

Approved: December 5, 1996

Indiana University - Purdue University Indianapolis

Faculty Council Meeting

October 3, 1996

School of Dentistry, Room S115

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

**Present: Administration:** Chancellor Gerald L. Bepko, Trudy Banta. **Deans:** John Barlow, P Nicholas Kellum, Mark Sothmann, H Oner Yurtseven. **Elected Faculty:** W. Marshall Anderson, Susan Ball, Joseph Bidwell, William Blomquist, Paul Brown, Nancy Eckerman, Naomi Fineberg, S. Edwin Fineberg, Julie Fore, Janice Froehlich, Karen Gable, Paul Galanti, Patricia Gallagher, William Hohlt, Sara Hook, Nathan Houser, Elizabeth Jones, Henry Karlson, M Jan Keffer, Miriam Langsam, Rebecca Markel, Fred Pavalko, Richard Peterson, Richard Pflanzner, Rebecca Porter, Terry Reed, Frederick Rescorla, Richard Rogers, Bernadette Rodak, Beverly Ross, William Schneider, Erdogan Sener, Martin Spechler, Stephen Stockberger, Soren Svanum, Jeffery Vessely, Kathleen Warfel, Jeffrey Watt, Robert Weetman, Harriet Wilkins, Marianne Wokeck, Charles Yokomoto. **Parliamentarian:** Harriet Wilkins. **Ex Officio Members:** James Baldwin, Henry Besch, Richard Fredland, Steven Mannheimer, William Orme, Carl Rothe, Rosalie Vermette.

**Alternates Present: Deans:** J M Kapoor for Roberta Greene, Kathryn Wilson for David Stocum.

**Absent: Administration:** William Plater. **Deans:** A James Barnes, Paul Bippen, Trevor Brown, Lawrence Goldblatt, Robert Holden, Norman Lefstein, Angela McBride, John Rau, Robert Shay, Philip Tompkins, Donald Warren, Charles Webb. **Elected Faculty:** Charalambos Aliprantis, Merrill Benson, Jana Bradley, Thomas Broadie, Lynn Broderick, William Burke, Kenneth Byrd, David Canal, John Eble, Bernardino Ghetti, Sanjiv Gokhale, Richard Gregory, Robert Hall, Robert Havlik, Dean Hawley, Antoinette Hood, Robert Keck, Michael Klemsz, Raymond Koleski, Colleen Larson, Stephen Leapman, Thomas Luerssen, Joyce Man, Najja Modibo, Byron Olson, David Peters, Gerald Powers, Virginia Richardson, Mark Seifert, Jay Simon, Karen West, Mervin Yoder. **Ex Officio Members:** Michael Cochran, Richard Fredland, Stuart Hart, Juanita Keck, Stephen Leapman, Bart Ng, Jay Starks, Marshall Yovits.

**Visitors:** Victor Borden (IMIR), Erwin Boschmann (Dean of the Faculties Office), Mark Grove (Registrar).

**Agenda Item I: Call to Order**

**PORTER:** Our quick reminders: (1) please identify yourself before speaking, and (2) an attendance sheet will be circulating. Make sure you sign the attendance sheet so the minutes can reflect your presence. If you have looked at the agenda, you have noticed that we have attached labels to different items. This is to give you a perspective in planning the meeting what we think will happen with each of those items. If the item is labeled "Information", it indicates that we have provided in the packet information for you or you have previously received information. We think this will be a brief opportunity to address the item or we are giving an update on the item.

When we have items labeled "Discussion" that means that we are anticipating that this is an item that will generate comments from the Council and that we will be actively engaged in looking at this topic. Again, our intent will be always to provide you with background information. Occasionally, that will not be possible. If it appears that motions will be coming forward or we know that motions will be coming forward, we will label the items as "Action." However, I want it to be clear that whether or not we have indicated that an item is an Action item, if the Council members wish to make a motion, certainly a motion can be made. We are not trying to preclude people from directing actions.

### **Agenda Item II: Memorial Resolution**

**PORTER:** A memorial resolution for Joseph Trosper, Professor Emeritus of Business Administration, was distributed with your agenda. I will ask you to please stand for a moment of silence.

### **Agenda Item III: Administrative Report: Chancellor Gerald Bepko**

**PORTER:** We will now proceed with Chancellor Bepko and the Administrative Report.

**BEPKO:** Thank you. We have concluded the administrative reviews that were conducted in 1995-96. We have three that have been completed; two of which are being reported on today. The first one was a review of Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education Herman Blake and the second was a review of the Dean of the Purdue School of Science at IUPUI David Stocum. Copies of the summary of those two reviews are on the back table. I invite you to pick them up and if you have any questions, we would be happy to discuss those reviews. They were both generally positive and made some suggestions for the future.

The one review that is completed but not to be reported on today is the review of Bloomington-based dean, Jim Barnes of the School of Public and Environmental Affairs. The reason that is not ready to be reported on is that we are discussing right now this rather novel situation where there are IUPUI procedures involved in a review for a Bloomington-based dean who has responsibilities on other campuses as well. That will be coming out shortly. The faculty in SPEA should have the report on that within a relatively short period of time. It will be available for the next meeting of the Faculty Council to be sure.

I will say one more thing about how these reports and these summaries (memos) come to be. The policy

of the Faculty Council and campus administration is to have the report of the review committee be confidential and for the administration. But, the policy states that the Chancellor will then discuss the substance of the report with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council. A few years ago we thought that it would be better, particularly in the case of schools, if we had a summary of the report that was identical to the discussion that we would have with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council and that that be distributed to all faculty and staff in the schools. We started the practice of summarizing so that we could distribute something for people beyond the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council. The reason we don't distribute the whole report is because we think that, not only is that what the policy says, but we think the policy is sound in that the report is confidential, which encourages the review committees to include all of their commentary in the report, including even occasionally some matters of sensitivity. Those matters can be summarized in these reports, but it makes it easier for the review committee to be candid. However, in preparing the summaries we follow a practice that you should know about and that is mentioned in the introductory paragraphs of each of these memos; that is, that we ask the summary to be reviewed by the chair of the review committee; in both of these cases a faculty member and in one case a retired dean. We also ask that the reports and the summaries be reviewed by the President and the Vice President of the Faculty Council. We think the summaries are faithful to the report of the review committee, and we have an additional way of affirming that it is faithful by consulting with those three people.

I will mention a couple of things that are not on the agenda. First, at the last meeting someone raised the question about whether it was inconsistent for us to sell cigarettes in the bookstores or elsewhere on campus when we are a smoke-free campus and a health center committed to the advancement of health. I think that our position is that this a matter of faculty and institutional ethics. If the institution wants to develop an ethic that precludes the sale of cigarettes anywhere on campus, that would be fine with us and we would stop selling cigarettes in the bookstore. However, to date, we have viewed it in a sense as a matter of smokers' rights. The smoking of tobacco products is legal. It is legal to sell cigarettes. Many of our university community do smoke and it is something that we think is worthwhile to do for them unless we establish an institutional ethic that precludes us from selling cigarettes on campus. I think that your officers may refer this to a committee for a study. If that is true, that would be fine with us, but I wanted you to know the position that we have taken up until now. We are somewhat agnostic about the final decision.

Next, as you know there will be an Office for Women that will be activated shortly. There are discussions underway concerning the director of that office. We will also need the names of nominees for the Commission that will help to guide the office. If you have any suggestions, I suggest you send them to Bill or to Becky.

Last hour we met with the committee that is looking at the process, procedures, and practices of Faculty Boards of Review. As you may know, there is an ad hoc committee that is looking at ways that the process can be improved. Carl Rothe is chairing and Bill Schneider and I were there at 1:30 this afternoon and I think the committee is going to make good progress.

Also, we have a mailing that went out to all faculty having to do with Strategic Directions Round 2.

Trudy Banta is here and she may say a word about the Strategic Directions process and the materials that you received in the mail. We hope you have received them.

**BANTA:** This is the envelope that you should have received. It is dated September 26 so it probably arrived last Friday or Monday. There is simply a cover letter telling you what is in the packet and then the Strategic Directions Review Process that specifies a letter of intent by October 1 and proposals in by November 1. Then there is a copy of the new IUPUI Mission, Vision, Values, Aspirations, Goals and Strategic Initiatives that is a complement to the Strategic Directions Charter. There are links now between our goals and the goals in the Strategic Directions Charter. This should make it much easier for those of you who are putting together proposals to make reference, not only to the Strategic Directions Charter, but also the campus priorities. If you are interested in developing a proposal, and even if you aren't, because it contains very important information that is helpful to shape the future of IUPUI. Are there any questions about the process?

I should also say that Kathy Warfel can speak for the Planning Committee and the Budgetary Affairs who, in conjunction with the Staff Council, will be developing the review process that will take place between November 1 and December 3rd when the proposals are due in Bloomington.

**PETERSON:** Since some of us didn't get these until yesterday, our letter of intent is obviously late. How does that process work?

**BANTA:** This is a situation where no one can possibly please all the folks all of the time. We had an October 1 deadline that has been published and there are people who worked hard, burned the midnight oil to get the letters of intent in by the deadline and then there are others who say they just received the word and want more time. So, at the risk of offending those who did do their work and had it in on time, there was an announcement made by the office of George Walker in Bloomington that there would be an extension. The real purpose that letter of intent was for George Walker's office to be informed by those letters and for dean to learn and for chancellors and vice chancellors to learn what the future might hold in terms of monetary commitments that would need to be made. It is really an information gathering thing. Whether you submit it or not has no bearing on whether you submit something November 1 or not. So, I think it was with the spirit that "this is an information gathering thing" that the guideline was extended. For those of you did work hard and made sacrifices to make that October 1 deadline, we apologize.

I think Tess Baker has said that she would be pleased to receive letters of intent which are pretty easy to write since they are only one page. I might also say that the latest word from Tess who is still trying to unsnarl certain things about her modem. One of the two Fax numbers was an internal fax in her computer and every time a proposal or letter of intent would come in everything would stop and she couldn't use her computer. So, she has had a bit of a backlog, but she has done some special work today so that I could tell you that we have about 65 letters of intent at this moment. We may get a few more as she sorts through and as the end of the week approaches. But, it looks as if, if things are as we anticipate that there will, that we will have between 80 and 90 proposals as we did last time. Are there any other

questions? If not, Kathy, why don't you talk about the review process after the first of November?

**WARFEL:** The Planning Committee met today and the Planning Committee and the Budgetary Affairs Committee have been asked to determine what the campus review process was going to be like. The plan is that the Campus Planning Committee, which you may or may not remember, is composed of the chairs of all the standing committees plus Trudy, plus the Chair of the Planning Committee who is Richard Turner this year. Those individuals will merge together with the members of the Budgetary Affairs Committee adding to that group members from the Staff Council or their designees and some administrators. That group will divide and conquer looking at the proposals during the first two weeks of November. That is about as far as we got in terms of the process.

**BANTA:** I would just like to add that we have determined that 20 copies of each proposal should be turned in on November 1. We need to send 2 to Bloomington and we will use 8 copies in the campus review process. The 20 copies should be the final version with letters of support; everything just the way it should be to be reviewed in the central process. We will send the 12 copies to Bloomington to make it there by the deadline of December 3.

**BEPKO:** I would like to add a footnote to what Trudy said about the campus document that fits with the Strategic Directions document. We expect that there may yet be a third layer of these documents in the schools. So, if anyone asks what is happening at Indiana University, what is the future of the institution people can say "Here are our Strategic Directions. Here is the Strategic Directions at the campus level with our own campus priorities built into them built on the foundation of Strategic Directions. There may be a school document with the same cover possibly that would give you the whole picture of planning for the university. I would like to say especially with respect to campus document that we would like you to take a look at this and really think about what is in here because by the end of this academic year, I hope, we have established that this is our own campus plan that will be embellished some during the year, I am sure. It will probably change some too, but this should be our campus plan that will contain our campus priorities and by the end of the academic year we will probably be looking at this as a reference point in making decisions about funding priorities at the campus level. So, please look at it very carefully.

Finally, in the Strategic Directions Charter and our campus plan there is a reaffirmation of our commitment to quality and our responsibilities of excellence. Of course, that relates directly to the work of faculty because the faculty define an institution in terms of excellence. We were talking earlier today about some of the indicators of that growing standard of excellence in the IUPUI community and I thought I would mention just one of those many indicators. We hire faculty members each year with tenure from other institutions. For the fall term 1996-97 we have seven new tenured faculty members. We hired a lot more than that but they are hired without an initial appointment with tenure. To give you an idea of where we are recruiting from to appoint these faculty members with tenure they are in four different schools and they are from the University of Texas, University of Tulsa, University of Washington, University of Sherbrooke which is Quebec, Canada, Northwestern University, University of Chicago, and the University of Pennsylvania. Not bad as a range of schools from which we are recruiting faculty members with initial appointments with tenure. It is not only in one school. The

School of Medicine has been doing this kind of recruiting for a long time. This is in four different schools; three of which are on the general academic side of the ledger. Thank you.

**SPECHLER:** Will there be an opportunity to debate these general campus priorities as outlined in the report that you mentioned? If not, what will be the way in which ordinary faculty can express their approval of reservations about those priorities?

**SCHNEIDER:** The Executive Committee has referred the document to the Planning Committee. The Planning Committee, of course, has a little bit of work to do in the meantime, but that will be the vehicle by which the faculty on the campus can give some input. That is where it stands now. They may have some other ideas as far as what else needs to be done.

**SPECHLER:** I am not familiar with that committee, but will they be reporting to this body?

**SCHNEIDER:** Sure, I will ask them.

**BEPKO:** I think it is important to recognize that nearly everything that is in this document has been in the Campus Planning documents before. This is the blending of our campus planning, which has been around for a number of years with the Strategic Directions Charter so that it will not be brand new in terms of concepts and language. Also, I think it is important to recognize that in many ways, and I think we talked about this at the last meeting, we are on the brink of realizing a lot of opportunity and progress that is based on the work that all of you have done over the last decade or more. I think we have some extraordinary opportunities in this next period of growth for IUPUI. There are literally scores of major projects, both programmatic and physical facilities projects, that are ready to come on line. They either are under construction right now or we have the funding and we are ready to build them or they are in a planning stage where we think that before very long, before another five years are up, we will be able to bring them to fruition. This is really an important period in the development of IUPUI. I think at the end of the decade -- at the millennium -- IUPUI could well be both a somewhat different place and better place than it is today, but more importantly, recognized as a much, much higher standing institution with a national recognition factor as an urban university that makes us all very proud. That is what we think this planning process is all about. If we can get our priorities established and a consensus that reflects, as a consensus always does, a unanimity of thinking about what are the next steps in our future, we can bring all things together in the next half dozen years and I think that will be an extraordinary thing for the institution.

**SPECHLER:** When you read off the list of colleges and universities from which we recruited tenured faculty members it is indeed a source of pride. To which institutions have we lost faculty during the last year? I hate to think we have lost even one, but I am sure it must be more than that. It made me think of the results of the faculty survey which I read during the last week which reveal, for the first time in my memory, widespread discontent with the level of faculty salaries on this campus. I don't recall myself that it had ever been a prominent complain of our faculty. That was almost as vivid as the students' complaint which has been made all the time about the advising system. I would like to ask the question

whether the campus has any policy towards faculty raises or whether our policy is simply to leave this to the schools under Responsibility Center Budgeting?

**BEPKO:** For the last two years the University has had a policy universitywide with respect to salary increases. It has been a cap, in effect, on the average for a unit. I think there has been more salaries set centrally in the last couple of years than is true before that. Before that, for a period of years, our urging was for the schools to do everything possible to increase faculty salaries by as much as possible, and there was some unevenness. But, the last couple of years there has been a reluctance to allow that 'free market' to go forward. The reason is that there is a fixation in the Trustees on the relationship between various other factors and tuition increases. This stemmed from the budget setting about four years ago when the Trustees said "Why do you need so much of an increase in tuition?" and the answer was, "In order to get even minimal salary increases we have to increase tuition by that much." Then, the Trustees reluctantly said, "Ok, we will raise tuition by that amount." Then salaries were increased across the universities by an amount greater than what was expected. This raises the question about what is the relationship and the Trustees have been watching that relationship and have wanted to make sure that there were controls on the amount by which faculty -- all salaries not just faculty salaries, but all salaries -- were increased. So, you had to establish a target and then meet that target. The target was relatively uniform across the university. However, I must say that there is a little touch of inconsistency in all of this because the Trustees, and all of us, had believed that throughout this period, even during the period when the State had reduced our appropriation, that the most important priority would be the increases in compensation for continuing personnel -- mostly faculty. I think that study will be important in establishing the general priorities for budget setting in 1997.

#### **Agenda Item IV: President's Report**

**PORTER:** We will now move on to the report of the President of the Faculty.

**SCHNEIDER:** Thank you, Becky. I have a comment or two about the faculty survey, but I will save that until the end.

I want to point out a couple of things. The UFC will be meeting here at IUPUI next Tuesday at the Conference Center at 1:30 p.m. You might find it interesting to attend. Three of the items on the UFC agenda are, in fact, three items on our agenda this afternoon. Therefore, I would urge you to keep that in mind so that those of you who go on to UFC can take comments from the Faculty Council to the UFC. Things don't always coordinate so well, so we might as well take advantage of it when we can.

One of the items is the ARTI Report which Dick Peterson will be talking about. There is a motion that he will probably mention that is going to be proposed there. Of course, the Teaching Excellence Awards will be discussed for the first time at the UFC on Tuesday, and Kathy Warfel will be talking about that with you and hearing what you have to say today.

Chancellor Bepko's review is on the agenda for our meeting today. Given his status as an officer of the

University, it goes before UFC as well. I don't know how controversial that will be this afternoon. You may have some questions or comments about the procedure or use of the review.

I would like to also mention the Trustees' meeting last September 20 which considered one item I think is worth talking about. That is the first discussion of the matter of non-tenured teaching faculty. The UFC and the administration promised to work hard on gathering data and begin formulating suggestions in order to have a status report by the December or January Trustees' meeting. I thought probably the most interesting comment was by President Brand who expressed his opinion that his greatest concern was with the conditions of work for part-time and other non-tenured faculty, including protection of academic freedom.

An item that is a follow-up from the last meeting has to do with the matter of conflicts between schools arising from course duplications, presumably exacerbated by Responsibility Center Management. I have spoken with several of the people involved (deans, chairs of the curriculum committees, etc.) and we have discussed this at the Executive Committee. We are convinced that the existing mechanisms, both at the undergraduate and graduate level, can handle the problems for now. Dean Plater's office handles complaints and problems with the undergraduate courses. Dean Sheila Cooper in the Graduate Office handles graduate problems. The Graduate Office actually has a fairly elaborate mechanism including remonstrances. It has a Curriculum Committee of the Graduate Affairs Committee. If there are any particular problems with the graduate courses, they should be taken to Dean Cooper.

The undergraduate courses are a little more complicated because the CUL has just created a Curriculum Committee that is formulating policies and suggestions to avoid disputes in the future and to try to mitigate the kinds of problems that are foreseen. If you have any suggestions about such policies, you should send them to Raima Larter who is the chair of the Curriculum Committee. In the interim, if there are specific problems with undergraduate courses, they should go to Dean Plater's office. No one sees the need for any different interim means to handle the problems. Existing procedures should work. By the beginning of next semester we should have a report on the situation, including any new procedures or implementation that are recommended, especially those that will come back to the Council. Jeff Watt of the Academic Affairs Committee has agreed to keep track of what is going on in the various places and present that report.

The Executive Committee, since last Faculty Council meeting, has met with the chairs of the Faculty Council committees and the presidents of the school faculties. As a result, we have a pretty good picture of matters that will be under consideration by faculty governance both at the campus level and to a certain extent at the school level. There are no surprises that we have discovered, at least not yet. One of the interesting things we are trying to work on is better coordination with the school faculty governance organizations. I must tell you, however, we have a long way to go given the differences that exist between the schools as far as faculty governance. There are two things that we are hoping to work on. One is greater coordination between the Faculty Council committees and the school governance organizations. The other is a specific test case with last year's recommendation that there be a budgetary affairs committees at the school level. That will be a good test as to how well that will work.



Finally, as a preview for the next Council meeting and relating to the question of the faculty survey, that will be an item the Executive Committee is going to invite Vic Borden to come to discuss ; not to tell you conclusions that are ready for action, but more to give you some background on how it was conducted and validity, etc. I think having looked at what I have seen, it is going to be a very important document that will be used for a lot of different faculty as well as non-faculty entities.

The other item that will be on the agenda in November, we think, will be final consideration of the Teaching Excellence Recognition Award.

**PORTER:** Are there any questions related to the President's Report?

**BORDEN:** I want to make one comment on the faculty survey. When I sent it out I thought it might be nice if you had a copy of the questionnaires to see what the questions looked like and what the results were in relation to the questions. Some people have been filling in the questionnaires and returning them. Please don't do that.

**PORTER:** We now have a follow-up sample.

**BORDEN:** It does increase my response rate. [Laughter]

### **Agenda Item V: Old Business**

**PORTER:** We will now move on to Old Business. Our first item is the Report of Chancellor Bepko's Review Committee. Jim Lemmons who was the chair could not be with us this afternoon, but representing the Review Committee will be Steve Mannheimer. There are also other members of the committee present today. The full text of the report is in your packet.

**MANNHEIMER:** Jim Lemmons called me and asked me to present this to you. As you have all read, in a nutshell, I think the lead sentence pretty much says it all -- Chancellor Bepko is doing an outstanding job. This committee was perhaps a tad apprehensive that the **(CHANGED TAPE AT THIS POINT)**

**PORTER:** The second item under Old Business is the ARTI Report and that will be given by Richard Peterson.

**PETERSON:** **(MISSED THE FIRST PORTION OF THIS BECAUSE OF CHANGING THE TAPE)** . . .Advanced Research and Technical Institute (ARTI) research policies and practices. That is that relationship that we will have with ARTI in a way that we will be able to have our input into ARTI. The University Research Policy Committee would replace the existing Intellectual Policy Committee. That will require action by the Board of Trustees and the University Faculty Council's Research Development Policy Committee which I have mentioned earlier. This committee then will report regularly to the Vice President for Research and the University Faculty Council's Agenda Committee and, as needed, to the University Faculty Council.

The composition of the committee is listed here. It is initially set up to be somewhere in the range of 11. I have seen various numbers there. The actual document that will go before University Faculty Council says 10-12 members in the resolution that has been supplied to us today. Unfortunately, didn't have this until I got here. It is probably on my E-mail at home but I apparently missed that one today.

The committee will be jointly appointed as I said earlier. I think at this point I will stop and ask if there are any questions.

**WILSON:** Can you explain the relationship of this organization now with the old organization?

**PETERSON:** No. It doesn't replace it. The technology transfer is only one component of ARTI. Julie Watson is a new individual who has taken over that and it is part of ARTI. There are two offices that are set up for the technology transfer. There is one set up in Fesler Hall and Julie Watson will be here at least two times a week. There will be other staff set up her for the purposes of technology transfer. That is probably the way you will interact with this group more than any other way as you have something that might have some value.

**WILSON:** One of the problems that we had with technology transfer previously is that there really wasn't a good enough liaison committee set up. For example, we had a faculty member in the School of Science who was the liaison who didn't even know he was supposed to tell everybody else what was going on. So, there was no communication at all about the issues that were coming up or about the activities that were going on that the faculty didn't know about. That was finally straightened out at the end. When you say there are faculty representatives, what exactly are their duties going to be?

**PETERSON:** I think that is something that has to be addressed by this committee that is going to start functioning. In fact, it is one of the responsibilities of this new University Research Policy Committee to facilitate relationships between the faculty and the various components of ARTI. How that will be done, I can't tell you. The committee hasn't been formed and it hasn't set up the way that they are going to do that communication. Obviously, the university community overall needs to know a lot more about ARTI and what it can do for you as faculty members. Does that answer your question?

**WILSON:** I don't know whether it answers my concern or not. Some faculty have very good relationships with this organization and know a lot about it. But, the question is, will all the faculty have a way of being informed?

**PETERSON:** We don't all need to be informed if we don't have something, but when we do have something that this unit can do something for us with then we do need to know about it obviously. That is a communication issue that needs to be addressed. We have had a committee on this campus that addresses that issues and that might be a suggestion to have the committee on this committee that relates to this organization.

**FINEBERG:** Obviously, this may never affect me in my lifetime, but at any rate, I need to ask some specific questions about this. First of all, the organization, I assume, is set up funnel funds into the University accounts and it will eventually have a pot of money.

**PETERSON:** That is one of the purposes of the organization.

**FINEBERG:** This organization in fact will facilitate things like holding ownership rights, patents, and arranging contracts.

**PETERSON:** The components of this organization that had existed already have had those responsibilities. That will be enhanced, as I understand it, through this new organization. We have a patent office; sometimes now as effective and not as much communication as we should have.

**SPECHLER:** I would like to ask whether, to your knowledge so far, there have been any problems coming up of particular concern to IUPUI? For example, has it been a problem that the main facilities of ARTI are located some 56 miles south of Michigan Street and that that might impair our ability to cooperate actively in projects of ARTI?

**PETERSON:** I think it has been an impediment and I think it will continue to be an impediment until the offices are set up here so we will be able to handle those activities. It is the full intent that any place where there are significant activities there will offices here to handle that including Watson's office being set up in Fesler Hall. It is certainly intended to be one of those offices. Obviously, the main organization is down there but there will be offices here to service this area on the IUPUI campus and all the other campuses across the university. They should also be servicing.

**SPECHLER:** Is it anticipated that in the future there will be space for projects also on this campus?

**PETERSON:** I am not aware of the plans, but that obviously comes to my mind. When I heard about the research park and some of the activities going on in Bloomington, I said to myself, "We should have that kind of an operation here on the IUPUI campus." Maybe Jerry knows something about the possibilities that I don't.

**BEPKO:** There is nothing for discussion at this point. There has been some E-mail exchange just this week to my office to discuss putting together a group to talk about our research park here. We have toyed with that idea a number of times over the years. The right combination of tenants and funding and other ingredients have not been available up until now. I think it is something we ought to look at. With respect to the issue of where IU is located, while its headquarters may be in Bloomington, it is clear that the main point of cultivation for technology transfer and new business development will probably be here at Indianapolis. For the past couple of years in the number of technologies that have been licensed and the number of patents issued, Indianapolis dominates. If you will look at the external support for research, which this year at Indianapolis topped \$124 million in awards, Bloomington was drifting down a little bit with \$67 or \$68 million. We are almost double what Bloomington is now. I think that is an

indication that the best locus for transfer of technology is going to take place here.

**PORTER:** We can have one more question and then we have to bring this to conclusion.

**BALDWIN:** Was it ever considered to put that here?

**BEPKO:** The research park in Bloomington was under development 7 or 8 years ago. When John Hackett was here he started that project in the Showers Building -- an old building in Bloomington. That is where the research park is now. So, it wasn't as if ARTI begat the research park. It was already there and they took it over.

**PORTER:** We are going to have to bring this to a conclusion. Thank you.

The next item under Old Business is the discussion of the Teaching Excellence Recognition Award document. You will find this in your packet. The Faculty Affairs Committee has discussed this and Kathy Warfel as Chair of that committee will lead our discussion.

**WARFEL:** I think at this point everybody understands what document we are talking about and how it came about. The Trustees developed an interest during the past year in using the cash bonus system for the rewarding of good teaching and thereby encouraging improvement of teaching. At the discussions of the Trustees' meetings it was left that over the summer President Brand would have a committee of faculty and administrators from across the university working to put together a way in which a teaching excellence recognition award could be implemented if it were to be implemented. That is the committee report that we were asked to react to at this time.

What I have handed out to you is labeled 'Draft Discussion Points.' That is exactly what these are. We are not coming forward from the Faculty Affairs Committee today with a resolution for the Council. The IUPUI Faculty Affairs Committee has had some E-mail correspondence and we actually met last week and discussed this. Most of these points came out of that discussion. Some of these points have also come out of discussions of the University wide level that UFC Faculty Affairs Committee. You have these before you. I don't want to read them to you one at a time, but I think that it doesn't take much of a scan to see that the Faculty Affairs Committee has many grave concerns about the wisdom of instituting such a program. One might predict that at some point the Faculty Affairs Committee would encourage the Council to in turn encourage the Trustees to let this rest a bit and to look at it again in light of other options.

**PORTER:** Is there any discussion on this item?

**SPECHLER:** I think that this a very worthwhile document. There are many thoughtful concerns here. The first thing I would like to ask is how this relates to the IUPUI Circular 96-31 which is perhaps not as complete, but at least is constructive and positive. May I say that we should accept not this, we should have a constructive counter proposal. Concerns, thoughtful as they are, are not sufficient. We should

never be in a position turning down money or appearing to devalue teaching. The proposal may be rather crude, but I think we have to have a counter proposal.

If you will permit me one comment, I think the one thing that is wrong with this proposal is that it creates more burden on upper administrative personnel and committees. The proper way to reward teaching is at the level of the department, where the effectiveness of teaching is well understood and where we already have committees that are dealing with this in connection with promotion and tenure and salary setting. I would like to recommend that we should have a constructive proposal and that proposal should say, "Yes, we should give out this money at the department level. Thank you very much. We are sure it will encourage fine teaching."

**WARFEL:** So, you are arguing in favor of cash bonuses?

**SPECHLER:** I think cash is the best practice. We should have a brief constructive counter proposal which says that we will give this out at the department level -- a procedure which will be relatively inexpensive in terms of administrative hassle, excessive people work, cost, and morale, etc. and that we are very happy to have the fine teaching going on at IUPUI be recognized in this way.

**E. FINEBERG:** I am actually opposed to the cash award, but I am very much in favor of recognizing excellence in teaching. I would suggest rather that the award be used in a more constructive way -- travel to a meeting, journals, books -- funds which are difficult to come by at times and yet would be used for furthering the teaching rather than for personal rewards. I think everyone in the department would recognize that as being a constructive recognition of excellence.

**BALDWIN:** Am I to assume that a cash award would be taxable? [the indication was that it would be]

**RODAK:** In the School of Allied Health the teaching award is given, not as a supplement to salary, but as a cash bonus as something you could use for paying your national dues or going to a meeting or something like that. You have to state what it is for and then it is paid through the office.

**SPECHLER:** It is identical.

**N. FINEBERG:** Not if you don't have a choice. The document said you could use it either way. But I think if people are not given a choice, there is simply money provided to the department chair to be used, it may not be taxable if there is no choice.

**VERMETTE:** When I mentioned this to students that this award was being considered, their response was, "Oh, that is a really good idea to reward excellence in teaching." We kept talking and when they found out that it was a cash award, their response then was "What? I thought it was going to be for improving teaching -- buying programs that are needed for computers. I don't know if the students have any idea where their money is going to be going and I don't know if they are going to really want to support a "cash bonus" for good teaching.

**ORME:** There has also been some concern I have heard expressed that what might start out as a reward might end up actually as a punishment in a sense that, particularly given that chairs or deans are allocating the reward, in times of tight budgets those receiving the award might not be given appropriate base salary percentage increases since they are receiving one-time salary awards for teaching. If you are a recipient of a one-time award, but do not receive as large a base salary increase as your colleagues, in ensuing years that might actually turn out to be a punishment rather than an award. So, I think we need to think about other methods of rewarding good teaching as well as how this might be administered, given the fact that we aren't in favor of a cash award.

**KEFFER:** As one who was chair of the faculty development funds from our dean's office, it is very difficult to support the use of faculty money for faculty development line going to a meeting, presenting, continuing education. That is always a continuing need.

Secondly, as one who teaches ethics, I have a real concern for the use of student money. I am wondering, as my colleague down here, whether students would be amenable to the use of "if this is student money" in this way. I do have that concern.

**SCHNEIDER:** It may be more useful in looking at the other side of the discussions to see that it is not so much student money as Trustees' money. **[laughter]** It is really the ethic behind the idea. It is the cash incentive motive. We have heard an economist speak to this point and hasn't defended the theoretical basis upon which it is founded. I wonder if someone from the School of Business is here that might speak for or against this as a working tool.

**WARFEL:** The Faculty Senate at the IUPU Northwest campus responded to this last year. Their president was, as a matter of fact, in the School of Business and economics. Their comments included things that are reflected in item #8. That is, in compensation theory and practice, the cash bonus programs are only successful when the criteria are clearly defined and there is little or no subjectivity involved in identifying bonus recipients. Something like, if you agreed to take one more section of an undergraduate course, that is easily defined. A cash bonus might be appropriate for that. But, when you come down to deciding who is in the 24th percentile of best teachers as opposed to the 26th percentile of best teachers, that is very subjective. People have indicated that other universities have tried this and it has, in fact, been very divisive. They have said, "this is a bad idea. We are not doing this anymore."

In #7 I put that in brackets because although the committees have heard this, no one has actually got the details about which universities and what their system was. That needs to be looked into more.

**WEETMAN:** It seems to me the whole idea is somewhat redundant because the rewards for good performance are retention, promotion and tenure. I am not quite sure why the university needs to add cash on top of that particularly at a time when some units are having trouble coming up with enough cash to operate.

**BESCH:** The question of the funding has come up in various places. It came out at the University Faculty Council meeting. An answer that was given by President Brand was that the Trustees indicated that they would add a smidgen extra additional money specifically for this purpose in the annual budget. With that gone forward now, it may be a moot point. But, it was indicated that the Trustees intended to add some small fraction to the request, if this were passed, and that practice could then be tracked by usual accounting measures to assure its proper use.

**WARFEL:** We are having a little bit of trouble getting that nailed down. Some people have suggested that the Trustees intended to increase student tuition by one-half of a percent. Others suggested that they would just designate one-half of a percent of tuition monies but not being an increase. In either case, it does occur to some people that it is not the Trustees' money; it is the students' money.

**LANGSAM:** I know this might be slightly treasonous but we have been trying to convince ourselves that when people are rewarded or promoted, given tenure, that research, teaching, and service have equal merit and are duly recognized by the university as such. So that, when you get promoted or when you get a raise, it is based on all of these three elements. If that is the case, then we should have, along with this nice teaching award, a special award for service that we reward the top 25 percent of people in service and the top 25 percent in research. Because otherwise why is this different? There is an old Jewish prayer, "Why is this night different from all other nights?" If, in fact, and I do believe that increasingly we are, we are caring about and rewarding teaching as a normal part of our everyday learning and evaluation of faculty and what they do. Then this seems a little bit odd to me. If there is an extra \$1 million that we can get, wherever it comes from, and we put it in the system so we can enhance people's salaries at the departmental level for excellence in any one of these three areas, I think we would probably boost morale and teaching.

**PORTER:** We are going to have an opportunity for two more comments. I want to ask, is there anyone who wants to give us an endorsement of the proposal since we have not yet heard that?

**UNKNOWN:** Which proposal?

**PORTER:** I was speaking about the Teaching Excellence Recognition Award. We have heard a number of concerns and I wondered if we wanted anyone to speak for it.

**ROSS:** This may sound a little heresy also, but I believe one of the reasons that this has happened is because the perception is out there, whether it is true or not, that teaching is not of the greatest importance on the campus. That promotion and tenure decisions are made on the basis of research, primarily, and on publishing, not on the basis of service and teaching. There is an effort being made to find a tangible way to reward people who are good teachers. An effort should be made, if possible, to allow people money for travel or some other kind of financial reward that is not taxable. I think we need to recognize the fact that we don't always reward people for what is perceived by students, the Trustees, and the general public as the primary focus of the university, teaching.

**MANNHEIMER:** I agree with everything that was just said and I agree with Martin's comment earlier that is behooves us of the Trustees. Why is this award different from all other awards? Because there aren't any other awards.

**LANGSAM:** Steve, if that is correct, and I am not willing to disagree either with you or anybody else, then the way to get the elephant is to shoot the elephant in the trenches where faculty and administrators are not rewarding teaching. That is where the issue is. So, adding something on to take care of the fact that we are not doing what we say we are doing, to me doesn't really address the issue. We have to change the culture to make sure that...

**MANNHEIMER:** It is one small step to start changing the culture.

**PORTER:** We need to come to a conclusion. This is going to be discussed at the UFC. Please provide comments to Kathy Warfel or the other IUPUI representatives to the UFC. I think we may have an opportunity continue this discussion in the future

Our final item under Old Business is a discussion of the Task Force on Service. They presented a draft version of this report in the past which was discussed in the Council and they are now bringing forward a revised version. Jeff Vessely Is going to lead our discussion. Our apologies on the time because Jeff has indicated that he will have to leave in order to make a class.

**VESSELY:** If you remember back 18 months ago or so the initial charge for the Task Force on Service was to develop a concept paper through faculty, librarian, administrative, peer institutions discussion in the area of service and its position in the teaching, research, and service areas. So, inherent in that charge we thought was the need to define service. The consensus of the people to whom we spoke and received information from defined service as Professional Service. Service to the institution, service to students, service to the profession, and service to the community.

Perhaps I should define or further define Professional Service. At least in our discussions as not private service. There is some very blurry lines there private service being the kind of service that one renders to their church or maybe to the little league. He just left, but if Nick Kellum, the Dean of the School of Physical Education rendered the service to the little league, it may be that his service in fact is professional service. Another example might be a nurse who renders service to his or her grandmother as being private service but if it were rendered to a nursing home or a neighborhood of people who needed that service, it may very well be professional service. It is maybe not as clear in every instance the difference between professional service and private service. But, we use those examples to help define it. The document goes on a little bit more detail in that regard.

Another point that I think is important as it relates to the report is that the quality of service is not limited to excellence. Most of the calls that I received in response to the original draft report was that we had set up some notion that unless the service was excellent, that it wouldn't count for anything. I think the document tries to give you the best examples to use for documentation and evaluation of the highest



levels of service. But, it doesn't further then comment that this is the only exceptional level of service. We didn't want to give you examples of bad service or examples of no service. We figured you would figure those out. So, we gave examples that we determined were high quality service. Then, where you fit or where the people in your department or those in your unit groups fit, is up to however you evaluate.

Another item that probably needs further definition is that notion of remuneration. We determined that service generally carries with it that connotation of *provo no* but some service is remunerated. What we found as we talked to other institutions and even colleagues in our own institution is that when substantial remuneration was provided, it sometimes took that service into professional consulting or, in some instances, a faculty member or librarian business. They had established a business that involved a service. Simply that being remunerated for service did not devalue that service.

In the area of documentation and evaluation, we hope that we provided a useful outline of potential items -- bullets, if you will -- in each of those categories. Again, the response to the initial document was, "Well, some of those you have 20 bullets or 50 bullets or 18 bullets and some areas you only have 6. So, that means you value that area less than the others." We are human. We could only think of 6, 8, or 10. It wasn't that we thought there were less or more. Some areas, if you look at those bullets, you will see that they lend themselves to great examples of service. The area that we heard was in our notion of university service or service to the institution that we had less bullets. There are only so many ways to say service to the institution be a committee service, task force service, professional service that you do for your department, school, or for the university, or the institution.

Finally, in that area of document and evaluation, Bob Bringle always reminded me on the committee that in research the credit was not given for the data collection, but rather for the vehicle that discusses or promotes that data collection. In the area of teaching credit is not given for meeting your class. Credit is given for the quality of what happens in the classroom. In the case of service, our sense of that is that the service is not given because you show up at a professional meeting or that you show up at a committee meeting as far as university service or that you sit when students come in to be counseled and have them already have the forms filled out and you add a signature and send them out the door. The documentation and evaluations given for the quality of the service that is rendered. That in a nutshell is what our sense and what we hope we were able to transmit in that document. Some of you know that we have gone a step further now and begun to conduct some workshops which we think are independent in many regards. They are the kind of thing that would have been done and is constantly done in the area of documentation and evaluation of research. Erv Boschmann is not here but in faculty development they are those kinds of things that are already done. We didn't feel like by offering those that we were suggesting that we would be doing something outside the purview of what we report here today, but rather in addition to or to enhance that. Our sense is that if we turn this now over to the Faculty Council Executive Committee that other committees may look at parts of this, much like the Task Force on Advancements and Appointments did. We will ask those committees to further evaluate or to further look into what we think we found as we prepared this paper.

**PORTER:** Are there any questions or comments?

**SPECHLER:** I have had the opportunity to read this in a couple of versions and I have some overall comments. I think it was useful for people who haven't had much experience of documenting their service and also useful in increasing the morale of people who do service as most of us do. Nonetheless, in the version of the document that we have before us, there is in the first paragraph, the notion of establishing parity among teaching, research, and service. It is said to be an essential move toward developing an innovative, integrative model for higher education. There are many people who believe that teaching, research, and service are worthy of parity in the university. I believe I heard that from my friend Miriam Langsam. But, I think it is a very controversial matter. In some units it may be quite appropriate. In other units it would be destructive and contrary to the consensus in that department. It would lead us to the notion that service is just as good as research and teaching for everything -- promotion, tenure, and raises -- and would easily translate into the notion that people with excellent service should be paid just as much as people with excellent research or excellent teaching.

Personally, I do not believe this. I have to be quite honest with you. I like to think I am a decent teacher, try to give service, but I take research as more valuable to the institution and more valuable in the market. That is my honest feeling about it. But, at least, you will grant that parity is a highly controversial matter on which units of this campus will differ very widely. So, I really would hate to see us endorse a generally helpful report which tries, in this version at least, to bring in a standard with which my department will not be willing to abide.

**VESSELY:** Was there a question there? You added some words that weren't there. I don't think that it says that establishing this parity is good for everybody. It doesn't say that. The sense is that we have been giving lip service for years to teaching. In fact, I have heard Dean Plater quote a number of times how many of the promotion and tenure cases are on teaching versus research. His eyes light up when he can it is about 50/50. So, the sense is that we have been saying those things, true or not, in your own admission that, if they were 50/50, you don't think very highly of that either.

**SPECHLER:** I didn't say that.

**VESSELY:** You said you think you are a pretty good teacher but research is more valuable.

**SPECHLER:** Right.

**VESSELY:** All we were saying here is that there are people who believe that service is more valuable than it has been given credit for and the purpose of this was to give that notion a chance by providing ways to document and evaluate the kind of service that many people are doing that is highly integrated of their research focus and their teaching mission which has never been brought to the floor prior to the beginning of this discussion. That is really what it is saying. If, in fact, it ends up with parity, that is another item.

**MANNHEIMER:** I think the last time Dean Plater talked about the percentage of people getting

promoted for teaching it was much less than 50 percent. It was closer to 25 percent and the number of cases being promoted or tenured for service was in single digits, if I am not mistaken. Although Dean Plater is not here to defend himself. Although I agree with you wholeheartedly on the teaching point, I am a little aghast that you don't understand the corollary of this. First of all, we have been talking about this -- it is the Balanced Case all over again -- for the past five years. If you say that service is valued upon teaching somewhere over here and teaching is way up here, we are going to run into some sort of a definition problem with IUPUI as a designated teaching university. We are going to be tripping over our own tongues and our own shoe laces. Maybe that will be a constructive fall, but I can only commend this report. I think there is lots of very good thought in this. Again, it is a step towards changing the culture. Admittedly, your vision that somehow having all of these people running around getting promoted and tenured because they have been on 15 committees, 99 percent of the people are still interested in primarily doing their research and secondarily doing their teaching. What this document does is create an open door for those relatively faculty members who really have something to contribute through an application of their professional skills in service areas.

**S. FINEBERG:** As someone who has sat on tenure and promotion committees, I think it would be very important that this document really establish the framework for defining service as part of a promotion document. I think as such it is really very useful and I commend you.

**VESSELY:** There are a few follow up pieces. One is the workshops that are being conducted now and the second of the follow up pieces was to develop some sort of handbook or set of guidelines that would be helpful from the discussion that we have had as we prepared this and the discussions that will come from the workshops and then to follow that up with some definitive piece.

**SCHNEIDER:** Is that part of the report or is that something that will come later or is it just assumed that you will do that?

**VESSELY:** It wasn't part of the initial charge. It was what we fed back to the Council saying here is what we think should happen. But, the charge was to develop a concept paper.

**SCHNEIDER:** So, you would welcome some kind of more specific expression of doing those kinds of things as follow up?

**VESSELY:** Yes. Our sense is that the Task Force will creep along. We are not going anywhere until the Council decides...

**ROTHE:** It seems to me the document is very helpful in terms of what you say providing information about how to define service and how it ties in with promotion and tenure. I think it is going to be a very helpful addition there. I am very concerned, however, about one of the things that Martin mentioned earlier -- remuneration. I am also concerned about your (**changed tape at this time**) doing the job well. That is part of the profession. I don't see that that is something special.

The discipline part that bothers me because you say that there is a difference between professional service and private service. That is a pretty good definition. But it bothers me that the discipline is mentioned. As a physiologist I can't provide professional service to very many people.

**VESSELY:** You would be an example of the service that you would consider to be of value that...

**ROTHE:** It is your definition that you have here where if I happen to have knowledge, skill, or expertise developed within my profession as a scholar -- teacher, administrator, practitioner. Leave out the word 'discipline.' It is not the discipline, but it is the special skills that I might have already developed that I can provide this kind of service that you are talking about.

**VESSELY:** Tell me where you just read that.

**ROTHE:** From your definition on page 3. **Service is the application by faculty members (including those with clinical ranks) and librarians of knowledge, skills, or expertise developed within their discipline or profession as scholar, teacher, administrator, or practitioner.**

**VESSELY:** Within their discipline or profession.

**ROTHE:** I know.

**VESSELY:** You are reading that as if it is within their discipline and their profession.

**ROTHE:** As soon as you put discipline in there you then are making...

**VESSELY:** No, that is why it says 'or'. That is exactly why it says 'or'. You might not do it as part of your discipline, but part of your profession as a scholar, as a teacher, as an administrator. It has nothing to do with physiology. Martin may do it because of economics. He might not be considered to be able to make a contribution as a scholar or as an administrator. But, strictly within his discipline he can provide a service. That is why it says 'or.' Because for some people it will be their discipline. For some other people it will be skills that they have developed as part of their professional as a scholar, as an administrator.

**ROTHE:** But, it seems to me that the profession is more generic, more inclusive and discipline is the subpart. It is not a necessary subpart. Faculty tend to put more emphasis on our discipline than the institution.

**VESSELY:** The only thing is, if we leave out discipline, then we leave out that person who hasn't developed some of those other skills where they have been honing their skills as part of their discipline and can provide a fabulous...

**ROTHE:** But, that is part of their profession.

**VESSELY:** Not necessarily.

**PORTER:** We have a definitional problem.

**ORME:** There are two sets of promotion and tenure criteria for tenure-track employees of the university. One set encompasses teaching, research, and service applies to the faculty. The other set encompasses performance, professional development and service, and applies to librarians. The set of criteria applicable to librarians appears on page 2 in the third paragraph, where it states "**University Librarians operate under a third model in which promotion and tenure criteria are in three areas**" and it states them. That single reference is the only mention of librarians' promotion and tenure criteria, as opposed to 11 references in the document to "teaching, research, and service." I can't adequately speak to how this document address that set of criteria because they do not apply to me, however, I can say this document does not adequately address the criteria by which librarians are awarded promotion and tenure. I think more work needs to be done to make that happen.

**PORTER:** Do you have a suggestion?

**VESSELY:** That is something the next Task Force can undertake.

**ORME:** There has been a special study group composed of librarians from all of the libraries on campus which has worked with Dean Plater as we try to implement the recommendations of the TFFAA, and insure that those recommendations recognize the criteria established for librarians. It might be beneficial to have that group work once again with the administration to see how this might be accomplished. I don't think you want to ask the task force to live through another round of...

**VESSELY:** We wrestled with it and every time we tried to infuse in other parts then it seemed like we were being exclusionary or the language got cumbersome. So, we chose to handle it by saying it up front then saying what, fortunately or unfortunately, the language most people are familiar with knowing that the spirit of it was that we would apply it or evaluate or document along with the criteria that normally is used for librarians. It got very difficult to try to say it.

**ORME:** I am sure it did in a unified document. I am not sure that a unified document in this particular instance will work. For librarians' promotion and tenure service is an acceptable area of emphasis. I think how "service" fits into promotion and tenure considerations for faculty, librarians are quite different. I would suggest that a unified document probably isn't in the interest of faculty or librarians.

**BALL:** I just wanted to state a support for the concept that remuneration does not devalue service. As a person who spends a great deal of time in patient care, I have a service that is an integral part of my teaching and research. My service provides a foundation for my department's missions and being remunerated does not reflect on either the function or quality of service. All of our work, including research and teaching, is remunerated which does not devalue those areas either.

**VESSELY:** A sense that we have in the task force that there may very well be a threshold level of service that goes along with the remuneration one receives. There is a level that goes way beyond the remuneration. If we use just simply the remuneration to value to devalue, then everyone who gets remunerated is excluded. Yet there are many levels of service from the threshold level to the exemplary level that occur even though you are getting paid for it.

**WEETMAN:** I think we are, as you know, a very diverse group. The concept of service applies much differently to the school of economics than it does to the School of Medicine. Frankly, the School of Medicine probably couldn't run without service because a lot of the funding that helps to run the different schools within the School of Medicine, \_\_\_\_\_ the major of it comes from service. The remuneration is not such that the person giving the service gets all the remuneration. Service means something different to different groups. I support the idea that you can't have one document that can apply to everybody under the circumstances. I have been around here long enough to remember when research was the big thing in the School of Medicine. Now service and research are important. All the time teaching has been important, but teaching doesn't bring in money. We are in times when things have changed physically and service, has become very important.

**PORTER:** Thank you, Jeff. I know you have to leave.

#### **Agenda Item VI: New Business**

**PORTER:** Is there any new business to bring before the Council?

**REED:** This really isn't a new item. It goes along with the last two discussions. By chance I happened to get information on the Chancellor's Convocation next week. There are reprints of articles in there by Dean Plater. A lot of the things that have been tossed around today are in those articles. Things are going to change, and faculty will be expected to have more service and more documentation of teaching.

#### **Agenda Item VII: Question / Answer Period**

**PORTER:** That moves us into the Question and Answer Period. We were reminded last month that this is a recurring agenda item. This is a period to address questions to the Chancellor. If you would like you can submit them in writing ahead of time although I am told that is not our practice.

**BEPKO:** We had one in 1988. [laughter]

**PORTER:** Are there any questions you would like to address to the Chancellor?

**FORE:** This is not really to the Chancellor, but earlier in the discussion about the Campus Survey, has that been distributed or will that be distributed?

**BORDEN:** We always have problems with the distribution. This time what we did was to distribute it to all academic committees that we could identify including the Faculty Affairs Committee and the leadership of Faculty Council, Administrative Policies and Procedures Committee, Council for Undergraduate Learning, all department chairs, all deans, and people who have migrated onto our list in the past by virtue of saying 'send me a copy.' We also sent copies to all directors of the administrative services that were evaluated. That is the bulk of the mailing. It is on the Web. The location on the Web is [www.iupui.edu/it/imir](http://www.iupui.edu/it/imir) under the Assessment Surveys section.

**SPECHLER:** I noticed that the renovation of Cavanaugh Hall has appeared for the first time on the list of priority capital projects along with the Mary Cable Building and some other worthwhile things. Can the Chancellor comment about the priority that that is receiving and when we might begin to see some work on this?

**BEPKO:** I think there are some R & R projects at Cavanaugh that will go forward in the next biennium. I am not sure of this though.

**SPECHLER:** Are you talking 1997-98?

**BEPKO:** 1997-99. They will be paid for out of the general R & R fund. I think that there is also a larger renovation project that will have to be funded as all capital projects are funded with the State fee replacement bonds. That is going to take somewhat longer because we have other projects in the cue. For 1997-99 the Herron / Law project will be the first of our priorities for completion and then a second highest priority, and one that we hope will also be funded, is the new academic / classroom building that will replace Mary Cable. Beyond that we don't have any priorities at this point because that is about all we think we could ever get in the 1997 session of the General Assembly. I might add that there will be some other construction though because we think that we will be able to move ahead and finish the renovation of the old library for the student learning center. Of course, we will finish Cancer Research. Tomorrow we dedicate the Indiana Cancer Pavilion on Michigan Street. We are under construction on the new addition to the VanNuys Med Science Building. We hope that we will have, in the next couple of years, off-state funding for the new student center and multi-purpose building at the corner of Michigan and University Boulevard where the old Bowers Building is and where the police department is now. The multi-purpose building will include all of the commercial purposes.

**KEFFER:** Will you pull the Medical bookstore out of the Union Building?

**BEPKO:** I think so. It will depend on how much people rely on that being located at the Union Building. My sense is that it is not that important. In fact, it would be closer and easier to have it at Michigan and University Boulevard.

**REED:** One last comment which has to do with a previous comment. There is sort of a catch 22 with putting stuff on Web pages. I am sure faculty have other things to do rather than sit around and play with the Web. It is getting to the point where we are going to need a generation list of key sites to look at.

You have to know where to look. I think it is going to get worse instead of better.

**BEPKO:** It is a shame Jeff Vessely left because I think that question is whether surfing the Web is service. **[laughter]**

**Agenda item VIII: Adjournment**

**PORTER:** Is there any other business to come before the Council? If not, we are adjourned.