

Approved: November 7, 1996

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY INDIANAPOLIS

Faculty Council Meeting

September 5, 1996

School of Dentistry, DS 115

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

Present: Administration: Chancellor Gerald Bepko, Trudy Banta, Dean William Plater. **Unit Deans:** George K. Stookey, Oner Yurtseven. **Elected Faculty:** Susan Ball, William Blomquist, Lynn Broderick, Paul Brown, Kenneth Byrd, John Eble, Nancy Eckerman, Julie Fore, Karen Gable, Paul Galanti, Richard Gregory, Robert Hall, Dean Hawley, William Hohlt, Sara Anne Hook, Elizabeth Jones, Robert Keck, M Jan Keffer, Raymond Koleski, Miriam Langsam, Stephen Leapman, Najja Modibo, Byron Olson, David Peters, Richard Peterson, Richard Pflanzner, Rebecca Porter, Gerald Powers, Terry Reed, Richard Rogers, Beverly Ross, William Schneider, Erdogan Sener, Martin Spechler, Soren Svanum, Jeffery Vessely, Kathleen Warfel, Jeffrey Watt, Robert Weetman, Harriet Wilkins, Charles Yokomoto. **Ex Officio Members:** James Baldwin, Henry Besch, Dolores Hoyt, Juanita Keck, William Orme, Carl Rothe, Rosalie Vermette.

Alternates Present: Unit Deans: Miriam Langsam for John Barlow, J. M. Kapoor for Roberta Greene, Stephen J. Jay for Robert Holden, Margaret Applegate for Agenda McBride, Dolores Hoyt for Philip Tompkins. **Ex Officio Members:** Donald Humphress for Virgie Montgomery.

Absent: Unit Deans: A James Barnes, Paul Bippen, Trevor Brown, P Nicholas Kellum, representative for Continuing Studies, Norman Lefstein, John Rau, Robert Shay, David Stocum, Donald Warren, Charles Webb. **Elected Faculty:** Charalambos Aliprantis, W Marshall Anderson, Merrill Benson, Joseph Bidwell, Ulf Jonas Bjork, Jana Bradley, Thomas Broadie, William Burke, David Canal, Naomi Fineberg, S Edwin Fineberg, Janice Froehlich, Patricia Gallagher, Bernardino Ghetti, Sanjiv Gokhale, Robert Havlik, Antoinette Hood, Nathan Houser, Henry Karlson, Michael Klemsz, Colleen Larson, Thomas Luerssen, Joyce Man, Rebecca Markel, Fred Pavalko, Frederick Rescorla, Virginia Richardson, Bernadette Rodak, Mark Seifert, Jay Simon, Stephen Stockberger, Karen West, Marianne Wokeck, Mervin Yoder. **Ex Officio Members:** Michael Cochran, Richard Fredland, Stuart Hart, Steven Mannheimer, Bart Ng, Jay Starks, Marshall Yovits.

Visitors: Victor Borden (Information Management and Institutional Research Office), Erwin Boschmann (Dean of the Faculties Office), Kenneth Crews (Copyright Management Center), Mark

Grove (Registrar), Eleanor Kinney (IU School of Law - Indianapolis), Patrick Rooney (Chancellor's Office), Sarah Sprunger (Student).

AGENDA ITEM I: Call to Order

PORTER: I would like to call to order the first meeting of the IUPUI Faculty Council for the 1996-97 academic year. For those of you who may be new to the Council, I will introduce the individuals seated at the front table, even though two of the individuals should not need to be introduced. [Referring to Chancellor Bepko and Dean Plater] At the far end of the head table is Executive Vice Chancellor and Dean of the Faculties William Plater, Chancellor Gerald Bepko, William Schneider (President of the IUPUI Faculty), Harriet Wilkins (Parliamentarian), Bernice Chumley (Secretary of IUPUI Faculty Council and IUPUI Staff Council), and at the far end is Doug Bartlow (Media Services) who serves as the person taping these meetings, and I am Rebecca Porter (Vice President of the IUPUI Faculty).

I periodically will be reminding you to identify yourselves before speaking. If you read the minutes, you will note that periodically the faculty member label 'Unknown' adds a bit of wisdom to the discussion. We would like you to be able to claim your own statements for the purposes of the written record and so that the members of the Council can learn who you are.

One additional housekeeping request relates to the attendance sheet which circulates during the meeting. Please be sure to sign the attendance sheet so that the minutes can accurately reflect your attendance.

AGENDA ITEM II: Memorial Resolutions: Charles E. Ody, School of Medicine (IUPUI Circular 94-26), John A. Robb, School of Medicine (IUPUI Circular 96-25), and John L. Sullivan, School of Medicine (IUPUI Circular 96-26)

PORTER: While IUPUI continues its growth, we have also continued traditions which remind us of the sense of community and family among our faculty. One of the traditions is the writing of memorial resolutions which are received by the Faculty Council and then transmitted to the families of deceased faculty. The members of the Council rise for a moment of silence to remember our colleagues. Included in the agenda were memorial resolutions for three members of the School of Medicine -- Charles E Ody, John A. Robb, and John L. Sullivan. Please stand for a moment of silence. You may be seated.

AGENDA ITEM III: Approval of Minutes

PORTER: You may be wondering why this body is voting on approval of the minutes from the January, February, and May meetings. Besides the problems of figuring out who is speaking, the transcriptionist of the minutes sometimes has problems figuring out what was said. The procedure has been to send the paragraphs with missing segments to the speaker and request that the speaker try to reconstruct what was said. It is a wonderful way to oneself sound more eloquent, but unfortunately, not all individuals have been able to respond in a timely manner. Thus, the delays in the approval of the January and February minutes. This year we will try the procedure of setting a deadline for the response

and proceed with the publication of the minutes with the missing sections if no reply is received.

Are there any additions or corrections to the January 11, 1996 minutes?

ORME: I should have been marked present.

PORTER: We will add you to the list. Are there any other additions or corrections to the January minutes? Could I have a motion to approve the minutes as amended?

LANGSAM: I so move. **GABLE:** Second.

PORTER: All of those in favor say "Aye." Does anyone oppose? [none] The minutes stand approved. Are there any additions or corrections to the February 1, 1996 minutes? Hearing none, is it the wish of the body to approve the February 1, 1996 minutes?

LANGSAM: I move that we approved the minutes. **GABLE:** Second.

PORTER: All of those in favor say "Aye." Does anyone oppose? [none] The February minutes will stand as approved. Are there any additions or corrections to the May 2, 1996 minutes?

BESCH: I move that we approve them. **LANGSAM:** I second that.

PORTER: All of those in favor of approving the May 2, 1996 minutes say "Aye." Does anyone oppose? [none] The minutes of May 2 are approved.

AGENDA ITEM IV: Administrative Report: Chancellor Gerald Bepko

BEPKO: I have a couple of introductions to begin. We have a new dean present today who is attending a Faculty Council meeting for the first time as Dean and that is Oner Yurtseven who is the new Dean of the School of Engineering and Technology. He became dean in July and has already done some excellent work. He succeeded Doris Merritt who was the Acting Dean of the School of Engineering and Technology during the 1995-96 academic year.

Also, I should mention that over the summer there was an announcement of a new dean for the School of Dentistry --- Larry Goldblatt -- who many of you know as a member of the faculty here for about 20 years. He left to be dean at Case Western in Cleveland for the past couple of years and now is returning as the dean effective January 1, 1997. Continuing longer than he thought he would as the interim dean is our own member of the Faculty Council, George Stookey, who is here. I want to mention what a wonderful job George has done as acting dean. Two things happened this summer that I think are noteworthy and I have to mention them about George. First, the faculty adopted a new curriculum after some considerable discussion and debate which was, in its most important stages, led by George Stookey. As all of you know, curriculum reform is not easy. I am sure you have all heard that often

quoted metaphor that changing curriculum is like moving a mature graveyard. You don't get much help from the inhabitants. But, at any rate, this was a tour de force of faculty development and curriculum reform in the School of Dentistry and George, congratulations.

I think probably word will be sent later about the attire of some of us here. Do you want me to say anything about that?

PORTER: Of course.

BEPKO : There is a little history to this. I hope you can see that it says "Starship IUPUI." [holding up a tee shirt] There is a picture of a starship. You may recall that at the close of last academic year there was a lot of talk about "flagships" and the flagship campuses. Many people thought that was amusing and conjured up the idea of a flagship as being a 19th century British Man of War being buffeted by heavy seas and thought of other university campuses as being aircraft carriers and modern navy ships that might eclipse the old British Man of Wars. One of the more creative people in this body, Kathy Warfel, who is here, coined an even better expression for describing IUPUI. Since the word "flagship" had been used, she thought that IUPUI should be the "starship" to reflect its futuristic vision and its destiny in the world of ships. At any rate, some wags on campus had tee shirts made up with "Starship IUPUI" on them. They have been red-hot commodities. If you would like one, we have some left in the AO Building, but you will have to come after hours to get them because we can't be seen trading in this situation. **[Laughter]** I am told they will be on sale in the bookstores before too long. There are many colors. You can choose your own color of starship.

We have a report on some very good news about enrollment and Bill Plater will tell you about that.

PLATER: There is good news, indeed. There is a lot of information that I would like to convey to this body because it reflects a significant change in our campus in several respects. If you will bear with me, I will go through a number of pieces of information that will be available in various reports for your perusal and inspection in considerable detail at a later time. But, the highlights are these:

Our total enrollment for IUPUI is 27,011 and that includes both the Indianapolis and the Columbus campuses. Our credit hours are a little over 260,000. This represents less than a one percent increase in headcount, but almost a three percent <Number Style> increase in credit hours over last year. At the IUPUI (Indianapolis campus) the headcount is exactly the same this year as it was last year. The increases have all come at the Columbus campus. The enrollment here in Indianapolis is 25,526. Our credit hours are up just about the same as they are for IUPUI as a whole; about 2.2 percent.

Another significant change is that this year the number of full-time students at IUPUI has passed the number of part-time students. I believe, though this is yet to be confirmed, that this is the first time since we have been keeping data that we actually have more full-time students than part-time students. That is just a very slight difference -- 50.1 percent are full-time. The number of full-time students increased this year roughly five percent over last year, whereas the number of part-time students decreased by almost

the same amount.

Another significant change is the average credit hours being taken by undergraduate students which has reached nearly 10 credit hours per student. That is almost a full-time load. This represents a slight increase from last year -- 9.95 credit hours per person this year versus 9.79 last year. The trend obviously is towards more full-time students taking nearly a full load.

Other good news is that our total freshman class is up 8.4 percent over last year. That is especially good news because it suggests that we will be able to continue our enrollment growth. As you will recall, we have had first-year classes that have actually decreased during the proceeding three years and the turnaround that began last year and is continuing this year suggests that we will continue to have a strong enrollment growth. This year's total beginning population is up almost 13 percent over last year.

There is also other good news. Despite the fact that we continue to take in more first-year students, I am pleased to say that the SAT scores of our students have also gone up. This has been a matter of some concern in past years. This year we have not only had more students, but the students on average appear to present better records. The scores for the students directly admitted to schools this year is 995 (SAT) and the high school percentile rank is 61st percentile. Undergraduate Education Center (UEC) students have a slightly higher SAT and high school percentile rank than direct admits. The UEC students have a SAT score of 1,001 and are in the 70th percentile of their high school graduation class. UECP, on the other hand, has a SAT score of 858 and an average of 39th percentile in high school rank. It is also interesting to note that the matriculants in UEC increased their average SAT score by 20 points over last year. The UECP students increased their SAT score by five points over the previous year. So, I think there is reason for us to be very happy both about the way in which we are attracting students -- more full-time students taking full loads -- and the preparation the students demonstrate by scores and class rank.

The other piece of information that may be important for you to know is that the number of applications for admission also increased. It was up 7 percent from last fall and, if you will remember, last fall had seen a significant increase over the previous fall. We continue to have a slight decrease in the number of juniors and seniors, again reflecting the smaller classes that entered a few years ago.

Other data that may be of interest to you is that we have had a significant increase in the number of minority students. The total of minority student enrollment is almost 14 percent this year in comparison with 12.8 percent last year. Asian students had a 10.8 percent increase; Hispanic students increased by 10 percent; and African-American students increased by 7.6 percent. There are, this year, 2,334 African American students enrolled, which represents, by itself, over 9 percent of the total student body. On virtually every front there is good news to report for enrollments this fall.

The only area where there is any decrease is at the graduate level, in particular in the graduate non-degree. I think, as all of us understand, this is due almost entirely to the strong employment market in the Indianapolis region. Many of these students are not taking discretionary courses as they might have

in the past years. This information and other data will be available in a variety of reports soon. We invite your questions and comments when you have the full data before you.

SPECHLER: Very recently the report was published in an Indianapolis newspaper indicating that the retention rate of sophomores finishing their freshman year was quite low at IUPUI, if I recall, it was like 23 percent, and the percentage graduating was similarly rather low compared to other institutions. I would invite you to comment on that and, specifically, whether these data reflect people who may not continue or finish at IUPUI, but elect to continue or finish at one of the other campuses of the IU system or perhaps even at Purdue at West Lafayette.

PLATER: Vic Borden just walked in and I would like to defer this question to Vic who probably has a much better command of the data than I do about retention. I think, Martin, the figure that you cited for first-year, second-year retention is actually considerably lower than we have; although our number is not satisfactory and I will comment on steps that are being taken to address that point. But, Vic, do you recall what our first- and second-year retention rate is?

BORDEN: Yes. The answer to your latter question first is that IU does track students through the system so, if a student graduates from another IU school, they are counted as part of our retention rate. More importantly, the folks who start in Bloomington and finish here, are counted as part of Bloomington's retention rate. That is a much larger phenomenon than the other way. The 22 percent, as I recall, was the new six year rate based on the new criteria which actually is better for us. It is higher than the other rate was when they included, I am not sure whether it was the part-timers that was a change, but the change of methodology has brought our rate up in line with the other campuses. The population is first-time IU students at IUPUI. So, it is only those who are entering a higher education institution for the first time. We do not track students to Purdue or other non IU campuses. For us, the first-time entering population is the high risk population, whereas those who we graduate are predominantly people who have started in other places. We know that about two-thirds of those who finish here take at least 24 credit hours in other IU institutions. Those retention rates that are typically published do not pertain to a large part of our population, but they do pertain particularly to the high risk students that we enter as first-time students. Our one year retention rate among all first-time students is about 60 percent. We have been tracking the two-year retention rate that had gone from 54 percent down to 51 percent and it looks like things are picking up a little but that is all preliminary. We will find out within the next week or two how those retention rates are.

PLATER: Just to comment further, Marty. There are a number of initiatives underway by the campus as a whole to address retention and in particular concentrating efforts on first-year experiences of students. There will be a great deal more said about this throughout the year, but there is to be a concerted effort including the programs that the faculty in Liberal Arts are engaged in, the Liberal Arts Mentors Program, the peer tutoring project that has had a major impact -- very positive results -- in retention in some of the critical first-year introductory courses in mathematics, writing, economics, and other fields. There will be, as I said, a concerted orchestrated effort to look at this as a whole campus involving faculty from all of the schools.

BEPKO: I think it is very interesting that we do have more credit hours generated now this fall than we have ever had before in the history of IUPUI even though our headcount is not nearly what it was back in 1991-92. We have more credit hours this fall. That means that our students are taking more courses and we are generating more educational activities than we ever did at any time in our history. In 1992, when we reached our peak of enrollment, we had this record established. Then in 1993-94 we went down in enrollment by a pretty substantial amount which caused some concern among all of us about when this decline would stop or whether the decline was just a trough and then we would start back up. We embarked on a program of making the campus more customer friendly. Actually we accelerated a program that was already underway for making it more customer friendly, not to let the students write the curriculum or set the standards, but to make the environment more hospitable and not cause students to turn off because they were not treated well.

We also embarked, as you know, on a campaign of marketing to try to make the university more visible, particularly the undergraduate programs. "The More Is Better" campaign was begun. We thought that it would probably take us four years to get back up to the point where we would have the same number of credit hours generated as we did in 1992. We made that goal two years ahead of schedule in 1996. It is a tribute to all of the people who have focused on explaining the extraordinary quality of IUPUI programs, having the public understand that better, and rallying around our undergraduate programs to attract students in. It think it is especially important that we achieved that goal two years early while we saw SAT scores going up across the board. We are, I think, seeing that IUPUI is a much stronger magnet for students than it was in the past and that is really good news.

We have some administrative reviews that were underway this year, but we are not ready to file the final report. We should have that in October. Two administrative reviews are finished; one is not. That is the reason why we are not ready to make the final report. We will make them in the form of a published memo at the October meeting, I hope, of the Council. The two administrative reviews that are now completed and for which we have final reports are Dean James Barnes of the School of Public and Environmental Affairs. His base is in Bloomington. Dean David Stocum of the School of Science here at IUPUI. The one review that is not yet finished is a review of Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education Herman Blake. That committee is still meeting and they should have their report in shortly.

For this academic year we have one school-based dean whose committee is now in the process of being formed. That is Mark Rosentraub, the Associate Dean of SPEA, with responsibility for IUPUI programs. In addition, we have three persons in the campus administration -- Lillian Charleston, the Affirmative Action Officer; Scott Evenbeck, Associate Vice Chancellor and Director of the UEC; and Bill Plater, Executive Vice Chancellor and Dean of the Faculties. If you have any suggestions, we would be happy to hear them. If you would like to volunteer for a review committee, you should talk to Bill or Becky. They will be recommending slates of names.

Next, I think that it is an important time in our planning and development. We have been talking a lot about planning and the next steps this summer because the Strategic Directions Process is now launched and we are well along our way on that. We have to look at that and blend that Strategic Directions

Process with our own campus planning, which you have been participating in for some years. We thought a lot about this over the summer and the metaphor that is most attractive for us is the one that may come to mind if you pack suitcases the way some of us do and that is 30 minutes before you are ready to leave to catch a plane, the suitcase is empty and there are piles of things in various places all ready to be assembled at the last minute. That is the metaphor for where we are in terms of planning and also where I think we are in terms of the initiatives that have been underway on campus. I think in terms of planning we have lots of things that are spread around. We have the Strategic Directions Charter now that is fully developed. We have our own campus planning materials that you have been looking at and they have now come together in a way that is coherent and direct and that will be useful for us in making academic decisions in the next several years, but they are ready to be brought together. They really are very compatible and they are ready to be drawn together into a single document that we can use to tell other people about IUPUI and that we can use as our own charter for making decisions for allocating resources, for having a common vision of what we ought to become.

Also, we have lots of things that have gained great notoriety around the country. We have gone off to a couple of programs this year, several of us in the campus administration -- some of you have been on those trips -- to programs, workshops, seminars sponsored by the major national organizations -- ACE, AAHE, and others. At each one of these conferences or programs we hear back from other people at other universities about things that are going on at IUPUI. It is hard to find a subject that is under discussion in contemporary higher education that won't lead, at some point, to a reference to IUPUI or something that is going on at IUPUI. We have terrific things going on thanks to all of you. We have all of these initiatives and activities that are ready to go into the "suitcase" to complete what we think is the model urban campus for the 21st century. We are close. We haven't fulfilled the destiny of greatness that I think is IUPUI, but we are close. So, we have all of these things ready to be drawn into the final product, into the final result of IUPUI, and we have thought some about this during the summer and we are going to have some documents that we will provide for you. We have them available in the back of the room today. Trudy Banta will say a couple of words about the document that all of us in the campus administration have been looking at and working on over the summer. We don't want to suggest that this is being presented as a final document in any sense. This is the first draft, but we didn't want to have anything in our files that we didn't share with everyone. So, it is the first draft for us and we want you to know about and have it available to you to critique and comment upon.

BANTA: Many of you have seen this little two-year old Vision, Mission, Values, Goals, and Aspirations pamphlet and have heard us talking about IUPUI's four aspirations: quality, collaboration, centrality, and identity. When this document came out some of you in the schools and in your own departments may have thought about your own missions and whether there were ways to align them with IUPUI's new mission. Now the Strategic Directions Charter has been developed by Indiana University and it is time for us to modify our own goals and objectives to become more aligned with Indiana University's directions. What you have in your hand today is the first attempt to do that. We began talking about this in the Chancellor's retreat of August 15. The deans had a retreat the last week of August, and they barely had time to see it and give us very preliminary comments. This is today's version. We had 'quality' in our IUPUI mission and it had segments in it about faculty and students. The Strategic Directions Charter puts learning at the center of the institution's mission. Learning is now

reflected here in IUPUI's aspirations and many of the things that were said about students under 'quality' before are now here under 'Learning.'

The Responsibilities of Excellence now has a number of the things that were in 'Quality' related to faculty and staff development.

Our Collaboration aspiration is very similar to the same element in our earlier document. You will recognize much of the language because you have seen it before. But, there are some additions and some changes. You will also see, for the first time, whereas the prior document was just the outline, just the aspirations and goals, this new document actually has in it some strategic initiatives that will help us accomplish our aspirations. This is all very much in the talking stages. We would very much welcome your comments on it. Just to continue this very briefly, Collaboration is a very central part of what we think we do here on campus, across disciplinary lines.

Centrality and community connections enable us to capitalize on our location right here in the center of the state and the center of the U.S. population. We do have the opportunity to do much for and with the community.

We have added one new aspiration. It was mentioned briefly in part of the old configuration, but now Accountability and Best Practices is a section of this document. You will see that under the initiatives there are numbers in parentheses. Those are references directly to the 30 recommendations that are in the Strategic Directions Charter. These planning documents now are blended and we will look forward to hearing your reactions. If you have comments, send them to me either by jotting them down on paper and give them to me today or by sending them to me via E-mail: Tbanta@iupui.edu.

BEPKO: I think this is a very important time for all of us to sharpen the focus of our thinking about the future. The layout of a more concrete plan. We have good planning now and it is something that we have all shared in over the years, but I think that we can refine that plan and make it more concrete, draw it together as an academic community. Both ourselves and the Strategic Directions Project and our own campus mission, vision, values, goals, and objectives. With some degree of consensus throughout our academic community, I think that now is the time when we can make a major step forward -- take ourselves a couple of notches up in terms of accomplishment and recognition and make IUPUI the urban university for the 21st century. I think we are at the right time, the right place, we have the right ingredients, and I think now is the time to focus very specifically on this type of planning document and move ahead. I think it so much so that Myles Brand has chosen to give his State of the University Address here next week. We have some reason to believe that he is going to talk a little bit, maybe more than a little bit, about IUPUI when he gives his State of the University Address next week on Tuesday, September 11, at 3:00 in the Conference Center Auditorium. We hope that if you don't have a class or something else that prevents you from being there, that you will join us for his State of the University Address. We ought to give him a rousing IUPUI welcome, show him what a Starship really is, and matter of fact he already has a Starship tee shirt. I don't know that he will wear it, but I wouldn't be surprised if he had it with him. We hope you will join us next Tuesday to hear his State of the University

Address. It will be available electronically and in other forms. You can find out about that if you are interested. We will be happy to answer any questions about that. Thank you.

VESSELY: The announcement that was mailed out said the time would be 3:30.

BEPKO: The time is 3:30. Sorry. We should arrive early.

AGENDA ITEM V: President of the Faculty Report: William Schneider

PORTER: The next item on our agenda is a report from the President of the Faculty.

SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Becky, or should I say Captain Porter. **[Laughter]** I should add that President Myles Brand will be spending the following day, Wednesday, on the IUPUI campus meeting with various faculty, students, and staff.

I want to report on the State of the Faculty at this first meeting, but I am not going to for a couple of reasons: (1) there are only so many ways you can say "over worked and under paid," (2) having been on leave for the past year, I am still running very hard to catch up. It has only been one month since I have been on this job so I still have a bit more to see before I can do such a thing, and (3) I have been told one of the best ways to begin a popular administration is make sure the meetings are short.

What I would like to do is give you some warning about an agenda for the year, at least some of the things that are coming up. This is by no means complete. In fact, this month the Executive Committee is going to be meeting with the chairs of the IUPUI Faculty Council standing committees as well as the presidents of the faculty of the schools to try to find more about what is happening within the committees and the schools. There are already a couple of things that I would like to note or warn you about. For example, last year we went through the first round of funding for the Strategic Directions and we are about to start the second round. We will hear more about that later in the meeting today.

We have been trying to make plans that will streamline the process and make the review and the evaluation procedures better known to those who are interested in submitting proposals and to ensure faculty input on the review for this campus at least.

Last year major items were completed from the long past recommendations of the Task Force on Faculty Appointments and Advancement. Especially important is the Policy on Clinical Ranks which was finally approved at the UFC and presented to the Board of Trustees and accepted.

The policy dealing with Financial Difficulty including Financial Exigency was also approved.

There are a couple of other items left that we will be taking up this year. There is a Task Force on Service which has made a preliminary draft report and is going to be holding some hearings with faculty. There are also a few other items that we will be to work on. One is the Policy on Merger and

Elimination of Programs, and there is also the Policy for Review of Tenured Faculty. Both of those will be among the items that the Faculty Affairs Committee will be taking up and, hopefully, at some point in the year bringing before this body -- at least a progress report.

There is one carry over item which Chancellor Bepko didn't mention. His review has been completed and presented to the Executive Committee which is deciding how to present it to the faculty. The Faculty Council, I am sure, will be involved in that. That should be coming soon. In case you are wondering, it is pretty positive.

Another new item is that the Executive Committee has voted to create a small ad hoc committee on Board of Review Procedures to look especially at the initial stages of Boards of Review and the way that faculty grievances are handled. This will be a small five-member committee which we have asked to make some recommendations. Some may be easily made and some may require major changes, even Constitutional changes. The members are Carl Rothe (Chair), Paul Galanti, Gerald Powers, Emily Hernandez, and a former dean's perspective will be represented by Walter Daly.

There are two other matters we will be taking up most immediately. One is President Brand's Committee on Teaching Awards, which was established by the Trustees at the end of last year and has made its preliminary report. It is coming to the campuses for comment. This is something that will affect 25 percent of faculty who will, it is recommended anyway, receive one-time awards, not base salary increments, of between \$500 and \$1,500 each year -- an average of \$1,000. What the committee has left open is exactly who receives the awards and how the monies will be apportioned among the teaching faculty. The Trustees are interested in having the policy in place by the end of this calendar year -- by November or December. So there is quite a bit of discussion to be done. The Faculty Affairs Committee will be taking that up right away. We will, at least, be hearing what they have to say in the preliminary fashion by our next meeting in October.

Down the line, also from the UFC, there is another item that will probably be coming a little later as a follow up on the policy for Clinical Ranks. This is the matter of a policy for Other Non-Tenure Eligible Faculty. A preliminary report was made at the end of the year at UFC and it is an item that I know the Trustees will be taking up at their next meeting. This will include part-time and other faculty that are not eligible for tenure, etc.

Finally, the Faculty Council now has a Home Page. The URL for this is:

<http://www.hoosiers.iupui.edu/faccoun/faccou.htm>

The URL is also listed at the bottom of the agenda for the September 5, 1996 Faculty Council meeting. The page is obviously under construction, and we will report more about this at the next Council meeting.

PORTER: Thank you. It sounds like we are going to have a few things to keep us busy this year.

AGENDA ITEM VI: Guidance for Faculty on Copyright, Publication and General Research Dissemination (IUPUI Circular 96-23)

PORTER: The Ad Hoc Committee on Copyrights, Publication and General Research Dissemination has prepared a document titled "*Guidance for Faculty on Copyright, Publication and General Research Dissemination*" which was enclosed with your agenda. Eleanor Kinney and Kenneth Crews are here to answer any questions you might have. Please note this is an item brought forward for your information and discussion.

KINNEY: Just briefly, we had a very diverse committee of several faculty from throughout IUPUI, the representative of the IU Press, and also Ken Crews who is head of our Copyright Management Center. He was an invaluable member of the committee during the last academic year. Basically, I think those who drafted the charge on the committee had something a little more formal in mind. We found within the committee a great deal of confusion about the requirements of copyright laws and the conventions of publication. We were really quite surprised at the diversity and ways different disciplines publish materials, disseminate research findings. It was quite informative. The committee decided it was probably more helpful to faculty to develop some kind of guidance, both on the conventions of research dissemination and also on the elements of copyright law, and also to inform the faculty where they might get some better information about copyright law and the requirements in the event they had some specific questions. So, this document reflects our effort in that regard. It is presented to you for your comments and consideration. We met over the course of the year. At any rate, the document breaks down basically into two sections: one is some basic guidelines to faculty about research dissemination and replication of republication of one's own work and the second section talks about Applicable Principles of Copyright Law. Kenny, do you want to add anything?

CREWS: Thanks Eleanor. I have met some of you and have worked closely with some of you. Largely, what my office does as the Copyright Management Center is try to coordinate some of the developments here on campus and throughout the IU system because we can't work in isolation. What I also do is work extensively and closely with individual faculty members, programs, departments, and schools, to instruct people about some of these principles that we need to grapple with and that we need to become more aware of. Borrowing the name of the office, so that we may better manage the copyrights that we are creating. If we don't wisely manage them, we will find ourselves in a position where we have misused something or where we have misused our own materials or mistreated them or lost certain opportunities that we really should be careful to preserve so that we can advance our teaching and our research here in our own way and for the benefit of one another. We try to keep the doors open and try to use the materials that we create and use wisely for our mutual benefit. I hope that spirit comes through in this set of guidelines; not policy but really more tutorial -- things to watch for, steps to take. I do have some other more general literature with me that I can share with some of you about the office that we have and about copyright in general. At that point, we open it up for questions.

VESSELY: I remember reading in some minutes or something last spring that the UFC passed a policy on Intellectual Property. Is that compatible with this, different than this?

CREWS: I am not part of that process. That process was underway before I arrived here two years ago. It has taken that long to get to a point where the University Faculty Council has passed that policy. My understanding is that the next step is, it goes before the Board of Trustees to be formalized as University policy. The last I heard was that it is scheduled for a date in October. I don't know that exact date. I have about six people promising to send me the latest draft so I can see it. I wish I could have answered your question more specifically. The answer is based on my seeing an earlier draft. Yes, this is compatible. What we are generally describing in here is the better management of your own scholarly works. Those scholarly works are generally exempted from any kind of university oversight under this pending policy. That is my understanding. At least that seems to be what I have gathered from conversations and the previous drafts. That will be something that I will have watch very closely.

PORTER: Are there any other questions or comments?

GALANTI: Is there any particular area where you think we as faculty should be alert? I noticed the references to disseminating information on the Internet which I think some might not realize would jeopardize publication depending upon the discipline. Is there any one of these guidelines that you think, and I will direct this to Eleanor also, that we should be particular alert?

CREWS: I have a ready answer and you can give a different answer if you wish, Eleanor. I would say that there are a couple of things. One you touched on and that is the use of the Internet and the creation of Web pages. One thing I constantly caution people about is, as soon as you create a Web page, you have become a publisher. So, whatever you are putting on that Web page is the publication of that material unless you put some kind of restrictions -- password control -- to narrowly confine the sort of people who may access it. So, even though the reality is, we might want the whole world to drop in on our page, maybe only two or three people do, but nevertheless we made it available to the world. That means that we need to be extremely careful about what it is we put on that Web page. Some of the points are highlighted here and that is you may be jeopardizing your own publication in a journal of that material because you have already published it. Or, there may be patentable elements of what it is you are putting on that Web page and you may, therefore, undermine your ability to secure a patent on those works. So, you need to be extremely careful. Also, if you are borrowing from another source, 'I want my students to read this works so I am going to take this work and put it on the Web page so they can all get to read it before class. If you put it on the World Wide Web, you have made it available to the wide world and, therefore, there may be some instances that would come back to haunt us in the form of infringement. We are struggling. Believe me, it is an enormous struggle over the concept of fair use in that arena. The proprietor groups, publisher groups, and the academic groups are not going to come to an agreement on this so it is going to be a long term tension and struggle. That is one aspect.

The other one we try to emphasize in these set of guidelines is the publication agreement. You need to review it extremely carefully. Be careful of the joy of being accepted for publication and that joy taking over your need to read what you sign because the commercial publishing world, which publishes many of our journals, is adamant about the need to request and secure permission to distribute photocopies of their materials in class. Now, that may be fair use, but we might conclude that is fair use, but we are not

going to persuade them that it is. Again, we are back to that struggle. The time of signing that agreement is the perfect opportunity to say to the publisher, "Thank you very much I would like to add to this agreement a provision that lets me secure for my purposes at least the ability to make copies for my own teaching and future research." Many of those agreements do not give you rights for your own use for your own teaching. It is a question that you will need to go to task with your own publisher to secure. Ideally, I would rather see you obtain a set of broader rights so that everybody in this room, everybody on this campus, can use your materials for their own teaching, but getting that from a publisher is a tough task. At least get it for yourself. Some publishers are very generous about that and some are not. Read carefully what you sign.

KINNEY: I might also add I think we wanted to caution the faculty about their ability to negotiate with the publishers as well about future publication of work that is being copyrighted or included in a publication. Another area that we have wrestled with because it had been problematic in the past is the publication of materials, research findings in an article when it had been previously presented at a conference and might have been included in conference proceedings. We tried to anticipate some areas where people have some problems. I am not sure we come to the definitive answer for an individual case. But, you should probably consult Kenny. I don't mean to generate additional business for you, Kenny, but consult Kenny and also look more deeply into it. We have highlighted some problems and some recommended suggestions for dealing with those problems.

BESCH: If you make a link to some other page, is that publishing that other page, if you don't download it in your site and then display it on your site?

CREWS: Yes. I will gladly come and give a seminar in copyright principles, but I will answer that question. The question is, if you make a link to some other page, is that publishing that other page, if you don't download it in your site and then display it on your site? My answer is, yes you can because that doesn't create a copy of that Web site on your server in order to facilitate that link. It is when you download from another source that you are now generating another kind of problem that is different from a link. By the way, my remark about giving seminars, etc., I have done this extensively here and on other IU campuses where I have made presentations. In fact yesterday, I gave a presentation to the Chemistry department on the Bloomington campus. I will be glad to make arrangements to come to other organized events to meet with you and your colleagues at your location. After the last question I will have some materials that I can share with you.

JONES: Will this now be disseminated to all faculty or how will it get out to other folks?

PLATER: We would like to have your advice on this. My thought was that, subject to the concurrence of the Handbook Committee, that we would print these guidelines in the next edition of the supplement to the campus academic handbook.

JONES: When will that be out?

PLATER: Probably not for two years. We just published the last edition last spring. In the meantime, we will try to make these guidelines widely available in various locations. There is a blank spot in here (the guidelines) saying we "need some central office to answer questions and refer people" and that undoubtedly will be the Office of Faculty Development and the Center on Teaching and Learning.

PORTER: I believe that concludes our discussion. Thank you very much.

AGENDA ITEM VII: Unfinished Business

PORTER: We will now move to Unfinished Business. The second funding opportunity for Strategic Directions Proposals is approaching. We have asked Vice Chancellor for Planning and Institutional Improvement Banta to explain the process which will be used for the review of the proposals this time since it will have some differences with the process used in the first round of funding. This is an information item with no action required.

BANTA: It is with some trepidation that I begin to talk about Strategic Directions Round two. There was a first teleconference on August 2 to talk about Round Two. After that, there were still quite a number of unanswered questions about the process. I am not going to put anything in writing until after the next teleconference, which is scheduled for September 9. That is next Monday, the time is 1:00 - 3:00 p.m. and it will originate in Bloomington. We will have an opportunity to view it on this campus. I encourage you to call in with any questions that arise as you look at it. I hope that we can get some definitive answers about selection procedures at the central level. We know one thing and that is that the deadline for submission in Bloomington is December 3. That means that we have had to decide whether to go through a review process on this campus. We have been through all kinds of fora for advice on this, and many have said, "Yes, we do need a campus process to review." Such reviews can help us align what is coming forward from our campus with this planning document that I have just mentioned a few minutes ago to make sure that the projects funded on this campus are in alignment with our priorities. Some of you have picked up the matrix that has to do with the funded SDC projects from Round 1. It identifies the kind of projects that were selected in Round One. This contains not only those projects that were funded at the University level, but also campus-funded projects. This review process that we will do on the campus will be absolutely indispensable in making the decisions about how the campus funds would be allocated to those projects that were not funded in the central process.

November 1 will be the date for final copies of proposals to be submitted on this campus. That will give us time to do some review and make it through the Thanksgiving holiday and still transport the final documents to Bloomington. We would like to see as many of those documents as possible submitted electronically on the Web. Ann Kratz in The Center on Teaching and Learning is going to do some workshops. She did a beautiful, wonderful job last time during Round One in helping people develop proposals. She is not going to be as much involved on a day-to-day basis in that, but she will be doing a series of workshops for us on proposal writing and also on how to put your document on the Web.

Moving back from December 3 to November 1, November 1 is the date that these proposals will be due

here for our review. Richard Turner is the new chair of the Faculty Council Planning Committee and is working with Bob Keck, the chairman of the Budgetary Affairs Committee and with the Staff Council to determine the campus review process. It will be in the hands of faculty and staff to determine how those proposals are reviewed, graded, and ranked and then advice will come to the Chancellor from that process. Since the Planning Committee has not had its first meeting yet, we don't have those guidelines clearly in place yet, but as soon as we do, you will hear about them.

Between now and November 1 there will be a whole series of ways to get help with proposals beginning with a video tape. If you are not able to see the September 9th production, a tape will be available from the Strategic Directions Office - Tess Baker. Final details will come in written form and on the Web as soon as we can develop them after September 9. I am just giving you some preliminaries at the moment. The first thing to become available will be the video tape. Commonly asked questions with answers will be posted on the Web and we will continue to add to that. That will be second source. These workshops that Ann Kratz will do will be a third source. We have a proposal writing booklet compiled by Research and Sponsored Programs that should be helpful. We will make that available. We have the list of funded proposals so that you can see what was done last time. You have that in your hands now. It will also be on the Web. We have to draw on the associate deans with responsibility for research in the schools to help people develop proposals who are brand new to that process. Finally, Judy Palmer's office has offered to answer questions related to the development of budgets. So, all of these resources will be made available on the Web site and in paper form if you would like very shortly, after September 9. Are there any questions?

LEAPMAN: What is the difference between the teleconference that we had on August 2 and the one that is coming up next week?

BANTA: I hope we will learn some more definitive information about the selection process. In Round 1, for instance, there were three panels. I do not know at the moment what the panel structure will be. I don't know where proposals will be directed once they leave this campus. So, I can't give you that information today. I hope that after next Monday I will be able to give you that information. There are a few other things that are not written down yet and are not policy. There is another thing. There may be a required letter of intent before submitting a proposal. I am not sure about that yet.

LEAPMAN: May I ask another question about the funding? Are there two pots of money? If your proposal is accepted on the campus level, can it be funded on the university level? Can it be accepted on campus without being accepted through the university faculty?

BANTA: All proposals that will receive campus and university funding are going to go through the same process. They are due on November 1 on this campus. They will be looked at here then they will go to Bloomington. You must be a part of that review process in order to get Strategic Directions funds. There is a combination of university and campus funding and either Bill or Jerry might like to address that.

BEPKO: Some projects that were funded by the SDC process were funded only in part so schools, departments, and, in a couple of cases, the campus administration, had to provide funding to make the project work. That is one kind of additional funding. Secondly, in the first round, there were some proposals that were rated very high by our campus process that did not get into the top group for funding at the SDC. There was a little grouching about that. At the conclusion of the process it was determined that the portion of the Strategic Directions funding that comes from tuition money on the campus ought to stay on the campus. The only question will be whether the proposals are reasonable and supported broadly on the campus. So, there were some proposals that were funded, not by the panels in Bloomington, but by the campus using that extra portion of money that was to stay on campus all along. I can't tell you though what will happen in Round Two because in Round Two we expect that the panels will be more mindful of the recommendations of the campuses. In Round One, if the campus process, that is the process that Trudy has described, recommended against the proposal then it was pretty surely not going to be rated high by the panels. But, on the other hand, if the campus process rated it very high, that didn't mean that it was going to get funded.

BANTA: Another thought was that if it has such a high priority on the campus, maybe the campus should be the one to fund it. So, it has been an interesting combination. Then, there is the matter of matching funds. Some of the campus funds were used to provide matches for the university's funds.

BEPKO: The matches were done at two levels. One is the match that was revealed at the time the proposal was made and the other match was what happened after the SDC process came back and awarded something less than what was needed to complete the project thus requiring an additional match.

BANTA: There is one other somewhat interesting wrinkle: There has not been a ceiling placed on the amount of money that might be requested and yet the amounts of money that were awarded are considerably less than in most cases than was requested. We don't really have any good guidance to give you about how much to ask for or how much to expect.

PORTER: Are there any other questions? We wanted the opportunity to keep you informed even though at the moment we are providing you with the information that we don't know the answers to what is going on, but you are as well informed as anyone on the campus.

SCHNEIDER: The purpose of this is not to tell you how to do grants. The purpose here is to tell you that the faculty and how faculty will be involved in the decision making and the evaluation process such as we can control it. In that sense we are trying to do as much as we can. We will see what happens to the rest of the story.

PORTER: We will move onto our next item on the Council on Undergraduate Learning. The Council on Undergraduate Learning (CUL) serves as an interdisciplinary forum to guide the development of undergraduate curriculum, to promote collaborative curricular efforts, and to negotiate solutions to be curricular disputes. It is a large group which serves an information sharing and, therefore, coordinating focus for a number of committees and ad hoc groups. The CUL has three co-chairs: Herman Blake (Vice

Chancellor for Undergraduate Education); Trudy Banta (Vice Chancellor for Planning and Institutional Improvement), and in past, the President of the Faculty. Based on a recommendation to distribute workload, Bill Schneider has delegated the responsibility to the Vice President, so I will be serving as the third co-chair.

This year the top priority of the CUL will be the development of General Education at IUPUI. This includes:

increasing the campus wide understanding of the nine Principles of General Education which were discussed in this body last year, developing specific expectations for student competence related to each principle, and developing course content and assessment strategies that will ensure student attainment of the levels of competence associated with each principle. I am taking advantage of the presence of Vice Chancellor Banta to provide an overview of the functioning of the CUL since I am new to the group. Again, this is an information item; no action is required.

BANTA: I would like to emphasize that the Council on Undergraduate Learning (CUL) is a place where a lot of people from a lot of different committees and schools come together to discuss undergraduate education broadly. It serves a coordinating function. The standing committees that have representatives who come to CUL meetings and share what is going on in their own groups include Academic Affairs, First-Year Studies, the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (which was just named last year and has just begun to establish its own policies and procedures), the Personal Completion Compact Committee and the Program Review and Assessment Committee. The CUL has just announced that its top priority for the coming year will be the development of general education and the filling in of the very brief segments of information that we had which are called the nine Principles of Undergraduate Learning.

The way we decided to do that is to ask the Program Review and Assessment Committee to do the things that Becky has just pointed out. That is, developing expectations for what students should know and be able to do in writing and critical thinking. This will be a major effort to bring together curriculum committees from the schools and departments, Program Review and Assessment Committee members, Academic Affairs Committee members, and others who are leaders in the development of curriculum in schools and in departments to discuss these matters and to think now about how general education and the major come together in terms of student competence.

PORTER: Are there any questions about what the CUL will be doing this year?

SPECHLER: One of the problems that I have heard most from colleagues around the university and not just on this campus has to do with the competition, sometimes destructive competition, sometimes constructive competition, between the schools like the School of Liberal Arts, School of Science that concern themselves with undergraduate education and professional schools who have programs at the undergraduate level. The usual form of this conflict is who has the right and privilege to offer courses that have large enrollments and accordingly large contributions to the budget. Enrollments might be used to justify additional faculty lines, S & E, etc. Most faculty I have talked to believe that Responsibility

Center Budgeting has aggravated this problem, made the competition more intense, perhaps more destructive. Few people think that there was never any problem before Responsibility Center Budgeting. I believe that is true. A number of instances have arisen, and I am not going to repeat the specifics. But, the question is whether the Council on Undergraduate Learning is concerning itself with this Issue and what its procedures and standards are. I must tell you that this kind of problem is hurting morale, creating a lot of bitterness where cooperation will be more appropriate. In one case that I know very well, it actually is hurting standards because there is a race to the bottom to attract students. That is something that we should not stand for as a faculty. I think this is a very important question and I would like the Council to assure us that it is dealing with this and according to what standards and principles.

BANTA: This is discussion that is going on almost as we speak. The new Undergraduate Curriculum Committee is a body that will be working out some ideas to be brought to the CUL and to this group, that would encourage cooperation among units that may be edging into each other's arenas. This is a very important issue to the committee. They are meeting every other week. I think we will hear soon some guidelines along these lines.

PORTER: So, we will report back when.

WARFEL: I wanted to underscore some of what Trudy has said. The CUL itself is a large body and in its meeting last year we discussed this Undergraduate Curriculum Committee almost every time. Finally, at the end of the year we got the CUL to say "Yes" we should go ahead with this. We need to be clear about what the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee is. It is not a committee that decides what anybody's curriculum is going to be. Its functions are threefold. One is to have a small group of people who are knowledgeable about the undergraduate curriculum across the campus. Another function is to have this knowledgeable group of people facilitate the negotiation process that has to be undertaken concerning the type of thing that Martin brings up. Again, this small group will not sit as the board of judges and make the decisions, but it will work with the people involved in two different schools or in two different units of other sorts.

PORTER: Chancellor Bepko had to leave to catch a plane. His departure at this time does not reflect on his interest in our conversation.

BLOMQUIST: I am trying to gain more specificity along the lines of what Martin was asking Does this mean then that the Council, while it has said 'yes' to our committee's request to participate in this way, is it going to be purely complaint-based reactive process or does the Council have any charge on its own to undertake a review across units of these kinds of issues?

BANTA: It is the hope of all concerned that this will be a proactive, forward-thinking group as well as a reactive and responsive one. I think there are opportunities in our community too responsive with new curricula. It will be within the purview of this group to make suggestions about new interdisciplinary ideas that might be pursued in the form of curricula and to plant those seeds. The first order of business is to think about how negotiations might take place when disagreements arise. The committee hopes to

have the opportunity to look forward and out and to be creative as well responsive.

WATT: I was on the Academic Affairs Committee two years ago and we recommended that CUL take on the responsibility of referring or judicating conflicting courses between departments. This year I am chair of the Academic Affairs Committee and I know of at least four situations that are between departments in the same school or about different schools offering courses that have been overlapped and are just being created at this time. It is not like in the statistics where every school has their own statistics. These are new courses, some of which have not been approved through remonstrance the process. I am not that this is the place for the Academic Affairs Committee to hear those. I was under the impression that it would be moving to the CUL.

WARFEL: Raima Larter is the chair of the committee. Perhaps you should contact Raima Larter regarding this.

SPECHLER: Probably most of you are aware that the University Graduate School in which we participate has a remonstrance procedure for dealing with new graduate courses. My experience in graduate council is that very few remonstrances are actually heard since this phenomenon of destructive or possibly constructive competition does not occur at the graduate level nearly as often as the undergraduate level. I mention this because it seems to me that the remonstrance procedure would be even more appropriate at the undergraduate level than it is at the graduate level. This would indeed deal with what Professor Watt raises. These are big issues on which tempers will flare and in which a substantial amount of money is involved. But, even more important for us, is that they affect many of our undergraduates. We should be concerned with the academic standards that these conflicts do not result in the reduction of our academic standards. That is the most important thing. So, I think that we certainly need a mediation board and mediation may work, but I am afraid that we are also going to need a judge to deal with these things because the issues are substantial and material.

PLATER: Marty, I would just comment that there is a remonstrance process for undergraduate courses in curricula as well as graduate. The same process works at the undergraduate level as it does at the graduate. I think one of the things that will happen is the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee will be able to take remonstrances and use that perhaps as the basis of the mediation that you are describing.

SPECHLER: Do you circulate these new proposals as widely as the graduate ones?

PLATER: We probably have not done as good a job as we do with the graduate programs because there are more undergraduate courses than there are graduate courses. The system is as clear but I think one of the efforts that will be made now, with the establishment of that committee, is that a much more systematic dissemination of information, made easier perhaps by computers, will be undertaken.

VERMETTE: The remonstrance period as it is now present within the system and circulates course proposals throughout the system but only in that discipline. I think the problem Martin is addressing is interdisciplinary, interschool rather than in the same discipline. I think that is where the present

remonstrance process is weak or inadequate.

PLATER: That is exactly the part that needs to be addressed, Rosalie. Right now, a discipline almost always will confer with colleagues on other campuses on proposing new courses. That is not really an issue. The issue here is when departments are cutting into other people's disciplines.

LANGSAM: As a dean for students I get information about courses. So, you do try to screen those items and send them to the appropriate departments.

PORTER: Are there any other items you would like to bring to the attention of this group?

SCHNEIDER: In light of the response to this item I think that we can assure that we will bring back to you the progress that has been made in the Council on Undergraduate Learning. We will let you know how things are going and then you will have a chance to comment.

PORTER: There are other avenues. There are lots of people who sit on the Council and please use them to bring forward your concerns.

The next item of old business is listed as the Student Code of Ethics which is really the IU Code of Students Rights, Responsibilities and Conduct.

At the May meeting of the Faculty Council, the proposed Changes to the Student Code were discussed. When the Executive Committee generated the agenda for today, we were unsure as to whether there were any additional discussion required. As we continued to explore the need for discussion, the consensus was that the Council had concluded with this item by charging the Faculty Affairs Committee to bring the items discussed at the May meeting to the attention of the University Faculty Council (UFC). Is there a need for further discussion of the proposed changes to the Student Code?

SPECHLER: One issue that members will recall about the Code of Student Ethics is that we complained that the procedures of the Affirmative Action Office had never been presented to the faculty. One day when I was in the faculty lounge in the School of Liberal Arts, I noticed that they have circulated a three- or four-page version of those procedures. So, I would urge, that if you have failed to get a copy of that or haven't seen it, refer it to the new Faculty Affairs Committee to make sure that those procedures meet with our approval and that we are ready and willing to go ahead with them. We said last May that we had never seen such a thing. That is no longer true. But, those procedures should be examined very carefully to make sure that there are no objectionable aspects of it.

J. KECK Those of us who live north of Michigan Street complained last year about the lack of sidewalks. Today we are here to tell you that the sidewalks are lovely and we appreciate having them in before snow and slush.

AGENDA ITEM VIII: New Business

PORTER: Are there any items of new business to come before the group?

CHUMLEY: I would like to remind everyone, but especially the newly-elected members, after the meeting is adjourned if you would take the name cards and holders to the table from which you picked them up, I would certainly appreciate it. Thank you.

R. KECK: I have a question related to student housing and that planning.

PLATER: What is the question? [laughter]

R. KECK: How are those plans proceeding?

PLATER: Slowly, but certainly. I think we reported to you in the spring that the results of the request for proposals was presented to the Board of Trustees to decide if we would accept none of the proposals for building housing on campus through the private sector. As a result, the Trustees authorized the campus, in cooperation with University offices, to consider a proposal that would enable us to build housing on our own. We have to go through that step and receive Board of Trustees approval before we can proceed. That study is underway to determine whether or not it will be possible for the university to build the housing itself. We are still continuing with the assumption that there will be housing. It will be on the west side of the campus as originally planned and it will be very much along the lines as specified in the request for proposals that were issued last spring. It is just that this is now a delay.

BESCH: Will we continue not to have a Question and Answer Period on our agenda?

PORTER: I have to admit that I noticed that just as I sat down. I think we will say that it was the first meeting and it was all information sharing so it was all a question and answer period. But, we will make sure that item appears on future agendas.

JONES: A couple of years ago when we went through all those smoking policies for this campus, I know that took a lot of energy. I was wondering now, it seems to me that the only place on campus to buy cigarettes is the campus bookstore. Is there any way to stop that or to have that discussed? It seems to me to be counterproductive to have a smoke free campus but still sell cigarettes.

PORTER: We will note that and come back with more information next meeting. Is there any other business to come before this body?

AGENDA ITEM IX: Adjournment

PORTER: If there is no further business, this meeting stands adjourned.