

FC970306 Minutes:
Approved FC970501.

Indiana University - Purdue University Indianapolis
Faculty Council Meeting
March 6, 1997
School of Dentistry, Room S115
3:30 p.m. - 5:30 p.m.

Present: Administration: Trudy Banta, Vice Chancellor Gerald Bepko, Dean William Plater.
Deans: John Barlow, P. Nicholas Kellum, Angela McBride, Robert Shay, David Stocum, Philip Tomkins, H Oner Yurtseven. **Elected Faculty:** William Blomquist, Lynn Broderick, Paul Brown, Kenneth Byrd, Naomi Fineberg, S Edwin Fineberg, Julie Fore, Karen Gable, Paul Galanti, Robert Havlik, Sara Anne Hook, Elizabeth Jones, Robert Keck, M Jan Keffer, Raymond Koleski, Miriam Langsam, Rebecca Markel, Najja Modibo, Byron Olson, Richard Peterson, Richard Pflanzner, Rebecca Porter, Gerald Powers, Terry Reed, Bernadette Rodak, Beverly Ross, William Schneider, Erdogan Sener, Martin Spechler, Soren Svanum, Jeffery Vessely, Kathleen Warfel, Jeffrey Watt, Robert Weetman, Harriet Wilkins, Marianne Wokeck, Charles Yokomoto. **Ex Officio Members:** James Baldwin, Dolores Hoyt, Juanita Keck, Bart Ng, William Orme, Carl Rothe, Rosalie Vermette.

Alternates Present: Deans: LaForrest Garner for Lawrence Goldblatt, J. M. Kapoor for Roberta Greene, Stephen J. Jay for Robert Holden. **Elected Faculty:** Rick Ralston for Nancy Eckerman, Nancy Badia-Elder for Janice Froehlich.

Absent Without Alternates: Deans: A James Barnes, Paul Bippen, Trevor Brown, Continuing Studies representative, Norman Lefstein, John Rau, Donald Warren, Charles Webb. **Elected Faculty:** Charalambos Aliprantis, W Marshall Anderson, Susan Ball, Merrill Benson, Joseph Bidwell, Ulf Jonas Bjork, Jana Bradley, Thomas Broadie, William Burke, David Canal, John Eble, Patricia Gallagher, Bernardino Ghetti, Sanjiv Gokhale, Richard Gregory, Robert Hall, Dean Hawley, William Hohlt, Antoinette Hood, Nathan Houser, Henry Karlson, Michael Klemsz, Colleen Larson, Stephen Leapman, Thomas Luerssen, Joyce Man, Fred Pavalko, David Peters, Frederick Rescorla, Virginia Richardson, Richard Rogers, Mark Seifert, Jay Simon, Stephen Stockberger, Karen West. **Ex Officio Members:** Henry Besch, Michael Cochran, Richard Fredland, Stuart Hat, Steven Mannheimer, Virgie Montgomery, Marshall Yovits.

Visitors: J. Herman Blake, Victor Borden, Subir Chakrabarti (Chair, Student Affairs Committee), Scott Evenbeck, Mark Grove, Mark Sothmann.

Agenda Item I: Call to Order

Porter: I would like to call the meeting to order. We should have an interesting agenda today.

Agenda Item II: Memorial Resolutions

Porter: Our first item of business is to stand for two memorial resolutions. One written on behalf of Dr. William D. Armstrong, School of Medicine, and the other for Dr. Maynard Kiplinger Hine, School of Dentistry. [A moment of silence was observed]

Agenda Item III: Approval of Minutes - December 5, 1996

Porter: Just as a test to see who was paying attention between last meeting and this meeting, if you were present at the last meeting, you probably noticed that when you read through the minutes that were listed for approval for today, that they sounded familiar. We approved the December 5, 1996 minutes last meeting. We apologize for the error, but we will not act on them again.

Agenda Item IV: Administrative Report - Chancellor Gerald Bepko

Porter: Our next item of business is the Administrative Report with Chancellor Bepko.

Bepko: I have a couple of items that I would like to mention. We have been doing planning reviews, starting ten days ago or so. These planning review sessions that we have were at one time called budget hearings, but we have transformed them into planning reviews. We think there is a much better conversation and a much higher level of thought in these planning review sessions than there was in the old budget hearing format. There is less focus on specifics and microscopic issues and more focus on broader issues and macroscopic considerations. There is more harmonization between the Strategic Directions Charter, the Campus Plan, and the school and unit plans than there has ever been before and more focus on methods by which we measure our success. We think that a lot of grievances have come out of this in addition to some good planning and some good publications that will help us show our maximum accountability and progress toward becoming the best of these public research urban universities.

In the course of one of our planning reviews, we had a discussion with the IU Foundation leadership, as we do each year. I would like to report on some new developments with respect to the Foundation. As you know, over the years there has been some discussion about how much we pay for the Foundation and how much we got back in services from the Foundation. As a result of those continuing discussions, there is scheduled to be, as of now, a substantial reduction in the amount that is charged to the units on campus for the total costs of the IU Foundation. It is

somewhere in the neighborhood of \$600,000 per year. The Foundation has committed itself to being an anchor participant in the multipurpose building that will have as its core a new student center. That is to be built in the block between Michigan Street and New York Street, along University Boulevard across from Cavanaugh Hall. The Foundation has committed itself to investing \$2 million plus the rent they pay for the space they have downtown on Meridian Street. We think that is going to be a very important anchor and something that will give us leverage to build something that will be even more valuable to the campus in its totality than we had planned before.

Third, the Foundation has committed itself to the Campaign for IUPUI, which we think will start quietly in about two years. This will be a campaign of very substantial magnitude and we have talked about it in this forum before. It will be a campaign that will not only raise lots of money for the campus, we hope hundreds of millions of dollars, but will also raise the stature and visibility of the campus in a way that it never has had before and never could be under any other plan for visibility.

Finally, the Foundation Board has designated a special committee of the board for the IUPUI campus, not only to help with this campaign, but also to give recognition to the emerging role that this campus plays in the entire Indiana University and to highlight how important IUPUI is to the future of all Indiana University.

Thursday of last week we had the Hine Dinner. The Maynard Hine Dinner, of course, is the first public event we had that serves as a memorial to Maynard Hine. Almost as important, we honored three alumni of the University that are notable both for their visibility in the community and for the schools they represent. Ken Beckley who once worked for us and is now the H.H. Gregg spokesperson was recognized. He was also the Channel 6 anchor person for a while. Richard Schilling is a graduate of Engineering and Technology and is an Eli Lilly employee now working in the field of computer technology. William B (Joe) Moores is a dermatologist. He is very active in the Medical School Alumni Association and very active in raising money for the School of Medicine, including active a \$211 million campaign for medicine that was just finished last year. All three of them, and a whole group of some 200 or so people, were caught up in the alumni spirit at IUPUI. The Medical School alum Joe Moores said how deeply he felt about his alma mater -- IUPUI -- which is something that is not always said by graduates of the Medical School. John Walda, President of the IU Board of Trustees, started off the evening's festivities by giving a talk about how important it was for Indiana University to have IUPUI, as it is one of the nation's great universities.

I can't resist talking about the faculty discussion. The next morning at the Trustees' meeting, something that Bill will probably talk about more, in front of the Trustees was a group of faculty assembled not with any particular plan in mind; not to do anything except happily reflect the

excellence of faculty on this campus. The words I heard, some of which I used and sprinkled in with what others said as well are brilliant, focused, hardworking, productive, personable, interesting, and good colleagues. There was a video presentation of faculty on this campus that received rave reviews. The Trustees asked to have copies of it so they could use it to show people what the faculty at Indiana University do and how important all dimensions of their work are to the advancement of Indiana University, including research and service.

In the afternoon, we had a presentation to the Trustees. John Kremer from the Department of Psychology gave a presentation. The Trustees, including Ray Richardson, used the words “visionary” and “wonderful” to describe John Kremer’s activities.

The following day was Father’s Day and two of the four distinguished faculty came from IUPUI -- both from the School of Medicine. Bernadino Ghetti and Conrad Johnston were both named distinguished faculty of the University. The President’s Award went to John Tilley from the School of Liberal Arts. The John Ryan Award for international activities was given to Robert Einterz from the School of Medicine. All in all, it was a four-day weekend of tributes to IUPUI as far as the central university was concerned. Each part of it and all in its totality made me very proud to be associated with all of these events and with all of you. I think that the stock of IUPUI is rising in the state and at Indiana University.

Porter: Thank you.

Agenda Item V: President of the Faculty Report - William Schneider

Porter: We will move on to the President’s Report.

Schneider: I want to point out that it is that time of year in faculty governance when try as we may and plan as we may to spread the workload, these always seem to be that the most interesting and most important items on the Faculty Council agenda. We will be trying to consider things as diligently as possible.

There are a couple of things I want to mention about today and the remaining meetings. You will note that on the agenda for today, under committee reports, is the Athletic Affairs Committee. The Athletic Affairs Committee will not be reporting today; instead it will be reporting next month. As background for that report, let me remind you that we actually have two Athletic Advisory Committees with faculty representation on them. One is the Chancellor’s Advisory Committee and the other is the Faculty Council’s Athletic Affairs Committee. The two committees decided to meet jointly two months ago. This is partly for convenience, but it also an effort to be inclusive and make sure there as broad representation as possible in the coming months. Both chairs of those committees -- Bill Kulsrud who is the chair of the Chancellor’s

Committee and Roko Aliprantis who is the chair of the Faculty Council's Athletic Affairs Committee -- will be giving that report at the April meeting.

The second thing that is happening with athletics is that an Athletics Governance Study Committee is being created by the Bloomington Faculty Council's Agenda Committee. It is being done in the Bloomington Faculty Council's capacity as technically the faculty governance entity with jurisdiction over Division I athletics at Indiana University. They are, at the moment, the only campus with Division I athletics and the Trustees have delegated them that role. The Athletics Governance Study Committee will have essentially two charges. One is to look at the current rights and responsibilities of faculty in the oversight of athletics, and the other is that, if IUPUI moves to NCAA Division I athletics, to consider whether and what structure for faculty governance of athletics will be needed on campuses, as well as relations to the President, between the president, chancellors, athletic directors, etc. The good news is that the composition of the Bloomington appointed committee will consist of four faculty members from the Bloomington campus, three faculty members from the IUPUI campus, and one faculty member from the regional campuses.

The IUPUI Executive Committee has named Bill Kulsrud, Roko Aliprantis, and Kathleen Warfel as the three faculty members from IUPUI. We are awaiting Bloomington naming their representatives and then that committee will begin working.

Another item, the revised Intellectual Property policy, will be taken up by University Faculty Council at its meeting next week. However, it will not be voted on until April at the UFC meeting. In the meantime, it will be discussed at the various campuses. I hope you have picked up a copy of both the revised policy as well as commentary by Fred Cate who chaired the ad hoc committee which drew it up. What I hope to do is have an ad hoc group look at the new policy and report to Faculty Council at the April meeting so that we can discuss it and its implications on this campus before it is voted on finally at the UFC level. The Executive Committee will be naming members of that ad hoc group probably next week. If anyone has an interest and might want to be involved, please let me know. Otherwise, take a look at the revised policy and the commentary and it will be an item on the April agenda for this Faculty Council.

Finally, I want to report on the Faculty/Trustee discussion. One dozen faculty members met with the Trustees from six schools. The Executive Committee decided to do as we did in December and have broad representation rather than focusing on a particular issue, but, using different faculty members than the ones who met in December. I would concur with Jerry that the discussion did go very well from my own observation as well as others with whom I talked. Among the items discussed and raised by the Trustees were: What it meant by urban university? What computers and technology are doing to teaching and learning on the campuses? There were questions on retention and the impact of Strategic Directions funding on the campus. Among the

issues raised by the faculty members were: conditions of the buildings on campus, lack of dance/theater/performing arts space, the University College, and the continuing effects of the hospital merger. Again, on behalf of all faculty, I would like to thank those faculty members who participated and hope that the experience itself was its own reward.

Bepko: One thing I forgot to mention earlier. In this crescendo of positive activities over the weekend, at the Trustees' meeting on Friday afternoon, in the section of the public meeting of the Trustees' in which personnel matters are taken up, there were no notable personnel matters on any other campus. But, as is typical, there were quite a number here at Indianapolis. That means new faculty appointments with tenure or faculty appointments to endow professorships or chairs. We have two new faculty appointments -- Sharon Farley of Nursing, who comes from Auburn University School of Nursing where she was a professor and acting dean this past year. John Elder has come to us by way of the Naval and Air Force Academies, although he has been in our midst for a while working as a research scholar. Two faculty members were elevated to named professorships -- David Papke, Law School, is now the R. Bruce Townsend Professor of Law, and George Lukemeyer, School of Medicine, has been given a special recognition. He will now be the Frank C. & Ruby L. Moore Professor Emeritus in the School of Medicine; a special endowed chair in Medicine that will always be held by the person who serves as chair of the admissions process for the School of Medicine.

Agenda Item VI: Proposal to Create a University College

Porter: Our next agenda item is a discussion of the proposal to create University College. To introduce the discussion, Jeff Watt, chair of the Academic Affairs Committee, will be making a motion.

Watt: I have distributed a copy of the resolution. In the back of the room there was a revised proposal of the University College.

Resolution

The Academic Affairs Committee moves the adoption of the following resolution:

The IUPUI Faculty Council recommends the formation of University College, and requests that the Chancellor appoint a faculty to carry out the responsibilities of the faculty as described in Article II "*Faculty Rights and Responsibilities*" of the Constitution of the IUPUI Faculty in regard to the design and implementation of this new unit. The Academic Affairs Committee requests that the process by which such appointments will be made, the persons selected, and the forthcoming plans, implementation decisions, and outcomes, particularly in the areas of retention and progression to other units, be reported to the

Academic Affairs Committee at its monthly meetings.

The Academic Affairs Committee voted 14-0 in support of forwarding the University College resolution to the Faculty Council for its approval.

Let me share with you my report of the discussion that transpired in the Academic Affairs Committee concerning the formation of University College. Forgive me for reading the report, but there are a number of items involved.

The committee agrees that:

- Ø A retention and graduation rate problem does exist at IUPUI and that IUPUI has a responsibility to take steps to improve these rates.
- Ø At the same time, we need an operational definition of “retention” and how this relates to “persistence”
- Ø The proposal does not adequately define or identify the causes of the retention problem. The Academic Affairs Committee would like to have a better understanding of the causes related to our low retention rates.
- Ø We are not certain on what goals should be set for the University College because there is little data from comparable institutions, but we suggest that University College set a series of more ambitious goals -- which the “revised” draft has done -- and we support these retention goals.
- Ø We feel that more responsibility should be placed on the students for meeting these goals.

Let me take a quote from Ted Markcase who is an external consultant to the proposal. “The University College is not about students taking courses and getting degrees - but about students learning how to learn.” This quote reflects what the Academic Affairs Committee believes the University College is all about.

- Ø We believe that department chairs are an important key and that they need more involvement in the development of University College. It is the strong role of the faculty and the support of the chairs that will determine much of University College’s success.
- Ø We feel there are a number of concerns that Faculty Affairs should address: such as overloading a currently overworked faculty, and faculty reward structures.
- Ø The Academic Affairs Committee unanimously supports the concept and formation of University College.
- Ø And, we recommend that the Chancellor appoint a faculty who will begin planning the details for implementing University College.

Ø We are requesting that the faculty of University College provide monthly reviews of details during the planning and implementation period. We in general feel that the time line is rushed and recommend that the implementation period should be a full year. Again, this has been added to the revised four-page document.

Ø The Academic Affairs Committee will ask representatives from the Financial, Faculty, and Student Affairs committees, as well as students from student government to attend and provide input into these reviews.

Ø We believe that the forthcoming details are critical to the success of University College.

Ø The Academic Affairs Committee's primary concern for the details is the relationship and affect the University College will have on the other schools. Specifically, how are "better bridges" are going to be built between University College and the academic units?

Ø A secondary concern is that better assurance measures or assessment mechanisms need to be developed in regard to accountability of counseling. We recommend a mix of Qualitative and Quantitative measures be used.

Ø We believe that the University College will communicate to the outside community, IUPUI's commitment to undergraduate education, acknowledge to the public our determination to change and improve, and to attract and retain traditional age students.

Ø The greatest strength of University College is the focus on bringing all the faculty and staff who currently work with freshmen in isolation across the campus into a collective core of faculty who have common goals. That is, improved communication between faculty, counselors, and students regarding academic life and success of our freshmen -- inside and outside the classroom.

Ø The Academic Affairs Committee believes that the time has come for appropriate action to be taken at IUPUI to improve retention and graduation rates. The current price of our students' academic success is not acceptable.

Let me close by saying that, if University College is a success, it will be one of our most important successes at IUPUI.

Porter: We have a motion presented by the Academic Affairs Committee. It does not require a second. If you will note, on the agenda we have allocated approximately 45 minutes for discussion. We will determine at that time whether or not we are ready for a vote or whether or not it will be extended. We are now open for discussion.

Spechler: I have said before how much I welcome this initiative and how it addresses some of the important objectives that we should have at IUPUI. Still, as a supporter of the proposal and the concept, I must say I am somewhat disappointed with the most recent circular. I could, and

probably usually do, talk too long on these subjects, but let me mention too that I consider to have been missing from Jeff's otherwise useful report.

It seems to me that the attraction of the University College is that it adds important elements to the UEC other than just perhaps five new advisors which could have been added without this new concept. What it adds, as far as I can see, are three things: (1) faculty involvement, (2) general education, and (3) an honors program. At least those were the ones that came out to me. I am dissatisfied with the way that these have been included. Let me explain that. The easiest one is the honors program. I think the possibility of honors has not been explored or pursued as vigorously and successfully as it could have been if honors were primarily in the departments in schools. I speak as someone who supervised, we think, a successful honors program at another university. I don't think that honors fits into the University College scheme because honors are usually granted on the basis of advanced work which would be, under this plan, in the schools and departments and not in the University College. So, I don't think that fits in very well.

The second thing is general education. This proposal is contradictory on its face. It tries to have it both ways. If you read this at all carefully, you will see that. In the vision of the University College on page 3 you see that the University College is going to be "the forum" for general education. On the fourth page the faculty of the University College will provide regular reports about the development of general education. So, it does seem as if the University College will have some authority and involvement in general education. That I welcome. But, then we hear, taking back with the left hand what we have given with the right, that the faculty in the schools will continue to exercise authority and responsibility for the curriculum of students in their schools. Since general education cannot realistically be completed in one year, the year allocated to University College, I think we have it both ways here. I think general education is much neglected here. It is needed, but it is unclear as to who has the responsibility. Personally, I am very much impressed with the proposal put together by the Council on Liberal Arts and Sciences for developing a general education. It certainly is not the last word, but it is a major improvement over what we have had in the last few years.

There is no mention of a Council on Liberal Arts and Science and their fine work is integrated into the University College because it should be there. So, there is a problem with the crucial central connection contribution of University College to our campus -- our coherence which is in the general education area.

Thirdly and lastly, the University College promises something that I personally miss here from the faculty point of view and students miss, it is the personal connection between the faculty and the students. University College promised this and I welcome that. What are they producing? One of the very few concrete details in this four-page document is this course UC110 which is a jerry built, three-humped camel -- something that will neither run, walk, nor fly. I don't think,

quite frankly, that this can be staffed with faculty. I would like to challenge anyone to say how we are going to get a number of full-time or some people say “tenured” faculty to take part in this very awkward enterprise -- UC 110. I would have thought that a much superior design would have been to introduce this introduction to the University in the library, which is certainly useful, in the context of a substantive course. If a student is aiming to study chemistry, fine. Let the chemists invite in whomever they think is appropriate to teach students how to make their way in the university as chemists. Even if they switch to physics, they still won't be lost in the university. Similarly for French, English, physical therapy, or all the rest of it. I very much fear that this course has no academic content as far as I can tell but I am sure has good intentions. I don't think it will attract serious faculty. It won't attract me. I think I am serious. I don't think it will attract most of the people here to actually do it. I don't think we can afford the incentives that will be necessary to bring someone into this awkward enterprise when other kinds of teaching are so satisfying and so much needed within our own departments.

In short, while I am still for the concept and will agree with it, I am very much afraid that the promise is still somehow in the air -- not on paper. The promise to do more with general education for all our students, bring us together, and bring faculty and students together, I think this just won't do it yet.

S. Fineberg: I am very disappointed with the document also. I went to a Liberal Arts institution and, of course, my experiences are probably quite different from some of the students who come in for general education. Yet, I think that the definition of the college is not really honed enough to be really useful. It really should be structured along the lines of goals that you think are useful for the students who enter our institution. I suggest that, when polished as you have said, it should include an intensive advisory group. It should also include substantial remediation for our students. It should include ongoing support from a psychological as well as an academic advisory aspect. Because we have such a diverse institution, some unified educational courses and goals, which should be continued throughout the experience of the student in his four years with us. I think unless there is more thought given to structures and goals than is outlined here, it will fail.

Barlow: Martin, I don't know where you had the idea that the course proposed here will be such a jerry built course. Its predecessor which has been used last year and this year has been extremely successful and has attracted some of the most serious faculty we have in the School of Liberal Arts. These faculty will speak of the results of the course with great enthusiasm. You could have participated if you had wanted to. So, that aspect of your remarks I don't think stands up at all when examined in the light of experience. I am not disappointed in this four-page document. I am not disappointed for one reason particularly because the details that have troubled all of us in discussing the University College -- and there are lots of details in many of the various versions of the proposals I have seen that I am not happy with either -- the details are not the main issue anymore. For example, I am not even sure we want to call it University

College. But, I think the point of the four-page document is to get something started that is badly needed. It seems to me the immediate opinion of the committee and I think we should move ahead and approve it and then work out the details.

J. Keck: My problem is that I have a number of questions for which I have not found answers anywhere. My first question has to do with the cause of the retention problem that was mentioned earlier. It has not been made clear to me how University College will address those causes because it appears from the document as though the primary cause is something social, that there is a social lack for students on the campus. I would like to see evidence that a social need is something that contributes to retention. That is how I read the UC110 joining the scholarly community. Part of that is a social interaction component. My understanding about costs is a couple of million dollars. I have not seen a cost benefit analysis. It may exist, but to increase retention rate the first year by 2 percent, what is the cost benefit? Other than looking better in the press, what do expect to gain for that expenditure? I notice that one-third of the graduates that we have didn't meet initial admission criteria. I have often wondered how much of our retention problem is due to the fact that we admit students who don't meet admission requirements at other universities and yet we have graduated one-third of them. That sounds to me as though we are doing something right. Perhaps, focusing on what is being done right to graduate one-third of the students who wouldn't be admitted to other universities may be the place where we should be focusing our attention rather than a blanket freshman "meet the university" course. I was concerned as a faculty member, that a faculty member will be assigned to University College and become an integral part of that group and that the faculty member will still have to be assigned to their original department in the school and be an integral part of that group. I don't see how I can play both of those hats. You won't be able to give up your department and still be a part of this freshman component.

On page 3, it says that "we think University College will provide for greater curricular coherence." That may be true, but to me it appears as though that would provide for less curricular coherence. If we have a freshman year in one unit and the rest of the schools think the students' programs are in another unit, wouldn't that contribute to less coherence? There are parts of the document that I find not explained clearly enough for me to totally understand. I have the same questions about who would teach UC 110. It is my understanding that we would need lots of sections of 20 students each. That is a lot of faculty and where are they coming from? That may be worked out and I just haven't seen it. That would be a heavy addition of faculty.

I am concerned on page 4 under Plan for Assessment, that one of the first tasks after the College is developed is to make assessment plans. I would hope we would have some idea about assessment before we approve the College rather than approving it and then figuring out how to assess it. To me it is a major problem that we are being asked to approve an entity that we have not yet determined how we would assess whether it is successful or not.

My last concern is budget. As a member of an existing unit, I am really concerned about what developing University College would do to our school's budget. I am really concerned about what that is going to cost the existing units.

Langsam: I am proud that I actually need a button that says "I read all of the drafts." Not only did I read the drafts, but I wrote extensive comments back. I attended all but one of the forum meetings. Frankly, I am amazed at some of the questions because I think that there hasn't been enough attention to what has already appeared. I don't want to go into too much detail, but let me make several general comments.

One, there is plenty of literature that suggests that students who leave universities, not only here but elsewhere, are lost by the university in part because they are so completely lost in the first five or six weeks. We will have students who sit in their cars and study between classes and do not know the name of a single other individual on this campus. That lack of linkage which some of you have described as "social" is a valuable element. In fact, many of us in this room, I think, at one point or another snickering about our teachers and classes in graduate school, have said that we learned more interacting with other students on our campus than we ever learned in our classes. And, it certainly attached us to the place. We have many students who do not, because of many reasons, have that linkage. One of the things that University College is attempting to do is to create a physical environment and opportunities for those linkages to take place, especially with faculty and especially with tenured faculty.

Two, many of you are right, there are details that are not in it. But, when a huge document that tried to address all of the details was written, a number of us jumped all over those details. I know. I wrote a 16 or 17 page document saying "I don't like this and the faculty should be involved in making those decisions." I didn't want a "package" that was handed to me with all of the decisions already made. I think the faculty who are interested and who, by the way, amazingly I think considering all you have to balance -- writing, research, teaching, families, and broken cars want to be involved. If you are not interested in participating, you don't have to participate. But, those who are involved should make many of the decisions, not a document before the fact.

I think the most important aspect about University College, despite my questions about the detailed plans, is what it will do for undergraduate education in general. While many of us are vitally interested with learning however, for various reasons, and this is true in graduate schools and professional schools, for many, many years teaching has not been the main thrust. It has been research. Those of us, and I consider myself one of them, who came here to teach, have been orphaned. You almost had secret meetings with people in the bathroom about teaching. The value to me of University College is that it will create a critical mass of self-selected people,

none who are necessarily are terrible researchers, but who characteristically care about undergraduate education and bring them together with a kind of leveraging ability to do exciting things with students and with each other. To me, that alone is worth taking the chance with many unanswered questions of creating University College. It is a place where we can get that critical mass and start to do some of the things that many of us really care about, including some of the people that I think raised reservations today. I don't think there is anyone in this room who doesn't have questions and reservations, but it is an idea. It is a possibility and it is going to be put in the hands of faculty and colleagues whom we trust and that makes it, it seems to me, worth taking the risk.

Banta: I just want to weigh in on the side of faculty involvement and assessment as well. I don't think it would be appropriate for us to lay out a very detailed set of recommendations about assessment until we involve the faculty and see the program they propose. Since the assessment piece can be delayed, approval of University College can proceed.

Ng: Without contradicting Miriam, I don't think anybody is arguing against the concept. I think everybody understands that the lack in details is necessary. But, at the same time, I would be much more comfortable supporting this resolution if there were a clear plan telling me how to get involved. It is more than just going to town meetings. For example, there are real problems with counseling as it is now. There is a cultural clash between faculty and counselors. If you read some of the listserv E-mail messages that have been circulating lately, you would think that a lot of our counselors must have graduated from McDonald's Hamburger University at Oak Brook, Illinois. They believe that the purpose of the university is to just make our customers (i.e., students) satisfied. This is contrary to the faculty culture. Whether we are right or wrong, there is a clash. How do you work it out? I want to see some thought on the part of the coordinating committee to put in place a plan to involve faculty to resolve these conflicts. Unless these conflicts are resolved, putting faculty in the old library building will not help. There has to be closing of this cultural gap. I see the problem every day. I spent the last 11 years of my life running the Mathematics department. I am at the forefront of dealing with 7,000 students every semester and I can tell you it is not a pretty picture. The situation has gotten worse. Nobody is arguing that, in a way, we should support the concept, but the plans are not clearly laid out. In that sense, even for people who really want to make a contribution, it is not entirely clear how.

Vermette: I would like to second what Miriam said about the need for this kind of a focal point for the students on this campus. It is what I call a lack of "community" on campus. This might be a way of remedying the situation, especially if we take into consideration the large number we have of non-traditional returning students -- 25 and over. They have to be given special consideration also in this new student center.

I also agree with some of the things that Bart Ng said. I would really like to see the faculty be the

heart and soul of this University College. I don't like the title or name of University College either because I think it is one of the big bugaboos that is turning a lot of people against the idea -- because they think it is going to be a degree granting unit on campus. I think we have to get away from that idea. I just came back from a conference two weeks ago on First-Year Experience Programs throughout the nation. It was a very good conference. One title that I liked that is used in some institutions is First-Year College which might better define what UC will be and take away some of the fear that the faculty have about what this is going to become, even an AA degree-granting unit.

To respond to Juanita Keck's concern about how a faculty member could be part of a school and a department and yet feel some kind of commitment to another entity, I might be able to speak to that personally because of the experience I have had in the two years that I have been part of the program -- between Liberal Arts and UEC -- called COAS (for lack of a better term) dealing with students in UEC, especially UECP students. I volunteered for this because I wanted to work with students and I wanted to work with problem students, incoming students, especially minority students. I still kept an almost full load of teaching in my department. My dean allowed me to have some release time from French to work on the COAS courses by giving me that as one of the three courses in my course load last semester. It took a lot of time, helping to set up the COAS program. It took a lot of discussion time between the faculty members who were involved in creating it. It started out as only faculty and then grew to become team taught which is a group concept, I think. I am still not convinced of that. I think the faculty and students should be the center of the whole process. But, I don't feel I lost my identity as a member of the French faculty and the department of Foreign Languages and Cultures in the School of Liberal Arts while still being a part of the new program. If you want to do it, you can do it. It takes time but it is probably worthwhile if we are going to have a future as a university. With programs that go to the Ph.D. level, we need to start low here.

Spechler: To answer my friend and dean, Dean Barlow and to explain why it is that we are looking at the same horse -- he looks at its head and I look at the other end. **[Laughter]** Is it possible that it is the same horse? The answer is yes. In the School of Liberal Arts we have recruited some of our best, most conscientious, devoted faculty members who have taken a section of University College together with an established course. They have done well in their first year and I am sure that is what John is referring to. I have heard some of those good reports too. I think that is the head of the horse. That is the sort of thing that is envisioned in the proposal which I think would be a good thing. That is, University College linked to a substantive established course with a tenured faculty member. The sort of thing that Rosalie is doing, although she is not endorsing it fully. But, let's look at the other end of the horse. University College could not be linked, if you look at page 36. Now when we are talking about a wholesale operation with three or four times as many sections, we don't have three or four Rosalie Vermette's. I wish we did. We don't have three or four even the present number who will

continue this commitment. So, if you look at page 36, there are all kinds of different models that are acceptable for UC 110. What I really expect, if this expands, is that UC 110 will be taught by part-timers with no tenure, little connection to their departments, and the connection to established courses will be substantially attenuated. I would be delighted if there were a serious evaluation of UC 110 as established and John Barlow proved to be right and I wrong, and that it is mostly head and very little tail. I would love to have that because I think there are problems, as Miriam put it very well. I don't think we have an evaluation yet. So the point is, when this expands 4, 5, or 10 times, it is not going to preserve the kind of devotion and quality we have had in the first year and that is what I fear.

Keffer: I have a question that may be philosophical orientation and maybe just because of my activity. We seem to be working more towards creating courses that can be done by distance education, television, CD, videotape, and Internet where students may not ever have to come to the campus. How does this fit with creating a physical space for the social orientation of the students to a campus? Maybe I can't see the picture.

J. Keck: I want to make it clear that I am not particularly suggesting that we not approve it, but my concern is approval at this time. I think approval is premature. I totally agree that there is a problem with students' lack of feeling of community. What I have not been able to understand is that this is a solution to that. Sometimes students sit in their cars because they had a class at 9:00 a.m. and a class at 11:00 and they are not giving up their parking space. Or, they get more done. I have sat in my car as a faculty member because I am not anywhere near a telephone. I don't think that there is probably a great deal of question that for some students, particularly incoming students, lack of community is a problem. My concern is that this particular solution is a solution and maybe it is, but I don't have enough information to approve it at this point. To me this resolution reads as though the University College will be instituted the day that we approve it and I don't see built into the plan. My concern is primarily with the approving of this at this time with so many questions that are yet unclear.

Porter: Jan, my apologies. I interpreted initially what you were saying as raising a philosophical question. Were you looking for a response?

Keffer: Yes.

Plater: I am not the only one who could respond. I think that you are quite right about the role of technology and the fact that it is going to have a real impact upon the way which we teach both on campus and off campus. Undoubtedly there will be a great deal more done to encourage students' using technology so that there may be some activities that won't take place here on campus. The School of Nursing, as you know Juanita, has been the state's leader in distance learning, and certainly at the masters level, in delivering programs state wide to many students who don't even come to this campus. However, interaction is a very important part of students'

success. There is a lot of research data to demonstrate that the more you have students engaged in a social way the more likely they are to succeed.

One of the aspects of University College will be to address that social aspect -- everything from creating a much better social space, as is going on now with the Old Library, that is being renovated to creating not only new offices for advising and that kind of activity, but to adding a computer room lab for students. It will be open seven days a week, 24 hours a day. It will be staffed so that there will be places for students to go to use technology. They will have facilities for the UC 110 classes and facilities for student mentoring as well as peer interaction. There will be a whole set of planned activities that will increase dramatically the social interaction of students. It may seem, on one hand, that we have two very different philosophical things going on here -- more distance learning, more remote learning -- at the same time University College is trying to create a place in time where people can come together. This has happened at all institutions around the country, and we are not going to be any different here. But, certainly for first year students, for first generation students who have characteristics that we have described for IUPUI undergraduates, we need a place that promotes social interaction and that is grounded in learning. I think that is what University College will try to be. Later on there may be a lot of things that the students will do that will not require their coming to campus.

Keffer: So we can have two different populations of students beyond the campus students as well as the student in a virtual university setting. That is not incompatible.

Plater: I don't think it is incompatible, but I think most of the activities of the University College will provide engagement with the institution and try, if you will, to socialize them to what it means to be a student, to understand what their responsibilities are for learning. You have to do that by involving and engaging students, especially with faculty. That is what much of this activity at the University College will be oriented toward. It is not inconceivable that a student could graduate with a baccalaureate degree in a field where a significant portion of the course work were taken by technology or distance learning, but we want first year students to be on campus.

Vessely: I don't know about the notion that this will all be part-time faculty. I think there are a number of us who were never asked to be involved in the predecessor of UC 110. There are a number of faculty who would certainly be glad to participate at this next level. So, I don't know how you could judge that. Every day I walk through the learning center in the "not renovated" basement level of the Old Library where the offices, by the way, have no windows. When you walk through that learning center, you see the interaction of these students, which I can only believe will be enhanced as we promote the University College. For that program and peer mentoring and a number of other programs, which don't exist yet, will begin to exist under this new entity, To know that those students who are being connected, regardless of the statistics of

whether their grades are getting better or not, are persisting because the same basis they are there a lot and are obviously still persisting toward that degree. I think that is the kind of thing that we have to grab hold of. If we wait for the approval until all the t's are crossed and the all i's are dotted, then my sense is that we will be having this discussion a year from now and we will have another one similar to it a year after that. I don't need to bore you with all of the things that we have discussed and never done, because all we had time to do was discuss that. I think it is time to move on and, if we are willing to admit that a year or two or three or five from now that this isn't working and we don't do it anymore, then we haven't lost anything by making the attempt to do something that we all somewhat agree has some merit.

Baldwin: I would like to preface this by saying I am in favor of the general concept. It is time to do something like this, but I guess it is the devil in me that seeks out the details. In this four-page document it states, "The first year retention rate at IUPUI is 56% while the national average is 70%. The overall graduation rate at IUPUI is 27% while the national average is 40%." Then on page 2, under Goals ". . . eventually achieving the national average of 70%."

I just wonder how the assessment is going to work if our goal is to get to the national average. I was just looking at statistics from the *U.S. News and World Report* ranks of U.S. Colleges and universities. Chancellor Bepko drew our attention to this report last year because IUPUI went up a rank. It gives the SAT scores for IUPUI as well as other institutions. We have the lowest SAT scores of any "national university" as listed. That is okay. That reflects our admission policies, but I was wondering if comparing us to the national standard, which includes Harvard, Chicago, Illinois, and places like that, puts us up against a standard which is going to be very, very difficult to ever achieve. I have been noticing that the retention standards for junior colleges, which have admission requirements comparable to us, are more comparable to what we are now. So, is that a problem we want to fix? Is it really so bad?

Plater: If I could respond to that. The national average that is being used is based on a survey conducted by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities that has surveyed all colleges. The data that we are using is a group they have identified as our peer institutions. They are essentially urban, public universities. So, we are comparing ourselves with like . . .

Baldwin: I have seen that list. The University of Illinois at Chicago is a real peer institution of ours, but they have a junior college in Chicago as well as two other state universities which feed into it. So, they are not doing with the first year experience what we are trying to do. I don't know if that situation is comparable. I think that is also true with the University of Missouri at St. Louis.

Plater: I don't mean to be factious by saying this, but the trouble is that if we want to compare ourselves with community colleges then that is what we will be expected to behave as. I don't

think that is what we want to do. If we are going to appear in a report like *U.S. News and World Report*, then we have to have expectations that match the peer institutions, but I think you are exactly right. At one point in time we had two sets of data that we used. One was a set of community colleges that were in the cities where the other four-year urban universities were. We said we were like the community colleges with this part of what we do and we are like the four-year peer institutions with the other part of what we do. No one bought the argument. Not the Board of Trustees, not the Commission for Higher Education, not even our own faculty. They said “What are your retention rates? How do you compare? Who do you say are your peers?” I think we are stuck with that. I think the retention figures we are citing here are as close as we can come to like institutions. We do have a challenge. That is why some people criticized us for suggesting such modest goals. The first draft of this proposal had a one percent increase per year goal and people said, “Why all of the fuss?” The reason is that, that modest increase is going to be hard to achieve. Two percent, which is now what we are saying, is going to be very difficult. I don’t want you to have any illusions about how hard it will be to improve two percent.

Blomquist: Both the topic of comparability and this issue of how hard it is to raise retention promote this question which I apologize for not raising at one of the town meetings. What is the information base that this proposal is founded on to begin with? Have we looked for any peer institutions, or non-peer institutions for that matter, who have addressed the retention problems successfully and may I ask what they have done? If so, have they done this kind of thing or have they done something else? If we haven’t looked for those sorts of successful case studies, maybe we should. I am not sure who this question is directed to. Have we asked anyone to come and visit from an institution that has raised retention rates and found out what they have been doing?

Porter: Can you answer that, Dr. Blake?

Blake: I am somewhat reluctant to, even though I am a member of the faculty here at IUPUI, but as an administrator I recognize there is a certain onus that is sometimes reprehensible to most faculty. Nevertheless, I am not at all reluctant to speak about this particular opportunity for IUPUI.

I perhaps am the only person in the United States who has had the rare privilege of building a college from the ground up. In 1968 I was charged with the responsibility of developing a college at the University of California at Santa Cruz. We took an idea, developed an academic program, designed the facilities, and recruited the faculty and the students. We deliberately recruited students who did not meet the normal criteria for entering the University of California. At the end of our seventh year of the eight colleges on the campus of the University of California at Santa Cruz we had the highest rate of graduation after six years. We had the highest rate of admission to graduate and professional schools. We had people coming to seek us because we turned out students who did not need any more help once they completed their B.A. They were as good as

any.

Indeed, one of Myles Brand's supervisors, as a regent of the State of Oregon higher education system, entered my college with a D- average and graduated with honors.

I came to IUPUI resigning a chair position at Swarthmore because I wanted to work with Jerry Bepko and Bill Plater after seeing their vision.

The way in which we were successful, both at the University of California and in my presidency at Tougaloo College in Mississippi, were essentially the following: (1) engaging the faculty in developing the curriculum and plan for the students, (2) committing the faculty and the students to high expectations of their performances, (3) providing for the students a supportive network of activities and programs which were designed to make sure they lived up to faculty expectations, and, (4) building a larger social network where every place the student turned the academic program looked him or her in the face. So much so that their very extra curricular and social life became a reflection of the academic program.

University College is just the beginning. The resolution from the Faculty Affairs Committee is a resolution to appoint a faculty. It seems to me that it is moving in the direction of giving the faculty with the kind of commitment the opportunity to raise levels of expectations. As one who teaches every year at IUPUI (I am presently teaching an introductory course in my discipline, Sociology) and I have only 100 students in that course and I must say it is a sobering experience when you realize the challenges our students face and the challenges they bring to us. I think this effort is moving in the right direction. We are beginning to invigorate even more our Honors Program in support of it. And even more, our whole program of student life in support of this effort.

I could talk long and passionately about this but I will not. I will only say that, if we have respect for the minds of our students, for their potential intellectual capacity as compared to the social dynamics out of which they come, if we have that kind of respect, it seems to me it would be reflected in a decision to provide students with an opportunity to intellectually grow. I hope we will do that.

Porter: We have reached our allotted time for discussion. It would help me to have a sense from the body as to whether or not you are ready for us to proceed to a vote or whether or not this needs to be carried over to the next meeting. Are you ready to vote?

Watt: The Academic Affairs Committee moves that we take a paper ballot vote.

Porter: We have a motion from the Academic Affairs Committee to vote by paper ballot. This

does require a vote of the body. All of those in favor of voting by paper ballot, say "Aye." Opposed? The Ayes have it. We will distribute ballots. You have the motion in front of you. Is there anyone who needs clarification in relationship to the motion?

Galanti: My question is, what are the consequences of this motion if it is defeated?

Porter: If the option to create University College is defeated?

Galanti: If it is defeated at this meeting?

Schneider: Are you suggesting you might want an alternative?

Galanti: No. If the negative votes are enough to defeat the motion, is that the end of the idea of University College?

Plater: Let me try to respond to your question. I think we have been doing a great number of things that have been appropriated into the University College proposal. Those aren't going to stop. We are going to continue to try to serve students. We are going to continue to try to improve advising, provide orientation, offer an introductory course, and other things that are addressed in the proposal. I think there will be some key things we won't do. One of them will be to proceed without a faculty, which I think would be a loss. I think that is one of the real issues for us -- one that University College tries to address.

Someone asked the question earlier about what we can do to follow up. There are going to be two meetings, like the town meetings, but designed specifically for faculty who are interested in becoming the founding faculty of University College to talk about what it would mean to be the faculty of University College. I was going to say that before the vote, but now that the ballots are distributed, it may be a moot point. The two meetings are March 26 at noon and April 8 at 3:00 p. m. These dates will be widely distributed, as the town meeting dates were. The meetings are intended to address the question about helping faculty to continue to follow up and be engaged.

Schneider: If the vote is no, that means that this resolution does not pass.

Unknown Speaker: Does that mean it would go back to the committee for further work on specification meanings?

Schneider: You would have to propose another motion for that.

Porter: Could I request that Bill Orme and Byron Olson, as members of the Executive Committee, serve as our tellers? [The resolution passed 52 yes votes, 10 no votes and two

abstentions]

Orme: We would like to move that the ballots be destroyed.

Porter: We have a motion to destroy the ballots. [This was seconded] All of those in favor of destroying the ballots, please say “Aye.” Opposed? [None] Thank you.

Agenda Item VI: Exceptions to Student Code of Ethics

Porter: We are going to proceed to our next item. This is acting on Exceptions to what should be correctly labeled as the Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct. There were copies of the full document available in the back of the room. Distributed with your agenda was IUPUI Circular 97-04 which is a list of the items which the Student Affairs Committee is bringing forward. The Chair of the Student Affairs Committee is Subir Chakrabarti who will be helping us understand what it is they are bringing forward. Subir, could you help us understand something. These are labeled as exceptions to the Student Code and we are working on some language changes. Why are they called ‘exceptions’ as opposed to amendments?

Chakrabarti: My understanding is the following. The Code of Student Ethics which you have in your hand has already been passed by the Faculty Council of the entire system. So, that document is a document that has been accepted by the Faculty Council. Our committee was not happy with some of the phrases in that document. I spoke with Bill Schneider about it and asked what could be done about it. He said we could amend the phrases that you are not happy with and amend them as exceptions for IUPUI. If these amendments are accepted, then this is what the Code of Student Ethics will look like for our campus.

Porter: Am I correct that wording in line 2817 should be Dean of Students or the appropriate officer?

Chakrabarti: That is correct.

Porter: Is there any discussion of the motion to approve these language changes?

Galanti: Will these exceptions have impact on those schools that have our own disciplinary rules?

Langsam: The question was, will this override and force those schools, especially the professional schools, which have special blessed alternatives, will this force them to come back and re-request approval? The answer that was brought to us by Bill Schneider last time was those professional schools and other schools which have existing policies that have previously been

approved will remain and not have to go through additional processes.

Galanti: Thank you, Miriam.

Porter: Is there any other discussion of the motion? Hearing no further discussion, all of those in favor of the motion to enact these language changes, say “Aye.” Opposed? [None] Thank you very much.

Agenda Item VIII: Committee Reports

Porter: We will move to Committee Reports. As was mentioned earlier, the Athletic Affairs Committee report has been deferred. The Faculty Affairs Committee is chaired by Sara Hook.

Hook: This will be a very brief report to update you on the activities of the Faculty Affairs Committee for the semester. This semester we have quite busy. We have divided into a number of subcommittees. One of these subcommittees is looking very carefully at the issue related to Post-Tenure Review. We have collected a number of documents and other literature from other schools and plans that are currently in place around the country. We are looking at those in great detail with the idea of possibly coming up with a draft plan hopefully in the near future. At the moment, the work is still quite preliminary. We have a good subcommittee going and we are meeting regularly to cover this issue.

The other subcommittee is working on the issue of Merger Transfer and Elimination of Academic Programs. Again, we have collected a number of documents and literature from other schools and campuses. We are looking carefully at that again with an idea of coming up with a policy. That group is working a little more slowly than the Post-Tenure Review subcommittee. If you have any questions, please let me know.

Porter: Are there any questions? The Metropolitan Affairs Committee submitted their report and it is attached to today’s agenda as IUPUI Circular 97-05. If you have any questions regarding this report, please feel free to contact the chair Robert Bringle.

Agenda Item IX: Question and Answer Period

Porter: That moves us to the Question and Answer Period.

R. Keck: We have for years been talking about the acquisition of additional student housing on campus. I wondered if we might have an update on that.

Bepko: The plans are still developing. It is disappointing because we had begun discussion about

developing housing on campus five or six years ago. It was delayed for a variety of reasons because we couldn't use the land that has been set aside for housing until the Riley Outpatient Garage was finished; moving cars that were parked on the other land, acquiring the land from the city that was used as a roll call site for a fire training tower. All that took much longer than anyone wanted. Currently we have plans that are maturing. We have gone through, even after we cleared the land, an effort to get a private developer to build housing. That failed. Basically, the private developer either wanted a guarantee of their profits or they wanted us to accept major responsibilities for providing programming in the housing. Of course, if we do all of that -- either guarantee their profits or provide the full programming inside the housing, or allow them to rent to non-students in substantial numbers -- any and all of those things would make it unattractive for us to have a private developer. The plan now is to do this ourselves. Indiana University's Trustees are considering the plans. We hope that they will approve the plans before the end of the academic year or, if not before the end of the academic year, at the very first opportunity of the next academic year. Then we will be on our way to build roughly another 1,000 units.

We do have some planning issues that are yet to be resolved. That is, exactly what do we want to build? I hope that all of those things are settled and that when we get the green light from the Trustees, there will be little more to do but to go ahead and construct the facilities, which will be on the west end of campus between New York Street and Michigan Street. That means about 2,700 students. We have about 500 or 600 now. That means we would need to build another 2,000, 2,100, or 2,200 before we met our goal. I think this next phase would be units for about 1,000 students.

Keck: As a follow up, with what we did today in terms of the vote for University College and with the information that Herman Blake has given us, I would encourage us to speed up that process. If indeed socialization is one of the major obstacles for retention, one of the ways to increase the socialization, in my humble opinion, is to have a living condition that would foster that. If there is any leverage to be made in increasing the speed on that because of our work today, I would encourage people to think about that as a possibility.

Bepko: I agree wholeheartedly.

S. Fineberg: I realize that we have completed our discussion of the University College, but I would urge the Chancellor to present, in organized fashion, the physical pieces of the University College. This would assist those of us who have been less involved with its formulation to become more supportive.

Plater: I understand what you are saying. There is a lot more to be said. We will be certain to do that. We circulated the draft widely, and I think that is especially true of the schools other than the School of Medicine. There are a lot of people who have seen it. I just wanted to make that

point. There is a very long document with a lot of details and if some of you have not seen it, by all means let us know and we will make sure you get a copy.

Bepko: The resolution that we adopted says that we must make a monthly report to the Academic Affairs Committee. I suspect that we should make that report to the entire Faculty Council. Anyone who asks us for it will be able to get it.

Wokeck: May I also suggest that you make strenuous efforts to convince the students that the University College is not a continuation of UEC.

Langsam: May I change the topic? Now that we have passed a Code of Student Ethics, are we to believe that shortly it will appear in a printed version and a large number to be distributed?

Schneider: I can tell you that it is on the Web. You can link to it from the IUPUI Faculty Council Home Page.

Langsam: That is nice but some of our students, especially part-time faculty, don't necessarily have access to the Web. Hard copies are to be desired.

Schneider: The only thing that I would suggest is that, if you want our exceptions to be incorporated into the document that apply to this campus, you should wait for us to get the exceptions approved.

Langsam: I appreciate that we have to get them approved, but we have had a terrible shortage and sometimes a complete disappearance of copies of this document. If it is going to be really useful, we need to have copies widely available. Not necessary "slick," but copies available.

Jones: It seems like it would be part of what you covered in that course.

Bepko: I think we agree with the principle, Miriam, that this is a document that has to be readily available to everyone, and we ought to make sure it is by whatever means that is appropriate.

Jones: What is the connection between the Council on Undergraduate Learning and University College and how it progresses?

Plater: The University College will begin with a separate Board of Directors [Board of Advisors] for a period of time. Then that would eventually be replaced by the Council on Undergraduate Learning. The two will have a very substantial overlap. The reason for a distinction was to insure that there would be a lot of concentrated energy devoted to University College. My own personal view is that the general campuswide oversight for University College

ought to go through the Council on Undergraduate Learning. You know the role that the Council plays by having faculty governance, all the schools, and appropriate administration represented.

McBride: Following establishment of University College, will we also be going after grant funding to develop some of the programs in the depth that they need to be developed?

Bepko: Yes. This is an area that is further developing. There is an amendment to make a grant from the Lilly Endowment that would be available to support some of the activities of the University College, maybe a considerable number of activities.

Plater: There is another project with which IUPUI is involved along with some other universities that can be of direct help. There is no reason to think that we can't be successful with other grants.

Porter: Are there any other questions?

Bepko: There was a question that was asked before and the question was, is there a document on the Teaching Excellence Recognition Award? The answer is "Yes."

Agenda Item X: Unfinished Business

Porter: Is there any unfinished business?

J. Keck: Will this document be on a future agenda?

Plater: There are several reasons. The main one is that the Trustees have asked that all faculty be informed about TERA. This is, in part, an attempt to insure that you know that TERA is there and that these awards will be made this spring. In fact, the schools are obligated to turn in the names of the people who will receive the awards by March 28. If you do not know about it within your own school, then you should make inquiries to the appropriate office within your school about the review process, selection criteria, etc.

Ng: Regarding the TERA document, I understand that apparently the faculty could receive that only once every three years. Is that correct?

Plater: That is correct.

Ng: What is the reasoning behind that?

Bepko: We don't know **[Laughter]**

Schneider: It was a recommendation by a committee, none of whose members are apparently here. **[Laughter]**

Bepko: I would like to say if somebody wants to refer to this as a “Jerry built” provision, I would rather you refer to it as a “Jerry rigged.” **[Laughter]**

J Keck: Is there a mechanism to propose that perhaps that might be changed?

Porter: There is a review built in the entire teaching awards. It will be reviewed.

Ng: I would also propose that we do an assessment on how much it takes to administer this program. I think it is essential if we are going to use our resources wisely.

Stocum: I have another comment about TERA. I think we calculated in the Chairs Council meeting that after federal and state taxes, the top award would garner a faculty member about \$636.42. It might even garner them a negative number. It could push them into a higher tax bracket.

Agenda Item XI: New Business

Porter: Is there any new business? [There was no new business]

Agenda Item XII: Adjournment

Porter: The meeting is adjourned.