

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY  
AT  
INDIANAPOLIS

**FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING**  
**Thursday, September 3, 1987**  
**University Conference Center at IUPUI (Auditorium)**  
**3:30 - 4:25 p.m.**

**Members Present:** **Administration:** Vice President Gerald L. Bepko, Carol D. Nathan, William M. Plater, Howard G. Schaller.  
**Deans:** John Barlow, Walter J. Daly, H. William Gilmore, Elizabeth Grossman, Jeffery Grove, R. Bruce Renda, Sheldon Siegel, Marshall Yovits. **Director:** Barbara Fischler. **Faculty:** Billy Abel, Elaine Alton, Carl Andres, Margaret Applegate, Morris Aprison, John Baenziger, Anne Belcher, H. R. Besch, Jr., Willard Bostwick, Cecil Brown, Varoujan Chalian, Mervyn Cohen, Robert Colyer, William Crabtree, Theodore Cutshall, Paula Differding, Dolores Hoyt, Kenneth Dunipace, John Eble, James Edmondson, Elizabeth Evenbeck, Mary Feeley, Donald Gartner, Gary Gruver, Louis Holtzclaw, Florence Juillerat, Jerome Kaplan, Henry Karlson, Juanita Keck, Robert Kirk, John Lappas, Rebecca Markel, James McAteer, Dana McDonald, Robert Mendelsohn, Judy Miller, Bernard Morrel, Paul Nagy, Catherine Palmer, Richard Pflanzner, Gerald Powers, Richard Rogers, Beverly Ross, Glen Sagraves, Judith Silence, Susan Sutton, Jeffery Vessely, Vernon Vix, Kathleen Warfel, Dorothy Webb, Henry Wellman, Maudine Williams, Susan Zunt.

**Alternates Present:** **Deans:** John Hunger for Charles Bonser; James Brown for Trevor Brown; Hugh Wolf for Howard Mehlinger; Scott Evenbeck for James Weigand; Tom Lenz for Jack Wentworth. **Faculty:** Edgar Fleenor for Richard Beck; Suetta Kehrein for Emily Hernandez; David R. Papke for William Hodes; Carl Andres for Rosemarie Jones; Neal Rothman for Jerome Kaminker; Mary McKenzie for Judith Kosegi; Melvin Glick for Kenneth Ryder.

**Ex Officio Members Present:** Richard Schilling, Student Assembly President.

**Members Absent:** **Deans:** Nicholas Kellum, William J. Voos. **Faculty Members:** Sharon Andreoli, Frederick Bein, Linda Brothers, Dewey Conces, Andre DeKorvin, Joseph DiMicco, Robert Dittus, Mark Farber, Margaret Felton, B P Garg, Linda Haas, Celestine Hamant, Robert A. Harris, Eugene Helveston, Linda Kasper, Jeanne Pontious, D. K. Rex, Richard Rogers, P Kent Sharp, A. N. Siakotos, Craig M. Stoops, Karen West.

**Visitors:** Patricia Blake (School of Nursing); Pam Chambers (MBA, School of Business); Thomas Ehrlich (President, Indiana University), Leslie Fuller, (Sagamore), Cliff Goodwin (Engineering &

Technology); William J. Jackson, Kim Manlove (Dean of the Faculties Office), Norman Mikesell (Director, IMS), Susan Myers (AHS, OT), Terry Reed (Ad hoc Committee on Faculty Deliberations); Edward Robbins (Ad hoc Committee on Faculty Deliberations); Hitwant Sidhu (Physical Education); Robert B. Stonehill, Susan Swinehart (AHS, OT); Ann Marriner Tomey (Nursing); Lance Utterback (Sagamore); Gretchen Wolfram (Director, IUPUI News Bureau); Charlotte Wright (IUPUI News Bureau).

#### **AGENDA ITEM I**

**Memorial Resolution: Dr. Simon Katz, School of Dentistry (Read by Dean H. William Gilmore)**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** During the course of this meeting, if anyone speaks from the floor, we would appreciate it if you would identify yourself and then we will try to repeat any questions that are raised because our sound system is not hooked up to enable us to record things that are said from the floor. Hope you will bear with us in this first meeting in our state-of-the-art Conference facility which hasn't reached that state yet.

Our first order of business is a memorial resolution for Dr. Simon Katz. It is to be read by the Dean of the School of Dentistry, Bill Gilmore.

**DEAN GILMORE:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Council officers, and colleagues. My purpose is to present a memorial resolution for Dr. Simon Katz. Because of the sadness of his passing and the degree of activity that he achieved in his contributions to dental education research, his colleagues were overwhelmed and wrote a lengthy resolution that I have permission to shorten by making just a few comments about Dr. Katz. You have the printed material before you and the opportunity to have read it.

Dr. Katz was born and raised in the Argentine and educated in Buenos Aires. He was very active in dental education and migrated to the United States some 20 years ago, earning two graduate degrees in the Department of Prevention Dentistry in our school. He contributed heavily to dental research and education, and was an author of a textbook that was revised and in its fourth edition. He taught many courses and published rather heavily and was recognized as a specialist in the mineralogy of tooth structure, particularly the action of the fluoride compounds on the enamel crystal. Being bilingual, he had the unique opportunity to work in Spanish-speaking countries and was instrumental in Madrid and several other cities in Spain in instituting communal fluoridation, updating techniques of the dentists in those countries. He also, during his time, was a main source in organizing the Preventive Dentistry Research Institute, which today recognizes his efforts on many research products and projects that are rated as high as any in this

nation. He was instrumental in obtaining the first National Institute of Health grant that was founded in the Preventive Dentistry Research Institute.

I would like to read to you just the last three paragraphs about the passing of our dear friend. "Dr. Simon Katz had a notable impact upon the entire dental profession. Because of his dedication to excellence and his numerous outstanding contributions, people throughout the world have benefited immeasurably. Many faculty members at the Indiana University School of Dentistry have been influenced by his dedication and unique abilities, as well as having been touched by him as a person. His accomplishments will not be forgotten.

It is our challenge to carry forward his goals and ideas. His untimely passing is a loss for Indiana University and for the dental profession, as well as for his colleagues to whom he was dedicated throughout his life. He leaves behind a very charming wife and a nice family.

Now be it, therefore, resolved that this Memorial Resolution be presented to the Faculty Council of Indiana University - Purdue University at Indianapolis, and that copies of this memorial resolution be sent to Dr. Katz's family."

Thank you, sir.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** In keeping with our tradition, I would like to ask you to rise and observe a moment of silence.

#### **AGENDA ITEM II**

**Approval of Minutes - May 7, 1987**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** The next order of business is the approval of the minutes of the May 7, 1987 meeting. Is there a motion to approve? (Motion was made to approve. Professor Blake seconded it.) All in favor say "Aye". Any opposed? The minutes are approved.

#### **AGENDA ITEM III**

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

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Next, under Presiding Officer's Business, I have the pleasure of making a couple of introductions. First, and I think most importantly, I would like to introduce our new President Tom Ehrlich. He will be here to speak to you and to talk about our University in the State and to get some of your reactions and questions at 4:30 this afternoon. He wanted to attend the Faculty Council meeting as well. He is our guest. He is a person who I think represents the very finest possible

candidate that could have been obtained for the position of President of Indiana University. He is a distinguished scholar. His works are not only numerous but of very high quality. For those of you who are interested, a number are on display in a case in the foyer of the Law Library at this time. He has strong interests in academics. He is going to lead us to new distinction and to new excellence in teaching and research. It is my pleasure, so that we can recognize him here, to introduce our new President, Tom Ehrlich.

I am also pleased to be able to introduce a new person who will be at the head table for Faculty Council meetings. As all of you know, Bill Plater has left the deanship in Liberal Arts and joined us as Dean of Faculties. He will join me here as one of the presiding officers for Faculty Council meetings. I would like not only to introduce Bill, but I would also like to congratulate him because within the last few days he was appointed as Chair of the President's Council on the Arts and Sciences. This is a Council that was previously chaired by John Lombardi, who was Dean of the Colleges of Arts and Sciences at Bloomington. Now a member of our faculty from this campus will chair this very important Council within Indiana University. I would like for you to join me in welcoming Bill and congratulating him on this new chairmanship.

Finally, last but certainly not least, I would like to introduce the new President of the Student Assembly at IUPUI. He is a person I came to know in the very first few days that I worked in this job. I have been impressed by him all during this last year. I am pleased to say that he is now Student Assembly President. I would like to introduce Richard Schilling.

I have a couple of other items to report on very briefly. First, a number of search and screen committees are working right now, which we hope will lead to the appointment of new deans that report to Indianapolis. One was already appointed before the close of the school year, 1986-87, and you were told about that earlier in the year. That is the search for the deanship of the School of Science, which is chaired by Bill Plater.

There have been some other search committees appointed over the summer. I will give you just the highlights. The search committee for the deanship for Liberal Arts has been appointed; and Walter Daly, Dean of the School of Medicine, is chairing that committee.

A search committee has not yet been appointed, but will be in the next few days, for the deanship for the School of Nursing. The chair of that committee will be Sheldon Siegel, who is the Dean of Social Work.

Finally, a search committee will be appointed for the deanship of



the School of Public and Environmental Affairs in the next few days. The chair of that search committee will be Trevor Brown, Dean of Journalism in Bloomington.

There is one other search committee, which may not be of as immediate interest as these others. I will mention it just in passing. There is a search underway for the School of Optometry. That committee is chaired by our own Jim Roche, who is an Associate Dean in the School of Dentistry.

The other matter that I would like to touch on has to do with the development plan for the campus. Last year we reported on several occasions that we were working on a development plan that would serve as a charter for the campus over the next several years and would guide our decisions and help us to coordinate our efforts to improve IUPUI. That development plan is now in a new form. We will be circulating it shortly for comment and for your reactions. We would like to have the broadest possible discussion of this document before it moves from the stage which it is in right now, which is a very rough first draft, into subsequent and more refined stages where we will share this document with other constituencies. When you receive this document, I urge you to take a careful look at it. It is a long document, but we think it is very important that we have as much feedback as possible. We expect to have some open meetings during the fall term to discuss its contents so we would like to bring your attention to the document at the earliest possible time.

#### **AGENDA ITEM IV**

##### **Executive Committee Report - Susan L Zunt, Secretary**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Next, I would like to move to the Executive Committee report, which will be presented by Secretary Susan Zunt.

**PROFESSOR ZUNT:** Thank you, Vice President Bepko. I would like to extend our greetings to President Ehrlich, Dean Plater, members and guests of Faculty Council. I would like to begin by introducing to you the members that you have elected for your Executive Committee. I hope that Executive Committee members will stand up and be recognized after I call their names. Frederick Bein, Henry Besch, Varoujan Chalian, Kenneth Dunipace, Dolores Hoyt, Florence Juillerat, Rebecca Markel, and Jeff Vessely. Please stand and please help me acknowledge these persons.

Your Executive Committee met four times this summer to conduct Council business. I will be reporting on some of the things they accomplished and put into motion during that time. I would like to thank Dean Carol Nathan and her office, including Kim Manlove, for all the assistance they gave the Faculty Council Office this

summer, and specifically for providing through a budgeted item a computer system. Hopefully, we can accomplish the Faculty Council business much more quickly than we have been able to do it and with a higher degree of accuracy.

I also would like to thank Associate Dean Jim Brown from the School of Journalism, who has spent a tremendous amount of time working both with our Secretary Bernice Chumley and my office personnel in getting the computers operating and running.

Last spring you voted on a new admissions policy. Your comments were forwarded to the University Faculty Council, which approved the document and which was approved at the August meeting of the IU Board of Trustees.

Also this summer, a small committee was appointed by then President Ryan to complete the work of the Task Force to establish a new document for Students Rights and Responsibilities. This small committee contains five faculty members. We are honored to have Dr. Kerr in our Law School act as Chair of that committee. Other campuses are also represented on that committee, and we hope that they will be able to report to the University Faculty Council and to this body in the spring with an amended and revised Students Rights and Responsibilities document. As soon as we receive that we will, of course, send it to our Student Affairs Committee.

During the summer we have had Faculty Boards of Review working on matters of faculty grievances. On one of the committees a faculty member had to drop out of the committee because he had previously served in another decision about this particular faculty member, so the Executive Committee had to hold a special election to find a replacement. This was done. Dr. VanDeveer from the Columbus campus was the winner of that election. He will serve in the place of Henry Karlson on that Board of Review. This is the committee that is chaired by Gerald Powers. Hopefully later in the year, we will be able to report to you on the findings of our Faculty Boards of Review.

Also during the summer, an ad hoc all-campus Student Appeals Committee was formed and the Executive Committee was asked for nominees. We established a list of faculty nominees to serve in this capacity and forwarded it to the Student Affairs Office. Three of our nominees were placed on this committee and one of the nominees, Creasie Hairston, will serve as Chair of that committee. I hope to be able to report to you later in the year on the findings of that committee.

The IU Board of Trustees have met several times since our last meeting in May. In August, the Trustees met in Bloomington and at their Faculty Relations Committee meeting the two items that

were discussed were salary policy and academic strategy and achievement. The Board of Trustees will be on this campus September 10 and 11. That is a Thursday and Friday. Their meeting will be held in this University Conference Center. Retired IUPUI Archivist Jeannette Matthew has agreed to return to the campus and present a historical review to the Trustees concerning the growth of IUPUI. We would appreciate your being present to attend this review. It will be in Room 231 from 3:00 - 4:00 p.m. This takes place during the time of the regularly scheduled Executive Committee meeting. You have the Executive Committee schedule within the documents that were bound and placed with the agenda for today's meeting. The Executive Committee voted to change their meeting to coincide with the Faculty Relations Committee meeting. They will meet there from 3:00 - 4:00. They will then adjourn to Room 212 to complete the remainder of the Executive Committee business, which includes setting the agenda for our October 1 meeting.

Also, the Board of Trustees were originally scheduled to meet in Indianapolis in November. Because of the inauguration falling on October 11 and 12, there is not really enough time to have a Trustees meeting in October. Therefore, the October Trustees meeting has been cancelled. This Trustees meeting was to have taken place at IU East in Richmond. The November meeting will now take place at IU East in Richmond and the Indianapolis' site is cancelled. The next time the Trustees will meet on this campus will be in April of 1988. There is a note on your calendar, that is in the document that you received for this meeting, that that was tentative at that time. We now know that this is a firm decision.

We did meet Richard Schilling, president of the IUPUI Student Assembly, today. I have written to him and he has agreed to provide us with student nominees to serve on our Student Affairs Committee. He plans to have those to us this month so we can forward them to our Student Affairs Committee, which is chaired by Dr. McAteer.

The October meeting of the Faculty Council has been held at the Madame Walker Urban Life Center for a number of years. This was done free of charge by the Madame Walker Center. This year when we called to confirm our reservation, they already had a paying customer. So we are not going to be able to meet there. Charles Coffey of the Alumni Office has graciously agreed to schedule the October meeting in the Lincoln Hotel. The meeting, which is scheduled for 3:30, will be in the Presidents Room and then move to the Deans Room for a reception, which the Alumni Association is going to sponsor. It will be correct on the October agenda, differing from the meeting list that you have received today.

At that October meeting, Byron Olson, whom we have scheduled a number of times in the last year and we haven't been able to

hear, will be one of the first agenda items, reporting on Promotion and Tenure. We will have the results of the Promotion and Tenure Survey which was done about 18 months ago on this campus, published prior to that meeting so that you can evaluate it before his report. He will have a recommendation that it will be necessary for the Council to take some action on at that time.

Kathleen Warfel, who is the Chair of our Ad hoc Committee on Smoking Policy, has informed me this week that their committee has completed their deliberations and they will be able to make a presentation to you, including their recommendations, at our November meeting.

These are the major agenda items I wanted to bring to your attention. Certainly do not hesitate to call me or any of the Executive Committee members if there are things that need to be drawn to our attention.

I should congratulate Mr. Robert Martin and Mr. Bob Baxter and actually all of the staff, students, faculty, and volunteers who participated in the Pan Am Games. I am pleased to say that the Faculty Council Office did not receive one call or complaint during the Pan Am Games. I think all of us are to be congratulated on how we were able to take this in stride.

That completes my report.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Thanks, Susan. There is one thing that you mentioned that I would like to elaborate on very briefly. Susan talked about the Trustees meetings. The Board of Trustees is considering the possibility of reducing the number of meetings they will have every year. That would mean that there would be fewer meetings on this campus.

#### **AGENDA ITEM V**

**Ad hoc Committee on Faculty Deliberations Report - Ed Robbins, Chair (Discussion and Action item)**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** The next item of business is the report of the Ad hoc Committee on Faculty Deliberations, to be presented by Ed Robbins.

**PROFESSOR ROBBINS:** Thank you, Vice President Bepko. Before beginning my observations about the report, you should know that the members of the committee included each of the Chairs of the standing committees last year and those former Secretaries of the Council who were on campus. Several of those individuals are here today, and I invite them to add to or correct the comments and observations that I make about the work of the committee and its report.

Before beginning the report, however, a brief background on the events which led to the recommendations for the formation of the committee might be helpful. As the 1985-86 Academic Affairs Committee was completing its efforts of the year, it discussed, among the things, the nature and the quality of those efforts and concluded that some of the problems it had encountered -- poor attendance, uncertainty about its responsibilities, and concern for what would likely happen with the recommendations that it had made -- were common to other standing committees of the Council. Consequently, we recommended that the Executive Committee appoint an ad hoc committee to consider the issues we had raised. The Committee on Faculty Deliberations was the result of that recommendation.

The committee began its work in the middle of the 1986 fall semester and met regularly throughout the end of the 1987 spring semester. I guess it is only fair to admit that the committee encountered most of the problems that we were charged to consider.

We begin our report with a clear, straightforward statement about the importance of faculty efforts and administrative support for effective faculty governance and state our convictions that those conditions exist at IUPUI. I think that that position bears repeating. The committee was unanimous in its view that faculty governance on this campus, both historically and currently, has benefited greatly from the efforts of faculty and the support of administrators.

The committee began its deliberations by reviewing the role and considering the problems of the standing committees. It became quite clear early on, however, that the quality of the efforts of the standing committees of the Council was directly linked to the efforts of the Executive Committee and the Council Secretary. Accordingly, the report also considers and makes recommendations on those two elements of faculty governance. A copy of the committee report is in your agenda, so I need not read it to you. It might be helpful, however, if you have the report before you, I will simply attempt to provide additional background for the recommendations we make. That report is in the document that contains the agenda and follows the Academic Calendar. If you want to find that, it might be useful and helpful just to follow along with me.

The first five recommendations that we make relate directly to concerns about attendance at standing committee meetings. They are designed to add standardization to the scheduling of committee activities and to make acceptance of committee membership a bit more formal.

The first recommendation is that the Executive Committee establish a common time for an organizational meeting of the standing committees. It was our view that one of the problems the standing committees encountered was getting the year started. It turned out commonly that, when the secretaries and the chairs of the committees were identified and when they had gone through the elaborate process of trying to sort out schedules of the members of the committee, that it was well into the fall semester before the committees were able to get going. It was our view that a simple device of setting up an organizational meeting for the committee at the outset of the academic year might be useful.

The second recommendation is that one of the responsibilities at that meeting would be to establish for the committees at least a tentative schedule of meeting dates so that the members of the committee could at that time begin the difficult process that they commonly encounter of clearing their calendars. We assume that in those cases where it was simply impossible for a member of a committee to organize their calendar to be able to participate regularly and productively in a committee, that they might be replaced on that committee by someone who would be in a position to contribute more regularly and effectively.

We also think that membership on standing committees ought to be taken as a very serious responsibility. One of the ways that we recommend that we might add some element of formality to that is to engage in a process by which individuals who have been asked to serve on committees would in effect be required to respond with some kind of formal statement of acceptance. A statement that might include something about the charge of the committee, might include something about the expectation for attendance at committee meetings, and would at least be a reminder that taking on a standing committee responsibility is a serious one and it ought not be engaged in and taken on lightly.

The fourth and fifth recommendations under this section have to do with recording the attendance patterns of participation in standing committee meetings. It is clear that committees have suffered as a result of not having good attendance. It also turns out that the reports which committees complete, either the minutes of their meetings or reports at the end of the year, have not commonly or have not routinely included a pattern of attendance at the meetings. The absence of those have made it somewhat more difficult for the Committee on Committees to make judgments about committee membership the next year, based on just exactly who were the most productive and most active participants. So we think that, by adding a requirement that there be that kind of attendance report, not only would we highlight and emphasize the significance of it, but also would facilitate the very difficult effort that the Committee on Committees has to make judgments about the continuation of members and the selection of new members.

Items 6, 7, and 8 of the recommendations under the Standing Committees are designed to deal with concerns about how issues reach the committees, that is, how the ideas and issues that they are to consider, reach them or are referred to them and what happens to committee actions. It turns out, or at least it has in the committees that those of us who are on this particular committee have served on, receives requests from a very wide variety of sources. The committees get requests from individual faculty members, from other committees and councils, from administrative offices and officers, and it has never been at all clear about what the responsibility of the committees have been to deal with those issues that come to them in those variety of ways. Among other items these recommendations are designed to specify more clearly just what the anticipated and appropriate avenue for the receipt of issues might be. It is certainly assumed that the committees have the flexibility to take on whatever issues they might select themselves. It is clearly assumed that they have the responsibility to take up and discuss issues that are referred to them from the Council, from the Secretary, or the Executive Committee of the Council. And, as our recommendation states, they should also feel a responsibility to deal with those issues that carry over from previous committee efforts. But it was the view of the Ad hoc Committee on Faculty Deliberations that all other recommendations that come to the standing committees ought to come through the Executive Committee. That not only gives the Executive Committee the opportunity to exercise the very important role and responsibility it has of determining what it is that the committees are to consider but also which committee it thinks ought to consider them.

In recommendation #7, it also suggests that the actions by standing committees are for the consideration of the Faculty Council. It was, in our view, inappropriate for the standing committees of the Faculty Council to be making recommendations for independent action by other agencies or entities, (individual, faculty members, other faculty committees, administrators, or administrative officers). It was our view that the actions and the efforts of the standing committees are to guide and improve the quality of the discussions that go on in the Council itself, so the recommendations that are made by the standing committees ought to be then referred to the Executive Committee that would have the role or responsibility to determine which of those would then be forwarded to the Council for its action.

Item #8 is a recommendation that would permit the faculty and the members of the Faculty Council to track somewhat more carefully the disposition of actions of the Council. As can be expected, it quite commonly occurs that actions which the Council takes require administrative implementation or require the establishment of other mechanisms for carrying them out. And, as it turns out, there can be quite a delay or at least a significant time

interval between the action that the Council takes and the implementation of its actions. It also turns out that, in some instances, the actions that the Council takes are not carried out for a variety of reasons. It was a concern of the committee that in some instances the disposition of those actions is not well known. They are not clearly or carefully tracked. So, this recommendation is that actions of the Council would become report items of the Council Secretary so that each time the Council met and the Secretary gave a report there would be at least an identification of the disposition or the current status of previous actions of the Council. That would continue until an action of the Council had been disposed of or implemented or until the Council finally got so tired of hearing about it that it simply moved that it be removed from the report. At some point, if something is not going to happen, it doesn't make a lot of sense for us to continue to hear about it. We would also expect by the process, if it turned out that the Council had taken action and for whatever reason it was either undesirable or impossible to implement it administratively, that at least we would get a clear explanation and a rationale for why such actions had not been implemented or could not be implemented. So, we think this is a fairly significant recommendation in terms of faculty being able to feel confident about what has happened to its efforts and the rationale in those cases where its efforts simply cannot be implemented.

The last recommendation under the Standing Committees is really a recommendation to continue or to make somewhat more official a practice which exists now and that is an attempt to coordinate more closely the efforts of the administrative and faculty committees. It turns out commonly that the membership on the administrative committees of the University include members of the appropriate, related committee of the Faculty Council. So, this recommendation simply calls for a continuation of that and specifically suggest that the chairman of each of the Faculty Council standing committees and the secretary ought to be ex officio, voting members of the appropriate, related administrative committee.

A set of recommendations for the Executive Committee address issues related to membership of the Executive Committee and liaisons of that committee with the standing committees and with administration.

Recommendations 1 and 2 would increase the pool of individuals currently eligible for election to the Executive Committee. As you probably are aware, eligibility for election to membership on the Executive Committee is currently limited to those persons elected to the Council who still have two years remaining on a term. This, in affect, means persons beginning either their first or a second term, if they are a continuing member. Because it turns out that it is uncommon for persons beginning their



first term on the Council to be seriously considered for membership on the Executive Committee, what results then is that the pool of individuals who meet that eligibility requirement for election who are beginning a second term, when there is no absolute guarantee that anybody will be elected for a second term, is a relatively limited one. And, because our committee felt quite seriously about the importance of the role of the Executive Committee, we thought that we ought to try to do something that would expand the pool of qualified individuals for election to that committee. Our recommendations call for changing the eligibility criteria so that any person who has been a member of the Council within the last four years, whether or not they were currently an elected member of the Council, would be eligible for nomination for election to that committee.

It is also suggest then that those persons once elected would become ex officio members of the Council itself. There is a fairly clear precedent for that kind of mechanism because, in affect, that is, by and large, what exist currently for the Secretary of the Council. Under our current Constitution, the Secretary does not have to be an elected member of the Council, but if elected Secretary of the Council, becomes an ex officio member of it. So, we see this working in somewhat the same manner.

Item #3, under the Executive Committee, simply acknowledges the importance of the participation of the Vice President and the Vice President's Office in the efforts of the Executive Committee and encourages the continuation of that active participation. The shared roles and responsibilities for faculty governance, I think, make it imperative that that opportunity to share what the views, ideas, activities, and aspirations of the administration are with faculty is such a significant one that we thought that worth highlighting.

Recommendations 4 & 5 are designed to increase the communication between the Executive Committee and the standing committees. It was the view of our committee that, even though there is currently a practice of having a member of the Executive Committee as a liaison with the standing committees, that that hasn't worked entirely satisfactorily in all cases and that these recommendations under 4 & 5 would improve those kind of communications. One of the things it would do would be to provide minutes of the Executive Committee for the chairs of each of the standing committees. It would make it clear that chairs of standing committees or someone that they might designate would be welcome to attend meetings of the Executive Committee. It also makes a very strong plea for providing as much lead time as is humanly possible. Our committee recognized that under certain circumstances the amount of time we would like to debate and deliberate about issues just does not permit that, but on the other hand we thought it such an important factor in effective .

faculty governance and particularly faculty participation and deliberation in that governance that we ought to include it in our report. It simply calls for as much lead time as possible including, we would hope, efforts in some cases to try to point out to the persons who are requesting our input, the importance of even possibly delaying actions and activities that they might be contemplating. That won't always be possible, but from the point of view of effective family deliberations we think it is critical.

Under Council Secretary, because the role of Council Secretary is so critical to the effective functioning and operation of the Council, it is necessary to adopt practices and policies which make possible and support the Secretary's efforts. The Faculty Council Secretary has been and should continue to be equivalent to other top level campus administrative officers. Recommendation #1 would support this status through the establishment of a separate budget for the office. There were certainly no indication from the experience that those of us on the committee had that the support for the Faculty Council had not been adequate. So, it is not a matter of the amount or the adequacy of the budget. It is clearly the concept that the status of that office could be enhanced if it were in affect, established as a separate budget unit. So, this calls for that. And, in affect, the recommendations under #1 really outline what we consider now to be the budget practice that is followed to support the Council in its efforts. Certainly the provision of adequate clerical support is an important part of that budget. It has also been the common understanding that the budget and support for the Faculty Council has included a half-time equivalent appointment for the Secretary, in affect, releasing the Secretary of half of their other university responsibilities to devote to Faculty Council activities. Our examination of the practices that have applied to various secretaries lead us to believe that has been quite varied, in major part because of the nature of the assignments of the persons who have held that office. It wasn't always easy or appropriate simply to pick up half of the person's teaching load because in some cases they weren't teaching at all. In some cases, they were engaged in activities and responsibilities that they simply felt they should not give up in order to take on the roles and responsibilities of the Secretary. Yet there was still a great deal of work and a great deal of responsibility that goes with the position. Our feeling was that, if the position could be budgeted at the equivalent of a half-time faculty position, that there would be, within the nominal or normal budget guidelines, flexibility for the Secretary to arrange for covering the release of that half-time for Council activities. It might, in fact, in some cases simply mean reimbursing the department to cover the courses that were being covered for them that they had been released from.

In other cases where it wasn't possible to give up some of those

responsibilities or enough of them, it might be used to secure administrative assistance or other kinds of special support from other individuals who might then devote some time to the responsibility of the office. At any rate, it ought to clearly establish the significance of the position as at least being a half-time assignment.

Then, of course, we would hope that, if such a budget were established, that we would enjoy the same kind of flexibility and opportunities that we understand that other budget officers have, so that, on those occasions when the budget you have been given simply is not adequate or there are very special kinds of needs that you encounter, you could at least make the same appeals that the deans and directors and others make to the appropriate central office administrators for enhancements to their budgets.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Good luck.

**PROFESSOR ROBBINS:** We understand what the complexities and the possibilities of that are, but the point of the statements is to make it equivalent to other budget processes.

Our final recommendation is to gain recognize and highlight the importance of the Secretary's participation in the IUPUI Council of Deans and the IUPUI Board of Advisors. We think that in particular, the role or the responsibility of a Secretary serving on those boards and in that Council is to keep those administrators and those advisors apprised of the efforts and aspirations and activities of the Faculty Council and also to take every opportunity that present itself to emphasize the value and importance of faculty participation in the governance itself.

The completes my report. My understanding is that the report of the committee is now before you for discussion and/or action.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** We don't have a lot of time for discussion. Is there any discussion? Would you like to have the question? I take it that your report is in the form of a motion. Mr. Parliamentarian, does that need a second?

**PROFESSOR KARLSON:** Yes it does. (Dean Gilmore seconded.)

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Are you ready for the question. All in favor, say "Aye". Any opposed? The motion carries.

#### **AGENDA ITEM VIII** **Adjournment**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** We had planned to adjourn at 4:25 and it is now 4:25. We are adjourned.

**INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY**

**AT INDIANAPOLIS**

**FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING**

**Lincoln Hotel, Indianapolis (Presidents Room)**

**October 1, 1987**

**3:30 - 5:15 p.m.**

**Members Present:** **Administration:** Vice President Gerald L. Bepko, Carol D. Nathan, William M. Plater, Howard G. Schaller. **Deans:** John Barlow, H. William Gilmore, Elizabeth Grossman, Jeffrey Grove, Nicholas Kellum, R. Bruce Renda, Sheldon Siegel, Marshall Yovits. **Director:** Barbara Fischler. **Faculty:** Elaine Alton, Sharon Andreoli, Margaret Applegate, Morris Aprison, John Baenziger, Anne Belcher, H. R. Besch, Jr., Linda Brothers, Mervyn Cohen, Dewey Conces, William Crabtree, Paula Differding, Joseph DiMicco, Robert Dittus, Kenneth Dunipace, John Eble, James Edmondson, Elizabeth Evenbeck, Mark Farber, Margaret Felton, B P Garg, Gary Gruver, Eugene Helveston, Emily Hernandez, William Hodes, Louis Holtzclaw, Dolores Hoyt, Florence Juillerat, Jerome Kaplan, Henry Karlson, Juanita Keck, Robert Kirk, Judith Kosegi, John Lappas, Rebecca Markel, James McAteer, Dana McDonald, Judy Miller, Bernard Morrel, Bart Ng, Richard Pflanzner, Jeanne Pontious, Gerald Powers, Richard Rogers, Beverly Ross, Kenneth Ryder, P Kent Sharp, A N Siakotos, Judith Silence, Craig Stoops, Jeffery Vessely, Dorothy Webb, Henry Wellman, Maudine Williams, Susan Zunt.

**Alternates Present:** **Deans:** John Hunger for Charles Bonser; Shirley Quate for Trevor Brown; Hugh Wolf for Howard Mehlinger; John Werenko for William J Voos; Scott Evenbeck for James Weigand; Tom Lenz for Jack Wentworth. **Faculty:** Walter Buchanan for Willard Bostwick; Donna Marzouk for Mary Feeley; Neal Rothman for Jerome Kaminker; Joe Koss for Linda Kasper.

**Members Absent:** **Deans:** Walter Daly. **Faculty:** Billy Abel, Carl Andres, Richard Beck, Cecil Brown, Edwin Casebeer, Varoujan Chalian, Robert Colyer, Theodore Cutshall, Donald Gartner, Linda Haas, Celestine Hamant, Robert A Harris, Rosemarie Jones, Robert Mendelsohn, Paul Nagy, Catherine Palmer, Donald Rex, Glen Sagraves, ~~A N Siakotos~~, Susan Sutton, Vernon Vix, Kathleen Warfel, Karen West.

**Visitors:** Byron Olson, Chair, IUPUI Faculty Affairs Committee; Jean Hutten, Hitwant Sidhu.

**AGENDA ITEM I**

**Memorial Resolution for Professor Emeritus Harriett R. Becker, School of Nursing. (Read by Dean Elizabeth M. Grossman)**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** We have a full agenda today so we would like to begin now. Our first order of business is a memorial resolution for Professor Emeritus Harriett Becker to be read by Betty Grossman, Dean of the School of Nursing.

**NOTE:** Dean Grossman read the memorial resolution and a moment of silence was observed.

**AGENDA ITEM II**

**Approval of the Minutes - September 3, 1987**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** The minutes of the September 3rd meeting have been deferred until our next meeting.

**AGENDA ITEM III**

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

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** We have just a couple of brief items under Presiding Officer's Business. I just wanted to mention for those of you who are not familiar with this that we are currently working on the possibility of creating a Faculty Club in the Conference Center. The space has been preliminarily identified. We are working with the hotel right now to see if we can establish service arrangements with the hotel. We will then be working with the faculty committee that has been in existence for a couple of years, chaired by Professor Wellman from the School of Medicine, to make sure that the plans that we have talked about in preliminary fashion meet the needs of the faculty. You will be hearing more about this as the semester unfolds. We hope that we can have something in place if it is agreeable with the committee and faculty members by the first of the year. It may be that in the earliest stages of its development the Faculty Club will actually physically be invited to be part of the hotel, although we haven't worked this out yet, but it would be only for purposes of getting the Faculty Club started with sufficient membership and traffic through a club room so that we could move the Faculty Club into permanent private quarters in the Conference Center.

We have also been working on a project that I know that you are familiar with because you have all received copies of a document that has come from the efforts of people in campus administration. It is a campus development plan. We mentioned the plan at the last meeting of the Council and by now you have a copy of it.

I would like to ask Bill Plater to say a couple of things about where this project stands right now and what we are going to ask of you.

**DEAN PLATER:** This is the plan (holding up a copy of the Development Plan.) I hope all of you have received a copy of it. If you have not by this time, please call my office and we will send one to you immediately. I would like to emphasize that this is very much a draft and, as you have observed if you have looked at the Table of Contents, there are a number of sections that are yet to be added. It is incomplete as well as being a draft. It will require a great deal of discussion, conversation, and revision over an extended period of time, but we hope to concentrate a great deal of that discussion in the next two to four weeks so that we might prepare a second draft sometime during the last part of October or no later than the early part of November. Toward that end, we have not only circulated copies of this to all members of the Faculty Council but to members of the Staff Council and today we sent copies to the members of the IUPUI Student Government. We have asked each of these three principal groups to organize discussion in a variety of ways to provide feedback and comment on the draft through those mechanisms as well as, this is an offer to this body now, through individual comments from each of the members of the Faculty Council.

There will be an open meeting of the faculty scheduled for October 15th at 3:30 in the large auditorium of the Conference Center where we held the first meeting of the year. We hope that many members of the faculty will come to that open meeting (a kind of town hall, if you will) to discuss the plan. There will be a number of people from the administrative offices there, including the Vice President from Purdue Robert Ringel, to listen to the comments and observations that the faculty have. Let me iterate that fact that we would welcome your comments as individuals, preferably in writing as well as through various other mechanisms.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Thanks, Bill.

#### **AGENDA ITEM IV**

##### **Executive Committee Report - Susan L. Zunt, Secretary**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Our next item of business is the Executive Committee Report from Susan Zunt.

**PROFESSOR ZUNT:** Thank you. I would like to give you a little more detail about the open faculty meeting. The Executive Committee at their meeting last week decided it would be very important for the Faculty Council and all faculty to have an opportunity to look at this document, Development Plan, in detail and have an opportunity to respond to it. You will be getting in

the mail, probably tomorrow or Monday, your invitation to this open faculty meeting. Perhaps as Faculty Council members you have a bit more responsibility in this activity. We have asked the standing committees, through the standing committee chairs, to review the document from their perspective and come to the October 15th meeting prepared with comments or questions looking at the document from the standing committee's standpoint. Additional copies are available, as Dean Plater said, from his office. Someone made the comment to me just this morning that we have a very large document to look at and a very short time to accomplish that task. But, actually I should think that you have been very aware of the development of this document. We worked on the Mission Statement and we have had a number of reports on the Mission Statement through our various committees. Since the Vice President's introductory speech to us a year ago, we have had reports on the Ten-Year Development Plan reported in the Council and available in the minutes. All of you, through your schools, have been involved in developing the brief reports to orient President Ehrlich. So, what we are seeing here is part of a continuum. I hope when you look at this document you won't be overwhelmed with the job that we have to do. Much of it has developed from what we have been doing on faculty forums and faculty committees in addition to what has been done administratively. I hope that the administration is going to have a number of people available to answer our questions at the open meeting on the 15th. I hope you will be able to attend and encourage your colleagues to be present at that time.

The Executive Committee has established nominees to serve on the committee to look at faculty members for the Experience Excellence Recognition Awards. The award is named for former Vice President Irwin -- Glenn W. Irwin Recognition Award. Dean Nathan's office manages this. We have asked for nominees to send to Dean Nathan's office.

Professor Covert, who has left the University, was on the Academic Affairs Committee. Professor Shirley Quate, a fellow member in Journalism, has been appointed by the Executive Committee to complete Professor Covert's term.

As you know, Professor Wellman has been appointed to the Faculty Affairs Committee to chair the Faculty Affairs subcommittee on the Faculty Club.

At our last meeting we approved a document to look at making some major changes in our Constitution on how our standing committees, Executive Committee and Secretary will operate. A number of standing committees have already taken up the document that came from Professor Robbins' committee on Faculty Deliberations. They have taken up the topic and will report as soon as they can to you on their recommendations on Constitution and Bylaw changes. Other changes we will be able to initiate fairly quickly. For

example, one area was that the minutes of the Executive Committee be sent to all chairs of our standing committees. As soon as I can get the minutes corrected, those can go out to all chairs. We can institute that change immediately.

The Faculty Council Office has not yet received names of students to serve on our Student Affairs Committee. As you know, we contacted the Student Assembly directly in order to get student participants, but it is very difficult to get nominees. If you know of students who might want to serve in this capacity, you could get the names to us and we could get them assigned to the working committees.

The Executive Committee has received several requests from individual faculty members concerning our Faculty Boards of Review. Some of the issues that have been questioned concern with the number of administrators who serve on our Faculty Boards of Review. Certainly the Council elects the Faculty Boards of Review and the election slates are filled by our Nominating Committee. A year ago the Executive Committee sent to each school, the Dean's Office, and the faculty leader a request for nominees to serve on Faculty Boards of Review and the Tenure Committee. We received two responses to this request. It is very important that we generate names to do this task to serve on our Faculty Boards of Review and Tenure Committee. Last year we had 41 faculty members through our Preference Sheets volunteer to serve on the Faculty Boards of Review. It simply wasn't enough. We needed a minimum of 21 names. We will be sending you a letter in the near future asking you again to please meet with your faculty leaders and see if we can't develop some enthusiasm and some participation for this very important aspect of faculty governance.

The University Faculty Council met in Bloomington on Tuesday afternoon. It was the first meeting at which President Ehrlich presided. At that meeting Chancellor Wells reported on the search for the IU Foundation President. Chancellor Wells gave out the qualifications of the search committee as established and also asked that all faculty members, if they have nominees, send these names directly to him. So, if you have people who you think are qualified for the IU Foundation Presidency, you are encouraged by Chancellor Wells to send these names directly to him. I would do this as soon as possible because the committee hopes to make a recommendation to the Trustees I believe in February, 1988.

A little bit more on University Faculty Council business. You probably will recall that in February and April of 1987 there were two fringe benefits proposals that were passed by the University Faculty Council. I think it is important to bring you up to date on UFC business because many times you have worked on these same matters on this Council. The two proposals that



passed this past spring were the Total Disability Benefits Insurance Proposal and the Phased Early Retirement Proposal. To the best of our knowledge the proposals have not gone any further than being passed by the UFC. The Agenda Committee of the UFC is going to meet with President Ehrlich prior to our October 27 meeting. At that time the chairs of the UFC Fringe Benefits Committee, Michael Downs from Ft. Wayne, and our own Keith Moore, who is our Fringe Benefits Committee Chair, will make the presentation to the President. They will bring him up to date. We are asking him to forward these two proposals directly to the Trustees as they are studying retirement benefits and we think it is important that they study all of the proposals that have been made by faculty.

That concludes my report.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Thank you, Susan.

#### **AGENDA ITEM V**

**The Adult Education Coordinating Center - Patricia A. Boaz**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** The next agenda item is a report on the Adult Education Coordinating Center by Pat Boaz.

While Pat is coming up I would like to footnote one thing that was mentioned by both Bill and Susan. This Development Plan is something that we hope to use for a number of purposes as I think I have described before. We think it will be relevant for the 1989-1991 budget request that is made for this campus by the University. We plan to have abstracts made of the Development Plan after it reaches a more mature state. Those abstracts we hope to use to build support both within the University and the public for the plan for the campus. As you know the process for determining the appropriation of Indiana University starts fairly early in the year before the biennial session of the General Assembly. So, sometime early in 1988 we are going to have to start pressing our case for the campus for the 1989-1991 biennium. That is why we are moving as quickly as we can to try to build a consensus around this document. I would hasten to say that we will not rush the process. We will take as long as is necessary to get the broad support we need for whatever document emerges from this process. This must be our document. It can't be a campus administration document; it has to be our document meaning all of us as faculty members. It will always be a draft. I don't think we will ever say it is final and that there is nothing more that needs to be added or changed. We would like to move as quickly as we can, recognizing the things that we are going to use the document for. I apologize if it means a lot of reading or quick analysis on your part at this point. We would appreciate your participation at every stage and we hope to hear from you now and as the document emerges.

**DEAN BOAZ:** The Adult Center is the newest office established by the University to perform services for students. In fact, it was fully staffed and fully operative only on July 1 of this year. The staff consists of 3.5 professionals (the one-half belonging partly to us and partly to the office of Women's Research and Resources across the hall) and three clerical staff.

Currently over one-half of the enrolled students at IUPUI are 25 years or over. Many of these, of course, are in graduate and graduate professional schools. Some are completing undergraduate degrees in the regular academic units. But, an increasing number are entering or re-entering without a defined degree objective. The Center is the entry point for these people. Currently we have over 1,100 graduate, non-degree students. These are people who have various purposes in coming here. Some simply want to take a course or two to enrich their lives. Some want to take courses to improve job performance or opportunities for advancement in the work place. Some of them honestly are looking for a second undergraduate degree but do not know what direction they want to move. A number, for instance, are interested in taking the course work necessary to be admitted to medical or dental or possibly law school.

Also we have about 900 who are classified as adult non-degree. These come for some of the same reasons to take a course or two for pleasure or for advancement of some kind in the job. Many of them are hoping to find a new career direction or to complete a degree that they began earlier that was interrupted by some type of a personal responsibility. We are also doing the registrations and the counseling for transient students. This is simply because we are very conveniently located in Cavanaugh Hall catacombs and close to the Registrar, the Bursar, etc. Since we do general counseling anyway, we could conveniently help these visitors to our campus to find what they want to take back to parent institutions.

The Center has adopted a threefold mission of recruitment, services and research. We are in a very excellent position in concert with the other divisions of Continuing Studies and with some of the Student Affairs Offices to recruit adult students particularly in business and industry where we can offer a variety of adult assessment-instruments. A company that so chooses can offer on-site credit or non-credit courses. An example recently was a local business for whom 200 math placement exams were given; they are now going to have a credit course on site for their employees.

We also provide off campus admission and counseling and we represent the University to adults. As far as services are concerned, we are here to ease the transition of the entry and re-entry adult into the University. We provide information about

program opportunities. We assist in admission testing, academic counseling and registration. We also serve as a clearinghouse or referral center for returning students to meet their special needs, for example, in personal counseling, career counseling, financial aid, child care, etc.

Our current projects include a monthly newsletter and establishment of a peer counseling program. We have programs of special interest to returning adults. In October, for example, we will have a session on use of the library and how to read a textbook, which is a stumbling block to many adults. We have weekly brown bag lunches to learn what adult students are thinking and wanting us to do with and for them.

In the area of research, we are obviously doing marketing research. We have a data sheet that was developed before July 1. We are keeping such a sheet on each student who comes to the Center. At the end of the year we will have a great deal of information about who these people are, what they want, and how we were able to serve them. We have also begun some applied research in adult education in areas of adult retention with the assistance of some graduate students from Indianapolis and from Bloomington.

Recently, with the Vice President's approval, we requested the Governor to proclaim the third week of October as Adult Education Week for the state and he is so doing. We have several events planned here for that week, a reception for chief executive officers of Indianapolis businesses that employ 100 or more people and who have a tuition assistance planned for their employees. The reception recognizes them for their support of adult education.

We hope to have in your area a panel of returning students to tell you firsthand, better than I can, how they feel about things. You may be surprised, for instance, to learn that the instructor-centered learning, which is the most common kind - the lecture format -- is the least favored and the least effective with adults. This is something that we have to rethink if we have been using the same old lecture notes for years.

On the 22nd of October, we cordially invite all of you to the official open house of the Center. We have never had one and we hope that you will all come to visit us there. If you want some idea of who comes to us, in the brochure you have received are pictures that are duplicates of ones that hang in the Center. They were taken by the University photographer and are all IUPUI adult students. The gentleman on the left is Puerto Rican who is here studying electronics. The lady in the middle is a widow who supports herself hanging wallpaper. She is one of our students. You perhaps recognize the lady in the nurse's cap who is an employee at the Union who is in the associate program in

Nursing. The gentlemen who is enjoying his pipe in front of the steel structure sells steel for Bethlehem. He is doing something he has always wanted to do, which is take courses in psychology. The lady underneath his photo in Human Resources Counseling. What she has always wanted to do and is now doing is to take courses in political science. So we have a great variety of very interesting people coming to the Adult Center.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Thank you, Pat.

#### **AGENDA ITEM VI**

**Faculty Affairs Committee Report on Promotion and Tenure Survey and Recommendation - DISCUSSION and ACTION - Byron L. Olson**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Our next item is the report of the Faculty Affairs Committee on the Promotion and Tenure Survey and a recommendation. This will be given by Byron Olson.

**PROFESSOR OLSON:** The first thing I want to do is to thank all of the Faculty Affairs Committee members and everyone who worked on this project for several years for all their help. I also want to thank the former Secretary of the Faculty Council Henry Besch for all his help as well as the current Secretary of the Faculty Council Susan Zunt.

The Faculty Affairs Committee examined tenure and promotions decisions since they are such great importance to all faculty as well as librarians. The Faculty Affairs Committee conducted a survey of all full time faculty and librarians in the spring of 1986 regarding their perceptions and concerns about tenure and promotion processes. A total of 471 surveys were returned of which there were 32 questions on each survey. This represented over 15,000 questions that had to be tabulated in order to get the survey results.

Today I would like to review only a few of these key points with you and leave the rest of them for your perusal at your spare time.

Looking at the rates of responses and at the breakdown of faculty by rank, for full professors and librarians, the response rate was 32 percent; for associate professors and librarians, it was about 37 percent; and for assistant professors and librarians, it was about 29 percent. It was about evenly divided between each type of rank.

If you look first at the tenure section of the survey and look under Question #3. The question asked of the faculty: "During 1984-85, did you receive an annual tenure review?" The replies for this particular section represent only untenured faculty, on tenure-track appointments. The responses were Yes 55 percent; No

28 percent; and a percentage that were not quite sure whether they did or didn't get a review.

Under Question #10, we asked the question: "Have you read the 1984 edition of the IUPUI Faculty Handbook concerning tenure?" Yes - 56 percent; No - 39 percent; and a percentage said they weren't sure whether they had read it or not.

Turning now to the Promotion section, and looking at Question #16, the faculty were asked (and these replies are only from faculty that are under the rank of full professor or librarian) "Did you receive an annual promotion review during the past academic year?" Yes - 50 percent; No - 36 percent; and again a percentage said they were not sure whether they had or had not received an annual promotion review.

To follow up on that, look at Question #25. "Have you read the 1984 edition of the IUPUI Faculty Handbook concerning promotion?" Yes - 62 percent; No - 31 percent; and there was a certain percentage that said that they were not sure whether they had or not.

Based on this information as well as some more of the information within the survey itself, in the last few pages there is some demographical data concerning the number of years that the faculty have been here which is quite interesting. There are faculty that have been here in teaching for as many as 50 years. Based on the results of the survey the Faculty Affairs Committee would like to make the following recommendations concerning promotion and tenure. Those are located on the last page of your handout for today.

1. The Committee recommends that all non-tenured faculty/librarians on tenure-track receive a verbal and a written annual review of their probationary appointments. This review should cover the performance of the individual in teaching, research, and service, or analogous areas for librarians.

The Committee recommends that the verbal and written reviews come from the individual's primary committee or appropriate review committee, with further review of the written comments by the individual's chairperson, unit committee, and Dean.

2. The Committee recommends that all faculty/librarians below the rank of full professor/full librarian receive a verbal and a written annual review of the individual in teaching, research, and service, or analogous areas for librarians.

The Committee recommends that the verbal and written reviews come from the individual's primary committee or appropriate review committee with further review of the written comments by the individual's chairperson, unit committee, and Dean.

3. The Committee recommends that every new faculty member/librarian receive a current copy of the faculty handbook and receive current information on tenure and promotion procedures from their primary committee and chairperson.

I would like to open this for discussion.

**DEAN YOVITS:** In #2 you recommended reviewing all faculty below the rank of full professor. That presumably includes people who are tenured but not full professors?

**PROFESSOR OLSON:** Right. These would be people who have tenure.

**DEAN YOVITS:** My question then is why not include full professors? Why do you exclude full professors?

**PROFESSOR OLSON:** As far as I know now, the only people that are reviewed are people below the rank of full professor. Is that not right?

**DEAN YOVITS:** No. It varies by school.

**DEAN SCHALLER:** It seems to me that this would be full professors without tenure. That's very rare but it does happen.

**UNKNOWN #1:** How many questions were sent out?

**PROFESSOR OLSON:** I think the full time faculty is around 1,200. We got back about 39 percent.

**PROFESSOR ZUNT:** If I may interrupt, a consultant from the department of sociology said that was an acceptable return rate. She had predicted, for a successful survey, 33 percent.

**PROF: ROTHMAN:** How many people are going to be involved in being reviewed this way through the unit committees. The departments do their job, I know. Forwarding these things on to the unit committees and further on, you are adding a lot of work possibly to the situation.

**PROF: OLSON:** I realize that but I think that tenure and promotion items are important enough that they really ought to be reviewed by everyone.

**PROF: ROTHMAN:** The unit committee is going to change the year the person comes up for promotion and tenure. It is not the same people who are going to be looking at it.

**PROFESSOR KECK:** Along those same lines, I am curious as to why you are recommending what the process should be, rather than that it is important that a process occur.

**PROFESSOR OLSON:** These are recommendations from our committee. These are not etched in stone. One of the things that we want to do is, we thought this would be a reasonable approach, since everyone usually has a primary committee or chairperson or both, and generally these go through some sort of unit committee or division committee and on to the dean.

**PROFESSOR KECK:** How many people would be reviewed typically by a committee?

**PROFESSOR OLSON:** It would depend on which committee you are talking about -- primary committee or unit committee. In my school, for example, in my department, there are three or four of us who are reviewed in a committee of three. Yet at the unit committee, probably over 100 that may be involved.

**DEAN SCHALLER:** We have required for a number of years verification from deans that all annual reviews were carried out. Those verifications are on file, so I am amazed to see that there are people here who are reporting that they didn't get an annual review. Schools have procedures for handling this and if you are going to pass requirements that are going to require some kind of centralized system, I think the schools ought to have an opportunity to examine this and comment on it. There are different practices that arise out of the fact that there are differences in the way faculties are handled. Some schools, the point that Dr. Robbins is making, do require that after the third year that the unit committee also do a review as well as the primary committee so you can start to get some feedback from the school or department. Other schools don't have that.

Also, you say that there is a statement in here that review are absolutely required. That is already in there. Also, if you want to have verbal discussion with the candidate, I would recommend that that be confirmed that that was done in writing, so that you will have something on file.

Also, I was just reminded that we are out of handbooks. As I recall, the IUPUI Faculty Council has suggested that there be a revision of the handbooks. I would hope that you could wait until that revision is done. If you are going to approve these recommendations, I think what you are proposing is that you are going to change the language in the handbooks at some point.

**PROFESSOR ZUNT:** I have two comments to follow up Dean Schaller's comment. At the UFC last Tuesday, we did call to the President's attention the fact that the handbooks are out of print. We asked that this project be taken up fairly quickly. There are many revisions that have to be made and I think we are talking about on the University systemwide level in addition to what is going on at the campus. Hopefully, we will have something that is effective systemwide perhaps in loose leaf binder that we can add the appropriate additional material for specific campuses. This is a long process. The handbook had been scheduled for review in the Bloomington Dean of Faculties Office in 1987. To the best of my knowledge that has not been accomplished. The development of a handbook could take up to two years if we are going to go through a complete revamping process. I think with the new President this is something that we might be looking at. So, I don't think we can totally put this off until we have a revised edition.

**MRS. HOYT:** I think that we were quite aware that we had the memo from Dean Schaller's office stating that annual reviews below the rank of full professor/librarian were required, but apparently the surveys showed that it was not happening the way it should be. I would just like to reiterate the fact that this should be done.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Has there been some effort to reconcile the conflicting data? We have data in our office that state annual reviews are routinely done. These data suggest that they are not. Shouldn't it be our first step to try to reconcile the data? That is, maybe there is some explanation for why, people responded to this questionnaire in a way different from the data that we have in campus administration. Has that effort ever been made?

**PROFESSOR OLSON:** No.

**PROFESSOR ROTHMAN:** Is there a difference between an annual review and a promotion review and a tenure review?

**DEAN SCHALLER:** Some people would say that they didn't get a promotion review because they weren't up for promotion; they didn't get a tenure review because they weren't up for tenure. But, they may have gotten an annual review. There is confusion, I think, in the language of the questionnaire that is probably responsible for that.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Unless we were sure of that explanation, though, it seems that it might be premature to make a judgment.

**PROFESSOR ROTHMAN:** In the view of the committee, are reviews by the chairpersons, unit committee, and the deans thought to be equivalent reviews? I would like to make a distinction between,



I don't want to say the value, but the impact of a review by the chairman vs a review that could be conducted by a unit committee. By grouping these three sources of reviews in the statement, are you intending to imply that each of these reviews must be treated at each of these levels?

**PROFESSOR OLSON:** I think it was our desire originally to go ahead and have each one of these reviewed at each level. In other words, the results would come through the primary committee up to the unit committee up through the dean.

**PROFESSOR SIDHU:** As far as the requirement is concerned, I think it has been mentioned each dean is expected to discuss the annual review, either submitted by the unit committee or the primary committee. If that process can be followed, that would cut out at least some duplication from the unit committee and the primary committee.

The second thing is, and this is fact, if the members are not getting reviews -- written reviews or oral reviews -- by the dean, then I think it is their responsibility to ask the dean how they did. If I understand correctly, as far as our school is concerned, our unit committee reviews go to the dean and the dean discusses it with each faculty member. My question is I don't think the data is accurate. The question has not been understood or the data are not reliable to draw a general conclusion. I am for passing an annual review on to the faculty member, but on the other side, the data indicates they have not been getting reviewed. There is something wrong, something is missing.

**DEAN SCHALLER:** As to requiring the dean to have a discussion with every faculty member, conditions differ among schools. Dr. Daly would have a couple hundred of these.

**DEAN RENDA:** I would like to offer a comment here. I think what Dean Schaller says is exactly correct in that the requirement, as we interpret it, is that an annual review be done. In our case, it is done by the department chairman. If we ask a faculty member if they want a committee to review their performance, they would say "no", but an annual review has been done by the department chair.

**DEAN YOVITS:** I would like to emphasize, as a number of people have said, to require a unit committee in a large school to go through every one of these annual reviews, would be an inordinate amount of work, and I am not at all convinced that it would accomplish a great deal since the membership of the unit committees continues to change.

**DEAN WOLF:** There is another consideration. I am not sure how it might apply here but in our school, which is a merged school, we have a single committee. That committee reviews individuals on

have a single committee. That committee reviews individuals on both the Bloomington and IUPUI campuses. I am assuming this policy is intended to apply to people who are on the tenure track on this campus. I am not sure what it means to say that some people would be getting an annual review by our unit committee and others might not. That might or might not be a problem. If it were required that our unit committee review folks who are tenured, or on the tenure track at IUPUI, but not reviewing others, that could be a problem.

**PROF. VESSELY:** I think a follow up on something Dean Schaller said, as far as having schools participate in maybe reformulating these recommendations, is appropriate in light of those comments. I think one important point, though, is to not lose sight of the fact that there are people, whether they are perceiving this or whether it in fact happened, that believe they are not being reviewed on a regular basis. When that review comes for the promotion period or the tenure period, as we see it, during the four years that I have been on the Executive Committee, we received grievance after grievance where the process, at least the perception of process, was not followed. They didn't document the statistics. If the dean sends a letter to the Vice President saying "We reviewed everybody," that is different from sending the dossiers or the check sheets or whatever for 100, 200, or 300 faculty members. I think the perception is there that we have done our job because we have taken a report from a primary or unit committee, somebody who says that we have done that. In fact, that is not always the case. I don't think that big a percentage of people are just wondering around in oblivion somewhere. I think, in fact, that they are not being reviewed or not being reviewed adequately. So, the process needs to be looked at and maybe looked at with participation from all the various schools.

**DEAN SCHALLER:** I would like to second the point he just made about why they weren't told at the time of their initial appointment the length of their probationary appointment. They all have to sign a tenure track appointment and tenure statement, or we can't get them on the payroll. When they sign that statement, secondly they get an offer letter, which tells them how long they are appointed. Their appointment letter which comes from the Board of Trustees, which tells them how long they were appointed for. So, I think Jeff's point here is very well taken.

**PROFESSOR OLSON:** Some of the faculty on here, if you look at the data as well, they go back at least 40 years on the faculty. I don't know if 20 years ago they signed such statements.

**DEAN SCHALLER:** Yes. In fact, I am one of the few people who is that old.

**UNKNOWN #2 (NURSING):** I would like to speak as a non-tenured

faculty person in a situation in which my chairman provided my annual review and which he does very well. But, it would be comforting to me to know that I have the option, at least, to have more than one opinion about my progress toward tenure and promotion. We have had one incident in my school in which the department chairperson directed a non-tenured faculty member in one direction and when it came time for promotion, the promotion committee did not approve of that direction. Had this faculty member had other input, this very unsatisfactory situation might not have happened. As someone who is concerned from a personal point of view, I would support having annual reviews by a unit committee.

**DEAN SCHALLER:** Some schools do that.

**UNKNOWN #3:** It seems like a lot of difference in school policies. Does the Faculty Affairs Committee have all of these policies?

**PROFESSOR OLSON:** We don't have all of them.

**PROFESSOR VESSELY:** It seems to me that, one of the things Faculty Affairs Committee could do would be to gather all of these policies and compare them.

**DEAN SCHALLER:** They are all on file in the Dean of Faculties Office.

**PROFESSOR VESSELY:** Just one quick thing that might help streamline this process. My personal suggestion would be to maybe the promotion committee, since it is the larger group, would be the ones to look at this. It seems to me that every year in the IUPUI Promotion Committee there is a great deal of discussion about what is important and that it helps to create a perception problem that "I am doing the right thing or the wrong thing." Maybe that group could be one of the groups that could look at this process.

**PROFESSOR: ROTHMAN:** Please add somebody from Science and Technology.

**DEAN SCHALLER:** There are people from the School of Science and the School of Engineering and Technology on the Promotions Committee.

**PROFESSOR QUATE:** My suggestion has to do with the presentation as opposed to the substance of a recommendation. Shouldn't the word "verbal" be "oral"?

**PROFESSOR OLSON:** Yes.

**PROFESSOR POWERS:** There are two areas that I think also have to

be considered in this context. One concerns the issues that invariably come up on the University Promotion committee where programs on other campuses, like Ft. Wayne or Columbus, obviously march to a different drummer than the unit committee here on this campus. You have on occasion absolutely complete flip flops of a total vote for it at one level and a total vote against it at another level. Something seems to be wrong or out of sync in terms of criteria they are looking at or how they are interpreting it. Some confusion emerges by the fact that in the handbook it states that each campus is supposed to look at the whole trinity of teaching, research, and service in terms of its own mission. It looks as though the missions are so diametrically opposed. The other concerns terms of the substance of what gets written. It seems to be that, when there is a problem of the type that sometimes finds its way to Faculty Review Board, is the question of whether or not problems as blocks to eventual tenure have never been adequately stated so that the faculty member knows what he or she is supposed to have done to correct it. They get to the ultimate review year and say "nobody ever said I didn't have enough publications or I didn't. . ." A review is done and they fold up and they are right, because nobody ever said in so many words what needs to be done. I think that also needs to be reviewed.

**UNKNOWN #4:** I make a motion that we send the report back to the committee.

**PROFESSOR OLSON:** What is your perusal on this? Would you like this to go back to the committee?

**PROFESSOR HOYT:** As chair of that committee, I would like to know to do what with it?

**DEAN YOVITS:** Discuss it with the school.

**PROFESSOR HOYT:** We had representatives from almost all of the schools on the committee. Do you mean to discuss it with specific promotion and tenure committees? I am hearing two things -- the Deans and the promotion and tenure committees.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** The committee wants specific guidance. I guess the Council could vote on exactly what the committee should do. Whom it should talk to. But, I thought that the committee, as I have, has heard a lot about the problems that may arise if we implemented these recommendations. I think the essence of the discussion is that the committee is to go back, in view of these problems, and look at the recommendation and come back at a future time if they can address those problems.

**DEAN RENDA:** At the same time I think we should also have a chance to discuss those with the full faculty. I realize that one person from each faculty represents each school but it is not

the same as discussing the issue with the whole faculty. I think that would be useful to us.

**DEAN YOVITS:** Vice President Bepko had a very important point I haven't heard emphasized, namely, we have to worry about the validity and credibility of the data. It may be that we are drawing conclusions from this which are unwarranted. For example, in the School of Science every single individual is reviewed every year, both orally and written. If you have any data from the school that says they are not, then something ought to be looked into.

**UNKNOWN #5:** I move that the committee take the report back and send it to the dean of each school asking for that dean to consult with its faculty and come up with a response that it can return to the committee.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** It is a motion. It has been seconded. Is there any discussion on the motion?

**PROFESSOR VESSELY:** The emphasis there should be on communications coming from the school to the committee. Not that that should be the only communication; that should be the emphasis.

**PROFESSOR BESCH:** That is a friendly amendment.

**PROFESSOR ALTON:** I would like to reiterate a point that was made earlier that, regardless of whether the procedures are now in place for this, the perception of many faculty, a large percentage of them, is that these reviews are not being done and maybe this is a case where some of the data are false because people interpreted it in different ways.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** The question has been called. All in favor of the motion as stated and modified slightly by the friendly amendment, say "Aye". Opposed. The motion carries. Thank you.

## **AGENDA ITEM VII**

### **Introduction of Members**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** The next item of business is the annual introduction of members. It may be that, given the acoustics of the room, it would be a good idea if the deans who are going to introduce colleagues from their faculty would come up and use the microphone.

Our tradition is to ask the deans or representatives of deans to introduce the members of the Council who are from their school. We introduce the deans beginning with the smallest academic unit going to the largest. Given that procedure that we will follow

again this year, we will begin with the School of Journalism. Representing Dean Trevor Brown and Associate Dean Jim Brown is Professor Shirley Quate.

**PROFESSOR BESCH:** Mr. Vice President, a point of order. We requested last year that the order be reversed one of these years with the hope that it might be reversed this year. That is not possible, I understand. For the record, I would request again on behalf of the steering committee of one of the largest schools, that we consider formally in these chambers reversing the order in some subsequent year.

**PROFESSOR KARLSON:** You are out of order. That is not a point of order.

**DEAN YOVITS:** It is a point of personal privilege.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Taken as a point of personal privilege, it is a well taken point. I didn't remember it until just now. We should note for the minutes, if we can, that a request has been made that we reverse the order next and that, hearing no objection, we will reverse the order next year.

**PROFESSOR ZUNT:** That particular item of business was brought up at our last Executive Committee meeting and we hoped that we had that taken care of. I would like to interrupt right now and remind you that there is a sign up sheet going around. I know people will have to leave so please be sure and sign this sheet before you leave. Thank you.

**PROFESSOR QUATE:** Is it okay for Journalism to go ahead?

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Please.

**PROFESSOR QUATE:** It is my pleasure to introduce to you today the newest member of the Journalism faculty and also our new representative on the Faculty Council, Dr. **Margaret Felton** who prefers to be called Meg. She brings to our faculty a nice combination of journalism background as well as law. She has a bachelor's degree in journalism from University of Missouri and a doctorate of jurisprudence from our own Law School conferred in 1985. She also has some reporting experience with the Shelbyville News and was State House reporter for the Evansville Press. We are pleased that she brings us practical experience as well as her legal background to the School of Journalism and feel that she adds some desired strengths to those particular areas. I hope you will all make her feel welcome here, Meg Felton.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** We are especially pleased to have another lawyer in our midst.

Henry, you said it wasn't possible to reverse the order this

year. I guess that was true since we had already asked Journalism to proceed with their introduction. But, why couldn't we reverse the order now?

Mr. Parliamentarian, is that permissible? This has not been published, has it? So, we can do anything we want.

**PROFESSOR ZUNT:** The deans, when they were notified, were told of the order.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** I think we should continue then with the order that was announced to the deans. Continuing Studies would be next with Scott Evenbeck doing the introductions.

**PROFESSOR EVENBECK:** I would like to introduce Lou Holtzclaw who is a faculty member in the School of Continuing Studies. He is responsible for the general studies degree program on a system-wide basis. He has published many articles on adult education. If you are interested in Indiana history, as I am, you may be interested in some day reading his dissertation on a Quaker settlement over by Richmond before the Civil War. If you are interested in James Whitcomb Riley, he lives on Brandywine Creek south of Greenfield.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Next is the dean of the School of Physical Education, Nick Kellum.

**DEAN KELLUM:** I would like to introduce, first of all, our unit representative Jeff Vessley. Jeff is a member of the Executive Committee and is concluding his fourth year on the Council. Jeff has a primary teaching responsibilities in the area of kinesiology. He is also our director of Intramural and Recreational Sports.

For the first time in many years, I guess the second time in the history of our school, we have an at large representative and that is Betty Evenbeck. Betty serves on the Academic Affairs Committee and Student Affairs Committee of the IUPUI Faculty Council. I think it only fair that I tell the rest of the Faculty Council that, by my calculations, 30% of our full time faculty are now members of the Faculty Council. Because of this new-found strength we are probably going to be pushing some of our own agendas. [laughter]

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Next, from the School of Public and Environmental Affairs, Associate Dean John Hunger.

**DEAN HUNGER:** Once again my unit representative is not here. For the second year in a row that he has given a paper to the Criminal Justice Society which happens to be at the same time. Our unit representative is Bob Mendelsohn. Bob joined the school in 1973 after a Ph.D. program at Michigan State in Political

Science. Bob is a member of our Public Administration and criminal justice faculty. I was asked some unique things for extracurricular activities. Bob is, believe it or not, president of the Indiana Consumer Alliance for Insurance Reform. The second one that I found looking at his annual report is that he was the winner last year of the Hoosier Freedom Award by the Indiana Trial Learners Association.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** From the University Libraries, we have Barbara Fischler.

**MRS. FISCHLER:** I am not going to read from any annual reviews; however, we do go through virtually everything that is on that and I see all 20 of them and talk to all of the people.

Our unit representative is **Maudine Williams**. She is the Head Librarian at the Herron School of Art. She has been here for more years than I think even I. She has escaped by being on only one committee this year and it is an ad hoc committee on smoking. I would add that Maudine is a non-smoker. She told me not to tell this but I am going to anyway. Her extra curricular activity happens to be raising burley tobacco.

Our at-large representative is **Dolores Hoyt**. She is head of Technical Services for the University Libraries. You already heard her talk about one of her jobs a minute ago because she is going to chair this committee that is going to get all those things back to her. She is on the Faculty Affairs Committee. She is also on the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council and on the University Faculty Council's Faculty Affairs Committee. She is also the former Indiana Ladies' Skeet shooter champion.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Next from the Herron School of Art, substituting for Bill Voos, Assistant Dean John Werenko.

**DEAN WERENKO:** Dean Voos has asked me to introduce our faculty representative. It is therefore my pleasure to introduce, not actually a new faculty member at Herron. She has been with us for a while but she is our faculty representative on the Faculty Council. Her name is **Paula Differding**. Before I have her stand I thought I might give a little bit of her background. She graduated from Purdue University with a B.S. degree in 1976. When she recognized the error of her ways, she came to Herron and got a B.F.A. degree. She was a senior graphic designer for the Design Group, which is total communications and planning group in Indianapolis. She joined the Herron faculty in 1985 as Assistant Professor of Visual Communications. She is currently the advisor to the Professional Practice of Studio at the Herron School of Art. She is teaching classes currently in graphic design, typography, and production for graphic design. She also maintains her own free lance graphic design studio in Indianapolis.



**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** From the School of Social Work, Dean Sheldon Siegel.

**DEAN SIEGEL:** Thank you, Jerry. I am pleased to introduce our unit representative who has been our unit representative for a number of years, **Jerry Powers**. Jerry is a full professor in the School of Social Work. If you noticed in this week's Green Sheet, Jerry is identified as celebrating his 10th anniversary with IUPUI. He teaches a number of things, but as a teacher of research he really shines because he has managed to convert innumerable students who are really interested in action to an appreciation of research and to expressing some of their actions in their research activities. Jerry served as acting dean and I am not sure whether that time that he developed his skill or enhanced his skill as a runner. He runs in all of the 5K and 10K races in the state.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Next, for the School of Business we have Associate Dean Tom Lenz.

**DEAN LENZ:** I have the pleasure of introducing a colleague who I hope will stand as I call his name, Professor **Richard Rogers**. "Rich", as we know him in the School of Business, is a certified public accountant who did his Ph.D. work at Penn State University and joined our faculty in 1981 on the Bloomington campus. In one of his many brilliant flashes of insight, he requested a transfer to the Indianapolis campus. Since that time he has served us well. In 1984, 1985, and 1986 he won Teaching Excellence Awards in the MBA Program. Last year he played a pivotal role in a redesign of curriculum which will be implemented in the fall of next year. He serves as our unit representative. He also serves on the Budgetary Affairs Committee.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** We now have Associate Dean Hugh Wolf introducing those from the School of Education.

**DEAN WOLF:** I am pleased to have you meet, in absentia it looks like, our unit representative Dr. **Billy Abel**. Billy is a native Hoosier and he has been a teacher and coach in the schools of the state for a number of years. He also served as principal at Bedford High School, Ben Davis High School, Plainfield, and Attica high schools. Billy is professor of School Administration. He is also associate state director of the North Central Association. In that capacity he is involved in assessing the schools around the midwest region and also has had several opportunities to visit and be part of accreditation teams in military installations in Europe. I am sorry he couldn't be here today but many of you probably have had a chance to meet him on other occasions.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Next is the Purdue School of Engineering and Technology represented by Dean Bruce Renda. While the FCC

has abandoned the fairness doctrine, we are going to allow you to make one disparaging comment about either Indiana University or the Herron School of Art in view of Dean Werenko's comment.

**DEAN RENDA:** Well, I started as a freshman, believe it or not, at Indiana University Bloomington. After one year, I saw the light and went to West Lafayette. [laughter]

I am pleased to introduce to you our representatives. **Richard Beck** is a civil engineer. He has been very active in the Faculty Council affairs and has been elected and re-elected a number of times. He is a professor of civil engineering and technology and has designed a number of buildings.

Professor **David Bostwick** is an Associate Dean in the School of Engineering and Technology. He is a commander in the Navy Reserve and is involved in a great deal of information-gathering activities when he is on duty. In addition to being an at-large representative, he also serves as an IUPUI representative to the University Faculty Council. He is also a member of the UFC Student Affairs Committee and the UFC ROTC Affairs Committee.

**Linda Brothers** is acting chairman of the department of restaurant, hotel and institutional management. She has been very involved with the student affairs and I am very pleased to see her involved with the faculty affairs now.

Professor **Kenneth Dunipace**, Professor of Electrical Engineering, has also been very active in the Faculty Council affairs. He is a member of the Academic Affairs Committee, Fringe Benefits Committee, the Executive Committee, and he is also involved in the Student Professional Society.

**Kent Sharp** is an at-large representative. Kent was the Secretary of the Faculty Council a few years ago. He is a professor of electrical technology and is involved with the Student Affairs Committee.

**Judith Silence** is a professor in the computer technology department. She joined us after a number of industrial experiences and teaching at various other universities. We are very happy to have her with us. She is involved in a number of university and school committee affairs.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** From the Law School is Acting Dean Jeff Grove.

**DEAN GROVE:** Thank you Vice President Bepko. I am happy to introduce two of my colleagues from the Law School. First our unit representative is **Bill Hodes**. This is Bill's second year as our unit representative. He is a graduate of Harvard College and Rutgers Law School. He has practiced law in New Orleans and

worked as assistant corporation counsel for the city of Newark. He came to our faculty after spending a year as a Bigelow Fellow at the University of Chicago Law School. His areas of specialty are civil procedure, constitutional law, and professional ethics. Bill is tenured and fully advanced in rank as professor of law.

Next, I would like to introduce someone who I think is well known to most people in the room because of his service over the years as a member of this body. I speak, of course, of **Henry Karlson**. Henry received his bachelor's degree, his law degree, and his master of law degree from the University of Illinois at Champaign/Urbana. He practiced law for a short time and did a stint in the military service. During that time was assigned to the trial judiciary and worked as a trial judge in courts martial. As you know, he is the parliamentarian of the Faculty Council. He also chairs the Constitution and Bylaws Committee and is a member of the Student Affairs Committee. He is the local radio and television personality at the Law School. Perhaps you have seen him on television.

There is a third colleague whom I suppose I might introduce. Our friend and colleague **Jerry Bepko**. Perhaps because of his special role here, it won't be necessary for me to formally present him.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Thanks Jeff. Next from the School of Liberal Arts, the Acting Dean John Barlow.

**DEAN BARLOW:** Thanks Jerry. We have two unit representatives and four at-large representatives. One of the unit representatives, I found this morning, the identity of this person is somewhat in dispute. Therefore, I won't introduce her or him.

The other unit representative for this semester is **Ed Casebeer**, a full professor of English. His field is renaissance literature but he has also published fiction and poetry. He can often be seen on the stage here in Indianapolis in various theatrical productions.

Going to our at-large representatives, **Bob Kirk** is a professor of economics. His fields are urban economics and public finance. Bob is also very active in the School and in the community. In the school he has served on a number of committees. He also serves on a number of IUPUI committees.

**Paul Nagy** is not here this afternoon. He is a professor of philosophy in American Studies. His field is American Philosophy.

**Susan Sutton** is an Associate Professor of Anthropology. Her field is contemporary Greek culture, particularly rural life, and women's roles and migration. One of the fortunate things about

her field is that it requires that she frequently travel to Greece.

**Dorothy Webb** is professor of communications and theatre. She is a member of the University Faculty Council's University Structure Committee and the IUPUI Nominations Committee. Her field is Children's Theatre particularly, and she is very active in this area. She is responsible for the National Children's Playwriting Competition which occurs every two years.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Next, Dean Marshall Yovits from the School of Science.

**DEAN YOVITS:** I have here a handful of annual reviews. I picked up the wrong folder. [laughter] I am very pleased to introduce our representatives. First, is **Elaine Alton** from the department of Mathematical Sciences. She is particularly interested in mathematical education. She works as a state math consultant in the Indiana Department of Education on getting base data on enrollments in various courses. She also works on a survey of stumbling blocks to success in calculus. She is a representative to the University Faculty Council as well as being on the Honorary Degrees Committee. Among her extracurricular activities she is treasurer of the Board of the Garden Walk Townhouses, she is treasurer of the Pilot Club of Indiana, and the Indianapolis Women's Club. She is an at large representative.

The next person I am happy to introduce is **Ted Cutshall**. He is an at large representative. He is an associate professor of chemistry and well as being an organic chemist. He is a member of the IUPUI Constitution & Bylaws Committee, IUPUI Faculty Affairs Committee and the University Faculty Council's Fringe Benefits Committee.

Next I would like to introduce **Florence Juillerat**. Florence is an associate professor of biology. She is primarily interested in biology of women and biology in ethics. She also has a strong interest in biology education and in education of gifted children. She is an at large representative and on the IUPUI Faculty Council Executive Committee.

Next I want to introduce **Jerry Kaminker**. Jerry unfortunately teaches at this hour and can't be present. He is a unit representative. He is a professor of mathematics who is interested in operator algebra. I asked him to let me know what his interesting hobbies are and he said none of his hobbies are interesting.

Filling in for Jerry today is **Neal Rothman**. He is a professor of mathematics. He has been chairman of the department of mathematical sciences. He is presently the secretary of the IUPUI Faculty Council's Budgetary Affairs Committee and has recently been appointed to the Commission for Higher Education's Task

Force on Mathematics. His hobbies include gardening and computer training for non-profit tax-deductible organizations.

Next is **Jerry Kaplan** who is an at-large representative. Jerry is a professor of physics and among other things is very much interested in nuclear weapons control and is an expert on Star

**Bernie Morrel**, associate professor of mathematics, is a unit representative. He is on the IUPUI Faculty Council's Library Affairs Committee. He is interested in operator algebra.

Next is **Dick Pflanzner**. Dick is an at large representative. He is an associate professor of biology and is interested in physiology and anatomy. He is on the IUPUI Tenure Committee.

Finally, I would like to introduce **Bart Ng** who is a unit representative. Bart is a professor of mathematical sciences. He is an applied mathematician. He is also chairman of the department of mathematical sciences. I asked him to give me some information with which I could introduce him and he told me to say that he was a nice guy. So, Bart is a nice guy. That does not imply that our other representatives are not nice guys.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Next we have the Dean of the School of Nursing **Betty Grossman**.

**DEAN GROSSMAN:** We have three unit representatives and three at large. I would like to introduce first **Margaret Applegate**. She has been a representative on this Council before but now as an at large representative. She is the associate dean of the Associate Science of Nursing Program. She is actively involved in nursing at the national level with the National League for Nursing where she is on the Board as a director and has been elected second vice president. She also has been appointed to their executive committee. She is chairman of the long range planning committee and is a member of the National Commission for Nursing Implementation Projects. She is a member of the Education Work Group's steering committee. She loves gardening and antiques, picking up antiques at the auctions.

The next person I would like to introduce is **Anne Belcher**. Ann is assistant professor, teaching community health in our baccalaureate program. She is in her second year as a unit representative. Her research interest areas are sexual exploitation of children. She is a member of the IUPUI Task Force on Child Abuse.

**Dr. Juanita Keck**, assistant professor of nursing from the Nursing of Adults with Biodissonance in the Graduate Program, is an at large representative. She also is an IUPUI representative to the University Faculty Council. Her nursing practice and research interest areas include the development of non-invasive, non-

pharmaceutical interventions for nursing practice and the use of the health belief model to predict health behavior. Her professional activities include convener of pain research interest group of the Midwest Nursing Research Society; Director of the Friendly Visitors Program for the local chapter of the Multiple Sclerosis Society; Research and Statistics Consultant, presenter of workshops and lectures regarding the experience of acute pain. She didn't tell me this but I think her interest is gardening and this is the second year she didn't raise acres of strawberries.

**Dr. Rebecca Markel**, associate professor, department of pediatrics, family of women's health nursing in the Graduate Program. Active in University governance given leadership to many committees not only on this campus but in the large university community. She is an at large representative and a member of the Executive Committee and a member of the IUPUI Faculty Council's Metropolitan Affairs Committee. She is actively involved in the building campaign of Sigma Theta Tau, which is the honorary society of nursing. She also is a member of its international eligibility committee. She also is a recipient of the Glenn W. Irwin Recognition of Excellence Award and the Maynard K. Hine Leadership Medal. She didn't put anything down that she is interested in, but I know she is a sports enthusiast. If you go to any games, especially basketball, you will find Becky there.

**Jeanne Pontious** is an associate professor and is coordinator of professional role and coordinator for the Bloomington campus of the baccalaureate program. She is the unit representative of the school. She moved into downtown to enjoy the city and is a member of the Neighborhood Association for Directors, having become interested in city government and citizens responsibilities for city government. She keeps busy trying to hear all the symphony concerts and attend all of the plays in the theatres downtown.

**Beverly Ross**, unit representative, is an associate professor in the baccalaureate program and teaches management. She is a member of the IUPUI Student Affairs Committee and involved in work with the North American Nursing Diagnosis Association and the Mid-American Regional Nursing Diagnosis Association and also Sigma Theta Tau Council.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Next from the School of Dentistry is the person who we hope will be the next president of the American Dental Association, Bill Gilmore. To explain that comment, a group of alumni of the School of Dentistry and dentists around the country have drafted Bill to run for the office of president of the American Dental Association. He has agreed to go along with them and is the odds on favorite to win.

**DEAN GILMORE:** Thank you Mr. Chairman. They haven't counted the

votes yet. The School of Dentistry is pleased to have six representatives on the Council. First is **Carl Andres** who is an associate professor. He is new this year in prosthodontics.

**Cecil Brown** is an associate professor in endodontics. We have one putting the teeth back in the mouth and one working on the inside of the tooth.

**Varoujan Chalian** is a member of the Executive Committee, the Metropolitan Affairs Committee, and the Faculty Affairs Committee. He has been on the Council for quite some time.

**Dr. Rose Marie Jones** from prosthodontics is a member of the Council.

**Dr. Glen Sagraves.** Dr. Sagraves is a former Secretary of the Council and is on the Nominations Committee. He is professor of oral diagnosis and completed our project with Academic Computing to make it possible to track our patients and our business in the clinic. He has been a very active faculty person.

Last because of the way she spells her name is **Susan Zunt**. She is very active on all of the committees because she serves as our Secretary. We are very proud of her dedication and activities in all the committees that you placed her on. During exam week, I think, the chair of her department is going to place her under house arrest so she doesn't have to go to all of those meetings except we can't afford attorney fees.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Last, largest, but not least is the School of Medicine. Professor Eugene Helveston is going to pinch hit for Walter Daly and introduce the members from Medicine.

**PROFESSOR HELVESTON:** I think this is what you get for putting the order in this way. Perhaps next year when the School of Medicine is first we will have Dean Daly. The other side of the coin is that we will now have the other half of the room introduced.

I will try to be brief and I will say generically that all 36 members who are representatives to the Faculty Council have interesting hobbies, are nice guys, and make enormous contributions or they (1) wouldn't be on the faculty, and (2) wouldn't be elected to this body.

**Sharon P. Andreoli** is assistant professor in pediatrics. **Morris Aprison**, distinguished professor of neurobiology and biochemistry who serves on the University Faculty Council's Affirmative Action Committee. **John Baenziger** is assistant professor of pathology. **Henry R. Besch, Jr.** is just about everything -- was, is now, or will be. **Mervyn Cohen**, professor of radiology, IUPUI Fringe Benefits Committee. **Robert Colyer**, associate professor or

orthopaedic surgery. **Dewey J. Conces**, assistant professor of radiology. **William N. Crabtree**, assistant professor of Cytotechnology, Division of Allied Health Sciences. **Joseph A. DiMicco**, associate professor of pharmacology and toxicology, IUPUI representative to University Faculty Council, University Faculty Council's Affirmative Action Committee, University Faculty Council's University Structure Committee, and has the second longest introduction after Henry Besch. **Robert S. Dittus**, assistant professor of medicine. **James Edmondson**, professor of medicine and past president of the faculty. **John N. Eble**, associate professor of pathology. **Mark Farber**, associate professor of medicine. **Mary Feeley**, professor and associate of medical technology program, Division of Allied Health Sciences. She is represented by an alternate Donna Marzouk from physical therapy. Professor Feeley is doing what I should be doing and that is serving on the Promotion and Tenure Committee for the School of Medicine which is doing a very good job, by the way. **Bhuwan P. Garg**, associate professor of neurology. **Donald J. Gartner**, associate professor of medical technology, Division of Allied Health Sciences. **Gary A. Gruver**, assistant professor of respiratory therapy and Director of the Respiratory Therapy Degree Program, Division of Allied Health Sciences. **Celestine Hamant**, associate professor and director of Occupational Therapy Educational Program, Division of Allied Health Sciences, and director of occupational therapy at IU Hospitals. **Robert A. Harris**, associate chairman, professor of biochemistry. **Emily M. Hernandez**, assistant professor and director of radiological sciences, Division of Allied Health Sciences, IUPUI Faculty Board of Review. **Linda M. Kasper**, associate professor of medical technology, Division of Allied Health Sciences. She is a member of the IUPUI Fringe Benefits Committee and the University Faculty Council Fringe Benefits Committee. She is represented here today by alternate Joe Koss. **Judith E. Kosegi**, assistant professor of radiologic sciences, Division of Allied Health Sciences. She is on the IUPUI Student Affairs Committee. **John C. Lappas**, associate professor of radiology. **James A. McAteer**, associate professor of anatomy, IUPUI Student Affairs Committee (chairman), University Faculty Council Student Affairs Committee. **Dana M. McDonald**, head librarian, School of Medicine Library, IUPUI Budgetary Affairs Committee. **Judy Z. Miller**, associate professor of medicine in Medical Genetics. **Catherine Palmer**, assistant dean for graduate studies and professor of medical genetics. **Douglas K. Rex**, assistant professor of medicine. **Kenneth W. Ryder**, associate professor, pathology, IUPUI Fringe Benefits Committee. **Aristotle N. Siakotos**, professor of pathology. **Craig M. Stoops**, assistant professor of anesthesia. **Vernon A. Vix**, professor of radiology in medicine. **Kathleen A. Warfel**, associate professor of pathology. **Henry Wellman**, who was recognized earlier for working toward the establishment of a faculty facility. Finally, **Karen W. West**, assistant professor of surgery.



**DEAN BARLOW:** Mr. Chairman, one member of the Faculty Council who has not been introduced and that is Bill Plater of the School of Liberal Arts.

**PROFESSOR BESCH:** Mr. Chairman, the introducer for the School of Medicine is the president of our faculty governance body and it is by virtue of that that he was selected to be the spokesperson today.

**AGENDA ITEM VIII**

**Alumni Association - Charles M. Coffey**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** We have just one other item of business and we are running a little over time. Let me get to it quickly. We are the guest today of the Alumni Association and the Director of the Indianapolis office of the IU Alumni Association is here. I think you all know Chuck Coffey. Chuck, I would like to thank you for being our host and providing this reception which we are going to have following this meeting. I would like to introduce Chuck Coffey.

**MR. COFFEY:** Thank you very much. It is a pleasure to be with you. I had only a 45 minute report. [laughter] I do want to tell you how much we appreciate the support we have received from so many of you over the years in our Alumni program. The faculty are surely the heart of the University and in many ways they are the heart of the Alumni program as well because it is you, the ladies and gentlemen of the faculty, that our alumni come back to see every year. Those of us who are on the staff are always asked questions about how you are and are you as tough as you once were. My report is simply this - 66, 44, 26. We have 66,000 IUPUI alumni; 44,000 live in the state of Indiana; and 26,000 are still in the Indianapolis metropolitan area.

That is enough of a report for this afternoon, isn't it? Couldn't we adjourn to the reception? On behalf of the Indiana University Alumni and the Purdue Alumni Association, I have only one request. We have one bar and one hors d'oeuvres table. If half of you would go to the bar and the other half to the hors d'oeuvres table, it will make things go a lot easier.

**AGENDA ITEM IX**

**Adjournment**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** We are adjourned.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY  
AT  
INDIANAPOLIS

**FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING**  
**Thursday, November 5, 1987**  
**Law School, Room 116**  
**3:30 - 5:30**

**Members Present:** Administration: Gerald L. Bepko, Carol D. Nathan, William M. Plater. Deans: John Barlow, Jeffrey Grove, Nicholas Kellum, R. Bruce Renda, Sheldon Siegel, William J. Voos, Marshall Yovits. Faculty: Billy Abel, Carl Andres, Morris Aprison, Anne Belcher, H. R. Besch, Jr., Willard Bostwick, Linda Brothers, Edwin Casebeer, Varoujan Chalian, Dewey Conces, Jr., Theodore Cutshall, Joseph DiMicco, Elizabeth Evenbeck, Mary Feeley, Donald Gartner, Emily Hernandez, William Hodes, Florence Juillerat, Jerome Kaplan, Juanita Keck, Robert Kirk, Judith Kosegi, Rebecca Markel, James McAteer, Dana McDonald, Robert Mendelsohn, Judy Miller, Paul Nagy, Richard Pflanzner, Gerald Powers, Richard L. Rogers, Glen Sagraves, P Kent Sharp, A N Siakotos, Judith Silence, Craig M. Stoops, Jeffery Vessely, Vernon Vix, Kathleen Warfel, Dorothy Webb, Susan L. Zunt.

**Ex-Officio Member Present:** Richard Schilling.

**Ex-Officio Member Absent:** Shirley Newhouse

**Alternates Present:** Deans: John Hunger for Charles Bonser; Fred Ficklin for Walter J. Daly; James Baldwin for Barbara Fischler; Hugh Wolf for Howard Mehlinger; Scott Evenbeck for James Weigand; Tom Lenz for Jack Wentworth. Faculty: Edgar Fleenor for Richard Beck; Linda Marler for William Crabtree; Phyllis Scherle for Dolores Hoyt; Joe Koss for Linda Kasper; Hee-Myung Park for Henry Wellman; Randi L. Stocker for Maudine Williams.

**Members Absent:** Administration: Howard G. Schaller. Deans: Trevor Brown, H. William Gilmore, Elizabeth Grossman. Faculty: Elaine Alton, Sharon Andreoli, Margaret Applegate, John Baenziger, Cecil Brown, Mervyn Cohen, Robert Colyer, Paula Differding, Robert Dittus, Kenneth Dunipace, John Eble, James Edmondson, Mark Farber, Margaret Felton, B P Garg, Gary Gruver, Celestine Hamant, Robert A Harris, Eugene Helveston, Louis Holtzclaw, Rose Marie Jones, Jerome Kaminker, Henry Karlson, John Lappas, Bernard Morrel, Bartholomew Ng, Catherine Palmer, Jeanne Pontious, D K Rex, Beverly Ross, Kenneth Ryder, Susan Sutton, Karen West.

**Visitors:** Stuart Cohen, Professor, Department of Medicine; Hitwant Sidhu, School of Physical Education; Kathryn Wilson, Chair, Academic Affairs Committee.

**AGENDA ITEM I**

**Memorial Resolution - Professor John Ryan, School of Engineering & Technology - (Read by Professor Kent Sharp)**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** The first order of business on the agenda is the memorial resolution for Professor John Ryan to be read by Professor Sharp from Engineering & Technology.

(Professor Sharp read the memorial resolution and a moment of silence was observed).

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Without objection a copy of that resolution will be sent to the persons designated in the resolution.

**AGENDA ITEM II**

**Approval of Minutes - September 3, 1987 and October 1, 1987**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** The next agenda item is the approval of minutes for the last two meetings of the Faculty Council - the September 3rd and October 1st meetings. We can take them separately or together if you would like, but we do need a motion.

**PROFESSOR MARKEL:** I would move the approval of the minutes of both dates, September 3rd and October 1st as circulated. (This was seconded).

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor, say "Aye". Are there any opposed? The minutes are approved.

**NOTE:** A correction to the September 3, 1987 minutes was that Richard Rogers had been listed as both being present and absent. He was present. (This was telephoned to the Council Office prior to the November 5 meeting.)

**AGENDA ITEM III**

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

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** I have a couple of items of business. First, as many of you already know but some of you may not, we have been saddened to learn that our Affirmative Action Officer for this campus, Lincoln Lewis, will be leaving Indiana University around the first of the year. He is going to become the Affirmative Action Officer and Special Assistant to the President of the University of Virginia. For those who may not know, the President of the University of Virginia is a former IU colleague Bob O'Neil. Lincoln will be departing sometime before the first of the year to travel to Charleston to take this new appointment. There will be

some occasions when we will have an opportunity to congratulate Lincoln and wish him well. You will hear more about those later.

Secondly, we have talked many times in the Council about the Campus Development Plan. We have received many excellent suggestions and some comments correcting inaccuracies in the draft of the plan that has been circulated widely. We are very grateful for those and hope that those comments continue. We hope that people continue to talk about the draft and that we continue to get additional insights and commentary on it so that we can continue to make it a better and better statement about the aspirations of the campus.

A very abbreviated form of the Campus Development Plan has been incorporated in a packet of campus development plans for the entire IU system. This is something that has been done regularly over the years. They are called Ten-Year Campus Services Plans which will be presented at the Commission for Higher Education meeting scheduled next Thursday and Friday. If you are interested, we can get the exact time when our new President Tom Ehrlich will be making a presentation. This is something that in the past has been a rather perfunctory filing of campus plans. You should know that the abridgement, a very short version, will be presented as a part of a packet. That is not to suggest that the process of evolving our unabridged document is nearing conclusion. It is not. We plan to work on this document for some time to come. This is the document that really will reflect our internal planning. If it is different from what we have filed in the abridged version with the Commission, we will revise what has been filed with the Commission.

On the subject of planning, there is a university wide planning effort that is beginning. On the 16th of November a number of people will meet here in Indianapolis to talk about a draft of a planning paper that has been prepared by the President's office in an effort to set out a variety of issues that might be discussed by the academic community. Those issues will be shaped into clusters of issues that we could examine for planning purposes. Papers on these clusters would be prepared and then be circulated widely in the faculty so that the process could lead to a broad-based judgment about the most important of issues for the university to address over the next five years. After this meeting on November 16, I think there are going to be some task forces appointed that will take these issues and work on them and present some further planning papers. All of this will probably result in wide distribution of proposed planning papers sometime in January or February. I think it is something that will be a very useful exercise for the whole faculty of Indiana University -- all eight campuses -- to engage in. Whatever issues are taken up will likely involve all eight campuses. Whatever issues are finally decided to be the most important, from the planning standpoint for

the whole university, will likely fit into the three categories that the President set forth in his first statement to the university community -- the paper entitled "Our University in the States". Those three topics are Academic Distinction, Access, and Economic Development.

Finally, Bill Plater is going to give you an update and report on a proposed guidelines that we are going to be putting into place perhaps in the spring semester, for admission into the undergraduate programs.

**DEAN PLATER:** Thank you, Jerry. This issue has been discussed in the Faculty Council committees during the past couple of years. It has come to a point of implementation, largely because of the Access Center which I think most of you have read about or heard about. We hope to have some plans to announce about the Access Center sometime within the next two or three weeks and more than likely before the next Faculty Council meeting. All of the arrangements and agreements that are needed to implement that Access Center are not completed yet, so we can't make the public announcement. But, on the other hand, we thought that the most important policy issue related to this, the students who will be served by the Access Center, is something that we should bring to your attention and refresh your memory as to how we got to where we are right now.

In August of 1984, Vice President Irwin appointed a task force to review the undergraduate admission policies of this campus. This was a committee made up of faculty, administrators from this campus, admission officers from Indiana University, Purdue University, and community representatives. This group worked for a few months early in that fall semester to prepare a general guideline statement, philosophy if you will, of admissions for IUPUI. They circulated this document rather widely throughout the schools, the Faculty Council Executive Committee, and the Academic Affairs Committee. It was revised in December of that year and then again widely circulated throughout the undergraduate schools of IUPUI.

In October of 1985, almost one year later, the Undergraduate Admissions Committee began to look at the general philosophy statement in terms of specific criteria that could be used for determining admission of individual students into the various schools of the campus and into the University Division in particular. As you know, each school has set its own admission for admission to the particular school, but the general standards for admission to the university are set by a Board of Trustees policies, which are then interpreted in the Admissions Office for admission of students into the University Division. This committee developed some criteria then circulated again to the Faculty Affairs Committee, the Executive Committee and to each of the schools for distribution and discussion within the schools.

In the course of that year I think there were a number of discussions that took place resulting in the adoption in May of 1985 of a statement of the criteria that would be used for individual admissions to the undergraduate program at IUPUI. That document then essentially was put on the shelf until an alternative program could be developed to deal with the students who were to be denied admission to IUPUI. That is where the Access Center came into play. There were some preliminary plans under way during the 1986-87 academic year that were complicated because of the potential loss of federal funding for the program known as HELP. Later in the year we learned that, in fact, funding for that program would be withdrawn and it would be up to the University to make its own arrangements.

The HELP program has been continued through the fall semester even though the federal funding has disappeared. We hope then to have in place an alternative program called provisionally the Access Center effective with the spring semester. That will permit us then to implement the admissions plan that was first proposed in May of 1985.

Just to review that very quickly, in terms of the impact we went back and tried to assess what would have happened for the students who were admitted this fall had that admissions plan been in place because, as you know, we use two principal criteria in addition to a pattern of high school course work that is considered college preparatory. We use the high school class rank and SAT scores, particularly if those SAT scores are submitted within two years of high school graduation. After that time, whether the SAT scores are considered is essentially a matter of individual interpretation for the student who submits the credentials. In any case, in applying these criteria, we discovered that roughly 327 students would have been denied admission to IUPUI this fall had the criteria been in place. It is those students, then, that will be served principally by the Access Center. That, I think, is the important point that we want to bring to your attention. For the spring semester there will be students who will be denied admission and who will be referred to the Access Center as an alternative to University matriculation, where we will provide counseling, testing services, and college preparatory courses which hopefully will lead to the students' reapplying for admission and being accepted.

I will be more than happy to answer any questions if I can about either the admissions standards that we hope to implement this spring and the Access Center, though, as I said, the plans for that aren't fully developed yet, but very close.

**PROFESSOR NAGY:** I have three questions. First, how does this Access Center differ from the HELP program? Secondly, what is the status of the Guided Study Program? Thirdly, have we looked at

the impact that this change in the admissions policy will have on minorities?

**DEAN PLATER:** The difference between the Access Center and the HELP program will be that, first of all, we hope it will be a cooperative venture with the Indianapolis Public Schools, though that is yet to be determined. The public school district has to agree to that formally. Under the arrangement that we hope to work out, the University would provide basically the counseling and testing services, and IPS would provide a range of courses designed for college preparation -- some drawn from their existing inventories, some that would be specially developed. If this goes as we hope during the spring semester, then writing, mathematics, and reading courses would be developed to articulate with what IPS would offer and what we expect to offer at the freshman level for undergraduate students. The other difference would be that this would be done without federal funding at the moment, though we hope to join with IPS and seek either state or federal funds to support the program.

The Guided Studies Program will not be affected by these plans certainly not for the spring semester, though it is the intention of the Committee on Academic Policies Procedures to look at the impact of the new admissions criteria on the students who would be admitted to Guided Studies. In any case, the intent is to continue providing those services that we are now providing to the Guided Studies students. None of the students who are admitted, by the way, for the fall semester would have their admissions status affected in any way by the changes that we are planning to make for the spring semester.

The impact on minority students is something that we have been looking at. We don't have complete data on it, but it appears as though there will not be any disproportionate impact on minority students. Roughly, if I remember the figures correctly, 11 percent of the students who would be affected in that 327 figure that I gave would be minority students, which is very close to the percentage of minority students who are in that freshman pool.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Are there any other comments?

**DEAN PLATER:** (In response to a question on publishing minimum standards on admission) It had not been our intention of doing that, in part because of the difference between where the student might score and the SAT and rank in the high school class standings. There is considerable leeway in which it could go. A higher class standing would permit a lower SAT score and vice versa. The minimum that is in place is something that, I would be happy to tell you now. It is very clear how those students are affected. Any student who has an SAT score of 600 or below is denied admission regardless of any other high school class standing or a student who is lower than the 20th percentile or has

a GED below 45 is denied admission regardless of the SAT score. At the other end, the students who are clearly admitted is also well known. Any student who has both a high school class rank of 50 or higher or a GED of 52 and a SAT above 750 is clearly admitted. That accounts for roughly a third of all the students who were admitted this past fall. The remaining students fall into a category where it is very difficult to tell exactly how many would be admitted regularly and how many would be admitted on probation without looking at their individual cases because of the combination of SAT and high school class rank and the college preparation college courses. Roughly a third of those would be on probation, however. Two-thirds of that undetermined category we would have to look at. We don't at the moment have any way of doing that by computer.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Are there any other comments or questions?

**DEAN PLATER:** Although I think at the next Faculty Council meeting we would be very happy to talk about the Access Center in more detail. It is likely that it will be announced publicly in some way before the next Council meeting because of the importance of notifying the students who are going to be referred to the Access Center of what services will be available, where they will be located, etc.

**PROFESSOR NAGY:** I have just one more question about the location of this new Access Center within the administrative structure. Where will it be located?

**DEAN PLATER:** At least initially there will be an advisory committee made up of representatives of the departments that are providing the principal articulation services; that is, the English department, the mathematics department, the School of Education, the Financial Aids Office, testing center, and IPS. We also will invite, at least in an advisory capacity, some of the other agencies in town that have an interest in this type of program to join with us in discussions. It will report administratively through the Division of Continuing Studies, but the advisory committee will be chaired by Carol Nathan, the Associate Dean of Faculties, to maintain a tie with the central offices.

**PROFESSOR NAGY:** The HELP program was located in the University Division. Is there any particular reason why this new program is taken out of the University Division and put into the Division of Continuing Studies?

**DEAN PLATER:** The main reason is that this will not be a university program per se. It is a pre-admission program. The University Division has as its primary, its sole responsibility academic advising for uncommitted students. The HELP program should not have been in University Division to begin with. That simply is being done with this new program.



**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** If the program goes forward as we envision it, the students will not be students of Indiana University. They will be part of the Access Center but they will not be formally students of Indiana University.

**PROFESSOR KIRK:** What does that imply about budgeting?

**DEAN PLATER:** In the worst possible case, had this all been in place this fall, there might have been 300 students who would have been denied admission and referred to the Access Center. The budgetary implications of that are not immediately apparent. Most of those students are not enrolled in University tuition fee courses. Most of them would have been enrolled in the HELP program. In that sense, the immediate impact would not be there. How many of those students will then reapply and will come back into the admissions pool is yet to be known. We hope it will be very high. More importantly, we hope that additional, well prepared students will apply for admission to the University and be accepted. There is, at the moment, a development plan for admissions being devised through the Admissions Office, to try to make certain that we don't suffer an overall decline in student enrollments by implementing these new standards criteria.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** It is a very important question and one that we are studying very carefully. We are very concerned about it because it could cost us a considerable amount of budget funds; not only through tuition, but through the formula through which we obtain funding from the state. However, we are, as Bill said, mildly optimistic that other programs will generate additional enrollment of better qualified students so that we will come out, I hope, even.

**DEAN PLATER:** It is very difficult to track students in terms of our retention rate of the poorly prepared who have been admitted in the past. The best evidence that we can find is that there is not a very high retention rate among these students who may be here for a semester or a year. By replacing some of those students with even a smaller number of students who will be retained throughout the baccalaureate degree will in fact increase both the revenue and I think help us accomplish our primary mission much more directly.

**PROFESSOR WILSON:** Is there any possibility that would become systemwide or statewide on the IUPUI campus?

**DEAN PLATER:** Do you mean the Access Center? It solely is an IUPUI program at the moment, though, that we hope that the Indiana Commission for Higher Education and the Department of Education will be interested in this program and might see it as a model that could be replicated in other sites in the state. We hope the representatives from those two organizations will participate on

the advisory committee, just to become fully informed about what the program is attempting to do and how well it is operating during this trial period.

**PROFESSOR WILSON:** But the idea would be to replicate and not to make IUPUI a remedial center which was considered at one point.

**DEAN PLATER:** That is correct. I don't know that there has ever been any discussion making IUPUI a remedial center. That is not part of this plan in any case. Something I did not mention in the discussions is that this Council considered last spring new admissions policies for Indiana University as a whole. These were approved by the Board of Trustees at the August meeting. Those admission criteria standards will not go into effect until 1991. That is not what we are talking about here.

**PROFESSOR BALDWIN:** Will non-students be charged tuition?

**DEAN PLATER:** They will not be charged University tuition. The services that are being provided by the University, testing and counseling services, at least initially will be provided without charge. How long that can be maintained will depend upon the demand and whether or not we are successful in obtaining external funding for it. Students will be charged for the courses that they take through IPS, if indeed we are able to secure an agreement based on a subsidized rate. Students who do not have a high school diploma will be charged \$4 per course. Those who have a high school diploma will be charged at a rate of \$24 a course, at least under their current plans which of course is considerably less than what students would pay for a University course based on our current fees. That funding formula is being reviewed. It is a statewide subsidy and hopefully it could be provided at an even lower cost to students. Incidentally, if we go into a cooperative arrangement with IPS, this will be open to all students in the region that we serve. It is not limited to students who reside in the IPS school district. IPS, in fact, operates on behalf of the state to provide this service and that is why we are hoping to work out an agreement with them.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** This has been the subject of a long process of committee review, discussion, recommendations, and reports. As we approach the implementation stage, we thought it was important to raise the issue and these reports and remind people that it is almost time for us to begin this process and to begin denying students admission.

**PROFESSOR BESCH:** Because of the considerable discussion in the Budgetary Affairs Committee, we requested a development plan. I would like to raise the question of not how the program will pay for itself in the long run, but how we in fact are paying for it in the short run.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** We are not 100 percent sure at this point how we are going to pay for it. The only thing we know is that the only commitment that is going to be made will be for the remainder of the academic year this year. It will be a limited commitment because the program won't be completely established. We are going to be just starting it up. How we will be handling it next year is a question that we have not even addressed. We hope that we can obtain some support from outside of the University. If we don't obtain that support then, at this point, I couldn't answer the question about permanent funding. We do know that the discontinuance of funding for the HELP program has left us in a difficult situation. We have to have something to substitute for the HELP program. We have been talking about the HELP program and how we can make it better. Now that it has been discontinued, we think we ought to launch a program that is better designed to help address all of the problems of underpreparedness that come within our jurisdiction. We think this Access Center is a very significant step forward.

**UNKNOWN:** Could you tell us how useful and effective the HELP Center was?

**DEAN PLATER:** The most useful measure would be to look at the number of students who entered through the HELP program and then graduated or obtained degrees. In that measure it was not very successful at all. But, undoubtedly, a very large number of the students who participated in HELP through the courses they took, even if they did not complete a baccalaureate degree, improved their writing skills, their mathematical skills, and their prospects for employment. We have no information, no data, on those students. It is speculative. The reports that the counselors and the advisors who participated in the program during the nine years of its existence think it has been a very valuable program and very useful program in terms of what it did for the individual students but in terms of statistical measures, there aren't very good measures.

I should comment that many of the study opportunities the students took through the HELP program were not University courses. They were not credit-bearing courses and were not involved in the customary tracking system. So, it is very difficult to tell.

#### **AGENDA ITEM IV**

**Executive Committee Report - Susan L. Zunt, Secretary**

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

**PROFESSOR ZUNT:** As you know we held a special meeting of all faculty and Faculty Council members on October 15 in the Conference Center. This was supported by the Vice President's Office. Dean William Plater, Dean Carol Nathan, and Vice President Ringel from Purdue were present to answer questions about

IUPUI's development plan. We had most of our standing committee chairs and other faculty members report at that meeting. We used the full two hours. We still have a few other standing committees that remain to report. Budgetary Affairs submitted a written report today. It may be best to duplicate that with the minutes of the meeting for you to read. Faculty Affairs plans on making a report at our December Faculty Council meeting. Academic Affairs Committee has not committed as to when they will report on the development plan. The Staff Relations Committee has met and will be submitting a memo. I will duplicate that also and include it the minutes of today's meeting so you can see what those comments were. We appreciate the support that we had and the attendance that we had by faculty in general and Faculty Council members on very short notice. There was a lively discussion and a number of topics were covered, as you know.

We are circulating a sign up sheet this afternoon. The sign up sheet is an informal method to find out if any of our IUPUI Faculty Council members would be interested in working on a committee to develop transportation or to evaluate the possibility of transportation -- van transportation or bus transportation -- between the two components of the core campus, Bloomington and IUPUI. President Ehrlich feels very strongly that we should have some kind of transportation between these two campuses. At one time we did and if faculty members are interested in serving in this way, I will submit their names to the Vice President who is already working on this project. That is a University Faculty Council (UFC) concern, but I thought it would be appropriate to give you an opportunity to participate if you are interested.

The Faculty Council Office has been receiving nominees' names from all units, and we appreciate them, from not only faculty leaders, but deans and directors, to help us develop slates for the Faculty Boards of Review and the Tenure Committee.

President Richard Schilling of the IUPUI Student Assembly has submitted one student's name for the Student Affairs Committee. We are still hoping to receive the additional three nominations as soon as possible so that the Student Affairs Committee can work fully with student participation.

On Faculty Board of Review issues, it was necessary for two members to disqualify themselves from the Faculty Board of Review chaired by Jean Gnat. The Executive Committee held a special election. Vania Goodwin and Hitwant Sidhu were elected to replace these two members who disqualified themselves. According to our Bylaws these two individuals will serve only on this case. If there are additional cases that come before this Board of Review, it will revert to the membership as elected by the Council.

The Executive Committee had been asked for nominees to serve on the IUPUI Recognition Awards Committee. Those nominees were

reflected in the committee as received from the Vice President's Office. Charles Palenik and Debbie McGuire are co-chairs of this committee. Mary Stanley, Monroe Little, Gary Drummond, Irving Levy, Patricia Vannoy, Michael Cohen, Mary Kimball, and Etta Lenoir are the members of that IUPUI Recognition Awards Committee.

The Executive Committee has approved the development of a new agenda item for our IUPUI Faculty Council meeting. This would be a question/answer period where any faculty member and Council member could submit a written or oral question to the Vice President. The Vice President would respond to that question as soon as possible. If the Vice President receives the written comment or question prior to the meeting, he may be able to answer that at the subsequent meeting. If it is an oral question that comes up during the meeting, we may need to postpone that.

Would you like to comment about this?

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** We thought it would be a good idea to have a certain portion of the Faculty Council meeting designated for questions from the faculty. We would be happy to try to answer any question you may have. One way of doing that is to give us questions in advance and we would be sure we would be able to give a complete answer at the Faculty Council meeting. The other way would be to raise questions from the floor, in which case we will do our very best to answer them right there at that time. But, we might, in some cases, have to say that we can't provide a complete answer and we would have to respond later, maybe at the next Faculty Council meeting or, if it wasn't a question of general interest, by communicating directly with the faculty member who raised it. The whole purpose is to provide more of an opportunity to hear from you, to hear what your questions are, and to be able to provide information that you may be interested in having about a whole range of matters affecting faculty.

**PROFESSOR ZUNT:** Any faculty member is welcome to submit those questions directly to the Vice President's Office or if you would like you can send them to the Executive Committee and we would be happy to forward those to the Vice President's Office. If they are written, they will be a little bit easier to keep track of. There will be a mandatory observed time limit on this agenda item of 10 minutes.

The Executive Committee will be placing on the agenda for the December meeting a short discussion of our calendar. As you know, our current academic calendar, the one that we are experiencing for the first time this year, will observe a week's break at Thanksgiving. The Executive Committee thinks it will be appropriate at our December meeting to evaluate that and be able to have an opinion to send to our Academic Affairs Committee for the calendars they develop for two years from now. This Council has approved this calendar with a week's break at Thanksgiving for the

next two years. We may want to re-evaluate that while going through it this first time. You will see that as an agenda item on the December agenda.

I think that completes the Executive Committee Report unless there are questions.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Are there any questions? If not, we will go to our next agenda item.

#### **AGENDA ITEM V**

#### **Determination of N to establish representation on the Council**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** The next item is one of the most exciting events on the calendar which is the determination of N to establish representation on the Council. Susan Zunt will handle this.

**PROFESSOR ZUNT:** You should have before you two papers - one is gray and one is pink - that will be helpful in seeing how we come about developing our apportionment table and arriving at a value of N.

The value of N is directed by our Constitution and Bylaws to be established every two years. We do this by looking at the list of voting faculty on this campus which we get from the Dean of Faculties Office. Additionally, our Council recognizes Research professors so those numbers have to be added in. We, therefore, have a greater number than we get from the Dean of Faculties Office.

The Council will select the apportionment base. The Executive Committee evaluates three possibilities. They look at the value of N which is currently 41; then they look at something smaller; and then something larger.

Two years ago when the value of N was set we hoped to arrive at a Council of 100 people. We were close, we had 102. The Executive Committee is going to try once again to see if we can't arrive at this value of 100. Since our faculty has grown somewhat, to have a Council of 100, we would need to establish a value of  $N = 44$ . You will see on the gray sheet of paper  $N = 44$  we would be electing 40 at large representatives. All of this information as developed by our Nominating Committee chaired by Dr. Sagraves.

On the pink sheet you will see which units have representation of the units with arriving at a value of N, if we would vote to have a value of  $N = 44$ , the only unit that would change in representation would be the School of Medicine. They would lose one representative. They would go from 17 to 16 representatives. All other units' representation would stay the same.

You will note that the School of Liberal Arts will be electing two people because there was a resignation that was not filled by the school so they will elect two people.

I would like to place before you selection of a value of  $N = 44$  for your approval. This Council would use this value for two years and then re-evaluate it and establish a new  $N$  two years from now.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** That is an Executive Committee recommendation that  $N$  be 44. Is there any discussion? Are you ready for the question? All in favor of  $N$  equaling 44, say "Aye". Opposed?

**PROFESSOR ZUNT:** Thank you. Dr. Sagraves and his committee did an excellent job.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** That wasn't as exciting as I thought it might be. Congratulations to the committee.

#### **AGENDA ITEM VI**

**Smoking Policy - Kathleen Warfel, Chairman (Discussion & Action Item)**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Next we have another topic that may be exciting. In general, there are deep feelings on both sides. The smoking policy is something people feel strongly about, ranging from a button which I saw someone wearing that said "Don't Smoke Around Me," over to a sign that I understand has been put up in a colleague's office on the faculty that says "Smoking Required In This Office." That feeling makes this report not only something that is important, but also causes me to congratulate the people who prepared it for the care they have taken. The report will be made by Kathleen Warfel who is the Chair of this committee.

**PROFESSOR WARFEL:** Thank you for your introductory remarks. They were right on target. This was very exciting. The last time IUPUI as a whole did something about a smoking policy was 1980, and that policy consisted essentially of banning smoking in classrooms, period. Because of changes in both the scientific fund of knowledge and the attitudes prevalent in society, the time had come last year to review and update this simple policy. Some of you will recall that, at one of the last IUPUI Faculty Council meetings last spring, there was a call for volunteers interested in the issues and willing to serve on a Smoking Policy Committee.

Dr. Zunt took considerable care in putting together a committee roster that included staff and students as well as faculty and that included both smokers and non-smokers.

The committee worked over the summer and ended up with the proposed policy that you have before you. We began by gathering

information from a number of sources, including the medical literature, the literature on air pollution, the Report of the Surgeon General in The Health Consequences of Involuntary Smoking, 1986 and the Clean Indoor Air Act enacted in the 1987 session of the Indiana General Assembly.

We reviewed other available updated smoking policies and solicited comments and concerns from the faculty, staff, and student body through campus publications and posted advertisements.

Review of the literature showed clearly that involuntary smoking (or passive smoking) is a risk factor for the development of lung cancer. The evidence for increasing health risks of other types was a bit muddier, but the lung cancer facts alone were enough to tilt the balance weighing the rights of non-smokers vs. the rights of smokers for the issues were no longer ones simply of style and personal preference. At the same time, however, in writing the new policy, the importance of individual freedom in America and in the university were always kept in mind, and so an effort was made to demonstrate to the smoking IUPUI personnel and students that they were appreciated members of the family.

Since we completed our work in August, two additional documents concerning smoking policy have been circulated. One was a new policy for the University hospitals and the other a communication from Emily Wren, Associate Director of Administrative Affairs. The coincidence of all these new policies has caused some confusion, but unnecessarily so because all the policies are compatible.

As you see it before you, the Smoking Policy we propose for IUPUI is completely in line with the new Indiana law and also is in line with the policies recently issued for the University hospitals and from Emily Wren.

I would like to turn our attention directly to the policy. Much of the Preface and the Statement of Purpose reiterate the remarks that I have already made. The second paragraph in the Preface, however, should receive closer attention.

In writing the smoking policy for IUPUI other important information about environmental tobacco smoke has been considered. Because of the small size of smoke particles, they diffuse throughout room air rapidly and are not easily eliminated by standard filtering systems. Studies have shown that simple separation of smokers and non-smokers on opposite sides of a room is an inadequate measure.

This, of course, is just the sort of thing that is frequently done but legally it cannot be done any longer. For example, you cannot within a cafeteria say that these tables are for smoking



and the rest of them are for non-smoking. It is clearly an inadequate measure.

Going down further on the page to the actual policy statements, Item #1:

Smoking will be prohibited in auditoriums, libraries, classrooms, conference rooms, communal offices, hallways, stairwells, elevators, restrooms, cafeterias, vending canteen areas, non-smoking lounges, patient care and service areas, laboratories, and all work areas except for private offices.

In other words, item #2:

Smoking will be permitted only in private offices and in properly ventilated designated smoking areas.

Items 3 and 4 are not demanding rules but more by way of suggestions. The first one is that even in private offices, if non-smokers are present, that smoking be curtailed. The fourth item has to do with whether or not environmental tobacco smoke has a harmful effect on computers. After consulting a number of computing experts we could not get a clear opinion on this. So, we simply state here that it is suggested that smoking be curtailed in private offices that contain computers that are University property.

No. 5 is more about the designated areas.

Each building will have one or more designated structurally separate smoking areas. (That is, a separate room, not a corner of a room or a partially partitioned section of a room) The number and size of the smoking areas will be adequate to accommodate comfortably during work-breaks and mealtimes the number of smokers wishing to use them. The smoking areas will be furnished comfortably and attractively and will be well-maintained. These rooms will be well-ventilated, preferably with air exhaust vented to the outside so that smoke particles are not recirculated throughout the entire building.

Item #6 prohibits smoking in the university vehicles when non-smokers are present inside the vehicle.

Item #7 has mainly to do with signage and is taken from the state law but it also includes the fact that safe ashtrays will be provided in smoking areas whereas ashtrays will be prohibited in non-smoking areas and a fire extinguisher will be present in each smoking area.

Finally, #8, receptacles for safely extinguishing and discarding smoking materials will be placed at building entrances.

Enforcement is somewhat of a separate problem. Clearly, the enforcement of this policy will depend on the University community's cooperative nature. There is to be for each building a designated official and it will be that official's job to designate within the building where smoking can happen.

Not very many policies come with a list of references but because of "heat" that we got when we asked people what their comments and concerns were, we wanted to document the sound data we used in making our decisions and that is what those references are for.

Finally included is also a committee recommendation. We did not want to write this into the policy per se but believed it was a very important issue related to smoking. At some of the hospitals, the sale of tobacco products is already banned but at the time we were meeting Wishard Hospital and the VA were still selling tobacco products. We just wanted to make a public statement that we thought that was inappropriate.

I guess at this point I would be happy to try to answer any questions you have about the policy.

**UNKNOWN #3:** If enacted, will this allow for individual buildings to have more stringent smoking rules? A school of department could then have a policy that would in effect say "No Smoking Allowed in This Building."

**PROFESSOR WARFEL:** That is more restricted than the policy that we have outlined. I can't answer that question. I can tell you that in the state law, the state law says that the building official may designate a smoking area. It does not say that you have to have a smoking area. We felt that we wanted to essentially do something for smokers because they were people too. If they wanted to make an individual choice to smoke, we thought that during the next years, before they learned not to smoke, that there ought to be some provision made. I don't know the answer to your question.

**UNKNOWN #3:** I can foresee someone's private office becoming a smoking parlor and inviting a few other people in there and when you open the door, the other people in the hallway or whatever will encounter second-hand smoke.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** I think some units already have a more restrictive policy.

**PROFESSOR WARFEL:** Riley Hospital has a more restrictive policy than this.

**PROFESSOR WILSON:** How does this differ from the state law? All of the buildings on campus, at least most of them, must be state buildings. So why do we need a special policy?

**PROFESSOR WARFEL:** The difference in the state law, in the way that I just mentioned, is that the state law says that you may designate a smoking area. The state law also goes on to indicate that, if you don't follow the law, it is a class A infraction. It gives instructions for removing a person in violation, if that person fails to refrain after being requested to do so. Those are the basic ways they differ.

**PROFESSOR WILSON:** They are state buildings. Why don't we come under that?

**PROFESSOR WARFEL:** Well, of course we do come under it.

**PROFESSOR WILSON:** We can't make a less stringent policy than the state law. It is against the law.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** In other words, this is less stringent.

**PROFESSOR WILSON:** I don't understand the difference.

**PROFESSOR WARFEL:** This in no way is more lenient than the state law.

**DEAN YOVITS:** It is in a sense that the say law says you "may" designate areas. You have said you "will" designate areas.

**PROFESSOR WARFEL:** That is right. The state law gives us the opportunity to designate a smoking area. The Smoking Committee believed that it was in the interest of the University community to do that.

**DEAN YOVITS:** This is a somewhat different focus than the state law. What you have said is that we will designate smoking areas. The question is then that each school must have smoking areas designated.

**PROFESSOR WARFEL:** If you accept our policy as we propose it to you, yes.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** I think there is a question about how soon in some buildings we could create a special smoking area. I suppose we would have to determine what it means to be "comfortably and attractively" maintained. I suppose we would have to say that it would as comfortably and attractively arranged as the remainder of the building. In some places comfort and attractiveness may single out the area in the building.

**PROFESSOR CHALIAN:** Your questions are very good questions. This

committee, if I remember correctly, was nominated before the state law was defined. I don't know what they will do at this time but we are the body to make the decision. Maybe we don't need the policy; the state made the policy for us. We are a state university. But, this committee's job was defined and the charge was made before the state law was enacted.

**DEAN VOOS:** There are some very small buildings on campus. If every building must have a smoking area, that will mean that instructional areas in some buildings will have to be converted to smoking areas because there are no offices or other small spaces in such buildings.

**PROFESSOR WARFEL:** While the committee had fairly wide representation on it, we clearly were not familiar with every individual building.

**PROFESSOR VESSELY:** I think in item #5, I am trying to remember the state law exactly, but I think it is more restrictive in that in some state buildings you can designate part of an area for smoking. This clearly says that it has to be separate, so I think in that way, for example in the lunch rooms, half of the area is smoking and half is not, when there are some lounges in which on one side of it you can smoke and the other side you can't. So, in the concern whether this is more or less stringent, at least in that area I think it is more stringent.

**MS. STOCKER:** I am Randi Stocker for Maudine Williams. This is a minor detail but one that I think will affect librarians. I understand that smoking will be prohibited in auditoriums, libraries, classrooms, etc. Would this wording perhaps ultimately affect librarians who smoke in their private offices which are housed within the libraries? Is there some way that the wording could be changed?

**PROFESSOR WARFEL:** Possibly if we felt that was important, we could reword that.

**MS. STOCKER:** I think they should have the same privilege of smoking in their offices as anybody would.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** I think without redrafting the document we could, prior to voting on the document, stipulate that it should be interpreted that private offices would be available for smoking no matter where the private offices were located, even if they were in a library.

**PROFESSOR WARFEL:** If I can get back to your point. You were correct. The state law does specifically say "If a public building consists of a single room, any part or all of the room or all of the room may be reserved or posted as a non-smoking area. By reversing that means that you can cut off a corner and do that.

This is a period of time in which new information about smoking is coming out very rapidly and I frankly believe that we have had more information than the General Assembly did, because they had done their work months before we did.

**DEAN RENDA:** I am concerned about the wording in Item #5 where it says "structurally separate smoking areas." To engineers, structurally separated means a separate foundation, different walls. I really think "structurally separated" is too strong in its wording.

**PROFESSOR WARFEL:** We were just writing this policy for us folks, I guess.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** This raises a question about how comments like that can be accommodated within the committee's report and whether it would be useful to vote on this policy at the December meeting. It has not been published previously, and it may be that there will be other faculty members who have not had an opportunity to look at this or study it in sufficient depth. It may be better to wait until December to vote. That would give the committee an opportunity to take into account comments about drafting such as the one Bruce Renda just made. It may be better to say "physically separated" rather than "structurally separated" to avoid the suggestion of what "structurally separated" means in terms of the basic structure of the building.

**DEAN HUNGER:** How would this fit into a policy adopted in the School of Business/SPEA building? In our case we have a problem. We wanted to have a room that was separate. The only room that we could find that is separate is a canteen/vending area. We have no other room. We have already gone through and eliminated smoking every place that we could think of. That is the only place that we could find that was structurally separate. It is already operative under the guidelines from Emily Wren.

**PROFESSOR WARFEL:** I think one of the basic points that you are going to have to decide is do we want to allow individual buildings to have a stricter policy than the overall IUPUI policy?

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** This would actually be in conflict with it though, because they are in conflict with item #1. They would like to use a canteen area as their designated smoking area.

**DEAN HUNGER:** The way our building is constructed that is the only space we have that is separate.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Is it the intent of the committee that under no circumstances could a vending area be used as the designated smoking area?

**PROFESSOR WARFEL:** We put vending area, canteen areas in there because it was the experience of the members who were on the

committee that these were usually pretty grim places to begin with, with poor ventilation, and that they turned into smoke-filled awfulness. In most cases it was to everyone's benefit if people didn't smoke there. But, again, there are individual buildings with individual problems.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** That seems to be a problem that we ought to address because the Business and SPEA faculty ought to know if they can designate their vending area. That ought to be resolved before the policy is voted on one way or the other. It may be that the intent here is not to permit you to use your vending area because it would attract people into an area where smoking takes place. On the other hand it may be that that should be allowed because it is the only place in your building that you could designate.

**UNKNOWN #4:** I am still a little confused about the role of this policy. Emily Wren sent guidelines based on state law. Is this document a refinement of those guidelines that were based on state law? Do they stand parallel to them? Separate from them?

**PROFESSOR WARFEL:** In the material that Emily Wren circulated she does indicate "in the future additional areas may be precluded from designation which permit smoking subject to the pending recommendations of Faculty Council."

**UNKNOWN #4:** So this is revised ...

**PROFESSOR WARFEL:** I think whatever we decide will have to be implemented by the administrative...

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** The Faculty Council trumps the Administrative Affairs Office.

**PROFESSOR KECK:** Is there a reason for the wording in Item #5... "Each building will have" rather than "Each building may have?"

**PROFESSOR WARFEL:** We did that intentionally because we were probably reacting to the extremes on a notion that were coming out and what we were trying to do is to find a middle ground where it was not a world that belonged to the non-smoker. We had people suggesting that anybody who smokes should not be hired at IUPUI. We were trying to say, "Just because you smoke doesn't mean that we don't love you anymore. We value your contributions and we want to accommodate you."

**PROFESSOR KECK:** If one can smoke in one's private office, what would the rationale have been for requiring smoking areas, especially if you are in a building in which there are no smoking areas?

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Some people don't have private offices.

**PROFESSOR WARFEL:** Because the students, laboratory technical people, and the custodians do not have private offices. There are lots of people who don't have their own private office.

**PROFESSOR KECK:** I would hope that this body would support non smoking in canteens because the policy was to provide places for non-smokers not to have to breathe something else in canteens.

**PROFESSOR WARFEL:** We put cafeterias and canteens on the list because that is where people go for lunch. If it is smokey there, there is no place to go.

**PROFESSOR KECK:** That is exactly why I hope that we would support it.

**PROFESSOR HODES:** One clarification where I think we agree, if classrooms are all now automatically non-smoking areas, does that mean that it is no longer permissible to have designated smoking classrooms during exams? Must the students go to the otherwise designated area to take their exam without smoking?

**PROFESSOR WARFEL:** I am not familiar with the concept of smoking exam rooms. I don't know.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** I don't think that is addressed in the policy. So, I suppose things not addressed in the policy would be up to the schools.

**PROFESSOR HODES:** This is related to the second point I wanted to raise, which is something that we have already done in the Law School. We have taken a couple of areas and designated them as either smoking or non-smoking depending on the circumstances. We said no smoking would be permitted in our Conference room if it is being used for a meeting. If it is being used for lunch or a non-formal function, then people can smoke there. I wonder if the same thing could be said about classrooms. I am not necessarily advocating it, I am just asking if classrooms, when used for class, are to be non-smoking areas but when they are being used for exams, then at least one of them could be designated as a smoking exam room.

**PROFESSOR WARFEL:** So, what you do is set up a place for people who want to smoke to go in and take the exam, but you don't have other students in there taking the exam who don't want to be there.

**PROFESSOR HODES:** That is right.

**PROFESSOR WARFEL:** I don't see that that is hurting anyone personally.

**JAMES BALDWIN:** I am Jim Baldwin representing Barbara Fischler. I

am new to this background. I am not aware of it. Why wasn't any consideration given to adapting a policy that some of the other institutions have which abolishes smoking in buildings? Two of our major functions here are health and physical fitness and yet allowing smoking, even in designated areas, seems to be in contradiction to that. Was that considered?

**PROFESSOR WARFEL:** Yes. That was suggested by people on one end of the rope. We wanted to preserve as much as possible, I think, people's right to make a decision about whether they wanted to smoke.

**UNKNOWN #4:** According to the state law, smoking is prohibited except in designated smoking areas. That law went into effect on September 1. It seems to me that, if the Council can't decide where the designated smoking areas shall be at this time, then according to the law, no smoking would be permitted.

**PROFESSOR WARFEL:** I think the wheels have been turning. The Administrative Affairs people have been contacting building officials. They have been notified that they are to have the signs posted. I guess there has been foot dragging.

**UNKNOWN #4:** The signs are posted but people ignore them because they do not know what they mean.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** There probably has been some violation of the state law. I am not sure what the question is other than to refer to the enforcement language of this policy which I think, even if not adopted by the Faculty Council, would be good advice in terms of enforcing a smoking law or smoking policy among colleagues. If people are reminded that they shouldn't smoke they should comply with the rules. They should abide by the law once reminded of it.

**PROFESSOR COHEN:** I have a copy of the state law with me and I wanted to make a comment and also want to ask a question. In terms of the state law, it is still vague about what those areas are. I see the IUPUI smoking policy as being somewhat more specific in identifying these areas as to which are for smoking and which are prohibited. That is not included by the state law. What is the purpose of the policy? One might be to more clearly designate those areas which is permitted by state law. My question concerns the definition of the term "private office." If two faculty members share a common office, is that considered a communal office or is that considered a private office?

**PROFESSOR WARFEL:** I think if one is a non-smoker, it is a communal office.

**PROFESSOR COHEN:** To put it another way, are we saying that a private office is always a private office? Are they synonymous?



**PROFESSOR WARFEL:** I guess that was what was in the mind of the committee.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** In keeping with that philosophy, if there were offices with two faculty members in them and it happened that smokers paired up as they might want to, I don't know that the spirit of this policy would prohibit them from smoking in the privacy of that office.

**DEAN VOOS:** You just mentioned the "spirit" of the policy. To me that is the thing that I would like to address. You speak specifically of having a designated smoking area in each building. Perhaps we have a different problem in Herron. We are spread out in five different buildings. We have one student lounge. If we follow this, we will have five smoking rooms and one other lounge. In order to do that we will have to convert instructional areas in the smoking lounges which, it seems to me, is not really following the spirit of what we trying to do. I don't think we are trying to create five smoking lounges for one non-smoking lounge. So I would hope that we could look at individual areas. Of course, we want to provide smoking space. We are not against allowing that, but I think each school may have its own problems to be addressed individually.

**PROFESSOR WARFEL:** Can you suggest some language that would solve this problem?

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** You might say "each school or building."

**PROFESSOR VESSELY:** The second sentence in #5 says something to this effect, as "the number and size of the areas will be adequate to accommodate the number of smokers wishing to use them." In each area or as Vice President Bepko said, each school or building or some conglomeration of terms followed by that notion, that if you have only one smoker in those five buildings, you don't need five areas. The other part of that is, Business/SPEA and Education /Social Work might be interpreted as being one area. I see people walk from one end of that complex to the other to get a coffee pot full of water. It wouldn't be unreasonable that a smoker would walk that same distance to have a smoke.

**DEAN RENDA:** Can we provide each building with a moving smoking van? (laughter)

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Which side of this issue are you on, Bruce?

**PROFESSOR MENDELSON:** What we are after is an enforceable policy. I suggest that we see to it that this gets back and circulated and try to figure out some way that we can deal with it.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** That is a good point. It may be that ultimately, because of all the practical problems associated with

the way that it is drafted now, we may have to say that the University will use its best efforts to provide a smoking area in some reasonable proximity to where all persons work rather than each building or each school. We can't redraft in the Faculty Council meeting. It may be that the suggestion that we hold this until December is the one that we should follow.

**DEAN YOVITS:** First of all, I question the need for fire extinguishers. This is the first time I have seen such a request made. Smoking has been going on for a long time and, by and large, it is not the worst fire hazard that we have. I was wondering if it is really necessary to go any further than the state law. The state law gives us the guidelines and most of us have already reacted to the state law and have designated areas or are looking for areas which may be designated as smoking areas. We have posted the signs indicating what is necessary. So, I would recommend that, unless some of this diversity can somehow be covered, that the policy simply recognize that the state law is out there.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Is there any other discussion?

**PROFESSOR BESCH:** It is clear that smoking is socially unacceptable. It seems from the discussion and your references that it also is clear that passive smoking is hazardous to your health. It is not brought out in this policy but, speaking of canteens, brings to mind that a clear hazard to your health is drinking a saccharin-containing soft drink or a soft drink containing Nutrasweet, etc. I say that to impress upon us again the question of how separate the smoking vs. non-smoking areas are to be, which seems to be part of the difficulty of #5. The question I would raise to you as a pathologist and also as chair of this committee, if I were to drink a can of Tab in a canteen, can you give me any kind of an estimate about how much more shortened my life would have been if I also were someone at the other end of the room

**PROFESSOR WARFEL:** Well, we could answer that better if we made you chairman of the ad hoc committee for Nutrasweet. (laughter) There is, coming out now, some information on how many particles have to be in the air to be bad. I don't think the answer is in on that.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** A person who drinks a can of pop containing Nutrasweet makes the decision to do so. The person who is exposed to smoke from someone else's smoking materials, is not doing it voluntarily.

**PROFESSOR MCATEER:** I have just one question. It states that ashtrays will not be permitted in the areas where smoking is prohibited. I am wondering what the rationale is for that and, when we bust a smoker where does he/she put out the cigarette?

**PROFESSOR WARFEL:** The rationale for that was that if somebody

sees an ashtray available, they are likely to assume that it is alright to smoke.

**PROFESSOR SHARP:** I move to send this back to the committee with instructions to bring it back to the Faculty Council at the appropriate time.

**PROFESSOR ZUNT:** In December?

**PROFESSOR SHARP:** Whenever they want to bring it back. (This was seconded).

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** The motion has been made and seconded to ask the committee to take into account the discussion that has taken place here and report back at a subsequent meeting.

**PROFESSOR KECK:** Based on your statement earlier that perhaps we need a broader consideration of this policy, does that also mean that you plan to send the policy to other faculty besides the Council members?

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** The policy will be sent to any member of the faculty. I am not sure what the question is beyond that.

**PROFESSOR KECK:** I thought it was originally said when you suggested it go back to the committee that one of the problems was that the policy required a much broader range of consideration among more faculty. It seems to me then that the policy would have to be submitted to more faculty.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** I think that we should not reconstitute the committee. Maybe this is beyond my jurisdiction, but my sense of this motion is, not to reconstitute the committee but to allow the committee to take into account comments that have been made today and to solicit additional viewpoints from other faculty members by circulating, to some extent, the draft of the policy. The committee is to take all of those comments into account and try to address them and reword the statement of this policy, to be brought back for a vote at a subsequent meeting. (Call for the question)

Are there any other comments? All in favor, say "Aye". Opposed? (There was one person opposed).

I would like to repeat our collective gratitude to the committee and to its chair because this is a very difficult subject. They have done an outstanding job of addressing the difficult issues and we look forward to a subsequent report.

**AGENDA ITEM VII**  
**Old Business**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Is there any Old Business? [There was no Old Business]

**AGENDA ITEM VIII**  
**New Business**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Is there any New Business?

**PROFESSOR NAGY:** Before we adjourn, Bill Plater mentioned the absence of more complete information about the Access Center. I would like to request that a report be given to the Council. Also, perhaps the Executive Committee consider this as an agenda item in some future meeting. The reason why I make this request is that it seems to me, and again this is in the absence of complete information, that such a policy represents a major departure from what I have always considered to be a very important mission of this campus. I would like to have it verified.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** That is fair. But, just let me comment on your last statement. We don't envision any change in the mission of the campus with respect to this Access Center. We are changing the way, and we hope improving the way, we deal with a particular segment of the public that comes to us for assistance.

**AGENDA ITEM IX**  
**Adjournment**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** If there is no further business, we are adjourned.

# **INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS**

## **FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING**

**Thursday, December 3, 1987**

**Law School, Room 116**

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

**Members Present:** Administration: Gerald Bepko, Carol D. Nathan, William M. Plater.  
Deans: John Barlow, Charles Bonser, Nicholas Kellum, R. Bruce Renda, Sheldon Siegel, William J. Voos. Director: Barbara Fischler. Faculty: Sharon Andreoli, Anne Belcher, H. R. Besch, Jr., Willard Bostwick, Linda Brothers, Varoujan Chalian, William Crabtree, Theodore Cutshall, Joseph DiMicco, James Edmondson, Elizabeth Evenbeck, Mary Feeley, Donald Gartner, Gary Gruver, William Hodes, Dolores Hoyt, Rose Marie Jones, Florence Juillerat, Jerome Kaplan, Henry Karlson, Linda Kasper, Juanita Keck, Robert Kirk, Rebecca Markel, James McAteer, Dana McDonald, Robert Mendelsohn, Judy Miller, Bernard Morrel, Paul Nagy, Bartholomew Ng, Catherine Palmer, Richard Pflanzner, Gerald Powers, Richard L. Rogers, Beverly Ross, Glen Sagraves, P. Kent Sharp, A. N. Siakotos, Judith Silence, Jeffery Vessely, Kathleen Warfel, Dorothy Webb, Karen West, Maudine Williams, Susan L. Zunt.

**Alternates Present:** Deans: James Carter for Walter J. Daly; Patricia Blake for Elizabeth Grossman; Jim Bindley for Jeffrey Grove; Hugh A. Wolf for Howard Mehlinger; Scott Evenbeck for James Weigand; Tom Lenz for Jack Wentworth. Faculty: Patricia Blake for Margaret Applegate; Edgar Fleenor for Richard Beck; Mary McKenzie for Judith Kosegi.

**Visitors Present:** Kathryn Wilson, Academic Affairs Committee Chairman.

**Members Absent:** Administration: Howard G. Schaller. Deans: H. William Gilmore, Marshall Yovits. Faculty: Billy Abel, Elaine Alton, Carl Andres, Morris Aprison, John Baenziger, Cecil Brown, Edwin Casebeer, Mervyn Cohen, Robert Colyer, Dewey Conces, Paula Differding, Robert Dittus, Kenneth Dunipace, John Eble, Mark Farber, Margaret Felton, B. P. Garg, Celestine Hamant, Robert A. Harris, Eugene Helveston, Emily Hernandez, Louis Holtzclaw, Jerome Kaminker, John Lappas, D. K. Rex, Kenneth Ryder, Craig Stoops, Susan Sutton, Vernon Vix, Henry Wellman. Ex-officio: Shirley Newhouse, Richard Schilling.

### **AGENDA ITEM I**

**Approval of Minutes - November 5, 1987**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Our first agenda item is the approval of the minutes from the

meeting of November 5. Do we have a motion for approval? [Motion made and seconded]  
All in favor say "Aye." Are there any opposed? [None]

## **AGENDA ITEM II**

**Presiding Officer's Business - Vice President Gerald Bepko**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Under Presiding Officer's Business I have just one item. Ordinarily at this meeting I would present the State of the Campus Paper, but because of some misunderstandings about when the State of the Campus was to be given, we are going to do this at the January meeting. Today we have a reasonably full agenda anyway, so it is probably just as well that the full State of the Campus report not be provided today.

However, I am ready to give it and I had thought of it in two parts. One part is a light hearted preface to some thoughts that I think are appropriate to put forward at this time about the campus. Since there are these two parts, one light hearted and the other more serious, I thought that to begin the holiday season I would offer you the light hearted today and offer Part Two - the more serious side - in January.

The light hearted part has to do with an update for some of you, and maybe information given for the first time for others, about a recurring dream which I began having when I was dean of the Law School. I often dreamed that I was playing baseball. There is nothing unusual about that because I have played and watched baseball all my life. What is unusual about this dream is that my team was always in the field and the other team batted continuously. On my team I am the pitcher although I am not called a pitcher. Reminiscent of the earliest days of baseball I am called a server and that is written across my back.

In my earliest dreams, the other team was always composed of Law faculty members, thirty or forty of them. They batted in no particular order and some seemed to come to bat more often than others. A few of them batted four or five times in a row until they were tired or bored and allowed another batter to come to the plate. The Law faculty batters frequently struck out but this never stopped them from running around the bases. It was as if they had hit safely, with the usual congratulatory gestures as they cross home plate. The stands were always full of Law students and law alumni who cheered at every hit and occasionally came down from the stands and ran around the bases themselves. They often chanted "Practical education!", "Practical education!, Practical education!.

In this last year my dream has changed. Although some law faculty are still running around the bases, the batters are now the deans of the campus, people like Bruce Renda in Engineering

and Technology, Betty Grossman in Nursing, Bill Gilmore in Dentistry, and members of the Faculty Council, such as H. R. Besch and Constable Karlson, who bats even more now than he did in earlier dreams. These batters in my recent dreams are more disciplines. They bat in order and only occasionally does a batter insist on consecutive terms at bat or on running the bases after striking out. But they come to bat more rapidly and sometimes I have to hurry to serve enough pitches to satisfy their needs. My only relief comes when Marshall Yovits bats because Marshall, otherwise an excellent batter, seems always to stop the game to ask questions. And, the crowd has changed. Now the stands are composed of sections of students and alumni of different schools who cheer wildly when their dean comes to bat. On two occasions Betty Grossman has led thousands of cheering nurses in forming a wave.

Some of the most formidable batters come from the Medical School and their supporters, medical students and physicians, sitting in mostly sky boxes and private suites, cheer at a more subdued manner but with great power. When Walter Daly comes to bat, a hush falls over the crowd except for a section of dental students who sometimes seem not to focus on the game. Walter seems indifferent to the game, almost as if he didn't like baseball. He bats nonchalantly and effortlessly, sometimes with one hand, but seems always to hit a home run, after which he politely tips his hat to the cheering physicians, assigns someone to run the bases for him, and returns to a medical veranda down the right field line.

Among the two or three more powerful batters is someone I think you might not expect. She is quiet and unassuming but every time Susan Zunt has come to bat she has hit a record 600-foot home runs. And, while the officials are measuring these record home runs, more law faculty usually come out and run around the bases. In the most recent dreams, nearly all of the spectators and umpires, as well as some of the players, have stacks of papers in their hands entitled "Planning Documents." They have been waving these papers frantically and many have shouted "You don't understand our program."

It is not surprising that the dream has converted into one about planning documents because there is so much planning going on in the University today, both at the all-university level and certainly on this campus. When we have our January meeting I am going to begin Part 2 of the State of the Campus by talking about our planning efforts and related matters. With that, I would like to move to the next agenda item.

### AGENDA ITEM III

Executive Committee Report - Susan L. Zunt, Secretary

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Our next agenda item is the Executive Committee Report by Susan Zunt.

**PROFESSOR ZUNT:** Thank you, Vice President Bepko. I have just a few items to bring to your attention. Dr. David Allmann who is the chairman of our Metropolitan Affairs Committee has resigned and Dr. Walter Buchanan, School of Engineering and Technology, has agreed to chair that committee for the remainder of that term.

President Richard Schilling of the IUPUI Student Body has at this time sent us our four student nominees for our Student Affairs Committee. Dr. McAteer who chairs the Student Affairs Committee will be working with this committee to make those selections. Two members, one undergraduate student and one graduate or professional student will be selected to serve on our Student Affairs Committee.

The Executive Committee has received a number of letters from staff, students, and faculty members concerning the IUPUI Child Care Center supporting expansion of offering child care services at this campus. Currently, Dean of Students Dr. Timothy Langston is working on this issue and, at this point in time, we do not have anything to report to you but the administration is looking at the child care issue in its entirety.

As you know, the University has initiated a search for a Vice President of University Relations. To initiate this search, an outside search consultant has been hired. His name is Gary Posner. He is working with the University Faculty Council's Nominating Committee and Agenda Committees to conduct the search. When we met a month ago in Bloomington, the search was pretty well thought to be an external one. Since that time, there has been a lot of interest in internal candidates from the University, systemwide, for this University Relations post. I spoke to Mr. Posner yesterday. He will be coming back to Bloomington on Monday and he will be reevaluating the possibility of organizing an internal search in addition to the external search that had been planned a month ago.

The Executive Committee is going to be meeting on the 10th of December. At that time we are going to be reviewing a summary of Ernest Boyer's book, "College: The Undergraduate Experience in Higher Education. Also, at that meeting we will be reviewing a recent article that was published in the Chronicle of Higher Education concerning retirement and academic professors. There has been a national committee formed but they don't have money to meet. On a campus level, at the University Faculty Council level, meeting with President Ehrlich last summer we had decided to wait and see what was going to happen on the national level. It may be more important now for Indiana University to go ahead and undertake this process on its own.

On another item of university planning, as you know the President has initiated systemwide planning. This was begun November 16 here at the Conference Center. As of yesterday,



Steven Wailes and I received the major topics that are going to be addressed by working groups that will develop working documents to address certain issues. These issues are: The Content of Undergraduate Education, The Faculty as Mentors in Undergraduate Education, Professional Education, Research and Research Degrees, Access to Quality Education, Economic Growth, and The Identity of Indiana University. Steven Wailes and I will have the opportunity to appoint one or two University Faculty Council members to each of those topics. Your suggestions are welcome.

Henry Wellman who is a chairman of a subcommittee of the Faculty Affairs Committee on the Faculty Club, is going to be meeting with Lincoln Hotel officials on December 11 about 11:30 or noon. I will be unable to attend that meeting but hopefully at our next Faculty Council meeting on January 7 I will be able to report to you some progress on our Faculty Club.

In January we will have a report on the Access Center. We have a report from the Learning Resources Committee looking at the possibility of collaboration with this committee on ethical decisions and code of ethics. Rebecca VanVoorhis, chairman of the Learning Resources Committee, will be meeting with the Executive Committee on December 10. Also at the January 7th Faculty Council meeting, there will be a report from the Faculty Affairs Committee concerning Salary Policy. This is going to be an issue that will be discussed on this campus and will also be going to the University Faculty Council. I am sure you will be very interested in participating in that discussion. Also, as you know from the Vice President's comments, we will have the State of the Campus Address. This will mean that the Faculty Council Meeting will adjourn early. Then other faculty and staff members will join us and we will have the State of the Campus Address.

That completes my report unless there are questions.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Are there any questions or comments? I might note that a number of people from the campus will be co-conveners of these work groups that President Ehrlich has appointed. Bill Plater will be co-convener along with Anya Royce, who is Dean of Faculties at Bloomington, for a working group on the faculty as scholarly mentors in undergraduate education. Bill Gilmore and Sheldon Siegel are members of the Professional Education work group. Betty Grossman is a member of the Content of Undergraduate Education work group. Walter Daly is a member of the Research, Research Degree work group. Bruce Renda is a member of the Economic Growth work group. I am the co-convener of the Professional Education work group. I would encourage you, if you are interested, to volunteer.

PROFESSOR ZUNT: We will be appointing University Faculty Council members, but if you

want to support particular members, of course, I would like to know who those should be for these very select issues we are going to be covering. The documents need to be completed by March and then as soon as possible we will submit the planning document and these working documents to the faculty in its entirety for additional review. I have already asked the President to let me know as soon as it's appropriate for me to distribute it to both our Council and the University Faculty Council.

PROFESSOR CUTSHALL: I had a question on something that was not reported on. That is the upcoming at-large elections for the Faculty Council. The question that I have is that the ballots have just been received by some of us earlier this week. The deadline date is next Monday for returning them. On top of that, several errors were noted in the list of candidates who were eligible for election. I have been instructed to present a motion. I would like to move that the deadline date be extended by one week, from December 7 to December 14, for return of ballots.

PROFESSOR ZUNT: Dr. Sagraves, would you like to respond to that?

PROFESSOR SAGRAVES: We had planned to extend the deadline until Wednesday at 5:00 but I have no problems with extending it until the following Monday. We only received two calls on the corrections. Bernice and I found the others. We have sent you the corrections. We only had two people who called us on corrections to the voting roster. Why you didn't receive the entire ballot before just recently, that I don't understand.

PROFESSOR CUTSHALL: I think we just received the correction sheet.

PROFESSOR SAGRAVES: Yes. The correction sheet did just come out. But, I have no problems with extending the date.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: There is a motion on the floor. Is there any discussion of the motion? The motion is to extend the deadline for return of ballots one week until Monday, December 14. If there is no discussion, are you ready to vote? All in favor say "Aye." Any opposed? The motion carries. Will that be communicated in any way other than by word of mouth? Will we send a notice to all faculty informing them that the deadline has been extended?

PROFESSOR SAGRAVES: Yes.

#### AGENDA ITEM IV

##### Question and Answer Period

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: The next agenda item is a question and answer period that Susan explained at our last meeting. We have established a ten-minute break from the regular agenda to give an opportunity for anyone who has questions or comments to have an opportunity to speak. We will do our best to answer any questions or to respond to any comments. This is something that we historically have taken up in a very brief fashion at the very end of our meetings. As everyone is leaving we have said "Is there anything else, any Old Business, any New Business or other business for the good of the order?" I think that under those circumstances it was not likely that Faculty Council members who had questions would feel that the opportunity was right to raise them. Therefore, we have concluded that it would be a good idea to set aside a limited time early in the meeting and experiment with that to see if a ten-minute period is sufficient. That is what I would invite you to do now.

PROFESSOR WILSON: Could you explain to us how you go about formulating a budget? The way we see it, the faculty respectively said that they go to a lot of trouble to say what we need and so on, and then we get a budget increase of three percent without any regard to what we asked for. Could you please briefly outline how the budget process works?

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: The schools make budget recommendations. The campus administration, in recommending the budget for the whole campus, relies heavily if not exclusively on the presentations that are made by schools. The other source of their insight is the Faculty Council's Budgetary Affairs Committee. The very simple answer to the specific question that you have is that we have at least, in recent years, not had any money that gave flexibility to do any more than provide the standard increases that were given by the General Assembly to the campus across the schools. I can't speak to the specific percentage. (Three percent) I doubt if it was that low. What little flexibility that has been used to address the most pressing needs that are presented by the schools, the schools' first priorities. That is, with the advice of the Faculty Council's Budgetary Affairs Committee. I have only made one budget and it was such a lean year that there was not an extended debate within campus administration on how to spend the money we had because we had so little to spend. It was almost applied across the board to deal with what we saw as the most urgent needs, which in last year's budget making focused mainly on salary increases for continuing personnel.

PROFESSOR KAPLAN: Could you tell us something about the time status of the Science and Engineering Building?

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: The bonding authority was approved by the General Assembly.

The State Budget Agency has approved the project. Those are the only state approvals that we need to begin construction. We are working right now on preparing the architectural plans that must be ready before we put the contracts to bid. We hope all goes smoothly during this academic year and that we are able to break ground for the building in late summer of 1988.

There are two sets of plans for a new building. One is a set that is used for gaining approval of the concept of the project. That was the planning that was done over the last couple of years for the Science, Engineering, and Technology complex. The second set of plans that have to be prepared are the ones that are used for soliciting bids from construction contractors. They are more detailed and take time to prepare. An architect has to be hired in order to do that. That is something that Physical Facilities Division of the University is working on right now.

UNKNOWN #1: So if they start in the summer of 1988, when can it be occupied?

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: The first building, of the two buildings that we hope go in tandem, should be available probably in the late fall of 1989 or early spring 1990. The second building, which is also part of the package we hope is approved, should be authorized for bonding in the 1989 session of the General Assembly. If it is, construction can go forward on the same time frame and would open about one and one-half years later.

PROFESSOR MENDELSON: I was approached a couple of weeks ago by a student regarding the funding for the University Library. He was very concerned that this isn't getting the attention it should.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Part of the State of the Campus paper is devoted to the library. We are very optimistic that we will have a very substantial component of private funding before the 1989 session of the General Assembly. It would be our hope to have enough private money raised so that we could make a compelling case, an overpowering case, to the General Assembly to not only approve the final phase of construction of the Science, Engineering, and Technology complex but the main library of the University as well. That is our plan. The fund raising effort has already begun. I can't say anymore than that at this particular stage, but there will be much more that may be visible after the first of the year. We hope to bring into service a number of community leaders who are interested in the library to try to add to funding that we think is already in hand to make up the really substantial package of private funding to, as I said, make the case for state support overpowering in 1989. That is a somewhat optimistic view, but it is a realistic view as well.

UNKNOWN #2: When our new President spoke to us earlier in the year there was a lot of concern about the Purchasing system on this campus. I was wondering if anything has been started to deal with the Purchasing problems.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** There has been a correction of what we think was the very serious personnel problem with Purchasing which should help. More structurally, there is an effort underway to change the orientation of all the University support services so that success will be measured not in any other terms other than in service to the faculty. All of the administrative support units would judge their own success or failure by whether the faculty members that they serve are accomplishing their objectives, something which I don't think has been prevalent in the past. We would like to avoid ever having the kinds of problems that were raised and used as examples when Tom Erlich was here in September. We would like to prevent that from ever happening again. We have dealt with some specific cases as well. We have hand-carried some things through the system.

I might say that one of the things that will permit us to serve faculty needs better will be a new approach to the issues that have to go to the Board of Trustees for approval. Already the Board of Trustees has delegated more authority to University officers, to the President in particular, but in turn the President can delegate that authority elsewhere. That will eliminate a lot of the paperwork that had to go always to Bloomington first, into the University system, and then to the Trustees. Coupled with that, there is a movement underway to allow more decisions to be made at the campuses, so that if the matter doesn't have to go to the Trustees, it can be concluded here on the campus. We are already working under that system. We think it has saved a lot of time and effort. Personnel matters are now resolved here at the campus. There need be no approval beyond the campus for a whole range of personnel matters. The only thing the campus has to do is file a report so that the University Central Administration knows what is going on. But, there is no approval necessary. The same will be true for Purchasing. There will be a whole new range of matters that can be resolved at the campus level. We think that will expedite Purchasing in a significant way.

**PROFESSOR BLAKE:** I wanted to ask for an update on the parking situation. I know that your feeling is that eventually we will get into the parking garages, but when I signed up for the parking garage, it had a five-year waiting list. I wondered what the plans are for more parking and more parking garages.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** We are struggling with the financing of more parking garages right now. As you know, all of the parking is financed out of revenues derived from parking. All of the facilities for parking are financed that way. We are at a point where we don't have money to build a new garage. We are going to have to figure out a way of financing another garage in the near future. I think it is going to be especially important because if the Science, Engineering, & Technology complex is complete on the schedule that I just described and the library goes forward at the same time, about 1,200 parking places are going to be eliminated.

We will have to have another garage. The garage will probably be the one that is planned for just east of the Natatorium. How we finance that, though, is the problem that we are wrestling with right now. I am not sure how we will solve the problem. We have some ideas but they are just that - ideas.

PROFESSOR BESCH: Can you deal as effectively with contracted services to IUPUI as you can the non-contracted services? In particular, I have heard a lot of faculty complaints about Hoosier Travel concerning long delays and a variety kind of things that used to apply to Purchasing and now it doesn't but now applies, instead, to another aspect of faculty service.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: We should be able to do something about that. That should only take a phone call. I hadn't heard that before. Rest assured we will make a note of that. If you have specific cases, we would like to know about them so that we can explain what the problems are. That should be something we can deal with very quickly. They should be very responsive because I think they value their relationship with the University.

I think we have used up the question period.

#### AGENDA ITEM V

Nominating Committee Report - Dr. Glen Sagraves, Chairman

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Our next agenda item is the Nominating Committee Report by Dr. Glen Sagraves.

PROFESSOR SAGRAVES: Each of you as you entered the room should have picked up a copy of the slate for the three Faculty Boards of Review. These slates were developed from three sources. We used the preference sheet list which is sent out every year. Susan sent out a letter to all deans and faculty leaders requesting nominations. That was the second source. The third source was all of those people who are presently serving on Faculty Boards of Review are eligible for re-election. These slates represent 13 of the 16 units. Of the three units that are not represented on the slates, two had no names available from any of those three sources I just mentioned. The third unit did have one member on the list, but that person was going on sabbatical leave this next year so we couldn't use that person. So, 13 out of the 16 units are represented on this slate. We will be voting on this Faculty Board of Review slate at the January 7th meeting.

The Executive Committee has referred three recommendations to the Nominating Committee, all of which would limit membership on the Faculty Boards of Review. The first recommendation would limit membership to faculty who have never served in an administrative post. The second recommendation would limit membership to faculty who have never had a

grievance against the administration. The third one would limit membership to faculty who are tenured only. We are presently considering these. We have only had one meeting so far but we plan to continue to have our next meeting shortly after the first of the year. If any of you have any comments or suggestions to make, we would appreciate hearing from you.

#### AGENDA ITEM VI

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

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Next is the explanation and announcement on our annual Martin Luther King, Jr. Birthday Celebration in January. This will be given by Lincoln Lewis.

DR. LEWIS: Thank you. Good afternoon. Each year for the past three years I have claimed this spot on your agenda. I thank you for that opportunity. Again I have the pleasure and privilege of telling you something about the program that we have to honor Dr. King's birthday.

IUPUI, of course, takes pride in the fact that we have been in the forefront of starting this tradition which, of course, is now a national event. You will recall that the very first tribute to Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., in 1985, was the year before the national holiday began. It had been an item of debate at the Faculty Council here and became a campus consensus for the campus to invite the whole community to observe this date as a meaningful and visible event from the institution.

Howard Schaller then came to a committee which I have chaired called the Forum on Campus Interrelations, or FOCI, and suggested that we might undertake the responsibility for giving recognition to Dr. King's ideas and his accomplishments.

What has emerged then is an all-day program, which I am proud to say on behalf of all those who have been involved and have worked on it, that it has been very well received by this campus community and the outside community as well.

I would like to point out that the Faculty Council has been represented on this committee and has had two members participating in the planning programs from the very beginning. You have copies of flyers before you which describe the program we are planning for the coming year's celebration of Dr. King's birthday on January 18, 1988.

You will note that we will use the new University Conference Center for the morning convocation. This session draws attention from not only the campus but also from the outside community. I can say that the community has always felt welcome at this function on the

campus for Dr. King's birthday. Vice President Bepko will give the University welcome, along with Dr. Susan Zunt, Secretary of the Faculty Council.

The guest speaker, as you see indicated, is Dr. Marvalene Styles-Hughes. Her background is indicated there as presently being the Associate Vice President for Student Development - Arizona State University. She is also the President of American College Personnel Association.

Our guest speaker for the afternoon session is Donald M. Stewart, President of the College Board. This is a session in the Student Union Cafeteria. The attendance of that is usually by students, mostly because of the subject nature. We try to give it something of interest to them. I believe, as you can see from the flyer, we will have a very good discussion about Minority Participation in Higher Education. The format is that we will have the guest speaker. We will then have some breakout sessions which will be chaired by some of our faculty. These sessions then will be reported back to the general body, and then we will conclude the program with a wrap up.

Students really enjoy this. This is one of the most gratifying parts of the day because last year, for example, the student cafeteria was filled to capacity with students. Faculty are welcome to attend also.

The evening program is going to be the 17th Annual Commemorative Dinner that is put on by the Black Student Union. This year the site will be the Madame Walker Urban Life Center. The capacity is about 250 people. We already have, I understand, sold 100 tickets. So, there are still tickets available. The price is \$15 for the students and community and for students with ID the price is \$12. The phone number where you can get information is indicated.

Incidentally, in the afternoon session we have invited President Erhlich to attend. He will be out of town but has promised to send a message on this occasion.

I would like to urge your attendance and ask you to support this program. Are there any questions?

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Thank you, Lincoln. As we would expect, Lincoln has done an excellent job on this Martin Luther King celebration these three years. That matches the really fine work that he has done as an Affirmative Action officer for the campus, in leading FOCI and in so many other ways that Lincoln has played an extremely important part of the campus life and in advancing the interest of the university. He also has been a good friend. We are going to miss him as he goes off to Charlottesville, Virginia to be the special assistant to the



President of the University of Virginia. I ask you to join me in expressing appreciation for Lincoln.

PROFESSOR NAGY: A directive came from your office last year and was mailed to the faculty. It requested cooperation in providing the opportunity for participation in this annual program. Can we expect this again this year?

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Yes. Thanks for reminding us.

## AGENDA ITEM VII

### Smoking Policy - (For Action)

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: The next agenda item is something that is carried forward from our last meeting. It is the proposed smoking policy and Kathleen Warfel will present the revised policy.

PROFESSOR WARFEL: The Smoking Policy Committee had an opportunity to meet a couple of weeks ago. We took into consideration everything that was said at this meeting. We have some revisions in the policy that we hope will satisfy the majority of the Council.

The revisions are shown as printed by being underlined. In Item #2 we added the words properly ventilated in front of the words "private offices" feeling that this would take care of situations where people outside of private offices or adjacent to them might be bothered unduly.

Most of the changes were in Item #5. We added the phrase or set of buildings so that each building or set of buildings will have one or more designated... This was to take care of situations such as the one at Herron that was brought up. We changed "structurally separated" to physically separated for the engineers. We added the words and location in talking about the designated smoking areas so that, for example, if you have a set of buildings and not each of them has a designated smoking area within it, the designated smoking area would have to be located in such a way that it would accommodate the people wanting to use it. We also changed the wording so that the designated smoking area didn't sound too good.

In Item #7 we eliminated the requirement for a fire extinguisher in smoking areas. In the Enforcement segment we changed the wording to "Any conflicts should be brought to the attention of the building official"... rather than what we previously had.

Are there any questions about these revisions?

PROFESSOR PALMER: Where do tunnels fit in?

PROFESSOR WARFEL: Tunnels, I presume would be the same as hallways.

PROFESSOR BESCH: Call for the question.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Mr. Parliamentarian, someone moved for the question but there is another person who has a question. How do we handle that?

PROFESSOR KARLSON: The question requires 2/3 of the vote to suspend discussion.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Henry, would you wait until Bill Hodes has a chance to ask his question?

PROFESSOR HODES: This is just a point of clarification on the possible clash between Item 1 and Item 2. Item 1 states that smoking will be prohibited in a whole list of places. Item 2 states that you can smoke in the designated smoking areas. Presumably, one of the designated smoking areas will be one of those included on the prohibited list. In other words, if we took a cafeteria and made it a smoking area, would that override Item 1?

PROFESSOR WARFEL: No. I think that the intention was the you cannot designate the cafeteria.

PROFESSOR HODES: What areas can you designate as a smoking area?

PROFESSOR WARFEL: A room that isn't used for any of those other things. Essentially, an extra room.

PROFESSOR HODES: Then it is room by room rather than purpose by purpose. What about the question I asked last time about a classroom which is temporarily designated as a smoking classroom during exam time? Is that out of order?

PROFESSOR WARFEL: I think officially this has to be.

PROFESSOR HODES: We have also designated our faculty lounge as a smoking area unless there is a meeting at which no smoking is allowed.

PROFESSOR WARFEL: I think the category of "lounge," that is one room that can be designated as a non-smoking or smoking area.

PROFESSOR HODES: But, how about classrooms?

PROFESSOR WARFEL: No smoking in classrooms.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: In other words, if an academic building contained two conference rooms and the school decided they wanted to use one conference room as a non-smoking room and the other conference room as a smoking lounge, you would prohibit that?

PROFESSOR WARFEL: No.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Item #1 says "conference rooms."

UNKNOWN #1: If you have a series of classrooms or a whole series of cafeterias or conference rooms, can you designate one as a smoking room?

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: I guess what you would have to do is redesignate that room. Not call it a conference room anymore but call it a smoking lounge.

PROFESSOR WARFEL: You could just take down the sign that says "Conference Room."

PROFESSOR HODES: Could we do that with our exam room?

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: You could designate the classroom as a smoking lounge for one day.

PROFESSOR WARFEL: We talked about that a little bit in the previous meeting. Apparently what they do is they have an exam room for everybody, presumably non-smokers would be there, and another room to take the exam in where you can go if you want to smoke.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: I think that, in order to address this specific question, my view would be for whatever it is worth, that you could redesignate a classroom as a smoking lounge during exam period as long as it is properly marked and announced so that non-smokers wouldn't use it by mistake.

PROFESSOR MILLER: I think you have a way out of this dilemma by the Enforcement Policy in that you have a building official who resolves problems. So, if that official properly designated a room as a smoking lounge, it appears to me that that person has the authority to use any room available as long as the name is changed.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: That is a good point except that Bill is speaking from the reference point of the Law School where the building official is likely to be a rule-oriented intransigent Law dean. [laughter]

PROFESSOR MILLER: I think we need to realistically say that the building official has the authority to designate that room for one day or whatever.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: I think that is a very good point.

PROFESSOR KARLSON: I hate to be a nitpicker, but the way this is written you could not designate any exam room as a smoking area because that becomes a work area for the person supervising it and work areas, except for private offices, cannot be smoking areas. It states that quite clearly in the last section of section 1.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Would you like to respond to that?

PROFESSOR KARLSON: Obviously, the professor supervising or the person supervising it is working and, therefore, the exam room becomes a work area.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Professor Miller's comment I think is especially apt here.

PROFESSOR KARLSON: But, it still is a work area.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Well, then the building official could review it and not find that to be a violation of the policy.

PROFESSOR HODES: I think that is the point she is making. I agree with Henry that it would be a clear violation but if nobody cares, then it is not a violation.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: No harm, no foul.

DEAN VOOS: Is it fair to assume that, although vending canteen areas cannot be designated as smoking areas, smoking areas can contain vending machines?

PROFESSOR WARFEL: At this point, for those buildings that have what we would all recognize as vending canteen areas, that is that small room that contains multiple machines, and some tables where people go to take breaks. I think that is not be designated as a smoking area. If, on the other hand, you were in a room that happens to have in a far corner one coke

machine, I don't think that is necessarily the vending canteen.

**BARBARA FISCHLER:** Is point 1, where smoking will be prohibited etc. taking preference over all other points? You say in Item 5, "Each building or set of buildings will have one or more designated physically separated smoking areas... The University Library is a discrete building and has no other attached buildings. What takes preference, Item #1 or Item #5?

**PROFESSOR WARFEL:** I am not familiar with the University Library. I don't know what is next to it. I don't know in that example how things could be worked out.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** You could interpret this to include Cavanaugh Hall in the set of buildings. There may be a smoking lounge in Cavanaugh Hall.

**PROFESSOR WILSON:** Some librarians have private offices in the library. They should be allowed to smoke in them.

**PROFESSOR WARFEL:** That point was brought up last month. We think when we said no smoking in the library, what we meant was that there would be no smoking in the stacks, in the long term study areas. If you are thinking of the library as a whole building that has not only the function of the library, but the support areas to it, I don't see why you couldn't use some of the support areas.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Are there any other comments? Are you ready for the question? [Question called for] This has been proposed for adoption as University policy for the campus. All in favor, say "Aye." Are there any opposed? [None] Thank you very much. We will distribute this policy to all deans and directors. We will call attention to the enforcement provisions and ask that the persons already appointed as building officials take steps to implement the policy within their buildings or sets of buildings and report back to us so that we have a record of what areas have been designated as smoking areas.

#### **AGENDA ITEM VIII**

**Constitution and Bylaws Report - Professor Henry Karlson, Chair**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Next we have a report from the Constitution and Bylaws Committee by Henry Karlson.

**PROFESSOR KARLSON:** As most of you probably remember, we had the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Deliberations earlier this year. In order to implement parts of those recommendations, it was necessary for the Constitution and Bylaws Committee to look at these

recommendations and translate them into changes in the Constitution and Bylaws. We have started to do this.

The first recommendation from the circular was that membership criteria for the Executive Committee should be changed to permit election of faculty members who are now or have been a member of the Council within the past four years. Persons selected to serve on the Executive Committee who are not currently on the Council would become ex officio members of the Council.

In the Constitution and Bylaws Committee and since our Constitutional mandate, we discussed and dealt with this, modifying it slightly to change it to two years instead of four years but still carrying out the intent of this provision. The proposed amendments, which are stated under our first recommendation, are given on page one of the Circular 87-06. I must thank Henry Besch for drafting this with his computer. He has been a valuable aid and makes it quite clear what otherwise might be somewhat confusing.

The rationale is also given. The basic rationale is that Each spring the Nominating Committee prepares a slate for election of four new members of the Executive Committee. Under the existing rules, there was a very very small group from which these could be selected. When you found that many people didn't want to spend the time, and it is quite a bit of time and effort on the part of the Executive Committee, the group became even smaller. This effectively triples the pool. The effect of these amendments then would be to allow people who had served within the last two years upon the Faculty Council to be elected. It would further provide that, if they were not otherwise members of the Faculty Council, they would become ex officio members and it would further provide that in determining the at-large and school representation on the Faculty Council, these people would not be taken into consideration. In other words, they would not be counted in N. That is the first recommendation in the proposals. These are amendments to the Constitution. On page 2 of our circular we see the revised provision and the current provisions.

The second recommendation also comes out of the Ad hoc committee. This is that Council actions which require administrative implementation will be so identified and continued as Executive Committee report items until they have been implemented or until the Council authorizes them to be dropped as Executive Committee report items.

Our proposed amendment, again, is given on page 3 of the circular. Basically, it would require a report in the minutes on the status of all Council actions which require subsequent implementation but have yet to be completed, such reports to be continued as informational items in the Executive Committee report until either they have been completed or the Council

authorizes their discontinuation from the report. This would not mean that there would be an oral report. They would merely be on the agenda to be read in front of people so people might bring them up as a question to find out what their status is.

The rationale is again given. We have drafted it a little bit broader, I believe again on the spirit of the committee which Henry Besch and I both have served on, to include not only further implementation by the administration but also further implementation by the Executive Committee of the committees. So, that again the members of the Faculty Council would be reminded of what has happened and what yet has to be done. Things would not be lost in the cracks.

Our third is implementation provisions. This is merely a lot of renumbering in order to permit these amendments to properly be put into the Constitution and Bylaws. As to the effective date, we would move that the proposed amendments take effect immediately upon passage so that the Nominating Committee could take these changes into account in reaching their next slate for the Executive Committee this coming spring.

I have not read the exact wording. I think the wording is well outlined on your handout. It would be rather boring to read it. I see no purpose in doing so. However, if anyone would desire that I do so, I would be glad to do so. Are there any questions?

PROFESSOR WILSON: I think you said, "any person who has been elected to the Council." Does that mean anybody who has ever served on the Council?

PROFESSOR KARLSON: The original committee was very very broad. The Constitution and Bylaws Committee, that position was argued, considered this in two different meanings. This was a compromise by the Constitution and Bylaws Committee in our Constitutional charge to draft and deal with proposed amendments.

PROFESSOR WILSON: Does this significantly increase the pool of people?

PROFESSOR KARLSON: It at least triples the pool. It is a significant increase. That was the final point which the committee rested upon. We thought that, if a person had not been on the Faculty Council for a large number of years or a long period of time, they would not necessarily be fully aware of the issues which are presently before the Council. We thought that too long a period would destroy their value.

Are there any other questions? As this comes to you from a standing committee, no second is necessary?

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Are you ready for the question? Since this is a committee report, no second is required as Henry pointed out. Is this the final stage of the Constitutional amendment?

PROFESSOR KARLSON: As for the Constitutional amendment, there will be 30 days during which any 15 members of the faculty can petition for a special Faculty Council meeting in order to return it to the Council. If no such petition is forthcoming within 50 academic days, a vote must be taken by the members of the IUPUI faculty to make it final. The Bylaw changes take effect immediately upon passage.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Are you ready for the question? All in favor say "Aye." Opposed? [None] Thank you, Henry.

#### AGENDA ITEM IX

##### Academic Calendar (Discussion)

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Next we have discussion of the Academic Calendar. Susan Zunt will lead us.

PROFESSOR ZUNT: As you know, this year we have adopted a new calendar. You should have picked up when you walked into the room a piece of paper that has the report of the 1986 Academic Affairs Committee chairman concerning the 1987-88 academic calendar on the front. On the back of that paper you will see the calendar that we are currently working our way through. There have been a number of questions raised by faculty, students, and, in some cases, staff and the administration about the appropriateness of some of the changes that we initiated with this new calendar.

As you know, we did approve earlier this spring a similar calendar for the academic year 1988-89. The Executive Committee has brought this issue to the Council floor for further discussion to see if we do indeed want to continue with this calendar for the 1988-89 year or whether we should consider this academic calendar and make certain changes that might bring it in line with faculty, staff, students, and administrative concerns.

Two issues that have been brought forward to the Executive Committee that I shall report to you are: The first issue is to reinstitute the recognition of the Labor Day holiday. This will be September 5 in 1988. The feeling that the Executive Committee has collected is that students, staff, faculty, and administration in general would prefer to have no classes on that day.



The second issue is to look at the current Thanksgiving break which, as you know for the first year is a week-long break. We have just gone through this. The comments should be fresh in our minds. The concern here is to shorten that Thanksgiving recess to go back to holding classes on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday of that week with the recess for Thursday and Friday. Our University-wide calendar guidelines tell us that we have to have Thursday and Friday off. The Executive Committee is asking you to reconsider to consider having classes during Thanksgiving week on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday.

Those are the two issues - Labor Day and the shortening of the Thanksgiving recess.

UNKNOWN #4: Item #4 states, "A recess week each semester which begins on Monday and ends on Sunday." Do we have another week earlier?

PROFESSOR ZUNT: These were the guidelines that I had duplicated for you of the calendar that was brought forward. We would be changing some of these. I wanted you to know what the guidelines were in the calendar that we had approved a year and one-half ago.

PROFESSOR BLAKE: Susan, we never had classes on Wednesday before Thanksgiving. We had Monday and Tuesday classes but they ended there.

PROFESSOR KECK: Susan, the idea of having classes during Thanksgiving on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday would give us one more Tuesday and Wednesday class than there were Monday, Thursday, and Friday classes. Would not a solution be to have none on Wednesday and end classes on Monday and have the break on Tuesday through Friday?

PROFESSOR ZUNT: That would be one solution.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: It seems to me that it would be very difficult to try to resolve all of the implications of any change in the calendar in the Faculty Council as a committee of the whole. I think that the one point that I can provide from an administrator's perspective is that we have heard a lot of complaints about the two issues that Susan has raised. More about Labor Day, I think, than about Thanksgiving week. But, we have heard a lot of complaints about Labor Day from students who felt that it was first a disruption of an important three-day break that they had, especially part-time students who looked at those three-day breaks for a relief from the treadmill of work and part-time study at the University. Also some of them had to come down here at night even though they didn't work during the day which they found inconvenient, I suppose. I am not as impressed by that as the former rationale they gave, but anyway there were a lot of complaints that we heard about the Labor Day class schedule. There was somewhat less, but nonetheless some, criticism of the Thanksgiving week. Again, largely from part-time students who have a regular work week and work Monday through

Wednesday and didn't see any reason to have a break in classes. They didn't think it was something that enhanced their education. We think from the administrative perspective that this is our first experiment with these new features in the calendar. Maybe we ought to know a little bit more about how it worked, gathered in an organized fashion, and find out what the students think and what the faculty thinks after having some experience so we don't simply lock this into our future calendars without having an opportunity to gather some empirical data. We did a little bit on our own in campus administration but not very much. Carol Nathan, who made a few inquiries, is here.

DEAN NATHAN: They support what you are saying. I attended the Executive Committee meeting where this was discussed and I thought the Executive Committee recommended having classes just on Monday and Tuesday. I don't think that Wednesday was mentioned in that meeting. Maybe I am wrong but it seems what we had before was Monday and Tuesday with classes and with Wednesday being a day when classes were off. Am I not correct?

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: We also have a question of appearance. We are right here on the doorstep of the business community and state government. I think that there is some misunderstanding in the community about why we don't have classes during Thanksgiving week. There is some suspicion. I don't think we can ignore the fact that very delicate chemistry exists in support for higher education. That delicate chemistry may be unstable right now, or less stable than it may have been. My concern is that people in the community may not understand clearly what it is that prompts us to take that week out of the calendar altogether. We ought to be sensitive to that.

PROFESSOR WEBB: As an instructor coming back after a week down, I am finding it very hard to get classes back up and then we are going to be closing down for finals. It is one thing to miss one day of class as we did previously. If it were earlier, it may be different.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Or if it were later, such as at the end.

PROFESSOR WEBB: Something like that and then come back and take finals. But coming as it does, I have not found it very helpful at all.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: That is the perspective that we had, that we ought to know more about what our experiences have been, what students think about it, what faculty thinks about it, and not just assume that because we decided it this year, that it should forevermore be that way.

PROFESSOR SILENCE: I talked with two other faculty members and three of my classes. I

came to the conclusion that the daytime students which worked on part-time jobs liked the week off and felt it was useful and they could get caught up. The part-time students who come at night who have full-time jobs and have a spouse and children did not like it. They want to have the same days off that their families have off.

PROFESSOR HODES: What is the point in coming back so late in the semester? It is worse for us in the Law School. I wanted to raise the question. We came back and had just one legal class. We just finished our classes now. That causes me to ask, to what extent are we bound by this first principle, which is 15 weeks of school and one week of exams? The Law School has always had 14 week of class and two weeks of exams. Is that prohibited?

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: I think the graduate professional schools generally have not been governed by the general calendar. It would be better if everyone was on the same calendar and, where possible, everyone ought to adhere to the same calendar, but there are special needs that arises in graduate and professional schools that makes it necessary to go off this calendar from time to time.

PROFESSOR HODES: I am not speaking specifically of a day here or a day there as to whether it is Monday or Wednesday, but I am speaking about a whole week of instruction. Is it permissible for us to have 14 weeks of instruction despite this calendar?

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: I think the more important consideration would be what the accrediting organizations for law said about the number of weeks. For example, in Medicine this calendar has no application at all.

PROFESSOR KIRK: Do we have to have so many contact minutes? I thought we did beyond the graduate level. Is that correct?

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Yes. I think so.

PROFESSOR HODES: My understanding is that we have exceeded that and Bloomington exceeded it even by a smaller margin.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: The usual three credit lecture class shall meet for a minimum of approximately 2,000 minutes excluding the final examination period.

PROFESSOR KIRK: Where does that come from? Is that a state requirement?

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: That comes from the All University Faculty Council.

PROFESSOR HODES: The way it is now it is 2,250.

PROFESSOR WILSON: I have a problem understanding these things because I was involved in formulating this calendar. First of all, I don't understand why there is a problem with the business community about having the week off in the fall when we have a week off in the spring. Why aren't they objecting to our spring break?

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: They probably don't like that either but it is such an established institution to have a spring break that there is not as much clamor over it.

PROFESSOR WILSON: It has been an established institution in Bloomington.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: I don't think that the suspicion or criticism is directed only at Indianapolis. I don't think the people on the committee think it is a good idea for Bloomington either and have said so. I think, if you took a vote of the community, it would probably say spring break is a luxury also, that probably you shouldn't have but it has been in existence for so long that you now want a break in the middle of the fall term, too, which generates this kind of attitude.

PROFESSOR WILSON: The other point is that perhaps it has not been explained to them that we have not changed a single minute of instruction. We have not lost a single minute of instruction with this calendar. We haven't changed anything. We haven't eliminated any class time. Also, did you tell them that I added two laboratories to my introductory biology course because of this calendar? Did you inform them of that academic wonder?

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: I must apologize but I did not focus on your class. We have explained that, of course. This is not a proposition that I am convinced of. I am not saying that they are right. I am only saying that it fans the flames to create what appears to be a vacation week in the middle of the fall term, even if you have the same minutes of class.

PROFESSOR WILSON: Fine. But there are some academic advantages that were brought forth in all the discussions that dealt with this. The people in Allied Health, for instance, pointed out that their clinics can run more efficiently along these lines. It certainly helps the sciences in defining the way their laboratories run. It allows us to add more laboratories to our curriculum. Those are real advantages to this calendar. I think that in a way those kinds of criticisms ought to be pointed out -- that this calendar is actually better academically. I polled my class which has 70 students in it and it is a daytime class. I had only about four people who said they didn't want to have classes on Labor Day. They wanted to change the calendar. They preferred it the way it was. I explained to them that, if you take Labor Day off, you have

to replace that day somewhere and the most logical place people will put it is not at the beginning, we start so early anyway, not at the end, because it does so close to Christmas, but rather it would be added to the Thanksgiving break. They thought that was not a good idea. The argument about the break being over Thanksgiving breaks the intellectual continuity, can also be argued as not being quite fair because many of the faculty use that time to catch up and to prepare for finals, etc. They use it for professional purposes. I think there are two sides to that point.

Another thing is that we did an informal poll in the Academic Affairs Committee about this. The members of that committee were asked to try to poll their faculty. The majority of faculty known to the Academic Affairs Committee prefers this calendar. What they don't like about it, however, is the Labor Day. They would prefer to see Labor Day added on at the beginning or at the end of the semester and not during Thanksgiving week.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: We ought to know whether this is a successful digression from the present calendar or whether it was not. I think we should know more about faculty and student reactions now that we have had one year's experience with it.

PROFESSOR WILSON: I have one more comment. The other thing I think we should consider is other alternatives can really affect different calendars because it wasn't until I found the fall semester to be truly an experience. You have to go so long until you come to the end. A lot of people have had calendars where you have an earlier break in the semester which is only two days a week. Then you have another four-day break at Thanksgiving. One is at the end of October and one is at the end of November.

PROFESSOR KAPLAN: Purdue has an early week break in their calendar.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Are you suggesting that ~~is~~ an argument for having one or not having one?

PROFESSOR KAPLAN: That is just a point of information, that's all.

PROFESSOR CUTSHALL: Didn't we used to have one week at Thanksgiving also and are now going back to that? I was on the same committee and one of the arguments was having a whole week at Thanksgiving because of the fact that when they had classes scheduled many instructors were dismissing classes and the students didn't have to come anyway. Therefore, they were losing time by doing it that way. They might as well take the whole week off. I know this happened this past semester at Purdue. My son, who is up there, came home early because they dismissed classes early. His Tuesday classes didn't meet at all. If the instructors

are going to do that, you might as well have the whole week.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** One other point that we hear a lot about that I think should be introduced into this discussion is that there ought to be symmetry between the calendars at Indianapolis and Bloomington. People in the community don't understand why those calendars can't come together. That is a little more difficult to explain than the reasons we give based on academic consideration for the things that we have done in our calendar. It would be better if we did have a common calendar for the campuses.

**PROFESSOR KARLSON:** I would point out that Bloomington has approximately 20 less instruction days in an academic year, which is approximately one academic month less than we do. So, in order to do this, either we get a month off that we haven't been getting or Bloomington starts doing some work. I am not sure which would be best.

**PROFESSOR ZUNT:** This is an issue of the calendar that I believe the University Faculty Council Structure Committee, chaired by Professor Shipps and Day, will be looking at and presenting to the University Faculty Council as a unified project. Also, this was an issue that was brought up at the President's Planning Committee. I think there will be some impetus to move toward a common calendar. Early indications, as you might expect, are that the rest of the system will have to agree with the Monroe County School System. If we do that, we will have a common calendar and we will be working to that end.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Is the report of the Executive Committee for action or is it just for discussion? Would it be fair to ask that we take some valid samplings of faculty and student opinions so that can help inform further discussions either in the Executive Committee or in the Faculty Council?

**PROFESSOR ZUNT:** Would it be helpful to have a straw vote on these two issues to see if there is strong Council opinion?

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Sure. In other words, if the Faculty Council was near unanimous in its support for what we did this year or was near unanimous in rejecting what we did this year, then I don't think we would have to conduct a study. If there is some disagreement, then maybe we should do a little more to try to find what faculty and student opinion is - more than just the impressionistic data that we have now.

**PROFESSOR WILSON:** Maybe this is a little unfair but when we have a vast majority of medical faculty who don't even follow the calendar plus the Law School who doesn't follow the calendar at their own admittance, plus in our survey we found out that the Dental School doesn't follow the calendar either...

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** I think your point is that whatever sampling of faculty opinion is, it ought to be from the faculties that are explicitly governed by the calendar, not the faculties that are off the calendar already.

**PROFESSOR HODES:** I just wanted this clarified. We are one basic calendar other than in terms of Thanksgiving and the Labor Day. All we do is allocate two weeks for exams. I did want to ask a question about the straw poll that we do here. Susan, is it your thought that we should vote our own opinions or what we think to be the opinions of our constituents. I circulated a memo in the Law School, knowing that I was coming to this meeting, asking people if they had any opinions, that they should let me know so I could present them. Of course, no one responded.

**PROFESSOR ZUNT:** I would hope that all of us could vote representing our constituencies. That is why we are here.

**PROFESSOR HODES:** This is not always clear and I just wanted to clarify that point.

**PROFESSOR BESCH:** I just wanted to inform Catherine that I don't intend to give up my vote, however, I will be pleased to vote on behalf of the community rather than one behalf of the...

**PROFESSOR PALMER:** Well, the graduate program in the Medical School supposedly goes with the standard calendar.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Why don't we do a straw vote just to give us some guidance on whether this is an issue that is worth continuing to examine. If no one objects strenuously to that, why don't we ask how many people are greatly enamored with the calendar that we have right now and would like to keep it without further inquiry?

**PROFESSOR HODES:** Could you repeat these separately because even though I didn't get any direct responses, I did get some comments on the separate issues.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Do you mean Labor Day and Thanksgiving?

**PROFESSOR HODES:** Yes.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** How many think their units support the Labor Day regular calendar so that classes are held on Labor Day? How many, with a show of hands, think their

units support that principle that was in our calendar this year? [No hands raised] How many think their units oppose the Labor Day calendar? [The show of hands was almost unanimous against having classes on Labor Day.]

How many think their units support what we did this year at Thanksgiving week? How many think their units opposed what we did this year at Thanksgiving?

I think this is a suggestion that we do some investigation and try to find out more about reactions to what has happened this year. We will do that in connection with the Executive Committee and report back later.

PROFESSOR WEBB: Could you in that survey also discuss the openness of something that has come forth here? Some of the greatest problems of this calendar create real problems for members of our community whose family is on vacation. I teach at least one graduate course and I found that my class did not start until the next week. If the students aren't there, you either are faced with penalizing them in terms of their grades or you deal with the situation that exist. I would like that included in here. I am not representing just myself but I have heard that voiced among colleagues.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: The argument is that we should also sample opinion on the beginning of the fall term.

PROFESSOR HODES: As a suggestion of things to include in your poll, it seems to me that there was much more unity on the Labor Day question than the Thanksgiving question. One possible compromise is one that was suggested here which is whether people would compromise on having no classes on Labor Day and having Thanksgiving break being only Tuesday through Friday rather than Monday through Friday. At least that is one possibility.

PROFESSOR ROGERS: It would be helpful to our school if the Executive Committee would also look at the possibility of putting spring breaks in line with Bloomington. There is a number of people that travel between the two sites and teach on opposites and what happens is, if you teach in the undergraduate and graduate program simultaneously, you don't get a spring break because you are teaching one week and then the other. If you could put that as part of your agenda, I know it is a particular need of ours, but it is in uniformity with bringing the one calendar issue to their attention.

VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Are there any other comments?



**AGENDA ITEM X**

**Old Business**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Is there any old business? [None]**

**AGENDA ITEM XI**

**New Business**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: Is there any new business? [None]**

**AGENDA ITEM XII**

**Adjournment**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO: If there is no old or new business, we are adjourned. Have a nice holiday!**

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS

FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING

January 7, 1988

Law School, Room 116

3:00 - 4:00 p.m.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** **Administration:** Vice President Gerald L. Bepko, Carol D. Nathan, William M. Plater. **Deans:** John Barlow, Elizabeth Grossman, R. Bruce Renda, Sheldon Siegel, William J. Voos, Marshall Yovits. **Faculty:** Billy, Abel, Sharon Andreoli, Carl Andres, Margaret Applegate, Morris Aprison, Richard Beck, Rick Bein, Anne Belcher, H. R. Besch, Jr., Willard Bostwick, Varoujan Chalian, Mervyn Cohen, William Crabtree, Theodore Cutshall, Paul Differding, Robert Dittus, Kenneth Dunipace, John Eble, Mary Feeley, Margaret Felton, B P Garg, Gary Gruver, Robert A. Harris, Louis Holtzclaw, Dolores Hoyt, Rosemarie Jones, Jerome Kaplan, Henry Karlson, Juanita Keck, Robert Kirk, Judith Kosegi, Rebecca Markel, Dana McDonald, Robert Mendelsohn, Judy Miller, Paul Nagy, Catherine Palmer, Richard Pflanzner, Gerald Powers, D K Rex, Richard L. Rogers, Glen Sagraves, P Kent Sharp, A N Siakotos, Judith Silence, Susan Sutton, Jeffery Vessely, Kathleen Warfel, Henry Wellman, Maudine Williams, Susan Zunt.

**ALTERNATES PRESENT:** **Deans:** John M. Hunger for Charles Bonser; Mary Beth Minick for Barbara Fischler; Sue Barrett for Nicholas Kellum; Hugh A. Wolf for Howard Mehlinger; Scott Evenbeck for James Weigand; Tom Lenz for Jack Wentworth. **Faculty:** Hitwant Sidhu for Elizabeth Evenbeck; Clyde Crockett for William Hodes; Connie Gaither for Linda Kasper; Harriet Wilkins.

**EX OFFICIO MEMBERS PRESENT:** Shirley Newhouse.

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** **Deans:** Trevor Brown, H William Gilmore, Norman Lefstein. **Faculty:** Elaine Alton, John Baenziger, Linda Brothers, Cecil Brown, Robert Colyer, Dewey Conces, James Edmondson, Mark Farber, Donald Gartner, Celestine Hamant, Eugene Helveston, Emily Hernandez, Florence Juillerat, Jerome Kaminker, James McAteer, Bartholomew Ng, Jeanne Pontious, Beverly Ross, Kenneth Ryder, Craig Stoops, Vernon Vix, Dorothy Webb, Karen West.

**EX OFFICIO MEMBERS ABSENT:** Richard Schilling.

**VISITORS:** Edward L. Robbins, Education.

**AGENDA ITEM I****Approval of Minutes**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** The first item of business is the approval of the minutes of our December 3, 1987 meeting. Is there a motion to approve? [Dean Renda made the motion to approve the minutes. Professor Markel seconded.] All in favor, say "Aye." All opposed. The minutes are approved.

**AGENDA ITEM II****Presiding Officer's Business - Vice President Gerald Bepko**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** I have two items under Presiding Officer's Business today. The first one is to introduce the President of the Student Assembly Richard Schilling.

The second is to let you know that we have a new taping system. You will see microphones around the room.

**AGENDA ITEM III****Executive Committee Report - Susan L. Zunt, Secretary**

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

**PROFESSOR ZUNT:** I have several items to report on today. The first is the Policy for Non-Academic Units. Kathryn Wilson, who is the chair of the Academic Affairs Committee, will have a report in February on this item.

In December the Faculty Council directed the Executive Committee to develop a survey instrument to assess the faculty's academic priorities in establishing the academic calendar. Following preparation of an initial draft we will meet with Deans Plater and Nathan and Professor Brian Vargus, Director of the IUPUI Public Opinion Laboratory to implement the survey.

The IUPUI Faculty Council has been invited to participate in the Martin Luther King, Jr. Birthday Celebration on Monday, January 18, 1988. Dr. Chalian, a member of the Executive Committee will bring greetings from the Council.

Regarding the UFC, there are faculty representatives on each of the seven planning groups. The initial draft of their reports will be presented to President Ehrlich on Monday, January 26, 1988 by the co-conveners. The faculty representatives will report to the UFC and there will be an opportunity for discussion. The UFC Agenda Committee plans to schedule additional time for this important academic planning process.

**AGENDA ITEM IV****Nominating Committee - Election of Faculty Boards of Review**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** The next item is the Nominating Committee with the Election of the Faculty Boards of Review.

**PROFESSOR SAGRAVES:** Today we have the elections of three Faculty Boards of Review. If you will note, on Faculty Board of Review #3, you are to vote for no more than two from the same academic unit. You are to vote for five of the seven candidates. [Elections were held for the three Boards of Review. Following the elections the results were as follows:

**FACULTY BOARD OF REVIEW #1:**

Cyrus Behrooz	Social Work	Professor	Tenured
Margaret Felton	Journalism	Asst Professor	Eligible
Ralph Gray	Liberal Arts	Professor	Tenured
Emily Hernandez	Medicine	Asst Professor	Tenured
Beverly Richards	Nursing	Assoc Professor	Tenured

**FACULTY BOARD OF REVIEW #2:**

Jean Gnat	Library	Assoc Professor	Tenured
David Hennon	Dentistry	Professor	Tenured
William Marsh	Law	Professor	Tenured
Richard Pflanzner	Science	Assoc Professor	Tenured
Carl Rothe	Medicine	Professor	Tenured

**FACULTY BOARD OF REVIEW #3:**

Patricia Blake	Nursing	Assoc Professor	Tenured
Clifford Goodwin	Eng/Tech	Asst Professor	Tenured
Harry Jarrett	Science	Asst Professor	Eligible
Dana McDonald	Library	Librarian	Tenured
James Peva	SPEA	Assoc Professor	Tenured

I need a motion that the ballots be destroyed. [The motion was made and seconded that the ballots be destroyed.] Motion carried.

**AGENDA ITEM V****Question and Answer Period**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Now we come to the portion of the meeting where we ask that, if you have any questions or comments, you may make them at this time.

I have one item to report from the last meeting. There was a complaint made about Hoosier Travel. There seems to be a false impression that employees must use Hoosier Travel. That simply is not true. You can use whatever travel service you wish. The one advantage to using Hoosier Travel is that they will charge your

tickets to an account instead of your having to use a charge card. Hoosier Travel has a contract commitment with the University to give you the lowest possible price. However, if you find that you can purchase the tickets for less somewhere else, if you will let Hoosier Travel know, they will reimburse you the difference between what you had to pay and the amount they would have sold them to you for.

**PROFESSOR SIDHU:** After Dean Schaller retires will the positions of Executive Dean and Dean of the Faculties remain separate or will they be combined again?

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** [Taping problems. Did not record.]

**PROFESSOR NAGY:** What about the Affirmative Action Officer position. What is being done about that?

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Right now Dean Carol Nathan and Kim Manlove are covering that position. We have advertised for that position. We are optimistic that we will have someone appointed by February 1.

**PROFESSOR NAGY:** What about the formal review of undergraduate education on this campus?

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** [Taping problems. Did not record.]

#### **AGENDA ITEM VI**

##### **Access Center Report - Scott Evenbeck**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Our next item is a report on the Access Center given by Scott Evenbeck.

**PROFESSOR EVENBECK:** I appreciate the opportunity to give you an overview of the University Access Center. I want to report briefly on the progress to date in opening the Center. I hope to have the opportunity to report later in the semester on the Center in more detail as the services and courses are developed.

Today is the right day for a status report.

- 1) Moved into the house on 38th Street
- 2) First appointments with students are today.

To give you some background on the Center, this is a new office for IUPUI to help students not admissible to the University to prepare themselves for admission here or for continuing their education elsewhere. The contents of opening the Center includes new Admissions Policy for IUPUI. While the New Admissions Policy, approved by the Faculty Council last year, will not be implemented until the 1990s, IUPUI has implemented admission

standards this term. These students are being referred to the UAC. In addition, a federally funded project which served under-prepared students was not renewed for funding. While the UAC is not a replacement for HELP, the UAC will be able to serve students with backgrounds akin to those of the HELP program.

The implementation of the Access Center includes the appointment of an Acting Director (Nancy Obergfell). This semester it is devoted to developing the program and piloting the programs. While we are clearly in a pilot stage, we intend to deliver excellent services to students this semester.

The services include services, including testing by the Testing Center, courses being developed by the Math and English departments in concert with IPS which is a partner in the UAC.

The goal is to have courses and measures of performance for students who complete the courses such that students with successful performance as defined by the faculty are admitted to the University and succeed after admission. The faculty are preparing courses now and will be meeting again next week to prepare the announcement for the courses which will be offered beginning in February. The courses will be offered on campus.

While the Math and English components are part of the two departments, we are concerned that faculty are involved in the development of the Center. There will be a UAC Faculty Advisory Committee. Professor Wilson will be naming a representative of the Academic Affairs Committee to this committee.

You will be invited to an open house later in the semester. Please feel free to stop by the Center. And, again, I hope to have the chance to talk with you again this semester with a more complete report as the Center's programs are implemented.

#### **AGENDA ITEM VII**

**Faculty Affairs Committee Report - Salary Policy Issues - Dolores Hoyt**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Our next item of business is the Faculty Affairs Committee Report on Salary Policy Issues with Dolores Hoyt.

**MS. HOYT:** Secretary Zunt asked me to introduce a topic to you which Faculty Affairs Currently has under consideration, a revised written salary policy statement for the IU Academic Handbook. This will be brought to you with a specific recommendation at a later date.

I would like to give you some historical background on this topic. The current salary distribution statement in the IU Faculty Handbook reads:

6  
Salary adjustments are based upon merit; across-the-board increases are not utilized at Indiana University.

A January 13, 1987, report of a Bloomington Faculty Board of Review in the case of two faculty salary grievances stated that "the Faculty Salary Policy should be reformulated so as to align the reality of differential distribution of salary monies to units with official pronouncements concerning individual merit."

A subsequent letter of February 6, 1987, by then President John Ryan, accepted the Board's report and stated:

Your Board's Report concludes that "targeting (or a policy like it) is unavoidable and is favored by precedent, but also concludes that it conflicts with the published faculty salary policy. You recommend that the published salary policy should be reformulated so that any published salary policy will conform to the practice sanctioned by precedence and necessity.

I accept and will forward your Board's recommendation to the Co-Secretaries of the University Faculty Council...

The University Faculty Council forwarded this task to the UFC Faculty Affairs Committee, which in turn has also contacted individual campus Faculty Affairs Committees for input.

Thus, a subcommittee of the IUPUI Faculty Affairs Committee has been formed to discuss issues related to this topic which are already under discussion in other Faculty Affairs Committees on other campuses, as well as related issues presented at a local Faculty Affairs meeting.

These issues include such items as: merit (and its definition), cost of living, recruitment and retention monies, equity, salary minima, compacting of salaries, and faculty participation at various levels in formulating policies and/or criteria.

The main emphasis for the IUPUI Faculty Affairs Committee at this time is a statement that is general enough to allow flexibility but specific enough to provide some amount of faculty participation in establishing guidelines.

We are also taking into account previously published statements by AFT and AAUP concerning this topic.

**AGENDA ITEM VIII****Learning Resources Subcommittee - Rebecca Van Voorhis, Chair**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Next is the Learning Resource subcommittee report with Rebecca Van Voorhis, Chair.

**PROFESSOR VAN VOORHIS:** During the Spring Semester, the IUPUI Learning Resources Committee and the IUPUI Faculty Council are offering a series of programs entitled, "Ethics: Everybody's Business." All programs are open free of charge to faculty, students, and others who are interested. The goal of this program series is to increase understanding of ethical issues and the process of moral decision-making. The first and last programs will address broad ethical issues of general interest to the whole campus. Other programs in this series will focus on ethical issues that are specific to a particular discipline.

The opening program will feature Dr. Arthur Hansen, Director of Research for the Hudson Institute and former President of Purdue University. His presentation will be on January 25th at 3:00 p.m. in the University Conference Center Auditorium. His topic, "Ethics: Our Academic Legacy," will examine the ethical issues of professional life and the university's responsibility to prepare students to make ethical decisions throughout their careers. He will give particular attention to the various professional codes of ethics and the guidance that they provide for responsible decision-making.

The closing program will be held at 10:00 a.m. on April 26th. President Ehrlich's presentation, "Ethics: One Last Word," will examine common themes identified in the preceding programs and the challenge that they present to the university. His summary to this program series will consider the direction needed to maintain our academic legacy of preparing students for ethical action in their chosen careers.

Other programs in this series are planned for February, March, and April. They will focus on current ethical dilemmas facing a specific discipline or field. Each will be sponsored by one or more IUPUI schools. Those programs with established dates are:

Week of February 22nd - The School of Engineering and Technology is planning to have a panel of engineers from professional engineering societies discuss ethical dilemmas that engineers confront. Their panel discussion will be held during National Engineering Week and will focus on "Whistle-Blowing."

March 14th - At 9:00 a.m., Dr. Marsha Fowler will discuss "Professional Ethics and Health Policy Formulation."



March 14th - At 1:00 p.m. Dr. Fowler will present "Ethics and Decision-Making at the Bedside."

In both presentations, Dr. Fowler will examine such topics as brain death, living wills, organ transplants and Power of Attorney. Her morning presentation will focus on policy formulation in health care. Her afternoon presentation will target the ethical dilemmas that confront caregivers in the health care professions of medicine, nursing, physical and occupational therapy, social work, dentistry and law.

March 14th - At 4:00 p.m. Father Robert Drinan will speak about "Controversies in Contemporary Legal Ethics" at the Law School. A Congressman during the Watergate Era, he will discuss the ethical issues that face those whose careers take them into public service.

March 22nd - At 3:00 p.m. Gary Edwards, Executive Director of the Ethics Resource Center in Washington, D.C., will discuss: "Managers' Ethical Dilemmas."

March 25th - "Lawyers and Other Professionals: Bound by Rules or Responsible for Moral Choice?" is the theme of Boston College Professor Reed Loder's presentation. Her 4:00 p.m. presentation will examine the various professional codes of ethics and the impact that they have on professional behavior.

April 7th - Congressman Lee Hamilton will speak at 4:00 p.m. about Ethical Decision-Making in the Public Sector."

Other programs to be included in this series that do not have a definite date at this time include:

"Religion, Ethics, and the Caring Professions," will have a panel of presenters: IUPUI Professor James Smurl, Dr. David Smith of the IU Poynter Center, and Father Joseph Rautenberg. They will discuss the religious heritage of the caring professions and some religious constraints that may confront professionals in such fields as psychology, social work, recreational/art/occupational/physical therapy, medicine, and nursing. They will examine the dilemmas that professionals in these fields face when their religious beliefs and professional ethics are in conflict. Topics such as abortion, gay rights, euthanasia, and surrogate motherhood will be discussed by these panelists.

A panel of faculty from the School of Liberal Arts will discuss "Ethical Dimensions of Scientific Research."

The School of Dentistry plans to have a presentation about the ethical dilemmas in dentistry. Nancy K. Logan from the

American Dental Association's Department of Ethics, Bylaws, and Judicial Affairs will examine the current ethical issues that confront dentists.

The School of Education wants to bring Steven Cahn to speak about "Ethics and Academia." Cahn, who is Provost at the City University of New York, is well known for his book: Scamps and Scholars. Co-sponsors for Cahn's presentation are being sought to assist the School of Education in meeting the costs involved in Cahn's presentation.

The School of Journalism is developing a presentation around "Journalism Ethics." A reporter from the Louisville Courier-Journal will examine the issues that journalists face as they obtain and report the news.

Faculty are encouraged to attend these presentations and to promote attendance by students in their classes. Faculty are also urged to lead discussion about the various presentations in their classes so that students integrate the presenter's ideas with the course content.

**AGENDA ITEM IX**  
**Unfinished Business**

There was no Unfinished Business.

**AGENDA ITEM X**  
**New Business**

There was no New Business.

**AGENDA ITEM XI**  
**Adjournment**

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

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS

**FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING**  
**Thursday, February 4, 1988**  
**Law School, Room 116**  
**3:30 - 5:30 p.m.**

**Members Present:** Administration: Vice President Gerald Bepko, Dean Carol Nathan, Dean William Plater. Deans: Walter J. Daly, Elizabeth Grossman, R Bruce Renda, Sheldon Siegel, William J Voos. Director: Barbara Fischler. Faculty: Elaine Alton, Margaret Applegate, Morris Aprison, Richard Beck, Frederick Bein, Anne Belcher, H. R. Besch, Jr., Willard Bostwick, Dewey Conces, Theodore Cutshall, Paula Differding, Robert Dittus, John Eble, Mary Feeley, B P Garg, Celestine Hamant, Dolores Hoyt, Rose Marie Jones, Florence Juillerat, Jerome Kaminker, Jerome Kaplan, Henry Karlson, Juanita Keck, Robert Kirk, Judith Kosegi, John Lappas, Rebecca Markel, James McAteer, Dana McDonald, Robert Mendelsohn, Judy Miller, Bernard Morrel, Paul Nagy, Richard Pflanzner, Gerald Powers, Richard Rogers, Beverly Ross, Glen Sagraves, P. Kent Sharp, Judith Silence, Susan Sutton, Jeffery Vessely, Vernon Vix, Dorothy Webb, Henry Wellman, Karen West, Maudine Williams, Susan Zunt.

**Alternates Present:** Deans: Barbara Jackson for John Barlow; John Hunger for Charles Bonser; James R Roche for H William Gilmore; Georgia Miller for Jack Wentworth, R W Keck for Marshall Yovits. Faculty: R M Jones for Carl Andres; Cliff Goodwin for Linda Brothers; John Rafert for Emily Hernandez; David Leonard for William Hodes; Joe Koss for Linda Kasper.

**Members Absent:** Deans: Trevor Brown, P Nicholas Kellum, Norman Lefstein, Howard Mehlinger, James Weigand. Faculty: Billy Abel, Sharon Andreoli, John Baenziger, Cecil Brown, Varoujan Chalian, Mervyn Cohen, Robert Colyer, William Crabtree, Joseph DiMicco, Kenneth Dunipace, James Edmondson, Elizabeth Evenbeck, Mark Farber, Margaret Felton, Donald Gartner, Gary Gruver, Robert A Harris, Eugene Helveston, Louis Holtzclaw, Bartholomew Ng, Catherine Palmer, Jeanne Pontious, D K Rex, Kenneth Ryder, A N Siakotos, Craig Stoops, Kathleen Warfel.

**Ex Officio Members Absent:** Shirley Newhouse, Richard Schilling.

**Visitors:** B. Keith Moore, Fringe Benefits Committee, Chair; Kathryn Wilson, Academic Affairs Committee Chair.

**AGENDA ITEM I**

**Memorial Resolution: Drexell A. Boyd, School of Dentistry**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Our first item of business is a memorial resolution for Drexell A. Boyd from the School of Dentistry. The agenda suggests that this is going to be read by Dean Gilmore from the School of Dentistry. It will be read instead by Associate Dean Jim Roche in the School of Dentistry. I would like to say, while he is coming up to the podium that Jim has just completed a very special task as Chair of the Search and Screen Committee for the deanship in the school of Optometry. I thank you now publicly and I will have a chance to thank you on other occasions, Jim, but I wanted to say here how much we appreciate what you have done.

**PROFESSOR ROCHE:** Thank you very much, Vice President Bepko. As many of you probably know, Dean Gilmore is a candidate for President-Elect of the American Dental Association. We are excited about his candidacy. On occasion, it requires Dean Gilmore to be away from the campus. As a substitute, it is my honor to read the memorial resolution about Drexell A. Boyd who happened to be my first teacher in Pediatric Dentistry. While many of the faculty members were trying to figure out whether to use a Freudian approach on child management or a behaviorist technique, Drex Boyd had the child out of the chair, out the door with a smile on his face because he was just an outstanding clinician. The resolution has been prepared by Dr. Melvin Lund, Dr. Ralph Phillips, and the chair, Dr. Maynard K. Hine.

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

## **AGENDA ITEM II**

### **Approval of Minutes - January 7, 1988**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** We will not have an approval of minutes at this meeting since the minutes from the last meeting have not yet been distributed. The reason for the delay is that we had problems with our new sound system at the last meeting and we had to reconstruct the events of the meeting. That process is still going on and those minutes will be appended with the minutes of today's meeting.

## **AGENDA ITEM III**

### **Presiding Officer's Business - Vice President Gerald Bepko**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** I have two brief items of business. First, as you know, our Affirmative Action Director Lincoln Lewis resigned effective in December 1987 to take a job as Assistant to the President for Human Resources at the University of Virginia in Charlottesville. We have been engaged in a search to recruit an acting Affirmative Action Director to replace Lincoln. We would like to report the results of that search. We have appointed, and she has accepted the title of Acting Affirmative Action Director, one of our own, a person who holds a Bachelor's Degree and a Master's Degree from this campus and who has also worked on the campus, both as Assistant to the Dean for Student Services and more recently as Assistant Director for the Center for Urban and Multi-cultural Education. Her name is Lillian Charleston. We think she has grown extraordinarily in the jobs that she has had at IUPUI and will discharge the responsibilities of Affirmative Action Director in extremely good fashion. She couldn't be here today to be introduced personally because she had a conflict in her schedule, but I think at a subsequent meeting we will ask her to come so that you can meet her.

Secondly, I want to give a brief update on the progress we are making toward the creation of a faculty club. There have been some delays because of schedules not coinciding and the holiday season interrupted the progress of our work.

The faculty committee that has been working with us has now approved of a place within the Conference Center. We are prepared and will, in the next few weeks, go ahead with some remodeling work that will have to be done in order to make the

space suitable for a faculty club. The space is on the second floor of the concourse between the hotel and the Conference Center, a little closer to the Conference Center than the hotel. Because of its location in that concourse, it will be centrally located on campus. It will be, I think, very convenient to get in and out of. It is not an extraordinarily large area that we have set aside at this point, but we think it is the type of space that will accommodate 50 to 60 persons seated for lunch or dinner and it can seat far more than that for a colloquia or for other types of meetings. It can be configured to suit the kind of faculty group that would be using the facility on any given occasion.

The work will not be done for a while and we will have some memos distributed giving you a little more information about this so you can react to it if you have any concerns or comments. We would like to hear your comments within the next few weeks so that, if there is some fundamental problem, we will know about it before we begin to do the remodeling work that will be necessary to put this area into the condition that we would like to have it to begin the faculty club.

#### **AGENDA ITEM IV**

##### **Executive Committee Report - Susan L. Zunt, Secretary**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Next we have the Executive Report from Susan Zunt.

**PROFESSOR ZUNT:** In December the Council directed the Executive Committee to survey the University community and determine some priorities for developing the academic calendar. I met with Dean Plater, Dean Nathan and Brian Vargus, Director of the Public Opinion Laboratory. We are a little closer to developing that survey. It is going to be a telephone survey. Primarily faculty will be contacted, basically part-time and full-time faculty and some staff members will be contacted. We will also use a different mechanism to contact students and community individuals so we will have a balanced opinion. We plan to have the results of this survey available for the March 3rd meeting of the Council.

The Executive Committee has appointed a committee to prepare an orientation process for our Faculty Boards of Review. We did this about 18 months ago and now we have elected new Faculty Boards of Review. We have assistance from the Dean of Faculties Office and the Vice President's Office to provide legal counsel to assist a small committee in developing an orientation process. In addition, the Executive Committee has asked this orientation committee to record their process so that we can use this in subsequent years to orient our Boards of Review. Pat Blake, School of Nursing, has been appointed chair of this committee; Gerald Powers, School of Social Work, and Glen Segraves, School of Dentistry will also be on the committee. Dottie Frapwell, University Counsel, will be assisting, supported by the Vice President's Office. We plan to have this orientation completed this semester.

The Indiana University Board of Trustees are meeting on this campus today through Saturday. This campus is responsible for developing the agenda for the Faculty Relations Committee meeting which takes place at 8:30 Saturday morning in the Conference Center. We didn't have much time to develop this agenda because there had been a change of venue for this meeting for the Trustees. With support from the Executive Committee and many of the schools on the campus, our agenda

consists of a program on Images from Liberal Arts; Ethics from Social Work; and Henry Karlson, Law, and Oliver Tzeng, from Science will be discussing Child Abuse and Neglect: The University's Response. The program, as I said, takes place at 8:30 - 9:30 Saturday morning. I believe it is in Room 208 in the Conference Center. Any of you who are on campus Saturday morning, we would love to have you there for that hour. Coffee is served. I know many of you are on campus Saturday morning. I see the parking lots in the faculty areas and I know that is the only chance you get to work privately or without a lot of interruptions but, if you have time this Saturday morning to attend the Faculty Relations Committee meeting, we would appreciate your support.

At the last Faculty Council meeting, the Council approved some Bylaw changes and Constitutional amendments. The Constitution then directs me to circulate this to the faculty for general review, and then the faculty members have the opportunity to circulate a petition which would recall that to the Council. It takes 50 faculty members to recall an issue to the Council and we would then have a special meeting. The information about this is at the printer and you should be getting it probably the beginning of next week. You will have an opportunity to review those amendments and the Bylaw changes. I have also included a ballot. The ballot needs to be taken 50 days after the beginning of this process. The ballot needs to come back to Mrs. Chumley by March 25th and that date includes the five days for spring break. Please, look at that carefully when you get it and vote and return the ballot to Mrs. Chumley.

The Academic Affairs Committee, as you know, will be looking at the non-academic faculty policies for non-academic units. We have, with the help of the deans from the involved schools, appointed three faculty members to the Academic Affairs Committee: Georgia Miller, School of Business; Creasie Hairston, School of Social Work; and John Werenko, Herron School of Art.

The Executive Committee, at their last meeting, developed nominations of faculty members, students, and community members to serve on a task force that is going to look at child care at IUPUI. This is a task force that will be named through Dean Timothy Langston's office and we were just submitting our recommendations. We have also asked that when this committee is formed that it include high ranking IUPUI administrators to inform and advise the committee regarding University and campus policies.

At the last University Faculty Council meeting President Ehrlich talked about two major searches that are going on in the University. Vice President for University Relations and the Vice President for Finance and Administration. That will be a new title for that Vice Presidency. The President met in Bloomington today with members of the Agenda Committee and also Gary Posner who was conducting the two searches. Gary Posner reported that there were about 70 candidates for Vice President for University Relations. When these candidates are narrowed to about five, the Agenda Committee will participate in interviewing these final five or six candidates. Mr. Posner predicts that the search will be finished by the end of this academic semester for both Vice President for University Relations and the Vice President for Finance and Administration. He estimated that there would be about 100 applicants for the post of Vice President for Finance and Administration.

The President also spoke about the beginning of responsibility-centered budgeting. I understand that the deans and budget officers in schools are now undergoing that process of orientation. Beverly Hill, who is our chairman of the Budgetary Affairs Committee, will be attending meetings on behalf of the IUPUI Faculty Council concerning responsibility centered-budgeting.

The President also spoke about his planning process. At the last University Faculty Council meeting, the seven groups reported through their faculty representatives. The President said that by February 17th we should begin a process of taking the seven groups and combining them into one report and that the composite report will be published in the IU Newspaper. I think May 2nd the large planning committee gets together again for final review and then the document goes to all of the faculty for review and discussion. Vice President, that completes my report.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Since it just took place this morning, I might add one thing that we are doing to try to substitute for a procedure that was in place up until the beginning of this academic year. There was a meeting of the University Agenda Committee and the University Administrative Committee about ten days before each Board of Trustees meeting usually on a Tuesday morning in Bloomington. Susan and her counterpart in Bloomington, Steve Wailes, were on those committees and attended those meetings. At those meetings there would be a preview of all of the items that were to be on the agenda at the subsequent Board meeting. Those items would be discussed, some items would be dropped from the agenda, and some would be added. There was an opportunity for this large group to review everything that was to be on the agenda. Under the new system, not as many things go to the Board of Trustees. Only some things go to the Board now. The rest are simply reported to the Board by way of an administrative report. Those Agenda Committee meetings and the Administrative Committee meetings are no longer held. The problem is that eliminated an opportunity for the leadership of the faculty councils in Bloomington and Indianapolis to keep abreast of things that were being reported to, or going to the Trustees for resolution. To fill that void, Ken Gros Louis and I volunteered to have a meeting with Susan and Steve Wailes prior to each Board meeting so that we could go over not only the things that are on the Board agenda but the things that are in the administrative reports that are going to the Board now simply for informational purposes. We had our first such meeting this morning by conference call. I won't speak for the Faculty Council representatives, but I think the meeting was good and we accomplished all of the things that we had hoped to accomplish. It will be a good substitute for the Administrative and Agenda committees.

**PROFESSOR ZUNT:** Could I talk again? I do appreciate your meeting with us in that way. It was very valuable to keep abreast of what is happening with faculty matters and with the Trustees.

I have a few notes here that I forgot to relay to you. Our Staff Relations Committee, which is chaired by Scott Evenbeck, did develop a written report concerning the IUPUI Development Plan. We filed that and we will have it duplicated with the minutes of today's meeting so that you can see that report. A copy has been forwarded to Dean Plater's office.

I have been contacted about changing the location of our April 7th meeting. For that April 7th meeting, we are tentatively invited to meet in the Clubhouse of Lockfield Gardens. Following our meeting, if this plan is approved, there will be an open faculty reception to allow us to preview that facility.

The last thing that I need to mention, President Ehrlich's office contacted me about an IUPUI all-faculty meeting similar to the one that we had on September 3 when he addressed the faculty. That was with a Faculty Council meeting. This is going to be a separate meeting. We have it scheduled for April 28th, which is a Thursday, in Emerson Hall from 1:30 - 3:00 p.m. Of course, you will be getting multiple communications about this but I wanted you to get it on your calendar as soon as possible since it is something you don't know about yet. The agenda for this meeting is going to be discussion of the academic planning process. By that time we should have the composite document on academic planning available to us. The President wants to hear our response. I hope Faculty Council members will accept the responsibility to attend this meeting and certainly see that your units are well represented at this meeting. Thank you.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Thank you, Susan. On the subject of planning and planning documents, we would like you to know that next week you will receive the most current draft of our campus plan for development. Each member of the Faculty Council will receive a copy, I think late next week. The following week we hope to have a copy of that campus plan sent to each member of the faculty on the Indianapolis campus.

#### **AGENDA ITEM V**

##### **Question and Answer Period - 10 Minutes**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Our next item of business is our 10-minute question and answer period. Does anyone have any questions or comments?

**PROFESSOR NAGY:** In recent months I have expressed concern about the Access Center and what it implies for admission to this university. My feeling is, even primary responsibility is given to the IPS support by the university. In addition, the original development plan called for decentralizing the Affirmative Action Office. I understand that that has been modified now so that, I hope shortly, we will undertake the national search for the Affirmative Action Officer. This raises an issue in the context of what people are doing in recruiting and retaining minority students. What have we been doing in the way of addressing the recruiting minorities, especially blacks, for faculty positions, administrative positions, and staff positions?

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Let me answer those questions, first by taking up the Access Center. We have been mindful of the concerns expressed, especially by people in the community, over our establishing a relationship with IPS and with delegating too much of the educational function to IPS. It turns out that for this inaugural semester for the University Access Center, there is not one course being taught by anyone at IPS. We are doing everything. That is probably the way it is going to end up, not only because of the concerns that have been expressed to us in the community but also because of the evaluation that we have been making of how the courses can be developed best. Right now, all of the



courses that are being offered through the University Access Center are being offered by IUPUI faculty. So, there is no IPS presence in the University Access Center at this time. We are looking at this, reviewing it, evaluating it, and if this is any forecast of the future, it may be that there won't be any IPS role. We don't know that yet, but that is the way the initial activities have tended to go.

With respect to the Affirmative Action Office, I don't think there has been any change in plans. Our plan all along has been to try to strengthen the centralized Affirmative Action Office by adding to it a network. That is what decentralization implies. The Affirmative Action Office, we think, will be strengthened both in terms of the staffing of the Affirmative Action Office in the campus administration and by having this campuswide network which will give the Affirmative Action program of the campus a voice in every unit. All of this is explained in the Campus Plan for Development. I don't know if I can state it any better than it is stated in the written plan. But, there was never any intention to decentralize, and by doing so, weaken the Affirmative Action Office. It was always the intention from the very beginning to not only strengthen the central Affirmative Action Office, but also to add to that an additional dimension of activity in the units. What is envisioned is a senior person in each unit who would have responsibility for reviewing the personnel issues that come up in that unit from an Affirmative Action standpoint. There would be an additional voice, if you will, speaking on behalf of minority recruitment. We think that adds to, rather than detracts from, the Affirmative Action effort. As to what we are doing to recruit minority faculty and students, I think we are doing a lot but it is obvious that we are not doing enough. Our results have not been satisfactory. We are going to try with this new program and the new Affirmative Action Office and a new Affirmative Action network to not only redouble our efforts but to employ a number of new strategies to try to have better results in the future both for student recruitment and faculty recruitment, staff recruitment, staff retention, staff promotion, faculty retention, faculty promotion and for the success of the students that we do recruit. I don't know whether it would be useful to go into all of the things that we have in mind that we may do that we are not doing now but they are also, like the plan for our Affirmative Action Office, set forth in the campus plan for development in writing.

**PROFESSOR NAGY:** I just want to add a sense of urgency, perhaps even emergency, with regard to improving student and faculty recruitment to see how far we have come if at all in the past eight years or so. I have the feeling that we do have a very very urgent problem on our hands.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** I think you are right. The plan that we have treats it that way although I don't think we can adjourn this meeting and all go out and spend the rest of the day working on this. That is not the kind of thing that I think would be productive. We have in the works, I think, a solid plan that we will implement as quickly as we possibly can and that we hope will create a greater record of success than we have had in the past. Our record of today has not been one that we can brag a lot about. I don't think that is because of a lack of effort and I don't think it is because of a lack of imagination. We just haven't done well enough, we just have to do better.

**PROFESSOR KIRK:** Is there a report from the State House?

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** There was, initially, a statement made by the leadership of the General Assembly that there would not be any opening of the budget in this short session. The budget for the biennium was approved in April, 1987, and that is for 1987-89, and they didn't want to open it up in this short session because if they did open it up for any reason, they were afraid that the whole budget bill that they had adopted the year before would unravel because everyone would want to be included in whatever changes were made in the budget. I think there has been some weakening of that position. The revenue forecast that was published in December was reasonably good. It projected a small surplus at the end of this year and another small surplus at the end of the following year -- the second year of the biennium. There is some modest hope that there will be an enhancement of the budget in this 1988 session. If there is, then higher education has a chance of being included in that enhancement. The universities have joined together to recommend to the General Assembly that, if there is some change in the University budgets, that the legislature should provide one additional percent of personnel compensation and also provide funding for the second year of the biennium in the "High Priority" category established by the Commission for Higher Education in 1987. The "High Priority" category, just to refresh your recollection, is the middle category that the Commission uses. They have the "Highest Priority," "High Priority," then "Programs of Importance." The Commission recommended funding of all requests in the "Highest" and "High" priority categories. The Legislature provided funding only for those requests in the "Highest Priority" category and the first year of the two years in the "High Priority" category.

The second year of the "High Priority" category is what is at issue right now. It happens that the Indianapolis campus has a great deal at stake in that second year in the "High Priority" category, at least in one specific area, that of part-time faculty replacement. I think there is about \$1,700,000. in that request. If the Legislature opens the budget and honors the request being made jointly by all of the public universities, the Indianapolis campus would get that part-time faculty replacement money. How likely it is that that is going to happen, I can't say. Anyone's guess would be worth hearing or not worth hearing as the case may be because no one knows at this point. There is a ray of hope but there can be no assurances at this point.

#### **AGENDA ITEM VI**

##### **Nominating Committee Report - Professor Glen Sagraves, Chair**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Our next item of business is a report from the Nominating Committee with Professor Sagraves.

**PROFESSOR SAGRAVES:** We have three persons who have been nominated for the position of Secretary of the IUPUI Faculty Council. They are Henry Karlson, School of Law; Rebecca Markel, School of Nursing; and Jeff Vessely, School of Physical Education. The election for the Secretary will be held at the March meeting.

Ballots for the election of the at large representatives to the IUPUI Faculty

Council and the University Faculty Council were distributed on January 26. The ballots are to be returned by February 19. We should be able to tell you the results of that election at the March meeting also.

The University Faculty Voting Roster has been corrected and submitted back to Bloomington and it appears that we have 1,163 voting members as far as the University Faculty Council representation is concerned. That does not change our representation this year. That still gives us 12 representatives to the University Faculty Council. We have six holdovers and six to be elected on the ballot that you have all now received.

## **AGENDA ITEM VII**

### **Fringe Benefits Committee Report - Professor B. Keith Moore, Chair**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Next we have a report from the Fringe Benefits Committee given by Keith Moore.

**PROFESSOR MOORE:** Secretary Zunt and the Executive Committee have asked me to be here today to bring you up to date on some things which have happened over the last six months on several items which either have been of interest to this group or certainly should be.

I would like to start by mentioning a couple of items that have been approved for action by both the IUPUI Faculty Council and the University Faculty Council. The first of these items is the insurance-based Long Term Disability Program. I am happy to report that the IU Board of Trustees has requested that the insurance and retirement programs staff prepare a request for proposal along the lines of the specific sort of proposal that we looked at and approved. This proposal then would be submitted and bids would be solicited from commercial vendors. This to me, at least, would indicate that the Trustees are interested and very serious in moving ahead on this, because preparing such an RFP for submission is not something that you would do, at least I don't believe that it is something that you do, unless you are seriously interested in it. So, I think that is a positive sign.

The other item that has been approved both here and by the University Faculty Council is the Phased Early Retirement Program. This was mentioned to President Ehrlich last fall in a meeting of the University Faculty Council's Agenda Committee. He has looked at it and his feeling, at least at the present time, is to place this proposal on hold pending a review of all of our retirement programs and perhaps take some action on some more urgent areas.

One of those urgent areas is the last item I would like to report on. That area is the 18/20 plan. As probably most of you know, there has been increasing concern on several levels in the University about the cost of the 18/20 plan and the lack of control and even predictability of some of those costs. This concern led the Board of Trustees last summer to appoint a committee to review all of the IU retirement programs. This committee was appointed and consisted of Professors John Long and Harold Lindman from Bloomington. They were charged essentially to take the fall semester and review the entire IU retirement programs. After looking at it, they elected to limit the review simply to the 18/20 plan. I

think that was a wise decision because they managed to occupy more than the entire semester and produced a 300-page document on the 18/20 plan alone. An attempt to review the entire retirement programs would have probably occupied at least six years.

In any case, in the process of the review they appointed an ad hoc committee of several faculty members to act strictly as advisors to Professors Long and Lindman. The ad hoc committee consisted of Michael Downs from Fort Wayne, Herb Kaplan from Bloomington, Martha McCarthy from Bloomington, myself from this campus, William Popkin from Bloomington, and Albert Ruesink from Bloomington. The ad hoc committee had the opportunity to review bits and pieces of the Long Lindman document as it was being prepared and then an all day meeting was held on December 3rd, a face-to-face meeting where the entire draft of the Long-Lindman report to the Board was reviewed. Out of this review there were several items upon which general consensus was reached. This is basically what I would like to report to you.

The first item of unanimous consensus was that all existing faculty should have an option to remain with the existing 18/20 plan, assuming that some new plan is developed.

The second item of consensus was that if a new plan is developed that equality should be sought between 10-month and 12-month employees in terms of the manner in which the interim benefits are calculated. As you know, at the present time 10-month faculty members who had summer research or teaching appointments are not credited for those in terms of either TIAA/CREF payments or in terms of calculating interim benefits.

The final item of consensus was that, if major modifications are made in the 18/20 plan by the Board of Trustees, the broadest possible exposure to these changes should be given and advice sought from faculty and all individuals that are involved in TIAA/CREF and eligible for the 18/20 plan before the changes are made.

These three items, I think, give me at least some feeling of security or assurance. I would like to read to you a little bit of a letter that was sent from Professor Long to the ad hoc advisory committee following the meeting on December 3rd. The excerpt from the letter reads:

"The report for the Board of Trustees on the 18/20 plan has been completed. It reflects the guidance that Harold Lindman and I received from you especially at our December 3rd meeting. We listened and changed the draft to make it consistent with the major points on which the committee expressed a consensus."

I have no idea of what the draft looked like. I have not received a copy. There is indication that at such a time that the Trustees have looked at it and feel comfortable with doing so, that copies will be made available. Based upon the memo from Professor Long and on the consensus from the advisory committee, I feel fairly comfortable with the things that have happened. I will say that Long and Lindman did a very exhaustive study of the 18/20 plan and the potential problems and I think they have done a really excellent job in proposing some new alterna-

tives. As long as they are reviewed as alternatives and existing faculty have an option to either stay with what we have or to opt for some new plan, I think that our overall interests are really best protected.

I would be happy to answer any questions except those directed to what were the specifics of the document because (1) I can't tell you and (2) I don't know.

**PROFESSOR NAGY:** What prompted the Trustees to initiate this study? Was there a strong increase in the number of people who take the 18/20 option?

**PROFESSOR MOORE:** As I understand it, there were both a fairly sharp increase in number and a fairly sharp increase in the cost or the interim benefits to the people that were retiring. Long discussions with insurance and retirement programs have identified the stock market as the principal culprit. This problem largely went away surprisingly enough this fall. A lot of the pressure to make an immediate change, I think, has evaporated when the stock market did its rather abrupt decline. This is what I have been given to understand.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** The 18/20 plan is administered by the University with funds that are drawn from a tax on the campuses. Our tax was increased this last year. In other words, we had to transfer funds from our budget base that we could have used otherwise for salaries and faculty positions. That fund, I think, was something a little less than \$1 million, but it was a substantial amount of money equalling I think almost 3/4 of a percent of our entire salary budget for the campus. That is one of the things that caused the Trustee review. The cost of the 18/20 program has gone up so much that there is a fear that this unfunded liability is going to create greater and greater problems in the out years. Of course, this process may lead to a point where it may go back down again because you only stay in this 18/20 special status for five years. But it is important to emphasize for that five-year period, the persons who are in retirement at 18/20 get paid by the University out of funds that we contribute as a campus to the Central Administration.

The other thing was that there have been some recent cases, in the view of the Trustees, where faculty members retired under the 18/20 rule at an amount higher than their current salaries. That means you get more money to retire than you would get if you continue to work. Some Trustees have said that doesn't make any sense.

**PROFESSOR WELLMAN:** The rule itself isn't being reviewed in terms of being taken away. That really is a legal contract with those faculty that went into their employment. I mean, they either have to provide that or something as best one could see as being equivalent. Is that correct?

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** In these debates among members of the Trustees, I assume all kinds of things may have been argued and debated, but I don't think there is any chance that any employee could be deprived of the contract right to that retirement benefit. That is part of your contract of employment as I see it. I don't think anybody is going to seriously propose that. I think the types of things that have been considered had to do with new employees.

**PROFESSOR MOORE:** I might say, although I can't tell you any details, the new

plan that they are proposing, if it developed along the lines they were indicating, looks as if it would be very difficult for an average employee to look at and decide if they were better off under it or under the old plan. It does have some attractive features to it. I don't think it is going to be an obvious choice if that is the way things shake out. It is not going to be an obvious decision to any of us as to which way to go. It will give the insurance and retirement people some additional headaches in terms of consulting.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** There has been one related idea discussed but I don't think it is being pursued and that idea was to allow schools to give a new employee flexibility in choosing how compensation was paid. Instead of having a salary figure plus 14.8 percent or whatever is paid into TIAA/CREF, the new employee could choose to have a little larger base salary and 10 percent or 7.5 percent paid into TIAA/CREF. In other words, shift some of the money over from the retirement program into current income. The deans have reacted on both campuses to that idea and have reacted negatively, not because they want to deprive faculty members of options but because of the fear that if you give faculty members salary increases through taking away retirement benefits, it may relieve some of the pressure on the state to provide the salary increases that ought to be provided anyway. It would not be right, for example, if our salaries all of a sudden inflated because we opted for taking some of our retirement benefits away and then our standing in the Big Ten went up and the Legislature said "Now you are already fourth in the Big Ten why do you need any more money?" That is the kind of reasoning that has led the deans to be "cool" to the idea. I am not sure that it is going to be pursued any further. If you have an interest in it, you should make your voices heard. It was never considered, incidentally, for existing employees. It would only have been for new employees.

**PROFESSOR MOORE:** Secretary Zunt has asked me to present a teaser. You are going to have to look at me and listen to me again next month. We will be bringing next month to you an item out of the IUPUI committee for consideration relating to this very old issue of the inequity between the treatment of 10-month and 12-month employees that have summer employment, whether it is research or teaching.

There will be a specific proposal from the IUPUI committee that is included with the agenda for next month's meeting. The way we are viewing this is that we are going to present it next month just as an information item and then allow you a month to think about it before we ask for any kind of action on it in April.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Thank you, Keith.

#### **AGENDA ITEM VIII**

##### **Academic Affairs Committee Report - Professor Kathryn Wilson, Chair**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Next we have a report from the Academic Affairs Committee by Kathryn Wilson.

**PROFESSOR WILSON:** I have come today to tell you what our committee has been doing this past year and what the results of some of our activities are.

First of all, I would like to tell you what our agenda has been for this year.

One of the first things we were asked to do by the Executive Committee was to establish a policy committee to oversee the University Division academic policies. Instead of doing that we decided that, in fact, what we should do is establish a committee that would oversee any non-academic unit that is now established or might be established in the future. We drafted a proposal for what this committee should do and what it should consist of. It was decided that it was probably a bad idea to establish another committee, at which point our committee was enlarged to include members from units that deal with University Division in particular so that the Academic Affairs Committee could take over this responsibility which in the past it has not traditionally handled. Thus far, what we have done is have Pat Boaz of the Adult Education Center come and give us a report on the policies and procedures that she has established for her unit. At that time we were able to make a preliminary assessment of her policies and procedures and we will have a further opportunity to do so when some of those procedures are more firm. We recently had Marie Miller come and speak to us about issues that her University Division's Policies Committee has been dealing with the past four years. Marie Miller's committee has been the committee, an administrative committee, responsible for establishing the new 56-hour rule that says that students may not remain in University Division after they have 56 hours. They must be transferred to another unit. Our committee is now in the process of making a formal request to University Division that they present to us a written documentation of their policies so that we may review it before the end of this semester. We have taken over that.

A second agenda item that we are about to take up has to do with mid-term grades.

A third agenda item that we will take up has to do with advanced placement programs at IUPUI.

A fourth agenda item is the question of whether IUPUI should enforce the core curriculum which was passed several years ago by the IUPUI Faculty Council. Core curriculum has become an issue in the Educational Policies Committee of the University Faculty Council. A preliminary report was issued by that committee and is in the minutes of the University Faculty Council. We will take up this issue as it comes out of the Educational Policies Committee.

The last agenda item that we have dealt with has yielded some very interesting data which I would like to present to you. We actually last year began to consider whether or not we should establish an admissions deadline -- not a registration deadline, but an admissions deadline. That is, we should tell students that they must have their applications to the University into the proper authorities by such and such a date or they will not be admitted until the following semester. It was the impression, and that is all that it was, of a number of committee members that people who were admitted late -- not who registered late -- but who were admitted late did more poorly and possibly dropped out soon, etc. We decided that we would investigate this. We asked Michael Wince, who runs the Office of Student Research, to help us with this. We also asked the Registrar for help and everyone in the University has cooperated. Dr. Wince has now submitted a preliminary report and I would like to read you a substantial part of this report. I think that you should be aware of some of the data.

"The Office of Student Research examined data on the fall 1986 undergraduate matriculants at IUPUI, Indianapolis campus, in order to determine the relationship between admission dates for these matriculants and their performance and persistence in the semester they matriculated, as well as in the subsequent spring semester. In order to further refine the data, profiles of these matriculants were also constructed. The major questions that guided this analysis were (1) Do matriculants who are admitted, late defined as anytime after the week before final registration, do more poorly than students admitted earlier as measured by their grade point average? (2) Are students who are admitted late any less likely to return to the University in the spring? Data was assembled on the total population of undergraduate matriculants for fall 1986, including both degree and non-degree students. This population numbered 2,920. The findings from this analysis are several.

1. Approximately 16 percent of all fall matriculants at IUPUI were admitted between the week before registration and the first week of classes. In terms of numbers this is 468 students. The late-admit population is approximately 62 percent non-degree students. This represents 292 of the 468 students. Whereas, 7 percent of all degree students were admitted during this late time frame, 59 percent of all non-degree students were admitted during the late period.
2. Approximately 68 percent of all fall matriculants were beginning college students. [All of them, not just the late ones.] Thirty-two percent were transfers. Transfer students are more likely to be admitted in the late period vs beginner.

There is a difference in the admission patterns of older and younger matriculants as well as part-time and full-time matriculants. Older matriculants are more likely to seek admission in the late time period -- 28 percent vs 7 percent. Part-time matriculants, those taking 11 hours or less, are also more likely than their full-time counterparts to be admitted late - 21 percent vs 7 percent. Also, predominantly older students tended not to have SAT and high school percentile data. If anything can be said about the quality of our matriculants with respect to entrance data, it is probably that those who are accepted earlier in the year are slightly better prepared students based on these two measures. [That is, SAT and high school percentile data]. Contrary perhaps to some people's expectations, those students admitted during the late period, defined by this study as August 13th, 1986 through the first week of classes for fall, 1986, had fall and spring GPAs roughly equivalent to or better than those students admitted earlier [exactly the opposite of what we expected], suggesting no significant negative impact on GPA as a result of late admissions. This study also examined the effects of admission dates on a student's persisting into the spring semester. From the earliest to the latest admission time frame, there is a steady increase in the percentage of students not returning to IUPUI in the subsequent spring semester. Nineteen percent of the October/May cohort didn't return whereas 52 percent of the late cohort did not return. Whether these students return at a later date will be the subject of a further study of this population of students.



Much of the above differences between admission dates and persistence into the spring semester can be explained by the behavior of non-degree adult students. When admission data persistence is examined, controlling for degree-seeking status the difference is in the stopout behavior of those students.

Further refinement of the data and an attempt to construct the profiles of students, based on their age, previous college experience, and degree-seeking status, provided further insight into student outcomes as measured by this study by GPA and the decision to enroll in the subsequent spring semester. Students experiencing the most academic difficulty are our traditional students -- those just beginning college and under 21 years of age. Those students who are older, as well as those students who have had previous college, do better among the degree-seeking students. Also, for nearly every profile, early admissions before the end of May seems to be associated with greater academic success."

The committee also noted on this point about our traditional students that we ought to examine the kinds of services that we offer those students. IUPUI has traditionally been extremely interested in providing services for non-degree and adult students. It made the committee wonder if, perhaps, we are ignoring what may be an increasing population of traditional students.

"Data also suggest that if older students do better academically, they are also more likely to drop out or stop out than their younger counterparts. Late admissions accounts for a relatively small percentage of the young returners, stopouts, and dropouts. The one exception perhaps is the older transfer student. Eighteen and one-half percent of these non-returnees were admitted late."

This report comes with a set of charts. Michael Wince is prepared to give this to anyone in the University who requests it from him. Finally, I would like to add that, if any faculty wish, they may suggest agenda items that they feel are important for our committee to take up.

## **AGENDA ITEM IX**

### **IUPUI Network Committee Report - Dean R Bruce Renda, Chair**

Dean Renda, as chairman, reported on the status of work by a committee appointed by Vice President Bepko, who had charged the group with three tasks -- preparing an inventory of existing computing and telecommunications resources at IUPUI, submitting recommendations for effective future use of those resources, and developing a plan for integrating the campus telecommunications infrastructure, taking into account existing Indiana University strategies. The committee is considering the characteristics and potentials of voice, data, and video signals, the existing delivery systems on the campus, and the needs of students, faculty members, and administrators, along with functional and geographic considerations. The capability of various kinds of disks for information storage also will be pertinent. The 13-member committee had met three times and had scheduled four more meetings, into April. Initial meetings had focused on the inventory phase of their charge.

Dean Renda then described a computer software system for inventory purposes, which he and a colleague had developed. This "Quick-Draw" system can include items of equipment located within a campus' buildings, within floors of those buildings, within rooms of those floors, and within portions of those rooms. He offered to furnish copies of the system to the Deans without charge and requested their help to the committee by furnishing lists of computer equipment in their schools.

**AGENDA ITEM X**  
**New/Old Business**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Does anyone have any old or new business?

There was no old or new business.

**AGENDA ITEM XI**  
**Adjournment**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** If there is nothing else, we are adjourned.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS

**Faculty Council Meeting**  
Thursday, April 7, 1988  
Lockefield Gardens Clubhouse  
3:30 - 5:00

**Members Present:** Administrative: Vice President Gerald L. Bepko, William P. Plater. Deans: John Barlow, Walter J. Daly, Elizabeth Grossman, R. Bruce Renda, Sheldon Siegel, William J. Voos, Marshall Yovits. Faculty: Billy Abel, C. D. Aliprantis [replacement for Bernard Morrel], Margaret Applegate, Morris Aprison, Richard Beck, Anne Belcher, H. R. Besch, Jr., Willard Bostwick, Linda Brothers, Varoujan Chalian, Theodore Cutshall, Kenneth Dunipace, Margaret Felton, Celestine Hamant, Dolores J. Hoyt, Jerome Kaminker, Jerome Kaplan, Henry Karlson, Linda Kasper, Juanita Keck, Robert Kirk, John Lappas, Rebecca T. Markel, James McAteer, Dana McDonald, Robert Mendelsohn, Judy Miller, Paul Nagy, Bartholomew Ng, Richard Pflanzner, Jeanne Pontious, Gerald Powers, Richard L. Rogers, Beverly Ross, Glen Sagraves, Richard Schilling, P. Kent Sharp, Judith Silence, Henry Wellman, Karen West, Susan Zunt.

**Alternates Present:** Deans: Robert Mendelsohn for Charles Bonser, Jean Gnat for Barbara Fischler, Patricia Boaz for James Weigand. Faculty: Richard Hyde for Frederick Bein, Narcissa Hocker for Mary Feeley, Suetta Kehrein for Emily Hernandez, David Leonard for William Hodes, Mary McKenzie for Judith Kosegi, Richard Ward for Susan Sutton, Jennifer Hehman for Maudine Williams.

**Members Absent:** Administrative: Dean Carol Nathan. Deans: Norman Lefstein, Nicholas Kellum, Howard Mehlinger, Jack Wentworth. Faculty: Elaine Alton, Sharon Andreoli, Carl Andres, John Baenziger, Cecil Brown, Mervyn Cohen, Robert Colyer, Dewey Conces, William Crabtree, Paula Differding, Joseph DiMicco, Robert Dittus, John Eble, James Edmondson, Elizabeth Evenbeck, Mark Farber, Mary Feeley, B. P. Garg, Donald Gartner, Robert A. Harris, Eugene Helveston, Emily Hernandez, Louis Holtzclaw, Rosemarie Jones, Florence Juillerat, D. K. Rex, Kenneth Ryder, A. N. Siakotos, Craig Stoops, Jeffery Vessely, Vernon Vix, Kathleen Warfel, Dorothy Webb.

**Visitors:** Ralph Jersild, School of Medicine; Richard Meiss, Unit Rep., School of Medicine; B. Keith Moore, Chairman, Fringe Benefits Committee; Kathryn Wilson, Chairman, Academic Affairs Committee.

**AGENDA ITEM I - Memorial Resolution - Dr. Richard C. Webster, Medicine**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** The first order of business today is a memorial resolution for Dr. Richard Webster from the School of Medicine to be read by Professor Ralph Jersild. [The memorial resolution was read and a moment of silence was observed.]

**AGENDA ITEM II - Approval of Minutes - March 3, 1988**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** The next item of business is the approval of the minutes for the March 3, 1988 meeting. Is there a motion?

**PROFESSOR MARKEL:** So moved.

**PROFESSOR CHALIAN:** I second it.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** All in favor say "Aye". Opposed?

**AGENDA ITEM III - Presiding Officer's Business - Vice President Gerald L. Bepko**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** The next item is Presiding Officer's Business. I have two quick items. One is to remind you that on Thursday, April 28 we will have the first annual IUPUI Spring Celebration Dance entitled "The Tradition Begins". This is the student government sponsored event which they would like to make, and I would like also to make, an annual event. That is why it is called the first annual Spring Celebration Dance. If you have an interest in attending or acquiring further information, Richard Schilling, President of the Student Government, is here. He will give you a brochure and tell you more about the event.

Also, one other item. The subject of applications for enrollment at IUPUI will be on the lips of a number of people in the University administration this month. As you know, we are going to have a Person-to-Person Week later in April. If any of you are interested in participating in that, I hope you will let us know. Carol Nathan is in charge of this. It is an opportunity for persons who are interested in finding out more about IUPUI to come here and to learn more while being shepherded around the campus by members of the faculty. We think this might increase interest in IUPUI and also will give people more information about what actually is here and will help in the long and difficult process of disabusing people of false impressions and old myths that exist. I have some brochures on the Person-to-Person Week if anyone would like to have them.

Directly related to that, we have some interesting news from the Admissions Office. It seems that applications for admission to IUPUI as freshmen are up about 27 percent this year over last year, which was a very good year. We reached our record enrollment in 1987 in the fall and our applications are up 27 percent over that year, which is very encouraging. I don't think this increase has come about only at IUPUI. Other campuses and universities are having a similar experience. The interest in the university education has increased in the public generally, but we are seeing a really heart warming increase in the number of applicants for IUPUI and I think that is good news.

**AGENDA ITEM III - Executive Committee Report - Susan L. Zunt, Secretary**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Next we have the Executive Committee Report from Susan Zunt.

**PROFESSOR ZUNT:** I apologize that on this agenda you didn't see the TIAA/CREF benefits for 10-month appointees as we said we would postpone it until this month. Dr. Aliprantis is here today to discuss that, and we will do it under Unfinished Business. That is why you received that duplicated handout as you came in.

The results of the ballot have been tabulated concerning the Constitutional amendment. The Constitutional amendment has been ratified overwhelmingly. There were some negative votes.

**MRS. CHUMLEY:** There were 222 for, 11 against, and one person didn't care which way it went.

**PROFESSOR ZUNT:** The Constitutional amendments have been approved concerning the way the Secretary conducts and reports the business and especially the ongoing business of the Council and also who can be elected to, for example, the Executive Committee. It expands a pool of eligible faculty members. Those provisions go into effect with the beginning of the next academic year.

You will be receiving from me a memo shortly concerning an open faculty meeting with President Thomas Ehrlich. The academic planning document was published in The IU Newspaper in the April 4th edition. I think all faculty members have also received a copy directly from the President's Office. On April 28 we will be able to meet as a faculty and discuss this planning document with the President. As you know, the faculty representation in this planning process was derived from our University Faculty Council membership. This is really now our opportunity to respond to this draft document. So, I hope that all Faculty Council members will take advantage of this opportunity and attend that meeting and encourage your colleagues to attend. I will remind you, as I do in the memo, that this is going to be held in Emerson Hall. There is garage parking close to that area but there is no surface parking just adjacent to the building. So, you probably will need to plan just a little more time to get to that meeting than you might for a typical Faculty Council meeting.

The committee membership for our standing committees is in the process of being determined. The preference sheets have all been received and tabulated in the Faculty Council Office. We are sending the faculty committee preferences to the current chair, the current secretary, and an Executive Committee representative to help develop recommendations which the Executive Committee will make for our standing committees for the next year.

There is an item of business that we received on the University Faculty Council level that we did transmit to each Council. I want to tell you about that. It concerns budgetary implications of University Fringe Benefits policies. Those of you who attended the UFC meeting have already heard about this. President Ehrlich has requested the University Faculty Council's Fringe Benefits Committee and Budgetary Affairs Committee to review fringe benefits commitments and consider substantial decreases in these commitments for 1989. Areas of specific concern include group health insurance and fee courtesy. The Legislature has budgeted roughly eight percent increase in those areas, and projected increases to keep coverage the same as we have now and to keep anticipated fee courtesy at the level we have now would be a 50 percent increase. President Ehrlich has asked these two committees to consider holding increases in those two areas to 8 percent. Our Fringe Benefits Committee, chaired by B. Keith Moore, has been sent a copy of this document and as soon as they have a recommendation, it will come back to you. The University Faculty Council is also working on that. As you know, that committee is chaired by Michael Downs and B. Keith Moore.

The Capital Campus Faculty Club organizational meeting was held yesterday in the Conference Center and was hosted by Vice President Bepko. As you know, this was a project that the Faculty Council has worked on for a number of years. There were quite a few faculty members who attended that meeting and, in addition, I have brought some papers with me today if anyone was unable to attend that meeting and would like to get in on the ground floor of the organization which needs to be separate from the Faculty Council. I have about 30 sheets. I don't have enough for everyone, but for those who would like to join the Faculty Club or get more information about it at this point, they will be available for you after the meeting.

At the March 29 University Faculty Council meeting, which was held here in Indianapolis, the University Faculty Council did approve a recommendation concerning the 18-20 proposal. It is very much in line with what we as a campus had transmitted to the Board of Trustees. This proposal will be given to the Trustees at their meeting in Fort Wayne which begins tomorrow afternoon. The Trustees have announced that they will be holding a faculty meeting in Bloomington on Saturday, April 16 at 9:30 a.m. They want to meet with faculty representatives. We just found out about this this morning. Our Fringe Benefits Committee, I think, is probably hearing about this for the first time. We will be getting representatives who are knowledgeable and informed to attend. If you have specific concerns, Keith Moore and I will be there from this campus. I think we could deputize other faculty members, it is important to have this representative group. I don't have a location yet for that meeting. If you are interested in attending, being a Faculty Council representative, you would have to contact either myself or Keith Moore to find out where it is going to be held.

Becky VanVoorhis, who is the chair for the Learning Resources subcommittee on Ethics, sent me some brochures. I expect most of you have received this already through the mail. If you haven't, I do have a few here that you are welcome to take. There are a few more programs left in that series and you probably recall that the Faculty Council is co-sponsoring that lecture series.

The last portion of the Executive Committee Report is a summary of the Academic Calendar survey which was conducted by the Public Opinion Laboratory by its Director, Brian Vargus. I would like defer now to Dr. Vargus to present this material.

**PROFESSOR VARGUS:** Thank you. I apologize for reading from it. It is relatively short but it will perhaps answer a lot of your questions by following the text of it.

Early in the spring a meeting was held in the Office of the Dean of Faculties William Plater concerning the prospects of a survey of relative constituencies regarding the IUPUI Academic Calendar. Those attending the meeting included Dean Carol Nathan, IUPUI Faculty Council Secretary Susan Zunt, Kathryn Wilson of the Academic Affairs Committee, and Brian Vargus, Director of the IUPUI Public Opinion Laboratory. The Dean of Faculties indicated the willingness of his office to underwrite the expense of a technically sound survey of IUPUI faculty regarding matters related to the academic calendar.

It was decided that the main focus of the survey would be voting faculty with some attempt to represent part-time faculty. Further it was decided that the medical professions faculty would be restricted to the non-clinical faculty. This decision was made because the academic calendar is in many respects irrelevant to those engaged in clinical instruction and supervision.

The preliminary questionnaire had been designed by Dr. Zunt with some suggestions made at the meeting by all present. The staff of the Public Opinion Laboratory developed a final instrument and pretested it. Final approval for the instrument was left to the Dean of Faculties' representative.

The first task was a sample of what the Dean of Faculties gave the Public Opinion Laboratory a list all full-time voting faculty at IUPUI that was current as of November, 1987. This list was divided by school and assignment which meant librarians were included but gave no indication of clinical or non-clinical status of the Medical faculty. In addition, there is no central list, as near as we can find, of part-time faculty so the Public Opinion Laboratory staff was left to develop a way to represent that group in the final results.

An initial meeting indicated a desire to randomly select about 200 faculty to be interviewed. Thus, the lists were entered at a random point and every eighth name was selected for interview. If that person was unavailable, a clinical faculty member, or otherwise ineligible, they were replaced by alternating between the name just before or just after the person selected initially.

Part-time faculty names were secured by calling schools and departments that were identified as having such employees, securing names and phone numbers of as many as possible. These lists were then sampled at random. Interviews were conducted by trained and experienced interviewers from the POL staff between March 28 through April 5. The long period in the data collection phase was caused by the difficulty in securing non-clinical, medical faculty members who would answer the questions. The Medical School faculty members when contacted were frequently very abrupt and indicated that the matter was of no interest to them. This caused the staff to implement a policy of asking selected respondents for the names and numbers of faculty who fit the categories needed. While this introduced us to some small error, we still think the sample can be treated as an essentially random sample.

Other than in the Medical School, the faculty cooperation was outstanding. Only six faculty refused outright to be interviewed. A small number, less than ten, indicated displeasure at the end of the interview because of one of three reasons: (1) they felt the academic calendar was irrelevant to them, (2) they didn't like the questions we asked or the design of the questionnaire, and (3) they felt they had no time for Faculty Council matters and felt that such a survey was a waste.

The calls were made from our facilities in Cavanaugh Hall. To complete the more than 200 interviews reported on, the staff made more than 1,230 telephone calls. Many resulted in requests to call back at different times. The difficulty in contacting faculty in the health schools, in general, was extreme. However, we feel we have, using the referral method described above, a good sample of the voting faculty with interest in the academic calendar.

It is important to note that the faculty were asked to make their choices considering the academic soundness of various options for the academic calendar. There is some indication this did not always figure in the faculty responses. The best example of this is the Medical School faculty member who indicated at the end of the interview that his major complaint about the calendar was that the numbers are too small and the pictures are not pretty.

As can be seen from the distribution of the schools of the respondents, all units are represented in the study approximately in proportion to their representation in the faculty as a whole except for the Medicine units. That is because of the decision not to include the clinical faculty.

Over 85 percent of those we interviewed indicated they were full-time faculty members with more than 68 percent indicating their rank as professor or associate professor. The number of students reported as taught each semester varied from zero, largely for librarians and a few others, to 400. The median number of students taught was between 50 and 60 per semester.

Almost two-thirds of those we interviewed indicated they were not in favor of classes on Labor Day. Another two-thirds indicated they preferred something other than a one-week break at Thanksgiving. At the same time, when offered as an alternative to that, a plan of two long weekend breaks, more than 60 percent indicated they did not want two long weekend breaks either. There was almost equal division between those favoring the Wednesday to Friday Thanksgiving holiday and those favoring a Thursday to Friday Thanksgiving holiday.

Over 14 percent of those interviewed indicated they teach at more than one IU campus. Almost two-thirds of those interviewed said they would prefer that IU Bloomington and IUPUI have coordinated calendars. Almost 50 percent indicated they prefer that the University develop an All University calendar. When asked when the fall semester should begin, over 50 percent said they liked the current pattern of late August. A significant minority, 30 percent, indicated they preferred classes starting after Labor Day. An opportunity to provide any comment they wished to was given to each respondent. The most common comments involved some support for standardizing schedules between schools, campuses, and local schools. Over 22 percent of the faculty indicated that as a concern. Almost eight percent, virtually all from the Medical faculty, indicated a desire to coordinate the professional school calendar with the other academic calendar particularly that of the graduate school.



A small number indicated a desire to abolish Spring break or at least change it to correspond with other campuses in the state. Miscellaneous comments involved things such as shortening the IUPUI calendar in weeks to match that of IU Bloomington and the need to make sure that IUPUI, rather than IU Bloomington, sets the calendar for the IUPUI campus.

The conclusion. Three major things emerged from this study. The majority of the faculty are opposed to having classes on Labor Day; the majority of faculty are opposed to a full-week break at Thanksgiving, and there is significant support for standardization of the academic calendar with other schools and/or local schools. One minor faction is very aware of the longer semester at IUPUI when compared to Bloomington and they think that is an issue that needs additional study.

I certainly would be glad to answer any questions.

**DEAN YOVITS:** I am curious. Is one of the people involved the Dean of the Medical School?

**PROFESSOR VARGUS:** We operate under rules of confidentiality so I can't answer that question. Although I would doubt it unless he teaches classes. We were specifically interested in teaching faculty.

**PROFESSOR ZUNT:** We have presented this now. Hopefully, it will be helpful to us in our deliberations about the development and voting on the academic calendar in the future. The academic calendar, which you see on your agenda, was supposed to be distributed today. As soon as we got the results of this survey, we recognized that we cannot present the calendar that the Academic Affairs Committee has prepared for you. So we will do that next month.

**DEAN YOVITS:** I have a question. It was a point of contention a long time ago as to whether we would have to start on Monday. Was that one of the questions you asked?

**PROFESSOR VARGUS:** No. We did not ask that question but I can say this. I read all 200+ of these myself. I didn't conduct the interviews. My staff did that. But, I did read each one myself. There were a number of people who commented, particularly those that wanted classes to start after Labor Day, who specifically said the Tuesday right after Labor Day. There are some problems with that. It was apparent to the interviewers that many faculty do not understand the academic calendar. I picked on that one about pretty pictures because I thought that was kind of funny, but there are a number of people who simply do not understand that if you take away from one end you have to add on to the other or something like that. Several of the interviewers, who, by the way are all paid students, so they are acutely aware of the academic calendar. We are told again and again by faculty members that it wouldn't matter. There was one faculty member who went on to some length about the questionnaire because they felt that those particular options that are restricted were not made clear in the questionnaire. But, we did not specifically ask about the Monday issue.

**PROFESSOR ZUNT:** That concludes our report.

**AGENDA ITEM V - Nominating Committee Report - Glen Sagraves, Chair**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Next we have the Nominating Committee Report with Glen Sagraves, Chairman of the Nominating Committee.

**PROFESSOR SAGRAVES:** There were two sheets made available to you as you came in. The yellow one lists all of the new Unit representatives that have been reported to us by the units for the years 1988-1990.

The second sheet is gray and lists the slates for the three committees - the Nominating Committee, the Executive Committee, and the Tenure Committee. The election will be held at the May meeting for these.

For the Nominating Committee we will be voting for four as far as we know right now. For the Executive Committee we will be voting for four. For the Tenure Committee, we will vote for three.

**PROFESSOR ZUNT:** This is marked "ballot." That is inaccurate. We hope to use this as a ballot but we will use another color of paper.

**AGENDA ITEM VI - Academic Affairs Committee Report, Kathryn Wilson, Chair**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Next we have a report from the Academic Affairs Committee. Kathryn, were you going to make a report on the Student Appeals issue.

**PROFESSOR WILSON:** I was but I don't have the paper.

**PROFESSOR ZUNT:** Since we don't have this available, and I am not sure why we don't have this available, we will have it to distribute with the minutes and with the agenda for the May meeting.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** We received copies of it but apparently it wasn't sent out to everyone.

**PROFESSOR WILSON:** It wasn't sent out. I thought it was going to be duplicated.

**AGENDA ITEM VII - Question and Answer Period - 10 Minutes**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** That takes us to the Question and Answer period. We set aside 10 minutes for people to ask questions. We have received no questions in writing prior to the meeting so I have nothing to tell you about. Does anyone have a question or comment?

**PROFESSOR NAGY:** I am a member on the Forum on Campus Interrelations which is an administrative committee. At our monthly meeting this week I was asked to preside over discussion of the relevant portion of the Campus Development Plan. Many of the members did not have copies of the latest draft that was circulated. The question arose as to the origin of the planning document itself which no one has any answers to. I simply raise the topic. Who mandated the document

originally and what procedure was used to develop the document? I think the question is an important one because the second question to that is, since the second draft has been distributed, will there be an opportunity for this Council to respond to it in some systematic way?

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** First, I am not entirely sure who in on the Forum on Campus Interrelations Committee but every faculty member at IUPUI has received a copy of this most recent draft. We have distributed copies to student organizations. We have put copies on file in the Library. We have distributed copies to the schools. We have made copies available in almost every way that we thought was reasonable given that it cost something to reproduce copies. In fact, if we were guilty of shading away from reasonableness, it might have been that we made too many copies available because it is costly to reproduce. We even made them available by way of computer so that, if you like computers, you can access the document through Academic Computing. If you have a number, they will print out sections if you would like, or the whole document for that matter. As far as availability is concerned, I am surprised to hear that people would, at this point, say that they haven't had access to the document. I don't know what more we could have done other than send multiple copies to people by different methods.

The question of its origin we have discussed, I thought, any number of times in the Faculty Council. I would be happy to go back over it now if you would like, but this is something that we have discussed a number of times.

It all began with the Commission for Higher Education asking us to prepare a mission statement for the campus. I think that this was probably in 1984 or 1985. The reason for the request was based on some dialogue that took place between the University and the Commission. I will try to recapture that dialogue by saying that the Commission staff had done a study of the funding for campuses in the Indiana University system as well as funding for campuses of the other public universities. They had classified campuses based on some kind of system that they were using and they classified IUPUI as a regional campus. They did some things with the budget at IUPUI that mixed together our basic academic program with some of the professional schools. Their conclusion was that IUPUI was both a regional campus and, as a regional campus, was overfunded. Our reaction was that their conclusion was absurd because we know, from our direct experiences on campus, looking at our facilities, the number of faculty members we have to teach, the excessive reliance on part-time faculty, the poor to non-existent student services, and the inadequate library, that this conclusion was simply wrong. That kind of issue that created the dialogue which led to the Commission that we ought to have a study and new Mission Statement for the campus. That study took about one and one-half years. Carol Nathan chaired the overall Mission Statement project. There were 125 faculty members or so involved in the Mission Statement project. There was a tremendous amount of data. Ideas and information were gathered and brought into the files and a Mission Statement was filed with the Commission in, I believe, December of 1985. The Commission reviewed that Mission Statement for several months and over the summer of 1986 entered into discussions with the President's office, at that time John Ryan about what the Mission Statement should say. In effect, the Commission took the Mission Statement that we had filed as a campus and reworked it so that it included some things that they wanted to include, excluded some other things, and it was a different document from what we had filed.

Those discussions took place between the President's Office and the Commission, then there was a hiatus in administration of the campus because Glenn Irwin retired on July 1 and my appointment wasn't announced until August 1, and some of the things that were going on took place during that period. By the time I saw this Mission Statement, which was in mid to late August of 1986, it had clearly been placed on the Commission's agenda for September. We, meaning me and a couple of others in Campus Administration, Howard Schaller and others, expressed concern over some of the things in the Mission Statement. We protested a couple of points in the Mission Statement and sought some revisions of it to make it more consistent with what we thought was the appropriate mission for the campus. However, we were finally at a point where we thought we had done as much as we could without starting all over again. At the same time we were told by the Commission that what was really more important than the Mission Statement was a plan for the development of the campus, that responded to the Mission Statement and that grew out of the Mission Statement.

So, we went to the Commission meeting in September of 1986, expressed reservations about the Mission Statement and said that we wanted to have, especially since I had only been on the job at that point for about five days, we wanted to have an opportunity to go back and look at the Mission Statement again. But, because the Development Plan would be at least as important, and because we wanted to work on that and talk about what we should do to further develop the campus, we didn't want to go back and argue about what should be in the Mission Statement. We agreed to what was in the statement at that time and the Commission adopted it in principle as the working Mission Statement for the campus. The invitation was made at that September 1986 meeting to file a Campus Development Plan. We were told that it was to be filed within a very short period of time. We said that couldn't be done, but that we would file a tentative draft of the plan, hurriedly, just to have something on file, but then it was going to take a good deal longer than they expected before we would have a Development Plan for the campus since we wanted there to be a lot of faculty involvement in the creation of the plan.

So, over the course of the next 18 months we have been at work organizing all of the school documents that were filed, all of the plans that have been filed by the schools, and taken all of the work that was done on the Mission Statement project in which 125 faculty members were involved. We have used all of those data in preparing a series of drafts of a plan for Campus Development that we think captures all of the work that has been done by all of these groups over the last four or five years. We first published a draft for general consumption last Fall. I think the first draft went out in early September. We asked for faculty comment. We had a meeting where all faculty members were invited to come and talk about the draft. We have received comments from about 250 different persons. We have incorporated the sense of almost all of those comments. Where we judged them to be good comments they were incorporated automatically. We have distributed and discussed this at a Council of Deans meeting. We have now distributed it to all 1250 or so faculty at IUPUI with a request for comments. We think at this point we have a document that not only represents a good vision for the campus and a good sense of what the institution is about to become, but also a document that has been reviewed, re-reviewed and commented upon by as a broad a cross section of faculty at IUPUI as is achievable. Certainly the document has gotten more scrutiny and more review of faculty than any other document that has

ever existed in the history of IUPUI. That is the process by which we came to this point. The document is dated February 1, 1988. We are receiving comments to this date. Within the last few weeks, we have gotten a very thoughtful four- or five-page memoranda from a couple of people on the faculty. We continue to respond to those comments, criticisms, and ideas. Deans have distributed this document to their faculties. Deans have brought back commentary and criticisms. The cumulative affect of all of this and the sum total of all the efforts that have been spent by all of the different people on this campus is, I think, a collective product that we can be pleased with right now.

It will always be a draft. It will always be under the process of revision but right now we think it is in pretty good shape and it represents a broadly supported vision for the campus.

**PROFESSOR KAPLAN:** Can you bring us up to date on the status of the School of Science Building? I have heard recently of some people seeking some changes.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** I don't think there are any changes unless you are talking about discussions about which departments will move first. Marshall, do you want to address that question?

**DEAN YOVITS:** What has happened basically is that the footprint of the building has been changed. The two buildings will essentially be the same size rather than; building two being large and building three, being smaller. So, it will be two buildings roughly the same size, each about 100,000 assignable square feet. That necessitates some sort of a modification of who would move when. But, ultimately, it is essentially the same.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** I am not sure that that is a change either. The way it was explained to me was that this was the plan from the beginning. The one thing that has changed over the several months, which I thought we had talked about that in previous meetings, I have talked about it a lot and may not have talked about it here, is that the location of the buildings has been moved slightly. The original plan was to have the three buildings that would constitute the Science, Engineering, Technology complex in a line along Michigan Street so that they would form a wall and you wouldn't be able to see beyond the buildings. They would be joined by walkways and you wouldn't be able to see from Michigan Street to the south, you would see only the buildings--three in a row. Because of the desire to make the new library, which we are working on right now, the center of the campus, spiritually and physically, in an effort to make it the center we think it should be observable from the north. In order to achieve that we have moved the Science/Engineering/Technology Buildings a little so that there is a gateway in between the first phase of SET and the second and third phase. There will be a gateway and you will be able to see into the courtyard where the library will be. We think that is a very positive step. It will make the campus more attractive, although there can always be disagreements about aesthetics. We think it will be a better plan. It will not take away in any way from the available space for the Science/Engineering/Technology complex.

**DEAN YOVITS:** There was a question about the architects deciding that the buildings would be roughly the same size rather than a different size.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Well, they say to me that they had planned that all along even under the earlier configuration of buildings. But it has all been worked out and everyone is happy as far as I can tell.

**DEAN YOVITS:** As a matter of fact, Engineering and Technology and Science has gotten together and decided who would move when.

**PROFESSOR KARLSON:** We are basically a commuting campus. That is one of the reasons we have not had housing construction built on our campus because of our commuting nature. However, we also have a large number of sporting events coming onto the campus which are displacing the very small number of parking spots that we have. Recently, the head of our student bar association called Parking Services and asked to speak to the head of it because he was quite upset by this and asked what the priorities of this campus were -- was it education or was it sporting events? He was told quite emphatically that it was sporting events when it came to parking. So, I have two questions. I know we have access space in several of our parking garages so why don't we have people who come to sporting events park in parking garages and be given some type of transportation over to the sporting events rather than completely disrupting the educational function of the campus?

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** I don't know if I can get into specifics about parking problems because it is so complicated. I think you may have some specific cases which might not be good to use for an indepth policy discussion, but, let me say, just to make the record clear, that the first and perhaps only priority of the campus is academic programs. I don't know who said this, nor do I know if there was some interpretation problem. I can't believe that anyone would say that the first priority is athletic events on campus. There must have been some interpretation process. But, if they said it, they were wrong. I think we ought to work from that premise. Whenever we talk about parking we start with the assumption that the first and perhaps only thing that we are really concerned about is academics.

Beyond that, how can we get persons to park in certain places? We are doing our best. I think the parking people are doing a pretty good job in a situation that is filled with problems. The only thing that I can say is that I have the same problems that you do. I have the same grievances that you do. I think we just have to live with some discomfort in parking. The only comfort that you can take is that we have it a lot better than some other urban campuses.

**PROFESSOR KARLSON:** The issue that I was saying is, is it possible perhaps in light of the priorities, that we perhaps back out of some sporting events until we have more adequate parking facilities? I don't want to use specific examples...

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** We are not going to cancel the Olympic Trials. We have good people working on trying to accommodate the various uses that are made of parking lots. We think that there have been only a few occasions where there were any significant inconveniences to faculty members. When we find out about those cases, we make careful note of them, investigate them, and try to change the patterns of parking so as to prevent them from ever happening again. Henry, I know that the person you heard this from was an honorable person, but I have heard you complain about parking over the years and he probably knew he had a

sympathetic ear when he came to you. I have also heard you complain about sporting events.

**PROFESSOR KARLSON:** I was told a similar statement by Parking Services when I have complained in the past, so I believe his interpretation.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Did the student say he was speaking on your behalf when he called Parking Services? [laughter]

**PROFESSOR KARLSON:** No.

**PROFESSOR McATEER:** I have a question about the enforcement of the smoking policy. When numerous complaints have been made to the appropriate administrator in the building and there has been no resolution of the problem, what is the next step?

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** I think the first complaint should go to the dean. Is what you are saying that you have complained to the dean and he won't enforce the smoking policy, is that right?

**PROFESSOR McATEER:** No, we have not contacted the dean.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** I think the dean is being contacted right now in this room.

**PROFESSOR McATEER:** The problem is that there is a particular problem in the Medical Sciences Building. We are making contacts with building administrators and not seeing any results. The next time then it should be a formal complaint to the dean?

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** I don't think that these things should be thought of as, at least not initially, as "formal". Our hope was that the smoking policy issues could be worked out informally among people who work together. If they can't be, then I suppose you make known your concerns to the next level of administration. If that means the dean, then that mean the dean. But, I would hope that it could be kept on an informal basis. Once we start filing formal complaints, I think we tend to harden positions. It is less likely that we could work things out amicably.

**PROFESSOR McATEER:** I don't see my dean very often on an informal basis. It would have to be through a memo or something.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Write him an informal note. [laughter]

**PROFESSOR NG:** My question concerns the movement of the Engineering Building. Are there any plans in that part of the operation to clean up the west end of the Engineering building? You have the open end off the platform of the Engineering & Technology Building and then on the other end on the other side you have the open platform on the Business/SPEA Building at the building end. At the garage end you have the open portico from the top part of the parking garage leading to the tube. Those are a constant problem and with more public traffic moving through some of that area it really is becoming more and more hazardous in the winter time.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** I would appreciate it if you would send us a memo describing that hazard since it is something that I am not familiar with. I would like to pass it along to people who could do something about it. With respect to the east end of the existing Engineering & Technology building there is going to be a change. The loading dock there will be removed and the space will be captured for Engineering. I would like to know about the hazard. We should have that in our files. Bruce is here. He would know.

**DEAN RENDA:** A resolution addressing that concern was passed by the faculty of the School of Engineering & Technology. That was sent to Bob Martin and he has promised me that he is looking into doing something about that.

**PROFESSOR NG:** It has been kicking for sometime like the plastic screens they put on and they get torn up by the wind.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Bob Martin is already aware of it. I will make a note to ask him. How long ago was it that you sent your memo?

**DEAN RENDA:** It has been maybe six weeks ago.

#### **AGENDA ITEM VIII - Retirement Planning - Robert Heid, Personnel**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** I think we should move on to our next agenda item which is Retirement Planning by Robert Heid from the Personnel Division.

**MR. HEID:** We are again this year going to present our pre-retirement program, Designing Your Financial Future. It is going to be held two weeks from tomorrow. It will be in the School of Nursing primarily on the first and second floor. That will be April 22. It will begin at 8:30 a.m. and go on to about 3:00 or 3:30 in the afternoon. We have one program that will go as late as 4:30.

Here again, this year we have focused on financial type issues. Based on a survey which we did of faculty and staff, people who had already retired as well as people who were getting close to retirement, the overwhelming issue seemed to be financial issues that people were concerned about. We have a lot of professional people coming in for this program. I hope that all of you will be able to attend. We really ask your support in getting your faculty and staff to attend this program. It is geared so that some of them will be an hour and one-half presentations as well as just certain people available for consultation all during the day. So, if you don't have a whole day or one-half of a day, you can stop in for a half-hour or something like that. We just ask your support in that. Our brochures are running late for about two days. They won't be available until probably Monday. I do have some copies here which I pass around. We will also be sending brochures to everyone age 55 and older with a personal invitation to the program.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Are there any questions?

#### **AGENDA ITEM IX - Direct Bank Deposit Report, Judy Smith, Payroll**



**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Our next item is a report on direct bank deposit by Judy Smith, Director of Payroll.

**JUDY SMITH:** Lots of you have requested direct deposit for as many years as I have been on this campus and that is over 20 years. It is finally here and it is going to happen. All of you will be receiving, through the campus mail, some material and a form to fill out if you are interested in direct deposit. It will cover almost every bank. I understand 99 percent of the banks are participating so, unless some of you have real small banks that you can't get to unless you go to the boondocks, most of them will be covered. Indiana National Bank will act as our clearinghouse. Right now they are really drummed up. They are also expecting the Indianapolis campus to be the largest people with interest. As many of you know, several years ago we took a survey and we had the highest percentage interested in direct deposit. The material will be coming to you. If you do not get something by April 15, you may call my office to Lori Forsythe at extension 4-3910. What we will be asking for is a cancelled check or a savings deposit slip. You will only be able to deposit one way and that will be either into your checking account or into your savings account. Almost every credit union in Indianapolis is included. The Credit Union in Bloomington, all of the banks in Bloomington, banks and savings and loans in Indianapolis, and many, many outside of this area. It is here. I am excited because I have yelled loudest for the longest time. I just wanted to let you know that you will be receiving the information. If you do have questions, don't hesitate to call me and I will be glad to help you with anything.

There is going to be a meeting on April 22 from 9:30 - 11:00 and from 1:30 - 3:00 in the Nursing Auditorium. People from Indiana National Bank, from Bloomington, and I will be there to answer any questions that you may have. That will be after you receive the material. Please come if you have any questions. I am really excited about this. It has been a long time in coming.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Thank you, Judy.

#### **AGENDA ITEM X - Unfinished Business**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** We have an item of unfinished business. Roko Aliprantis is going to talk about the TIAA/CREF benefits for 10-month employees.

**B. KEITH MOORE:** I want to introduce Professor Aliprantis who has done an enormous work in terms of the research that has gone into this whole project. As I think everyone knows, at the present time 10-month faculty appointees and librarians who teach or do research in the summer do not get payments made into TIAA/CREF for their summer activities. These payments are made for 12-month employees but not for 10-month employees.

This obviously is an all-university question. I think there might be a reason to wonder why we are considering it here and I think there are several good reasons. First, the All-University Fringe Benefits Committee has been very busy this year and didn't have time to get around to it. I think more importantly there are a number of really good rationales for this campus looking at the issue. One of them is that we have a mixed faculty here representing both IU and Purdue

faculties and, as you will notice in the information that was distributed, it is that the Purdue policy is to make these payments for all faculty members - 10-month or 12-month. Because we do have a mixed faculty here representing IU and Purdue makes this perhaps a more pertinent issue on this campus than maybe some of the other IU campuses.

We have a large number of 10-month appointees on this campus in every area except the health fields. That is another major factor. There is going to be an increasing emphasis, as we have all heard, on conducting research for all employees for all faculty and for the 10-month appointees. This is going to mean that they are going to be doing these activities in the summer. There are going to be even more people impacted by the current policies and equities than we have now. Finally, we have had multiple interest expressed in this issue on the part of the Fringe Benefits Committee for many, many years by many, many people. It was our feeling that it was finally time to sit down and do some hard work and try to unearth the facts, weigh them and come up with a suggestion. Without further ado, I would like to introduce Professor Aliprantis who, as I said, has done all of the work on this and has all of the facts and figures at hand. I will let him go ahead and present the proposal and answer any questions on my behalf.

**PROFESSOR ALIPRANTIS:** Thank you very much. I would like to make a comment about the amount of money which is involved. We made a thorough study and it turns out that, we are working in rough figures, it turns out to be roughly \$200,000 for this benefit for the summer. If you put it against our budget which is \$90 million, it is a very minimal amount.

One thing to keep in mind is that people who do research and prepare grants are not supposed to get any fringe benefits. The University does not allow this to be given to us. Although your grantees are willing to give you the money, the University say no. If you are allowed to get this money out of the \$1,000 fringe benefits, the University will get 47 percent for overhead which comes out of the roughly \$5,000 for a grant. This amount of money will be accumulated to the IU Foundation. You say you cannot get it out but it goes to the University. Last year we passed a resolution that covers part-time clinical appointees and voted to give them full TIAA/CREF fringe benefits. I do think it is to the interest of everybody who is working on a 10-month appointment to get this fringe benefits during the summer. I would like to move to pass this motion:

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

I would be very glad to answer any questions. I understand that this is an all university matter, but it should be on record that this campus has made a thorough study, this is what it costs, and this is what the faculty would like to have.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** I guess I should make an observation. I don't have strong feelings about this proposal one way or another, but I think it is important for people, when they vote on something like this, to recognize the economic effect of the proposal. There is only a certain amount of money for compensation. What we are talking about is moving some money, I think \$170,000, from the academic year into the summer budget. In other words, if you want to be paid more in the summer and less in the 10-month year, then you should recommend that money be

moved to the summer. It is all the same money. The money is not going to come from somewhere else. It can only come from what is now being paid to all of us during the regular academic year. The reason that I think this proposal has not been successful before, I think it was taken up at the Bloomington Faculty Council at one time along the way, was that it was seen as encouragement to teach in the summer, something that, for academic reasons, a number of faculty members had reservations about. They would prefer to get money in their 10-month contract and not have the extra incentive to teach in the summer.

**PROFESSOR ALIPRANTIS:** Could I make a comment to your comment? The summer budget is self-supporting, isn't it? I mean we do supplement other programs for the summer. The summer school is very very successful and, if I understand it correctly, is self-sufficient. We do get some money from there and put it somewhere else. You don't have to take academics to put it into the summer. Is that right or wrong?

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Taken as a whole, I don't think the summer school is self-sufficient. In any case, I don't think it is useful to look at programs or activities and say here's something that generates more revenue through tuition than it consumes in budget. That I think is an analysis that doesn't lead anywhere in this particular case. What I think you have to recognize is that we get a certain amount of income every year for the whole campus. We get that income from three sources: (1) tuition from our students; (2) grants and contracts from outside the university; and (3) a State appropriation. That is the total amount that we get. What you are talking about is moving a little bit of that total from the academic year into the summer. I don't care whether the summer program in one school is self-sustaining or whether the summer program as a whole is self-sustaining. What you are talking about is moving some money that is now in our expense budget for compensation in the academic year and moving it to compensation for the summer. It is not a great amount so it doesn't really cause a great concern, but that is what you are talking about -- paying people more in the summer and paying them less in the academic year.

**DEAN YOVITS:** The first thing is what is the right thing to do? You can only save money by doing what most of us see as not the right thing to do. The second thing is the question of priority. If the faculty feel this is a high enough priority, then it is something you ought to do. As you point out, of course, one has to choose the alternatives. What Roko is saying is that to many, particularly in the School of Science where summer activity tends to be research oriented, this is a very important issue. Simply to say that we don't have the money, is not correct.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Nobody said that we don't have the money. We could decide to pay ourselves more and more for summer teaching. It is just that we would have to take the additional salary money from somewhere and the only place to take it from is the general academic fund. I am not opposing the idea I am just saying that everybody should understand what is happening in economic terms. Nobody should be mistaken about where the money is coming from.

**DEAN YOVITS:** What Roko is saying is, with regard to the self-sufficiency, you maybe and you are probably right, that the summer program is not self-sufficient taken as a whole, but in some of these schools where the summer program is quite successful, it is more than self-sufficient. His suggestion is that, let's say in the

School of Science, we do take in far more than we actually spend. Maybe it would be appropriate to consider using some of that for TIAA/CREF during the summer.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** I think that that misses the point. The economic point is not that some units generate more than they consume.

**DEAN YOVITS:** I didn't mean to make that point but this in line with his thinking.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** I just don't want anyone to be under any misapprehension about how the funds would be derived. For financing a program that would increase our costs in the summer, the funds could come from only one place because we have no other source of funds. The funds would come from the expense budget for the academic year. So, the economic effect is to transfer what we pay ourselves now during the academic year over into the summer. We would pay ourselves a little more for the summer. I was told that the reason why this proposal was not voted up in the Bloomington Faculty Council was because of an academic policy consideration. The academic policy consideration was to say we don't want to encourage people to teach in the summer. We would like to pay ourselves as much as we can during the academic year to discourage the temptation to accept regular teaching assignments in the summer.

**DEAN YOVITS:** Jerry, the point here is that what really has given birth to all of this is not the teaching so much as it is the people doing research, where the TIAA/CREF benefit is normally considered to be part of the research grant. What Roko is saying is that the University simply will not permit us to accept that. That is really the bottom line here.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** I don't know about why there has been an unwillingness to let someone who has a research grant in the summer have TIAA/CREF.

**DEAN YOVITS:** Because the University simply will not allow it. It seems to me that, if an administrative decision could be made, that it might be appropriate to permit it.

**PROFESSOR DUNIPACE:** I don't think it is the University. I think it is that the granting agencies won't allow the University to discriminate.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** I assume that issue has been explored sufficiently, but I have never been involved in the discussion. I don't know who said that someone who has a research grant for the summer cannot earn the TIAA/CREF benefits even if the granting agencies are willing to provide it. I suppose I could see the argument that the people who teach and the people who do research should be treated equally, but I could see another argument that those who get research grants in the summer should be favored. In any event, if the only reason for this proposal is to take account of those who have research grants in the School of Science who would like to have the grantors' wishes fulfilled and have TIAA/CREF benefits for the summer, I would want to make sure that there is no way of achieving that, short of this kind of global proposal, which has implications far beyond research grants. In fact, it doesn't address research grants at all. It only addresses teaching.

**DEAN YOVITS:** Roko, have you looked into that specific issue?

**PROFESSOR ALIPRANTIS:** On the specific issue, I put it into my grant and it was erased. We are not supposed to ask for TIAA/CREF during the summer even if your grantor is willing to give you that. I find that this is illogical. Why should they even do research during the summer -- to bring money to the University? On the same argument, they say everybody does this. The question is why spend your summer trying to write proposals, you get the same effect.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** I am sympathetic to that.

**PROFESSOR WELLMAN:** Some of us work 12 months and we don't quite understand the issue. Does a person who has a 10-month appointment, would they be working as a faculty member? Some of that salary comes in as a faculty member during that two-month period. I mean, are they actually faculty members? Technically, they are only faculty members for 10 months of the year and the other two months they can be bankers, or whatever. From my point of view, I thought they were totally free during those two months to do whatever they want. I am asking for a point of clarification so I can understand the issue.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** I am not sure that I want to tackle the broad issue raised about defining what a person who is on a 10-month contract is in the summer. I think if they teach in the summer, then they are certainly faculty members.

**PROFESSOR WELLMAN:** That is what I think is appropriate. If they are functioning as faculty members, they ought to have the opportunity to have TIAA/CREF benefits. If they are not functioning as faculty members, then no. Some of the Medical School faculty who have heard this proposal actually think that, "Gee! What we are going to be doing is paying TIAA/CREF on people who are out working at some other job." The issue is not very well understood at all.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** That clearly is not the case. That is not the proposal. The proposal is to have those who are teaching during the summer and getting paid a summer stipend have the fringe benefit paid in proportion on their summer salary.

**UNKNOWN #2:** Just to pursue the point that was made before, could we request that the administration look into the possibility of allowing the granting agencies to pay TIAA/CREF in order to encourage people to do grants?

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** I would be happy to look into it without a formal request. I think it is something that, on its face, doesn't sound right. I have never looked into it before and often times when you look into something you find perfectly good reasons for the condition that we have. But, in this case, I can't imagine what that reason would be. In fact, if I were stating my own views about it, I think it would be better to encourage people to do research in the summer and if that meant that people who did research in the summer got a little extra benefits because their grantors could pay their TIAA/CREF during the summer, I would say so be it.

**PROFESSOR NG:** I don't know whether instituting this will encourage people to teach or not but I should tell you now, it doesn't encourage them to do research. My faculty come to me, many of them teaching two courses and at the same time doing research. It discourages research as it is now because people are getting

grants they will be paid some benefits but, it is lost because the University simply will not allow for it.

**DEAN YOVITS:** Could I propose that we look into that specific point and let you know specifically what the problem is and what might be done about it. May I suggest that?

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Sure.

**PROFESSOR LAIDIG:** I am a bit confused about the idea that paying TIAA/CREF will encourage summer teaching when I know in the School of Science 10-month faculty must teach in the summer or there won't be any courses taught in the summer because there are so few 12-month faculty. They are being encouraged to teach in the summer by their program. Without having TIAA/CREF they are being essentially required to teach summer courses. Somebody has to teach them. So, they are being penalized for teaching in the summer.

**PROFESSOR NAGY:** This is a budgetary problem, it seems to me. Whether we are talking about grants or teaching, there are summer budgets. Years ago there was a task force to look into the whole question of summer programming and building of budgets. I don't know what the results of that task force were but I do recall in some informal conversations with the previous director of the budget that it was possible, at least from his point of view, to create a summer budget which would, in effect, permit 12-month appointments. As I said, I don't know what the report of that task force eventually was, but that conversation I recall very clearly. That is, it was indeed possible for this campus, perhaps not for Bloomington or other campuses, but certainly for this campus, to create a summer budget that would in effect give faculty the option of 12-month vs. 10-month appointments. It seems to me that that would address the proposal that is before us now.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** I am not sure what the difference would be. You mean this would be a way of changing the policy on paying TIAA/CREF benefits on summer teaching by calling it a 12-month contract?

**PROFESSOR NAGY:** That is correct.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** I think that if we are going to face this, we should face it directly and not create some budgetary legerdemain, by calling something one thing when it really is another. I don't like that. I am not, by nature, attracted to that kind of solution. It seems to me that if you did that, the economic outcome that I was suggesting would be the same. What we have right now is a system where people who teach in the summer only get paid their base salary. They get only TIAA/CREF benefits paid on their 10-month salary not for the summer salary. If you change that and call people 12-month appointees so that they would earn TIAA/CREF benefits in the summer, that still has the same economic affect as what is being proposed here. It just does it in disguise and calls it something else, which I think is not good. We should address the issue directly and ask the question if the faculty feel that they should recommend that summer appointees be paid these TIAA/CREF benefits directly without disguising them. If you do, whether you do it the disguised way that Paul is attracted to or a direct way, I think that you have to examine the economic impact which is to take money out of the academic year and put it into the summer.

**PROFESSOR ROSS:** Could I raise a question? I am a little confused as to what you are saying. Are you saying that if we vote to do this, then we are in essence just shifting \$200,000 from the academic year to the summer year, the base is the same. We are not really changing what is being fed into the TIAA/CREF. We are really shifting the money. So, we are really not helping the faculty at all. It really makes no difference in terms of the total amount that is being fed into TIAA/CREF

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** We are not creating money from anywhere. We don't have a way of creating money. The money has to come from somewhere and all we are saying is, should we put a little more of the total compensation money that is available for all of us for the whole year, should we put a little bit more of that into the summer than is now there and take it out of the regular academic year to do so.

**PROFESSOR ROSS:** Then we are not changing overall at all.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** There would be no change in the total amount available for compensation.

**PROFESSOR ABEL:** I think it is the right thing to do to have the fringe benefits for summer. We are not talking about, if we get new funds this would not be maybe active this year, but if we get more funds we get more funds for everything else from additional tuition and state legislature appropriations that should be included in the request at some point down the road. I think that is only fair that that be done whether it is grants or teaching. As far as encouraging people not to teach in the summer, what are we going to do with all of these students? What I am hearing is "I don't get fringe benefits, so I am not going to teach in the summer". We are going to have all of these demands for students and nobody to teach. Do you want to get in somebody pulled off the street or what? I think that is the wrong thing to do. I think we can get it if faculty push for it and I think if administrators go to the Legislature and get increased tuition and appropriation, we could get it.

**DEAN YOVITS:** I think you are missing the point.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** We are trying everything possible to get as much money as we can for faculty compensation.

**PROFESSOR ABEL:** That's not the point. The point is to get fringe benefits for the teaching in the summer. That's the point

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Let me just say that we are doing everything humanly possible to get as much money for faculty compensation as possible. We will continue to do that. All we are talking about is where to put the money that we get. The proposal means taking it from the academic year and putting into the summer.

**PROFESSOR ABEL:** Get additional appropriation to put into the whole...

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** I think we are missing each other, maybe.

**PROFESSOR WILSON:** I speak as a faculty member. Sometimes I have a grant based on summer salary, sometimes I don't. When I don't have one, I have to teach from economic necessity. The rest of the time I do research, publish papers, and go to meetings. I am not functioning any differently than a 12-month appointee but I am getting compensated less. It is not fair.

**PROFESSOR LAIDIG:** What are the possibilities for TIAA/CREF resources because people who have grants must do research for those two months in the summer. So, part of the source of the \$200,000 would come from grants when the two months are placed back in. So, all of the \$200,000 wouldn't have to come from the academic year.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** The figure I was using was net of the grant income. The \$172,000 is the net of the grant.

**PROFESSOR LAIDIG:** I move that we table the motion and maybe discuss it at the next meeting for the simple issue that we think we need a little more information particularly from the research grant idea. I personally would like to see this as a little more flexible motion so that there would be some discretion there either to the dean or the person who is doing it to make that decision instead of saying it is yes or no, where the person could say research grant people would get it, senior teaching people would get, some sort of other incentives and flexibility built into the motion. I think we should table the motion and discuss it again next month.

**DEAN YOVITS:** I second the motion. It is undebatable.

**PROFESSOR SHARP:** Could I ask that the Budgetary Affairs Committee also review this?

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** There is going to be a meeting of the Budgetary Affairs Committee coming up.

**PROFESSOR SHARP:** Tomorrow morning at 8:30.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** I can't be there tomorrow morning but we could plug it in for the next meeting. There has been a motion to table. Henry, that is not debatable, is that correct?

**PROFESSOR KARLSON:** Yes that is correct. It is not debatable.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** So, we have to vote on that. All in favor, say "Aye". Opposed? [some No's] I think the ayes have it. We are almost ready to adjourn. We have one other administrative matter and that is the sign in sheet. Make sure you have signed it before you leave. This is the first month that we were to employ this new system of signing in. In the past, everybody signed in as they came in the door and it created long lines. As a result, we have decided to pass the sheet around. So, I want to remind everyone to make sure you have signed it so that you are recorded as present at the meeting.



#### **AGENDA ITEM XI - New Business**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Before we adjourn, I wanted to say one other thing if I could. When we were talking about the Campus Plan for Development, I wanted to make sure that I noted, as I should on every occasion when we talk about that plan, that Bill Plater has done a yeoman service and an extraordinary job of gathering the data and writing the major portion of this plan and incorporating the comments that many of you have made. He really has done extraordinary work on this and deserves congratulations every time we have occasion to talk about the campus plan. Also, I believe I forgot to mention, when I was talking about all the things we have done to make sure that this is a truly campus wide document with broad participation and support, that the Faculty Council, has been actively involved; and we have had commentary from Faculty Council committees and from the Executive Committee and have discussed the document in the Faculty Council when we have met as a group. In case I left that out, I add that as a footnote as we adjourn.

#### **AGENDA ITEM XII - Adjournment**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** We are adjourned.

# INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS

**Faculty Council Meeting**  
**Thursday, May 5, 1988**  
**Union Building Cafeteria**  
**3:00 - 4:00 p.m.**

**Members Present:** Administrative: Vice President Gerald L. Bepko, Dean Carol Nathan, Dean William M. Plater. Deans: John Barlow, Elizabeth Grossman, Nicholas Kellum, R. Bruce Renda, Sheldon Siegel, Marshall Yovits. Director: Barbara Fischler. Faculty: Elaine Alton, Morris Aprison, John Baenziger, Richard Beck, Frederick Bein, Anne Belcher, Willard Bostwick, Linda Brothers, Varoujan Chalian, William Crabtree, Theodore Cutshall, Robert Dittus, Elizabeth Evenbeck, Mary Feeley, Emily Hernandez, William Hodes, Dolores Hoyt, Florence Juillerat, Henry Karlson, Linda Kasper, Juanita Keck, Robert Kirk, Judith Kosegi, Rebecca Markel, Dana McDonald, Robert Mendelsohn, Judy Miller, Paul Nagy, Bartholomew Ng, Richard Pflanzner, Gerald Powers, Richard L. Rogers, P. Kent Sharp, A. N. Siakotos, Judith Silence, Susan Sutton, Jeffery Vessely, Kathleen Warfel, Dorothy Webb, Henry Wellman, Karen West, Maudine Williams, Susan L. Zunt.

**Ex Officio Member Present:** Shirley Newhouse, President, IUPUI Staff Council.

**Members Absent:** Deans: H. William Gilmore, Norman Lefstein. Faculty: Billy Abel, Sharon Andreoli, Carl Andres, Margaret Applegate, H. R. Besch, Jr., Cecil Brown, Mervyn Cohen, Robert Colyer, Dewey Conces, Paula Differding, Joseph DiMicco, Kenneth Dunipace, John Eble, Mark Farber, Margaret Felton, B P Garg, Donald Gartner, Gary Gruver, Celestine Hamant, Robert A. Harris, Eugene Helveston, Louis Holtzclaw, Rose Marie Jones, Jerome Kaminker, Jerome Kaplan, John Lappas, James McAteer, Catherine Palmer, Jeanne Pontious, D. K. Rex, Beverly Ross, Kenneth Ryder, Glen Sagraves, Craig M. Stoops, Vernon Vix.

**Ex Officio Member Absent:** Richard Schilling, President, Student Assembly

**Alternates Present:** Deans: John Hunger for Charles Bonser, James E. Carter for Walter J. Daly, Hugh Wolf for Howard Mehlinger, Richard Ruwe for William J. Voos, Scott Evenbeck for James Weigand, Thomas Lenz for Jack Wentworth. Faculty: C. D. Aliprantis for Bernard Morrel.

**AGENDA ITEM I - Memorial Resolution:** Donald D. Macchia, Ph.D., IU Northwest

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** The first item on our agenda is a memorial resolution for Donald Macchia to be read by Dr. Iatridis of the IU Medical School, Northwest. [Dr. Iatridis read the memorial resolution and a moment of silence was observed.] The memorial will be distributed as requested.

**AGENDA ITEM II - Presiding Officer's Business - Vice President Gerald L. Bepko**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** The next item of business is the Presiding Officer's portion of the agenda. As you probably know, some time ago we decided to try to coordinate the external affairs activities of the campus better than they have been in the past. Last summer we brought together all of those persons who have been involved in external affairs activities for the campus or for the University on this

campus. That included the IU Foundation, Alumni Association, and the University Relations Program as well as a number of other offices within the campus administration. We formed an External Affairs Advisory Council and we asked Gene Tempel to chair that Council. After the Council was operating it occurred to us that we should have some reorganization of our external affairs activities to coordinate them more and to give them more focus. We thought that we should have a Director of External Affairs to coordinate all of these activities. We sought advice on who that should be. The unanimous conclusion was that Gene Tempel should move from his position as chair of the External Affairs Advisory Council, continuing to chair that Council, but to take on the additional responsibility of being the overseer of all the external affairs for the campus. We wanted to have him come here today to introduce him. I think all of you know him. Many of you, in fact a very substantial number of you, have talked to me about what an excellent choice Gene would be for this large responsibility. We had planned to bring him here today to talk about the External Affairs Council and some of the ideas that have been discussed in that Council over the last several months. It turned out to be a happy coincidence because there is an item in the newspaper today that has been discussed by the Council which you may be interested in hearing about. I would like to further that happy coincidence and introduce Gene Tempel who will tell you a couple of things about the external affairs activities of the campus.

**MR. TEMPEL:** Thank you very much, Jerry and thank you all for your support. It has been a happy occasion for me to be here on the campus for the past five years. I appreciate the opportunity to serve in this broader capacity because I think that, as a transplanted person from Bloomington, I have come to understand the quality of this campus and what it has to offer and the chance to work with many of you. I would say that, in organizing and coordinating the external affairs program for this campus, we build on an excellent base, not only among the programs themselves but among the faculty on this campus. The image of IUPUI is only as good as the faculty and its research, teaching and service activities. It is a happy occasion too, when we can talk about these things because there is a lot of good quality on the campus. It is the quality of what is going on here that is going to tell the story of what we are, that is going to broaden the public relations and public image program on this campus, that is going to broaden the involvement of alumni back into the campus, of community leaders back into the campus and broaden the base of support, not only for the public support but the private support as well. that will take us to the next plateau. That will help implement the Campus Development Plan that has been discussed here and in many circles that provide a direction for the campus between now and the year 2000.

The External Affairs Council that has been meeting includes, as Jerry said, a number of people. Walt Buchanan, the chair of the Faculty Council's Metropolitan Affairs Committee, has been meeting with us along with John Short, who directs the Conference Center, Scott Evenbeck from Continuing Studies, Bill Spencer and Bob Baxter from the Vice President's Office, and others who interact with the publics of this campus. We have tried to share ideas there to support one another. For example, in discussing the admissions and student recruitment program for the campus, on a guest basis we had Carol [Nathan] and some of her people in there. John Short suggested that a lot of high school students stay at the Conference Center and that would be a great place at some point to have an admissions booth where there is information about the campus available to high school students

coming in from all over the state. That kind of thing will continue to happen out of this broader coordination.

The Council also undertook a couple of projects. One was the possibility that IUPUI change its moniker, and I emphasize the possibility that it change its moniker. There may be an easier way to identify the campus, that there may be something that signals to the public that we have become now an institution that has grown into its own, that there is a great deal of quality here, that we are different from what we were twenty years ago, for example. This would be a good time to look at that. Coincidental with that is the fact that next year IUPUI will be twenty years old. This would be a good time to celebrate the first twenty years and look at the next twenty years, for example. It is a good time to look at where we are and how people perceive us. So, we have been discussing that. We have now moved that to the point where people think it is a good idea to look at it at least. The newspaper this morning quoted the great number of us who think it is worthy of looking at. We are in the process now of looking at some consulting firms that can look at this for us in a very systematic way, putting into place a process where this summer we would involve students, faculty and administrators from our campus, people from our publics, that is, the news media itself, our alumni, community leaders, etc., to get a reaction to what IUPUI is, what it stands for, how they perceive us, and how we can best identify ourselves back to those publics and to ourselves. It has to be something we are all comfortable with. That is one of the projects we are working on. I hope we will have a chance to talk with many of you this summer as we go forward. We are working on that. We will probably have a whole list of suggestions this afternoon about how the campus might be identified. I understand there is a couple of "name the campus" contests under way now in the community. Those are some of the things that we have been up to.

Further, in discussion with President Ehrlich, we have the opportunity to organize a legislative program for the University at this campus that will help us work with the local legislators to make our case for the University and for this campus in a systematic way. In doing all these things we will be working within the University alumni relations program, the public relations program, the governmental relations program, and with the IU Foundation which is the fund raising arm for the University. We will be working within those contexts to design a broader program that will involve faculty, that will enable faculty and deans to participate in a greater way in making the case for this campus, involve more people in the campus, and ultimately bring back more in student, public and private support for the campus.

Jerry, I will end there. I will be glad to hear any particular comments or to answer any particular questions.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Thank you, Gene. Does anyone want to offer any advice or ask a question of Gene while he is here?

**PROFESSOR WILSON:** Did I hear you say we are going to have a lobbyist?

**MR. TEMPEL:** No, I did not say we are going to have a lobbyist. I said we were going to work in an organized way with the local legislators. In doing so, we would try to make the case for Indiana University and also bring forward the

particular needs of this campus with the local legislators who are our chief spokes-people in the legislature. I hope in doing that we will have a chance to involve a lot of faculty from this campus interacting with the local legislators in an organized way to help us make the case for the campus as part of the University's legislative program. Did that answer the question, Kathryn?

**PROFESSOR WILSON:** Did I hear a 'yes'?

**GENE TEMPLE:** No.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Gene, maybe you could mention the suggestion that has gotten the most support about naming the campus, that is, specifically, we haven't been thinking of eliminating Indiana or Purdue from the name.

**MR. TEMPEL:** That is one of the ground rules that I have told JoEllen Sharp, that we were operating under in this renaming. One of the ground rules the President gave us very early, if you will remember, the first time he addressed the faculty, was that both Indiana and Purdue had to remain in the name of the campus. One of the early suggestions we got from a number of people, it is something that as soon as we talk about this, the first people way is "Why don't you simply call it IPI? It still could be Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis." The second thing that comes forward that has been advanced is the concept that we call it not only IPI, but advance at the same time and name it the Capital Campus of Indiana and Purdue universities. So, we have not only those two but a whole list of things that we have brainstormed with. Through systematic involvement of faculty, students, and alumni, all of the particular constituents that this campus has we can test not only those concepts but other concepts that might come out to see how people feel about those ideas and how they react to them. It is interesting, last week during Person-to-Person Week, I was in the Natatorium. One of the displays had a headline from the Indianapolis Star in 1979 which still referred to this campus as IPI. So, less than ten years ago that was still the designated name that the Star used for the campus to spite of what we here called the campus.

**PROFESSOR WILSON:** First of all, I wanted to say that I am from a Purdue School. We had President Beering speak in front of our school and we asked him if he had any objections to eliminating Purdue from the name and he said "No."

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** He said as long as Indiana wasn't in the name.

**PROFESSOR WILSON:** He did not. We asked him specifically if we could call it Indiana University at Indianapolis and he said, "Sure, if you will put down at the bottom something like a consortium with Purdue University at Indianapolis" or something like that."

**DEAN RENDA:** I am also from Purdue University and we very strongly object to eliminating the name of Purdue.

**DEAN YOVITS:** I believe some consideration should be given to having a separate logo and where it is more important, separate stationery.

**MR. TEMPEL:** Marshall, I think in doing this we would accept a lot of suggestions which would then go back into the internal process. All these things could be

looked at but nothing has been decided and anything is a viable option at this point as long as we have that particular ground rule. That is a ground rule that no one has told us to deviate from.

I will look forward to working with you in this new capacity, Jerry. Thank you.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Gene, thank you.

### **AGENDA ITEM III - Election: Tenure, Nominating, and Executive Committees**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** The next agenda item is an election of Tenure, Nominating, and Executive committees. Professor Dorothy Webb will conduct the election.

**PROFESSOR WEBB:** We are distributing ballots to all of you who are voting members of the Faculty Council. The names are on the ballots and the instructions are clear. You are to vote for four for the Nominating Committee; four for the Executive Committee, and three for the Tenure Committee.

### **AGENDA ITEM IV - Executive Committee Report - Susan Zunt, Secretary**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** We will continue with other business while the election is being conducted if there is no objection. We have a long agenda and, as you know, we have another event that follows this Faculty Council meeting. I would like to move to the Executive Committee Report from Susan Zunt.

**PROFESSOR ZUNT:** Thank you, Vice President Bepko. All of you should have picked up as you came into the room a sheet of paper which is a summary of actions of our Faculty Boards of Review for the last two years. These results of these Boards of Review need to be reported to the faculty. Our Constitution says that the chair of the Board of Review makes this report. We have three chairs and I have permission from those chairs to make this report to you today. I would like for you to take a look at this at your leisure. You are all aware that we have a Faculty Board of Review orientation committee that has the same information and it has developed a draft that will come back to the Faculty Council. We had hoped that it would be available for today's meeting but it is not ready yet. This is the committee that is chaired by Pat Blake. We will have that draft to attach to the minutes of this meeting. Discussion can occur at the first meeting in the fall, if that is the Council's desire.

The Board of Trustees held a special open faculty meeting on April 16th in Bloomington. There were quite a few people from IUPUI and the smaller campuses who spoke directly to the Trustees concerning 18/20. We didn't say anything new. We said things over and over, perhaps a little louder, a little bit more emphatically. I spoke to Trustees Stoner and Gonso after the meeting and they said that they did not believe a document could be ready before July 1. So, we have nothing new. The Board has not yet presented anything for faculty to look at as to what they want to do about 18/20. They are still, as far as I understand, in the information gathering stage. Jeff Vessely and I will be attending the Trustees' meeting starting tomorrow. That meeting is beginning this afternoon, the same time as this meeting here.

I should tell you that the Executive Committee has completed the standing committee membership assignments and we will publish those with the summary of what we have done in the last year. That should come out early this summer. I want to remind you that, as the Executive Committee forms the committees, we have a general guideline that we know that 50 percent of the committee stays the same because we have staggered two-year appointments. So, we are looking then at one-half of a committee's roster to either retain or replace. The general guideline that the Executive Committee gave to the chairs, liaisons, and the secretaries is that no more than 25 percent of a committee should be reappointed and we should allow that other 25 percent to be new people. We try to bring new blood in and train people to complete the work of the committees.

Keith Moore, who is chair of our Fringe Benefits Committee, became acutely ill this afternoon and could not be with us. I think he is going to be just fine but he was going to make a very important report to us about Health Care Benefits. The costs of the premiums that we pay for health insurance will be increasing. This depends on a vote that the Trustees will take tomorrow. I understand that it is about 99.9 percent sure that they will agree with this plan. The increase in health care benefits will be 30 percent both for the University and for the faculty or staff member. We have had a shortfall of about \$2 million and it is anticipated that this increase which is thought to be a short term mechanism will, in the next year or two, cover the shortfall and create a small amount of surplus. If this predicted surplus occurs, the President, at our UFC meeting last week in Bloomington, assured us that this would go back to the people who paid the premiums. The bottom line is a 30 percent increase for faculty and staff and the University will also pay a 30 percent increase. I think we will probably be seeing details of this in the IU Newspaper and other publications once the Trustees act on it.

The Faculty Club election was held. Henry Wellman was elected Chair, Linda Brothers, Secretary, and, as you know, previously Henry Besch had been elected Treasurer. I have prepared a one-page memorandum for all IUPUI faculty giving the election results and some information about this interim government and what we know about the Faculty Club. We still haven't tied down a location as far as I know. There will be a little slip at the bottom of that page that you can send to Linda Brothers if you would like to get involved with any of the committees or membership. We still don't know prices for the different levels of membership. It was discussed at the meeting but no decision was arrived at.

One other item I want to mention is, if you didn't sign in as you came in, Mrs. Chumley needs you to do that before you leave today.

The last item I need to tell you about is an important appointment of a joint Faculty Council and administrative committee. It is a Task Force on Faculty Appointments and Advancement. This is something we have mentioned in the Council most of the year, we have worked on in the Executive Committee, and we have developed a committee that we will ask to very carefully evaluate the changing context, the changing meaning of tenure and other conditions that are being forced upon us by the loss of a mandatory retirement age. All faculty will be receiving a copy of the charge to the task force and I ask you to please read this very carefully and transmit your comments to the committee. If you want to send them also to Dean Plater's office and to the Faculty Council, that would be fine also. The committee has co-chairs - Dr. Joe Christian, Medicine, and James Torke, Law.

Vice President Bepko, that completes my report.

**NOTE:** The Executive Committee urges all faculty to adhere to the published policy in the Academic Handbook requiring final examinations to be held during finals week, not during the last scheduled class meeting.

#### **AGENDA ITEM V - Question and Answer Period - 5 minutes**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** We have a question and answer period scheduled for five minutes. Are there any questions that anyone would like to ask or points you would like to make?

**PROFESSOR ALIPRANTIS:** A few more comments about the task force. I hear that they are considering abolishing tenure.

**PROFESSOR ZUNT:** Not to abolish tenure. May I ask Dean Plater to answer your question?

**DEAN PLATER:** There have been a number of discussions in a variety of places including national organizations about the implications of federal legislation that apparently will end mandatory retirement in 1994, which means that there must be some basis for evaluating faculty for cessation of appointment on a base other than age. That raises, then, a whole series of issues about what the meaning of tenure is and how tenure relates to continued employment if age isn't going to be a discriminating factor. In that context, the Executive Committee began to discuss tenure, the meaning of tenure on this campus, and a whole series of questions related to faculty appointments. We thought that one of the best things we could do would be to have a panel, a group of faculty who would become, in a sense, experts on these issues by reading the national studies, by taking into account the complexity of this campus where we have both Indiana University and Purdue University operating on slightly different procedures, and to advise us then on how to address these issues. In essence, we hope that in any kind of crisis or pressing matters, we will be well prepared for things that might happen a year or two years from now. In the course of the year, the discussion grew and I think more and more things were added to the agenda. If I recall correctly, the letter of charge to the committee contains eleven specific points and, if you were to actually map them out, there are probably 20 or 30 issues contained in those 11 points. I am sure the committee will identify others during the course of the year. It is a very broad charge to become essentially experts on the issues and then to begin to make recommendations through the regular Faculty Council process for any changes that might be appropriate for us to consider.

**PROFESSOR WILSON:** Are these kinds of changes going to be considered at Indiana University and at Purdue University campuses or just IUPUI?

**DEAN PLATER:** At the moment we are thinking only of IUPUI. One of the things that was identified for the committee is to be mindful of its responsibility to have some sort of liaison with Indiana University as a whole and with Purdue University. At the moment there is no thought of anything except IUPUI, though some of the changes that one could imagine being necessary or desirable would require going through Indiana University, for tenure for example, with the approval ultimately of the Indiana University Faculty Council, etc. Some changes might take years to



make but at the moment no specific changes are being contemplated by anyone.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** I think we would like our Task Force which is an excellent Task Force to do such a good job that the rest of the university, and maybe Purdue University, would simply imitate what our Task Force proposed, if anything.

**PROFESSOR WILSON:** Some of us have had a chance to look at this document and some of the changes that are implied that might come down include things like the possibility of having long term contracts, going a longer time before you go to tenure, and all kinds of things. If you read that document, that seems to be the bottom line. The problem is why are we doing this first?

**PROFESSOR ZUNT:** Kathryn, I probably played a major role in bringing this to the attention of the Council in asking us to move forward on this. I would like to answer that. Those issues that you have just outlined are ones of national concern. They are not in there just to affect Indiana University or IUPUI. They are national concerns and we would like to examine them. There may be no proposal necessary to be made but we want to examine them as faculty members so we have a response before any administrative change would be recommended.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** If there are no other questions or comments we will move on to our next agenda item.

#### **AGENDA ITEM VI - Academic Affairs Committee Report - Kathryn Wilson, Chair**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Our next agenda item is a report of the Academic Affairs Committee by Katherine Wilson.

**PROFESSOR WILSON:** The first item that I am to bring before you has to do with the memo from Dean Plater which is a circular in your agenda for today. The Academic Affairs Committee has looked at these deadlines. We discussed it once before and basically what these documents do is establish deadlines for academic misconduct appeals brought forward by students. Essentially, it establishes a 90-day limitation. The student must bring his appeal within 90 days of the date on which he should reasonably have learned of the accusation or whatever if that date is later. After that, there is a recommendation of 30 days after the date of a unit's decision where the Dean of Faculties will no longer consider an appeal. The only thing that I would like to make you aware of is that when we are speaking of academic misconduct appeals, this does not have to do with grade appeals. It only has to do with grade appeals insofar as grades are involved in the academic misconduct. That is, a student wants his grade changed because he really didn't cheat as the professor claimed. For instance, in the School of Science, some policies about deadlines were issued on the basis of this document which had to do with grades per se. That is not what this document speaks to. It speaks only to academic misconduct. Schools have to set their own grade appeals. That is the other thing. This document, in the way it is stated, limits grade appeals to within a school. It can go no farther. Schools, then, must establish their own procedures and their own deadlines with respect to grades.

The other thing that came up last time we discussed this was the fact that many different units have different procedures and this does not speak to pro-

cedures. This is only a deadline document.

I move that the policies within this document be accepted.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** That needs no second, is that correct?

**PROFESSOR KARLSON:** That is correct.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Is there any discussion? [none] Are you ready for the vote?

**PROFESSOR HODES:** Does this thing set any time in which the unit must respond to the student?

**PROFESSOR WILSON:** That is all we did was make a recommendation. We didn't want to do anything that might be contrary to any unit's procedures or already established deadlines. If you want a deadline, you will have to establish it within your own unit.

**PROFESSOR HODES:** It seems to me that the main reason for such a separate policy is really for the protection of the students. It is very very unlikely that any student is going to wait as long as 89 days.

**PROFESSOR WILSON:** You are wrong. People bring these kinds of academic misconduct appeals three or four years after the fact.

**PROFESSOR HODES:** It seems to me that 90 days is too long. It should be something like 30 days for the student and 20 days for the university.

**PROFESSOR WILSON:** Our committee believes that 90 days is a reasonable limitation. You may differ, in which case I believe you can set more stringent rules within your own unit.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Is there any further discussion? If not, are you ready for the vote? All in favor, say "Aye". Opposed? The motion carries. Kathryn, do you have another item?

**PROFESSOR WILSON:** Yes I have two more items. The next item that the Academic Affairs Committee brings before you is on the next page. That is circular 87-21.

We are asked to review a recommendation from the University Division Policy Committee which would require the submission of midterm grades for all undergraduate students who have completed fewer than 26 hours. These are freshman students. Currently, IUPUI policy contains such a requirement only for freshman students assigned to University Division. This policy has not been enforced in recent years, at least in many parts of the University. I have put in here a quote from the Academic Handbook from a 1985 edition that states "Faculty members are expected to give each undergraduate a written evaluation of performance as early as compatible with the nature of the course, but not later than after two-thirds of the semester or summer session have elapsed." The Academic Affairs Committee feels that midterm grades are important to freshman students who need to know how

they are doing in classes to help them make decisions regarding the following semester's registration. We have put forward the following resolution which is before you.

- (1) Faculty must assign midterm grades in academic year semesters to all students who have received fewer than 26 units of academic credit unless the course is shorter than an academic year semester;
- (2) The written grade reports must be made before registration for the following semester is conducted; and
- (3) Appropriate administrative personnel must notify students and the counselors in their academic or administrative units of those grades before registration for the following semester is conducted.

I move for acceptance of this resolution.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Is there any discussion?

**PROFESSOR VESSELY:** In (2) and (3), does that mean before the procedure for registering in advance of a course which is done sometime during the middle or two-thirds of the previous semester?

**PROFESSOR WILSON:** Yes it does.

**PROFESSOR VESSELY:** Can it be interpreted that you could give this person a grade while they are standing in line at walk-in registration?

**PROFESSOR WILSON:** No, this has to be done before counseling. Registration now occurs in previous semester.

**PROFESSOR VESSELY:** But it also occurs immediately before the semester.

**PROFESSOR WILSON:** But the first registration occurs in the previous semester.

**PROFESSOR VESSELY:** Should it say before the first registration?

**PROFESSOR WILSON:** I don't think it has to.

**PROFESSOR VESSELY:** If the policy is not being adhered to, if that was the reason for this, people who are not adhering to it could delay this report until after the grades are issued from a semester and while the student is going through walk-in.

**PROFESSOR WILSON:** No, because this says it has to be handed in before registration occurs. The first time we have registration is the previous semester so this would reiterate that the faculty are required to hand in midterm grades.

**UNKNOWN #1:** Does that mean then that there is going to be some standard form of reporting the grades?

**PROFESSOR WILSON:** We have left this open. We did not speak to the procedure but all of us receive midterm rosters where we are supposed to say whether a student is actually attending our class and they even ask us to correct the Social Security numbers. At that point, we would enter freshman grades. That would be one way of doing it. That is really up to the Registrar to come up with a procedure to collect the grades as well as to be responsible for mailing them out.

**PROFESSOR HODES:** The Academic Handbook that is quoted here says that the faculty members are expected to give a written evaluation and now what is proposed here is making a rule that all faculty must do that for undergraduates only. That seems to be an extraordinary change. I think, if I were an undergraduate teacher, I would oppose it very strongly.

**PROFESSOR WILSON:** I am an undergraduate teacher. I teach a large undergraduate class and I frankly don't see the problem. I can assign a grade based on half of the semester's work, what I would give, if I had to give a grade at that moment. In fact, I do that because I think that freshman students have a right to know how they are doing. They need to know that. They need to know it much more than upper level students do.

**PROFESSOR HODES:** I think it is wonderful that you do that and I probably would do it too. But that is different than making it mandatory that you do it whether you want to do it or not.

**PROFESSOR BECK:** I guess my question was asked. I wondered if you had checked with the Registrar's Office in terms of implementing this. I really think that ought to be done.

**PROFESSOR WILSON:** I did check with the Registrar who said "Well, it is just a matter of money." I think those were his words.

**PROFESSOR BECK:** They don't see any problem with that. They can identify 26 credit hours...

**PROFESSOR WILSON:** They do this in Bloomington now. This is done for all students in Bloomington. They fill out forms and send students midterm grades.

**PROFESSOR BECK:** A midterm roster, when it comes out, tells us who has 26 hours?

**PROFESSOR WILSON:** The Registrar says "No".

**PROFESSOR NG:** I find it very difficult to isolate a group of students within one plot and never giving a signal as to how they are doing. I just don't think it is workable. Either you require midterm grades in the fall and everybody does it.

**PROFESSOR WILSON:** In my class, which is mixed, I make the grades available to everybody. I obviously don't send them. I post them. It would take me about ten more minutes to write them down for the Registrar for the freshman students. The basic discussion in the Academic Affairs Committee was one of the academic soundness of the policy not the amount of work that the faculty had to do.

**PROFESSOR NG:** Why don't we make it sound for everyone?

**PROFESSOR VESSELY:** I think Dean Plater probably knows the numbers better than I, but I think our track record as far as freshman students is not very good in terms of retention. If this is one small effort of a faculty member to put forth to help retain students, then I think we should support it.

**PROFESSOR SHARP:** This is an important issue that I don't think the faculty has really discussed very well and I would move to send it back to the committee to give the faculty some time to discuss it.

**PROFESSOR ZUNT:** Professor Sharp, do you mean to send it back to the committee or just bring the issue back in the fall?

**PROFESSOR SHARP:** I didn't want to table it because that avoids discussion. I am willing to permit discussion.

**PROFESSOR WILSON:** The committee voted for this resolution unanimously so if you send it back, I have the suspicion that you will get the same resolution back again.

**PROFESSOR SHARP:** I will change the motion just to bring it forward to the Council next fall.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Is there a second to Kent Sharp's motion? [motion seconded] Are you ready to vote on that motion? All in favor of Kent Sharp's motion to bring the issue back in the fall, say "Aye". Opposed? The no's have it. The main motion stands. Are you ready to vote on the main motion? All in favor, say "Aye". Opposed? Motion carries. Do you have another item?

**PROFESSOR WILSON:** I have the academic calendar. The next issue that I am bringing before you is the Academic Calendar. I am sorry that it has been delayed until this last meeting. If you table it or do anything like that, we won't have a calendar until next fall.

What we have done is to look at Brian Vargus' survey and we decided that what that survey did basically was present the parts of the calendar in parts and asked about their academic soundness. We felt that a calendar's academic soundness could not be decided on the basis of looking only at it piecemeal. Therefore, what we have done is presented you with two different choices - Choice A and Choice B. The basic difference between Choice A and Choice B is highlighted.

Choice A begins classes on a Monday and it has a full week of Thanksgiving recess. Choice B begins classes on a Wednesday and has three days of Thanksgiving recess. You have a choice of either A or B unless you want to amend it or do something else drastic.

Let me point out another thing. The committee has eliminated classes on Labor Day. Labor Day classes, we believed, were so unpopular that they would never get through. That Monday, then, has been moved to the last Monday of the semester, so that classes end on a Monday and final exams also end on a Monday. Those are the basic elements of the calendar. The Spring Semester is as it has

always been. Choice A is exactly the calendar that you have just been through and the calendar that you will go through again next year. Choice B is the calendar we had two years ago. So, it is the old pattern. You are choosing between the new pattern and the old pattern.

**PROFESSOR HODES:** In Choice B, when it is on a Wednesday before, does that mean that there are classes are aren't classes on Wednesday before Thanksgiving?

**PROFESSOR WILSON:** There are no classes. That is the old pattern.

**PROFESSOR HODES:** Would it not be possible, instead of having a final Monday to make up for the Monday losses to have classes on Wednesday and designate that as Monday. That is the way we always did it in our school.

**PROFESSOR VESSELY:** We haven't had classes on Wednesday for several years.

**PROFESSOR WILSON:** We have never done that.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** The Law School does.

**PROFESSOR WILSON:** Being conservative, we simply went back to the old pattern. There are an infinite number of permutations to this calendar which we can't discuss here. It is just impossible.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** I think we have to vote on either A or B. I think the committee has prepared the issues well and I think the only thing to do is vote for either A or B. Do you want to vote now? Is there any need for clarification? Those who would like to Alternative A, raise your hand. Those who would like Alternative B, raise your hand. [counting - B had one more vote. A recount was requested]. [Voting the second time] Alternative A - 27; Alternative B - 32.

The approved calendar is as follows:

1st Semester

Classes Begin	W Aug	23
Labor Day (No Classes)	M Sept	4
Thanksgiving Recess Begins	W Nov	22
Classes Resume	M Nov	27
Classes End	M Dec	12
Final Exams Begin	T Dec	13
Final Exams End	M Dec	19

2nd Semester

Classes Begin	M Jan	8
Spring Recess Begins	M Mar	5
Classes Resume	M Mar	12
Classes End	N Apr	29
Final Exams Begin	M Apr	30
Final Exams End	N May	6
Commencement	N May	13

1st Semester

Classes Begin	W May	9
Memorial Day Recess	M May	28
Classes End	W June	20*

2nd Summer

Classes Begin	W June	27
Independence Day Recess	T July	4
Classes End	W Aug	8

\*M May 28 classes meet W June 20.

Thank you Kathryn.

**AGENDA ITEM VII - TIAA/CREF Benefits for 10-Month Appointees**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** In the interest of time that we have, I wonder if we could defer Item VII, TIAA/CREF Benefits for 10-month appointees. Who is going to make that proposal?

**PROFESSOR ALIPRANTIS:** I am going to present that. I would like to speak to that item.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** We have to adjourn fairly soon and it is not listed as an action item for today.

**PROFESSOR ALIPRANTIS:** Could I make a motion then that it be the first item on the agenda in the fall?

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** I think that is an appropriate motion. I don't think we would be able to implement this for the summer anyway this year so there would be

no loss in having it be the first item on the agenda for the fall. Can we take that by consent?

# **AGENDA ITEM VIII - Faculty Board of Review Orientation Committee Report**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Item VIII has already been covered.

# **AGENDA ITEM IX - Athletic Advisory Committee Report - Hugh Wolf**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Item IX is the Athletic Advisory Committee Report by Hugh Wolf.

**DEAN WOLF:** I would be very happy to do something that people have said in the past that I am very good at doing, which is make up time on the agenda and simply say to you that the full text of this report will appear in the minutes as it has in the past. There are two things that I would like to mention however that I think would be of particular interest to this Council. During 1987-88 for the third consecutive year all seven of our intercollegiate athletic teams have collective grade point averages of C or better. The overall cumulative grade point average for all the student athletes was 2.53 and for the second time in the history of the IUPUI intercollegiate athletic program we had an academic All-American named to the National Association Intercollegiate Athletics All-American teams; Sue Whitlow, a softball and volleyball player. The IUPUI Athletics Advisory Committee is an administrative committee responsible to the Vice President-Indianapolis. The committee is charged with "exercising institutional control of the intercollegiate athletic program at IUPUI as outlined by the applicable national, regional, and state associations." The committee is composed of fourteen faculty members and eight staff members. The 1987-88 members and their campus affiliations are:

Hugh A. Wolf, Chair	School of Education
Amy-Jeanne Ade	Staff Council
Sharon K. Alger	School of Nursing
C. D. Aliprantis	School of Science
Dorothy A. Cheesman	Admissions Office
Charles M. Coffey	Alumni Association
Thomas A. DeCoster	SPEA
William N. Kulsrud	School of Business
Miriam Z. Langsam	School of Liberal Arts
Timothy Langston	Dean of Students
Robert L. Lovell	School of Physical Education
Robert E. Martin	Administrative Affairs
James L. McDonald	School of Dentistry
Ronald L. Montgomery	School of Social Work
Dale Neuburger	Natatorium
Larry Ryan	Faculty Council Athletic Affairs
Edmund Schilling	School of Physical Education
Phillip Tennant	Herron School of Art
James W. Torke	School of Law
Patricia Treadwell	School of Medicine
Dyke L. Wilson	Alumni Relations
Charles F. Yokomoto	School of Engineering/Technology



There are seven varsity sports at IUPUI. We have baseball, basketball, soccer, and tennis for men. Women athletes compete in basketball, softball, and volleyball. 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 1987-88.

- The committee approved a ticket pricing plan recommended by the Athletic Department. The plan included free admission to all events for IUPUI students with a valid ID card.
- Early in the fall, the committee met with Michael Carroll, President of the Metro Athletic Club. Mr. Carroll updated members on the Club's activities and thanked them for their support.
- A subcommittee investigated the potential for conference affiliations with similar urban institutions in the Midwest.
- Another subcommittee has been studying the substance abuse education program which was instituted by the Athletic Department in 1985. The committee voted unanimously to support the stance taken by the campus and university administration in regard to the Indiana Civil Liberties Union's legal challenge to the mandatory testing part of the program.
- The committee provided input to the Vice President's office on those elements of the IUPUI Campus Development Plan having to do with intercollegiate athletics.
- The chairman participated in the annual seminar conducted each fall by the Athletic Department. Student-athletes were updated about NAIA eligibility regulations.
- The chairman also served as a member of the committee appointed by Vice President Bepko to develop a long-range plan for intercollegiate athletics at IUPUI.
- The committee has redoubled its efforts to identify someone who could act as Coordinator of Academic Advising for the student-athletes.

In addition to the activities of the Athletics Advisory Committee, attention should be called to the achievements of IUPUI student-athletes during 1987-88.

- The 1987-88 year marked the inaugural season for men's soccer at IUPUI. The program was supported in large part through a significant monetary contribution made by Manufacturers Financial Group. In the team's initial season it finished 15-5-1 and reached the semi-final round of the district playoffs, losing to the eventual champions, Earlham College.
- The men's tennis team finished its season with a 7-2 record in spite of injuries and facility problems associated with the Pan American Games. In the NAIA District 21 Tournament, the team was runner-up to Grace College,

missing the championship by only five points.

- The women's volleyball team had an excellent season finishing with a mark of 24-7 and being ranked in the NAIA top 20 for most of the year. The team placed in the NAIA District 21 Tournament.
- The women's basketball team completed a 17-11 season and lost in the semi-final round of the District 21 Tournament. A highlight of the season was winning the DePauw Invitational Tournament.
- The men's basketball squad had a school record 24 wins in 1987-88. During the course of the season, the team captured the championship of the Brooks Peach Basket Classic Tournament for the second year in a row. The Metros fell to Taylor University in the District 21 semi-finals.
- The men's baseball season is still in progress. The current won-lost record is 29-21. The team has recorded wins over Indiana State, Villanova, Louisville, and Notre Dame.
- The women's softball team has a present record of 31-4 and is ranked third nationally by NAIA. The women will begin defense of their District 21 championship with a home game against Anderson University at 10:00 a.m. on Friday, May 6th. The Lady Metros are aiming for their sixth consecutive appearance in the NAIA national tournament.
- During the 1987-88 season IUPUI intercollegiate athletic teams have won 73% of the contests in which they have participated. Twenty of our student-athletes have been named to District 21 All Star teams and four have been accorded NAIA All American honors.
- IUPUI athletes have fared well as scholars, too. Sue Whitlow, a women's volleyball and softball player, became the second athlete in IUPUI history to be named to the NAIA Academic All-American team. For the third year in a row each one of our seven intercollegiate teams posted collective GPA's of C or better. The overall cumulative GPA for the group was 2.53. The men's baseball team won the academic achievement award which our committee has given annually since 1984. Their collective GPA of 2.68 edged out the women's softball team by only .04 of a point!

Hugh A. Wolf, Chairman

Thank you very much.

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** Thank you, Hugh.

#### **AGENDA ITEM X - Old Business**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** We have one more item of business which we must take up and that is the report of the results of the election. Is Dorothy Webb ready with the election results?

**PROFESSOR WEBB:** The results of the election are as follows:

**NOMINATING COMMITTEE**

C. D. Aliprantis	School of Science
Richard Fredland	School of Liberal Arts
Robert Keck	School of Science
Charles Yokomoto	School of Engineering/Technology

Professor Yokomoto received the highest number of votes and therefore will be the Chair in 1989-90.

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

Billy Abel	School of Education
Paula Differding	Herron School of Art
William Hodes	School of Law
Dana McDonald	School of Medicine

**TENURE COMMITTEE**

Erwin Boschmann	School of Science
Mary Kimball	School of Physical Education
Susan Zunt	School of Dentistry

Do I have permission to have the ballots destroyed?

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** We have a motion to destroy the ballots? Do I hear a second? [seconded] All in favor of destroying the ballots say "Aye". Opposed? Motion carries.

**AGENDA ITEM XI - New Business**

**VICE PRESIDENT BEPKO:** We have another session immediately following this to make awards and we would appreciate it if you would stay. There will be refreshments served after the awards ceremony. Before we adjourn I would like to note that this is the last Faculty Council meeting at which Susan Zunt will be the Secretary and our leader. I think it is important to stop for a moment to acknowledge what a truly superb job she has done as the head of the Faculty Council. She has always exercised good judgment. She has had a calming influence when it was needed and supplied energy when it was needed. Although I have known quite a few, I haven't had a chance to work closely with many Faculty Council secretaries so I can't compare them. Nevertheless, I can't imagine anyone doing a finer job than Susan Zunt has done these past two years. To recognize her work in appropriate fashion we would like to present Susan with a plaque. The plaque says,

**To Susan Zunt in appreciation of your dedicated service as Secretary of the Faculty Council of Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis for the 1986-1987 and 1987-1988 academic years.**

Let's stand and recognize Susan Zunt. [applause]

**PROFESSOR ZUNT:** I would like to thank you all for this opportunity to represent you. It has been a pleasure. I have learned a lot. I hope I haven't made too many major mistakes. I do appreciate this very much. I have to acknowledge that I did nothing except merely to try to bring forward what faculty wanted brought forward. I have to thank the Executive Committee that has worked for you so hard and your chairs of the standing committees. It was a very rare occasion when I asked someone to work for the Faculty Council and I was turned down. It really has been a wonderful experience. Thank you! (On behalf of the Faculty Council and the Executive Committee I thank Vice President (Indianapolis) and Chancellor Bepko, Executive Dean Howard Schaller, Dean of the Faculties William Plater, Associate Dean of the Faculties Carol Nathan and the rest of the administrative staff that have facilitated the Council business during the past two years.)

**AGENDA ITEM XII - Adjournment**

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