, the large attended events are tending to fall on the weekends. That gives us a little bit of breathing room.

What I would like to generally outline very quickly for you is that we are controlling all spectator parking south of Michigan Street. There will be none allowed north of Michigan Street. South of Michigan Street we draw another boundary and that is south of the Dental School patient lot. We are not going to be disturbing that for spectator parking. You can really draw a line with Vermont Street, if you are familiar with that, right behind the south parking garage, from that boundary line south to New York Street is where we are opening up the spectator parking. As we move to the eastern part of the campus, east of the Business/SPEA, Education/Social Work Building, all the way up to the Engineering and Technology Building, everything east of there, north of New York Street and even north of Michigan Street will be open for spectator parking. All of those areas will be controlled both from a traffic pattern standpoint and as spectators are coming into those lots to park by virtue of charging to park.

Traffic control will be at the direction of the IUPUI Police Department. Plans to alter any routes are not going to occur. Traffic patterns will flow as they do today. John Mulvey and his staff will be at some of the critical points directing traffic but we are not going to reroute traffic. The major arteries of Michigan Street, New York

Street, and now Agnes Street are going to be the major arteries in and through the campus. John will be spotting his people at those various locations to direct the traffic. We are going to be encouraging, particularly on the health care side, for the patients and visitors, to enter the campus by using the now major north/south artery which is Agnes Street. That is not the only way you can get in, but we certainly would encourage them to come in that way. You should use the northern part of the campus as the entry way into the campus.

South of New York Street, where the string of venue sites are all the way to and including the Law School, all of that parking south of there is not a part of the spectator package. The critical areas between the School of Physical Education, the Natatorium Building, and the Law School will not be opened to spectator parking. We will be preserving for the faculty, staff, and students of those entities for parking in those areas. The rest of what is available in there will be for VIP parking and officials of the Pan American Games. I would like to emphasize for the occupants of those buildings, we are taking care of our faculty, staff, and students first. What is left will then be made available for VIP parking. We think we can accommodate both of those. The reason we are not opening that up, other than just the congestion that already exists around there, is that we have a long pattern of dropping athletes off as they move from Ft. Benjamin Harrison out to the various venue sites. They are going to be dropped off by buses along New York Street, entering the various venue sites and the buses moving on. Just the criss-cross of that makes it virtually impossible.

I want to re-emphasize again and then I would like to ask for an encouragement from you in a positive direction in terms of steering maybe some of the parkers who need to get in and out during the day. I would not stand up here and lead you to think that, if you leave during the day and come back, that everything is going to be fine. I would not do that. I think for those that arrive early in the morning, most of the venues and the athletic events do not start prior to 9:00. People arrive on campus at the normal time should not have any difficulty parking where you park now. There will be difficulty, as there often is, like now, in leaving the campus and trying to get back to that same spot. But, arriving and getting a spot should not be a problem. Getting out of the campus at the traditional 4:00, 4:30, or 5:00 period of time again, if you overlay the way the events are scheduled, that should occur in most of the cases while events are still going on. At least we will be able to get out of here and not have the competition of events changing, with people coming in and people leaving.

We have opened up the major South Garage that is south of Michigan Street on Vermont Street. During that Pan American period we are going to allow all current parkers (faculty, staff, and students who have decals) to park in the garage and won't be charged. The reason we are opening that up is that I would really recommend that, if you want to avoid some of the confusion, please park in there. If you are mobile and need to get in and out during the day, that would be your best bet

to get in and out, and it is not going to cost you. The subtlety of that is that you might like it so well you will want to sign up. Our estimate is that, if we were to identify current A and B surface parking in all of those lots that we have outlined with the red boundaries up here, if all of you chose to park in the garage during that period of time, we would be able to accommodate you. So, we are not squeezing anybody out. We are not collapsing anything that is servicing the health care center side. It is simply a timing and scheduling matter during the summer period that we feel we can accommodate you. We are not forcing anyone to park in the garage, but I would strongly urge you that that might be the best place to park during that period of time. It really isn't that far off from any of the academic buildings. Your freedom of getting in and out during the day would be much better than maybe some of the closer lots toward New York Street.

Generally, that is the plan. It is not a complicated one. We will be controlling it. We will be sending out information, I hope, very soon and identifying access routes much as we did when the city closed the bridges on New York Street and Michigan Street. That process worked out very well, particularly with communicating for visitors to the campus during that period of time. We will try to have for each of you a supply of both what the parking boundaries are and what the recommended access routes are.

I want to speak very briefly to the security question. Security has various layers to it. It is all coordinated through a security committee of Pan Am and that is inclusive of the FBI, CIA, state police, various municipalities and certainly our own police department. The coordination effort is primarily focused on the actual venue sites. As Bob indicated earlier, the access to those venue sites will be by two means -- a ticket which you purchased or a credential that allows you to get into that site. The credentialing process is something that is going to be controlled by PAX-I, coordinated through Bob's office. Those are the only two ways you can get in. The real coordination on the security really has to do with the actual venue site. John Mulvey will be responsible for the physical security of the rest of our campus and he is prepared to do that. Again, we are not looking at anything that is really out of the ordinary. There are certainly coordination points that we wouldn't normally do, but John is prepared to handle that. I think his contact with most of the critical areas in the health care side do indicate what we will be doing.

If, in this whole parking plan, there are visitors or constituents or events that we are not able to cover under this but you know are going to be occurring during that period of time, if you have not already been contacted for that kind of information by Parking Services, namely John Gilbert, please in turn give him a call. One of the things that we really need is that information. If there are things that are going on, we really need to know about them. The schedule is set, the time is set, but there still is a lot of refining going on in terms of the

actual venue sites and the logistics of all of this. Each day we are getting more and more information. From you we would expect to have that kind of information so that we can accommodate it and we are prepared to do so.

That is generally the plan. I would be happy to answer any questions.

MR. ROBERT BAXTER: You might mention one other thing. On the credentialing process, to get into any of the venue sites, that does not get you into the site where you can observe what is going on on the track, or in the Natatorium and gets you into the field of play. That is by ticket only. No credentials that you will have will get you into a seat on any of the venue sites.

PROF. ROBBINS: On the access to the South Garage, is that also extended to the East Garage for faculty, staff, and students?

MR. ROBERT BAXTER: The reason I am hesitant is I am not sure what the Conference Center and its restrictions in terms of CBS are going to present to us. We think at this point that the garage parking that is underneath that facility will accommodate all of their needs. When we send out the final parking plan, I will be able to confirm that. My reaction right now is yes we will open that up.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Are there any other questions?

AGENDA ITEM VI

Athletic Advisory Committee Report - Dean Hugh A. Wolf

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: The next agenda item is a report from the Athletic Affairs Committee. This is an annual event that is done with great skill by Dean Hugh A. Wolf.

DEAN WOLF: Thank you, Vice President Bepko. We will see how much skill we have here.

In part, I am here this afternoon to comply with a systemwide policy that obligates the chairperson of the Athletic Committee on each campus to report annually to their respective Faculty Councils. Even if I was not required to do so, I would still welcome the opportunity to share some information about the work of our committee and the achievements of our athletes with you.

The IUPUI Athletics Advisory Committee (AAC) 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, 9 staff members, and 1 student. The 1986-87 members and their campus affiliations are:

Hugh A. Wolf, Chairman	School of Education
Amy-Jeanne Ade	Staff Council
Sharon K. Alger	School of Nursing
Leonard W. Birdsong	Military Science
Dorothy Cheesman	Admissions Office
Charles M. Coffey	Alumni Association
Thomas A. DeCoster	SPEA
Sharon Johnson	Student
William K. Kulsrud	School of Business
Miriam Z. Langsam	School of Liberal Arts
Lincoln V. Lewis	Affirmation Action Office
Robert L. Lovell	School of Physical Education
Robert W. Martin	Administrative Affairs
David J. Malik	Faculty Council Athletics Affairs
James L. McDonald	School of Dentistry
Dale Neuburger	Natatorium
Doug Oblander	Student Affairs
Peter W. Rabideau	School of Science
Edmund Schilling	Faculty Council Athletics Affairs
James W. Torke	School of Law
Patricia Treadwell	School of Medicine
Dyke L. Wilson	Alumni Relations
Charles F. Yokomoto	School of Eng & Tech

There are six varsity sports at IUPUI. We have baseball, basketball, and tennis for men. Women athletes compete in basketball, volleyball, and softball. All programs are conducted under guidelines and eligibility criteria established by the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA).

The following is a summary of the principal items the committee and its individual members have dealt with during 1986-87:

- The committee's recommendation to add men's soccer and women's tennis to the inventory of varsity sports will finally be implemented next year. Soccer competition will commence in the fall of 1987 and our first women's tennis players will take the court in 1988.
- A subcommittee has been studying the substance abuse program which was instituted by the Athletic Department in 1985. The NAIA requires each of its member institutions to have such a program in place.
- Work has continued on the longitudinal study of the academic achievement of IUPUI student-athletes. A considerable amount of data has been collected which is not being synthesized and analyzed.
- The chairman participated in the annual seminar conducted each fall by the Athletic Department. Student-athletes

were updated about NAIA eligibility regulations.

- The chairman has also been serving as a member of a committee appointed by Vice President Bepko to develop a long range plan for intercollegiate athletics at IUPUI.
- The committee anticipates taking action soon on a proposal from the athletic department setting limitations on the number of contests which can be played in the respective sports.
- The Athletics Advisory Committee met with Vice President Bepko shortly after he assumed his new post as IUPUI's chief operating officer. Mike Carroll, President of the Metro Athletic Club, also attended the meeting which was marked by an excellent exchange of information and a lively open discussion.

In addition to the activities of the Athletics Advisory Committee, I want to take a few moments to call attention to the accomplishments of our student-athletes during 1986-87.

- The men's tennis team had its best season winning eight matches and losing only one. The squad was runner-up in the District 21 tournament.
- The women's volleyball team also finished second in district play. The squad had an excellent season in rebuilding year finishing with a record of 16 and 14.
- The men's basketball season was highlighted by a twenty game winning season. The team reached the quarterfinal round of the District 21 playoffs but was eliminated by the eventual champions, Taylor University.
- Aldray Gibson, a four-year letter winner in men's basketball, became the school's all-time scoring leader amassing 2,454 career points. Aldray was named to the NAIA All-American Second Team.
- The exemplary performance of the women's basketball squad was one of the highlights of the 1986-87 season to date. The Lady Metros completed the regular season with a record of 11 and 8 and went on to win both the district and bi-district championships. In so doing, the team qualified for its first-ever appearance in the NAIA national tournament in Kansas City.

- The men's baseball team opened its season with a doubleheader win over DePauw University. For the first time in its history, the team has a home field to play on. A cooperative arrangement between IUPUI and the local parks department coupled with some herculean labor on the part of the coaches and players led to the creation of a splendid baseball facility in Belmont Park just across the river from the IUPUI campus.
- IUPUI has become a national power in women's softball. In 1986 Coach Nick Kellum and his players made their fourth straight appearance in the NAIA national tournament. They finished third. The team is ranked #4 in the nation and presently has a record of 37 and 8.
- In the past five years IUPUI has won eight Indiana championships. Four of our six sports have been represented in national tournaments. A number of IUPUI student-athletes have been named to district or bi-district all-star teams. Ten have been accorded All-American honors including Laura Swann, a women's volleyball player who was named to the NAIA Academic All-American team in 1985.

I want to conclude my report by calling attention to some other exemplary academic achievements on the part of our student-athletes in the academic area. Gary Frye, a men's baseball player, has compiled a 3.90 G.P.A. Mark Romerhaus, a men's tennis player has a 3.68 as has Kelly Fitzgerald, a member of the women's basketball team. Kelly has been invited to be a member of the Athletes in Action basketball team which will be touring South America this summer. I also want to call attention to Sue Whitlow, a member of both the women's volleyball and softball teams. Sue is a mathematics major in the School of Science and is planning a career in teaching when she completes her program. Now a senior, Sue has compiled a sparkling 3.74 G.P.A. at the end of seven semesters of her work. We have submitted her name to the NAIA National Office as a candidate of the Academic All-American team. We have every expectation that she will receive that honor.

Finally, I'm especially proud to say that for the second year in a row all six of our intercollegiate teams finished with collective G.P.A.'s of C or better. That was a first last year. I submitted that information to the NAIA National Office and they published it in their national newsletter because it was a first, as far as I know, for any institution in that organization. Our men's basketball came in with a 2.30, women's softball at 2.53, men's baseball at 2.65, women's volleyball at 2.69, and our championship women's basketball team at 2.87. And, for the second year in a row, the men's tennis team won our committee's academic achievement award with a record breaking grade-

point average of 3.04. Congratulations are certainly in order to all these fine young men and women and their coaches.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Thank you, Hugh.

AGENDA ITEM VII

Center on Studies and Research in Philanthropy - Gene Tempel, IU Foundation

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: I would like to talk to you about the Center on Philanthropy, Gene Tempel who is Vice President of the IU Foundation in charge of the Indianapolis office. Not only that, without whose efforts we would not have received the \$4 million grant from Lilly Endowment.

GENE TEMPEL: Thank you, Jerry. Sorry I am late. I just got here from doing some of my business.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: How much money did you raise?

GENE TEMPEL: This is one of those pleasant things. I took an attorney and his wife, who gave \$50,000, down to Bloomington to meet with Dr. Wells. This man was a student when Dr. Wells was rewriting the banking laws. Dr. Wells paid him \$.50 an hour to do research on that project, which research was used to rewrite all of the banking laws in the State of Indiana. This man went on to become a prominent banking attorney. He was grateful for that and made a gift to our campaign. I had a pleasant day taking him down to the campus for a luncheon with Dr. Wells.

I do appreciate the chance come and talk to you about the Center on Philanthropy. Those of us who are involved in this program, several of the deans, Dr. Irwin when he was Vice President, then Vice President Bepko, and Howard Schaller after him, helped us work on this. I think it will be a significant program for the campus. Every place we go and talk about this, people get excited about it. I meet people from other communities who are working on problems related to voluntarism and philanthropy in their communities. We think that this Center, given the grant from Lilly Endowment, given the kinds of things we would like to do with it and the participation we have already gotten from faculty and staff on this campus, and in Bloomington as well, will make this an outstanding Center.

The Center on Philanthropy will work on research, public service, and teaching related to philanthropy. Philanthropy is the voluntary giving and donation of time and funds for not-for-profit organizations which make up what we call the independent sector, or third sector, of our economy. There is a great public need for the Center, as is evidenced by the people who attend courses on how to raise funds for organizations and how to manage not-for-profit organizations. There are some factors which make it unique for Indiana University and for us here at Indianapolis to get involved with it.

I will tell you briefly about the mission of the Center, how it will be structured, and something about its funding. You already know about one of the major funding pieces, the grant from Lilly Endowment, but we hope that there will be more.

The role of philanthropy in the American economy is not a small one. In 1985, nearly \$80 billion was contributed by American people to causes that they supported, including religion, but to other not-for-profit organizations as well. Ninety-three million people volunteered time and it is estimated that those organizations have budgets of nearly \$240 billion. If there are economists here, as Howard Schaller is, you know that that is not an insignificant part of the economy, yet very little is done in terms of research and paying attention to this particular area. There is a great need for theoretical research related to philanthropy, as well as applied research at the other end of that research spectrum. There is also a great need for education at the formal institutional, higher educational level, and there is a need for excellent training and development for persons who work in those organizations.

Why would we at this time undertake to establish such a center here on the Indianapolis campus? First of all, as we looked around the University on this campus and in Bloomington, we found that there was indeed a great deal of expertise at the University already, at least related to the whole topic, the whole area of philanthropy. There were existing graduate programs at the master's level and, indeed, some at the doctorate level in higher education administration, social work, arts administration, business administration, public administration, and hospital administration which related to the not-for-profit sectors and to specific kinds of institutions. There are also people doing research in areas highly related to this topic. Indeed, when we made the announcement of the Center we found other people who are doing research directly related to it. There is a faculty member in the School of Business on this campus doing research on corporate giving programs. That is something that we didn't know about, and we believe that this Center will enable people like that to work with others who are interested in the whole area of philanthropy.

Finally, our second reason was that the Fund Raising School, which is based in San Raphael, California, and which has been counted by many as having the best program for training people how to do development work, was in a transition period. The director, president, and founder of that institution (it is a not-for-profit, public benefit corporation in California) will be 70 years old next month and is looking for a way to continue that organization beyond him. He was one of those folks who started an organization, has made it work well, but he needs to figure out what to do after he no longer can run that School. It has an excellent reputation, and we were interested in relocating that institution to Indianapolis. We didn't get quite that far, but we are working on an agreement now to affiliate that organization with the

University. On July 1, we hope that it will become the property of the Trustees of Indiana University, along with all of its copyrighted material, and will be one of the parts that will give us a running start on our Center on Philanthropy. It is not only to operate a good training program but there are excellent materials in that School which we believe will help us again initiate the other parts of it.

Finally, the Lilly Endowment, when we began discussing this, expressed an interest. They gave us \$4 million just recently to initiate the program. It will be an interdisciplinary program. We hope it will establish research here on the Indianapolis campus and teaching as well.

I will cut right from there to say some things about how it will benefit the faculty of Indiana University. The Lilly Endowment grant of \$4 million is all program money. There is no construction money in there, but there are funds to conduct research projects. There also are funds to pay faculty fellowships in the summer to develop courses: there also are funds to provide two schools who are willing to take courses and put them in their curriculum. So, everything in there, in some way or another, can come back in terms of program money for this campus. We believe that once we get started, once we get the research projects going, that we will attract people to us. There will be major seminars here, the first of which, I guess, is being held next week for folks who are interested is a seminar by Gabriel Rudney from Yale who is going to talk to us about his research project on the Motivations of High Income Givers. That is the kind of thing that will happen here. We believe that it should be a good energy force in terms of bringing attention to this campus and getting faculty members involved in an emerging new field. I'll stop there, Jerry.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Thank you, Gene. Again, you have a great sense of timing because we wanted to adjourn at 3:55 and that is exactly what it is now.

AGENDA ITEM VIII **Adjournment**

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

Note: Following the Faculty Council meeting the Glenn W. Irwin, Jr., M. D., Experience Excellence Recognition Awards Ceremony was held.