

APPROVED: NOVEMBER 2, 1995

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY INDIANAPOLIS

FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING

SEPTEMBER 7, 1995

SCHOOL OF DENTISTRY, ROOM 115

3:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Administration: Chancellor Gerald Bepko, William Plater, Dean of the Faculties. **Deans:** John Barlow, P Nicholas Kellum, Angela McBride. **Elected Faculty:** Larry Abel, Charalambos Aliprantis, Susan Ball, Lynn Broderick, Paul Brown, David Burr, Kenneth Byrd, Lucinda Carr, Jeanette Dickerson-Putman, Karen Gable, Patricia Gallagher, Nathan Houser, Dolores Hoyt, Henry Karlson, M Jan Keffer, Michael Klemsz, Raymond Koleski, Missy Dehn Kubitschek, Miriam Langsam, Dana McDonald, Debra Mesch, Bart Ng, William Orme, Fred Pavalko, Michael Penna, Richard Peterson, Richard Pflanzner, Rebecca Porter, Ken Rennels, Virginia Richardson, Edward Robbins, Bernadette Rodak, Kent Sharp, Jerrold Stern, Stephen Stockberger, Kathleen Warfel, Kathryn Wilson, Richard Wyma, Charles Yokomoto. **Ex Officio Members:** James Baldwin, Paul Galanti, Juanita Keck, Carl Rothe, Martin Spechler, Rosalie Vermette, Marshall Yovits (Senior Academy).

Alternates Present: Deans: J. M. Kapoor for Roberta Greene, Pat Fox for the School of Engineering and Technology. **Elected Faculty:** Hitwant Sidhu for Karen Teegarden.

Absent: Administration: J Herman Blake. **Deans:** A. James Barnes, Trevor Brown, Walter Daly, H. William Gilmore, Kathy Krendl, Norman Lefstein, John Rau, Robert Shay, David Stocum, Philip Tompkins, Donald Warren, Charles Webb. **Elected Faculty:** W Marshall Anderson, Margaret Applegate, Merrill Benson, Joseph Bidwell, Diane Billings, Ulf Jonas Bjork, Jana Bradley, Zacharie Brahm, Thomas Broadie, Timothy Brothers, Timothy Byers, David Canal, Michael Cohen, Paul Dubin, Elizabeth Evenbeck, Naomi Fineberg, Joe Garcia, Bernardino Ghetti, Carlos Goldberg, Robert Havlik, William Hohlt, Antoinette Hood, Stephen Lalka, Golam Mannan, Rebecca Markel, David Peters, Brian Sanders, Jane Schultz, Mark Seifert, Anantha Shekhar, Jay Simon, Akhouri Sinha, James Wallihan, Karen West, Mervin Yoder, Susan Zunt. **Ex Officio Members:** Henry Besch, Ronald Dehnke, S Edwin Fineberg, Carlyn Johnson, Stephen Leapman, Robert Lehn, Justin Libby, Steven Mannheimer, Byron Olson.

Visitors: Trudy Banta (Planning and Institutional Research), Victor Borden (IMIR), Erwin Boschmann (Dean of the Faculties Office), Garland Elmore (Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor), Mark Grove

(Registrar), John Kremer (Psychology), Carol Nathan (Dean of the Faculties), Melinda Phillabaum (IUPUI Staff Council), John Snyder (Allied Health), JoAnn Switzer (IUPUI and IV Tech Office Coordinated Programs).

AGENDA ITEM I: CALL TO ORDER

TURNER: I would like to call this meeting to order. I would also like to remind you to identify yourselves so the minutes can show accurately who you are. If you would like to present yourself as someone else, that is fine too, but we may insist on the real name in the minutes. [laughter]

As you know, we are meeting in a new location beginning today and there are some cables laying throughout the room, so please watch your step. We don't want anyone to trip.

AGENDA ITEM II: MEMORIAL RESOLUTION: ARTHUR S. NUNN

TURNER: The first order of business today is a memorial resolution for Arthur S. Nunn, School of Medicine. I would like for us to stand in a moment of silence. [A moment of silence was observed.]

AGENDA ITEM III: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

TURNER: Next, we have the approval of the minutes for February 2, 1995, March 2, 1995, April 6, 1995, and May 4, 1995. These minutes have been distributed. Are there any additions, corrections, or deletions? The motion has been made to accept the minutes as distributed. [Seconded]

GABLE: There are omissions in the minutes of April 6 on page 6. Have those been modified?

CHUMLEY: Are you speaking of Professor Lehnen's portion?

GABLE: Yes.

CHUMLEY: He is sending the corrections to me and those will be reflected in today's minutes.

GABLE: Thank you.

TURNER: Are there any other corrections? Hearing none, all in favor of accepting the minutes as distributed, please say "Aye." Opposed? [none] Abstained? [none] The minutes are approved as distributed.

AGENDA ITEM IV: ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT: CHANCELLOR GERALD BEPKO

BEPKO: We have some inauspicious beginnings and some auspicious beginnings to the 1995-96

academic year. As we move ever more rapidly to the turn of the century, we think we are more and more poised and positioned to become the clear national model of urban higher education that we have talked about over the past half dozen

years or more. But, every now and then there is a bump in that road, a path toward the millennium and toward our destiny of greatness. I would like to spend time talking about one of those bumps.

That is, in the School of Engineering and Technology, we have had the resignation of the dean just as the school year was getting organized. There were some significant differences of opinion between the dean and quite a number of members of the faculty. I think that, while Al Potvin as dean, had developed a very convincing and compelling vision for the school, there were specific issues of implementation and pursuit of that vision about which

there was substantial enough disagreement to cause these tensions to develop at the school. It was Al's view that he did not want to exert the personal efforts that were necessary to be able to bring everyone in the school to his point of view on the vision for the school and that it would be too great a personal cost to try to mend all the fences that had been breached in this first couple of years of his deanship. So, he decided in a completely voluntary way, to resign. Therefore, we have a very, very temporary interim arrangement for the management of the school. Because Al's resignation was effective immediately and it came rather suddenly, we established an executive management for the school that consists of two of the associate deans who are already in place -- Bob Orr who has been on the faculty for about 10 years and Russ Eberhart who is relatively new but whose interests and expertise in biomedical engineering have made him someone who has shown a significant value to the school in a relatively short period of time. The two of them, along with the deans' senior management team, and the co-presidents of the Faculty Senate for the School of Engineering and Technology, have provided, we think, a good interim management for the school and have gotten the school year off to a good start despite the hooks that are naturally associated with a change in leadership. In very short order we will ask someone to be a permanent acting dean during the search period that will begin very shortly and that we hope will result in the appointment of a new dean for the School of Engineering and Technology before the end of the academic year. We intend to be very focused on the School of Engineering and Technology during this year. We think the school is extremely important to all of IUPUI and to all of Indiana and Purdue University. As a result of this change in leadership, as a result of the conditions that gave rise to the change in leadership, I think an increasing awareness of and focus on the importance of the School of Engineering and Technology to all of is merited, as well as a reaffirmation of the commitment that we have to its continued growth and success.

So, thus, we have the inauspicious part of the beginning of the academic year, but I would rather focus on the auspicious and portentous beginning of the academic year which we have now observed, and I think the most auspicious part of that is the fact that our enrollments have gone up and in all of the right places.

For an enrollment report and some comments on a Capacity Model of faculty effort that we are going to

be reporting on for the first time this fall term, I would like to ask Bill Plater to comment.

PLATER: Thank you, Jerry. I am happy to be able to report on a very positive item and that is that enrollments are up for the first time in several semesters. In fact, I think this is the first time in six semesters that I have been able to come to you with such good news. The general figure is that we are up almost one percent, eight-tenths of a percent in the headcount but we are up over three percent in student credit hours, which is quite a significant turn around from the previous semesters. I won't go into school by school enrollment patterns, but most schools have had some increase in at least credit hours. The changes in headcount has been more varied reflecting, perhaps, the results of the marketing efforts we have been engaged in for the past year--meaning that we have been successful, I believe, in attracting a larger number of beginning, first-year students than we might otherwise have. Specifically, the matriculants, that is students new to Indiana University, are up 17 percent in comparison with last year with freshmen, or first-year students, making up 25 percent of that increase. This includes transfer students from other institutions as well as those just beginning college for the first time. There were significantly more at the undergraduate level than the graduate level, although there was also an increase at the graduate/professional level.

We also had increases in minority enrollments for the first time following two years of slight decreases in minority enrollments. The overall minority enrollment was up from about 12.2 percent to about 12.8 percent; a very small increase, but in the right direction. However, the largest, most noteworthy increase occurred among African/American students where we had a 7.5 percent increase this year in comparison with last year. Again, I think this reflects the hard work of a number of offices that have been trying to turn around declining participation of African/American students.

Full-time enrollment is also another significant area of change in the students this year. Full-time enrollment by undergraduates is up 5.8 percent, part-time enrollment by undergraduates dropped 2.9 percent. So, we are having a shifting proportion of students at the undergraduate level with more full-time undergraduates. One particular fact that is noteworthy is students new to UEC who are full-time increased 35 percent over last year. Of course, the largest number of the new headcounts are logged in UEC, as opposed to the individual schools.

One other fact that I would mention is that the number of students in the 18-20 year old range is up almost 9 percent over last year. At the same time, we had a drop of almost 5 percent in the students who are in the 29-44 year range. Again, this reflects what I think has been the marketing effort targeted towards the population of students who are most interested in attending college. I would be happy to refer any questions you have about enrollments to Mark Grove who is here.

SPECHLER: I think that is wonderful on the quantitative side. Could you tell us about the qualitative side? The average SAT, for example, of our incoming students?

PLATER: Not yet, Martin, but we will have that information soon. There is a full analysis of the characteristics of the students being developed now, and we will report that as soon as we can --

probably at the next Faculty Council meeting.

BEPKO: I might just say one other thing about enrollments. The first reports indicate that all the other IU campuses are down, including Bloomington by small percentages, but nevertheless, enrollments are down everywhere else. I think it is also important to at least start the analysis that Bill has suggested of explaining to ourselves why we may have moved up a little while all of the other IU campuses were moving down. I think it is probably based on five points:

1) Your good work as faculty at attracting students; 2) It may be that the economy is slowing ever so slightly and that could throw students back into taking more hours, if not re-enrolling,

2) It may be that the economy is slowing ever so slightly and that could throw students back into taking more hours, if not re-enrolling;

3) We had what we think was a very good promotional program. You may have seen the advertisements on television or in the newspapers... "More is Better" is beginning to be understood by people. I think it is resonating in the community.

4) We had a new emphasis on service and customer orientation in our service units. For students, we consolidated some of our activities, drew together units that had been quite independent before and tried to create this web of services that students find very responsive.

5) Finally, I think we made some headway, again thanks to the excellent work that you have done as faculty, on our retention of students. Our retention figures, I think, are moving up for the first time in a number of years.

It is good news and it is even better news because it is the result of excellent work on your part and it is also the case that our promotional program was envisioned to be a five-year effort. We did not expect payoff to come early in the process. We thought maybe after two or three years the ideas that we were trying to communicate across the region, across the state, would take hold after a couple of years. But, it seems, at least to some extent, to have paid off earlier than we expected. We are still going to continue, however, with this multi-year program of making people more aware of the extraordinary educational resources that are here at IUPUI.

PLATER: I think it is important to emphasize this last point. Our success, in comparison with other, especially, public institutions means that the competition is likely to increase for the student body that we have been most successful in attracting to IUPUI. We will have to renew and sustain the efforts that we began in so many different ways during the past year or two to continue this growth. Are there any other questions or comments?

The Capacity Model is a term that I am sure is familiar to almost everyone on the Faculty Council. Just to remind you briefly of the history of this, the Board of Trustees has expressed considerable interest in

the teaching effort of faculty across Indiana University, and it initiated a series of discussions that led to our appointing various task forces during the past several years that came together to talk about how we define the work the faculty are engaged in with special emphasis on reporting teaching activities. The Trustees continued their interest, developed some refinements in their own views about faculty work, especially as it relates to teaching, and asked the chancellors of the campuses to make reports which occurred about two years ago. Chancellor Bepko reviewed with the Faculty Council an analysis that we had prepared of faculty teaching efforts and made that presentation to the Trustees. Other chancellors did the same. The Trustees, in turn, began to refine their understanding of how to define faculty work, and they developed two models that they refer to. The first one is the Wisconsin Model which is a way of reporting faculty work aggregated by group instruction and individual instruction. And, a more significant model is known as the Capacity Model which grew out of work of the College of Arts and Sciences in Bloomington; in very simple terms, it is a way of defining what the capacity of a department is or a school and then estimating what percentage of the capacity is actually being delivered by the faculty in terms of teaching sections of courses -- reporting only group instruction as opposed to individualized instruction.

In adopting these two models the Trustees required that all campuses prepare a summary report, in our case, on a school by school basis, and to have this report available for review on September 1. Thanks to the very hard work of Victor Borden and his colleagues in the Office of Information Management and Research the work of deans and their staffs, over the summer we were able to pull together these reports and submit them by the September 1 deadline. They are very interesting reports. I am sure that all of the faculty will want to see the models for their schools and, indeed, other schools. We will be glad to make them available through the school offices. You should know that this is an evolutionary process. I don't think we have reached the final stage of defining what the Capacity Model is. In fact, one of the likely events of reporting this information for campuses as large and complex as ours, along with the other campuses of IU, will be some further revisions, redefinitions of the model itself. A committee appointed by the Trustees, including members of the Trustees, faculty, and administrative officers will make the first review or analysis of all of this data and presumably come to some conclusions about how effective the model is in representing faculty work, particularly as it relates to teaching. I would say that we allowed considerable variation among the schools in how they defined some of the terms that apply to the model such as "section sizes" and "policies for releasing or assigning faculty to work other than teaching". This information is reported in the model and, as you look through the various ways in which schools have chosen to represent their work, you will see that there is a reasonable consistency but some significant variation that reflects the diversity of the school and the mission of the school and the type of work they are engaged in. The work of the School of Medicine, for example, is very different from the School of Physical Education, and the model has the flexibility to reflect those differences in work. I think it would be difficult for us to say much more without your having the model in front of you. At some time in the not too distant future, that information will be readily available to faculty. I would be happy to answer any questions you might have.

SPECHLER: Point of information. We have an elected representative to this joint committee to review the teaching Capacity Model and he is David Malik, chairman of the chemistry department. We all elected him and if you have questions about this rather sensitive matter, David is pursuing this rather

energetically and thoughtfully. Now, I have a question for you, Bill. I have heard many different things about your thinking on this matter and the position of the campus overall. The major issue is whether the teaching capacity model should be defined department by department where, for example, Department A would have a capacity of four courses per FTE with certain deductions and Department B would have two or six or whether it should be defined school by school or rather, in your view, there should be, at least as a starting point, an overall number for IUPUI? The number that has been mentioned is six. We have certain deductions moderated through the AO Building. Can you give us an idea of your thinking about how the teaching capacity model will evolve here -- department by department -- school by school -- or basically campus wide?

PLATER: Jerry may want to comment further on this, but I believe that what we are trying to do is reflect the expectations of the Trustees who, in adopting the Capacity Model, were looking at the specific form of the Capacity Model used by the College of Arts and Sciences which did reflect each individual department. It is our assumption that, this is indeed the form in which the Trustees would like to have the information ultimately presented. After this committee looks at the information from all the campuses, the committee may come to a conclusion that the information should be displayed in some other way that is not by departments, but instead by schools. However, at IUPUI many of the schools can only report their data on a school-wide basis. It is primarily Arts and Sciences where the data is reflected department by department.

I think you are correct in stating the expectation of the teaching capacity of this campus being set at six sections as opposed to four for Bloomington and eight for the smaller campuses. However, in some schools the capacity has been defined slightly differently to reflect, in the case of core campus schools -- Business and Education--the expectation shared between Bloomington and Indianapolis. The decision rules for how faculty are assigned to work

other than teaching allowing some latitude in accommodating research or administrative work. That results in a lowering of capacity to give a figure that would be called, I believe, the Final Capacity. In most cases, when you make a reasonable allowances for administrative work that is involved in being department chairs, advisers, etc., in most schools the Final Capacity is over 100 percent. I think the Trustees will be very interested , and indeed the committee will be very interested, in looking at the display of this information and wondering whether or not the decisions that we made about assigning work to things other than teaching are reasonable. But, we have tried to be very forthright and direct in explaining what we are doing and why we are doing it, on the assumption that the work the faculty are engaged in here and the decisions being made by administrative officers are very reasonable and defensible. We are prepared to explain directly and frankly what it is that we are doing.

ALIPRANTIS: We accept here the six courses as the teaching load. Is that what we are saying?

PLATER: I don't think it is a matter of our accepting. I think it was a matter of the Board of Trustees saying the expectation for this campus is six. I certainly believe this is a first-rate campus and will continue to improve. I think most of the schools have made allowances for research and other activities

that are reasonable and defensible.

BEPKO: I think Roko is right. I don't think the Trustees adopted a formula that suggests that every faculty member on a regional campus has to have an eight course teaching load and every faculty member in Indianapolis has to have six and Bloomington will use four as its benchmark. I think these were just reference points -- general notions of what the expectations might be. I think this focuses largely on the faculty that has a principal responsibility for undergraduate education as well. I don't think the School of Medicine, for example, is thought of as falling into this analytical framework. It is important to keep in mind that the reason for saying that there might be a difference is to counter what had been suggested and that is that Bloomington and Indianapolis ought to be exactly the same. That is something that the Trustees do not accept. They say that there are some differences between Bloomington and Indianapolis, maybe not in some programs, but in the general academic programs especially at the undergraduate level. In saying what those differences are, they say, "Well, we think that in an urban university, if you look at peers, you will find that the teaching loads are probably a little higher than they are in the campus that Myles Brand has referred to as the 'flagship campus,' the Bloomington campus." That is the original reasoning. I don't think that in any given program there is a suggestion that there is a second class citizenship, but I think we have to recognize that the expectations of the community, of the state, and of the Trustees are that we will not emulate Bloomington in a way that causes us to reduce everyone's teaching load so that it is the same as Bloomington.

MCDONALD: What do you do with librarians? Do you ignore them or do you count them as "Other"?

PLATER: The focus now is on teaching capacity. As a consequence, we have not included the librarians in the models including...

MCDONALD: In this brave new world librarians feel that they are doing more and more teaching what with these automated systems and computerized access points, etc. and somehow or another would like to be in assist.

PLATER: I think that is an important point. One of the things about which we are all very conscious is that the model which we are working with is extremely simple and does not adequately reflect the complexity of the faculty work. For example, there is a lot of small group or individualized instruction that is not adequately reflected in this model. What we have tried to do is to find ways to aggregate it so that the work can be recorded in some statistical way, but the model itself does not allow it. More over, there is a lot of teaching work that the faculty are engaged in that doesn't come in the form that is most familiar to the public. There is laboratory work and rotation supervision of clinical work, etc., and we are trying to find ways to translate that work into this common notion by section. It is imperfect and that is why I think that we are merely at a point in the development of a model some years from now that we will all feel comfortable with. By then, hopefully, the emphasis will have changed from these issues to the results of faculty work: the students who have graduated, how much they have earned, and how well they have learned instead of how many students we are teaching. But, for right now we are trying to use the public perception of what teaching is.

BEPKO: I would like to say one other thing in response to Roko's question. The beginning of this discussion was that IUPUI was a regional campus and should teach eight. That is how the discussion began. I wanted to make sure that you were aware of the fact that we think that there is some progress that has been made in developing a thorough understanding of the extraordinary resources that are here and making the Trustees aware that this is a special kind of university that is not to be compared with other campuses. It may not be exactly the same as Bloomington, but it may emerge as the most important part of Indiana University.

KARLSON: You made a comment which has really bothered me. You talked about this campus being a flagship campus. I thought we were a core campus concept. Now, suddenly the flagship is sailing again. Are we rejecting this core concept? I do know that President Brand caused great problems with some of the Law School alumni with some of his comments made about the Law School on this campus which he had to retract and apologize for to one of our prestigious alumni who controls quite a bit of funding in this state and political power. Is he again sailing the flagship and is the flagship going to be shooting at this campus? I find this exceptionally disturbing and a backward movement. The idea that we are going to have different teaching loads bleeds over into another area because in the past when we have discussed salary differences between the various campuses, one of the factors that has been brought up is the publications and the standing and reputations of people teaching on different campuses. Well, it is very easy to say, 'You teach four courses, you teach six, but we are going to give you more money because you publish more.' This I find to be an extremely disturbing concept.

BEPKO: Like I said, Myles Brand has used the expression. I didn't say that it was something that was agreed to as a way of characterizing campuses. As far as University policy is concerned, the core campus is Bloomington and Indianapolis.

NG: It is often said that we want to move ahead to become a Carnegie One institution. I would like to ask two questions. The first is how do we compare to a Carnegie One institution in terms of teaching loads? Second, assuming that the normal faculty teaching load among Carnegie One institutions is different from the six courses per year load expected of us, how are we going to resolve the differences between our aspiration to become a Carnegie One institution and the demand from the Trustees? I am convinced that there is no Carnegie One institution which has a six courses per year teaching load.

PLATER: There are two points. One is that this is not what our faculty are doing. We are teaching less than six sections on an average. There may be an expectation that defines what the capacity is, but the model tries to reflect as accurately as we can, given all of the flaws that we have mentioned here and others that we haven't mentioned with the model itself, what we are doing. It depends on the school, but the average is not going to be six courses per semester. It is going to be less than that because there are good reasons for our teaching less than the six sections that might be expected if we defined capacity at six sections. If you were to look only at the capacity as projected, again it would vary from school to school, but let's say in the School of Science, your actual work might be 80 percent of what the capacity would be if you assumed that every full-time faculty member were going to teach six sections (defined in a fairly narrow way) during the course of the year. That seems to me to be a reasonable statement of

what we are doing and is defensible. There is nothing wrong with that. It just means that if you choose to look at capacity in one way, a very narrow, strictly defined way, then we are at 80 percent of capacity. On the other hand, if you make allowances for assigning faculty to other activities than teaching, then you can come up with a capacity that is higher than that. I would say that in the School of Science the final capacity, as Vic has called it, is over 100 percent because it is reasonable to define the nature of the faculty work to take into account these other activities we have to perform. So, the model simply tries to describe what is going on.

In terms of other institutions like us but who were also Carnegie One institutions, we are trying to gather that data right now to find out what the teaching loads are at other institutions that fit our institutional profile. You have all heard us talk in the past about peer institutions and how hard it is to come up with a set of peers for IUPUI, but we now think we have 10 institutions that are engaged in the full range of activities that we are and another institutions that are engaged, essentially, in work that is more like a community college. So, we can make a distinction between the teaching capacities of the two parts of the institution. We will gather that information and we will certainly share it with the appropriate committees and with the full Council when we have something valuable to report. Impressionistically, I can tell you in conversations with Vice Chancellors for Academic Affairs and Provosts around the country that almost all of the institutions are going through exactly what we are right now. There is a changing expectation about how much faculty will teach.

TURNER: I am sure that your enthusiasm about being back to your responsibility as Faculty Council members, is causing it, but you are doing a lousy job of identifying yourselves when you speak. (laughter). Let me ask you again to identify yourself before you speak so the minutes may accurately reflect your comments.

BEPKO: I have two more quick points. We have used so much time that I will simply mention these two other items. One, as you can see in the newspaper, the hospitals' consolidation efforts continue including the Governor's Panel, which is reviewing all of the plans that have been made for the consolidation of IU and Methodist Hospitals. The Governor's Panel met the other day. You might have read an article in the newspaper about it. There are a number of issues that have been raised along the way. The progress, although a little slower than might have been expected, is still steady and there is still an expectation that the consolidation of the hospitals will take place sometime either much later this year or early in 1996.

While there still is that expectation and still optimism that this is the right thing for Indiana University and for the School of Medicine, there are a variety of problems any one of which could cause this consolidation effort to unravel at some point along the way. We don't anticipate that, but it is not beyond the realm of possibilities. The one most important thing to mention here is that the non-negotiable, indispensable bottom line requirement for Indiana University is that the arrangements looking into the future not be such that they would disturb or change in a radical way the chemistry, the culture that we have in academic medicine today at Indiana University, the culture that has made the IU School of Medicine one of the finest schools of medicine in a public university in the country. If it appears that the efforts to consolidate cannot accommodate the preservation of that culture, then I think probably there

will be some unraveling of this relationship.

Finally, the University, as you probably recall from the spring term, has been engaged in the "Strategic Directions" project since last fall. Eight task forces started their work; three of them chaired by colleagues of ours from IUPUI. The eight task forces began their work in January and filed their reports in June after the Faculty Council had its last meeting. During the summer those task force reports have been compiled into a couple of longer documents that will be used during the fall term to precipitate discussion all across the university. In a couple of weeks time you will receive a copy of what will probably be described as a draft Strategic Directions Charter. This is a refinement and a compilation of the task force reports. It has been reviewed by the Steering Committee for the Strategic Directions process, of which Kathy Warfel is a member. It has also been reviewed by all 230 members of the task forces that we now think of as a Strategic Directions Council for the whole university. Most of those are faculty members, and as you know, all chairs of these task forces were faculty members. 'Pure' faculty members as we have described them; not tainted by an administrative appointment. When this compilation of these documents is ready in its next version, which will be right after the Trustees' meeting next week, and I would hope before the first of October, will be sent to all of you along with some suggestions. There will be discussions during the fall term leading to what may be the consideration of these documents along with all of your comments, these documents as amended by your comments at the Trustees' meeting in December. That may be an overly ambitious schedule, but that is the one that has been set forth and we will try to adhere to it.

I think Kathy will probably mention some things that are being done by Faculty Council groups this fall term to help with the process and to make sure that the documents that are finally submitted to the Trustees for their approval reflect a good, solid consensus and agreement across the university about the important strategic directions that we should follow.

AGENDA ITEM V: PRESIDENT OF THE FACULTY REPORT: KATHLEEN WARFEL

WARFEL: I would like to say something in follow up to the discussion about President Brand's view of Bloomington and the other campuses -- our campus in particular. I don't know how many of you have had a chance to meet President Brand or talk to him. Have you had a chance to talk with the President? Anybody? I think that there is cause to be wary perhaps and uncertain about how he views IUPUI. I think that he to date has been sort of 'Bloomington based' and more visible on the Bloomington campus. I know that he has visited all of the small campuses and talked with the faculties there. He has not yet visited with us. I have encouraged him to do come to IUPUI and interact with the faculty here sometime as soon as possible. I hope that when he does come that you come forward and interact with him.

Secondly, It is an extremely busy year with faculty governance work to be done. This Strategic Directions project is a large part of it, but even without that we would have a lot of business to follow up on -- Dismissal for Financial Exigency, Post-tenure Review, moving the Clinical Ranks issue through the UFC -- to name a few. I think that we have it fairly well sorted out in terms of distributing it to committees. We have not yet had a chance to have an organizational meeting, but we will soon. The

Executive Committee will meet with the chairs of our IUPUI standing committees and with the Presidents of the school faculties, as many as can come to the meeting, to lay out an overview of everything that is stewing and what pot it is stewing in and what our expectations for progress should be this fall. We will do that soon before the next Council meeting.

Of the several items left over from last year, the year went by without launching the administrative reviews. Two of them that were supposed to begin last year. The reviews of Vice Chancellor Blake and Dean Stocum will begin soon.

The only other thing, given that there is a lot on the agenda and we are going to have an organizational meeting for the chairs later, I have one other thing that I need to make known. You may remember that last fall when we were talking about Dismissal for Misconduct Policies, we had before the Council a document concerning discussion on the Dismissal for Misconduct. The subject of this document was whether or not refusing to be have your faculty work reassigned should constitute serious misconduct. There was a couple of examples in the paper. The question is, if you come here because of expertise in one area and there is an agreement that the university is hiring you because of that expertise, you come because you want to work in that area of expertise. However, you are asked to go to another area and you refuse to go. Would that be serious misconduct? We never got around to discussing that in the Council but I need to make known to the faculty that at least in the School of Medicine, we now do have a precedent set. There was a case this past year where someone who was reassigned out of their area of expertise was found to be guilty of serious misconduct by doing that. So, in advising your fellow faculty members what they should if they find themselves in this situation, I think that they should be aware that in fact it may turn out to be viewed as serious misconduct.

NG: By refusing to be reassigned?

WARFEL: That is correct.

SPECHLER: A word further on the flagship concept. That is loose talk. What is on paper in Strategic Direction 1.5 is the following sentence which ought to reassure my colleague from the School of Law..."Retain the Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses as the focus of doctoral and terminal professional degrees." I think that is very reassuring for us. The other thing is, for people to reflect on the naval history and success of such flagships as the Bismarck and the Missouri. [laughter].

KOLESKI: If a faculty member is transferred out of an area of expertise into a new area, I would presume that faculty member would have time to prepare for the new area. The question then turns out to be, how much and what kinds of resources can be used in relation to helping the faculty member make the change?

WARFEL: I think in regard to professional incompetence we talked about transferring someone into an area where they work and were competent or could be competent; taking them out of an area where they are incompetent. That is not a play in the scenario I described. It was not a matter of incompetence. It

was a matter of 'you came here to do this, but I am sorry you aren't going to do it anymore.'

KARLSON: There are two possible scenarios here. One is a need scenario in which there is a need scenario in which there is a need in this field and they transfer someone from another area because of that need. I can see that if that is the basis of the transfer, to refuse that transfer could be considered misconduct assuming you have confidence in that field and you are given time to obtain that confidence. What if you are dealing with a personality clash when it is being done for a particular purpose? I could say in particular an untenured faculty member. A movement into a new area could delay their research significantly so they would not meet the qualifications for tenure. Is there any attempt to make a distinction between the reasons for this transfer and also the additional time that the untenured faculty member would have to have to acquire the expertise in this new field to start making a contribution that tenure requires.

KOLESKI: I would like to follow up on a previous question. I understand that the organizations which employ us are concerned with their organizational survival and achievement as they have to be. But, at the same time, to move a faculty member from one department to another without the opportunity for adequate preparation to do something new is quite unforgivable.

KARLSON: There was no answer to my question. Is there any response to that?

WARFEL: I think you made very good points. There are a number of valid reasons for rearranging the work of an individual and I think it is important to study them in any given case. My purpose in mentioning the whole thing here at Council today is not to analyze any particular case. I do think that we shouldn't under estimate the importance of this having happened. The importance to other faculty members. I think they should be aware that this can happen.

PLATER: I would just comment very briefly because I think that what has been described here are a set of hypothetical situations. We could all conjure up details that would make us think that something unfair, perhaps unjust has been done. It is very difficult to have a discussion like this where the situation is so hypothetical or abstract. In dealing with specific cases, Kathy Warfel and I often talk about the specific individuals, and I think we are able to sort out the issues reasonably. We may not agree on them. I think other people would as well if they were look at specific cases. The point that I have tried to make in dealing with this general topic is that there is a Faculty Board of Review process which assures all faculty of an opportunity for a hearing before peers. That right is unabridged and unaffected by anything that might happen in the way of an assignment of faculty to work that they feel is inappropriate. Faculty have that right and should exercise it when they feel that they are being asked to do something that is unreasonable.

ROTHER: Faculty Boards of Review, to my knowledge, does not have the power to say 'You may not.' Then can the administration tell the director they cannot move this person? Is that what you are saying? If the Faculty Board of Review says that this is not fair, then the administration can reverse the decision?

PLATER: The recommendation goes to the Chancellor. The Chancellor has the authority to accept or reject or accept in part the recommendation of a Faculty Board of Review.

BEPKO: We have never had a recommendation from a Faculty Board of Review, that I recall, which has been rejected. We have had some that we have had to modify. We have had some that we didn't think we could implement quite as they were made, but we have not taken action that was directly inconsistent with a Faculty Board of Review recommendation ever that I know of.

KARLSON: Just as a follow up on this. If a faculty member is given a reassignment, his request for a Faculty Board of Review is going to take some period of time. I assume that the _____ that reassignment pending the Faculty Board of Review's recommendation, particularly if he isn't given adequate notice. In theory, what happens during that period because his qualifications, his teaching report, his teaching standards for the students are going to be low if he hasn't had time to prepare. That justifies other action.

TURNER: The questions you raise are important and especially since we are now faced with the needing to respond the cases. The language in the original policy, which I don't have at my finger tips right now, anticipate some of this. Maybe for the next meeting you could look back at the actual language of the policy that we passed and then come back to us. I think some of what you are asking, Ray and Henry, is covered in the policy. I am not sure if all of it is. It may be that we would be better off if we had the language in front of us.

AGENDA ITEM VII: QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

SIDHU (Alternate for Karen Teegarden): Service by the faculty members has been a very important factor for IUPUI. That has been a great strength of IUPUI. My question to Chancellor Bepko is, have we tried to convince the Trustees to keep service as an important factor for rewarding in promotion and tenure of the faculty members or in calculating the contributions of the faculty members in general? We are talking about the work load in the teaching courses. Service should be included in calculating the work load. I think service needs to be paid some attention because, if you neglect service, some of the members, those who have been active in university service may drop out of it and that will be a great setback for the progress of IUPUI. My question is, are you going to try or have you tried to convince the Trustees to pay some attention to service?

BEPKO: Yes. There is a group working on defining service and its value to the institution right now. Bill [Plater] may want to comment on that.

PLATER: There is a task force jointly appointed by President Warfel and myself to look at professional service with the goal of issuing a document that we can take a look at as faculty it will help in recording and documenting the work of faculty in service and making it known, not only to ourselves for the faculty rewards process, but also to the public such as the Board of Trustees. I think the work of that committee is very important. It is chaired by Jeff Vessely and I am sure he would be very eager to hear

from members of this Council about their interest in the work of that task force. I would also say that the Strategic Directions Charter talks a great deal about service. I think this will be a very important subject for discussion among faculty during the coming year. The point that you are making is to be foregrounded in those discussions. So, I think there will be many opportunities for us on this campus and university wide to address the issue of service and its role as a part of our overall responsibilities.

The final comment that I would make is that in the Teaching Capacity Model we have tried to take into account service of two particular kinds. One is the service that is rendered in mentoring and advising students which I tend to think of as being part of our teaching responsibilities, but in some people's minds is regarded it as service. It is important to record and document that work of the faculty. Of course, there is administrative service--people who are department chairs or advisors of graduate programs, etc. The model tries to take that into account reporting that part of the faculty work to the Trustees.

SIDHU: Somehow we are getting either the wrong signal or feeling that service should not be given that much importance that it has been given in the past. That is the reason I asked that question.

BEPKO: There is a question that I know is lingering here that I would like to answer even though it hasn't been articulated and that is, what is this Strategic Directions project going to do to our campus planning process, which we have been developing for a number of years? As you recall, last year we distributed documents reflecting the thinking of groups that were at work in envisioning the future of IUPUI. We had planning concepts built around four ideas that the institution's quality was the most important factor in developing its future. That collaboration was a key to our future. That centrality -- the location of our institution -- was key to our future and that identity issues were very important to achieving the kind of institution we would like to develop. All of that goes forward in partnership with the Strategic Directions project. In fact, there is tremendous overlap. The planning ideas that we have had on our agenda and that have been in front of you for some time now coincide directly with the Strategic Directions task force reports. So, you will be hearing about these projects going forward together and you will be receiving documents and reports from groups that will include your membership as well as the membership of people in the administration as the fall term unfolds and as we move into the spring. I should also mention that the funding that has been set aside to support Strategic Directions projects will be looked at with the hope that our campus planning and the Strategic Directions will coincide and that we will have funded proposals, initiatives, that will attract funding in this process and that will reflect both the Strategic Directions initiatives and our own initiatives.

Finally, I think it is important in this setting to make one point about all of this planning; that is, that we have thought all along that IUPUI would be something special and different. It would not be exactly the same as Bloomington. If we define ourselves in terms of Bloomington, I think we will lose --not only because politically it will be very difficult to convince the State of Indiana that they should have another Bloomington without disparaging Bloomington. I don't think the state wants another Bloomington. What they want is a new model -- something that we can provide in this setting because of our quality, because of our history of collaboration, because of centrality in our location, and because of the developing identity that we will have that sets us apart from Bloomington. I think we will inherit the

future and we won't do it because we are going to emulate and insist on a particular teaching load that originated in Bloomington. I think that the most important thing for us to do is to make that our new identity so that people have sufficient appreciation for it and can join the bandwagon that will cause this campus eventually to be the flagship, if you want to use that expression.

PETERSON: I have a question about administrative positions. I saw a line in the newspaper a month or so ago about the combination of two administrative offices. Apparently David Robbins' office was combined with Bob Martin's office. This is positive in some ways. It would reduce the number of Vice Chancellors by one by doing it. I was unclear as to the rationale for this -- whether there is a move to centralization of some of these facilities or whether this was just an expeditious move or whether it is true.

BEPKO: We were trying to respond to your oft-repeated comment that we have too many vice chancellors so we did something about it. [laughter] Our concern was primarily for showing in a way that affected our own work, and that will require some sacrifices on our part, that we are just as serious about the costs of operating as we have asked others to be. We think we can handle this new combination of responsibilities without losing anything. We think that we will be able to do the same sort of work that we did before, but with less in the way of senior people. It won't result, we hope, in any loss of services.

PETERSON: That was our concern as faculty. Obviously, we have enough concern and that is there are too many administrative persons which will detract from our overall budget of the campus.

BEPKO: We want to do more with less.

PETERSON: We are all apparently trying to do that.

TURNER: That is the end of the Question and Answer Period. We will move on to our next agenda item.

AGENDA ITEM VII: DRAFT: PRINCIPLES OF UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION (IUPUI Circular 95-24)

TURNER: You have before you the draft of the Principles of Undergraduate Education at IUPUI. Our business today is to discuss these principles. You have seen them before. They have been out to the schools for consideration. Those responses have been brought back. They have been to the committees of the Faculty Council and now we need to look at and consider them and, if possible, to endorse them as principles that would be used campus wide. Kathy, would you talk a little about this?

WARFEL: You will remember last year we constituted the Council on Undergraduate Learning and agreed that it would serve as a forum for discussion about Undergraduate Learning issues campus wide. The reconstituted Council has the dean of each of the schools with an undergraduate mission or the

dean's designee, an elected faculty member from each of those schools, the offices of the Faculty Council, plus the chairs of Budgetary Affairs, Student Affairs, and Academic Affairs committees, administrative members on it. It has turned out to be, I think, a very useful forum for working towards consensus. You also remember when we agreed on the CUL process that the CUL was not going to be making decisions. It was going to be facilitative decision making.

We are at the point with our campus wide Principles of Undergraduate Learning, started out as campus wide Principles of General Education. We have initial input from each of the schools. It has been analyzed. The analysis has been sent back out to schools. It has been sent to our Academic Affairs and Student Affairs committees, etc. Pretty much at this point all the groups have signed off on these principles as being what we can agree to campus wide.

Looking at these principles was on this Faculty Council's agenda for May but the wrong attachment was sent out so we didn't get a chance to look at it last May. I had been asked by the faculty in SPEA why they are not demonstrated in Table I since they are in fact a significant part of this. Barbara had indicated that it was an omission because of the timing and many apologies. SPEA is also a very important part of the Undergraduate Learning mission.

So, at this point this is a chance for the Council to have an opinion about these nine principles that have been, if you have read this document, carefully called from what each of the school statements about general education or undergraduate learning said.

SPECHLER: I think that this is basically a good job and I like the principles, but any process of integration depends on the kind of questions that are asked and the method of collating answers. Very curiously and very troubling to me is the fact that the international dimension which is identified explicitly in our Mission Statement that was just promulgated is totally absent from these nine principles. There is no mention whatever of the fact that our country is becoming more and more a part of the local society and that our economy, our poverty, and our culture is intimately and more and more connected with the international reality. No mention of this. It can't be that schools are not aware of this. Our school, the School of Liberal Arts, certainly has what I would call international dimension -- a foreign language. The School of Business has what is called an international dimension. Somehow in the collation of this document, that was entirely deleted. I would like to call on the Council to add the international dimension as a tenth principle which will explicitly be considered by the Council on Undergraduate Learning. About one dozen colleagues and I have consulted and we bring forth a page which has been endorsed by a number of members of our faculty and which explains why this principle should be explicitly recognized as it is in our Mission Statement and how it could be implemented throughout the campus. So, I would like to move that this proposal be forwarded to the committee for study and report.

WARFEL: Martin, it doesn't fit under Understanding Society and Culture?

SPECHLER: No. A lot of things fit, Kathy, but I noticed that professional philosophy is mentioned,

professional economics is not mentioned, but professional philosophy is mentioned. Why? If it is acceptable, let's put it in. I don't think that there is any great importance to whether it is a separate principle. We are not going to teach principles, but the important thing is whether we are going to teach about our international connections on this campus. I very much think that we should and so do more than one dozen of my colleagues in the School of Liberal Arts just in a preliminary canvas of their opinion.

WILSON: In the Council of Liberal Arts and Science we would include international education and we do under Understanding Society and Culture. We are having discussions about what exactly does that mean in curriculum and part of our discussion has included foreign language. So, it is actually in there. I think faculty understand it to be in there. It is not excluded just because the word 'international' isn't in there. Culture doesn't mean just American culture or Indiana culture or Indianapolis culture. It can mean culture period -- culture all over the world. I don't see any problem.

BALDWIN: If we had the words, instead of Understanding Society and Culture, we would say 'Understanding the World's Societies and Cultures.' That would include all societies and cultures. Indiana society is a broad culture.

WILSON: But, by not specifying it, you don't exclude it.

BALDWIN: No, but I think there is an interest in...

WILSON: But, we can do that for every special interest on this campus and try to include every special word to include everybody's interest. For example, in Library Science, maybe that should go in there too, because it is....

BARLOW: When we did the Council of Liberal Arts and Science principles we didn't try to do it in terms of sound bytes. This list here is almost a list of sound bytes. We specified for each principle that we had what that actually meant and were clear about some of the international dimensions. I think the conception here is a bunch of sound bytes. We know what sound bytes have done to politics in this country. I didn't notice this, but because I was so aware of the presence of the international dimension in some of the original documents that I took for granted, but there is a danger in having a document where it doesn't have a couple of phrases here and there, without specifying exactly what those phrases mean. That hasn't been done. Ten years from now someone could act on the assumption that there is no expectation of anything international in general education.

In one of the principles listed, Principle #1 Core Skills, it was felt necessary to specify what those core skills were to make sure that none were left out. It seems to me when you say, under #4, Understanding Society and Culture, we could be equally specific. I think what Jim Baldwin suggested is as simple as possible to solve this problem. I think the point that Martin made is a good point. I think we need to get international in there somewhere.

WARFEL: Those are very important points. It has been a long road to get to this document and I don't think that anybody views this stage right here as "Oh good! We have done that, we can now go on a do something else." It is an incredible accomplishment to have gotten as many factions as already agreed on these nine sound bytes. So, I would suggest, if we could say today that we accept this as the starting point and where do we go from here? The next step is to flush these out, to define more clearly what we mean.

BARLOW: There is a motion on the floor that Martin made. Martin, would it be satisfactory to your motion, if Jim Baldwin's suggestion was added to say, "Understanding World Society and Culture?"

TURNER: It is not exactly on the floor. It didn't get a second.

BARLOW: Oh, it didn't. **VERMETTE:** I second it.

TURNER: It has now been seconded.

BARLOW: I agree completely with Kathy about doing this as simply as possible, but I think we have to get it in there somehow.

KOLESKI: The committee, to get this far, should be commended. They have done a remarkable job in trying to raise our awareness of "cultures" and "societies." I like the idea of the gentleman from the Library [Jim Baldwin]. Our School of Social Work was faced with the same issue in relation to re-accreditation. This led us to rethink our society's relationship to others in the world as to social and economic well-being, social problems, and social services. With due recognition of the fact that we live in multiple cultures in our society, we had already embraced the concept of the plural "cultures." The School, thanks to one primary person and a few other key people, has a long standing international program. But, we were still using the singular term - "society" in our curriculum material. It is just not possible to do that nowadays with people, goods, services, ideas, information and decisions flowing across societal boundaries. We now use the plural -- "cultures" and "societies." Many of the things that transcend boundaries are positive for us in the United States and for those in other countries. But, we also must be aware that when Glaxo makes a decision in England, it affects 1,400 jobs in North Carolina. We in the United States do the same to other countries. We live in a world of "cultures" and "societies" and we have to recognize that there are both positives and negatives in the reality of growing international relationships.

NG: Point of information. According to the handwritten note at the bottom, everyone should have two years of foreign language?

SPECHLER: That is the opinion of Lucila [Mena]. It is just to show you, Bart, that some people would go even further than I would. **[laughter]**

NG: The School of Science has no language requirement for graduation. I am not sure what the motion

is.

SPECHLER: The motion is not to adopt here. The motion--I'll accept Jim's idea or other ideas--that is not the issue. The issue is to have international dimension considered on its merits by the appropriate committee and not here. That is all that is in the motion. This is to show that it is feasible. I would ask people to support simply the idea of referring it to the appropriate committee for study and report.

TURNER: The motion, then, would accept that we could go ahead and give our blessing to the document as it has been shaped and add to it, as we send it along, the statement that the further committees consider specifically international dimension?

SPECHLER: That is fine, Richard.

VERMETTE: I have a question for Martin. Do you want the international dimension to become a tenth principle or do you want it worked into #4 "Understanding Society and Culture?" If you look at Table #2, on the next page under #4, would adding it in there be sufficient as one of the possibilities or dimensions to that particular principle?

SPECHLER: The answer, Rosalie, is that I prefer a tenth principle, but as we all do who engage in this there will be give and take. The real importance is not whether it is ten commandments or 613 commandments or some other count, the important thing is what we do, how it is implemented. If the implementation takes the international dimension seriously, as I think this proposal does, then whether we have five, nine, ten, or 600 principles, really doesn't matter.

KUBITSCHEK: I support John Barlow's comment because it seems to me that one of the ways to get all of these groups, these factions, to agree on something is vague language. I would point to #9 -- Communication --which I had assumed would be writing, reading, and speaking. If we look at what Communication covers on that fourth page, there is a lot about collaboration. Communication and collaboration are not the same thing. You can make a case that they are related, but they are certainly not the same thing. I would like to know what is meant by communication. There is nothing there spelling it out. If it is not reading, writing, and speaking, what is it?

WARFEL: I would suspect that collaboration is under Communication because the idea is that one needs to be able to communicate in order to collaborate.

KUBITSCHEK: If we are going to have collaboration as a principle, I think it ought to appear directly as a principle for approval.

ORME: I am not sure I know at this point what it is, but before we go into communication and collaboration, I think there is a motion on the floor referring to the second. Should we not know whether that motion passes first?

TURNER: We have a motion to send along with whatever our disposition is of these principles, at least to add to it a suggestion that the international dimension be included explicitly as the principles are disseminated and incorporated. Included in that suggestion will be the recommendation that it be included as an independent principle or as a part of an expanded definition of something like Principle #4. I trust that implicit in that, Martin, is your willingness to send along your specific recommendations to whomever.

ROTHE: Point of order. What is the exact motion? Are we approving this. If we are approving this, we have all sorts of problems with something being added on when we have no idea of what the exact wording is.

TURNER: The principles have been developed through the process that the Council on Undergraduate Learning has adopted as its procedure and have gone to schools as well as to committees of the Faculty Council. At this point, all or at least most of these bodies have accepted this version of the principles. It is our intent then, if we can do it today, to approve these as the principles that will be used across the campus as the shaping forces in the undergraduate curriculum.

WARFEL: What we are doing now is saying, "Okay, the CUL has worked on this and this is what we have come up with so far, please comment on it and, if the Faculty Council's comment is "It is not too bad, but we are not going to sign off on it until you fix this international issue problem," that is fine. If the Faculty Council wants to say "I think this is a reasonable place for us to be, we endorse these principles, but we strongly suggest to the CUL that the international dimension be worked out and please report back to us." That is fine.

ROTHE: If you want that last one in the form of a motion, I would be happy to make it. What we have now is nothing specific.

WARFEL: I thought that the motion was that one message this Council is sending back to the CUL is that the CUL should, through the CUL process, bring up the international dimension and see if everyone who has already agreed to the document as it stands and will agree to the document with a stronger international statement. It was my understanding that the motion on the floor does not say "We will accept it with that." It is just that all by itself.

ROTHE: Would somebody please read the exact motion?

SPECHLER: The original motion said that the committee will consider and report about international dimension. Now, if you don't figure that there would be any way that the international dimension would be appropriate, you should vote "No." If you think that it might be worth thinking about, I urge you to vote "Yes."

TURNER: Is that acceptable to you as a motion? Is that clear, Carl?

ROTHER: Is that an amendment?

TURNER: We did not bring this to the Council in terms of a specific motion. It is an item for discussion because that is the way the procedure is set.

ROTHER: So, we have no motion?

TURNER: What we can do as a Council is choose to approve these principles as they stand and then we can also add on Martin's suggestion about the international dimension. We can do that separately. The motion that is on the floor is Martin's motion. The motion that the Council can pull together to decide on, if they choose to do it at all, is that the Council approves of and recommends these as the nine principles on Undergraduate Education. What happened is that Martin's motion is on the floor and we can vote on that.

WILSON: I actually would vote on that motion to get rid of it because I think that he is right. We need to have it more explicitly stated in here exactly what we mean. Maybe not exactly what we mean by these things. If we are too exact, we will never get it passed. But, we ought to be a little more explicit and not, as John said, just have a set of sound bytes that we can't define.

STOCKBERGER: Do we have the authority to add in words at this point and then approve it? So, could we could add "Understanding World's Society and Culture" and then approve it?

WARFEL: The whole problem with getting this sort of thing campus wide is that this doesn't belong to the Faculty Council. It belongs to the Faculty Council and the school faculties. It is not something that is brought to us because we are "the" final word on it. I suppose we could say a final, "No" and that would have a pretty strong impact, but it really isn't our document. It is a campus wide document.

KOLESKI: Point of information. Is this a report to the Faculty Council? Then, doesn't this come in the form of a motion that we could vote on and then follow up with Martin's proposal?

WARFEL: It is being brought to the Faculty Council to see if the Faculty Council can endorse these principles.

KOLESKI: Can we vote on this document and then go to Martin's motion?

TURNER: We could had we presented it as a report that had that as its motion.

KOLESKI: We didn't record the motion?

TURNER: We can. It didn't come in that form; Martin's motion got on the floor first.

WARFEL: Can we call for the question on Martin's behalf?

TURNER: We can respond to Martin's motion and then proceed to the focus on the principles themselves.

KARLSON: Point of information. Exactly from what committee is this being brought to the Faculty Council? Is that a committee of the Faculty Council or is it a committee of some other organization? Then, for what purpose is it being brought to the Faculty Council?

TURNER: What you have before you was brought to you from the Executive Committee.

KARLSON: So, it is a committee of the Faculty Council. As a committee of the Faculty Council we, as the Faculty Council, have the right to change that report of the committee and report on it as changed if that is what we want to do. If it is merely being brought to us for purposes of information and a straw vote, that is something different. I would like to know exactly what the status of this document is so that we can know what we can or cannot do with it.

TURNER: The status of the document is that the Executive Committee is bringing it to your attention for your discussion and understanding and with the possibility that the Council will decide that these principles are indeed valuable as they stand and, therefore, vote the approval of these principles as part of the undergraduate learning process. It certainly is true that the Council has every right to change however many words in this report as it approves it. As Kathy suggested, that is something that has a very big cost in terms of time. So, it is something that shouldn't be done lightly.

KOLESKI: Point of information. We can't amend something that hasn't been passed. So, we have to pass something in order to amend it.

TURNER: No. We can change the report as submitted before we vote on it.

ROBBINS: A little bit of history might help this discussion. We got to where we are today as a result of actions this Council took over a year ago to assign responsibility for this issue to the Council on Undergraduate Learning. And, as part of that action, we restructured that Council in a way that we felt would adequately represent all the interested constituencies in that process. I think that what we should do now is respond to how we feel that process has gone. That is what Martin Spechler is doing. The group he represents looked at the process and concluded that the international dimension of the principles was inadequate and they are now asking the body that we charged with the responsibility to review that. All of that is quite appropriate. But the notion that the product, i.e., the principles, be brought back to this body for approval isn't an appropriate follow-up to our action last year. For the very reason that Kathy points out, having this body try to deal with the adoption and approval of the principles leads us, as predicted, right where we are now. We appropriately assigned the responsibility to the Council on Undergraduate Learning, and we should now simply comment on what we think the quality of that process has been and instruct them to continue the process.

LANGSAM: My biggest concern about all of this is to send a document back that we approve part of it but say, "You haven't exactly done it." What is the group that gets it back do with a document that we have approved but we told them that they are not finished? I think that perhaps we would be better off if we feel that the international component is an issue, to approve Martin's motion, send the whole back to the committee and get a document we know what are going to approve. If we send back 92 percent of it with this eight percent that we don't know, we are going to kill a lot more trees, they are not going to be able to proceed because they have this thing hanging around that they are waiting for us to hear from them and then approve. I would like to call for the vote on Martin's motion. Once we do that, then we can take up tabling the product until we get a response from them that we can vote on. I don't see how we can vote on something we don't know what it is exactly. That is what I think we are doing. I would like to call for the vote.

TURNER: The question has been called. There is no controversy about that matter. Could we then take a vote on the motion as made by Martin and seconded by Rosalie? All in favor of the motion, say "Aye." Opposed? [A few nays] The ayes have it and the motion passes. The next order of business will be the decision as to whether or not we take a position on this document today.

KARLSON: I move that we resubmit to the committee with directions consistent with the motion which we just voted on.

PENNA: I second that.

TURNER: Is there discussion of this motion?

WYMA: I would like to comment on earlier discussion concerning the Communication principle (Item #9) in the report. In my opinion, the descriptions of communication are worthy of further consideration. I would like the Council to review the descriptions of Communication in terms of writing, reading, and speaking.

TURNER: The process is meant to be one of moving towards consensus all along and that at any point in the process regarding any of these points you are welcome to make comments. If we, on the other hand, would like to develop an individual motion for each one of these suggestions or questions, I suppose we could do that as well.

LANGSAM: Excuse me, but unless I am misunderstanding what I am reading, Table #2 is not really exactly the committee's definition of what the principles are, but phrases from different schools which they think reflect that...this is not a definition. We are really left with sound bytes and phrases because it says "Table 2 contains a list of all key phrases used by the school. The key phrases have been grouped under the principles to which they apply." I am not sure that is right, but I don't think those are definitions. I think that is what some people have been thinking they were.

KREMER: You can see the problem that you got with general education with this discussion. This is why it is sound bytes. What we have in this table thus far are all of the key words that we use in every school.

LANGSAM: In what?

KREMER: In documents that each was asked to say what are the key objectives, the key statements that you think about general education. We took that set from each school and cut out, literally on paper, the key concepts in each school. We ordered them and we took what we thought were the most descriptive statements to describe that grouping. So, you are exactly right. These are not intended to be definitions. What they are is what every school gave us. It so happens that international is not mentioned here because it was not a key statement that we saw in any of the school documents. This process has been going on for five years. It is a long, long time and I can tell you that in every discussion in which this comes up, no matter whether it is this group of close to 50 or 5 or 2, there is disagreement about what they think. One of the reasons that there aren't statements here is that to narrow this down to absolutely what we can agree on, we had a document that was put out roughly two or three years ago that had a set of descriptive statements. That created a great deal of concern. Our hope is now to at least define the areas and then go from there.

In addition, it has been a concept, is that these are not things that we want to put anywhere on the wall of a building and say these are our principles. This is supposed to be an involving document. What I think ought to be done, in my opinion, is approve these and then the next statement we would like for you to strongly consider international dimension and then, by all means, try in your next step to define what each of these are. What we will do is go back to each school, investigate how they do this, how each school defines it, and then we will come back with a statement like this that indicates what each school thinks these principles mean.

TURNER: The motion on the floor is that we resubmit this to the committee along with the suggestion about international dimension. We are going to close this discussion very soon.

KOLESKI: Often we have heard that 'a camel is a horse put together by a committee.' But, the thing goes and you don't get your feet burned if you have some sort of transportation. If they have gone this far, let's support them.

ORME: If I am reading this correctly, this document was not brought to us today to approve, but rather to review and there is to be continual modification of this before it is redrafted and redistributed.

TURNER: That is true. We can simply review it as we have and leave it. The Executive Committee simply raised the possibility that upon review we might want to agree. That hasn't happened.

ORME: Rather than trying to approve the document in this session, it seems to me it might be more fruitful to invite those who have comments to forward them to someone who is appropriate so that you

can consider them as they start to redraft this document rather than getting hung up today as to whether we can approve the exact wording is in front of us.

KUBITSCHKEK: I don't believe in approving first and defining second.

TURNER: The motion on the floor is that we send this back to the Council on Undergraduate Learning with our suggestions about how they might see its definition and that we are withholding our approval at least for the time being. If there is no further discussion, all in favor of that motion, say "Aye." Opposed? [a few] Abstentions? [none] The motion carries. We will send it back to the Council on Undergraduate Learning.

AGENDA ITEM VIII: PROPOSAL FOR AN IUPUI UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT AND REVIEW PROCESS (Circular 95-28)

TURNER: Let me, if I may, call your attention to the Proposal for an IUPUI Undergraduate Curriculum Development and Review Process. You have seen this before. It has been revised again. This is the document which asked the Council On Undergraduate Learning to use this Curriculum Committee to negotiate and develop proposals from across the campus. We are bringing it to you today from the Executive Committee to ask you to approve this Undergraduate Curriculum development and review process. That is the motion that is on the floor. It doesn't need a second. Is there discussion of the proposal for the IUPUI Undergraduate Curriculum Development and Review process?

LANGSAM: I need a point of clarification. Does this mechanism replace all existing school curricula committees?

WARFEL: No.

LANGSAM: So then, presumably, what would happen is a course would go from this school curricula committee to this committee?

WARFEL: No.

LANGSAM: I guess several of my points is that I am not totally clear how to know which courses would go to this for approval and, more importantly, if it is an add on. It already takes close to a year to get a course approved and if you count the time to get it into the schedule of classes, you are talking about a year and one half. I am not sure this process is going to expedite developing courses at the undergraduate level. That is a concern and I would like somebody who is involved in this to speak to it for my own better understanding of how this will function and how it will speed up or slow down getting new courses approved.

BARLOW: There is no curriculum committee on campus at IUPUI. There is for graduate courses. This is not meant to be a curriculum committee to approve every course that is proposed by any means. The

purpose of this committee is to mainly review conflicts in curricula and particularly to satisfy the needs that this campus has. We have Responsibility Centered Budgeting no kind of committee that would be able to consider when schools were teaching courses that really belong to another school. It is more or less an appeals committee. We have such a committee at the graduate school level but we never have had one at the undergraduate level. It may be required to consider specific courses, but ordinarily ...

LANGSAM: So, the review process is its main function?

BARLOW: It also serves to make suggestions too.

KARLSON: Would this then have the authority to tell, for example, the department of psychology that they couldn't teach a particular course because it should be taught in the School of Education?

WARFEL: Let me try to clarify that. This document describes a process and part of that process is the creation of the IUPUI Undergraduate Curriculum Committee that would report to the Council on Undergraduate Learning and through that Council mechanism to all of the schools and to the Faculty Council and the committees and the campus administration. One of the roles of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee is to keep abreast of courses that are being developed and also to receive concerns from faculty about the dispute issue. This Curriculum Committee does not sit in judgment about disputes. The Curriculum Committee receives concerns about interdisciplinary curricular disputes and, under the guidance of the CUL, it assembles appropriately constituted faculty and administrator working groups to find solutions. This committee doesn't make any decisions at all. This committee keeps on top of the situation, tries to facilitate the development of curriculum, tries to facilitate working out solutions to disputes, but it is not a "court." It is not an authoritative courts of appeals. It is just a group that has as its charge "Would you please go out there and keep track of what is going on with undergraduate curriculum? When you see something come up that needs fixing, let's figure out a way to fix it."

WILSON: So, what this is, is an improvement over the process as it exist right now. I will just give you one example. With all deference to Dean Plater who did an excellent job in this, we had a dispute between the anatomy department and the department of biology over teaching anatomy. The department of anatomy said, "Anatomy should be taught in Anatomy. Of course, that is why we call it the anatomy department." Whereas, biology has historically been teaching service anatomy courses for nursing and allied health for years. It came up as a dispute. Who should do this? Finally, the only way it could be solved was that somebody had to decide, and in this case it was Dean Plater, what would allowed and what would not be allowed in teaching courses in anatomy on this campus. The problem with that is that you end up having to send it to higher administration because that was the only way to dissolve the dispute. We had to bring in an administrator to help us sit down and do it. It would have been better to have a faculty group sit down and do it because this is something that is supposed to be in the hands of faculty.

I think that this particular document is a very well worded way of avoiding a couple of problems. One

problem is that some people don't want to have a curriculum committee that sits up and decides these things -- just decides them as an authoritative court -- for lots of different reasons. So this is very carefully worded to avoid that and to keep curriculum decisions in the schools with the faculty where those decisions really belong.

TURNER: Due to the lateness hour may I ask if we are ready to vote on this proposal today?

WILSON: I had one more point. I just gave this document to the Agenda Committee in my school to bring back to the departments for discussion because that was my direction and I gave it to them at the very first meeting. This has not been discussed in my school as was promised to be done. If it is approved today, this hasn't really been discussed.

WARFEL: This is just like the other document we had. Our committees have been involved in developing this document throughout the entire year. The Academic Affairs Committee has been involved through their representation on the Council on Undergraduate Learning in doing this. Today we are bringing to this Faculty Council and, if the Council says "Yes, we accept this" and your school says "No, we don't accept it," then the CUL has a problem. Then the CUL has to say, "okay, I guess we don't have it quite right yet." So, the fact that this body expresses an opinion about it today, it is a parallel thing with your school. We are not supreme over your school. Nor is your school supreme over the opinion of this Council. It is one of those campuswide consensus things. Everybody is going to be asked to comment on this. If we can comment on it today, fine and if we can't, we can't.

NG: It seems to me we have commented about it enough. Do we need a vote?

WARFEL: If you could vote that you like this, that would be great.

TURNER: As you ready to take a vote on this? All in favor of expressing approval of this structure as developed by the Council on Undergraduate Learning, please say "Aye." Opposed? [a few] Abstention? [none] The ayes have it. We will announce to the CUL that the Faculty Council has considered this and is happy with it as it is presented.

I would like to apologize for not getting to the agenda, especially to John Kremer who came to report on the Task Force on Student Evaluation of Teaching. I hope we can persuade him to come back again. If you will allow me just a couple of minutes, was there anything on the IUPUI - IV Tech Office that had to get announced today?

PLATER: No, but JoAnn Switzer very kindly came to the meeting today as well. If I may take one minute to explain something. Most of you know that IUPUI and Ivy Tech formed a joint center on the 38th Street campus that was in operation for the past two years. That center served its purpose reasonably well. However, we had a review committee made up of several representative faculty chaired by Scott Evenbeck. Some of the members were Bart Ng, Richard Turner, and others who were directly involved with the operation of the Joint Center. We were overtaken by events with the decision to close

the 38th Street facility and thereby close the physical center. In continuing our conversations with Ivy Tech about cooperation, our program evolved, if you will, into an office of coordinated programs that continues to be directed by JoAnn Switzer with the purpose of trying to avoid needless competition between Ivy Tech and IUPUI in offering courses particularly in the General Education areas. We will try to work together so that if we are offering courses at off-campus sites, we are doing it at a planned, deliberate fashion. In addition, JoAnn will continue to work with Ivy Tech to make it possible for students who are transferring from Ivy Tech to IUPUI to have the benefit of the student services that we can provide to coordinate work between, for example, the Financial Aids Office, the Admissions Office, etc.

Finally, the office will work in helping market to the public an understanding of the relationship between IUPUI and Ivy Tech so that our missions are clearly differentiated but also that we have substantial areas of overlap. In these areas we are working closely together for the benefit of the citizens. That is being carried out by JoAnn and an office that is equally funded by IUPUI and Ivy Tech. We wanted to let you know this evolution and, if you have questions after the meeting, you may ask JoAnn or me.

TURNER: Thank you, Dean Plater. We are running out of time, however, the agenda items which we have not discussed today will be on the agenda for next month's meeting.

AGENDA ITEM XIV: ADJOURNMENT

TURNER: The meeting is adjourned.

Approved March 7, 1996

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY INDIANAPOLIS

Faculty Council Meeting

October 5, 1995

School of Dentistry, Room 115

3:30 - 5:30 p.m.

Present: Administration: Chancellor Gerald L. Bepko, Dean William Plater. **Deans:** John Barlow, Angela McBride, Doris Merritt, Robert Shay. **Elected Faculty:** Larry Abel, Margaret Applegate, Susan Ball, Ulf Jonas Bjork, Lynn Broderick, Paul Brown, Kenneth Byrd, Lucinda Carr, Michael Cohen, Jeannette Dickerson-Putman, Carlos Goldberg, William Hohlt, Dolores Hoyt, Michael Klemsz, Raymond Koleski, Golam Mannan, Rebecca Markel, Dana McDonald, Bart Ng, Michael Penna, David Peters, Richard Peterson, Rebecca Porter, Ken Rennels, Virginia Richardson, Edward Robbins, Bernadette Rodak, Jane Schultz, Jerrold Stern, Stephen Stockberger, Karen Teegarden, Kathleen Warfel, Kathryn Wilson, Richard Wyma, Charles Yokomoto, Susan Zunt. **Ex Officio Members:** James Baldwin, Juanita Keck, Robert Lehnen, Justin Libby, Steven Mannheimer, Byron Olson, Carl Rothe, Martin Spechler, Richard Turner, Rosalie Vermette, Marshall Yovits. **Visitors:** Dean Erwin Boschmann (Faculty Development Office), Mark Grove (Registrar's Office), John Kremer (School of Science, Psychology), Joseph McConnell (Allied Health Sciences/Medical Technology), Doris Merritt (Acting Dean for Engineering and Technology), Melinda Phillabaum (Staff Council Representative).

Alternates Present: Deans: Ann Richmond for Walter Daly, J. M. Kapoor for Roberta Greene, James East for Kathy Krendl. **Elected Faculty:** Betty Jones for Elizabeth Evenbeck, Glenda Hood for Karen Gable, David Lewis for William Orme.

Absent: Administration: J. Herman Blake. **Deans:** A. James Barnes, Trevor Brown, H. William Gilmore, P. Nicholas Kellum, Norman Lefstein, John Rau, David Stocum, Philip Tomkins, Donald Warren, Charles Webb. **Elected Faculty:** Charalambos Aliprantis, W. Marshall Anderson, Merrill Benson, Joseph Bidwell, Diane Billings, Jana Bradley, Zacharie Brahma, Thomas Broadie, Timothy Brothers, David Burr, Timothy Byers, David Canal, Paul Dubin, Naomi Fineberg, Patricia Gallagher, Joe Garcia, Bernardino Ghetti, Robert Havlik, Antoinette Hood, Nathan Houser, Henry Karlson, M. Jan Keffer, Missy Kubitschek, Stephen Lalka, Miriam Langsam, Debra Mesch, Fred Pavalko, Richard Pflanzner, Brian Sanders, Mark Seifert, P Kent Sharp, Ananatha Shekhar, Jay Simon, Akhouri Sinha, James Wallihan, Karen West, Mervin Yoder. **Ex Officio Members:** Henry Besch, Ronald Dehnke, S Edwin Fineberg, Paul Galanti, Carlyn Johnson, Stephen Leapman.

AGENDA ITEM I CALL TO ORDER

TURNER: I am calling this meeting to order. I would like to remind you to identify yourself by name when you speak so the minutes can reflect what you have said.

AGENDA ITEM II ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT - Chancellor Gerald Bepko

BEPKO: I have a couple of items. First, Martin Spechler asked last time about data on SAT scores for entering students. We were going to have that information today; however, due to some data recovery issues, we haven't been able to get that ready yet, but we will have it next time. Mark Grove is signaling that we will have it at the November meeting. Perhaps, before, if you are interested, you could call and we could send it to you directly.

Secondly, something we do have to present to you today is a new dean and I think he is attending his first meeting as a dean of one of our schools, but he has attended these meetings many times as dean for Research and Sponsored Programs or as an associate dean in the School of Medicine. As you probably know, Al Potvin resigned as dean of the School of Engineering and Technology and we were successful in recruiting the best person that could ever be conceived of to be the acting dean of the school and a person with extraordinary experience and a good friend of us all -- Dr. Doris Merritt-- who is a professor of pediatric medicine and associate dean of the School of Medicine and all sorts of other laurels in her career, including a stint with the National Institutes of Health where she was the first director of the National Institute for Nursing Research. Doris has already become a leader of the Engineering and Technology faculty. The faculty seem very happy with her leadership and I would like to welcome you as a school dean, Doris.

MERRITT: Thank you.

BEPKO: We have an event that will be taking place this weekend at the American Cabaret Theater. I thought that Bill Plater might mention the event.

PLATER: Tonight is the opening night for "Eyes" which I hope all of you have heard about. It is a musical written by a local poet and part-time faculty colleague, Mari Evans, based on the novel of Zora Neale Hurston Their Eyes Were Watching God. This is a very special performance in that it involves a lot of very talented people who are joined together as a partnership between the University and the community. The music is being written and provided by David Baker, who is an extraordinarily well known and very talented jazz musician and a distinguished professor from Bloomington, along with other colleagues in the School of Music. Darrell Bailey from our music program has been making all of the arrangements; Dorothy Webb (Communications Department) has been providing lots of support. It is an event that has brought a lot of people together to make this evening possible. The performances will be tonight and then Friday and Saturday nights and Sunday afternoon -- this weekend and next weekend. It is also being sponsored as a part of the Wordstruck program, which is a city wide event. There will be some other activities associated with Wordstruck including opportunities to talk to Mari Evans and

people in the cast. But, as a part of our own contribution to the event, on Friday (tomorrow) there will be a symposium that will take place in two parts. The morning session at 9:30 will be led by Missy Kubitschek from the English department involving a panel of scholars from other universities who will talk about the play itself and the issues related to taking a novel and converting it into a play and musical. It should be a very interesting discussion.

In the afternoon, Claude McNeal, another of our colleagues from the English department, and the director of the American Cabaret Theater, which is also a partner in the production, will talk about the issue of funding for the arts and the changing political climate. So, this will be an event going on for a few days. We hope that you will participate in the symposium tomorrow and will have an opportunity to see "Eyes" during one of the eight performances.

BEPKO: We hope that you will participate in one of the performances or in the symposium tomorrow. Next we have some committees that have been appointed that I will call your attention to. We have copies of the rosters of some of these committees available on the table in the back if you would like to pick them up as you leave.

First, we have at long last the review committee for the Dean of the School of Science -- David Stocum. Laura Jensi is the chair. Laura is from the department of biology. You can see a list of the persons who have been appointed based on the recommendations of the school faculty and the agenda for the Executive Committee of the IUPUI Faculty Council. We have invited the persons listed on the sheet, in addition to Laura Jensi as chair, to serve as this review committee.

Secondly, the review committee list is not printed up, but I can tell you who is on the review committee for the Office of Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education. Sheldon Siegel will serve as chair and the committee will include Gayle Cox (Social Work), Kit Foster (Undergraduate Education Center), Ron Johnson (Retired Eli Lilly Executive), George Kuh (Professor of Education, Bloomington), Raima Larter (Chemistry), Bart Ng (Mathematics), Helen Schwartz (English), and John Snyder (Dean of the School of Allied Health Sciences). That letter has not been sent out yet so, among others, Bart Ng is here. He doesn't know that he is being invited to serve on this review committee; since he is smiling, I guess he will accept. *[Laughter]*

Also, we have search committees, one of which has just been appointed. Of course, Doris [Merritt] is Acting Dean in the School of Engineering and Technology. We just appointed a search committee for the deanship in Engineering and Technology. It is chaired by Antoinette Hood who is associate dean in the School of Medicine. She is a faculty member in the department of pathology and also dermatology in the School of Medicine. The membership of that search committee is listed on a sheet that you can also pick up at the back of the room as you are leaving.

Finally, if you are interested, there is a search committee that has been at work for sometime and recently filed its report. We have sent a memo to the school that is involved, the School of Medicine, indicating the four final candidates who were recommended by the search committee. Those final

candidates include two members of the faculty -- Evan Farmer who is chairman of Dermatology, and Robert Holden, who is chair of Radiology, and two external candidates -- Charles Krause who is the Senior Associate Dean and Senior Associate Hospital Director at the University of Michigan and Donald Nutter who is Vice Dean and Professor of Medicine at Northwestern University, School of Medicine. Those four candidates with their titles are listed on a memorandum which we have copies of in the back. Should you want that for your file, you are welcome to pick up a copy of that as well.

Finally, there is in the mail to you, you may have received it already, I hope you did. In fact, let me ask how many have received the October 2 version of the Draft Strategic Directions Charter that has emanated from this Strategic Directions Planning Process that has been underway since January. How many have received it now? [Several indicated they had] That is very good. How many have not received one and wish to have one? Dana, I will remember that. But, if others would like a copy, would you let me know afterwards and we will make sure that one is especially designated for you. They will be sent to every employee of Indiana University next week. They were sent to every member of the IUPUI Faculty Council and should have arrived by now, but if you haven't received one, we will get another one for you. Kathy Warfel may say more about this, but we hope you will look at this, read it, think about it, talk about it, talk to colleagues, talk to us, and help us make this Strategic Directions Charter the best statement of the strategic choices that Indiana University must make so that it can help us all over the next five years or so become, throughout the eight campuses of our University, "America's new public university."

AGENDA ITEM III PRESIDENT OF THE FACULTY REPORT: Kathleen Warfel

WARFEL: Actually, I don't have anything to report today. There are dozens of things cooking but nothing is done, so rather than take up time giving a long list of things that you will hear about soon, I am just going not to say anything.

AGENDA ITEM IV QUESTION / ANSWER PERIOD

TURNER: Moving onto the Question and Answer Period. We have ten minutes for this agenda item. Are there any questions?

KECK: It is not that I don't want to finish by 4:00, but for those of us who couldn't get into the new parking garage, our primary parking area, if we are on the north side of Michigan Street, is the Dental School parking lot. There is no walkway or any way to get from any of the buildings on the north side of the street to the south side without walking through the grass which is now newly seeded and muddy. Are there any plans to make sidewalks or some way to get actually to the places where we park?

BEPKO: Are you talking about the area where the Cottages used to be?

KECK: No. Just south of where the Cottages used to be. There used to be parking lots just north of Michigan Street in front of Coleman and in front of Long. That is now all grass. There is no place to

walk. We have to walk through there to get from our car to where we work. It would be nice if someone put a sidewalk in somewhere so we don't have to continuously walk in the muddy grass. Are there some plans for that since they have grassed in everything?

BEPKO: That is a good point. I don't know the answer, but I will find out and if there are no plans for any sidewalks, there ought to be some. We know from experience that if you don't build sidewalks in the places where people want them, they create what is called "desire lines" in the grass. I think what we would be best advised to do is to report back and if others are interested, we will make a report at the next meeting; if not, I will send you a letter, Juanita, and tell you what plans have developed as a result of your suggestion.

WYMA: I have a question directed to Vice Chancellor Bepko not so much in terms of an explanation at the present time, but I am asking for a future clarification. I have noticed in a recent U.S. News and World Report a listing of different universities in the country and some statistical information. I am wondering if at a future meeting of this Council you would be able to give us some indication as to how these numbers originate and how they are gathered. Also, specifically, I am wondering if you would bring up the matter of SAT scores of entering students. The U.S. News and World Report indicates that entering students have SAT scores ranging from 700 to about 940 which represents a low range for all schools in tiers one through four. One thing that I was wondering is if you could comment at a future time about the fact that only 6 percent of our incoming freshmen are in the upper 10 percent of their high school class.

Another item that I have noticed is that, in terms of our student to faculty ratio, the number of students to faculty is somewhat on the high end of all schools listed in the report. The education costs expended for students is somewhere in the range of \$13,700 per student which is much higher than Bloomington, for example, and other schools in our area. Also the freshman retention rate is about 63 percent at IU, but only 25 percent of our students actually graduate from IUPUI. So, when I was looking at some of these figures, it seemed to me as though they would represent some important things for us to talk about and see if we could do something about it in the future. Maybe you could give the Council some direction as to how we can tackle some of these issues. I am not asking for a discussion right now, but if you could schedule one at a future time, I would appreciate it.

BEPKO: When you say "tackle some of these issues," do you mean reconciling the data?

WYMA: I guess with only 6 percent of our incoming high school students in the upper 10 percent of their class have ramifications in terms of our Honors Program. How difficult is it for us to get superior students, and what are we doing to encourage top notch students to come to IUPUI? Also, are the students that come to IUPUI as freshmen as well prepared as incoming students in other schools of our area? There are all kinds of questions that come to mind when you look at these statistics. Maybe you could give us some guidance on how the data may be interpreted.

BEPKO: But, your interest is in delving into the actual experience that we have rather than to analyze

the scoring system of U.S. News and World Report?

WYMA: Well, the question that always comes up is how valid is this data? As a reader, I would have no idea as to how to interpret that.

BEPKO: The reason I ask is I think there are two separate questions. One of the questions that came immediately to our minds was how did we score in this third tier? In the previous U.S. News and World Report we had not been classified as one of the national universities. I think we are put into a regional category. Now, we have not only moved into the national universities category, but we have also moved into the third tier which was quite pleasing and we talked about this a lot in public. We pointed out where other institutions were. We said just one level above us were Bloomington and Lafayette in the second tier and just one level below us were institutions like Ball State and Indiana State. We thought that was probably a very accurate characterization of where we should stand as an institution. But, we also noted some errors. You haven't mentioned the one that probably is the most egregious and that is the one that specifies the amount or the percentage of alumni support. I think it is phrased in terms of alumni giving to the university. Our number is one of the highest in the whole national university listing. It is way higher than Bloomington. We are not sure if that is an accurate number. *[Laughter]* But, we did not protest the ranking. You asked where did they get these data? They get these data from the Indiana University Central Administration. Sometimes when data go from the University Central Administration to outside organizations we end up feeling that we have been disadvantaged because of the way it has been classified. For example, if you look in the Chronicle of Higher Education and you see the reports on research support for universities, you will find Indiana University listed. It doesn't say Bloomington or Indianapolis, it just says Indiana University and, of course, everyone thinks Bloomington but, in fact, a significant amount of our research seems to be included in that. We think that is probably a disadvantage in the way the data is reported for Indiana University. In this case, we think that the data may have favored us a little bit. U.S. News and World Report got it right when they put us in this third tier of working our way up into a higher tier in the national university rankings.

We will be happy to "unpack" some of these categories for you, but I think what you are primarily interested in is how do we stand and how many of our entering students are in the top 10 percent of their high school class and how does that compare with other universities that we like to think of as our peers? I think that would be a good thing to discuss.

One thing which was listed in that U.S. News and World Report study that I think is unsteemingly valid, it is not distorted in any way, and that is the ranking that was given to us by presidents of peer institutions. We were rated 129, I believe, out of the 240 national universities. That is not based on some data flaw. That is based on what people think of us and I think that is quite good. That puts us solidly into that third tier if not toward the top of that third tier. I think there are others in the third tier that have lower rankings in the estimation of university presidents.

TURNER: That is our 10 minutes for this item. We will now move on to our next agenda item.

AGENDA ITEM V IUPUI FACULTY COUNCIL DISCUSSION: Strategic Directions Draft (IUPUI Circular 95-42)

TURNER: This item calls for a discussion by the Council of the Strategic Directions Charter draft. Although we have tons of confidence in your abilities as quick readers, we think that, if you received it in your mail today, you may not be ready to talk about it as a body. What I would like to do is take 10 minutes or so to ask you for a brief discussion of the document drawing on the knowledge of those who have read it. I thought it might be useful if people could speak, at least from what they know of it, at this point, to the kinds of questions or concerns that they have about the Charter. What are they going to be looking for when they read the actual draft? If we could do that, and if we could collect some kind of wisdom going into it, perhaps we could create some kind of study guide. That will make it easier for us to deal with the draft of the Strategic Charter at the November meeting. We would like to make sure that everybody is familiar with it. Then we can get a sense of the Council in terms of the degree to which the Council is supportive of the Charter or has significant concern that they would want addressed. It is not a matter of coming up for an up or down vote, but rather of getting a general sense from this body as to what we expect from it and how we think this will serve the needs of the University and our own needs. We can collectively generate a list of specific concerns or ways in which the final draft will be shaped. I thought we might be able to enhance that discussion if we spend some time today at least collecting what we know so far about the Strategic Directions Charter. I would like to open it up for people who have had some experience with the Charter. The Faculty Council has developed this schedule in order for an orderly and timely consideration. May I ask those of you who are familiar with the Strategic Directions Charter draft in whatever stage to speak to that in order to help us prepare for our reading it?

BALDWIN: I am curious as to whether some of the basic premises can be questioned at this point. I have a problem with the premise that academic units should be decentralized if possible and service units should be centralized if possible. I am not sure that the assumption that service units work better through more centralized as opposed to decentralized is something that should be proven. In my own experience in dealing with centralized service units is a lot less efficient than dealing with ones that are decentralized (i.e., here.)

SPECHLER: First, to Jim's question. That assumption can be questioned, has been questioned, and has been answered. When we challenged the President on that matter, he admitted that there would be many, many exceptions. Indeed, you can see, Jim, yourself when you read the document that it is internally inconsistent on this matter.

I would like to point out two inconsistencies. On the one hand, the general rule is proposed that academic programs be decentralized as much as possible. On the other hand, among the few definite proposals is one to make academic programs and requirements uniform throughout the system. Myles Brand recognizes that is an inconsistency and in that instance we will have to have centralization of some sort. There is also inconsistency with respect to the degree to which support activities will be centralized. It is inconsistent with the notion of cost minimization and stewardship of resources. While I didn't challenge him on that one, I assume he will say that it could be a big waste of resources to decentralize. For example, buying paper in Gary, -- we would choose to minimize costs in that situation.

Now for a more general comment because I have had something to do with this and like Kathy and some others, will have a lot to do with this within the next few days. I think you should view this as a request for proposals. There are questions and answers, proposals, and a report on things that we are already doing. But, the working end, the place where the rubber hits the road, is this is a request for proposals -- \$18 million reportedly is up for grabs. The people in Bloomington are already working at their proposals to work themselves into the \$18 million. People on other campuses are already worried that they won't work their way in. So, I think the first thing you have to do when you read this is think about how your unit or things that you are concerned about can be worked into a proposal. The proposal does not talk, and maybe, Jerry, you can answer about this, about who is going to decide where the \$18 million goes. I assume many different directions in vastly different amounts. My first general comment is that request for proposals are things that the President is thinking about. He has taken the money and he is ready to hear proposals, especially partnerships, which I think are the most important idea here. If you have proposed a partnership that fits in, you may be funded. So, that is a general comment.

If I may make one other comment, it has to do with Ways and Means. This document, if you read it, proposes many different new directions for an education at Indiana University serving new a clientele with more flexible types of degrees, more flexible types of courses. Personally, I think that is all to the good. We have to be open, we have to be creative, we have to be accessible. The question is, what are the means to do that? What is going to be given up? How are we going to do that? That is really not addressed. What are we going to give up of our present activities -- not all of which are useless, I assume -- to do these new things? That is really not clearly addressed. However, if you read between the lines, it endorses technology as one way of doing that. I think that is correct, but we have to be careful. It also enforces the idea that staff and adjunct faculty will be used more extensively in these roles. The clinical ranks are explicitly endorsed. This presents, I think, a matter of first-rate importance for any faculty: should the faculty be teaching as many or more courses at Indiana University than in the past? I worry about that. I think that is a general issue. The general issue is, can we do more with existing resources? If not, what are we going to give up? How are we going to economize to meet those desirable objectives? Thank you for your patience.

WARFEL: Marty, I think you are absolutely right in urging all of us to think seriously about putting together proposals and to apply for some of the money that is available. There is a draft process for the review of proposals and the disbursement of the funds, but it is only in a draft stage at this time. The Agenda Committee of the UFC is going to be discussing it with the President next Tuesday and I certainly assume that, as we know more exactly how it is going to work, we will let everybody.

The proposals can certainly come from individuals or groups of faculty or schools or combined school groups, but on this campus we have put together a way of not only commenting further on the draft document, but also beginning to think about proposals in a collaborative way. Actually, Trudy Banta in her work with the Planning Committee on IUPUI Missions, Goals, and Aspirations, has evolved into this. What we are putting together, Richard and I were meeting yesterday trying to add faculty into study groups, there will be seven study groups on the campus and each of them will take a particular focus in studying the document but also take a particular focus in beginning to write proposals that we can

submit from this campus. Again, we won't depend on these study groups entirely to be the source of proposals for our campus, but I think we have to get something started. I cannot recite what the seven study groups are, but two of them have to do with partnerships. One of them has to do with focusing on how we can evolve partnerships within our institutions, specifically, within ourselves on this campus and in liaison with West Lafayette and with Bloomington. Another study group is focusing on partnerships externally. One is focusing on doing a better job of letting our communities [our local, national, and international communities] know what our expertise is, what our interests are etc. One is about improving the climate of learning for students. I am not going to come up with all seven of them, but the rosters of the study groups are in the formative process right now. Certainly, if anyone on the Council has a particular interest in serving, let us know.

MERRITT: Kathy, what is the deadline for submitting these names? Are there any specific instructions?

WARFEL: At this point, there are no specific instructions for the format. At this point, the thought is that there won't be just one round of proposals and that is it -- you either get it or you don't. It is envisioned that the funding will be available and handed out in phases. So, for example, the draft indicates that in mid February the first round of proposals will be submitted and then several months later a second round of proposals is submitted. So, it is not just a one-shot thing.

MERRITT: At first glance, it seems it would be May of this academic year.

WARFEL: Yes. The first round of proposals is envisioned coming in for review in February and funding being handed out during this year.

MERRITT: If they are, then the study groups are going to have to cram. *[laughter]*

(UNKNOWN SPEAKER): Could we get a list of those study groups?

KECK: They are the lists which I gave to you.

WARFEL: We chose good "crammers" for this. We had asked members of the Executive Committee to suggest names for these. The study groups are:

- 1) Enhancing the Climate for Learning That Promotes Students' Success;
- 2) Increasing Accessibility of Higher Education and Promoting Diversity Among Students, Faculty, and Staff;
- 3) Defining Faculty Roles for Changing Conditions (I think in the Strategic Directions Draft there is a lot about faculty roles and the changing needs of higher education and in society)

- 4) Developing Assessment Measures and Infrastructure for Data Collection that Promote Improvement and Demonstrate Accountability to External Stakeholders;
- 5) Identifying and Prioritizing Strategic Areas for Cross Disciplinary Collaboration Within IUPUI and Between IUPUI, IUB, and Purdue-West Lafayette;
- 6) Strengthening IUPUI Connections With Its Community, Especially Through Partnerships With Business, Industry, Nonprofit Organizations and Government Agencies;
- 7) Publicize the Professional Interests and Contributions of IUPUI Faculty, Students, Staff, Branch With Departments, Schools, on the Campus Locally, Regionally, and Internationally.

BEPKO: Just one additional comment. I think it is important to recognize that these seven study groups reflect an effort to merge the campus planning that has been under way to identify mission, vision, values, goals, objectives, strategies for our future and the Strategic Directions process. So, we are bringing two sets of vocabulary and ideas together.

The good news is that America's new public university, as it is defined by the Strategic Directions Draft Charter, looks a lot like IUPUI and the sorts of things that we have been talking about in the planning process that has been under way on campus for sometime. So, this merger will be a happy one and I think this is a very important process for us not only because of the potential for funding which lies just ahead, but also because it is a reaffirmation of sorts of the work that has been going on on this campus for a long time. When the study groups and other groups on campus, schools, departments, faculty, administrative units, etc., prepare their proposals, they will go through some process on campus involving these study groups, involving also Faculty Council committees, which will then be sent from the campus with a priority recommendation from the campus. So that we as a campus will get to say which things we think are most important even though proposals may be coming from every corner of the campus, we collectively will be able to say what we think is most important. That will then go to peer review panels composed of faculty members and the panels will review the proposals. In that process the proposals will also be sent to the University Faculty Council's Agenda Committee for their own priority ranking of proposals. They will also be sent to the Steering Committee of the Strategic Directions process. There is a steering committee of some 17 people. Kathy and I are both members of the Steering Committee and that Steering Committee will also have an opportunity to give priority rankings. All of this will then go to the President's Office and the President, with the advice of a lot of other people already then in hand, will decide on the grants. Grants which are not awarded in the first round might be awarded in the second round, which will probably be in the summer of 1996 and there will be a third, and maybe a fourth round after that, so that there will be multiple opportunities for projects to be funded.

MANNHEIMER: I found myself surprisingly in total agreement with everything that Marty said and, of course, Chancellor Bepko. *[Laughter]* I was part of the process, as many of you were, that created the primatorial draft from which draft was created. I want to echo Jerry's words. I think it does smell like

IUPUI, particularly in the partnership's notion and the ability to interface with the center of the state which is we and the city of Indianapolis. However, one of the points that my little sub, subcommittee tried to make all summer was that if we were to take fullest advantage of those opportunities for collaborative ventures and partnerships, etc., that many of the efforts that will thus be expended and the directions that will be pursued will not easily or obviously smell like teaching or research, but perhaps more so like service. In order for us to take advantage of partnerships, we in our subcommittee felt perhaps a little greater emphasis on service, a little more "beefing" up of the third leg of our contractual tripod. Although I think some of that language was present in the primatorial draft, I think it got soft pedaled in this draft. I would simply urge all of us to think about that and particularly those people who have a hand in rewriting it, if indeed any rewriting is done.

TURNER: If you would please remember to announce your name when you speak. If you insist on not identifying yourselves, we will make up names but we prefer to have your real name in the minutes.
[laughter]

NG: I assume that you will also welcome proposals from more people getting together from more than one campus, for example, IUPUI and Bloomington?

BEPKO: Absolutely. Not only that, but multiple schools, even with external groups joined in. I think it is also true that proposals will be more attractive if there is matching funding.

NG: I was thinking about getting the money as the matching fund for external funding.

BEPKO: That would be very attractive.

TURNER: Our hope is that this will give you some ways to begin your thinking about the draft as you begin to read it -- some things to watch out for, some things to look for. I hope that you will come to the meeting next time ready to develop some kind of consensus on this and also some specific recommendations to send along to the committee that is going to put the final charter together.

SPECHLER: Richard, you proposed that we have a general discussion and that is fine, but we are being pressed to develop a consensus and a list of concerns even earlier than that. There is a procedure that wasn't mentioned which is the E-mail procedure. Kathy is the one who will receive comments. As you read this and have particular concerns, we have set up a method through the University Faculty Council to receive specific comments and concerns. Kathy is one of the addressees on this. It would be helpful, I think, speaking as one of the chairs of the committees concerned, to hear from you rather earlier about specific problems that you have. I am concerned with the faculty affairs but there are others here who are concerned with other matters.

WARFEL: My E-mail on INDYVAX is KWARFEL@INDIANA.EDU.

SPECHLER: If you will distribute it to everybody else, I will be happy to receive comments about the

faculty aspects of it, as will Rebecca Porter, who is the chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee at IUPUI.

BEPKO: There is also a listserv that you can sign up for. I don't have the address, but if you are interested, I will be happy to send it to you. The listserv will include all of the persons who are on all of the task forces. We call that now the Strategic Directions Council -- some 240 persons. If it is anything like the period when the task forces were working, there will be lots of communication back and forth on this listserv. If you are interested in participating in that, you are certainly welcome to do so. Anyone can sign up. All you have to do is get the codes and log on.

Also, on the World Wide Web there is a Strategic Directions Home Page, the address of which I can also get for you if you are interested, where you can access all of the original documents from the very beginning of the Strategic Directions process -- all of the original documents, the original reports of the task forces, and the appendices.

TURNER: We appreciate your comments on this. Now, we will move to our next agenda item.

AGENDA ITEM VI REPORT FROM THE TASK FORCE ON STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING (IUPUI Circular 95-29)

TURNER: Our next item is a report from the Task Force on Student Evaluation of Teaching. I would like to ask John Kremer to introduce the document. You have had the document before you for over a month. John, if you speak to this and then we will open it up for discussion.

KREMER: Before I start, Dean Plater or Kathy, could you give us a little of the background about why you called this task force together?

PLATER: I will start and Kathy can correct and add to my comments. Kathy and I, in cooperation with the Executive Committee, decided to appoint a committee which John was the chair of, to look at student evaluation of teaching because there had been a great deal of public discussion about the role of student evaluations. The discussion had come from several different quarters including our own Board of Trustees and, more specifically, students who wanted to know why they could not have access to student evaluations as a matter of public record and to use that information in a publication that they could make available to other students for purposes of, for example, selecting courses. This was a matter of discussion in the Sagamore among other venues as you will recall last year. We thought that there were enough issues being raised that it would be valuable to ask a committee of knowledgeable colleagues to come together and think about the role of student evaluations both, in our faculty rewards process, whether for promotion and tenure or for salary increases, and to address the more recent concern about public access to student evaluations. That was the primary reason for appointing a task force at that particular time.

KREMER: The first thing we did was contact some representatives from the schools and ask them about how student evaluations were used. Every school that responded did student evaluations. They

were often used in promotion and tenure decisions and also in salary decisions by the administrators. They were never given to students helping them select classes. That was the main input from the schools.

We made a request on some listservs to see what other universities did. A lot of places give this information to students in a variety of forms. We realized that the student evaluation has several audiences. There is the student, the department, the school, the university, and individual faculty members. Currently, the system is primarily for the benefit of faculty, departments, and school. The task force which was composed of faculty and some student representatives recognized the difficulty of publishing personnel information to a broad array of people. In fact, among the task force members there was no consensus on how to do that. With the wide diversity of schools and faculty here at IUPUI, and considering the recent experience that we have had with general education, we thought it was almost impossible for the task force to set a policy in this area.

As other input has suggested, the students on the committee were very strong in their requests that this kind of information be made available to students. What we did is put together a recommendation that, if the Faculty Council wanted to pursue it, the Faculty Council could so do. We thought that the best way to go from here would be to ask the schools a series of four questions and have the schools respond to these four questions. The first one we knew part of the answer to -- that almost all schools require evaluations be done. We recommended that these policies be put in school bulletins so that it is a matter of public record and administrators and others would know what those policies are. Those policies should also include how evaluations are to be administered.

The second issue refers more to the university level. Currently, we have one or two questions that are on the general survey given to students about the quality of teaching at IUPUI. That information has always been favorable. However, there are times when more careful data is needed. If the schools would like to do this, we have a series of seven survey items that every school could ask and then we could collect that data. For example, it could be grouped according to part-time versus full-time to see what the quality of that teaching is. A lot of people have questions about how well graduate students do. Graduate students could be listed as a variable. There seems to be a need to have information at the university level for reports to determine the quality of teaching at IUPUI more effectively than that one general question.

In regards to reporting data to students, we thought that the university could develop and support a central mechanism for storing that information (i.e., on the World Wide Web) but each school could determine what information would go in there. For example, at the least there could be a spot on World Wide Web for every faculty member. And that faculty, on their own, could say "Here is what my teaching philosophy is" in four or five sentences and include any data they so choose about their teaching. If the school wanted to require more, the school could require more.

Those are the things that we thought schools could address if the Faculty Council so chose. We decided to point out two other things that were striking to the committee. There seems to be no specific criteria stated about how this data is used in personnel decisions. The literature contains examples, I don't know if there are numerous examples, about how this information is not used appropriately in personnel

decisions. We thought it would be a good policy if each school would examine how student evaluation data are used. It might be more important even for a part-time faculty.

The other obvious thing in the data from the schools was that almost every school representative was dissatisfied with how they helped faculty improve teaching. Although there is an office for that, this also seems to be a shared responsibility for departments and the schools. We would encourage schools to identify ways that faculty can be helped to improve their teaching.

TURNER: Thank you. That is the report of the Task Force. It is before you today for discussion. The report comes with specific recommendations about sending it to the schools to address the questions. We need to decide what we would like to do with it next.

WILSON: I come from the School of Science and for many years, under John Kremer's leadership, our school has used student satisfaction surveys that until last year have been uniform across the school. Faculty over the years has become more and more dissatisfied with the surveys until they finally convinced the dean that they need not be used across all departments. Now, departments are free to either continue using those forms, which many departments are doing, or redesign the forms for their own uses. One of the reasons we did this was because we felt that this is only a single measurement of teaching and that there ought to be a more comprehensive approach.

The one thing I really don't like about this task force document is the idea of reporting student satisfaction numbers to a central location and using them for whatever purposes. I think that is totally inappropriate. I also sit on the Assessment Committee for IUPUI and one of the principles that I think we have established is that assessment of teaching ought to take a very comprehensive approach. It should look at many different perimeters. When you boil it all down to one number, it is like stamping it on a faculty member's forehead. It does not necessarily tell you how good a course is or reflect how well it fits into the curriculum and performs its academic function. It can often be quite unfair to label a faculty member early in his or her career with this number when it changes over time. It is only one parameter.

Again, I think the student surveys are fine, but I think we ought to retain it only as one part of a larger picture and we ought to encourage schools to develop more comprehensive ways of assessing teaching and not ever use these on a campus wide level. If students want to know what student satisfaction numbers are for any given professor, they have always been free to conduct these kinds of studies themselves and publish them in the newspaper. They do that at lots of different universities and they can do it here as well.

GOLDBERG: Whatever is decided, I think it would be preferable instead of a single score to have a profile where the strengths as well as weaknesses of instructors are indicated. This would aid each individual instructor to focus on those areas in which he or she is weak. As of now, it seems to be just a single number as opposed to showing strengths and weaknesses.

NG: I completely agree with Kathy Wilson. In fact, I could share with you many horror stories which I have fully documented in my thick file. Let me just tell you why. I think the student evaluation is really not an evaluation. It is a satisfaction survey. Education often is a rather painful experience, unfortunately. It requires hard work and dedication which some of our students are not quite willing or mature enough to make. I will tell you one horror story. If anyone wants me to tell you with documentation, I will be happy to share them with you. I had a case in where I had an instructor that her evaluation was so spectacular that I was so impressed that I went to her office (she happened to work on campus) and tried to pay her extra to engage her to help me to do something experimental in some of our remedial level courses. In the meeting with this person, this person showed me a wonderfully, beautiful leather briefcase that this person was given and I was even more impressed when I saw that. I was convinced that I picked the right person to carry my load to do wonderful things for my students. As I said, I was totally caught off guard and quite by accident I discovered that what appeared to be the wonderful teacher was not at all the wonderful teacher. In a sense that, when I tried to do some tracking data trying to find out how this person's students do and how they did in the next class. Mathematics fortunately is very structured so we know exactly if somebody has done a good job in one course and the next course should have some correlation. I found that this person had given out A's and B's and not a single student from this person's course, with the exception of perhaps one, passed the next class.

This is not the only case I know of. I also had a full-time instructor who actually had problems with tenure and promotion. This instructor also had a rather lousy single number evaluation. In fact, that person had to be suffering in the process because he was considered to be not a very good teacher until I did some tracking. By that, I mean I take every student from that person's class and I look at what the students were doing in the next class -- whether they retain the same level of performance. I also look at that person's drop out rate and to my great surprise that person turned out, despite what every student said in the evaluation, to be one of the most effective instructors in my department. So, if anybody wanted to look at student evaluations and draw any conclusion from a single number, I think these are misleading.

SPECHLER: I, too, agree with Kathryn Wilson, of course, that a single number can be misleading, but I don't agree with her conclusion. Let me explain why. I think that the educational research, Bart's horror stories to the contrary notwithstanding, do indicate that student satisfaction is positively correlated, although not nearly perfectly correlated, with what people learn. That is the first thing.

The second thing is that assessment, my friends, is inevitable. We do owe our students, our supporters, and our stakeholders an account of how well we do. This is going to be part of it. If we do not do it ourselves, someone who is less close to the matter will do it for us. I think that is something that we should keep in mind. Now, this is just one number. What we should do is insist that there be other means for evaluation of teaching. Certainly, peer review which Barbara Cambridge has worked on, interviews with alumni, cognitive tests, nationally normed tests of our large courses -- all of those things have a role. But, then you will say, "Well, this is getting very complicated. How did students possibly evaluate all of these things and put it into a proper perspective when deciding which courses to take?" That is exactly the point.

This report seems to assume that the only options are not to give out the information or to give the information directly to the students. They are not the only options. I believe a proper option is to give a much richer set of information to the students' advisor. The students' advisor is in a much better position to appraise how reliable the information is, whether it is self-contradictory, or broadly confirmatory of the results, and it will strengthen our advising system here at IUPUI. Some of you will remember that I have spoken to this before. I think our advising system on this largely commuter campus needs to be strengthened and it needs to be strengthened by us. We need to tell the students in confidence what these assessments show and how it influences them because for an advanced, bright student the results will mean one thing and for a weaker student at the beginning of his or her career the results will mean a different thing. We have an obligation, in my view, to interpret these results. I believe that is way to go, that we should be interpreting these results for our students and help them understand the need for them in their educational careers.

LEHNEN: I also sit on the Program Review Assessment Committee representing our school [SPEA] and I am particularly interested in this issue. I am troubled by this report. I guess the two main questions that I wonder if the committee even considered are (1) What is your purpose for this? I have heard Martin give us a purpose and it is one that I don't support. That is, a discussion that we have had in the Program Review Assessment Committee. It seems to me that assessments can affect one in two ways. They are either designed to improve teaching and they become a device for informing the faculty members so they can get better. But, most often and especially in public schools the second reason is that they are used for accountability purposes. Somebody external usually to the faculty member decides what that faculty member should do and who should be accountable. The publishing of scores almost by definition says that we can't be like everyone else and that everybody is above average. If we are going to have a campus average or school average, some faculty members are going to look better and some of them are going to look worse. So, I raise the question why do we do this? I think we ought to do it but we ought to do it in the context of a Program Review Assessment Committee strategy of improving teaching and not in the context of trying to set some sort of Dow-Jones indicator for teaching at IUPUI. I think it would be counterproductive. You get a lot of fear and you get a lot of other problems, but I think we ought to clarify what we are trying to accomplish. I hope it is quality improvement in teaching and not some other accountability.

MANNAN: This document is wonderfully superficial. In recent years we have challenged the sole use of numbers and objective tests to assess student performance. We are now talking about performance-based assessment, portfolio assessment so that we can get away from simple numbers. We are talking about instruments that are more meaningful. This suggestion takes us completely in the opposite direction. It simply focuses on numbers -- simple numbers that do not convey any reasonable meaning.

NG: I am suggesting that we get rid of student evaluation. In fact, student evaluation does tell us one thing. If you make students comfortable in fact would help learning. But, it does not necessarily mean that everybody is above to create the same comfort level. I often tell students that sometime is not a bad thing. You do not go through life having the most perfect bosses and supervisors. This is part of the learning experience. I agree that the purpose of evaluations should always be one to improve teaching -- not to cover our back [or whatever part of our anatomy], but at the same time it must be multi-facet. It

cannot be just simply relying on one number. Peer evaluations are very important. In fact, I agree with Kathy Wilson. If the students wanted to due evaluate to have their own perspective, they should be welcome to do so and administer their own evaluation and publish it. But the university should not endorse it because when we do it. I think this is one pitfall we must avoid. We should do more evaluations. We should even have peer evaluations from my part-time faculty. There is a lot that can be done, but I think if you stop student evaluations, that would be a real mistake.

KREMER: I wish we had had this discussion before we did our work. The focus we were asked to take was student evaluation. The response we gave was that there should be a discussion of these issues in the schools. We did not make a policy about student evaluation. I think a straw man has been set up and torn down. We asked schools to talk about: (1) how we evaluate teaching, (2) how we reported this data to students, (3) how we use that information in personnel decisions, and (4) what will we do for faculty development? The whole impetus of the task force was we could not make a decision for the whole campus. We anticipated this discussion. In fact, we had this very discussion for weeks in our own committee until we started looking at the evidence on student evaluation and then the whole plan changed. It is not surprising. What we are doing is confronting the Faculty Council with the issue of whether this is going to be dropped or are the schools going to pick up these four key issues and talk about them? We recognize, and this discussion again amplifies it, that you cannot decide these things on the campus level.

YOKOMOTO: I was on John's committee and John didn't mention some things to you that I think you should know. The committee debated this many, many times and, while Bart suggested I thought that maybe the students should do it, we thought that we didn't want the students to do it, that If this had to be done, because otherwise the students would not be listened to "Tell them No we just won't do it" would not be the answer. If it had to be done, we thought it would be better done by the faculty than by the students. We tried to implement a system which was as least threatening as possible. Remember, many things are brought up but then the notion was that faculty would not buy this. If you read this very carefully, I think you will see that there are so many jobs. I thought that Golam's statement of "wonderfully superficial" was close to what we were trying to do. *[Laughter]* Not to make it superficial, but we tried to set up a system that would be least threatening, give students something that they could grab hold of, and have schools not use that information for personnel decisions and let the students do what they may with it, but at least have some input into it so that it is not done at the student level on some superficial level. For those of you who had an immediately bad reaction, please think about it again because the faculty committee spent quite a few hours debating this, trying to create something to respond to the student editorial and apparently our administration's response saying that we will get our faculty task force together and do something. We thought the answer was not to do anything, but what to do to answer the question.

TURNER: In the few minutes we have left for discussion, could we address the suggestion that the report makes that we send this report to the schools with a request that are listed at the end of the report.

APPLEGATE: I would like to suggest that we do send them to the schools for the simple reason that I am very disturbed by the concept that we would even give as much credibility to an editorial that we

would seek to give a shallow response. The issue is much broader than student evaluation. To give student evaluation that much power is problematic. So, I think if the schools look at what they are doing broadly in terms of faculty development, faculty evaluation, and faculty reward in the area of teaching, it might be more useful. So, it probably would be well to spend another two weeks. I would speak in favor of sending it to each of the schools and asking them what they are doing and what they plan to do.

TURNER: That was not a motion?

APPLEGATE: It was not a formal motion. Would you like one?

TURNER: We need one at some point if we are going to . . .

APPLEGATE: You have it. So formalized.

TURNER: Is there a second to that motion?

(UNKNOWN SPEAKER): I second that motion.

TURNER: Is there any discussion on the motion?

PORTER: Would you repeat what the wording of the motion is?

APPLEGATE: Sending this document forth to the schools and ask the schools to respond by indicating what their plans for faculty evaluation of teaching are.

TURNER: To send the report to schools asking them to respond to the four questions that the report asks. We can now discuss that motion.

MANNAN: I have a very simple comment. We can't afford to call it a student evaluation of teaching because that is not what it is. It is a student satisfaction survey. Start calling it that.

PETERSON: I have a question about where this information is going to go back to. When the schools evaluate, do they send it back to the Council in general, to the committee, or to the Executive Committee? How will that information be used and what are we going to do as a result of it? If we are not happy with the way the School of Medicine does its evaluation, what are we going to do about it?

TURNER: I would guess that since the task force is asking the questions that we would ask that the responses be sent to them.

LEHNEN: I would like to amend the motion that this report be submitted to the Program Review Assessment Committee for review and with the recommendation to come back to the IUPUI Faculty

Council.

TURNER: That would be a substitute motion.

LEHNEN: Whatever you want to call it.

TURNER: We can't do that.

WILSON: The thing about this motion is that it asks for exactly what the Program Assessment Committee has been doing already and that is trying to get at assessment of teaching. Each school has a representative on that committee and what we are supposed to be doing right now is working up some kind of an assessment plan for our school. So, this is quite redundant. If we send this back to our school, I just want to warn people about that the experience in the School of Science is that when student assessment came up many, many years ago it was pointed out, "No, this is just one part of the assessment process. Don't worry about it. It is not going to be a number stamped on your forehead." That is just not what happened. It is really a great mistake to accept one number as being very meaningful. I think a document like this tends to lead to that.

LEHNEN: This committee has been in operation for three years?

(UNKNOWN SPEAKER): Three years and, as I said earlier, there are two representatives from each school. There is considerable experience already with this very issue. It truly is redundant.

TURNER: I think we can take that as speaking against the motion on the floor and then continue with the discussion on the motion on the floor and then vote on that and then we can certainly have another motion after that. Is there any more discussion on the motion on the floor to send this to the schools as the task force report requests?

PORTER: I would like to speak against the motion. I don't see how we are going to effectively utilize information that we have collected from the schools. If the intent of this group is to say, to take a direction, we want each school to establish a policy, then we need to do that. But, to send this information back to the schools and say, "Well, what are you doing? What are you thinking?" We haven't given them direction. We have a group that has experience with faculty evaluations from students in multiple different schools. We are delaying moving ahead and collecting information we are not going to utilize.

MANNAN: Call for the question.

TURNER: All of those in favor of the motion, say "Aye." [A few] All of those opposed, say "Nay" [Many] Abstentions? [None] The motion fails. Is there another motion to be made?

LEHNEN: I move that this report be sent to the Program Review Assessment Committee and ask them

to report back to the Faculty Council.

(UNKNOWN SPEAKER): Second.

TURNER: Is there any discussion of this motion? [None] Hearing no discussion, I'll call for a vote on this motion. All in favor of the motion to send this report to the Program Review Assessment Committee with the request that they consider it and report back to the Faculty Council, say "Aye." [Many] Opposed? [None] Abstentions? [None] The motion passes.

AGENDA ITEM VI UNFINISHED BUSINESS

[There was no unfinished business.]

AGENDA ITEM VII NEW BUSINESS

[There was no new business]

AGENDA ITEM VIII ADJOURNMENT

TURNER: The meeting is adjourned.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY INDIANAPOLIS

Faculty Council Meeting

December 7, 1995

School of Dentistry, Room S115

3:00 p.m.

Present: Administration: Chancellor Gerald Bepko, Dean William Plater. Deans: P. Nicholas Kellum, Angela McBride, Doris Merritt, David Stocum. Elected Faculty: Larry Abel, Charalambos Aliprantis, W Marshall Anderson, Margaret Applegate, Susan Ball, Jana Bradley, Kenneth Byrd, Jeanette Dickerson-Putman, Karen Gable, Carlos Goldberg, William Hohlt, Nathan Houser, Dolores Hoyt, Elizabeth Jones, M Jan Keffer, Raymond Koleski, Dana McDonald, Bart Ng, William Orme, Michael Penna, Richard Pflanzner, Rebecca Porter, Edward Robbins, Bernadette Rodak, Erdogan Sener, Akhourri Sinha, Karen Teegarden, Kathleen Warfel, Kathryn Wilson, Charles Yokomoto. Ex Officio: James Baldwin, Paul Galanti, Juanita Keck, Justin Libby, Steven Mannheimer, Carl Rothe, Martin Spechler, Richard Turner, Rosalie Vermette.

Alternates Present: Deans: J. M. Kapoor for Dean Roberta Greene, James East for Dean Kathy Krendl. Ex Officio Members: G Roger Jarjoura for Robert Lehnen.

Absent: Administration: Trudy Banta. Deans: John Barlow, A James Brown, Trevor Brown, H William Gilmore, Robert Holden, Norman Lefstein, John Rau, Philip Tompkins, Donald Warren, Charles Webb. Elected Faculty: Merrill Benson, Joseph Bidwell, Diana Billings, Ulf Jonas Bjork, Zacharie Brahm, Thomas Broadie, Lynn Broderick, Timothy Brothers, Paul Brown, David Burr, Timothy Byers, David Canal, Lucinda Carr, Michael Cohen, Paul Dubin, Naomi Fineberg, Patricia Gallagher, Joe Garcia, Bernardino Ghetti, Robert Havlik, Antoinette Hood, Henry Karlson, Michael Klemsz, Missy Kubitschek, Stephen Lalka, Miriam Langsam, Golam Mannan, Rebecca Markel, Debra Mesch, Fred Pavalko, David Peters, Richard Peterson, Ken Rennels, Virginia Richardson, Brian Sanders, Jane Schultz, Mark Seifert, Erdogan Sener (replaced Kent Sharp), Anantha Shekhar, Jay Simon Jerrold Stern, Stephen Stockberger, James Wallihan, Karen West, Richard Wyma, Mervin Yoder, Susan Zunt.

Ex Officio Members: Henry Besch, Ronald Dehnke, S Edwin Fineberg, Carlyn Johnson, Stephen Leapman, Byron Olson.

Visitors: Barbara Albee, Barbara Cambridge, John Morgan (Staff Council), Dean Carol Nathan,

William Schneider.

AGENDA ITEM I CALL TO ORDER

TURNER: Let's call this meeting to order. We have a relatively rich, but short agenda today. At the end of today's meeting we will move from this room to room 117 for the State of the Campus Address.

AGENDA ITEM II ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT

TURNER: Roman Numeral II will be our quickest item. Since Chancellor Bepko is going to have plenty to say later on he is foregoing his Administrative Report for today.

AGENDA ITEM III PRESIDENT OF THE FACULTY REPORT

WARFEL I do have a couple of things I want to mention. I said at the last meeting that President Brand was going to have a discussion and luncheon with our Executive Committee and Campus Planning Committee. He has decided to divide that into two separate lunches so the Executive Committee is meeting with him tomorrow and then after the holidays are over he will have another session at which he can talk to the Campus Planning Committee which, as you know, is the committee that consists of the chairs of each of the standing committees or their designee with Dana McDonald as the overall chair of that committee plus Vice Chancellor Banta. I wanted to follow up on that.

Last time we also raised the question about what is moving along in regard to the Task Force on the Status of Women Faculty. That committee report will be forthcoming. As we all know, there is almost too much going on this semester university-wide and on this campus and to help the work of that task force. Becky Porter who, of course has nothing else to do, [laughter] has agreed to help the task force with the reports. So, we will expect to see that in the new year.

One of the things that you had a chance to pick up is a synopsis from the University Faculty Council meeting which was November 28. This isn't the synopsis of the entire meeting, but it does show the four official resolutions that the UFC passed in regard to the Strategic Directions Draft Charter. The first is simply asking the full Council to give the Agenda Committee permission to act in the way that the RFP process toward funding suggests that the Agenda Committee will act because it isn't something that the Agenda Committee really, otherwise, should take on.

The second is a statement that was originally passed by the Bloomington Faculty Council. It is a fairly lengthy statement about how important faculty governance is in making decisions within the university.

The third is a statement about our continued commitment to the value of tenure for faculty.

The fourth was offered at the end of the meeting as sort of a wrap-up resolution to bring closure.

This is just for your information about how the Charter went at the All University Faculty Council.

In regard to the Strategic Directions funding process, as promised Vice President Walker is planning informational sessions about the request for proposals process. There will be a university-wide program on December 13 from 2:00 until 3:30 p.m. On this campus we will be able to participate in that in ES 2132 for those at Columbus there is a room at Columbus also. For those who are not able to participate in the live session, there will be a video made of it and personal consultations and also there is to be an official designee on each campus to, again, help people who aren't familiar with this format in developing proposals. Do we know who our campus liaison is?

PLATER: I assume it will be Erv Boschmann because on the following day there will be a campus-specific workshop to follow-up on the university-wide one. We will plan additional workshops for faculty and staff who would like assistance in preparing proposals.

WARFEL: That is Thursday, December 14. Do we know where that is?

PLATER: I am sorry. I don't know. It has been posted on E-mail and will generally be available.

WARFEL: Lastly, among the many important things we have before us this year is the whole issue of the nature of Faculty Work and changing times, work assignments, etc. Dean Plater has been preparing a memorandum and the Executive Committee has reacted to several drafts of that memorandum. We all agree now that it is time to distribute it more widely. Each of the Council members will be receiving a copy of that memorandum with a cover letter indicating how important the topic is and that the discussion needs to continue in a broader form. That is all the new I have.

AGENDA ITEM IV ANNOUNCEMENT FROM THE TASK FORCE ON SERVICE

TURNER: The next item on the agenda is an announcement from the Task Force on Service and Jeff Vessely will present that.

VESSELY: This is the draft of the Report on the Task Force on Service. There are copies available in the back of the room if you didn't get one earlier. We are asking that you take this back to your individual faculty organizations to discuss it. We think it is somewhat self-explanatory. We have included at the very end of the report the three-page memo that came from Dean Plater and Kathleen Warfel that established the Task Force. If you want to know what we were about, you can start at the end and then go back to the front. We would like to receive your feedback on or before March 8, 1996 so that we have time to rediscuss it. We are hoping to establish some sort of workshop schedule maybe to include some discussion in or around the Moore Symposium. That timetable would allow the task force to review your comments. We hope that two and one-half to three month time period, even though the next 30 days of that we won't probably be having faculty meetings, but maybe in January or February you can set that up and have some discussion and circulate it to your faculty. We have some discussion on how we might get this on the E-mail to see if people would review it that way. We would

ask that your comments come within the next two to two and one-half months. Thank you.

TURNER: You are asking for a response to the report in its draft form but we are not to ask committees formally to respond to it at this point. Is that correct?

VESSELY: When you read it and you think it needs some review by a committee, that is certainly appropriate. We have gathered information from peer institutions and the various schools and our sources may have caused us to overstate or understate the case in an individual situation. Any of those things that would be considered to be more factual may not be quite accurate. Our timetable would have us to come up with some sort of a handbook type information by next fall and so we want to make sure it reflects what is actually happening in the area of service as it relates to the promotion and tenure process, the merit process that we have in place. So, if you think it is appropriate to ask a committee to react to it, we would consider that appropriate also.

TURNER: Thank you, Jeff.

AGENDA ITEM V DRAFT POLICY FOR DEALING WITH THE EFFECT OF FINANCIAL DIFFICULTIES UPON FACULTY AT IUPUI

TURNER: Our next item is the Draft Policy for Dealing With the Effect of Financial Difficulties Upon Faculty at IUPUI. Lawrence Wilkins and Rebecca Porter who are the chairs respectively of the Faculty Affairs Committee and the Faculty Affairs Committee will present the report to you. We are simply distributing the policy today. They are going to walk you through it. We will talk about it in some detail at the January meeting.

WILKINS: Thank you. I appreciate the opportunity to speak with you about this draft. We began the process of formulating this policy in April. We geared up in mid to late May and met frequently and regularly through the summer right up through September and October. What you have before you is, by my count, the 12th significant draft of this proposal. We have looked at it and have banged away at it for some time. It is a pleasure to pass this document on and have it run through other minds.

We started with the idea that in order to be acceptable and coherent the document must have at its core a set of principles. So the first task that this joint subcommittee of your two committees undertook was to develop a set of Starting Principles, or core principles, if you will, to serve as the heart of this policy. We arrived at five principles that are either expressly stated in the document or are inherent in it. As you move through this document and as you think about it, I believe that you will see these important principles in this document in one form or another.

The first being that when dismissal of individuals with academic appointment are considered as a possible solution to financial problems, it ought to be under the most extreme circumstances and as a last resort.

The second and very closely allied with this notion is that when we, as an institution, reach this point, such decisions and the execution of the decisions should be a collaborative effort on the part of administration and faculty. That it shouldn't be a hierarchy goal vertical process. But, that it should be elements of the institution moving together toward the solution of the problem that threatens the institution.

Thirdly, this collaboration should be continuing and should be for the purpose of preventing or minimizing the continued effect of financial problems.

Fourthly, whatever plan is developed as a result of this process should be flexible because of the complexity of IUPUI and its many elements.

Lastly, the focus of solutions that are developed in this process should be as close to the source of the identified problem as possible.

Again, I think you will find each of these principles either expressly stated or inherent in the document. Becky is going to give you an idea of the process that has been formulated in this document.

PORTER: As you will recall, last year the Council dealt with the policies on Dismissal of Tenured Faculty for Incompetence and Academic Misconduct. When the Faculty Affairs Committee first started looking at then what would be the third reason by which tenured faculty could be dismissed, we came into the concept of financial exigency. As was indicated as we looked at the overall process, it seemed better to generate a document that talked about faculty and administration in a collaborative process through a variety of levels of financial difficulties leading up to the most severe conditions. That is why you see this document talking through a series of levels of difficulty and how faculty and administration can work together.

The document cannot be called succinct and that is why we took the strategy of trying to walk through the overall process in an outline format to give you a view of what you will be reading as you study it.

We had to start off by first defining what we are proposing as the "Normal Financial Conditions." In the normal financial condition there should be a local budgetary affairs committee, a school-based committee that consults with the dean in the development of the budget so that the idea is that faculty will be continually well informed about the financial status of their school. As part of the ongoing budgetary review process, the campus budgetary affairs committee has an overview and that means that on a broad perspective the health of the institution is reviewed.

What is critical in the policy but really doesn't show up until later on is when we are in this normal financial state that each school faculty will develop the policies and procedures that would guide the development of a financial exigency plan. The intent is that before we get to that final state of having to decide how individuals would be selected for dismissal, that the faculty of a school will have the opportunity to think through what are the values that they want to be embedded in that selection process.

So, in this plan should be considerations about rank, length of service, the importance particular positions because there is only one person who is going to have expertise in a particular area but that is critical to the academic unit meeting its mission.

The next level that is described is referred to as "Impending Financial Difficulties." The definition says this is an early stage of financial difficulties. For example, it is recognized in the budgetary review process that there is an anticipation that during this academic year all the financial reserves will be exhausted and it is now time to begin looking at taking actions to restore the financial health of the unit.

The recognition can take place internally within the academic unit based on the dean or based on the faculty budgetary committee process or can be identified externally through campus administration or the campus budgetary affairs committee.

As you look through the document, by convention if you see Budgetary Affairs Committee referred to with small letters that is referring to the local budgetary affairs and when it has capital letters Budgetary Affairs, that is referring to the campus level. Actions suggested at this level of financial difficulties are looking at ways of increasing revenues as well as looking at ways of reducing costs. For example, looking at ways of reducing physical plant or equipment costs, looking at administrative and support personnel costs. These are not costs related to tenured faculty salaries.

The campus Budgetary Affairs Committee role at this point in time is to review the plan that is developed within the unit and, if it is a problem that crosses more than one unit, to really look at coming together with a joint plan that reflects both the campus Budgetary Affairs Committee input and conversations with representatives from the Deans' Council and the Chancellor's Office. Again, the collaboration between administration and faculty.

At the next level we termed it a "Financial Crisis." These are conditions which could seriously jeopardize the health of the institution such as problems that could not be resolved at the school level or a problem that did not respond to the locally generated plan. Attempts were made to increase revenue and decrease costs; they were not successful. It may be that there are external circumstances which are continuing to change which are worsening the situation. At some point we had to say, there are all of these other things that could happen but we are not going to be able to enumerate them.

In this case it is the responsibility of the campus Budgetary Affairs Committee and the Chancellor to notify the Faculty Council so that the financial state is broadly known. A plan is developed by the local budgetary affairs committees and the deans to increase revenues or decrease costs. There are suggestions of ways to reduce costs. At this stage it may include non-reappointment of probationary faculty. This is non-reappointment so we are not terminating probationary faculty in the midst of their appointment term, but notifying them that they would not be reappointed. During a financial crisis no involuntary dismissal of faculty or librarians with tenure can occur, and, no involuntary dismissal of faculty or librarians serving an unexpired appointment term. So, it would be probationary faculty who would be notified of non-reappointment.

The deans would submit a plan to the Chancellor which would include the faculty's position on the plan so that the faculty have an opportunity to indicate their support or areas in which they disagree with the dean's plan. The plan is forwarded to the Budgetary Affairs Committee for review and recommendations and those recommendations then go back to the Chancellor who will implement the plan as it is modified or approved.

At the final level we have "Financial Exigency." This is defined as when conditions pose an imminent threat of indefinite duration such that the central mission of the campus is in jeopardy. This is looking at a situation where severe actions are required in order to save the institution. There is a process by which financial exigency is declared. The Chancellor asked the Budgetary Affairs Committee to consider the possibility. The Budgetary Affairs Committee then is charged to consult with the Faculty Affairs Committee and with others as is appropriate. The Budgetary Affairs Committee must respond back to the Chancellor within 30 days. The Chancellor discusses the recommendations with the President of the Faculty Council and with the chairs of the Budgetary Affairs Committee and the Faculty Affairs Committee and, based on those discussions, will decide whether or not to declare the campus in a state of financial exigency. That declaration would take place in an open forum so the faculty will be aware.

The next step is to formulate a plan. A task force is appointed to formulate the plan that includes appropriate administrators, faculty and librarian representatives. There is discussion about who should be on the task force so again we are building in the opportunity to make sure that appropriate faculty are part of the task force. Specific recommendations are submitted by the affected units as to how the plan should be composed. Again, this is where it is important that the schools have in place their standing policies and procedures on how one would go about making these decisions. This plan would include identification of the specific individuals to be dismissed. At this point, only essential administrators, support personnel, and non-tenured faculty should remain. If we are to the point of dismissing tenured faculty members, the intent is that we have looked at all other ways of resolving the financial crisis.

The plans are brought together by the task force. It is then forwarded to the Chancellor. The Chancellor then forwards the plan to the Budgetary Affairs Committee, Faculty Affairs Committee, Faculty Council Executive Committee, and others as is appropriate for their discussion and recommendations. Those go again back to the Chancellor who finalizes the financial exigency plan and notifies administrators, faculty representatives, the President of Indiana University, and the IU Board of Trustees. There is a requirement of regular reporting to the Faculty Council for the duration of the financial exigency and this declaration is for a one year time frame. If it is resolved within one year, then the process must be reconsidered. At the conclusion of the period, it is specified that again there is a broad report as to what has happened.

The final section talks in terms of dismissal of specific individuals. The Chancellor notifies the individuals who are to be dismissed by certified mail. Tenured individuals receive two years notice or an amount equivalent to two years' salary and benefits or a combination of those two elements. Other employees receive the normal notice for termination.

There is a right to a Faculty Board of Review. The Faculty Board of Review hearing can address whether or not policies and procedures were followed, the validity of judgments and criteria for identification of who was to be terminated, and whether or not the criteria were applied properly. The right to request to Faculty Board of Review on hiring and rehiring issues is retained for three years.

As you read through this section, you will note that the institution is committing to trying to re-hire individuals who are dismissed, if at all possible for a three-year time frame. All dismissed tenured individuals shall be offered reinstatement before hiring of replacements for vacancies can begin. Individuals who were not reappointed or were terminated prior to expiration of a term shall be offered reinstatement before hiring a replacement for that individual. If there are vacancies due to attrition, there is only essential replacement hiring and, if at all possible, dismissed individuals will be considered for those attrition vacancies.

There is also a section which talks about special considerations which are given to the dismissed individuals looking at the possibility of could they be retrained or appointed to serve in another position if there is an opportunity for an appointment in another unit, or to another campus. There is a list of what we call "Affiliated" status privileges for three years to allow the opportunity for the individual to remain in contact with IUPUI and also the opportunity to continue in terms of scholarly productivity which would help them find another position.

That, in a brief summary, is what is contained in the document. What we would like you to do is take this back to your colleagues to begin the process of generating the broad discussion. If you have questions or comments or areas that you think we need to go back and look at again, I hope that you will forward your comments to Larry and me so that our respective committees can look at those areas.

TURNER: Thank you, Becky. We will discuss this further in some detail at the January meeting and take some action on it. It will be distributed to all members of the Council by then. You have your copy today and those who aren't here will receive it in the mail

AGENDA ITEM VI QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

TURNER: We have a few minutes left for a short question and answer period.

HOYT: To follow up on what Jeff said, would it be possible for both of these documents to be made available electronically. They are both somewhat lengthy and it would help us with the distribution with our colleagues to be able to tell them where to access it rather than trying to make a lot of copies of it.

TURNER: Yes.

KOLESKI: Where specifically would it be available electronically?

HOYT: I didn't know what the options would be electronically.

TURNER: I don't have a sense of how many people have the kind of access to make that a fair decision.

WARFEL: I think what we can do, Ray, is to see where we can put it and then let everyone know where it is.

KOLESKI: The reason is, on the first one, Financial Exigency, we are talking about a return date of January for discussion.

WARFEL: That one may not make it on time. But, certainly the second one, there is more time.

PLATER: At a minimum, we can put the documents behind the IUPUI Home Page. There is a section for faculty governance issues, and you can access the documents there. We should be able to mount them very quickly. So, if you have access to World Wide Webb and Internet, you can find the documents shortly.

KOLESKI: In our schools half of the computers have access and half don't. So, if it came in another way, by E-mail, it would be better.

CAMBRIDGE: In regard to the Task Force on Service, there will be a series of three workshops in January, February, and March for faculty to look at the document and also to try to apply the criteria in the document to actual artifacts people are now using when they are representing their service. The workshops will be advertised in the Office of Faculty Development booklet about faculty development activities in the spring.

ALIPRANTIS: What is the rumor about the Promotion and Tenure Committee for Purdue and IU systems? I understand that IU is 50 percent plus one and Purdue requires two-thirds. Are these rules going to apply this year?

PLATER: We followed the procedure of votes being recorded and reported; all dossiers being sent forward. A dossier is considered, a candidate is considered, and a vote is taken at each level. Where there is a committee, the vote is recorded, and that vote is forwarded along with the dossier to the next higher level. At Purdue, in the past, not always but frequently, if a dossier did not receive a two-thirds majority, it was stopped and did not go forward to the next level. Now, all dossiers will go forward.

NG: Do you or Chancellor Bepko actually make recommendations on promotion regarding the people in Purdue schools?

PLATER: Yes. That has always been the case.

NG: So, I think Roko's question may be, would you be making a positive or negative recommendation based on a two-thirds or 50 percent vote? How will you make the recommendation?

BEPKO: Recommendations will continue to be made based on a reading of the file no matter what the votes may be.

WARFEL: So you totally disregard the opinion of the . . . [laughter]

BEPKO: Contrary to popular view, that is not so. Those, of course, are of influence but not controlling. I think that was so even when there was a policy requiring two-thirds votes. I don't recall specific cases, but it seems to me that we have had somewhere the case may have stopped but it was resurrected because of the belief that the file was stronger than Panel E had credited it with being.

PLATER: This is a status report on enrollments. Some of you may know at the end of the regular registration, which we are now calling "Priority Registration," we had enrolled about 2,000 students fewer than last spring. I am pleased to tell you that as of today most of that has been made up. In fact, at the end of formal registration yesterday we were only 102 students, in terms of headcount, behind last spring. That is one-half of a percent, but we were actually ahead in credit hours by almost one percent. Beginning today and tomorrow a wash out will occur. This is a removal of students who have not yet paid their fees. There will be an attrition, as there always is, but there is an opportunity for those students, by special arrangement, to pay their fees and to be reinstated. So, we hope we will not have a significant loss. In fact, we are hopeful that the spring semester will actually begin with perhaps one student more than we had last spring. We can say that our enrollment increases continue. We need, at this moment, 103 students.

The efforts that many of the schools and individual faculty made during the past few weeks have really paid off. We think that there were about 300 or 400 students who enrolled who might not otherwise if there had not been that individual contact. So, it is making a difference and we encourage you not to let up, but in fact to see if we cannot turn this around and continue for two consecutive semesters with our enrollment increase. Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM VII UNFINISHED BUSINESS

TURNER: We will now move to unfinished business.

PORTER: May I speak on behalf of the IUPUI Handbook Committee? Those of you who have noted that you did not yet receive your copy of the IUPUI Supplement to the Indiana University Academic Handbook will be pleased to know that as a holiday gift soon to be in the mail will be the supplement. On behalf of the committee, we are presenting a copy of what it will look like to Chancellor Bepko and Dean Plater to publicize that please be looking for this. It should be in the mail soon. I think you will find it very useful in terms of being a place where you can find a tremendous amount of information. As you receive it and begin reviewing it, the Handbook Committee is already in the process of planning the next edition so give us feedback and let us know.

WARFEL: A special congratulations to that committee for coming in on time. It is a real undertaking to keep the Handbook up-to-date. Thank you very much.

AGENDA ITEM VIII NEW BUSINESS

TURNER: Do you have some new business, Martin?

SPECHLER: Are questions and answer still in order?

TURNER: We already did that.

BEPKO: Which do you have -- a question or an answer? [laughter]

SPECHLER: The question is an old question that has not yet been answered. We are certainly glad to see more students taking advantage of IUPUI. Some of my colleagues are worried about the quality of these students. I again would like to renew my question of what has happened to whatever objective indicators we have about the quality of students we are taking into IUPUI? That is my first question, Richard. The other question will wait until later.

PLATER: I would like to respond briefly to Martin's question. We can provide further information but in specific response to your question and inquiry, we arranged a faculty forum on exactly that issue in this building about two weeks ago. It was a panel led by Subir Chakrabarti, chair of the Student Affairs Committee, with participants including Bob Sandy and Victor Borden. They talked for a little more than one hour to an audience of about eight or ten colleagues. There was extensive discussion and review of all the data about the characteristics of the students that we are admitting and all of the criteria that went into the U.S. News and World Report rankings.

TURNER: I think the question is probably not one that we can answer in the time that we have left.

WARFEL: At this point, where can Martin go to find the answer?

PLATER: He can go to Victor Borden.

TURNER: It may be that the Student Affairs Committee needs to look at that, but they would need to construct a more useful question than just "What is the quality?" because it is a complex question.

BEPKO: I think it is also fair to say we have more information now, more insights into the different dimensions of the student body than we have ever had before. We really do have a lot of information and it permits a much better policy analysis now than we have ever been able to mount before.

SPECHLER: I would look forward to any information that might be available on this subject.

KOLESKI: Does Victor Borden know we are coming?

PLATER: Victor has a number of reports which are prepared that address the issues. Whether the answer to the specific question you have raised is readily available is something he would be able to address. We can make those reports available.

BEPKO: First I think we should get the dated reports that Victor Borden has generated and distribute them right away.

AGENDA ITEM IX ADJOURNMENT

TURNER: I am ready for a motion to adjourn. [Motion was made and seconded.] The meeting is adjourned. We will now move to Room 117 for the State of the Campus Address.

APPROVED: September 5, 1996

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY INDIANAPOLIS

FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING

January 11, 1996

SCHOOL OF DENTISTRY, S115

3:30 P.M.

PRESENT: Administration: Chancellor Gerald Bepko, Trudy Banta, William Plater. **Deans:** John Barlow, P Nicholas Kellum. **Elected Faculty:** Larry Abel, Susan Ball, Joseph Bidwell, Lynn Broderick, David Burr, Kenneth Byrd, Naomi Fineberg, Dolores Hoyt, M Jan Keffer, Missy Kubitschek, Rebecca Markel, Dana McDonald, William Orme, Bart Ng, Michael Penna, Richard Peterson, Richard Pflanzner, Rebecca Porter, Bernadette Rodak, Jane Schultz, Erdogan Sener, Stephen Stockberger, Karen Teeguarden, Kathleen Warfel, Charles Yokomoto. **Ex Officio Members:** James Baldwin, Henry Besch, S Edwin Fineberg, Juanita Keck, Byron Olson, Carl Rothe, Richard Turner, Rosalie Vermette.

ALTERNATES PRESENT: Deans: Shirley A. Ross for Angela McBride, Dolores Hoyt for Philip Tompkins. **Elected Faculty:** Robert Rigdon for Charalambos Aliprantis

ABSENT WITHOUT ALTERNATES: Deans: A. James Barnes, Trevor Brown, H. William Gilmore, Roberta Greene, Robert Holden, Kathy Krendl, Norman Lefstein, Doris Merritt, John Rau, Robert Shay, David Stocum, Philip Tompkins, Donald Warren, Charles Webb. **Elected Faculty:** W. Marshall Anderson, Margaret Applegate, Merrill Benson, Diane Billings, Ulf Jonas Bjork, Jana Bradley, Zacharie Brahma, Thomas Broadie, Timothy Brothers, Paul Brown, Timothy Byers, David Canal, Lucinda Carr, Michael Cohen, Jeanette Dickerson-Putman, Paul Dubin, Karen Gable, Patricia Gallagher, Joe Garcia, Bernardino Ghetti, Carlos Goldberg, Robert Havlik, William Hohlt, Antoinette Hood, Nathan Houser, Elizabeth Jones, Henry Karlson, Michael Klemsz, Raymond Koleski, Stephen Lalka, Miriam Langsam, Golam Mannan, Debra Mesch, Fred Pavalko, David Peters, Ken Rennels, Virginia Richardson, Edward Robbins, Brian Sanders, Mark Seifert, Anantha Shekhar, Jay Simon, Akhouri Sinha, Jerrold Stern, James Wallihan, Karen West, Kathryn Wilson, Richard Wyma, Mervin Yoder, Susan Zunt. **Ex Officio Members:** Ronald Dehnke, Paul Galanti, Carlyn Johnson, Stephen Leapman, Robert Lehnen, Justin Libby, Steven Mannheim, Martin Spechler, Marshall Yovits.

Visitors: Erwin Boschmann (Dean of the Faculties Office), Barbara Cambridge (Dean of the Faculties Office), Julie Fore (School of Medicine Library), Mark Grove (Registrar's Office), Harriet Wilkins (Chair, Constitution and Bylaws Committee).

AGENDA ITEM I: CALL TO ORDER

TURNER: I would like to call this meeting to order.

AGENDA ITEM II: MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS

TURNER: Distributed with the agenda were two memorial resolutions, One for David M. Dickey and one for Bruce V. Mitchell both from the School of Dentistry. I would like to ask you to stand for a moment of silence.

Before I turn to the next item on the agenda, I would like to note that we have many items of business that might take a good bit of time. Therefore, I am going to place some time limits on some agenda items. My expectation is that we can probably handle the election of the Faculty Boards of Review in 10 or 15 minutes. The discussion and the possible vote on the Allied Health Sciences amendment will take about 10 or 15 minutes. That leaves us about 30 minutes each for dealing with the discussion of the draft policy of Dealing With Financial Difficulties and another 30 minutes for the Faculty Work Memorandum. I think those are both expandable. We will have about 10 minutes under Unfinished Business to receive and announce the results of the Faculty Boards of Review election. We are going to look for a few minutes to see if we can come back to the General Education Principles and come to some kind of determination on that. That will probably take about five or ten minutes.

I will be watching the clock and calling the discussion to a close so that we can get to everything. With that explanation we will now turn to the Administrative Report with Chancellor Bepko.

AGENDA ITEM III: ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT

BEPKO: I have taken the lesser amount of time than was allocated for each of these activities and have backed that up to 5:30 and find that, in a very subtle fashion, you have given me 84 seconds for the Administrative report, which is a little too long actually. *[laughter]*

I would like to mention three things. One, because it is so interesting and important. Two, enrollment, because it is so timely. The third involves some deadlines which are coming up.

The first one we are very proud of. Last month we noted how much national attention is coming to the faculty and to the programs of IUPUI. Every week we learn something new about the activities on this campus and how they are being appreciated and lauded by faculty members and the University people all across the country. Today I would like to ask the person who I think is most responsible for one of the more important developments of the recent past. That is our own member, Bart Ng who, along with one of his colleagues in Bloomington and a couple of other colleagues from around the IU system, has shepherded a National Science Foundation project to the funding stage, nearly \$3 million for new approaches to teaching math. Bart, will you mention that?

NG: We have been recommended for funding of our proposal, the title of which is "Mathematics and

Undergraduate Education: A New Framework for Mutual Invigoration." By the way, a referee who read our proposal, Becky [Porter] would appreciate that, said "This sounds like an excellent proposal for physical therapy." [*Laughter*] But, in spite of that remark, he still recommended that we be funded.

We will be receiving about \$700,000 a year for four years. This is a full partnership between us and Bloomington together with the various other campuses within the IU system to develop a new approach for interdisciplinary course development. Essentially, we tried to aim to raise the "numeracy" all students, rather than the just math majors, across the board. So, this is not really just for teaching people mathematics for mathematics sake, but rather trying to put mathematics in context so that students will understand and appreciate how mathematics is essential.

We already have approximately 60 or 80 faculty members from approximately 20 different departments all over the IU system on board. In fact, we will continue to solicit new ideas and the possibility for new proposals for course development. We are still working on the final details. Dan Mackie and I are the principals. You will hear more from us as things get developed and as we get going on the project. The bad news is that our original proposal was cut substantially, but I think we still did reasonably well. It is one of six grants awarded nationally. I think Jerry mentioned the other schools. They are the University of Pennsylvania, Poly Technical Institute, Dartmouth, Oklahoma State/Nebraska. Thank you.

BEPKO: Congratulations, Bart. [*applause*] Next Bill will give us the enrollment report as of the opening of the semester.

PLATER: There is good news, though I must begin by saying that we did not match our Spring enrollment headcount of last year. The campus as a whole is down 1.1 percent (that is about 285 students) from Spring a year ago. There was more significant decline at the Columbus campus. If you look only at Indianapolis, the decline was about 184 students, a decrease of a little less than one percent. There continues to be evidence that our marketing efforts are paying off and that we are doing a better job of attracting new students as well as retaining current students.

The significant good news is that our credit hours were up overall by about 1.2 percent. Many schools enjoyed enrollment increases in terms of credit hours. This reflects, by and large, the trend we have more full-time students and it accounts for the reason that the credit hours have gone up while the headcount has actually gone down. Most of the schools that had enrollment decreases anticipated them and planned for them, so I think overall we are in very good shape for the Spring semester.

BEPKO: Do we know about other campuses within the IU system?

PLATER: We do not have definitive information, but I can say that all of the campuses that we know about have had decreases in the headcount. Most of them reported decreases significantly greater than ours, some in the six, even, or eight percent range. Most of them have also had decreases in student credit hours, though not all. Some have had the same pattern that we have had. Bloomington was down slightly in headcount and also down slightly in credit hours.

NG: You said there would be _____ last spring. Is that a year ago last spring?

PLATER: That is correct.

NG: So, there are fewer freshmen matriculated this semester. Is that correct?

PLATER: I am sorry Bart, I cannot tell you now whether the decrease is in the first-year students. Mark may have a sense of whether it is beginning students or not.

GROVE: The incoming population, Bart, for the Spring semester will be down. Alan doesn't have the final figures yet, but as of Monday of next week we will be able to answer more of these questions. Because we had a good increase in getting students in the Fall, many of those are carried forward in departments such as mathematics and liberal arts who are benefitting from that strong beginning class this past fall.

BEPKO: Finally, many have asked about the Strategic Directions (SDC) proposals, funding, and how the campus is going to provide encouragement, advice, and evaluation of proposals that emanate from IUPUI. Trudy Banta will give you some information about that.

BANTA: Most of you have picked up the Strategic Directions Proposal Guidelines and another piece on workshop schedules. We have engaged in a two year-long planning process at the campus level to involve as many faculty as possible in thinking about the IU Strategic Directions and the proposals that will come in. We have seven study groups, each organized around one of our IUPUI aspirations and goals, with appropriate Strategic Directions topics under each. Those study groups are now involved in the review process. Each of the study groups has named one representative to an overall review panel that will carefully read the IUPUI proposals and make comments that we hope will strengthen them as they go forward to the university-wide process. There is time for pre-proposals to be reviewed, shared with the study groups and a response communicated to the Pis. February 1 is the date for full proposals to be sent to Research and Sponsored Programs. Immediately thereafter, they will be reviewed by the IUPUI panel. By the middle of the month they will be further reviewed by the Planning Committee, which represents the Faculty Council in this process. This committee will have an opportunity to look at the proposals and make some judgments about relative priorities. There will also be some reviews by the administration -- the deans, vice chancellors -- and ultimately the proposals will be sent with some recommendations to be processed in by university-wide review panels. Are there any questions about the IUPUI review process?

PETERSON: I was under the impression that all proposals could go forward whether or not they are approved at the campus level. What is the real story on that?

BANTA: Every one will go forward, it is just that there may be a special endorsement by the Chancellor for some. These will be ones that he feels are particularly good in terms of campus directions and

priorities. These are ones that we feel are particularly good. There may also be multi-campus proposals that will come in strongly when viewed together with all the others from the IU system. Are there any other questions?

AGENDA ITEM IV: PRESIDENT'S REPORT

WARFEL: I will take just a few minutes to make sure that everyone is on the same wave length about a number of issues. Barbara Cambridge handed out a document about Modifications of Principles of Undergraduate Learning. This is what Richard said we were going to look at under Unfinished Business. You remember in September this Council expressed three reservations about the principles and it is hoped that this material will solve the problems that the Faculty Council had back then. Although you need to pay attention to what is going on at Council, if you can simutanenously look this document over so we can discuss it later.

It is past time by a few weeks for me to officially tell people how many unit representatives need to be elected to the Council next year. Letters will go out to the heads of the school governance bodies, but briefly I will say that the schools that will need to be electing unit representatives for next year's Council include Continuing Studies, Dentistry, Engineering and Technology, Liberal Arts, Law, Medicine, Music, Physical Education, Science, SPEA, and the University Libraries. The other schools have representatives continuing and we will not be adding new unit representatives from those schools next year. The unit representatives' names are to be submitted to the Executive Committee by March 15.

Other election related things that are going on include the at-large election and the election of representatives to the University Faculty Council (UFC) are proceeding as they should be.

You will recall that we had the faculty vote on the constitutional amendment regarding the non-voting membership of the Staff Council President and the Senior Academy representative. Those ballots are all in, but the official ballot opening committee has not been able to meet with Bernice because of the holidays and the weather. As soon as those ballots are tallied, we can officially report to you on that.

Something to look forward to at our next meeting which is an important issue is the Academic Affairs Committee. They have looked at the resolutions from the Trustees about Grade Indexing and Grading Policy. They will be submitting something to the Executive Committee and we will bring it to this Council in February.

Concerning Faculty Boards of Review, we do have one formal hearing stage of a faculty board of review in process now and which concerned Faculty Board of Review #3. One of the members of Faculty Boards of Review #3 was on sabbatical so, according to the rules, the Executive Committee replaced that individual with someone else. It was Peg Fierke who was not able to serve on that Board and we replaced her with Justin Libby who had been elected to Boards of Review in the past and who was in fact willing to take on this job. That is the only Board of Review that is active at this point, although there is another request for a Board of Review in the very early stages.

Some of you had asked that the documents we are working on now -- the memo about Faculty Work, the Draft of the Policy Dealing With Financial Difficulties, and the draft report from the Task Force on Services -- are in fact going to be available on line through the IUPUI World Wide Web Home Page. I have more information for anybody who wants it right now. Those of you who are on an E-mail system will receive a message regarding this. That is all I have to report today.

TURNER: Thanks, Kathy.

AGENDA ITEM V: ELECTION OF FACULTY BOARDS OF REVIEW

TURNER: We will now turn to the election of the Faculty Boards of Review. The Nominating Committee will conduct this election.

HOYT: You are to vote for four for the first Board and for three for the other two boards.

AGENDA ITEM VI: ALLIED HEALTH SCIENCES AMENDMENT

TURNER: We can continue with Agenda Item VI. The Constitution and Bylaws Committee has brought before us the proposed Allied Health Sciences amendment. I would like to turn the discussion over to Harried Wilkins, Chair of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee. I would also like to mention that Harriet has agreed to act as the Parliamentarian for the Faculty Council for the rest of the year.

H. WILKINS: With your agenda you received a document which says "IUPUI Faculty Council Constitution and Bylaws Committee" with the amendment proposals. Before I give you some background on these proposals and make a motion for your actions, let me ask you to make one change. Toward the bottom of the first page in *Article IV Faculty Council* in the section which will be new, the last sentence says, "The organization of University librarians." I would ask you to change that to "the University Libraries." The last sentence will now read "The University Libraries of IUPUI shall be considered an academic unit."

Let me give you some background and then ask you to take some action on this proposal. At the time that the School of Allied Health status was changed to make it a university wide school with its own dean, but reporting to the Dean of the School of Medicine, Allied Health came to the Executive Committee asking whether it would be appropriate for them to be represented directly to the Council. The question was given to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee. It tended to be the sort of thing that we would look at the beginning of the year and worry about for a while and find it easy to put on the back burner because it was difficult to deal with. We couldn't find a way to resolve it. Finally, this year we came back to it one more time. We have had conversations with the faculty organization of the School of Allied Health Sciences. We have had conversations with various deans who were involved. What we agreed to, we hope, is not only a way to resolve that particular question which brought the matter to our attention, but also to give you some language about the definition of academic units for the

purposes of representation to the Council which we feel is more appropriate and better placed. As we began to look at the location of the information in the Constitution, we felt that we were looking at something which was in the wrong place. What we really needed to be looking at was the definition of academic units in terms of representation to this body, not in some sort of abstract, isolated way. The definition in our current Constitution is in the section which talks about the exercise of faculty rights. We felt that was an inappropriate place for the definition to be located. Therefore, we are bringing you a couple of amendments which will relocate that definition and change the language of that definition.

The first amendment then is to change *Article III* of the Constitution. *Article I* talks about faculty membership, *Article II* lists faculty rights and responsibilities, and *Article III* is devoted to exercise of rights and responsibilities. What we are proposing to you is a new section A which will be a statement about the way faculty exercise their rights and responsibilities in academic units and then to re-letter the other sections so that *Section A. Faculty Council* now becomes *Section B. Section B. The Review of Council Actions* will now become *Section C* and *Section C. Meetings of the Faculty* will now become *Section D*. Our rationale is that it is in academic units that we have our basic exercise of the faculty rights and responsibilities outlined in *Section II*. It is more appropriate for that to be the lead item in *Article III*. That is the substance of this first proposed amendment, placing the statement about Exercise of Rights as Section A and moving the others down with no change of language.

PETERSON Relative to that, there is more to Article III, Section D. than that one sentence. What happens to the rest of the original Article III?

H. WILKINS: Most of the rest of the section is moved to Article IV. Article IV is where we propose to put the information defining academic units for the purpose of representation to this Council. We propose to do that with the language that you have at the beginning of the article, before the section about elected members. Right now *Section I* has ex officio members. *Section II* is a long section on elected members and then *Section III* has alternate members. *Section IV* has student members. That latter part may be changed if the amendment which was passed last year has been confirmed by the faculty, but we haven't done anything with that except to change the letters. What we would propose is that we move the *Elected Members* to be the first section under that article and before we get into the *a, b, c, d, e, f*, of that we have this preamble which you have in italics.

Faculty members dedicated to teaching, research/creative work, and service shall represent academic units. To be entitled to representation on the Faculty Council, an academic unit shall have its faculty organization documents on file with the President of the Faculty, be headed by an academic Dean, and be certified by the Chancellor of IUPUI. The University Libraries of IUPUI shall be considered an academic unit.

The major change there is to take out that language about whom the deans report to and to add the language which we found in an old constitution. Fortunately one of our members, Carl Rothe, keeps everything. He found an old constitution from the days when the Faculty Council was new and the University was growing along and adding new academic units. At that time there was a piece of that

constitution that said that when new academic units were formed on the campus that the way the Faculty Council came to recognize them was through "certification by the Chancellor." Our proposal is that we pick up that old language from the old constitution and we make it clear that it is a dean who is the head of this academic unit and that we also try to get faculty to organize themselves in their units and to have their organization on file. I suppose that this could give the Executive Committee the authority, if somebody doesn't file their constitution with them, to decide that they don't get representation here. I don't know whether the Executive Committee would choose to do that. For a long time we have had something in the constitution about the faculty organization documents being on file. That is really not new. To answer that question, the information which was formerly in Article III, we have now proposed to move to Article IV.

The third proposal is a proposed amendment to the Bylaws. As part of the action that we would like for you to take, we would ask you to say that this would not go into effect until after the constitutional amendments would go into effect. The reason is that constitutional amendments don't go into effect until the following academic year. Bylaw amendments can go into effect immediately. Right now, in the language about representation to the Promotion and Tenure Committee, Allied Health is named specifically as having one of the representatives from the School of Medicine, and while we like the people from Allied Health, we really didn't think they deserve two representatives. By taking them out here and presuming they would then have direct representation to the Council, they would have their representation on the Promotion and Tenure Committee in the same way everyone else does. These changes don't do anything to the way that the School of Medicine and the School of Allied Health run their business or, as we understand it, won't do anything to the way that the Promotion and Tenure procedure is done over there. This is just a matter of representation to this council and to the committees of this council.

I don't know how you would like to proceed, Dick, whether you would like general questions or do you want to do it item by item?

TURNER: There is a motion.

H. WILKINS: I would suggest that you act on them one by one. I would move, on behalf of the committee, that the amendments to Article III as outlined In the document, be approved by the Council.

TURNER: Is there a second? [Seconded] Is there any more discussion? If not, we can move ahead to a vote. It doesn't need a second. All In favor of adopting the change In Article III, Section A, as recommended by the Constitution and Bylaws Committee, indicate by saying "Aye." Are there any opposed? [none] That passes.

H. WILKINS: On behalf of the committee, I would recommend that the proposed amendments to Article IV, as outlined in the handout, be adopted with the change.

TURNER: Is there any discussion of Article IV?

WARFEL: Can we go back to reinserting the phrase about "be certified by the Chancellor of IUPUI?" I am concerned that there may have been a good reason that it was taken out of the constitution. I don't know if Carl remembers why it disappeared. If I ask myself, "What does it mean?" I am not sure what it means. You are the Chancellor, do you know what it means?

BEPKO: [shaking head to indicate no]

WARFEL: Does this give an evil chancellor the right to say "I don't care that you are the School of Medicine, I am not going to certify you for Faculty Council purposes?"

H. WILKINS: I suppose that would be an option.

GALANTI: Wasn't it sort of the opposite way? To prevent the situation where a non-academic group that is called a unit and has as its head someone designated "a dean," but which is not truly an academic unit as we think of such units, saying "We are entitled to membership on the Faculty Council." They might, in fact, have an organization document. They might be headed by a dean, fudging on the word "academic." This is sort of a safeguard for the chancellor giving him or her a chance to say, "No, you are an administrative unit or you are a non-academic service unit, therefore, you are not certified as an academic unit for purposes of the Faculty Council."

WARFEL: Couldn't we let the Executive Committee do that?

ROTHE: If I recall correctly, it seems to me that part of the rationale is that the administration is the one who decides who is going to be a dean. Therefore, with that bit of logic, if they make that decision, it is then their responsibility as well as prerogative to decide whether they should be considered an academic unit for purposes of the Council. Since that point starts at the administrative level, it seemed to us to be adequate to stay with that language. Of course, the other alternative is, as you say, the Executive Committee making the decision. It seems to me that if we are going to do that, then it should come back to this body not the Executive Committee. It just seems simpler, more straight forward and reasonable to assume our Chancellor will make the right decision.

BEPKO: I think that, while I may not have been altogether enamored of the idea at the time, I think that this body has sought to re-define the relationship between the administration of the University and the Faculty Council by having the Faculty Council be more independent. The symbol of the partnership used to be that the Chancellor was the presiding officer at the Faculty Council meetings. We all decided together that it might be better to have the Council itself act as an independent body. For that reason, as well as for the fact that the administration does appoint the deans, so there is already one opportunity for the administration to participate in the decision as to what units are represented, I think it would probably be as well to have the certification actually done by the body itself. That is true of Congress. That is true of state legislatures. Those bodies certify membership and it is not the executive branch of government that does the certifying in most cases. However, at the same time, I would raise a question that may be answered easily, but I don't see the answer to it, and that is, there may be more than just

Allied Health that is envisioned or covered by this proposed change. We have IUPU Columbus which is not now represented, but which is a unit of sorts, does have an academic dean, and could be certified, I supposed, so that there would be another entity that has faculty members in it who could be represented under this language.

H. WILKINS: The difficulty as we worked with it, is that almost every time we came up with language, then we would start through the list of all the units that we knew and try to see who that brought in and who that excluded. Because of the great variety of organizational structures here, it gets extremely complicated. I think you are probably right about Columbus.

ROTHE: Part of the reason, for example, that the Columbus campus, most of those units are already parts of other units.

BALDWIN: Except for the Purdue schools.

H. WILKINS: I don't think that the committee would object if someone wants to propose an amendment to change the language from '*Certified by the Chancellor*' to '*Certified by the Faculty Council*.'

BEPKO: If I could just comment on Carl's comment. I think he is right in that the Columbus-based faculty are members of departments up here with the exception of the Purdue faculty, although they are Purdue statewide technology and technically they are not IUPUI faculty at all. But, that is also true of Allied Health faculty today. Allied Health faculty are members of a unit that is represented.

BESCH: It is very clear that the section that we created to keep Allied Health from having a representative was that section which read, "which reports, by virtue of a dean directly to the Chancellor." As regards idea that the chancellor might be the certifier. today I would agree with your comments that we are in a different situation than we were when that language was written. In fact, the chancellor certified the numbers of faculty, by an article, the individual faculty of all units, according to our Constitution at that time.

BEPKO: I think we agree.

PETERSON: With respect to the dean of the School of Allied Health Sciences, do you appoint him or is he appointed by the Dean of the School of Medicine?

BEPKO: The incumbent was appointed by the Dean of the School of Medicine.

PORTER: but, at that time, we did not have school status. At that time we were a division within the School of Medicine.

PETERSON: Under these conditions, if a new dean were to be appointed, would you be the one

responsible for appointing that dean?

BEPKO: I think the answer would be that the reporting line still goes through the dean's office. all university offices are appointed by the trustees, but the first recommendation and the appointment of the search committee would be in the dean's office of the School of Medicine. I think that is how it would work even today, even though we have designated Allied Health as a school, and even though the head of the school is a dean. Because of the reporting line the first recommendation and the search committee would be in the dean's office within the School of Medicine. That is not to say it will always be that way. I think that most everyone envisions this as a process of gaining independence, but it has been a step at a time and not dramatic. So, it may be in the future Allied Health will be a separate school.

PORTER: I am Becky Porter of the School of Allied Health Sciences, but I sit here as an at-large representative. The language has been troublesome. But, the concepts I hope is abundantly clear. We are an undergraduate unit who sits within the School of Medicine. Our faculty concerns and our interests are different than the interests of our School of Medicine colleagues. We ask that we have the opportunity to be represented in this body so that we may speak on our own behalf. Without having representation that is recognized within the Faculty Council, there are opportunities which we miss. For example, there was a meeting at the beginning of this academic year where the presidents of faculty organizations were invited to talk about what was happening on this campus. Because we are not recognized as a unit for Faculty Council representation, even though we have a president of a faculty organization and that faculty organization has been separate from the School of Medicine since I joined the faculty in 1976, we were not invited. It wasn't intentional. It was an oversight, but we would ask that we have an opportunity to be visible and be vocal on our own behalf.

TURNER: Is there further discussion? Is there any suggestions on changing the language?

ROTHE: What is the status of the Chancellor versus....

H. WILKINS: No one has done anything. If a member of this body wants to make a motion for the amendment, they may do so.

BALDWIN: I would so do that. If the language could be changed to '*be certified by vote of the Faculty Council.*'

BEPKO: I second that. *[laughter]*

TURNER: Harriet, you suggested that at least that would be a friendly amendment.

J. KECK: Could you repeat it for some of us who are getting hard of hearing in our old age?

BALDWIN: I make a motion that the language be changed to read:

and be certified by vote of the IUPUI Faculty Council."

TURNER: Is there further discussion? Hearing none, we can move to a vote. All of those in favor of the amendment to language as proposed. All in favor of amending it as suggested, say "Aye." [Unanimous] Those opposed, say "Nay." [none]

PETERSON: What is the form for certification? I don't know if we have a protocol for certification within the Bylaws of IUPUI Faculty Council.

H. WILKINS: There isn't anything right now. We can take that back to the committee. It would seem to me that when the president brings the kind of report that she did today about what elections need to take place for next year, sometime in that process there would need to be a proposal of the academic units recognized for the following academic year.

TURNER: Are there other questions or discussion? Hearing none, let me ask you to vote on the language as amended. All in favor of Article IV as presented and amended, say "aye." [unanimous] Those opposed, say "Nay." [none]

H. WILKINS: On behalf of the committee I would move that the Bylaws be amended under Article III, Section C: Composition. Description of the Promotion and Tenure Committee and that this bylaw change go into effect after the constitutional change goes into effect.

TURNER: Is there discussion on this motion?

WARFEL: In the current Section C.1. Composition:-- as you have your italics here, you don't include the last sentence that is currently in number 1- Composition. The last sentence is "the chair of the committee shall be elected from and by the members of the committee."

H. WILKINS: I apologize. That is an oversight and it should be included in there.

WARFEL: So, you didn't mean to eliminate that sentence.

H. WILKINS: We did not mean to eliminate that sentence. If you would add the last sentence of that current section: *the chair of the committee shall be elected from and by the members of the committee.* "The only change that we intend is that the #3 will be changed to #2 and that Allied Health will be eliminated as specifically having _____ representative.

TURNER: Is there any further discussion?

BALDWIN: I would like to ask a question about the term 'library faculty.' Does that refer back to the library faculty of the university libraries of IUPUI and not all of the librarians on campus?

ORME: That is all of the librarians.

TURNER: Are there any other comments or questions? If not, let me call for a vote on this last section as proposed. All in favor of the language suggested by the committee and as clarified in the discussion, say "Aye." [Unanimous] Are there any opposed? [None]

H. WILKINS: Regarding the proposed amendments to the Constitution, first of all, the faculty is notified that this Council has taken action and then following that notification, a ballot is sent to the faculty. For the first two, that will be the procedure that will be followed. Thank you very much.

TURNER: Thank you, Harriet.

RODAK: I am Bernadette Rodak, School of Allied Health Sciences. As President of the School of Allied Health Sciences, I would like to thank and commend the committee for all their hard work. [applause]

AGENDA ITEM VII: DRAFT POLICY ON DEALING WITH FINANCIAL DIFFICULTIES

TURNER: We can now move on. I think my idea about time limits on each item is deteriorating. We can turn to Agenda Item VII - the Draft Policy on Dealing With Financial Difficulties. I will ask Larry Wilkins and Rebecca Porter to lead the discussion. We have 30 minutes to move to through the discussion of this document.

PORTER: We made a presentation last month to walk individuals through the document so it was not our intent to repeat that presentation today. Rather we are here to listen areas of comment.

TURNER: The floor is now open for discussion. In this case, the policy takes into account dismissal for financial exigency, but the committee has expanded to the whole range of financial difficulties. We need to talk about this. We need to understand clearly what is at stake here and say what we want to happen. The Budgetary Affairs Committee and the Faculty Affairs Committee have worked on this long and hard and what they bring you today is the result of that effort.

WARFEL: I think it is a very fine document and I think that the process of working with several committees together touching base often with the administration has been extremely useful. I hate to jump too far to begin, but I was wondering if you could clarify on what is now page 10, when we are talking about Faculty Boards of Review, so that individuals who have in fact been dismissed can have a Faculty Board of Review. In "A" the document says that the findings of Faculty Boards of Review in previous proceedings involving the same issue may be introduced. I wondered if one of you could clarify what you mean by that.- - the actual details of individual previous cases or summary documents.?

L. WILKINS I think the intent is more toward summary documents and conclusions reached by other Faculty Boards of Review as opposed to the details on a given grievance or controversy. It seems to me

the main operating idea in that sentence is that individual boards of review don't have to operate in a complete vacuum for the purpose of deciding cases that are likely to be similar in terms of the subject matter of the grievance. But, it is not an intent to widely disseminate the delicate and potentially embarrassing details of a grievance or controversy.

PORTER: I just want to note that this particular one deals with the policies and procedures of declaring financial exigency. That process isn't specific to an individual. It is whether or not the administration and faculty actions have proceeded in the sequence that has been described. If the procedures were not followed for declaring financial exigency, it is not specific to an individual, although there may be difference faculty boards of review that are sequential to hearing a person's appeal based on this lack of following procedures.

WARFEL: Later in the document, after "C", it says that the merits of the overall financial exigency plan shall not be subject to the board of review. So, what you are saying really is that a grievant can't ask for a board of review saying, "Look, it isn't fair that I am the one that they got rid of. They should have gotten rid of this other person."

L. WILKINS: That is not the intent of that at all which is one reason why we did put FINANCIAL EXIGENCY PLAN in caps. That refers to a specific document that is developed through this rather detailed process at the institutional level as opposed to an individual decision in which the plan as implemented at a particular unit or school level.

WARFEL: In my mind, I had that financial exigency plan naming names about who is going to go.

L. WILKINS: That is the over-arching document under which particular decisions are made after it is developed and approved through the approval process.

PORTER: The intent is that the Faculty Board of Review would look at whether or not the criteria for applying was unfair to the individual. That certainly is within the purview. The plan is developed through an extended process with multiple opportunities for faculty input. We were concerned that the Faculty Board of Review, if they went back and said, "Well, instead of doing this cut here, you should have tweaked the budget there." It would take them too long and it would be a very small faculty group who was looking at a plan that had been agreed to by a much broader group. We will make sure that is clear.

WARFEL: I like what you are saying now. I think I had the wrong idea about what the plan was.

PETERSON: I had a question about the process. I certainly appreciate the work that this committee has done and the protections that have been built into this document. But, relative to process, as I heard this described last time and as we are discussing it this time, it seems like there might be some time... I am wondering if, before this is to be done and when the process is done, can the committee give me some idea of what the timing of this will be? Is it a matter of months, years, or decades before we can go

through this process of getting an approved exigency document?

L. WILKINS: The committee itself was concerned about time in many respects. I think the orientation of the committee was to devise a process that allowed us as a collection of decision makers to act with dispatch but without having to act so quickly as to maybe unintentionally tread on rights or entitlement. I think that the time frame that emerges would be better stated in terms of months rather than weeks and certainly not years.

PETERSON: Some of these decisions obviously have to be made reasonably quick once you find that there is a significant...

L. WILKINS: In fact, you will find a fairly well defined time frame in the sense that once a financial exigency is declared, it has a life of one year. If the problem is not well underway to being resolved, the process must begin anew in terms of declaring financial exigency and perhaps revising the plan.

BALDWIN: I would like to go back to the issue that Kathy raised, because there is something that is still bothers me. On page 10, 2.A, the last sentence, "*The findings of Faculty Boards of Review...*" I think from the discussion meant the findings with regard to general procedures, but the way the sentence reads, it looks like they would actually be able to ask for the final documents of a board of review that was done three or four years earlier. I always thought that those things were supposed to be confidential. I would hate to see, having served on a board of review, that these things float up ten years later without any effort to protect the confidentiality of the names or the people on the review, etc. When we do the boards of review, we tell people that they are confidential among the group, the plaintiff, the chancellor and the President of the Faculty. We have to tell them that maybe 10 years from now there might be a case where it will be dragged up and who knows who will have it? Is that what is intended?

PORTER: No. The intent was that if there were a finding that in this specific case of declaring financial exigency, that there had been a fundamental flaw in the process, the Chancellor had declared it with none of the consultation that is envisioned in this document, that finding could be presented to a subsequent board of review involving someone who was dismissed within that time frame.

BALDWIN: So, the document would ask from the Chancellor is the findings of the boards of review with names and dates in it. Would you want those deleted for confidentiality purposes?

PORTER: Clearly this is an area that is raising a concern. If you will allow us to go back and think about how we can better clarify the intent and provide the appropriate protection, we will be delighted to work on this again.

BESCH The Constitution requires the document be destroyed after three years so in a situation of four years or ten years later, the documents wouldn't be available.

L. WILKINS: I can't imagine a question of the policy and procedure involving the implementation of a

financial exigency plan that has a life of one year arising 10 years later. I take your point of view as a valid one that there needs to be some qualifying terminology to limit the reach of evidence to be brought before the board of review. I think we can fix that.

YOKOMOTO: I have been on two boards of review and in both cases we were told to only look at the procedures and not on the merit of the particular case. When you say the validity of the judgment, isn't that getting into the domain of merit now or am I misreading it? Does this now mean that the boards of review have expanded their domain?

BESCH: I have been associated with I think 12 board of review cases and we have never rendered ourselves to only the procedures.

WARFEL: Charlie, the actual language in the "Purpose" section of the bylaws reads: *The Faculty Boards of Review shall determine whether appropriate procedures were followed, whether the grievance arose from inadequate consideration of the qualifications of the faculty member or librarian, whether presentation of erroneous information substantially affected the decision and whether essential fairness was accommodated throughout the decision-making process.* So, whoever told you that you could not follow procedures was erroneously misleading you.

L. WILKINS: It seems to me that that is not the effect of the subsection that Charlie just mentioned. Those subsections are addressed to the problem of redoing the entire process of deciding whether financial exigency exists. I don't think any of us here want to be involved in any sense in a faculty board of review that is charged with that kind of responsibility or take it on. I think the streamlining that is involved here is seeking to pursue the interests of faculty members who would like to have these decisions made by some reasonably early date. I have also served on faculty boards of review and I know how complicated and strung out it can get. It seems to be that it doesn't work to faculty members' interest to have a board of review process strung out in this kind of a case.

KUBITSCHEK: I wasn't here last time and so I don't know if I am raising something that people have talked about already. On page 11, under "Replacement and Reinstatement...", *...all tenured faculty and librarians shall be reinstatement and a reasonable time in which to accept or decline it before hiring can begin for full-time or part-time replacement faculty or librarians...* I am concerned about the part-time replacement faculty. If you are offered a part-time job as reinstatement, you might well not be able to accept that. The movement toward part-time faculty I think completely undermines a university. We have been trying to cut down on part-time faculty in favor of full-time faculty, and it would be a great temptation after a large cutback to replace with part-time faculty. Maybe I am missing something, but I don't think that is wise.

PORTER: We certainly are not advocating replacing full-time faculty with part-time faculty. We were trying to build in a protection so that people who were dismissed would have an opportunity for employment. Again, we will go back and look at the wording to see if we have clearly expressed our intent.

L. WILKINS: It seems to me that what we were trying to do was be all inclusive. Would striking "full-time or part-time" satisfy your concern? Then it would read: ...*before hiring can begin for replacement faculty...*"

TURNER: The ordinary situation would be for tenured faculty or librarians to be full-time.

L. WILKINS: The thinking is that it started out as "can begin for full-time replacement." Then, the question was asked, "Doesn't that mean that they could avoid that by hiring part-time?" We said, "No." It seems to be that we now go back to the more general idea and prohibit replacements without an opportunity for...

PETERSON: When one uses the term "reinstatement," does that mean that that faculty member would be reinstated without full tenured faculty status at the time that that position was re-offered? Or, would they have to start all over again with the tenure track process?

PORTER: That was never our intent.

PETERSON: You would need something specific. You would be at the same status at which you left and I hope that no one would interpret it any differently.

GALANTI: The use of the word "reinstatement" rather than re-hire to my mind satisfies that. The simple meaning of the word "reinstatement" means that you come back as you were, not starting from scratch. I have a great deal of trouble with the "re-hire." The word "reinstatement" I have no trouble with.

PLATER: One of the reasons for me to participate in the committees' discussions was to urge some flexibility for units that are under financial exigency. In this regard I would say that reinstatement might mean coming back at a lower salary than you left if that unit's way of addressing financial exigency in part were for everyone, for example, to have a reduction in salary. So, I think we ought to understand that It means reinstatement in the context and I would certainly agree that a person ought to come back at full rank and comparable salary, if there had been some other kind of adjustment. But, what I am arguing for is allowing us enough flexibility to deal with whatever the financial exigency is. I would say the same thing applies to part-time faculty. I think said something about this to the committee before and I would argue that one way in which a school or unit may address, financial exigency is by relying, in part, on part-time people to help it through a transition period. By removing that as a possibility, we may compound the problem.

J. KECK: I don't want anyone to think I agree with Bill on regular terms, *[laughter]* but when I had my hand up before he spoke, that was exactly going to my comment. If you take part-time out, tenured faculty almost by definition means full-time, does it not? If that is taken out, that means while this person is gone you can hire part-time people to fill that faculty position. I would strongly urge putting part-time back in because that then states that that person's position can't be filled by anyone at any level until that person has been offered that position back again. I didn't read that at all to mean that we could

fill with part-time. That told me that it gave us no permission to fill with part-time.

TURNER: So, you don't agree with Bill.

J. KECK: I did agree with Bill, didn't I?

TURNER: No. *[laughter]*

J. KECK: then, I definitely don't agree with Bill. *[laughter]* I am saying we need the flexibility for part-time because if you have someone out there who can already do that, the person who lost their position should be the first person to be hired back part-time.

PETERSON: But, it is cheaper.

J. KECK: But, it is not fair.

TURNER: There was another concern raised earlier concerning people who had been full-time, tenured being invited back, and thereby following the language, but offered not a full-time reinstatement, but a part-time reinstatement.

J. KECK: But, you can't fully replace a tenured faculty with a part-time position which can't be tenured.

L. WILKINS: Tenured and unemployed and tenured and part-time, if those are the only options, *[laughter]*, I want an opportunity to decline or accept the position.

BURR: This is a different topic. Do you want to stick with this topic or do you want me to go on?

TURNER: Hold on a minute.

FINEBERG: I would interpret it to say that if there is only enough money to hire someone part-time, the full-time person who is let go should be offered that job before you start hiring other part-time people. But, what I think it should also include is that accepting that does not take away their right to request a full-time position which become available the next year. In other words, they could say, "We gave you this part-time job, therefore next year we can open up a full-time job and we don't have to consider you because we have already given you this. Therefore, I think they should have the opportunity but I think it should not preclude their rights to the next full-time job that opens up. Maybe that somehow needs to be clarified in there.

FORE: It seems to me that, if you take out both the words "full-time and part-time" and just say "before hiring can begin for replacement faculty for any vacancies," if a vacancy comes up and it is a part-time vacancy, you are going to fill with that person. So, if you don't state either way, it doesn't seem that

limits you to only full-time people.

ORME: Maybe I am confused about the issue, but it seems to me that what is lacking in some sense is a statute of limitations of some sort. Maybe that is more than a three-year period. If you are reinstated as a part-time and that is all that is offered to you under conditions of financial exigency, does that status not revert back once the exigency is lifted? If there is that kind of clause, then it seems to me perhaps to address the concern. I think the concern is you are going to be stuck with the option of either being unemployed or being employed part-time forever.

TURNER: David, do you want to go ahead with your concern?

BURR: On Page 8, in the two paragraphs in the middle and at the bottom of the page that deal with guidelines of dismissing existing faculty when it becomes necessary, I notice that not one time is there mention of quality of faculty in how you decide who is dismissed and who is not. There is one statement relative to individuals who say we should weigh factors such as rank, seniority in rank, and length of service, and in the bottom paragraph it says "*Dismissal of a faculty member or librarian with tenure in favor of retaining a faculty member or librarian who has not attained tenure is a departure from AAUP policy and jeopardizes the academic freedom and economic security implicit in tenure that is acknowledged by Indiana University.*" "*It can be justified only in the extraordinary circumstances...*" It seems to me that is not necessarily beneficial to the university. I am sure that we are all tenured here so we probably think it is, but in fact, shouldn't we be trying to retain the best faculty regardless of their rank for tenure consideration?

PORTER: We tried not to impose views from the campus level on to each of the academic units as to how they were going to weigh a variety of different factors. That's why built into this is the principle that the schools will establish the policies and procedures for selecting individuals for dismissal. One school may say we think quality, however that is measured, supersedes some of these other factors such as seniority. But, as a broad campus level group, we did not find it possible to agree that we could decide for other academic units.

BURR: Well, in a fact you have. It says "any plan that retains untenured personnel while dismissing tenured personnel must clearly and convincingly justify the departure from policy." The strength of all these statements suggest to the school that they should not be doing this instead of just saying, "It is up to the school. here are the factors that you should consider, tenure certainly being one of those."

PORTER: But, tenure is the principle that is protected in the Academic Handbook.

BURR: But, in a case of a financial exigency there are lots of protections that have to be reviewed and that is only one of them.

FINEBERG: David, I think it would be difficult to dismiss a tenured individual, but not impossible. I think if the decision of the unit is made on the basis of that person not carrying out quality work any

longer, then they have to justify their decision. I think the concept of the protection of tenured, but not a tenured person could not be dismissed for cause, I think that is appropriate. A person like that, according to this, could not be dismissed because I don't think that would be considered extraordinary circumstances where a serious distortion of the academic program _____. So, the case you just gave would not be the case of a tenured faculty member.

YOKOMOTO: I think if you go back to the beginning of that paragraph, it talks about centrality and quality in the school. So, I think quality is in there. The middle of the paragraph only starts talking about weighting factors to be considered as you are using the criteria for dismissal. mission in making your plans. For me, it says quality in the beginning.

BURR: The quality you refer to here applies to components of a school. I never see quality of faculty referred to in this.

TURNER: We have another five minutes to devote to this unless you decide we need more time than that in which case we will continue this next month.

PORTER: I would like to invite individuals, as they look through this and have areas of concern, to submit alternative wording to either Larry Wilkins or to myself, Rebecca Porter. We are both available via E-mail or other forms of communication. We have given this our best shot in trying to be clear, but after you work with something for an extended period of time, I think you lose some of your objectivity. You can help us out if you not only identify the problems, but also suggest a solution.

WARFEL: Shall we schedule this for the February agenda with the idea of voting on it? Do you think that is a reasonable time frame?

TURNER: Are we going to be ready to vote on this and live with it if we adopt it in February? In the meantime, be ready for that discussion. Send any suggestions you may have to Becky or Larry.

AGENDA ITEM VII: FACULTY WORK MEMORANDUM: Discussion

TURNER: If we could move on to the next agenda item which is the Faculty Work Memorandum. We have only about 15 minutes for this discussion. If we need more time we will either extend the meeting or reschedule discussion at another meeting. I would like to call your attention to the document that is up for discussion. It is a memorandum addressed to academic deans, department chairs, and IUPUI Faculty Council from Bill Plater and subject is Faculty Work and it is dated December 8, 1995.

This is a document that has been drafted and reviewed by the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee has been through two drafts of it and now bring it to you for discussion. Its origin and its assumptions are outlined at the beginning. It is an explanation on the part of the Dean of the Faculties about the relationship of administrative offices to work and presumably this will shape decisions in the future if it meets our approval.

WARFEL: Without coming across too strong, I do want us to get in the record that the cover that came from Richard and me tried to explain that the Executive Committee had gone through this a number of times as it was being revised. We are bringing it to you, not as something that the Executive Committee endorsed in its entirety, there were some bones of contention, but it just seemed to be time for us to stop talking about and time for a larger audience to look at it. It is supported but not endorsed.

TURNER: In my field a lot of times we deal with text and make decisions about what we are supposed to do with them, but we operate without the writer being present.

PLATER: I offered to leave. *[Laughter]*

TURNER: Now we have the author present so you can go right to the source if you have questions.

PETERSON: I think we have a slight problem. Some of us didn't read our agenda carefully enough and the memo was apparently placed in our briefcase to be read at some later date and didn't get into our Faculty Council packet. So, I am without information to look at during this time. I am not sure how many people have it here to enter into a useful discussion.

TURNER: Dick, that was a royal "we." How many of you are willing to buy into Dick's explanation? [a few]. Dick, your suggestion then is that we don't discuss it as yet?

PETERSON: I would like to have a copy before I discuss it in detail. But, if anyone does have discussion items that they want to bring up, I certainly can note that, but I don't want to make that the final decision until I am able to discuss it with the document in front of me.

ORME: I would like to ask one fundamental question about the outcomes of our discussion. Are we discussing so that we can in effect say, "No, these philosophies should not prevail" or "Yes, these should stand?" What is the perceived outcome? We can discuss from now until forever, but what is the desired outcome of these discussions?

TURNER: I take it that what we have before us is the Dean of the Faculties' thinking on these matters that have been opened to discussion, and in some cases, dispute. The attempt is to clarify and to establish the understanding of what these various parts of the handbook are and various other practices which have been discussed over the past. Presumably, if we read it and agree, then we all understand the rules under which we are operating. If we disagree, then we have an occasion, it seems to me, of identifying the terms before we the discussion.

ORME: Are we then to tell the Dean of the Faculties to think differently?

TURNER: I think so.

PLATER: You have done it before. *[Laughter]*

TURNER: Part of the argument has to do with who gets to say what about what, when. Our position is that some of things are not up for us to decide one way or the other. If we agree with that, then that is fine. If we don't, then it seems to me that we need to say our piece and try to identify the ways in which that is not true. This is our occasion to begin that discussion or, if this is not true, what is in fact true?

NG: What if we agree to disagree? Then what?

TURNER: I don't know, Bart. These are matters which are going to affect our work and what we do in a lot of ways. A lot of people lately have expressed a sense of concern about the regard, the place, the role of faculty. There certainly have been a lot of predictions made about what we are going to look like in the year 2000 and thereafter. So, the kinds of procedures, assumptions, and values as spelled out here ought to be things that we are concerned with.

BEPKO: I don't know if it is possible or desirable to try to anticipate every possible turn in the discussion and say what we will do if we reach that point. I think the important thing is that Bill has done an excellent job of setting out issues in a way that both reflects substantial experience and wisdom in academic life and it is provocative too. I think that the discussion is the important thing. We ought to discuss, try to reach agreement, consensus, and if we don't, we ought to worry about how to resolve that when we come to it.

WARFEL: I agree. I think that this is an excellent document for our discussion. If the Council members haven't studied it and thought about it, we need to reschedule it because this is not something that we should sit here and not pay attention to.

PLATER: I would say that the discussion should go on at several levels. I hope, in fact, the most significant or detailed discussion will occur at the department level where so much of our lives is effected by decisions that are made by administrative officers. It certainly should be discussed by schools and by the Council. I would urge you to take back this document and talk with the department chairs and with other colleagues at the department level. The only other thing I would say, perhaps partially in response to Bill's question, is it seems to me that it is important that the faculty have a general understanding of how, if I were called upon to interpret a policy or to deal with an issue, how I would respond? What the framework would be? I am trying to give that insight here. Not to say that every case can be determined by what is stated here, but we all ought to have a shared understanding of what the interpretation would be rather than fearing, perhaps, the very ad hoc, personal decisions that are made one way for one person and another way for someone else. I have tried to say what I think the rules are, what the policies are, etc.

TURNER: We will postpone this discussion until the next Council meeting. I think that it is very important that you dig out your copy. If you don't have a copy, as Kathy mentioned earlier, you can get it off the Web. If you don't want to get it off the Web, you can call the Council Office and Bernice will

be glad to send you a copy. We ought to be able to come next time to talk about this and see where it goes. The Executive Committee has spent a lot of time with this. As Kathy suggested, It is not our document, but we offered responses to it in a number of ways and in detail. It has changed a lot since its first version. I won't say it is easy to change this document but it is changeable.

VERMETTE: May I ask just one question? It is unclear as to what the status of the final document will be. Is this going to end up being a policy statement?

PLATER: I don't think so. It is possible that out of the discussions we have there could in fact be policy statements. My intention is to do nothing more with this document than what is being done right now.

TURNER: So, we will discuss this at next month's Council meeting.

AGENDA ITEM IX: QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

TURNER: We have a few more minutes for questions and answers. The floor is open.

J. KECK: I don't have a question I just need an answer. Is Mark Grove still here? [He had already left] The problem occurs for those of us who teach at 8:00 a.m. on Monday morning when registration is not over until however late it goes on Friday night. For those of us who teach by Distance Education and you can't see people and you can't pass around a piece of paper to see who is there and you have people who don't know whether they are to be in your class or not. It is difficult to figure out particularly if you meet with a class only once a week. We have registration problems. People are trying to get into your closed class and you don't want to let them. It is difficult to wait another entire week because then it is even harder to say, "No, you can't come to class." I wondered if there had been any consideration given to having registration end at a time that a person could get rosters to people who teach that first morning. I didn't get rosters until yesterday afternoon. That may not have been a registration problem. That may have been the School of Nursing's problem. If you teach at 8:00, there is no way you can get a final roster. It is a problem.

PLATER: I can't say for certain, but I believe the problem was because registration was extended until Wednesday due to the bad weather. This is an abnormal situation. I think your point is still valid. I see no reason that partial rosters couldn't be issued as long as everyone understood that the registration was not complete and that you would receive your official roster at the time that registration ends. So, we will make inquiries to see if we can avoid this in the future. It would probably only occur in January.

J. KECK: Some people can pull the rosters up on the system, but I personally cannot do that. I also can't get them early on Monday morning as I am in class at 8:00 a.m. The faculty don't have access to that kind of information.

BEPKO: We ought to be able to fix that.

AGENDA ITEM X: UNFINISHED BUSINESS

I would like to turn quickly to the two items that we have under Unfinished Business. The first is the report from the Nominating Committee on the election of the Faculty Boards of Review.

HOYT: I will give the names of those people who were elected.

Faculty Board of Review #1: Emily Hernandez, Betty Jones, Colleen Larson, and John O'Loughlin

Faculty Board of Review #2: Barbara Albee, Judith Ernst, Richard Pflanze.

Faculty Board of Review #3 Gayle Cox, Fred DiCamilla, Jeffery Grove.

I would like to have permission to have the ballots destroyed. The tally sheet will be retained in the Council Office.

TURNER: All in favor of this motion, say "Aye." Opposed? [None] Abstentions? [none] The ballots will be destroyed.

Now I would like to move to the next order of business, the Principles of Undergraduate Education. Barbara, would you explain what we are being asked to do?

CAMBRIDGE: At their September meeting there were some points raised about the Principles of Undergraduate Learning which had been brought to the Faculty Council. Those points were brought back to the Council on Undergraduate Learning which asked John Kremer and me to return to the original documents that came from all of the schools regarding the Principles of Undergraduate Learning. We made two modifications in the principles. and one clarification. We sent those back to the Council On Undergraduate Learning which accepted those and asked that they be brought forward to the Faculty Council. What the Council on Undergraduate Learning is asking for now is the Faculty Council's admonition of the Principles of Undergraduate Learning.

TURNER: The last time they were here there were some questions raised. Those questions have been addressed and presumably the document has been revised, in order to accommodate the concerns. The reason for bringing it up at this 11th hour and asking for it to be done now is that, if we can agree and vote on this, then people putting together proposals for the Strategic Directions initiatives will be able incorporate these agreed upon affirmed principles as being part of the campus mission and directions. So, if in fact it clears us at this point, then it has that benefit. The principles are before you. The motion is that these be approved as the principles that will guide and shape undergraduate education at IUPUI. That motion is on the floor and it comes from the Executive Committee and doesn't need a second. But it does need some discussion.

S. FINEBERG: I think there is nothing to comment about. These are all principles that I believe we can

support fully.

TURNER: Is there any other discussion? Hearing no further discussion, let me ask for a vote. All in favor of approving the principles as presented today, say "aye." Opposed? [none] Abstentions? [none]

BEPKO: We ought to be able to fix that even if we have unusual conditions. You should still have a roster in your hands.

TURNER: Are there any other questions?

AGENDA ITEM XII: ADJOURNMENT

TURNER: Do I hear a motion to adjourn? [so moved] We are adjourned.

Approved: September 5, 1996

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY INDIANAPOLIS

Faculty Council Meeting

February 1, 1996

School of Dentistry, Room S115

3:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Administration: Trudy Banta, Chancellor Gerald Bepko, Dean William Plater. **Deans:** John Barlow, P Nicholas Kellum, Angela McBride. **Elected Faculty:** Larry Abel, W. Marshall Anderson, Margaret Applegate, Susan Ball, Lynn Broderick, Paul Brown, Kenneth Byrd, Lucinda Carr, Jeanette Dickerson-Putman, Karen Gable, Patricia Gallagher, Bernardino Ghetti, Carlos Goldberg, William Hohlt, Nathan Houser, Dolores Hoyt, Elizabeth Jones, M Jan Keffer, Missy Dehn Kubitschek, Miriam Langsam, Rebecca Markel, Dana McDonald, Fred Pavalko, Michael Penna, Richard Peterson, Richard Pflanzner, Rebecca Porter, Ken Rennels, Edward Robbins, Bernadette Rodak, Jane Schultz, Erdogan Sener, Stephen Stockberger, Karen Teeguarden, Charles Yokomoto. (Parliamentarian) Harriet Wilkins.

ALTERNATES PRESENT: Deans: Steven Jay for Robert Holden, Pat Fox for Doris Merritt. **Elected Faculty:** Robert Rigdon for Charalambos Aliprantis, James Baldwin for Jana Bradley, Richard Patterson for Bart Ng. **Ex Officio Members:** James Baldwin, S Edwin Fineberg, Paul Galanti, Carlyn Johnson, Robert Lehnen, Byron Olson, Carl Rothe, Marshall Yovits.

Visitors: Paul Bippen (Dean, IUPU Columbus), Erwin Boschmann (Dean of the Faculties Office), Mark Grove (Registrar's Office), Mark Sothmann (School of Allied Health Sciences),

ABSENT: Deans: A James Barnes, Trevor Brown, H William Gilmore, Roberta Greene, Kathy Krendl, Norman Lefstein, John Rau, Robert Shay, David Stocum, Philip Tomkins, Donald Warren, Charles Webb. **Elected Faculty:** Merrill Benson, Joseph Bidwell, Diane Billings, Ulf Jonas Bjork, Zacharie Brahma, Thomas Broadie, Timothy Brothers, David Burr, Timothy Byers, David Canal, Michael Cohen, Paul Dubin, Naomi Fineberg, Joe Garcia, Robert Havlik, Antoinette Hood, Henry Karlson, Michael Klemsz, Raymond Koleski, Stephen Lalka, Golam Mannan, Debra Mesch, William Orme, David Peters, Virginia Richardson, Brian Sanders, Mark Seifert, Anantha Shekhar, Jay Simon, Akhouri Sinha, Jerrold Stern, James Wallihan, Karen West, Kathryn Wilson, Richard Wyma, Mervin Yoder, Susan Zunt. **Ex Officio Members:** Henry Besch, Ronald Dehnke, Juanita Keck, Steven Mannheimer, Martin Spechler, Rosalie Vermette.

AGENDA ITEM I CALL TO ORDER

TURNER: Before we get to the approval of the minutes I would like to announce that the vote taken regarding the representatives from the Senior Academy, President of the Staff Council, and the President of the Student Assembly as ex officio members of the Faculty Council was passed and will now become part of the Bylaws.

AGENDA ITEM II APPROVAL OF MINUTES

TURNER: The next item is the approval of the November 2 minutes that were mailed to you. At this time I would like to open the floor for any corrections or revisions.

SPECHLER: I am shown as absent but I should be marked as present.

TURNER: Is there a motion to approve as amended? [Motion made] All in favor of approving the minutes as amended, please say "Aye." Opposed? [None] Abstentions? [None] The minutes will stand approved as amended.

AGENDA ITEM III ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT

TURNER:: Before we get to the Administrative Report, I would like to announce that we are going to wait for Agenda Item VI until Larry Wilkins, the chair of the Budgetary Affairs Committee, arrives to discuss the Financial Difficulties document which should be sometime after 4:00 p.m. Now we turn to the Administrative Report.

BEPKO: I have three relatively short points. First, I have just come from a meeting of the Purdue University Board of Trustees, who are meeting on this campus today and tomorrow. One reason for meeting on campus was to have a seminar this afternoon on the subject of Biological and Medical Engineering highlighting the cooperation that is taking place between the two campuses -- West Lafayette and Indianapolis, highlighting the various types of Biological and Medical Engineering programs that are developing, that have attracted grant funding, and that very much fill a need for a Ph.D. program in engineering that will allow Ph.D. candidates to come and work at the labs that are being funded by external grants and that will support the work of faculty on this campus. The Purdue University Board of Trustees, just a moment or two ago, were briefed on the joint Ph.D. program in Biological and Medical Engineering. Actually, it is a broader set of degree programs in that it will include both Master's degrees and Ph.D. degrees. We already have a Master's degree program in both electrical and mechanical engineering on this campus. The B.M.E. degree will fit into those two existing programs, but there will be a brand new Ph.D. awarded by Purdue University jointly by West Lafayette and Indianapolis that will be available for Ph.D. degree candidates doing their work on this campus. Dick Schwartz, the dean of the schools of Engineering at West Lafayette, spoke with pride about the program. When asked about how many people were going to be subscribing to this degree program, he said, "Our worry is not about applicants; it is about resources to support them with, all of the high quality candidates that we can handle in very short order. At least one dozen right away." I think it is a

very important step forward for both universities (Purdue and IU) and a very important step forward for this campus, which has long held the promise to be the place of concourse for biology, medicine, and engineering. That is coming closer now to reality.

My second point is that there is nothing sadder or more moving than to lose a member of our University community, especially someone as young as the female basketball player whose life was lost the other night in a tragic automobile accident on I-65. Shannon Renee McPherson was a second-year student who was returning, along with the women's basketball team, from a victory over IU Southeast at New Albany late Tuesday night. The van in which she was riding, one of two vans that were bringing the players and coaches back from New Albany, hit a patch of ice on I-65, spun out of control into the median, and flipped over. Shannon was lying on the backseat sleeping or resting and was thrown out of the van and suffered fatal chest injuries.

As I said, there is nothing sadder than to lose a member of our University family, especially someone who is just at the beginning of adult life and filled with promise and hope. We will be seeking to raise support from the community for an appropriate memorial to benefit her child. We will also be thinking about an appropriate memorial that would be created within the University community to recognize both the terrible tragedy which has happened as well as to recognize the extraordinary things that she was doing with her life until it was ended so tragically short.

TURNER: I would like to ask you to rise with me in a moment of silence in memory of Shannon McPherson. [A moment of silence was observed] Thank you.

BEPKO: Finally, we have reported on intercollegiate athletics a couple of times here within the past few months. I thought I should bring you up-to-date. Last Friday at the IU Board of Trustees meeting there was a session held on the subject of moving IUPUI's intercollegiate athletic program from NCAA Division II to NCAA Division I. It was a good session. There were several challenging questions presented by the Trustees. A couple of Trustees, it is clear, are not very warm to this proposal. We think that we should continue to deal with the questions that they have raised, such as how we will be able to finance the intercollegiate athletics? Whether students will continue to support intercollegiate athletics? How important is intercollegiate athletics really to the academic community here? Is it worth the extra resources that will have to be invested in order to take the program to Division I? We are going to respond to those questions and continue to respond to respond those questions. We did in the Trustees' forum. Several of us were there, including Kathy Warfel, to speak on behalf of the proposal to go to Division I. We hope that the Trustees will see, and we trust that a majority will, the critical value of moving the intercollegiate athletic program to a level that is commensurate with our size and the quality of our academic programs. We think the other alternative is really not to have any intercollegiate athletic programs at all, and at this stage of development, that is not a very attractive or perhaps even an acceptable alternative. We think we must go forward to Division I. We will continue to press that case.

In the interim, there is lots of conversation about this mostly, oddly enough, not in Indianapolis, but in Monroe County. There was an editorial in the Herald Times opposing Division I athletics at IUPUI. We

will keep you posted. The Trustees are to take up the matter again at the February meeting which will be here in Indianapolis. I believe the discussion of this will take place at the public meeting [the business meeting] of the Trustees, which is in the afternoon of the second day of the Trustees' meeting. I think that will be Friday, February 23, in the afternoon. If you are interested, that is when it is expected that there will be consideration of the proposal and a vote on whether the Trustees approve or disapprove of IUPUI going to Division I. Thank you.

We decided that we should give you a report on enrollment. We gave you a glimpse of it last time but we didn't have the final figures and we certainly didn't have the figures for other campuses of IU. Bill [Plater] has those figures for you today.

PLATER: We reported the figures for Indianapolis at the last meeting, but just to remind you, we were down very slightly in headcount despite hopes and expectations that we might actually hold even in comparison with last spring. We were down about .6 of one percent. The good news is that we were up about 1.6 percent in credit hours. So, perhaps, in the most important measure, we actually had an increase. By comparison, in headcount, all of the other campuses were down just like Indianapolis. Bloomington was down by the same percentage point (.6 of one percent). Other campuses were down more than that except for IU East which was down by only a small one-tenth of one percent. Two campuses were significantly down -- Northwest by almost six percent and South Bend by four percent. Kokomo was down by about five percent with corresponding decreases in credit hours.

I think one of the things that most of us were concerned about was the undergraduate enrollment because that has been the area of greatest volatility over the past several years.

There is encouraging news and I wanted to report on that by comparison with the other IU campuses. Indianapolis had an increase of six percent in its first-year students. All other campuses except IU East had a decrease in first-year students. We also had a slight increase in sophomores. The area of the biggest decline for us was in juniors. We lost about five percent of the junior enrollments, which means that, if we are successful on attracting additional first-year students, we should be able to continue the growth that we began in the fall. So, I think there is good news and the efforts which many of you made through individual schools both to improve retention and to attract new students is paying off. I want to encourage you to continue those efforts. We are not over the hump yet but we can see the moment when we will be.

AGENDA ITEM IV PRESIDENT OF THE FACULTY REPORT

WARFEL: I have only two items. The first concerns the Task Force on The Status of Women Faculty. Dean Plater and I have received from Professor Rebecca Porter a copy of their report which they refer to at this stage still as a "Draft." It will be disseminated broadly and they are seeking campus reaction to their draft. So, please watch for this document and comment on it in a timely manner I presume that after we have responses, the Task Force will report back to this body.

PORTER: We will be glad to conclude its work.

WARFEL: Good. The other topic is Clinical Ranks. As you will recall, our document on Clinical Ranks went to the University Faculty Council last year and was tabled until the February 1996 meeting of the UFC. That meeting is coming up and we are working very hard to come up with language on the Clinical Ranks that will be something that everybody can live with and accept. There are many constituencies in this discussion. In the back of the room there is a copy of draft language which was put together by myself and Ed Greenebaum, the other co-secretary of the University Faculty Council. We are asking many people throughout the University to comment on that language to see if we can get to language that can be passed at the UFC, if not this month, sometime before the end of this academic year. If any of you want to comment, please send your messages to me or to Ed Greenebaum. That is the end of my report.

AGENDA ITEM V PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS: GRADE INDEXING / GRADING POLICY

TURNER: The next item on the agenda is the resolutions which have been suggested by the Board of Trustees. The Academic Affairs Committee has considered these and reported on them. Rick Ward cannot be here but Mark Shermis is here to lead the discussion on Grading Policy. We are not going to discuss the Grade Indexing today.

SHERMIS: My name is Mark Shermis and I am from the Testing Center in the department of psychology. The Academic Affairs Committee looked at both of the resolutions and if you would like I can restrict my comments just to the first one. Is that what you would like?

TURNER: We thought we would look at Indexing next month.

SHERMIS: Some of you may have received a memo that is a response to the Trustees' October resolution on Grade Inflation. however, I will limit my remarks to the first resolution..

In part, and due to a response to the resolution last October, Dean Plater commissioned a Task Force to report on its investigation of Grade Inflation. Some of you have had an opportunity to look over that report. While I did note differences in grading practices among schools, overall there is little evidence to support the fact that grade inflation even exists. If you look at the trend nationally, grades have actually dropped since 1972. In trying to scope out the impetus for the Trustees' resolution, we weren't too sure of their motive. The only thing we could figure was that a few schools did have a larger proportion of A's and B's. The reasons for that are articulated in part by the Commission's report, but primarily we suspect that the difference in the grade distribution among the schools is a reflection of philosophies of grading rather than any symptomatic problem. That is, a number of the professional schools, for example, look at taking a mastery approach or a criterion reference approach. So, for example in the health field, we really aren't so concerned that your performance falls along some sort of distribution, but rather we want to make sure that you have mastered a technique. If you have this kind of philosophy, then what you are grading against is an absolute criterion. This general philosophy now pervades

professional education that comprises a big part of what we do here at IUPUI. A number of faculty members in the liberal arts and sciences have also adopted this philosophy as well and that could in part account for some of the differences in the grade distributions.

As we looked at the resolutions, we tried to imagine what might be the underlying cause for the Trustees' concern. We weren't exactly sure, but we think the phenomena of the different distribution can be explained by the differences in grading philosophies.

With respect to the first resolution, there were two interpretations or readings of that resolution. It reads:

The faculty of every department or division shall, for the guidance of individual faculty members, establish a policy for the awarding of letter grades, which policy shall be filed in the office of the Dean of the Faculties or Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

One interpretation of this was simply to have the various academic units articulate for the general public at large what we mean when we say "What constitutes an 'A'? That is, an 'A' constitutes superior academic achievement. Most of you probably know what an A, B, C, D, and F are or what a Pass/Fail constitutes. We suspect that everyone else does as well.

The second darker interpretation of this resolution was based on the suspicion that the Trustees wanted to force a normal distribution of grades so that only 'X' percent could be A's, 'Y' percent could be B's, and so on. We hope this isn't the interpretation because, if you look at the reasons for grading, there are about 10 which have been articulated in the research literature, but only one has to do with forcing a distribution across academic performance. There are a lot of other reasons that we might award grades in addition to simply forcing a distribution of academic achievement.

It is for this reason that we hope what the Trustees' meant was that we should communicate with the public perhaps through the bulletins that all of us produce. We hope it was not the intent of the resolution to get faculty to force the distribution because that would be inconsistent with the various philosophies underlying the grading process. It really steps beyond the balance of what the Trustees are here to do unless there is some compelling emergency. There has been no evidence that this is something that has been of main concern across the various campuses here at IU or anywhere else. So, with that in mind, I will be glad to answer any questions that anyone may have.

TURNER: This is a resolution which the Trustees will consider and pass, or not pass. What they have asked is that the faculty representatives who attend the meetings come with some sense of the faculty's response to this. What we are doing today, in a sense, is not approving it or disapproving it, but rather discussing it, gathering a sense of our own position on the matter of grading. With that in mind, we will open discussion.

SHERMIS: If I could just make two points. First, Rick [Ward] asked me to convey or help dispel a rumor that the Bloomington campus somehow endorsed or gave credence to the Trustees. He has

information which suggests that, that has not occurred. The second is, there is a Faculty Development Workshop on Friday, February 16 which will address grading practices and grade inflation phenomena.

SPECHLER: I haven't had a chance to read this, but as chair of the Academic Standards and Policies Committee of the School of Liberal Arts, we have dealt with this so I have a few remarks. First of all, it is not true that there is no evidence, and Rick Ward knows it very well. There are major differences in the grading among the departments in the School of Liberal Arts. I don't know what happens in other schools. Within school variation bothers me far, far more than across schools. The reason is that a student can be induced in the search for high GPA to move from department to department, from course to course on the basis of likely GPAs. When some departments have a full grade higher than others as their normal philosophy, as you say, this gives a nearly irresistible temptation to students who need a high GPA. This also has been documented in the literature which is not cited. But, I think it is just common sense that students do this. The idea that there has been no grade inflation is a false issue and not really the point. Over the very long term maybe there hasn't been for the group of students who attend the university. That really is not the issue. The most dangerous part about grade inflation is that it is selective. Some departments do it and other departments do not. Incidentally, you would have been surprised had you seen which departments do and which do not. It was against my intuition when we did the research. But, the students know who is giving the easy grades and they are very concerned about their GPA. So, selective grade inflation, not the long term, is the thing that ought to bother us because it is giving an extrinsic and irrelevant reason for students to take courses in which they are less interested in order to "beef" up their GPA. If you don't think so, talk to some students in the undergraduate division. They do it all the time.

I don't believe that this problem can't be solved. We in the department of economics, for example, have easily agreed to have broad guidelines about grades. We simply don't allow some instructor to come in which a philosophy of giving all A's. What is more, the main point here is Rick Ward does not give out degrees. We, as a faculty, give out degrees and our name is IUPUI. We have to develop enough consensus to certify that a student has passed the requirements at that level. If Rick Ward were giving out degrees, Rick Ward could grade just as he likes. It would be his reputation. But, we have to be concerned about our joint reputation at IUPUI which, fortunately, has been improving. I think we have to be concerned about our joint reputation and we have to develop some kind of consensus. Now, my friend says that we have enough consensus because we all know what an A means, what a B means. Why then do students in different classes get so different grades? It certainly cannot be accounted for, I can tell you, by the quality of the students going in. It is rather simply the grading standards. Now it is pie in the sky, I am afraid, for you to say that the Trustees are going to be satisfied with this document. I have talked to the Trustees. They are a lot smarter and a lot tougher than this document will satisfy. I really think that in the interest of being responsive to the Trustees, we have to do a lot better than this. Thank you.

SHERMIS: Let me respond to one component of what you just mentioned. I think you have a number of important points, but I think the main point is that, as a faculty within a department you can decide what grading philosophies you want to support. But I think to try to specify a range of the normal distributions always constitutes an "A, etc. To assume that all distributions are always the same every

semester every time you teach the course, I don't think is a reasonable assumption. I think you can articulate standards of absolute performance as do those who believe in criterion reference approaches to assessment. You can decide what constitutes good performance in a particular class, but I don't think you necessarily have to force that into a normal distribution of grades. I think if you get too specific in any response to the Trustees or anyone else, you are going to end up doing yourself more damage in the long run than you would otherwise.

SPECHLER: I don't know whether my friend teaches statistics, I do. I am afraid I have to disagree head on with what he says. No one has talked about a normal distribution. There are many other distributions. He assumes that statistics say that a sampling gives you the same result. It actually gives you just the reverse. Every sample will be different in some way providing there is a well drawn sample. Those of you who teach statistics know this very well. Practically, what does this mean? If we all adopted a broad distribution, it would still permit us a degree of latitude from semester to semester to recognize that this or that groups of students, especially small samples, could differ from that long term norm that we call the population distribution. That is the first thing.

If you will permit me, I have heard these arguments especially the argument about competency from the School of Nursing and, of course, I respect that. I wouldn't want a C or D nurse either. I want a competent nurse. So, what is the answer to that? I think the honest answer among colleagues is to say, "We are a rather different kind of school. We have a pass/fail or a satisfactory/unsatisfactory standard. If you are a satisfactory nurse, fine, you get certified. And, until you are a satisfactory nurse, you don't get certified. I think that is the honest way and I would be perfectly comfortable if the School of Nursing were to say that. What gives me trouble is not so much across schools, what gives me trouble is where students can and do substitute easier graded courses for harder graded courses despite the fact that in very many cases those harder graded courses are quite essential to their program. I have never heard from any of the people of the opposite persuasion any effective answer to this point.

BALDWIN: Speaking as a member of the Academic Affairs Committee, we were not in opposition with this. We thought it was a good idea that discussions like this happen and that the policies on grading be put in writing and sent to the Vice Chancellor and placed in the bulletin or whatever. This is exactly the kind of thing the Board of Trustees were wanting. Even on the school-by-school basis, the problem is that it is not within the power of the Academic Affairs Committee to discuss within school matters. We have to ask the schools, those who have departments, to sort out these differences.

LANGSAM: As someone who deals with students as frequently as Martin, I am amazed at this tremendous information flow because I find that most students are very confused about a lot of things including the name of their instructor. In fact, I had a student sit in my American History class for two weeks and then said, "This is not an algebra class, is it?" *[laughter]* More to the point, and I can't speak to other schools, our students in liberal arts have an option of taking courses pass/fail. So, there is no need for them to avoid these harder classes. All they have to do is, for one area of their general requirements all of their electives, they can take as many as eight courses pass/fail. I don't think we should reduce how students do things. I have been working them for 31 years and I am still confused. I think we need more discussion about this before we make ascertains.

GOLDBERG: I think when calculating the statistics on grade distribution, we have to make a distinction between lower level courses and upper level courses. In upper level courses students get serious and dedicated and it shouldn't be surprising if half get As. The same thing would apply to the professional schools. It shouldn't be surprising that half of the class gets A's. So, we have to have these kinds of distinctions -- lower level and upper level.

BYRD: One model that is still existing, and I am pretty sure it is - this was debated at the University of Washington in Seattle when I was a graduate student (early 1970s). The Vietnam War was obviously still going on, but they were concerned about grade inflation and what they had, and as far as I know they still have it - someone might be able to check this - is the decimal point grading system. You can get everything from a 4.0 for a course down to a 0.7. The only thing that is constant is that it is flexible but also has the decimal option for the technical courses. The professions like it because they can discriminate between a high 'A' and a low 'A' all the way down to a D- (decimal grade of 0.7.) The only thing carved in stone, by consensus, is that one agrees that 'A' is a 4.0, a 'B' is a 3.0, a 'C' is a 2.0, and a 'D' is a 1.0. So, a student, and I was a recipient of these, can get a grade of a 3.7 in a course or whatever. At that time faculty handled a much similar situation; I imagine the trustees in Olympia were concerned about grade inflation and where money was going for some of the kids to try to stay out of the war and the whole bit. They essentially handled this debate. So, that might be an option if someone wanted to contact the University of Washington at Seattle and see if it is still there.

On the other hand, Evergreen State College in Olympia, Washington has all written evaluations, but that's a liberal arts-type school. That might be a way out without us flagellating ourselves and agonizing about all of this other stuff.

WARFEL: I wanted to clarify something. Mark, I think, had indicated that IU Bloomington had or had not done anything about this. I think what the confusion may be is over the two resolutions. We are really talking about Grading Policies today, although the resolution is entitled "Grade Inflation. IU Bloomington has not to date officially done anything about that. The other resolution, which we have put off until our next meeting, is Grade Indexing and the Bloomington campus has, as a matter of fact, already adopted internal grade indexing. So, let's be clear about that.

The other point I wanted to make was that I think we have got extremes here from, "I am a faculty member and you can't tell me what grades to give" down to the other extreme of the spectrum. Having been at the Trustees' meetings where this resolution has been discussed to some extent already in the University Policies Committee, I think what the Trustees on that Committee are trying to get at with this resolution isn't so much a policy in the sense of 'There shall be five percent A's at Indiana University.' I really do not hear that coming from the Trustees. I think what they are after is exactly what this has stimulated. They are after an annual discussion of what grades are we giving? What are the implications to our academic programs? What are the implications to the academic programs of the whole institution? Of course, there are reasons for their multiple components that go into an individual student earning a high grade or a low grade. I think what they are after is the annual discussion and reflection on grades.

PLATER: What I want to say is very consistent with Kathy's remarks. I think it is important this body know that a number of faculty have been concerned about grades for some time. It was out of the faculty concern, I think it was over two years ago, that we offered at least one and maybe two faculty workshops on Grade Inflation, not unlike the one which is coming up later this month. The group of faculty who participated in that workshop were so interested in it that they continued to meet and in effect became an ad hoc committee. Later we asked them to look at data and make some recommendations because it seemed to be a matter of broader concern than just a few individuals. It was that committee, chaired by Bob Orr in the School of Engineering and Technology, that, in fact, issued a report looking at the data for all of the schools.

Despite what Mark says, I think there is an indication that grades have tended to rise over the past decade. There are more A's being given than there were. It varies somewhat from school to school and that is the key point. I think the conversation here, and my observation is, that this is a matter that really needs to be discussed within each school and possibly within each department, Marty, but, certainly at the school level. To reinforce that, we have asked that each school take up this issue. We have distributed a copy of the report prepared by the Orr Committee, with all of the data so that each school now has that information. You could look at your grades over a period of time. You could look at them department by department. And, you could look at them in comparison with other units on campus. Our hope is that each school will decide that this is an important enough matter that you should discuss and do as the committee has recommended -- adopt a policy that will be clear to everyone on what the grading practices of the unit are. I would also say that some schools have already done this. I believe, Larry, that the School of Law has a policy that in fact suggests what a distribution of grades might be. It is not mandatory, but it is there as a guide for faculties and it will be some sense of what the standards are for a professional school. The point is that we are going to have quite different practices from school to school and it is appropriate that students understand what those differences are as they consider liberal arts versus science versus nursing. I think it is important for us to do this, but within the school context.

LEHNEN: I have had difficulty interpreting the fact that you just mentioned, Bill, that maybe there have been more A's given in the last 10 years than previously. In one sense, that could be interpreted as we are doing a better job, we are teaching more, and the grades reflect that. The reason I bring that example up is not to be factious, but I am sitting here thinking as I was listening to the various comments by Marty and others, that I have been experimenting with a different approach to teaching in my courses in the last couple of years and I have tried to apply a total quality management model to teaching a course, up streaming defects, in other words, and finding the problems students have and try to fix them before the end of the semester. So, in other words, I have changed my teaching methods and I think I am getting a few higher grades now because I am doing a better job.

The difference here is that I have measured explicit competencies. I have listed the competencies and defined them in operational measures of what I expect out of every course. I basically go in saying that "If you meet these competencies, you will get at least a 'B', and an 'A' if you exceed them. Every time, depending on the luck of the draw of the students who are in the particular section, I could have all A's in some semester. I can imagine how that would be interpreted out of context. I would agree with

Miriam that we definitely need to discuss this further because it seems to me that we cannot interpret grades without talking about what the faculty members goals, values and purposes were. Can you have a department or school policy when you get to something as individual as this, I don't know. Maybe we ought to have that conversation.

PLATER: I think that is what we are all saying. We need to have the conversation probably at the school level, but maybe at the department level. The only thing I would say is that I think if you have the kind of grade practices that you have, your colleagues should be aware of it and understand that in your class students may have all A's, and that they should be able adjust their grading practices accordingly. There needs to be some accountability to each other as colleagues within a department or a school as to what it is that we are using grades to signal. It seems to me that conversation has to go on in the unit and that it is most meaningful at the school or department level. Periodically, probably not every year, but every few years we ought to talk about grading and what we mean by it and how we are using grades and what they signal. In a very large measure this is the problem that I think Marty was trying to identify. We ought to understand how students are perceiving grades and grading practices.

WARFEL: The language of the resolution does not say what the policy is to be. The department's policy could state, 'it is the policy of this department that faculty will give letter grades to differentiate the work of their students and that annually the faculty will discuss what they do in each of their courses' or something like that. It is not a policy that says everybody is going to do the same thing. It is just a policy about how rating happens.

PETERSON: One of the issues that alarms me is when Bill Plater says we could see some increases in the number of A's that we are giving at IUPUI or some such comment, I would hope that we would, over a period of time, become recognized by students and that our admissions criteria would be increasing over time and that we would be getting a better quality of students here at IUPUI. It is a multi-faceted subject. I don't think we could say we have more A's therefore our standards are going down or more F's and therefore we are getting poorer students.

PLATER: Dick, that isn't what I said. I said that the data indicates there are more A's being given. We should look at the data.

LANGSAM: I recently was serving on the Challenger Scholarship Committee and one of the ways that we distinguished between a group of outstanding students was that one of our students had 17 A+ in a wide variety of courses. I wonder if, while we are discussing grade inflation or these other issues, whether we could look into the question "Why, a student who gets an A+ gets a 4 and a student who gets an A gets a 4?" One way to resolve grade inflation very quickly is to drop an A to 3.7 and only give 4s to people who receive A+. I don't know where that came from and why a student who gets an A+ doesn't get anything beyond the 4 that an A student gets. I find that to be a very interesting issue as well. There are some students who are superior and in some ways we do not reflect that in their GPAs. I would like to add that to the discussion if we are discussing grades.

ROTHE: I have a question. I noticed that the departments are to file a policy with the Chancellor, Vice Chancellor, or the Dean of the Faculties. Why not also provide grade distribution data at that time? It seems to me that the data are needed as well as the policy, if you are going to do anything about the policy. That would be a question for whoever put this resolution together.

TURNER: The Trustees put this resolution together. We have to move on; however, we will take the elements of this discussion forward to the Trustees. The Executive Committee is going to take up the matter of, beyond what the resolution suggests, how the conversation might be pursued on campus and through the structures of faculty governance? So, you will be hearing from us again. Thank you

AGENDA ITEM VIDRAFT POLICY ON DEALING WITH FINANCIAL DIFFICULTIES

TURNER: I would like to move to the next item on the agenda. I will remind you that we have two items which need some careful consideration. The first is entitled *Draft Policy on Dealing with Financial Difficulties* which is the next item and then the discussion on the *Faculty Work Memorandum* that was postponed until this meeting. I will now turn the floor over to Larry Wilkins and Becky Porter.

L. WILKINS: We are circulating some handouts which are intended to be responsive to some of the questions and comments that were raised last time in conjunction with various parts of the draft. One of the concerns that was raised last time had to do with the provisions regarding Faculty Boards of Review over the question of dismissal. Some specific statements about faculty board of review appear on page 10 on the original draft. The main item of concern expressed last time was that because of the provision in the proposal that allowed information from previous faculty boards of review to be admitted into subsequent review, that perhaps there would be a loss of confidentiality which would be inconsistent with University policy and the Bylaws of the Faculty Council on Faculty Boards of Review. To address that concern and to assure the protection of confidentiality, the drafting committee is proposing an amendment of paragraph 2, section A of that provision which appears on page 10. To make it clear that we don't want the matter of who was being involved with a faculty board of review and we wish to add the following language:

issues of the adherence to policy and procedures for declaring financial exigency may be introduced in subsequent board of review hearings, if but only if all information identifying the grievant has been removed from the findings to be introduced.

I think that will adequately address the concern about confidentiality. Do you want to go through all of these proposed amendments or do you want to take them up one at a time?

TURNER: Let's have some discussion and then if it looks like it is contentious, perhaps we should take them one at a time. If not, then we can add them all in and then vote on them. Could we do that?

L. WILKINS: Yes. The second concern had to do with another statement lower down on page 10 in

section 2, paragraph 2 in which the original stated:

The merits of the overall Financial Exigency Plan shall not be subject to review by a Faculty Board of Review convened for the purpose of hearing an individual's petition.

One of the comments made last time was that in essence puts the document at war with itself. You are allowing faculty boards of review but you are foreclosing meaningful review by excluding this term from consideration. We are proposing to strike that language and replace it with the following language:

The purpose of a faculty board of review proceeding upon an individual's grievance shall be to determine if the individual's selection for dismissal has been made fairly and in accordance with the policy and procedures specified in the Financial Exigency Plan. It is not for the purpose of opening up, on a wholesale basis, the merits of the declaration of a financial exigency, or the plan for addressing the financial exigency.

We think that clarifies the purpose of a faculty board of review where a faculty who has been dismissed wishes to have his or her peers consider whether they have been treated fairly under the policy of the plan.

GOLDBERG: I have no problems with that, but I do have a problem with Section 2b for similar reasons that you have stated, following the first part of the statement but the recommendations of a faculty body on these matters will be considered presumptively valid. The first section it says the validity of the judgements and the criteria for identification for termination,... There is conflicting language there as I see it. In other words, the issue of this hearing may include "the validity of the judgments and the criteria for identification for termination, but the recommendation of a faculty body on these matters will be considered presumptively valid." I see an inconsistency there unless you can clarify it for me.

L. WILKINS: I am not sure I see your inconsistency, but let me address your concern and try to clarify what the meaning of that subsection is. It is intended to put some credence by a faculty body that has considered the issue of whether one of their peers should remain on the faculty and to treat it as a special fact. That is, it is given a presumption. That doesn't mean that the presumption can't be overcome, but it does place a burden on the grievant to overcome the presumption of validity. That is all that is intended. It is not intended to block any consideration or review by a faculty board of review on the issue of fairness.

ROTHE: Would you define what you mean by faculty body? Does that mean a departmental promotions and tenure committee?

L. WILKINS: It may very well be. It depends on how the school or the unit has decided to render that kind of decision. It was an intentional decision on the part of the drafting committee to avoid putting that kind of detail to dictate to the schools on how they should reach the decision.

PORTER: It is referring back to the involvement of a faculty or faculty body in the development of the financial exigency plan which has to identify individuals to be dismissed. So, it is referring back to a faculty body that is talked about earlier in the document.

L. WILKINS: We didn't want to harden, by way of definition, a particular concept in this document but rather leave it up to the schools and departments to decide for themselves.

GOLDBERG: Could you be more specific about my concern which was the inconsistency? The first of Section 4b states that the Board of Review can question and deal with the validity of the judgements that have been made and then in the second parts it says the recommendation of a faculty body will be considered presumptively valid.

L. WILKINS: Right. In other words, there is a higher threshold that a grievant must reach to overturn a decision by a body of his or her peers.

TURNER: We will now go to the amendments and see where we are. Is there concern or discussion about the amendment that is suggested?

L. WILKINS: The third amendment is intended to address a concern that was raised last time that the proposed language would allow pressure to be exerted on a dismissed faculty member to accept a part-time position for reinstatement. The proposal is to strike the original language and substitute the following language:

For at least three years following dismissal, no unit shall engage in replacement hiring on either a full-time or part-time basis until all tenured faculty or librarians have been offered full-time reinstatement and a reasonable time in which to accept or decline the offer.

TURNER: Is there discussion on this amendment?

PLATER : When we talked about this the last time I the made argument, and I would again, that I think this places an unreasonable restraint on a school or unit's ability to recover from a financial difficulty if it does not have the flexibility to use part-time faculty because, as we all know, part-time faculty cost less and can help subsidize the salaries of full-time faculty. We are placing a burden on ourselves that I think in some units will cause financial exigency to increase or to accelerate rather than to help. I don't think we should restrict ourselves in this fashion. It will be a burden that some schools simply won't be able to live with if they find themselves in a situation that we have defined as a financial exigency.

BARLOW: I would like to second that. I think we are more dependent on part-time faculty than any unit in the on the campus. I can't imagine how awful it would be if we couldn't hire part-time when we are in financial straights.

PORTER: The Faculty Affairs Committee at our meeting this week did not come forward with specific language but in the discussion it expressed a concern that the document, as it is currently written, does not preclude dismissing tenured faculty and retaining part-time instructors. That was a concern that if a unit has the option of eliminating tenured faculty and keeping part-time instructors, that is not consistent with the principles that should be included.

WARFEL: The following up on Dean Barlow's point that the reality is that we rely on part-time faculty to teach a lot of course sections which generates income which helps keep us going. I am having trouble figuring out why we would want to make our financial difficulty even worse by eliminating that as a way to help. While I understand the concern, it seems to me that in the previous 10 pages we have had so much faculty involvement in the planning process that it isn't clear to me how the faculty would let that sort of thing happen. I would speak against this last amendment.

L. WILKINS: If I could offer some clarification. This statement is addressed at replacement hiring. Except for what Becky just mentioned, what we have in front of us in the form of a proposed amendment pertains to replacement hiring only. It is not a blanket prohibition against having part-time faculty members.

TURNER: There is always quite a turnover in part-time faculty. If that turnover continues and the replacement of those part-timers is prohibited, then the condition that Bill has been speaking about obtains.

WILKINS: that is true, but it forces the school or the unit to consider whether waiting until the next part-time position becomes vacant and combining the two sections and making it a full-time position.

WARFEL: How many would it take?

WILKINS: That may have been a bad example.

TURNER: So, in effect, it does prohibit the continued use of hiring part-time because there is a large turnover of part-timers.

WILKINS: That is correct.

APPLEGATE: I would speak against the final amendment. Of course, another option that you have is to increase the workload in terms of numbers and sections on the number of people that you have remaining. In some disciplines there are educational problems which develop. In fact, in some instances, it would even become unsafe because you are dealing with clinical courses. If you cannot have the alternative available to you for part-time, you cannot safely teach the clinical course.

LANGSAM: Perhaps what we could do is to split the concept of the full-time and part-time. I think it is relatively reasonable to suggest that rather than hiring six new historians we go to those people whom

we had dismissed. So, if the sentence just said, "...on a full-time basis until all..." then we could develop another sentence to address the part-time issue which not tie the hands of individual departments or units where there is an absolute necessity to hire part-timer and such hires have been a part of their normal operation. If we had 30 full-time faculty and we fire 25 of them and suddenly go out and hire 50 part-timers, something is wrong. But, if the English department regularly uses 90 part-timers, they regularly lose some of their part-timers. Even in a state of financial exigency it does not seem unreasonable to allow them to continue to hire those part-timers. So, I think splitting that sentence would alleviate part of the problem by not shackling people who are definitely dependent and have always been on as part-timers.

TURNER: Could I suggest something? We were going along smoothly and we said that we would continue going smoothly until we hit a bump and I think we have hit a bump. *[laughter]* *Can we back up and* look at the first two amendments that seem to be okay and then we can move to the discussion of this third amendment where it seems to require a good bit of thought and care and perhaps new wording.

So, let's return to the first proposed amendment and I would ask if we could address this with the idea of accepting it at this time. Is there discussion on accepting this amendment?

SPECHLER: I am against this and let me tell you why. It is not because I don't value confidentiality as much as everyone in the room. Under the circumstances, it is much to be wished, but I think it would, in such extreme circumstances, be unrealistic. We have had inflamed personnel problems on campus, and they don't remain confidential. They should, but they usually don't. I fear that if we adopt this language which requires that all information identified about the grievant be removed, the result would be the opposite of the one intended. There might be letters from the grievant in the file. How can you remove entirely the identification? I don't think it would be realistic to do that and actually might harm the case of the grievant especially if the grievant has a high degree of credibility on campus. If, for example, a grievant would say, "Well, the dean told me so and so in camera." Some faculty members you would believe implicitly and others you might not, depending on whether they have been generally credible. That is the principle of our annual review and law. I very much fear that the objective is good but actually in practice it would work against the grievant. Perhaps someone could convince me that is not so.

TURNER: Are there any other comments on Amendment 2A? If there is no further discussion, maybe we could ask for a vote on this. All in favor of the amendment as presented here indicate by saying "Aye." Opposed? [a few] The ayes have it. That amendment is passed.

If we could now move to the Proposed Amendment 2, original page 10, Section 2, Paragraph 2 and open this for discussion. Is there any discussion of this amendment at this time?

KUBITSCHKEK: I think I agree that the proposed amendment here does in fact contradict 2b. The amendment seems to suggest that the purpose of the faculty board of review is to make sure that the policy set out in a plan for addressing financial exigency for each unit has in fact been followed. That is

a different thing than opening up the validity of the criteria that plans puts forward. So, I think there is a contradiction between 2b and the proposed amendment.

WILKINS: All I can tell you is that, if the view is that the proposed amendment is functionally inconsistent with 2b, I think it misapprehends the affect and the operation of 2b which is simply to raise the level of proof on the part of the grievant with respect to decisions that are made by peers. It seems to me that 2b is a question of the level of proof that is required. The proposed amendment has to do with the jurisdiction or the power of the board of review.

YOKOMOTO: Larry, I wonder if part of the confusion might not be in the choice of words? In the main part it says, "In the criteria for identification and termination which can be looked at..." and in the new addition it says "...or the plan for addressing the financial exigency." I wonder if "criteria" and "the plan" are to be taken as synonymous so that in one place you are looking at the plan and the other place you are addressing the criteria.

WILKINS: It is pretty clear that they are separate sections of that area. In one, we are looking at whether the issue of the proprieting of the financial exigency plan. We are trying to limit the jurisdiction of faculty boards of review so that the entire process of the declaration of financial exigency and the development of the plan is not opened up for wholesale review. We are trying to limit the jurisdiction of the faculty board of review. Then, the second subsection that has pressed its nose into the tent here has to do with the burden of proof upon the grievant. The intended effect of Section 2B is to have the effect of giving some extra credence to a decision by a faculty unit that has decided to dismiss the grievant and to give it presumption. That presumption can be overcome, but it is not going to be overcome by simply complaining about it.

YOKOMOTO: Maybe I should ask it in another way? Is the criteria that you mention in B in "the plan" that you mention in the amendment?

WILKINS: No. That is why you don't see "the plan" in that document.

LANGSAM: Is the "or the plan" the school plan that you are talking about? In other words, you have a campus policy and then you have asked each school to have an entire policy. Now, within that policy there are procedures and criteria. What this amendment says is 'While we are deciding whether Charlie fits the specific school criteria for termination, you may not turn around and drag in and question the entire campus plan or even the over-arching plan of the school but all you may do is deal with 1) the assumption that the faculty decision is going to be considered valid, and 2) whether or not the individual fits into the criteria established by the plan.' Isn't that what we are saying? Would it help to say in the amendment, **...or the school plan or unit plan for addressing the...?** Would that help?

PORTER: The difficulty is that as you are moving through the various levels of generating the financial exigency plan, you move through a series of stages. At the end stage we actually have the specification as to who is going to be dismissed. But, that decision is to be made based on criteria that is talked about

on page 8 in relationship to policies and procedures that should have been established prior to the generation of the financial exigency plan. So, when you are getting to the faculty board of review, you are looking at 'were these policies and procedures that were generated before we had to worry about who it was that was going to be dismissed fair and equitable, and were they applied in a fair and applicable manner?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Call for the question.

TURNER: Is there further discussion on this amendment?

APPLEGATE: It might help me if you could clarify the criteria. On the one hand, on here it is saying we just want to be sure people are not treated arbitrarily. On the other hand, I need to know about those criteria. If the criteria are not in the plan, where are they?

WILKINS: The criteria of which we have been speaking in isolation and taken out of the context of Section 2b are the criteria for identification for termination. It is at the unit or the school level that the criteria are developed. Section 2B refers to that level of the process.

TURNER: The question has been called. All in favor of the amendment to the document before us indicate by saying "Aye." Opposed. [none] That amendment passes. We can now turn to the third amendment. Let me just say that we have only got about another 5,7, or 8 minutes on this.

FINEBERG: I think the discussion about the change in wording of that amendment is very apt. I think it could be simply changed to replacement hiring for a full-time faculty position, as the suggestion which was already made by Professor Langsam, that it would be replacement hiring on a full-time basis until all tenured faculty, etc. Since it is a full-time position that is being filled then certainly it should be offered to someone who has been dismissed because of a financial exigency.

TURNER: So the wording you are suggesting is: *engage in replacement hiring on a full-time basis* and the you would strike *on either a full-time or part-time*. So, basically you are amending that to read *replacement hiring on a full-time basis* and striking out the other words?

FINEBERG: That is correct. Is that amendment acceptable to you?

WILKINS: That is acceptable.

TURNER: Is there any other discussion?

BALDWIN: Could we charge the committee to do something else and then come up with a 4B to cover how part-timers would fit into this so the part-timers are not forgotten? I would like for it to be somewhere in the general philosophy that in financial exigency, you don't throw the crew overboard and buy galley slaves.

TURNER: I thought the distinction had already been made that this wasn't a matter of buying galley slaves, but we already have galley slaves.

BALDWIN: It is not clear.

PLATER: I think the original language does what everybody is asking for. I don't see why we wouldn't go back to the original language because if you read it, it addresses both Miriam's point and the concern that several have raised here today.

SPECHLER: I am in favor of this amendment. However, I interpret it differently. I think Miriam's point is very well taken. Suppose we have five part-timers and there has to be some financial exigency. Would it be a violation of this if we choose the identity of those five? Would that be replacement? In my view, it would be a replacement but in a contrary view it would simply be changing their identity but not the number. Those are two very different things. I remain in favor of this, indeed, along with the majority of the Faculty Affairs Committee of this body, I would go even further and say that no tenured faculty member may be fired unless all or substantially all part-timers are terminated. Why? Well, let me refer back to the basic point that our dean, John Barlow, made which is very important. It has to be confronted I think, philosophically. In my view, the university is the faculty first and foremost. We are constituent of what we mean by the university or the unit. So, to talk as if you can preserve the unit by firing the tenured faculty is a contradiction in the terms, as I would use them. We can always get a faculty member to serve as dean, with respect, although perhaps not as good a dean as we have, but there will be people. I might say that I am not an administrator and after what I say in a moment you will see that I will never be an administrator. *[laughter]* I have to tell you truth; that is the duty of faculty. If we cut tenured faculty -- and personally I don't believe we will come to this in the academic life of people sitting here -- unless there are very adverse developments. I really don't believe that any of the deans sitting here would take such a very serious measure knowing what it would do to our reputation locally and abroad, what the AAUP would say, what union might rise, etc. It would offer serious consequences that everybody here who had such a responsibility would take into account. Nor do I believe that even though it is sometimes said that 20 percent of us are brain dead, I don't think that 20 percent could be so easily identified so as to fire them. *[laughter]* So, that is why, since I think the faculty is the constituent part of the university, along with the students, of course, it doesn't make any sense to say that you are saving the unit by firing the tenure faculty. That is why I am for this and even a stronger version, along with the majority of your Faculty Affairs Committee.

FINEBERG: Under the time constraints, I move we table Amendment 3.

TURNER: Is there a second to that motion? There is no second.

PORTER: I did want to make sure that, as you are considering this issue related to part-time individuals, you look back to the final paragraph on page 8. If we walk ourselves through the process dealing with financial difficulties, by the time we get to financial exigency only those administration,

support personnel, and non-tenured faculty deemed essential to the central mission will still be around. Retaining an untenured individual while dismissing a tenured individual can only be justified in the extraordinary circumstances where a serious distortion of the academic program results. If you are going to retain the untenured personnel, you have to clearly and convincingly justify the departure from the policy. That language was put in, in recognition that at least for some of the academic units, a certain distribution of expertise is required if you want to maintain the program. There are some times of untenured personnel that, if you don't retain them, you will not be able to offer that academic program. At the same time, the drafters are saying tenure is supposed to mean something and we have tried to build in the language to protect individuals with tenure.

LANGSAM: I would like to propose some language change which I don't think we can take up at this time, but at least I would like to propose it. In the existing new sentence: *For at least three years following dismissal, no unit shall engage in replacement hiring of full time faculty until all tenured faculty or librarians have been offered full-time reinstatement and a reasonable time in which to accept or decline the offer.* Replacement of part-timers: *When such part-timers have been a regular component of a school's workforce shall not be construed as a contradiction of this policy.* In other words, we are not going to tie the hands of the English department because they have to replace their part-timers who have always been part of that program because we will in fact go down the drain even further.

TURNER: Would that same language have to be added to the other section?

LANGSAM: I don't know. I would turn that over to Larry and the people who have smoothed and tailored this. I think the key component is "that have been a regular part of the ongoing program" because what that does I think is it addresses the underlying fear that people have that we are going to kick out the regular faculty and bring a load of galley slaves or part-timers on. All this does is say, if those people who were already there as galley slaves and have an objection to them, we are not going to start at this point to cripple the departments or the programs from doing that. That splits the issue and I think would solve our problem is people would reflect on it.

PORTER: It seems to me that we have gone as far as we can today due to the time restraints. We will have to come back to this next month. We have some progress today. I hope that next month we will be ready to look at any revised language that the committee can bring us to respond to these concerns and then address the document.

GALANTI: I hate to bring this up, but I have been comparing the Financial Exigency document with the Clinical Ranks document. I wonder, if on the last page of the Clinical Ranks proposal, four lines up from the bottom, where it states "...a clinical rank faculty member holding a long term appointment shall be dismissed only for reasons of professional incompetence, serious misconduct, extreme financial exigency of the university, or closure or permanent down-sizing of the clinical program." whether this language is consistent with what we have been discussing?

PORTER: There are a couple of problems in terms of not limiting. There is an upper limit on the length of the probationary period but not a lower limit so you can have them be probationary for a week and then give them the seven year contract. In comparison, the individual who is on tenure probationary is at a disadvantage. As I interpret the Clinical Ranks, if you are in the midst of a contract period, that would be dismissal while you in a contract and they would be protected under this. There is some language changes that I would hope will be introduced in the Clinical Ranks so that, while we protect them, we don't want to protect them preferentially to tenure probationary faculty.

TURNER: I have to call an end to this discussion. We are running out of time and we have another lengthy and important item on the agenda that we have already postponed completely. If I may, I would like to ask you to look for the continuation of this discussion next month and turn to the next item on the agenda which is the Memorandum on Faculty Work.

AGENDA ITEM VII FACULTY WORK MEMORANDUM: DISCUSSION

TURNER: Our purpose in discussing the Faculty Work Memorandum is to respond first of all to what the memorandum presents us. Dean Plater, at the request of the Chancellor, has articulated the nature and the responsibilities surrounding faculty work within the parameters of present policy and practices as best as he can determine. What we are asking you to do, now that you have read it and considered it, is to respond to it. We have two questions here. One would be whether or not the document follows from University policies as it is suggested by Dean Plater? That is one item for discussion. The other one would be if, in fact, it is true that it follows from present policies, then presumably our discussion might focus on whether or not those are the policies we want to have? The floor is open for discussion of this document. It is a document that touches on some very important aspects of Faculty Work. Therefore, let me open the floor for comments, suggestions, or questions about the Faculty Work Memorandum.

KUBITSCHEK: On page 12, at the end of the first full paragraph on that page, "The department chair and dean are thus responsible for making these assignments based first on the need to meet unit obligations and second on the assessment of a fair and equitable distribution of work among all faculty." Are those intended to be prioritized or is the intent simply to say "both of these must be considered?"

PLATER: I can respond as to what I meant here. My sense of it is that ideally they would be co-equal, but if there is a choice between being fair and equitable and meeting the obligations of the unit, meeting the obligations come first. That may mean that some faculty members might have to teach, for example, more sections than some others if the sections have to be taught.

KUBITSCHEK: Do you not think it is the unit's obligation to be fair and equitable to its members?

PLATER: Sure. But, I think if we have offered the sections to students that we have an obligation to meet them first rather than saying that everyone will teach, for example, the same number of sections. I am not suggesting the baseline criteria, but I am suggesting that meeting the obligations should have a higher priority.

YOKOMOTO: Dean Plater, there are some statements in here that tell whether they are philosophy or if they are becoming policy. The wording leads me to wonder about this. For instance, on page 6, end of the first paragraph, you say things like "They are expected to contribute to all of these at a satisfactory level at all times." When you say they are expected to be satisfactory in all of these, are these statements of your beliefs and expectations or are these going to become statements of some kind of evaluated measures? I find those statements in several places. For instance, where you say, on page 7, about one inch from the bottom of the first paragraph, '...but they must meet their other assigned academic duties--including research...' So, this sounds as if now a chair is going to assign research to faculty and if they don't do it, then what?

PLATER: Charlie, I think that you are right. There is a combination here. There is no way to separate what I believe from what is written here. I understand our policies to say that there is an expectation that faculty will be satisfactory in teaching, research, and service. That is what I believe the policies say. If the faculty here disagree and say that is not what our policies say, then we should perhaps change our policy and say you have to be satisfactory in two of the three areas. But, I understand our policies to say you are to be satisfactory in teaching, research, and service.

WARFEL: I think the first part of Charlie's question may have been the 'at all times.' There has been quite a bit of talk in the last several years about how a professor goes through phases in a career and maybe research intensive at one time and teaching intensive or service intensive at other times. That little trailer, the phrase 'at all times,' could convey that every semester you had better teach a course, do some service, and publish a paper because that is what we expect all the time. I would hope that is not what it means but the language doesn't make it clear.

BALDWIN: The Handbook does say 'satisfactory.' At the point of evaluation that is what counts. The thing that Charlie referred to on page 7 is a bit scarier. When a faculty member's research goes off on its own, what the department is really evaluating is not the research itself but value of the research to the department. The department or schools' "mission" can change. I know cases where people have rewritten mission statements overnight. Beyond that, there is an implication here for academic freedom. One of the things that academic freedom does give faculty is the ability to let the research go where it will, and if suddenly you find yourself getting too far away from your unit's mission statement -- which in essence is a political document -- then you can be corralled back to the fold in spite of the direction that your research is going, whether it is AIDS research or the causes of The American Civil War. I am not sure we want that kind of action.

KUBITSCHKEK: I do think that is a serious point. Women's Studies developed out of Sociology and English in the early days and many, many departments did not welcome research in those areas. They are now established parts of the university.

PLATER: I don't think mission statements change overnight and mission statements aren't written by individuals. A unit has to agree upon what its mission is. If it is not as suggested throughout this document. If collective judgment of the department or the unit that is creating the mission for itself and

carrying out a mission is not valid, then none of this holds. If there is an arbitrary action by an individual; by a department chair who goes to his or her office at night and writes a mission statement announcing how colleagues must conduct their affairs, then I don't think this holds. It can't hold because the mission has to be of the unit and has to be legitimized by the unit. Missions do change and I think Missy has given a very good example of how they change over time. It would seem to me that the unit as a whole has to be the arbiter of those expectations, and the mission is indeed important and research has to be related to the mission of the unit. That is not to say that the mission of the unit can't change. Indeed, it needs to change over time.

LANGSAM: On page 7, there is a statement that bothers me as well. It says "There is no entitlement and no right to one day per week for scholarship or research, except as this assignment of time may be approved by the chair or dean within the context of the individual faculty member's overall responsibilities." I have been here since 1964 and I don't remember a chair or a dean ever saying anything like that to me. We might have occasionally talked about my teaching. Occasionally my arm has been twisted to serve on a couple of committees but I don't ever remember anybody, and I am glad, telling me what my assignment of time and having some kind of approval by my chair or dean. This suggests to me, at least from my school, a very different thinking or assumption about the relationship of faculty and chairs. I guess I am very uncomfortable about this assignment and this approval. In fact, if anything a lot of new faculty will say that nobody tells them enough about what they should be doing. So, this strikes me as quite different to the whole nature of the operation. It seems to me a real micro-managing kind of an assembly line foreman of the whole nature of the faculty as a cooperative enterprise of self-motivated, seriousness. I am at a loss for words. But, it sounds to me much more like a factory. I appreciate the need for direction. I understand that an institution faces flack from outside and we do need to rethink and take more seriously and change, as you have yourself suggested, mission statements that we all participate in, but this doesn't sound like an "all participate in," this sounds like something from camp where the counselor assigns people to do stuff. I don't know that sets the tone that I am think you were probably implying about collegial working common goals.

TURNER: I think that the issue comes up not so much as a general practice, but as a response to specific situations. An example would be if an administrator says, "We need a class on Wednesday afternoon" or something done and a faculty member says, "That is my research day." It seems to me that this is an attempt to formulate a response to that. I don't mean to suggest that what you have said is untrue. It is just that the situation that we are responding to is not a vacuum but rather the people say that is my research day and it is bracketed with that kind of absolute uncertainty.

LANGSAM: If you are correct, Richard, then perhaps a more frontal assault on that issue, which is to say that faculties' teaching responsibilities must be given and the needs of the department for teaching need to be given priority. Other needs such as research and service must take second place in establishing schedules. I don't have any problem with that. That addresses what you are talking about, but at least to me the wording of this has other overtones which I am not sure really were intended but I think, at least they struck me wrong.

PETERSON: I have some problems with that statement also relative to the last statement that we

related to satisfactory in all areas. If you take this statement which says you have no right for time for research, yet you have to remain satisfactory in research. That could be grounds for "dismissal" if you don't continue to remain satisfactory when you have been given some time to do those activities that are satisfactory. I am sure that is not the intent, but it could be interpreted that way.

S. FINEBERG: I have been involved in this kind activity for a long time now and I know that departments of medicine are never democracies. I think they are really autocracies or dictatorships. **[laughter]** In fact, at my last institution my head department of medicine refused to give me a contract and told me that if he would write one, it would be meaningless. Aside from that, there is no question that in schools of medicine and in their divisions the mission of the units is predominant and the tenured and tenure-probationary are expected to do research, but they are expected to accommodate their research activities to the overall mission of the unit. I think that a statement could be written in such a way that would say that the mission of the unit determines activities but should not preclude research activities of the tenure and tenure-probationary personnel. What the division is obviously up to the missions of those units.

PORTER: It is on a slightly different issue, but on page 6, Roman Numeral I, RESEARCH. It does not mention creative activities. The foreground is research and I think that is problematic for those faculty members who are not doing research in the traditional sense.

TURNER: Since this is an important conversation, we will continue this next month. Let me move on with the agenda.

AGENDA ITEM VIII QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

TURNER: You can address questions and answers to the Chancellor but he won't answer so we can skip that agenda item. **[Chancellor Bepko had left the meeting to attend another meeting]**

AGENDA ITEM IX UNFINISHED BUSINESS

PORTER: If any faculty member did not receive a copy of the new IUPUI : Supplement to the Academic Handbook or should wish another copy, to whom should they address that inquiry?

CHUMLEY: They can call the Council Office at 274-2215 and I will be glad to send them a copy.

PORTER: Thank you. I wanted to clarify that.

AGENDA ITEM X NEW BUSINESS

[There was no New Business due to the lack of time]

AGENDA ITEM XI ADJOURNMENT

turner: I would welcome a motion to adjourn. [A motion was made.] There has been a motion to adjourn and it has been seconded. All in favor say "Aye." Opposed? The meeting is adjourned.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY INDIANAPOLIS

Faculty Council Meeting

March 7, 1996

School of Dentistry, Room S115

3:30 p.m.

Members Present: Administration: Trudy Banta, Chancellor Gerald L. Bepko, Dean William Plater. Deans: John Barlow, Paul Bippen, Angela McBride, Doris Merritt. Elected Faculty: Susan Ball, Lynn Broderick, Paul Brown, David Burr, Kenneth Byrd, Michael Cohen, Jeanette Dickerson-Putman, William Hohlt, Dolores Hoyt, Elizabeth Jones, Miriam Langsam, Golam Mannan, Rebecca Markel, William Orme, Richard Peterson, Richard Pflanzner, Rebecca Porter, Ken Rennels, Edward Robbins, Bernadette Rodak, Jane Schultz, Erdogan Sener, Akhouri Sinha, Stephen Stockberger, Karen Teegarden, Kathleen Warfel, Kathryn Wilson. Ex Officio Members: James Baldwin, Henry Besch, Paul Galanti, Carlyn Johnson, Byron Olson, Martin Spechler, Richard Turner, Rosalie Vermette. Visitors: Erwin Boschmann (Faculty Development Office), Mark Grove (Registrar's Office), Robert Martin (Administration/Finance), Patrick Rooney (Chancellor's Office), Rick Ward (Academic Affairs Committee). Parliamentarian: Harriet Wilkins.

Alternates Present: Deans: J. M. Kapoor for Roberta Greene, Naja Modibo for Kathy Krendl, Dolores Hoyt for Philip Tompkins. Elected Faculty: Robert Rigdon for Charalambos Aliprantis, J. M. Kapoor for Raymond Koleski, Richard Fredland for Charles Yokomoto. Ex Officio Members: Melinda Phillabaum for Virgie Montgomery (Staff Council).

Members Absent: Deans: A James Barnes, Trevor Brown, Robert Holden, P Nicholas Kellum, Norman Lefstein, John Rau, Robert Shay, David Stocum, Donald Warren, Charles Webb. Elected Faculty: Larry Abel, W Marshall Anderson, Margaret Applegate, Merrill Benson, Joseph Bidwell, Diane Billings, Ulf Jonas Bjork, Jana Bradley, Zacharie Brahma, Thomas Broadie, Timothy Brothers, Timothy Byers, David Canal, Lucinda Carr, Paul Dubin, Naomi Fineberg, Karen Gable, Patricia Gallagher, Joe Garcia, Bernardino Ghetti, Carlos Goldberg, Robert Havlik, Antoinette Hood, Nathan Houser, Henry Karlson, M Jan Keffer, Michael Klemsz, Missy Kubitschek, Stephen Lalka, Dana McDonald, Debra Mesch, Bart Ng, Fred Pavalko, Michael Penna, David Peters, Virginia Richardson, Brian Sanders, Mark Seifert, Anantha Shekhar, Jay Simon, Jerrold Stern, James Wallihan, Kathleen Warfel, Karen West, Richard Wyma, Mervin Yoder, Susan Zunt.

AGENDA ITEM I: Call to Order

TURNER: I will now call the meeting to order.

AGENDA ITEM II: Approval of Minutes

TURNER: I would like for you to look at the second item on the agenda that is the approval of the minutes for October 5 and December 7, 1995. Are there any corrections to these minutes? Hearing none, all of those in favor of approving the minutes, say "Aye." Opposed? [none] The minutes will stand as approved as distributed.

AGENDA ITEM III: Administrative Report: Chancellor Gerald Bepko

TURNER: We will move on to the next item which is the Administrative Report with Chancellor Bepko.

BEPKO: I have just a couple of items about Strategic Directions and the universitywide planning process. Tomorrow morning we will send to Bloomington to Vice President George Walker's office the remaining proposals that were not sent last week. As those of you who are most familiar with this process will know, the original date of March 1 that was selected as the deadline for submitting proposals was extended to March 8. There was a plea to submit as many proposals as we had ready on March 1 and we did that. There will be another batch that will go down tomorrow along with campus recommendations. These are recommendations developed through a process that involved faculty committees and it is the campus administration's view that, with a couple of exceptions, we have just taken all of the recommendations of the priority rankings of the faculty review process and will forward that down as the campus' priority rankings and recommendations for the Strategic Directions proposals. So, you will know if you got a good rating from the review panels here on campus, that rating will be reflected precisely in the campus' recommendations that are made to George Walker's office in Bloomington. I mention this because the proposals that came from this campus were really outstanding. I think that it is yet another indication of the high quality work that goes on on this campus that we had such a large number and such high quality proposals as a part of this process. I do not think there are many campuses, particularly in the relatively short period of time that was available to complete these proposals, that could come up with the kind of creativity and depth of thinking reflected in these proposals. I think congratulations are in order to the people who have proposed these projects and to the whole academic community for another manifestation of excellence.

In addition to the proposals and the funding that will come through this Strategic Directions process, President Brand has asked that there be a system of reporting and accountability that goes beyond the funding. He has sent a memo to deans, and I believe it also is designated for departments and a variety of other people. The memo sets forth a list of offices within the university that ought to be responsible for developing, within the Strategic Directions framework,

goals, measurements and benchmarks so that we can talk about this on a continuing basis within the university and so that Myles Brand can report to the Trustees on how we are doing. It isn't just the funding of these proposals. It is the response of the whole university community to the Strategic Directions Charter. I hasten to say that doesn't mean that everybody is going to do something in response to every one of the entries in the Strategic Directions Charter. It may be that some departments will deal only with some of these Charter provisions, but it is an opportunity in a way for the whole university academic community to show how it is going to proceed, maybe not at all but maybe aggressively in response to any particular SDC provision. That memo and that list of assignments are now broadly distributed in the university community. The response in its first version must be done by March 31. We have an idea that I think will make it easier for us to respond on this campus than on other campuses because we had so much planning, mission/vision/values, goals and objectives and measurements already documented for programs at IUPUI. We are going to be able to do a first draft of the response to this request for information, which at other campuses is going to go out to everyone and hundreds of people literally. The Bloomington campus probably will be involved in responding to this in its first version.

In our first version we are going to use the materials that have already been gathered in Trudy Banta's office. We are going to prepare a first draft of a response that we will make available widely to the Faculty Council and to the schools so that all of you can see it. All the deans and department chairs will have an opportunity to make sure that these responses are the right ones. It will help us meet this very ambitious deadline of March 31 without wrecking your spring break or the spring break of many other people. I should mention that all of the matters gathered in Trudy Banta's office have come from the schools and the departments, have been gathered by the campus administration over time, have been developed by all of us, have been seen by everybody before. So, it is not as if there is going to be something new in this document, but it will be an easier way to respond. By the time you see it, there will already be something on paper so you can see how it will look when it goes to Bloomington on March 31. If you want to change it, add to it, or subtract from it, you will be able to do so. I say that in particular so that it will enhance your enjoyment of spring break, both knowing you won't have to do any of this and knowing that we will be here working on it. *[laughter]*

One other point. President Kathy Warfel and I have just been talking about this and she may wish to add comments. There is a proposal to reward outstanding teaching being made by Trustee Ray Richardson. I think you have a copy of it judging by the fact that you are all holding an orange piece of paper. So, you can see what he is proposing to do. However, there has been a new development with respect to this and that is that Ray has said that he did not intend for the money for this \$1,000 cash bonus for 25 percent of the faculty each year to come from salary increases that would otherwise be given. He did not intend that to be a part of the usual allocation of resources to compensation. But, he intended for it to be possibly from a new source of funding that would be an addition to tuition for students in the coming academic year. In other words, we would raise tuition and use the money to provide this 25 percent cash bonus.

This will be a discussion item for the Trustees' meeting coming up later this month. Our reaction to it has been that it is a form of management from the level of the Trustees that is not helpful, that it is micro management. That, while we would like to experiment with incentives of various kinds, this one incentive, which may be something that many of us would agree with, that we should find ways to reward excellent teaching even better than we do today, but, introduced as it is suggested here, it would be disruptive of other plans, other initiatives, other experiments that are under way to try to create good incentives for the type of conduct that we wish to stimulate on campus. This would not be a particular helpful thing at this time. That is only our view of it at this moment. You will have your own opportunity to comment.

One final thought. There is, as you probably know, on campus, the 1996 version of the Olympic Trials in swimming. It is a little bit of a nuisance if you are trying to go through the Natatorium or park in that garage. I think it is probably more crowded than it is ordinarily. This is another event that brings much national attention to the campus, and I think, is a good thing for the university especially if it brings people here who in the process become familiar with what an excellent university this truly has become and will be even more so in the future.

TURNER: Thanks Chancellor Bepko.

AGENDA ITEM IV: President of the Faculty Report - Kathleen Warfel

TURNER: We will now turn to the President of the Faculty Report with Kathleen Warfel.

WARFEL: Regarding Trustee Richardson's suggestion about rewarding outstanding teaching, Ed Greenebaum and I attend the Trustees' meetings and we had a similar reaction about the level of involvement with this sort of decision making. It hasn't been too long, I am sure many of you will remember, when the UFC and then the campuses wrote salary policies carefully incorporating faculty into the decision making about salaries and the principles about how different things would be rewarded. Initially, when we believed that Trustee Richardson's suggestion was going to use up some of the limited salary money, we were even more alarmed than we are now. It is just something for us to continue to watch.

Also, for your information I have included a copy of the latest draft on the Clinical Ranks. This draft formulates many, but not all, of the suggestions made at the February UFC meeting. It is for action at the UFC meeting on March 26 in Ft. Wayne. It will be very important for all of our IUPUI representatives to be there. We predict that this will pass the Council, but it is important that we have as many positive votes show up in Ft. Wayne as possible.

SPECHLER: Kathy, on that subject, I didn't know whether you were going to mention it, but it is fairly important to this campus that the clinical ranks proposal pass. There is one remaining issue that some of our colleagues may not be familiar with. We had very powerful presentations by the deans of the School of Nursing and the IUPUI Law School which were quite effective and

persuasive. But, the question is whether teaching in a clinical setting ought to be extended to the School of Social Work which is primarily here in Indianapolis and to the School of Education which is very important here in Indianapolis. These schools have not spoken up as forcefully, if I may say so, as the other schools. Let me say that they ought to. If they want to be included in the clinical ranks, they really have to speak now or they will wait another year before there will be another opportunity.

WARFEL: One thing that I did not copy for each of you, but you will be receiving, is a copy of the proposed changes in the Student Code. This will be an action item at the University Faculty Council in April. Unfortunately, these multiple changes were drafted by the Student Affairs Committee of the Bloomington Faculty Council in spite of the suggestions that such a procedure was not the way to go about it. As soon as Bloomington accepts them, they will go to the UFC. The campus Student Affairs Committee should now have this to begin work on it. In any case, you will be receiving a copy and you can look at it and comment on it.

Of other interests coming up from Bloomington, I was in receipt of a discussion document in which Bloomington faculty were talking about Division I status for IUPUI. Some of you may find it interesting and perhaps amusing. If you want a copy, you may have one. That is the end of my report.

TURNER: Thanks, Kathy. Any of you who are members of the University Faculty Council are urged to attend the UFC meeting in Ft. Wayne this month. If you find that you are unable to attend and you can't find somebody to go in your place, we would be glad to help you find a substitute so give us a call.

AGENDA ITEM V: Election of President and Vice President

TURNER: The next item on the agenda is the election of President and Vice President. Dolores Hoyt, the chair of the Nominating Committee will handle this.

HOYT: Members of the Nominating Committee are distributing the ballots. Vote for one person in each category. For President the candidates are Gerald Powers from Social Work and William Schneider who is on leave right now but will be back in time to do this. For Vice President the candidates are Rebecca Porter, School of Medicine (Allied Health Sciences), and Martin Spechler from the School of Liberal Arts. I would like to take this time to thank all of the people who were willing to be considered because it is a very critical position and very time consuming so we are extremely pleased to get volunteers.

[The result of the elections were as follows:]

William Schneider, School of Liberal Arts, was elected President and Rebecca Porter, School of Medicine [Allied Health Sciences] was elected Vice President.

HOYT: I would like to ask permission to destroy the ballots.

LANGSAM: I second the motion.

TURNER: All in favor of this motion please say "Aye." Opposed? [None] Abstentions" [None] The ballots will be destroyed.

AGENDA ITEM VI: Proposed Resolution: Grade Indexing

TURNER: While we are waiting for the ballots to be counted, we can move on to the next item on the agenda, the proposed resolution on Grade Indexing. Rick Ward will lead this discussion.

WARD: I am representing Academic Affairs Committee. I was not able to come to the last meeting for the first part of our response to this part of the resolution. I am assuming that this is something that you all have seen. In response to the resolution regarding Grade Indexing (Circular 96-04) we drafted a response after two meetings in which we discussed this proposal. Basically, to summarize our thinking on the response, we didn't address the idea of Grade Indexing as a merit in its own right. Instead, we were looking at it as a means of getting at the idea that there is grade inflation. Our response to grade inflation, which I understand was discussed last time, was essentially that we weren't convinced that there was a problem and, moreover, we were definitely not convinced that this was a way to get at it. Particularly with regard to indexing, it was really unclear to us from the resolution itself what value indexing would have in addressing a problem we weren't sure existed. We were quite concerned about where this resolution was coming from in terms of issues of academic freedom. We basically felt that, at this point, this is not a good idea.

I would also like to say that I know Bloomington's faculty has picked up grade indexing as a way of conveying information to their students. I note on their document that they specifically say that the Educational Policies Committee of the Bloomington Faculty Council notes that "grade indexing is not intended, in any way, to reveal or curb perceived grade inflation. Whether or not grade inflation exists is not relevant to the issue of grade indexing. Rather, the existence of variable grading policies, which occur naturally in any university setting, would suggest the usefulness of grade indexing in providing a context for understanding the meaning of the grades." So, I think that the Academic Affairs Committee's response to this would be, if this campus is interested in doing grade indexing and wants to put it in that context and get it back to us as a discussion item, that would make some sense to us. In regard to responding to a particular resolution, the Academic Affairs Committee was against the resolution as indicated in the letter.

TURNER: What are you asking of us?

WARD: I am unclear about that. I am not sure what procedure we normally follow when we have

a resolution from the Trustees. I assume that it would be nice to have some response from the Faculty Council supporting our recommendation that we, at this point, not follow the proposal.

WARFEL: We did have the report of our campus committee the last time and understood, even though it wasn't officially discussed, what the advice of our committee here was. At the University Faculty Council last week we heard the report of the University Faculty Council's Educational Policies Committee. You have a copy of that before you. The advice of that committee on Grade Indexing was that it isn't a solution to Grade Inflation as we find out. The Bloomington faculty has agreed, by a close vote, to make grade indexing available internally for the students at Bloomington. They are working with the Registrar to determine exactly how such a policy will be fleshed out and implemented. The committee suggested that the decision to index or not should be left up to each campus and advised that we allow Bloomington to go ahead, observe their trials and successes and then, with that advice under our belt, see what the other campuses will do and how they might do it. The UFC accepted that report. Ed Greenebaum and I officially asked President Brand to take the summary of opinions about that grade indexing and the grading policy forward to the Trustees. Without faculty governance voting in favor of their resolution or voting against their resolution, we have the mechanism to advise the Trustees. It seemed to me that what we were coming up with was not out of line in any way with the advice of your committee. So, that is where we stand now.

TURNER: Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM VII: Draft Policy on Dealing With Financial Difficulties

TURNER: Item #7 on the agenda is the Draft Policy on Dealing With Financial Difficulties. This is a document that was introduced in January. We have talked about it in February at last month's meeting and we are about to begin the discussion again. Our hope is that we can, with the revisions that have been made, move on to some resolution and perhaps vote on this today. Rebecca Porter will discuss this item.

PORTER: I hope that when you came in you picked up a document that is labeled IUPUI Circular 96-06 which contains amendment language. If you will recall, last time we adopted two amendments. There was a proposed third amendment which generated considerable discussion. Now you have a revision of that third amendment which attempted to incorporate concerns that we were hearing. The primary concern that is addressed in this amendment deals with the hiring of part-time individuals. That language is contained in item c that tried to capture the thought that, if part-time positions had been a tradition within a unit, one could continue to hire in part-time positions, however, again with the directive that they should look for efforts of reinstating dismissed tenured faculty. Some of the other changes you see represented is a creation of a heading for each of those categories so that there is parallel structure. I assume we want to go one amendment at a time.

TURNER: Yes. Is there any discussion of the proposed changes?

LANGSAM: I move that we accept the changes. [the motion was seconded]

TURNER: That is the motion from the committee and therefore does not need a motion.

LANGSAM: Then I will second the motion.

TURNER: If there is no more discussion...

LANGSAM: Call for the question.

TURNER: The question has been called. At present we are calling the question on all of them.

PORTER: On all of them? I thought we were taking them one at a time. Let's do them one at a time and right now we are doing what is labeled "Amendment #3 which is basically the first page.

TURNER: We are voting on amendment #3 which is the first page. If there is no more discussion, all in favor of Amendment #3, say "Aye." Opposed? [There was one] Any abstentions? [None] The motion passes.

PORTER: Amendment #4 is in response to an issue that was brought to our attention by colleagues who have their primary teaching on the IUPU Columbus campus. Dean Paul Bippen is here and can address the rationale.

BIPPEN: Thank you. The faculty has looked at this proposal on several occasions and have had at least three separate meetings to discuss this topic in addition to multiple E-mail conversations about the issue. A vote was taken and the majority of the faculty in Columbus asked that the amendment, as written, be adopted. I would be glad to speak more to it, but the rationale of the faculty in Columbus is that they meet the same promotion and tenure guidelines as do colleagues in Indianapolis and that, as a result of that relationship, they should be covered by the same policies in Columbus as those that apply in Indianapolis.

SPECHLER: Paul, I heard the rumor that the Columbus campus has been recognized as the ninth independent campus of the IU system. [laughter] I don't know if that is true, but you are the person to ask. If it is true or if it becomes true, how would that affect your position on this matter?

BIPPEN: I would go first to the assumption that Columbus is about to be recognized as the ninth independent campus. I think that assumption is not true. It is not likely. I don't believe that Columbus is likely to be recognized at the ninth campus of IU, but is likely to remain a branch campus of IUPUI. The name has been changed and that was done to give recognition to IU and Purdue in Columbus as opposed to linking Indianapolis to the names that we use in Columbus. It

is true that the name of the campus was officially changed. In fact, my title has also changed. But, both of those were changed to recognize our organizational maturity as a campus in Columbus, but in no way to presume that there is going to be any change in our organizational relationship to IU or to Purdue for that matter.

WARFEL: Although the language is very short and straightforward, it isn't clear to me what this really means in the case of financial difficulty? Does this mean if we have trouble on the Indianapolis grounds that we can look for solutions in Columbus or does this mean that Columbus is a sub unit? Given what it says, I am not sure what it means.

BIPPEN: The intent of the faculty is that Columbus, for this policy, be treated the same as any other academic unit of IUPUI.

WARFEL: So, in the case of financial difficulties at Columbus, these are the policies and steps that you would follow?

BIPPEN: Yes.

TURNER: Is there any other discussion of this? If there is no other discussion, is the Council ready to vote? All in favor of approving Amendment #4, say "Aye." Opposed? [None] Abstentions? [None] Amendment #4 is approved.

PORTER: Amendment #5 is a little more complicated than it may appear on the surface in that, if you will recall or if you have it with you, last time we adopted proposed amendment #1 and proposed amendment #2 which dealt with Section 2a and then the paragraph at the bottom of the page. We then had a discussion within the Faculty Council that raised some questions about whether the language was clear about 'what could be considered' and when you had the Faculty Board of Review, what can they look at and at what can't they look. This led to the wording that appears in the amendment that we gave you today which is under Section 2b. Having added the wording in Section b, there was a sense of some need to clean up some language in Section a and in the concluding paragraph. There are rather minor language changes and are meant to clarify. I want to make sure that the Council is clear on the background of these changes. If you are recalling that we had addressed these items before, you are recalling correctly, but we are trying to make the language as consistent and clear as possible.

TURNER: Is there any discussion of Amendment #5?

SPECHLER: In a previous discussion I raised the issue of whether removing all the identification of a grievant would serve her or his interest in this matter. I just want to be clear, before I vote for this, about a letter from the grievant to this Faculty Board of Review. I see in (a) that another Faculty Board of Review could consider issues of adherence to policy and procedures. What I would like to know, Becky, is would (2a) bar a letter from a signed grievant saying that "in my

case these procedures were unfairly implemented" on the grounds that a letter obviously does not remove the identification of the grievant. So, I would like to know whether this would harm the interest of a grievant by disallowing such letters or other kinds of testimony which must bear the identification of a person involved?

PORTER: Let me address that in two parts. The phrase, "*if, but only if, all information identifying the grievant has been removed...*" is part of the amendment that was passed by this body last time. So, that does not represent new language that we are introducing. So, it is an issue that this group addressed at the last meeting. My premise behind removing the information is that we don't want the person involved in the Faculty Board of Review revealed by actions within the institution. If that person chooses to make themselves known, then they are self-revealing. My understanding of the intent of this is to make sure that the confidentiality of the process is protected and that the institution in no way makes known the individual. If that individual chooses to go public, I don't see that this policy prohibits them from becoming public.

SPECHLER: I am very grateful for your putting that on record. With that understanding, I would be happy to vote for it.

PORTER: I am not an expert in Faculty Boards of Review, but that would be my understanding. It is a reasonable interpretation.

ROTHE: Because the Faculty Boards of Review have to be totally confidential, supposedly, how is this information going to be known in the first place? This information is going to be transmitted without the identification of the grievant.

PORTER: How would anyone know that there was a Faculty Board of Review that had dealt with a similar situation?

ROTHE: Yes. What is the definition of "in the strictest confidentiality?"

LANGSAM: If I understand what it says, is let's say we have a hearing about a problem with Henry Besch. If material from that Board of Review, which is essentially internally confidential, was introduced to a subsequent Board of Review, which is what it says here, in order to protect Henry, the second Board of Review, which is not required to be necessarily confidential about Henry because they are not involved in that first Board of Review, we would remove the identification of Henry so the second Board of Review would not find out. What we are interested in is the procedures and the discussion of policy and procedures, say in the School of Medicine. So, if in Henry's case we find out one whole series of things and then in the case of another member of the same school we find out that they are doing something entirely different, that is what we are interested in establishing. We are not interested in establishing that as Henry Besch. That is exactly what it says.

PORTER: Thank you.

WARFEL: To answer Carl's question, I think because the President of the Faculty is the person to whom the grievant comes, if the President says, "Well, we just had that complaint from somebody else last month", then that is how you would know.

TURNER: Are you ready for the discussion? Lacking any further discussion, I would like to ask for a vote on Amendment #5. All in favor of Amendment #5, please say "Aye." Opposed? [None] Abstentions? [None] Amendment #5 passes.

PORTER: It is appropriate now to act on the entire document as amended.

TURNER: What we have before us is the entire document, the Policy on Dealing With Financial Difficulties. You received it last month.

PORTER: In reviewing this document I have been told that there may be a couple of typos. I hope that you will not mind if we clean those up having now identified them before we transmit it on its formal way.

BESCH: May I recommend the same procedure for a misplaced "only"?

PORTER: If we have a misplaced "only," I hope you will tell me where it is.

TURNER: We will take that as a friendly amendment. Picky, but friendly.[laughter]

SPECHLER: Becky, if you will bear with me for just a minute about this replacement. I am very concerned about the use of part-time instructors on this campus. We, in our committee, have discussed that language. The question is of part-timers being used for financial reasons to replace tenured faculty who may be terminated in a financial exigency. My understanding of your language, now that we are discussing the whole document, is that if a department -- let's say the department of English, which uses a lot of part-timers -- say has 60+ people and they have a financial exigency, then I understand that the meaning of "replacement hiring" to say that they can hire up to that 60. hiring." Do I understand that right?

PORTER: Remember that in this process we have gone through a phase of financial difficulties and financial crisis before leading up to financial exigency. Along that way, through the involvement of the school level budgetary affairs committee, everybody who could possibly be gotten rid of has been removed before we get to financial exigency. So, there is language in that process that talks about getting rid of anyone who is deemed as non-essential personnel and they should have been looked at very carefully through this process. Things are still going bad. So, we are now moving into the financial exigency plan which, again, is involving school level review as well as campus level review trying to identify how can we best deal with this situation?

The language, as you pointed out, is not specific. In the discussion from this body last time there seemed to be some sentiment that because some of our units use part-time people and it is an essential part of what they do and to preclude them from hiring replacements would assure that they would never recover. That is what led to the crafting of the language. You are correct. The Faculty Affairs Committee remains concerned about the idea that part-time instructors could be used in place of full-time instructors. The Faculty Affairs Committee is committed to the idea that it is the full-time instructors who should be here to carry out the entire academic mission.

SPECHLER: That is fine. I just want to get on the record because this could (let's hope it never does) become actual, but if it did in the hypothetical case that I gave where a department has a substantial regular staff of part-timers who are doing good work, does this mean that you could hire up to a certain number or you could do anything you wanted in way of hiring part-timers in place of tenured faculty? My example was 60 or whatever the historical number has been, my understanding, just to repeat, is that replacement hiring means that you could hire up to that number, but not beyond it. That wouldn't be replacement. That would be substitution, at least as I would use the word. Could you be clear about what we are permitting here?

PORTER: Note that in the placement of this section that Section C, which is on page 10, talks about procedures and we talk about notification of dismissal, and faculty boards of review. Now we are saying, "Alright, we have dismissed the tenured faculty. We are in the year in which the financial exigency plan is running. In the spring semester a part-time person leaves the university. Can I hire a replacement for that part-time person?" The answer is "yes." That is permitted. It is permitted to hire a replacement for that part-time position asking that the unit consider first going back to the dismissed tenured person and trying to bring them back, but that isn't absolutely mandated. They can hire a replacement. It is dealing with that time period within the constraints of the financial exigency plan. Not going out to what was some past high in terms of the number of part-time faculty.

TURNER: Is there any other discussion? If there is no further discussion of the document as a whole, I would like to ask for a vote on the document. All in favor of adopting the Policy on Dealing With Financial Difficulties that is proposed and amended please say "Aye." Opposed? [One] Abstentions? [Two] The motion to approve the document passes. The document will become policy on this campus. Thank you, Becky. Thanks also to the Budgetary Affairs and Faculty Affairs committees for all their hard work on that policy.

AGENDA ITEM VIII: Faculty Work

TURNER: We will now move to the next item on the agenda -- the Faculty Work Memorandum. This refers to the memorandum on faculty work prepared by Dean Plater, as the statement at the bottom of page suggests, that he is prepared to gather the assumptions about Faculty work that are operating on this campus. It has been circulated widely. It has been presented to the Council

before for the purpose of discussion so we as a Council can respond to the document, say what we like about it with the notion that Dean Plater will revise it. Then, after the discussions are finished he will offer a final version of it which is an announcement of the assumptions about Faculty work that are operating on this campus. Our job is to respond to that, to find the places where we agree and disagree, and when we disagree what our suggestions are and what our course of action will be in order to keep this conversation going and to modify the assumptions and to institute whatever policy changes need to be there in order to fit whatever we ultimately are going to agree on. We have said before that this is a very important subject. It is something that touches on some very important aspects of our professional and institutional lives. Therefore, this is a discussion that we feel is very important. With that, I would like to call your attention to a document that Kathy Warfel has presented. Do you want to introduce this, Kathy? Then we will open it up for discussion.

WARFEL: I think there is a great deal of good in the memo as it is and it is extremely helpful in having us all understand certain basic things about our work at IUPUI. I would offer this proposal as a means of keeping part of the discussion going. If you had a chance to read through this, you will have the gist of why I am coming forward with this. My proposal is simply to ask for the discussion to continue and for our Faculty Affairs Committee to continue to talk with Dean Plater about particular aspects of the document. The particular aspect mainly being the really absolute authority that the memo at this point gives to the administrator. I would like the Faculty Affairs Committee to at least consider the possibly of writing some guidelines similar to those that we have in our salary policy where, of course, the administrator sets the policy, but there is an advisory faculty elected group that participates in that process.

TURNER: As we continue the discussion, I urge you to follow Kathy's example. In addition to what we have to say, we are taking notes and we will collect all of this as best we can, but it would be very helpful if you could write up or send to us on paper or in some other manner, any suggestions you may have.

MANNAN: I move that the Faculty Council adopt these three proposals and guide the Faculty Affairs Committee to work with the Dean of the Faculties on the basis of these proposals.

LANGSAM: I second that.

TURNER: It has been moved and seconded that the Council support the proposals that you have before you and, in a sense, regard that as instructions to the Faculty Affairs Committee. Is there any discussion on this motion?

WILSON: Is this going to mandate that department chairmen calls up a committee when he makes assignments to work? When I read "Departmental work assignments of all faculty/librarians should be determined..."

WARFEL: I think we should declare that the simple proposal is that the Faculty Affairs Committee continue to work with Dean Plater to discuss these suggestions, to analyze the implications, to advise us whether these are useful suggestions or terrible suggestions. I think in voting today we would not be voting that "Yes, we love these three suggestions." But, only that the Faculty Affairs Committee should work on the ramifications of them and the language of them, and come back and advise the Faculty Council.

PORTER: The Faculty Affairs Committee did discuss the Faculty Work document at our last meeting. What we found is that it was very informative in presenting an administrative philosophy dealing with a variety of different items. In the absence of the specific applications, we were dealing with a lot of "what ifs" or we dealing with "Well, it could mean this in one circumstance and that in another circumstance." So, directing the Faculty Affairs Committee to work in a specific area would give us more focus in terms of what was expected of us rather than being presented with a broad document that didn't show us direct applications. This type of motion would probably allow the committee to be more effective in its discussions.

SPECHLER: I think that the legal situation at Indiana University, a public institution, makes clear that the Trustees, the President, and the responsible administrators do have the power to assign work responsibilities to all of us -- staff, faculty. I wouldn't have thought that needed additional belaboring. But, I think it has, on the whole, been exercised with restraint and fairness. I was rather surprised that we would have to have such an extensive document to make clear what most of us have realized for a long time. What we want, of course, is some protection from depreciatous exercise of the powers that I think everybody has to recognize exists. These have been quite rare. But, what are the protections? I don't think there are very many in this document that Kathy has brought forth, but I think there could be others brought in short of organizing AAUP or a labor union on the campus.

The first thing is that your assignment should be cleared with your direct supervisor. It is the purpose, it seems to me, of a chair or our school dean to guarantee the morale and proper functioning of her or his school. I don't think it is the duty or the direct responsibility of higher deans, vice chancellors, or chancellors to do that and I don't think they have done that. I think it is a protection of faculty members to have direct recourse to their own chair and their own dean. The dean or the chair should have to tell you, "Well, this is your responsibility. It really is important." If the dean or the chair disagree with such reassignments, then their option, in fact, their duty, is to resign, if the assignment is sufficiently unfair to affect the morale of their unit. It seems to me that would furnish more protection of the faculty from depreciatous action than what we have here. So, that is what I would like to suggest to the Faculty Affairs Committee in which I happen to sit. I will bring that up again as a possibility because I don't think this document does much for us.

Secondly, on a small matter, Kathy. In #3 of the proposal you say that *"A chair or other administrator who reassigns a faculty member to a teaching, research, or service position at another site and outside the area of expertise solely as an unwarranted punitive measure or means of*

encouraging the individual to resign from the faculty should be sanctioned." I question the word "solely." If that is any significant part of the motivation for such reassignment, it is unwarranted and wrong in my view. So, of course there is always some legitimate reason that could be brought for reassignment, but I don't think that some auxiliary reason is sufficient to protect an administrator from sanction in the case of a clearly deprecious action. I would like to suggest that we strike "solely" as a signal which probably it should have been clear in the first place that we don't use reassignments as a way of punishment. We have much more civilized ways of doing things.

LANGSAM: As the seconder, I like the concept that was suggested that the top paragraph, rather than the specifics, are what I was seconding. In other words, we are suggesting the continued dialogue. I view these things as examples and, therefore, do not think anything at this point is a necessary activity because they are examples and we would hope in the dialogue that there are more that they are subtracted from. That was the spirit in which I made my second. What Martin is doing is not exactly what I had in mind. So, I thought I would mention that.

TURNER: The issue before us is whether or not we should as a body exhort the Faculty Affairs Committee to consider these matters.

MANNAN: I agree with Miriam that my intent was just what she suggested. We understand that the university is a collegial institution. It is a jointly governed institution between the faculty and the administration. Any document relating to faculty work should preserve the balance between faculty's rights and academic freedom and the administration's need to govern and should not be tilted in favor of one or the other.

TURNER: Are we ready to vote on this motion to take this proposal and recommend that the Faculty Affairs Committee consider this?

ROBBINS: Call for the question?

TURNER: The question has been called. All in favor of this motion, say "Aye." Opposed? Abstentions? [None] Now we are ready to discuss the Faculty Work document again.

ROBBINS: I would suggest that whoever is going to consider this also consider another issue that has occurred to me. The issue is related to the principle in the document which suggests, appropriately I think, that faculty work and a feeling of equity among faculty for their work relies heavily upon a sense of fairness, particularly in terms of the magnitude of their workloads -- not necessarily the way it is divided among the three areas of teaching, research, and service, but in terms of how much they work. Faculty should be able to how much they do with what other faculty do and have a sense that it is reasonably equitable. That seems to me to be an important principle. But, it does rely upon a fairly clear sense among faculty of what other faculty do. I am afraid there isn't as clear an understanding among faculty of how the level of their work compare

with others as there should be . It is easy to me that the institution ought to have a better way for faculty to understand what it is that each of us do so that we could make a judgment about whether or not some people are able to get by doing very little while others are working very hard. I have a hard time myself making these judgments as I look at faculty I know. In a sense, I don't know very much about what other faculty do. The closest I have come to that is when I have served on promotion and tenure committees where you get an opportunity to read a dossier and see the kind of things that they are doing. But, beyond that, I don't have a very clear sense about what the magnitude of faculty work is among my colleagues.

BALDWIN: That sounds a lot like work indexing. *[laughter]*

SPECHLER: In answer to Ed's point, which is a very interesting one, I haven't noticed, Ed, a sense of inequity floating around the campus. I think it would be very unhealthy if there were such a view, especially, in light of the fact that people have different capabilities. They have different outside responsibilities and, more importantly, at least for me as an economist, they are paid vastly different amounts. It seems to me that someone who is making a six figure salary is paid to be more active and more successful. That is why they are being paid that. Someone who is making \$30,000 or \$35,000 as a faculty member has different expectations. Now, I am really surprised, Ed, that you would say that you are not aware of what your faculty members do. In the School of Liberal Arts we have primary committees in every department and we review all our colleagues every year. One of the beneficial side effects of this review, in my opinion, is that faculty realize how active their colleagues are. Those colleagues may not have published something in a big name journal this year, but they were active in service and they introduced a new course. It sharpens the awareness within the unit that we are a unit. The performance of a unit depends on every one doing what he or she does best but not necessarily the same thing. I was really surprised that you would say that. Don't you have in your school a committee on which you would be the natural one to serve that reviews what people do?

ROBBINS: First of all, I would like to respond to your notion about the basis for salary distribution. I would certainly hope that it is based on market factors rather than upon the value of our individual work and magnitude for individual work. I hope that I work as hard as those who make the six figure income and I hope that my work is just as important. I recognize though that the market plays a different role in all of that and I can accept that.

To the notion about how we understand what our colleagues do and that when are on those committees that looks specifically at those things. When I have sat on tenure/promotion committees and I have faculty colleagues' dossiers before me and I will tell you that I have a very good appreciation, but not everyone is on the committee. I am not on the committee every year or even very often thankfully. As a result, that process itself does not, for me at least, provide a sufficient opportunity for me to understand. I will tell you, at least in our unit or at least in the circles in which I participate, there is a great deal of talk about faculty colleagues and whether or not they work hard or not and whether or not they are off playing golf, or whether they are doing their research. There are discussions of that type. It has just been my sense that there isn't as

much of an opportunity for us to know what our colleagues do. I think if we knew we would appreciate much more how equitable our work is. I do have a sense of equity myself, but I just did not feel that we have in place a system that might give us as good of information about our faculty colleagues as we could. I don't have a proposal for what that system should be, but I think I would like to have the Faculty Affairs Committee take a look at it and see whether or not there is a better way for us to have a shared vision of what it is that we all do.

ORME: I appreciate Martin's platonic view of a department in which it functions best when everybody does best what they do best. But, that is not always in real life the case. Sometimes what we do best ceases to be deemed valuable. Sometimes new things come along that are deemed more valuable that we don't know very well how to do. It is reassignments in those areas that cause friction and problems. That is what we are looking to the Faculty Work document for answers to, I think, in part.

I am also concerned about what protections we actually are afforded. Sometimes what seems deprecious may not be. What doesn't seem deprecious can be. I am also concerned about outside activities as outlined in the Faculty Work document. If I chose to augment my income by becoming a bagger at Kroger's, does that embarrass the university and am I precluded from taking that position? That is kind of an absurd example, perhaps and perhaps not. I am concerned about what is it exactly that the university is saying they have ownership over if we agree to become an employee of the university? It is those perimeters that concern me. It is that, that I think partly Becky was alluding to when she said we have a lot of abstraction here that really can't be discussed without something tangible to hang it on. What does this mean in the real world?

LANGSAM: I have a question that is puzzling me regarding the whole issue of work load. When I first came to what was then the Downtown Campus, the letter that I received of employment was extraordinarily specific in some areas and incredibly vague in others. Over the years it has been my sense, though I am not directly involved with the employment part of the school, that we have tried to be much more specific in order to let faculty who are being hired know what the terms of their employment are and certain expectations. I am real interested in how those terms in letters, especially for the first three years that first period, relate to some of the things that are being talked about in reassignments and to what degree that letter, for example, is some sort of legal agreement between the employee and the university. Suppose the letter states that your teaching load is going to be x. What happens if suddenly at some level the person responsible for you said, "Oh No! You are going to have a teaching load of five courses. There will be five different preparations and I expect you to run the Campus United Way as well." What are the implications of that? I am not sure anything I have seen really addresses that. Do we need to change the kind of letters we send out if we develop a policy about work load? I am just raising a question and I don't know the answer.

PLATER: Let me respond briefly. I think you are right that the memorandum does not address explicitly the point that you are raising. It is my observation that letters of initial appointment have increasingly been specific about the first few years, as you have suggested. I think we, in fact,

insist that there be some language that says overtime the assignments can change. It would be my assumption that, if a faculty member received such a letter and it said "for the first three years your teaching load is this and your laboratory assignment is that and you will have this much support" would be, if not a legally binding document, it would be such a strong contract that we would be obligated to honor it. If the terms of the appointment were breached, the faculty member should immediately have relief through a Faculty Board of Review. I would assume that peers would say "Yes, that was a reasonable assumption. It was a promise and it needs to be honored by the institution."

MCBRIDE: I am speaking as a dean to say that I think that the big problem that you run into is over time when you are dealing with someone tenured, particularly if you are in a field that is changing quickly. I can imagine if you are a chaucer or scholar you could really think through what the next few decades might hold for you in terms of being a chaucer or scholar. If in fact you are a health professional these days, you are wondering about the next six months in terms of what things are going to hold. I am speaking generally to development over time of assignments in light of abilities needed. Two things are true about my school. One is, if you look at where the growth is, it can shift widely so you can have a period where those just entering into practice are in demand. That was true three years ago.

There is greater interest now in post RN and education. That involves different courses. A school, therefore, needs the capability of redeploying faculty to different programs. I would say that what needs to go with any redeployment is also some facilitation of faculty development. Administrators need some flexibility. Ninety-five percent of almost every school's budget is invested in its people. That is your resource. So, when you are thinking about delivering a program, you really need to not have any language that binds you to what a faculty member is asked to do in the first year, three years, or five years. There needs to be sensitivity to evolution in terms of the demand of the programs with changing needs. I am thinking of sponsoring at my own school next year a series of sessions for everybody to attend by way of Continuing Education because the health care system is changing so much. There are certain skills we all need. I want to build on what Miriam said in terms of being flexible in initial letters. I am scared that any initial letter, would forevermore be some sort of a legal contract for what is expected of a faculty member in a world that is quickly changing. I think it is a problem of the world changing so much. How can you adapt?

MANNAN: I can appreciate the statement that in changing times you have to make adjustments. Because of that, it may be necessary that many people have to do something different than what theyand it can be settled in a collegial manner. Part of the problem is the nature of the university. What is this place? Is this a business or is this an educational institution? The document at one point said the university is not a business. It should not be run like a business. It is not that we have managers here who can hire and fire workers and lay off as IBM does.

While later the document suggests the university is a big business. There is a tension there. Is it a business or is it not? This will decide how we are going to make those changes. Are they

negotiated? Are they going to be something that all of us are happy about?

MCBRIDE: May I respond to that comment? The University is not just a business, but I find that there are lot of discussions where administration is portrayed as being concerned only about money. By contrast, the faculty are portrayed as being concerned about academic quality. You then wind up getting discussions at cross purposes as if it were either/or. As administrators think about using their biggest resource they need to be flexible. I want administrators also to say, "They are not just going to make arbitrary assignments." I agree with that. The delivery of programs must be concerned with the real constraints that each school has. Certainly with Responsibility Center Management you have to be regularly thinking through, Where are your revenues and how do you deliver the programs within the existing resources?

MANNAN: Could those both of those be done even in a collegial environment?

MCBRIDE: I would hope so.

MANNAN: I think that is the nature of the debate.

RODAK: I am thinking in terms of how specific the school and some of the programs are. In reading this document, I thought "This is impossible. Nobody could ever come up with a statement that is going to satisfy both documents and is going to satisfy everybody as to what everyone's workload should be." A lot of emphasis is put on those who bring in the most money by this proposal. We have to do a lot of research. There has been some dissention among some of the "troops." They don't want to teach more than one course because they don't have time for their research and they have a one-half million dollar grant. I'm reading this and I am thinking, "Okay, where do we stand on all of this? How can we come up with some kind of 30 percent, 30 percent, 30 percent?" I am very confused and I don't see how we can come up with something that is going to satisfy everybody.

LANGSAM: I would like to compliment Angela because I think one of the things that she said was part of what I think is important. She talked about the need to re-educate, on a constant basis, the people within the school. I think that that is so critical especially in some schools where things are changing. If a redeployment has to occur, then there are some very serious and very resourceful and intensive issues to be discussed as to how much money does one invest in a colleague that has been here for 20 years to allow them to successfully and competently deal with that reassignment? I think that is a very important issue for the faculty to just not to have the sense. I don't think anyone here thinks that way that one day I wake up and I am teaching Chinese history. Therefore, I think that is a very important element and something we need to discuss. I have a friend at the North Carolina school who has been an associate provost and she is leaving that job and going back into Latin American history and the university is giving her six months to re-tool herself to prepare to get back into the classroom even though she has done some teaching. That is the kind of example of a switching of emphasis which I think is the kind of thing that I would like to hear us

talking about. It might now be possible in all cases, but some kind of way that an individual who is being asked to do a very different assignment would have support from the university to make that possible. I think that it is very important to think about the changing of workloads. There is nothing in the document that suggests to me that is something you would not find worthy of discussion.

PLATER: I think in fact the emphasis group, primarily through departments and schools, does an extraordinary amount of that already trying to make appropriate adjustments for the reinvestment of faculty work in new areas. You gave an example of an administrative appointment to faculty work or indeed asking a faculty member to development confidence and expertise in a new area which I think is especially true in Nursing. We do that. We can't do as much as we might like because we don't have unlimited resources, but we are very sensitive to that.

ORME: I would once again like to get back on the map the notion of the basic question. If I join this institution, how much of me am I giving up? Part of the difficulty in dealing with Dean Plater's memo is that it covers a lot of ground and numerous issues. One is the notion of arbitrary versus negotiated assignment. Another is the notion of conflict of interest. There is the notion expressed of conflict of commitment. It seems to me that the Academic Handbook does actually have a Trustee's policy that addresses the issue of conflict of commitment. It seems to me that the Academic Handbook, as I read it, is much more laissez-faire in demanding less of the faculty's commitment than this document seems to. I just wanted to put that issue back on the table. You may have seen a recent Dilbert cartoon where one of the employees asked, "What are they going to ask for next, our first born son?" In this cartoon somebody was looking over the contract and they said, "What is this about having the rights to our DNA and all derivative products?" Therefore, I want to put this back on the map. I invite you to look at that memo very closely in the respect to conflict of commitment and see if this is what you, as faculty, are willing to accept.

TURNER: Is there further discussion? I think that we may finish talking about this here this afternoon, but the conversation can't be over. I hope that you will send your concerns along so that we can gather together and offer to Dean Plater before long a concentrated response and ask him to incorporate these concerns. We will also give advice to the Executive Committee and send these along to faculty committees as we see fit. The matter of faculty work is not something that can be settled in a semester's worth of faculty meetings. It will come up again. We are going to have to come back to these issues. All of us ought to take the time and energy to make ourselves experts and informed about these matters so that in discussions such as this, but certainly within our own schools and departments, we are able to make this discussion something that we get very good at since it is something that will affect us a lot. Thank you very much for your help with that discussion.

AGENDA ITEM IX: Question / Answer Period

TURNER: We will now move to Item #9 on the agenda which is the Question and Answer Period.

We will take 10 minutes for this item.

COHEN: When you began you talked about how nice it was to have the Olympics Trials here, and I think we all appreciate that, you also said that it was a nuisance for some people. It is actually pretty much of a disaster for a lot of our staff. We have sent letters and made phone calls to parking and have encouraged people to call if they are at all distraught. There has to be some kind of policy that at least some of the spaces in the parking garage and maybe even in some of the lots nearby are provided for at least the staff who work in the building. Faculty don't mind running around as much. There has to be some policy because there are times when you try to get in there and large vans are parked all over so that two spots are taken up by one van. There seems to be no distinction between A, B, and E. At times the guest parking lot is still fairly empty. I don't know what the policy is, but they just can't say, " We will deal with this." There has to be a policy so that some spaces are saved. I don't know whether a shuttle lot from one of the outlying parking lots might not be a good idea. If you are going to an event, you are just going from one place to another, whereas the faculty, staff and students are in and out at all different times.

BEPKO: I thought we had a plan for the garage by the Natatorium and that it took into account the principles that I think you would suggest that there be some permanent parking for staff. Bob Martin who was here for the whole meeting must have known that somebody was going to ask this question because he slinked out of the door about 15 minutes ago. *[laughter]* I think you are right. I thought we had such a plan in place. I am sorry if there has been more of a nuisance than we thought. We will find out and somebody will call you in particular, Michael, to see what we can do.

SIDHU: Mr. Chairperson, I ask the Council for permission to speak. I was not going to speak because I wanted to talk to Chancellor Bepko privately on this matter but the question has been raised. I have talked to Mr. Nolte and Mr. Martin and the problem is that all the spaces for which we have been charged money (A,B, and E) are being taken in the morning by the special events people by 8 a.m. or 8:30 a.m.. The answer we are getting, or at least the response we are getting, is "Sorry, we cannot handle it because that is the agreement between the people who organize these special events." Therefore, we are being thrown out and go wherever we can find a space. So, for the use of some space money has been collected from two persons which is illegal. We believe it is not the right thing to do. If anyone else parked in that area, they would be ticketed. There needs to be, at a higher level, some kind of agreement or discussion about this. Nothing is happening and I don't think anything is going to happen. We are in a big mess.

BALDWIN: This was discussed yesterday in great detail at the Parking Advisory Committee. I think the people in charge know the concerns. I have never seen a meeting get so intense. One of the problems that was pointed out is that someone coming to these events tried to drive a van which was too big into a parking space and they couldn't back up because of all of the cars behind them. That sort of thing causes an echo for about two hours afterwards. The problem is people coming into the garage who don't normally park there. Another problem is that they don't care where they park in that garage. There are A,B, and E areas in that garage. They are all assigned. We understand it. Most of the people who come to use the Natatorium on a regular basis

understand it, but when you are driving a rental car or a company car, apparently there are tickets just lying all around on the floor because people who get the tickets just rip them up and throw them away. That makes it very difficult for Parking Services to track them down. Everybody knows that. So, part of the problem is the mix of the reserved A, B, and E parking with the visitor parking garage and don't who don't know the rules. Even if they know the rules, they thumb their noses at them.

SIDHU: I don't think there is a solution.

BALDWIN: Oh, I think there is a solution.

SIDHU: There are solutions but the only thing is that those solutions have not been tried. I think the money that is collected on these occasions from paid parking on the first floor should not be collected. Either the faculty should be allowed to park in there or those people who are coming as guests. Secondly, divide this crowd into three garages. The third possibility is that they should be given surface parking and let them use the shuttles. There are some possibilities, but unfortunately, so far nobody has seriously tried to explore those possibilities.

JONES: I am also in the garage. One of the things I think happens repeatedly is the people who use the garage don't get any advance notice of what these agreed upon policies might be. I think if students knew to anticipate the arrival of all these people, they might even get there at 7 a.m. and beat them all out. I don't think there is good dissemination ahead of time about what to expect in the days coming up. That would be helpful.

BEPKO: That is supposed to be done. I don't know that it wasn't done. I did see a couple of memos on the swimming competitions, but I can't tell you when they were sent or to whom they were sent, but that is supposed to be in our plan for any kind of outside event on campus. If there is going to be any impact at all on parking, warnings are given in advance, or if any streets are going to be closed even for a brief period of time. We have that understanding that we give notice. We have a standard notice list that we send memos out to. Apparently, you didn't see anything on that.

JONES: I have had innumerable students miss classes or be 40 minutes late because they have got caught in the parking situation.

BALDWIN: I had a student mention something to me and it relates to this general problem. This whole fiasco of the garage has come too soon after the Board of Trustees' negative vote on intercollegiate sports at IUPUI. We are not good enough to have our own sports team, it seems, but we are going to host the nation. That's a colonial policy.

SPECHLER: For me, the parking situation was as good as ever this morning. They had people out there testing whether your A sticker was counterfeit or not. *[laughter]*

BESCH: Was it? *[Laughter]*

SPECHLER: Well, he thought so but a \$100 bill convinced him otherwise. *[Laughter]* President Brand has announced that he is going to be supporting better day care facilities on all of our campuses. I think all of us will welcome that situation. Day care facilities have been miserable on this campus and I would like to ask, in light of that move on his part, how would that affect our plans to move ahead with more adequate day care on this campus?

BEPKO: There are a lot of things going on. I don't know if anyone can predict now which of the plans will materialize. We have a request for proposals pending. We have had quite a number of responses from private companies for the inclusion of child care facilities and a new housing development that we have envisioned for the west end of the campus. There is a proposal that has been made through the Strategic Directions process that has been forwarded from the campus with the highest recommendation for a part-time child care and expansion of Beth Jeglum's facility in the Mary Cable Building. There is also developing a series of proposals to try to tap into the funding that is going to be made available or earmarked for child care facilities. Whether that funding will go into a new facility built by a private developer, whether it is an expansion on Mary Cable, something that we are not inclined to think is a good idea because we would like to blow up the Mary Cable building at some point. *[laughter]* Somewhere that money will be, we think, put to work to create more child care facilities on campus.

There are two kinds of child care facilities and we have to be careful about how we allocate because what we have now is mostly for employees. I think that is a great concern and we would like to make sure we have child care facilities for those employees who need it. There is a greater concern growing for child care facilities for students who really have no other options. We would like to try to develop that dimension of child care more. I think things will happen. We have explored things over the years and none of them have worked very well. In competition with other space demands, child care has not been a high enough priority to cause us, for example, to say that faculty whose offices are on the fifth floor of the School of Liberal Arts, should have even smaller offices than they have now in order to make room for child care. Space is at a premium. Child care, I think, now is a higher priority than it has ever been. We have some money and I think things will happen. We did look, though, at a facility on 16th Street by Stadium Drive that was a child care facility and has since been converted into something else. Beth Jeglum and others who looked at it said, "We would rather wait and get something better on campus than buy the facility on 16th Street." So, we passed on that. That is the sort of thing that has gone on over the years.

We do have one question that was asked in advance of the meeting. Somebody said, "What is this I hear about a faculty survey?" Trudy Banta is here to speak to that question.

BANTA: Most of you know that two years ago a faculty survey for IUPUI faculty was distributed. It was a nationally supported and sponsored survey, on faculty use of technology. The sponsor ran into some difficulty and so it was a year before we got any results to report. We have taken some

time getting those out to you in the form of a Research Brief, but you should have seen that memo within the last couple of months. We would like to follow up on that survey now and see how faculty use of technology has changed in the last two years. We started with technology questions and combined those with some others to give the sense of general campus perceptions of programs and services. This will be coming out the week of March 18. This is a plea for you to fill it out and send it back to us. Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM X: Unfinished Business

TURNER: Is there any unfinished business? [None]

AGENDA ITEM XI: New Business

TURNER: Is there any new business? [None]

AGENDA ITEM XII: Adjournment

TURNER: Is there a motion to adjourn? [So moved] We are adjourned.

Approved: November 7, 1996

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY INDIANAPOLIS

Faculty Council Meeting

School of Dentistry, Room S115

April 4, 1996

3:30 p.m.

Members Present: **Administration:** Vice Chancellor Trudy Banta, Chancellor Bepko, Dean William Plater. **Deans:** John Barlow, George Stookey, Angela McBride. **Elected Faculty:** W Marshall Anderson, Margaret Applegate, Susan Ball, Merrill Benson, Paul Brown, Kenneth Byrd, Lucinda Carr, Michael Cohen, Karen Gable, Patricia Gallagher, William Hohlt, Dolores Hoyt, M Jan Keffer, Raymond Koleski, Missy Kubitschek, Miriam Langsam, Golam Mannan, Dana McDonald, Bart Ng, William Orme, Fred Pavalko, Richard Peterson, Richard Pflanzner, Rebecca Porter, Ken Rennels, Virginia Richardson, Edward Robbins, Bernadette Rodak, Erdogan Sener, Karen Teegarden, Kathleen Warfel, Richard Wyma. **Ex Officio Members:** James Baldwin, Carlyn Johnson, Byron Olson, Carl Rothe, Richard Turner, Rosalie Vermette. **Visitors:** Victor Borden, Erwin Boschmann (Dean of the Faculties Office), Chuck Gilkison (Sagamore), Mark Grove, Jeffery Vessely (Chair, Student Affairs/Task Force on Service), Richard Ward (Academic Affairs Committee).

Alternates Present: **Deans:** J. M. Kapoor for Roberta Greene, Stephen Jay for Robert Holden, Nasser Paydar for Doris Merritt. **Elected Faculty:** Robert Rigdon for Charalambos Aliprantis.

Members Absent: **Deans:** A James Barnes, Trevor Brown, P Nicholas Kellum, Kathy Krendl, Norman Lefstein, John Rau, Robert Shay, David Stocum, Philip Tompkins, Donald Warren, Charles Webb. **Elected Faculty:** Larry Abel, Joseph Bidwell, Diane Billings, Ulf Jonas Bjork, Jana Bradley, Zacharie Brahma, Thomas Broadie, Lynn Broderick, Timothy Brothers, David Burr, Timothy Byers, David Canal, Lucinda Carr, Jeanette Dickerson-Putman, Paul Dubin, Naomi Fineberg, Joe Garcia, Ghetti, Carlos Goldberg, Robert Havlik, Antoinette Hood, Nathan Houser, Elizabeth Jones, Henry Karlson, Michael Klemsz, Stephen Lalka, Rebecca Markel, Debra Mesch, Michael Penna, David Peterson, Brian Sanders, Jane Schultz, Mark Seifert, Anantha Shekhar, Jay Simon, Akhouri Sinha, Jerrold Stern, Stephen Stockberger, James Wallihan, Karen West, Kathryn Wilson, Mervin Yoder, Charles Yokomoto, Susan Zunt.

AGENDA ITEM I: CALL TO ORDER

TURNER: I will call the meeting to order.

AGENDA ITEM II: MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS (CIRCULARS 96-05 AND 96-08)

TURNER: I would like to call your attention to two memorial resolutions which were attached to the agenda. The first one is for Constance Adams, School of Nursing and the second one is for James A. Norton, School of Medicine. I would ask that you rise with me in a moment of silence.

AGENDA ITEM III: ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT: CHANCELLOR GERALD BEPKO

BEPKO: First, possibly later that this month you will receive more information about and there will be an announcement about the definitive agreement that has been proposed between Indiana University and the Methodist Hospitals of Indiana to complete the arrangements for the consolidation of the IU/ Methodist Hospitals. It is scheduled for later this month. There is still some uncertainty because of the variety of issues that are being discussed, but that may come later this month. I will mention it today so you will know in advance that it is coming. There is nothing surprising about this movement. It is the same basic plan that was described last year in March that will create a new entity that will manage the IU and the Methodist hospitals. That will give the IU Medical Center and the School of Medicine, in particular, a much better opportunity to withstand the pressures of competition in the healthcare world in the future.

Secondly, we have had a program called the "Forum on Issues in Higher Education." It is a forum that takes place two, three, or four times a year. It was our effort to try to elevate the discussion in the larger community that already takes place but that is not on a high enough level in our view. We found that those who were inviting speakers to come to the city of Indianapolis to talk about issues in higher education were not representing the full range of views. Therefore, we thought we should create this forum that would give us in the academic community and people in the larger community an opportunity to hear from national figures who would develop subjects that would help raise the whole level of understanding in higher education in the community. We think it has been modestly successful and we hope that you get invitations and that you participate. I know some of you have participated. We have picked a theme each year. The year before this one we selected, "Higher Education and K-12" to explore the various relationships between our public schools and universities. This year we had affirmative action on our agenda because of all of the national discussion on affirmative action and some of the political activity that is taking place (for example I have just returned from an accreditation visit at a university in California - one of the Cal State campuses - where there is a tremendous amount of discussion about affirmative action, civil rights, and the California Civil Rights initiative which is on the ballot in November). There has been within the last month a decision in the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals that covers the state of Texas and a couple of other southern states called the "Hopwood Case" that dealt with the University of Texas law school's program of diversity and held that the program was unconstitutional. There are all sorts of things breaking in the field of affirmative action. Therefore, we thought we should not only add the second year of sessions on affirmative action in our forum on Issues in Higher Education, but that we should, at the suggestion of Richard Turner and Kathy Warfel and

others, try to expand this discussion, try to encourage faculty members to become involved in ways that would be related and I hope helpful to the courses that they are teaching and maybe have students involved to try to create and enlighten discussion of affirmative action in the university community as well as in the larger community. We think this is one of the nation's most difficult issues and one that needs all of the contributions that we can make to keep the level of discussion at the highest possible level. If you are interested in this, please let us know.

As you probably will hear from Kathy, we are pleased to see the University Faculty Council address and resolve the Clinical Ranks issue that we have worked with for so long. I won't say any more about that than to say that this was a task extremely well done by our faculty governance leaders here at IUPUI, in particular Kathy Warfel, who I think has been responsible for a congruence in faculty and university leadership in bringing this matter to a conclusion. Congratulations and thanks to all of those who were involved.

Related to that, I think you may be aware that there will be a change again in the membership of the Commission for Higher Education. There is a faculty member seat on the Commission for Higher Education. It was first filled by our own Barbara Cambridge four or five years ago and that set the standard for quality in that office that no one has been able to live up to since Barbara was there. But, in an effort to try to get back to that level of quality, we think that it is time once again for someone from IUPUI to be nominated and to be selected by the Governor to fill that post. We have had in the interim faculty members from other university campuses around the state. Kathy Warfel, as you know, is leaving the position of President of the IUPUI Faculty and I can think of no one better in higher education in Indiana these days, right on the heels of her success as President of the IUPUI Faculty and as co-chair of the University Faculty Council, than Kathy to fill that position in the Higher Education Commission. It just happens that Barbara Cambridge is the chair of the Nominating Committee for it. [laughter] We have two challenges. One is to, first of all, talk Kathy into agreeing to be nominated and to serve, if she is selected. I trust that you will all join with me in trying to influence her to do that. [applause]

WARFEL: I have a sign right next to my telephone that says, "Just Say No."

BEPKO: That is task number one. The second task will be to encourage our other colleagues from other campuses at Indiana University to be as supportive as all of us will be and to do what we can in strategic ways to try to help the Governor understand what a superb choice Kathy Warfel would be for this spot on the Commission. We will be talking to you more about that. Barbara, can you give us a sense of the time frame of all of this?

CAMBRIDGE: The nominations need to come in to the Nominating Committee by April 25. Although we think Kathy is an excellent candidate, the nominations are open to other people who would want to self-nominate or nominate other colleagues who might be good for the position. The nominations go to the Higher Education Commission in August. The reason this is wide open this year is that there is a change in law. Previously, the universities were cycled through the system. For instance, one year only

faculty members from Ball State could be nominated. The next year only faculty members from IU Tech could be nominated. The new law says that a faculty member from any campus can be nominated and that there is a two-year term. We are expecting a large number of nominations. The Nominating Committee then will limit, cull and interview a subset of those people nominated. By law, we are required to give to the Governor three to five names of faculty members from throughout the state. The Governor's office then interviews those three, four, or five candidates and decides on the person for the appointment.

BEPKO: One final note. In the back of the room you will find copies of a document that we described at the last Faculty Council meeting. It is a document that is organized around the Strategic Directions Charter. It is a document that we were invited by President Brand to submit by around the first of April. In this document we were to list all of the things that we are doing to pursue the Strategic Directions Charter. In a few minutes you are going to hear from Dana McDonald. I see Trudy Banta is here who may supplement what I am going to say and may help Dana as well because this was done in Trudy's office as well as with the able assistance of Victor Borden who is here as well. We were invited to list the goals that have been set by us as a campus or by schools, if individual schools have goals, under each of the Strategic Directions Charter provisions.

As we explained last month, this could have been an enormous and time-consuming task if we had been required to turn to the schools and to departments to say, "Please read the Strategic Directions Charter carefully and develop goals, timetables, measurements, and benchmarks, that you could use to show what your responses are to the Strategic Directions Charter." We didn't have to do that. Instead, we had on file in Trudy's area, the Office for Planning and Institutional Improvement, the plans, goals, benchmarks, and measurements that were already developed in the schools pursuant to our campus planning process. What we have done through the month of March is to take those planning documents that have been filed by each of the schools, take the entries in them, and reorganize them in a way that causes them to coincide with the terms of the Strategic Directions Charter. They are the same goals and the same measurements but now they are in a different format and they have been included in the format of the Charter and in this document. The document has been circulated to the deans' offices in all of the schools and we have received comment back from the deans' offices. Now, it is available for you to read if you have insomnia. Please review and look at your own school in connection with these different sections of the Strategic Directions Charter and see what is in there. In any case, if you have any comments on this, we would like to have them from you. We think that this actually has turned out to be quite an impressive document not only because it contains responses to the provisions of the Charter, but perhaps more importantly, because the responses are real. This was not an exercise of filling in the blanks or of responding in perfunctory fashion to a universitywide planning document. These responses are the real live and vital planning that has gone on throughout the campus the last few years, but plugged into the Strategic Directions Charter. I think Trudy, Victor and others who have worked on this deserve congratulations for a job really well done. [applause] They also made it possible for you to have a spring break. Trudy, do you have anything to add?

BANTA: Just that in addition to being school goals, they are connected to campus goals which are connected to university goals. I think it is wonderful that it is so easy to go back and forth between them.

AGENDA ITEM IV: PRESIDENT OF THE FACULTY REPORT: KATHLEEN WARFEL

WARFEL: I was certainly going to begin by talking about the Clinical Ranks document. I think we are all relieved and pleased that it is finally through the University Faculty Council. For the written record, I would like to recognize the role that many of us in this room played in addition to myself.

Richard Turner, we remember was chair of the Task Force on Clinical Ranks that came up with the core that we worked from. Within the School of Medicine, Dick Peterson and Steve Leapman, Naomi and Ed Fineberg who are here today played a very important role in championing this and then communicating with the Dean and the Steering Committee in the School of Medicine to come up with a document that would work for that school.

Rebecca Porter as chair of our Faculty Affairs Committee has done so many things this year, but supporting the passage of this document was very important.

I particularly would like to recognize however the work of Martin Spechler as co-chair of the University Faculty Council Faculty Affairs Committee. It was really Martin who helped the traditionalists at the Bloomington campus come to understand the need for clinical ranks. I think without him we may not have had the success that we had last Tuesday. So, thank you very much.

The Trustees' pending resolutions on Grading Policies and on the Indexing we have talked about at this Council and at the UFC. For your information, I brought a copy of language. It starts off with Amended Resolution Regarding Grade Inflation. This is a resolution that we believe will be substituted for the original resolution from Trustee Richardson. He has unofficially agreed that this would be an acceptable resolution to him. We think that this is progress first because it recognizes in the Whereas's that the assessment of student learning and assignment of letter grades is the responsibility of the individual faculty member. Also, it is an improvement because it broadens the scope of the discussion that is stimulated and asks not for a written policy, but for a written summary of the departmental discussion. Again, this has not been passed by the Trustees but we do presume that it will be. What is going to happen to the resolution on Grade Indexing is less clear. Ed Greenebaum understands that it is to be tabled. I am not sure that I understand that. We will let you know what does happen with these resolutions. Whatever happens will happen at the May Trustee's meeting.

I would like to encourage people to remember about the Honors Convocation that is coming up. This is an event where faculty can make an appearance in their academic robes and show their support of students who have worked so hard and done so well. I think it means a lot to the students and to the students' families to see a large number of faculty show up for the event. Therefore, I encourage you to join us there.

Finally, a reminder about the open forum discussion one week from today on discussion of the Report on the Task Force on the Status of Women Faculty. It is my understanding that will be at 3:30 in the

University Library's Auditorium. That concludes my report.

TURNER: Before we move to the Calendar Adjustments let me return the floor to Chancellor Bepko.

BEPKO: I noticed that we have a new member in our company today and that is the new Acting Dean of the School of Dentistry George Stookey. Accustomed as he is to being in this room, he is not accustomed to being at Faculty Council meetings. [applause]

AGENDA ITEM V: ACADEMIC CALENDAR ADJUSTMENTS (Document 96-10)

TURNER: Rick Ward, Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee, will now report on the Academic Calendar Adjustments.

WARD: Thanks Richard. At our February meeting of the Academic Affairs Committee Mark Grove presented a few minor changes that needed to be made to the calendar, particularly for spring 2003, believe it or not, and spring 2004. We needed to bring those changes to this body for formal approval.

GROVE: In 1992 the Council passed calendars through the year 2006. The following year we extended that to 2010. Part of our interest in doing so was being able to secure the RCA Dome and Convention Center for Commencement. The Alumni Association believed that putting our dates further in advance we had a greater chance of getting the Dome when we needed it rather than having a calendar driven by when the Dome was available.

We have since found that the Dome decided that having a two-week trade show, which follows us every year at commencement, which, for some reason seems more valuable than our one day. Therefore, we have had less flexibility in getting that third Sunday where the calendar so requires to make that possible. Recognizing the Dome already wasn't available for the third Sunday in 1997, 1998, and 1999, we made the adjustment previously to have those semesters begin on Saturday (spring term) rather than Monday. That avoids the conflict for students who would be taking their finals Sunday afternoon for Weekend College when they otherwise should be graduating. The Council approved that change at that time.

Now that we know the dates are further booked by this trade show, we recommend a similar change for the two years -- 2003 and 2004 which means that the calendar will start two days earlier -- on a Saturday rather than on Monday. Obviously, it has very little impact on most of you in your teaching. You will still do your Monday or Tuesday starts typically. It will affect Weekend College. Dean East has already agreed to this change.

The Council asked that we bring the calendar forward to you on a regular basis. This is part of that effort. The committee meets every year to review the calendar for any other things that may have happened since the previous time addressing issues that may have been raised, calendar issues, or processing issues such as Professor Robbins raised a couple of years ago (maybe last year) addressing

flexibility of students in having their fees adjusted for late starting and early finishing. We have made some technical changes in the Bursar and Registrar's system which make that much simpler. It takes the burden off the students. So, this is a minor change for those two years involved. We certainly recommend your approval.

TURNER: This is a report from the Academic Affairs Committee so the recommendations stands as a motion on the floor and it doesn't need a second. It is open for discussion.

APPLEGATE: I would like to raise one more time the question of whether Commencement will continue to be on Mother's Day.

GROVE: Commencement will be on Mother's Day as long as the Hallmark Corporation makes that possible, I think. We don't have a whole lot of choice. If we are going to have it on Sunday, we can't go a whole lot earlier in May and we can't get the RCA Dome facility on the third Sunday. That is the problem. Our goal in setting the calendar so far in advance was intended to have commencement fall on the second Sunday (Mother's Day) about one-half of the time. But, the facility that we have to use for Commencement, the only one in town that will support Commencement, isn't available on the third Sunday because of this trade show. We have managed to secure it a couple of times. You will see one date in there in the year 2006 on May 15 which is the third Sunday. That year we will avoid Mother's Day. We have no choice because of the way the facility is available. As long as the campus sticks to Sunday, we have no choice.

PETERSON: We have no other facility in this city that can accommodate us?

GROVE: It is a combination of the arena and meeting rooms which limits our options. It is not the size of the Dome proper. It is the size and number of meeting rooms. We obviously don't need 60,000 seats for the ceremony. But, as you know there are individual school ceremonies which use all the exhibit halls (A-E)-- School of Nursing, Law, Medicine, etc. They all have their own separate ceremonies before or after. So, we need the facility as much for those rooms as we do for the Dome.

PETERSON: What about Market Square Arena?

VESSELY: The last time we used Market Square Arena we had to go all over everywhere afterwards. What was traditionally a nice post ceremony became almost nothing because people either couldn't find where they were going and once they got into their cars decided not to go there. It was not a very good alternative.

GROVE: One final note. In the back of the room you will find copies of a document that we described at the last Faculty Council meeting. It is a document that is organized around the Strategic Directions Charter. It is a document that we were invited by President Brand to submit by around the first of April. In this document we were to list all of the things that we are doing to pursue the Strategic Directions in the Charter. In a few minutes you are going to hear from Dana McDonald. I see Trudy Banta here who

may supplement what I am going to say and may help Dana as well because this was done in Trudy's office as well as with the able assistance to Victor Borden who is here as well. We were invited to list the goals that have been set by us as a campus or by schools, if individual schools have goals, under each of the Strategic Directions Charter provisions.

As we explained last month, this could have been an enormous and time-consuming task if we had been required to turn to the schools and to departments to say, "Please read the Strategic Directions Charter carefully and develop goals, timetables, measurements, and benchmarks, that you could use to show what your responses are to the Strategic Directions Charter." We didn't have to do that. Instead, we had on file, in Trudy's Office and the Planning Office, the plans, goals, benchmarks, and measurements that were already developed in the schools pursuant to our campus planning process. What we have done through the month of March is to take those planning documents that have been filed by each of the schools, take the entries in them, and reorganize them in a way that causes them to coincide with the terms of the Strategic Directions Charter. They are the same goals and the same measurements but now they are in a different format and they have been included in the format of the Charter and in this document.

TURNER: Is there any further discussion? Maybe we could find out what this trade show is and we might want to go. [laughter]

GROVE: For you fixer-uppers, it is the National Hardware Convention. They not only take over all the meeting spaces, they took over all the corridors, as well as hallways. It is an amazing operation.

TURNER: If there is no further discussion, let me call for a vote on the motion that stands before you concerning the changed dates as recommended by the Academic Affairs Committee. All in favor of approving the changed version of the Academic Calendar, say "Aye." Opposed? [1] Abstentions? [0] The vote carries and it is our recommendation that the calendar be changed.

AGENDA ITEM VI: REPORT ON IUPUI STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS RESPONSE (Circular 96-11)

TURNER: We will now move to the Report on the IUPUI Strategic Directions Response. You have Circular 96-11 which is attached to your agenda for today. Dana, will you lead the discussion for this?

MCDONALD: We will discuss the document that you have in front of you with the Planning Committee's involvement and administrative input and direction. You are looking at a display of 24 successful proposals which are successful in that they carry this campus' recommendation to the groups that are making the decisions in Bloomington. These are 24 out of a total of 89, I believe, which were ultimately submitted. Of the 24, 21 were chosen through a complex process in which four groups made recommendations and those recommendations were combined to a final result which was discussed with the campus administration. The campus then enriched those 21 with three basic long-term proposals which will be helpful to the campus long-term planning. Therefore, there are 24 out of the first round

which carry a campus endorsement.

The four groups that met, for your information and reminder, were, first, the IUPUI Review Panel which was composed of nominations from the study groups (these are faculty nominated by their peers) and the Planning Committee and from administrative positions. Those panelists had to have experience in reviewing proposals of a high level and depth of experience that would give this a good, serious, and thorough review. That group reviewed the proposals in total (i.e., the final, full proposals).

Another of these was the Study Groups which this campus had convened to examine various parts of the Strategic Directions Charter as it can be applied to our campus and our specific goals. Also, there was the Planning Committee itself, which is composed of the chairs of all the other standing committees so that there is a history of understanding the kinds of discussions and desires that the faculty here have put forward over the last several years. Finally, a group of deans was also allowed to recommend various proposals that seemed to them to be extraordinary.

Those four groups together recommended proposals that they found outstanding. To be considered by the campus it was required that the Review Panels recommended it as an outstanding proposal. The others were substantive endorsements in addition. Those that received the top votes (21) were discussed with campus administration. After final review, it was certainly agreed that all 21 were strong proposals. As a matter of fact, there were many more strong proposals than could be recommended.

So, there are 24 IUPUI proposals going down south with campus recommendations; 65 others are also going without that particular recommendation, but we hope strengthened by this kind of process. Certainly, it was a difficult thing for administration and for the faculty and administrators to respond to and complete the proposals on time. The deadline was terrible. The information sometimes was not clear. The final deadline was changed. There were a lot of difficulties and yet people persevered and a very strong batch of wonderful things went down. Not only are those proposals being considered, but, according to the documentation which we have all received, May 1, and that is only three weeks away, the RFP for round two is going to be issued. I presume that before May 1 we will hear something final about round one. Then, those of us who are unsuccessful can resubmit, the second due date being September 15. The feeling of the faculty groups that did the reviewing was that it was difficult. They were wonderful, some only good, some incomplete; however, they can all be revised and there is more money in round two. I think I should allow the administration to add to this.

BANTA: I think Dana has done a beautiful job. I only want to emphasize that the study groups are organized around the IUPUI aspirations, quality, centrality, collaboration, and identity and there are 19 goals under those. It is the aspirations and goals that you should have in your brochure that came out in the fall. If anyone doesn't have that and would like to see another copy of it, let us know. It is just like the first long document that you saw connecting our goals with this Strategic Directions goals. Thank you, Dana for your good explanation.

BEPKO: Just to highlight one point. Dana is right. Just because a proposal did not get into the 24 and

have gone with the campus' recommendation doesn't mean they are not excellent. They are. They were all highly above average.

Secondly, just because it isn't in the 24, does not mean that the universitywide panels will not select proposals. Just because a proposal has a campus endorsement doesn't mean it will be selected. Just because a proposal does not have a campus endorsement does not mean it will not be selected.

Thirdly, there is round two, and perhaps round three, so that to not be successful in round one does not mean that there will not be funding. Also, we hope that out of the regular campus reallocation process our regular budgets setting that we are going to be able to do quite a bit more to try to fund or provide partial funding for Strategic Directions proposals that are not funded in the other processes. We are also looking at the proposals that will not be funded in round one of the charter process. We are looking for other opportunities. We have identified a couple of proposals that may be really excellent for outside funding and we have some other internal university funding sources like the Research Investment Fund that might be a good candidate to fund some of these proposals. We hope in the final analysis, when the dust settles, that we have lots and lots of these proposals funded and moving forward.

BANTA: Just to emphasize again, that quite a number of excellent, well-written proposals were not in this final group that was recommended. You have a sheet in this document called "Proposal Review Criteria." These were the criteria that seemed to be most important to the various groups that engaged in open and candid discussion and dialog about these proposals. As you can see, item three "The project is innovative--not just a continuation of something that is already underway." That was the judgment that collectively our review panel came to. The fourth one, "Benefits of the project are broad-based -- the impact goes beyond the department or school." The fifth one, "Collaboration with other programs/units is explicit -- needed linkages have been established." These are things that were important to those who reviewed this time. When we see the results of the deliberations that are going on right now with the central process panels, we will perhaps come out with a different set of criteria for judgment on the next set of proposals. We just wanted to be very open about the things that were used by these groups and to let you know what was on the minds of your colleagues when they made these decisions.

MCDONALD: Chancellor Bepko, do you know the \$2 million that goes for child care, where it comes off these various millions?

BEPKO: I don't think that is part of this Strategic Directions process. That is separate. The \$2 million will be added on to what was already earmarked for Strategic Directions.

MCDONALD: I may have misread the Sagamore article. The Sagamore, once in a while, is off the mark, but that is what I thought I read.

BEPKO: I didn't read that part of the Sagamore, but it is my understanding that it is above and beyond the Strategic Directions. Now, if your question is, where did it come from, I can't tell you. [laughter] That means I don't know.

SPECHLER: I have a question for Dana McDonald. I don't know all of the directors personally. I didn't bother to look up what they are doing. It seemed that there was a very high percentage of full-time administrators listed as director. That is not necessarily bad or out of line. I don't mean to quarrel with it, but, I wondered if that reflects the proportion of full-time administrators. What is that proportion and whether that reflects the proportion in the applicant pool, and if it is greater than the proportion of the pool, what do you think the reason is for this apparent disproportion, if there is one? Was it the short time horizon? A greater information about what the true criterion were? Can you be somewhat enlightening about this? The purpose of this question is not to pick a quarrel, but to see how we might increase the faculty success in the second round.

MCDONALD: I certainly have some ideas but I'll let the Chancellor answer that. I can say that in the group in which I participated (I was only in the Planning Committee) we were rather biased against the Administration because we felt that administrators are strong, they are rich, and they can take care of themselves. But, those of us who have these wonderful ideas needing implementation may not be successful in getting administrative funds. This is a chance to make a difference. As a matter of fact, when you are choosing what is best for IUPUI, you really are focused on the plans or the goals for the campus. That is exactly what our group was instructed to do. We were to look at the 19 goals of this campus which we had been working on in the committees for three years, and which you have all read. When we had to focus on those goals, it just turned out that administrative proposals managed to hit the target. Either they were really watching the goals or they had more resources. I don't know about that. The other groups, and how they came to the decision, I couldn't say.

BANTA: Could I also add that what you see here is generally the lead investigator? There were groups of investigators in association with almost all of these. If we were to list all the people who are associated with them, not just the principal investigator, you would find a good many more faculty

BEPKO: Administrators who are advancing the dark and evil interests of the university administration alone are more a suspect than when they are representing the faculty and I think in most cases these proposals were made on behalf of the faculties that these administrators represented. Richard Turner, for example, is in this group. He is a department chair and is based at our English program I think will probably involve faculty, will it not?

TURNER: Yes, and students.

SPECHLER: So, would you want me to believe that we faculty who would hope to get money in the second round had better pay more attention to these campus goals than we have up until now?

MCDONALD: That depends on whether the process is organized by the administration in the same way. We haven't heard that IUPUI administration will go through this process of determining what is recommended. I feel very strongly that it doesn't mean that only these 24 proposals on this list have any chance of success. It could very well be that the three groups of reviewers who are meeting in Bloomington, whose identity is mysteriously secret from some of us, might be quite disposed to look at

this issue differently. So, I think that we have a good feeling about chance of success in the next round. But, I do think that we may have to worry about broad-based appeal. I think maybe that some of the faculty proposals that we were looking at, I have heard in these discussions, were wonderful for as well as a very well focused research effort. Broad appeal is a requirement.

CAMBRIDGE: Readers on the panels did not have a charge to look at campus rankings in the first readings of proposals. Campus rankings became important during the process, but each of the proposals that came forward got an equal read. Anybody who isn't ranked got clearly a full consideration.

BALDWIN: It's not just any old grant that we are asking for here. It has to be linked to these goals. Not just the IUPUI ones. But, some faculty thought, "Here is a chance to get some money to do my pet project." The links to the overall goals of the program, if they were there at all, they were only dotted lines. I think if people will bring this together next time and do what Martin just said, they will make sure their projects link up strongly to the expressed goals of the university.

SPECHLER: Jim, I think that was reasonably clear that it was to relate to one of the Strategic Directions. Perhaps it was carelessness on my part, but I wasn't aware that the campus recommendation was based on tying it into these 19 goals, but possibly I didn't read carefully enough. I appreciate what Dana says, yet I think that our campus administration is held in rather high esteem and, therefore, its recommendation is much to be desired.

TURNER: What Dana was referring to is just what the Planning Committee did. Their position was to look at it in terms of campus goals, but that was only one factor that went into the ranking. Others were the IU review panel which was 100 percent faculty driven.

MCDONALD: There were 11 criteria that were used to judge them.

SPECHLER: I think this discussion has been quite revealing and helpful. As for myself, when I put in a new proposal I certainly take into account the campus goals as well as the review criteria which I guess were generated ex-post but certainly seemed sensible.

TURNER: Is there any other discussion, suggestions, or questions about the Strategic Directions process? This round is coming to an end and there was \$4 million available I this round.

MCDONALD: I have a page out of the RFP of the original documentation and it says that round two RFP is due, I assume from the President's Office, on May 1, 1996. The proposals will be due in Bloomington on September 15, 1996. That means that before school starts this campus will have to have completed its work.

TURNER: The pot is bigger for round two?

MCDONALD: Yes. I don't understand it. The first round is \$1.4 million and 1 percent tuition increase,

a quarter of a million appropriated by the legislature for university initiatives and \$3 million one time funds from the President. That is this time. This total of \$4.65 million is up to \$9.4 million in round two. Round three is just one year away. This is three rounds in 18 months.

BALDWIN: To put things in context, I think if I remember from the Budgetary Affairs Committee, the total of the grants asked for, all 249 were over \$50 million.

CAMBRIDGE: Could I just say that I think it is an extraordinary opportunity. I have been talking to people at other campuses in other states who have said, "What? You have money available?" I think we ought to put it in context. Our sensibility about these amounts when we in fact say \$4 million isn't going to be able to fund a lot of things because there are so many states where there is not even \$10 to do this kind of work. So, I think we ought to feel very positive about the fact that President Brand and others thought ahead enough to have all of this money available, even though we are feeling very hard pressed to do this work quickly.

COHEN: I also think we have to realize that the general funding we have is still below what we need. We are putting a lot of effort into new programs and that is wonderful. It is nice to have the possibility, but none of our schools are really up to the level of basic funding that we should be. It is sometimes very easy to get sidetracked and look at these wonderful new programs we are funding, but the basic maintenance of our basic programs suffer. It is really a tradeoff. I think it is unfortunate between basic undergraduate programs and special projects. I understand there is an increase in students to the university this fall. I think it was something like 12 percent. That is a lot of new students coming in and we have to meet their needs also.

NG: I think there is also another consideration. Mainly, the amount of effort and the cost associated in generating these proposals. We have got something like 200+ proposals. If you think about what kind of faculty time goes into making these proposals, assuming they are all good proposals, it is really substantial.

TURNER: I don't think that this closes this subject by any means. The process will, as Dana suggested, be upon us again very soon. It is certainly appropriate to bring this up whenever we have questions. Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM VII: TASK FORCE ON SERVICE REPORT (Circular 96-12)

TURNER: The next item on the agenda is the Task Force on Service Report. I would like to ask Jeff Vessely to introduce this report. This report was, as the opening page makes clear, a Task Force which was commissioned jointly by Dean Plater and Kathy Warfel. The Council and the campus administration has asked the Task Force to deliberate and this is what they have done.

VESSELY: There are colleagues here, Bob Bringle and Barbara Cambridge among others, who have been serving on the Task Force. I will ask them to defend me should the need arise or support me should

that need arise, or have the door open for me should the need arise. When we started the deliberation with this Task Force the charge was that stimulate discussion among faculty about the role of service in the academic community and that we search out for recognition for this role, and in doing so, to ask other institutions like ours, as well as the units among IUPUI, about their sense of the role of service as it relates to the three tiered dimension of the university. That is what we set out to do.

What I think the process incorporated was, in our sense, a need to provide information though this discussion and search for other views on this so that service would find its place in the mix with teaching and research. One of my faculty colleagues said to me earlier on in the process, "When you do this, this whole process of teaching, research, and service is going to hell in a hand basket because everybody is going to want to do community service. It is an interesting part of the whole mix." One, I am not sure that would happen, but that wasn't the goal. The goal was to clarify the definitions of service, to find ways to evaluate service, to provide for discussion the kinds of criteria that we thought and discovered might fit into this. Then, if someone chooses to use service as their primary area for promotion, tenure, or merit, then they would have the same benefits that we have given to teaching and research over the years. We have produced handbooks on how to document your teaching. We have produced numerous kinds of documentation about the research aspects. So, our intent was to do something very similar to that in the area of service.

The draft that you have seen has definitions contained in it. We emphasize that area which we call "Professional **Service**." The linkage of the academic area of study to the service. In getting feedback, what we seem to have de-emphasized or seem to have suggested took a lesser place in this was what was called "Institutional Citizenship"; service on the Faculty Council, service on committees. We received a number of inquiries as to how strongly the Task Force intended to promote that notion. I can't answer that because we haven't reached the recommendations stage in our report, but we hope to do that very soon so that we will have an end-of-the-year report and then determine what might happen in the Fall if we were to try to develop handbook or guidelines or evaluation type criteria. I can say that it was never our intent to devalue the citizenship to the point where no one would want to do it. We attended workshops and seminars. We had people come visit with us among them was Ernest Linton who has written a monograph as it relates to professional service. The advice that we have always been given was that the most effective means of carrying forth the academic mission of any unit would be through academic-based service and that institutional citizenship may not fit that criteria as well as some other types of service. It was not an intent to devalue it to the point of losing participants. The other thing that we have done in that deliberation is to examine ways that we might recommend to various units on how those units could, in fact, increase their participation in those areas of Institutional Citizenship and the committee and council type service so that, in fact, it would be more productive than less, but would allow those people who choose to put their emphasis on academic-based service to do that while others involved in the citizenship area would know that, if that is all that they do, it may not be valued as much as the academic-based service would be.

The final item that we have been concentrating on a little more heavily has been the evaluation both in a criteria sense, who could best do these evaluations, and how would you document this. That will probably be a point of further discussion in how to better do that. But, who are the experts? There might

be a debate that would exist that a faculty member might make to say that "my participation in a brown bag lunch about how my school, department, or unit can help solve a particular problem has just as much value as attending a national conference on the same subject." Those discussions will continue to take place. The Task Force has not reached any conclusion on that kind of evaluation and not prepared certainly at this time to do that.

I would ask Bob [Bringle] or Barbara [Cambridge] if there is anything they would want to add and then we can entertain questions. [They indicated there was nothing they wished to add] Are there any questions, comments, or reactions?

WARFEL: I follow your logic about the faculty governance / faculty committee type of work being citizenship activities. Therefore, unless one gets very out of sort of being expected and nothing special, I can follow you along that road until you come to the place where you say therefore the people who choose to do that shouldn't expect to be rewarded as much as the people who choose to be doing something else. I think if you are going to argue that this is just citizenship, that you ought to expect all citizens to be doing it. If you are not going to reward the citizens who are doing it, then you must punish the citizens who aren't. Or, I think if there is going to be a very bad effect on our committee and council work and it is not going to be in the best interest of those involved.

VESSELY: Quite frankly, in many regards this thing that we are calling 'Institutional Citizenship' has not been valued very much by many departments. When I was Secretary of the IUPUI Faculty, I remember handing off Boards of Review from faculty who said that their service work was not valued by their department or by their unit committee. Somehow they thought that met certain criteria and wanted to debate that point. I think part of the discussion was that to make this notion of service, if someone chooses that area to be widely accepted, there had to be a mix between the unit's mission and what the faculty member was engaging in. If it were solely that area of citizenship and it had the same check off value of something else, then units would not necessarily buy into the notion that service should have a similar place in that three-tiered mission. That at least was part of that discussion.

CAMBRIDGE: In the document we say that professional service may be internal or external to the institution and benefit society at various levels and then we identify four types: Student Service, Institutional Service, Discipline-based Service, and Public Service. Therefore, It is possible, in fact, to claim institutional service as part of one's professional service if the criteria apply. I think, Kathy, what you are saying is so important because there is a base line of expectation. If, in fact, the institutional service can meet the qualifications of, for instance, having some impact demonstrating some intellectual work, sustaining contribution and leadership, and communication and dissemination. That kind of service has as much opportunity, according to our document, of being warranted as any other.

WARFEL: While we are at that part of the document regarding the four types of professional service, providing care is listed both as a discipline-based service and then again as a public service.

CAMBRIDGE: It is listed in both places. Would you put it in one or the other?

WARFEL: Most of the items only appeared in one place and that particular one appeared in two places.

VESSELY: In terms of feedback, we have probably received much input from the health areas about things like patient care and 'what about the practitioner?' In fact, even in the definition that we thought was fairly general that said at the end of that sentence, was in their discipline or profession as scholar and teacher. There were some people who said, "But that doesn't include the practitioner." We saw the practitioner under scholar and/or teacher, depending on what it was they were doing. It filtered into more than one area because of that.

MCDONALD: I have the same question on that phrase for librarians because some librarians would have to stretch it or belabor the point to explain how they are either a scholar or a teacher.

VESSELY: Would they have to belabor that to those of us who are not librarians or to their unit group also?

MCDONALD: Possibly even to the unit.

VESSELY: We would certainly entertain any suggestions of language that would be more inclusive. One of the things that we brought into it in this discussion with the practitioner, short of saying scholar teacher/practitioner, which then other colleagues will say, "But you didn't include something like librarians." Then the definition would on. We were trying to find two or three or four inclusive terms. Therefore, we certainly would accept via telephone, hand written notes, E-mail, or whatever some alternative terms that would be more inclusive.

KUBITSCHKEK: The document talks about establishing a context in which service is valuable. I think that is very important because unless you can get tenure and more importantly, unless it is noted that you can get tenure on the basis of excellent service, the average age in this room is going continue to rise. I don't think that we are training junior faculty into institutional citizenship via our award system. That makes me concerned. On page 9 under the Expectations of Kinds of Professional Service, that in order to use service as the basis for promotion or tenure, one would have to document and be evaluated as satisfactory in each of the four kinds of service. That is not, on the face of it, at all unreasonable, but then at the end of the section, for annual reports and for other purposes faculty members may document and be evaluated in at least one area of service. I understand that to mean that you need to demonstrate in only one area of service something which is either a satisfactory, good, or an excellent rating which means that you could be excellent every year in service as you came up to the tenure proceedings, but not excellent in the sense that would get you promoted or tenured. I think that unless the annual report process is changed, the context itself won't change. You certainly don't want a clash in definitions between what is satisfactory, good, or excellent from year to year and what is cumulatively so.

VESSELY: The first place in which you have to demonstrate this is in the unit. We could write a campuswide document but it still is going to have to be accepted and interpreted by the unit. Part of the answer to that is how the unit handles the cumulative or the annual review process. We have had faculty

members who have received excellent comments in a variety of categories and then stopped doing those things and didn't get much credit for what they did three or four years ago. So, part of it is how the unit is going to value that. As I am reading that, it was our definition of the term "evaluated." Part of the process is self-documentation, self-evaluation. The annual report in many units has an actual evaluation technique. I am at a loss to say why we singled out one area and talked about the annual report because it is handled so differently. I don't know whether Bob or Barbara can shed any light on that or not. I don't know what that is singled out.

CAMBRIDGE: It was a problematic error. We had a lot of debate about whether someone who went up on excellence would in fact have to claim activity and excellence in all the areas of service or in fact just one and whether there is a difference when one went for tenure and promotion and having to do all those versus having it as just one of the items that a person gets evaluated yearly on. Would we want to make that claim that they would have to every year have all four? So, this is a problematic discussion.

VESSELY: We should go back and review that. I am reminded a little bit from that discussion that, when we were talking about the annual report, very often that was what the units told us was used for the merit raise or for the notion of the classes they were going to teach or things that are going to happen the next year more so than the promotion and tenure. We ought to go back and try to make that clearer.

PORTER: Barbara Cambridge and Bob Bringle just completed leading a wonderful workshop where we talked about service documentation and used this as a model which gave an opportunity to come to an understanding of what I didn't understand out of this document. The part that I struggled with and would like you to address is Criteria #1 Dynamic Interaction of Service, Research and Teaching and perhaps you could explain what is mean by that and some of the problems that became apparent to the application of that.

CAMBRIDGE: We were thinking in there of the fact that as people makes decisions about what service activities they are going to be involved in that sometimes those service activities are chosen without any reference to the other work that the faculty member is doing. That is one reason that very often it is hard to make a case about the service one does if there is very little connection. So, we were looking at the kind of choices of service that one could make that would, in some way, relate to that person's research and teaching and that having some sort of interrelationship would make one be able to support the case for service in a stronger way. We had a discussion this morning in the workshop about that and whether it would be essential that every bit of one's service would be able to linked to one's research and teaching. We decided, at least the group that was working on that, that probably would not be the case. That there would be some service that would not be as directly related, but if it were that it would be a more able to be strongly supported if one could make one's case that way.

VESSELY: Remember, too, that we received lots of information from various units about current practices. That information had to do with service, teaching, and research and that interrelated. Most often it made some comment about the value placed on research that was interrelated to teaching and teaching interrelated to the research. We picked up on that theme. I think there is more refinement

possible, but one of the things that came to light, there probably has been numerous instances, but an instance where someone who was teaching in an area, I'll use English as an example, and instead of teaching writing per se, they were teaching about this thing that they were doing service in, that they were interested in. Writing was part of it, but it wasn't really the main focus. They weren't doing service in teaching of writing and then bringing that back to their university classroom. The unit didn't value that at all. They didn't want to reappoint this person because they had gone off in their service area much more so than they had intended for them to do. It really didn't happen in English, but it happened in an area in which it was easy to do because the main subject was one that you could lots of examples as you teach and they happened to use the choice example which wasn't seen as related.

ROTHE: I am concerned about the service being defined almost solely by using our discipline and expertise. It seems to me service can also partly include the citizenship. I am particularly concerned that once a professor gets beyond tenure what we do after that. As mentioned in the document, you get older you do more to approach the service. As I read the document and from what you say, unless I am doing something for an outside organization (external group) and using my specific expertise doesn't count. Forget it. Serving on a school board, if I am an attorney or somebody who is related to an educator, would not mean anything because school boards don't need "engineers" as disciplines.

VESSELY: The key there is counts for what? Remember, the main focus of this is that the promotion/tenure process, and to a lesser extent, the merit decisions that are made. So, if you are a tenured, full professor, you may not need it to count for much. If your unit says that this is a good use of your time and there is no conflict, etc., then it is not going to be problematic. Again, remember that the units are the ones who initially have to buy into the notion that they are going to count service for something, and the feedback that we got early on was that those things that weren't either discipline based. That is why they didn't count service before now because their sense was that you were off doing something that didn't help the department or didn't raise the level of stature of the individual unit.

ROTHE: But, I will submit to you that there is a lot of career left after one gets to be full professor. The other thing is, do we have to look at the polls for what the units want to set the standards? It seems to me that there should be some mention of something beyond what will be strictly, purely discipline based.

VESSELY: Would you think it reasonable to say once you have reached a certain level that other criteria can be used?

ROTHE: That is fine, but I don't see it here.

VESSELY: This is the first we have thought about it. I thank you for that point.

APPLEGATE: I guess I want to support some of what he says. I certainly do worry about the post tenure and full professor people. I am also concerned about the idea that you have to so tightly link a narrow area of expertise that in fact you may become basically really boring. Sometimes it is what you get involved in and it makes a contribution based on the attitude of mind you have and the approach to

problem solving that you have. To keep yourself so narrowly focused is so stultifying as to be unbelievable. I might like an engineering on the school board who takes a different approach to education and again I won't like the engineer's approach to education. My point is that sometimes it is the very stretching that is useful and so I liked your point about what impact you made, but I am very troubled by the point that everything has to be so narrowly focused. We can talk to the students about a broad education, but we don't believe in living in lives in that way.

CAMBRIDGE: It is clearly, I think, I mistake to try to say that all professional service will be disciplinary based. I think that one of the things that we have been talking is 'what is the difference between saying one is a biologist and one is a professor of biology?' Biologists can exist in a research lab somewhere but a professor of biology has a larger area of expertise than the biology subject content. The professor, in fact, has some knowledge coming out of the operation in an institution; professional knowledge that comes from longevity and activity in an institution. There is a knowledge base there. I think we were trying to acknowledge that in this document by using the word 'professional' and saying that the professional expertise can come from a disciplinary base, but it can come also an institutional base.

VESSELY: One other point is that many of us do service that we don't intend to count for anything. We don't intend that it is going to be documented in such a way that it is adding to our portfolio. We just do it. We participate in a city wide cleanup. So, it wasn't intended for all the service to fit into some area either, but I think what we were trying to do, if we were going to err, we were erring on the side of saying that if it gets to that point of choosing, from again what we are hearing from the responses for what is being supported by the various entities, that the academic-based side has some level of importance that might where you want to focus. If you are the younger junior faculty that is what you might do. We have had faculty members who served on committees and have been on Faculty Council and done a variety of things who are now teaching at some other university because it came to a point they thought because the reward system was a certain way that, that was going to be valued for them. And, it wasn't. So, one of the things that we are doing is pointing out what we knew from the historical sense was in fact true. That all service isn't valued like all other service.

TURNER: We are going to have to continue this for the next meeting, but we can take one last round of comments and then I am going to bring this discussion to a close.

VESSELY: Could I ask you to at least let Bob respond because I think he was on these deliberations.

BRINGLE: There are several points, but there are a couple that I will touch on. First, we had to distinguish between personal service and professional service. Secondly, we have to realize that there are different forms of recognition. Maybe the university needs more forms of recognition. Some forms of recognition are discipline-based. I am not rewarded for doing anthropology research, I am rewarded for doing psychological research. We actually have a broader definition than others we encountered because we allowed the three knowledge bases -- one based on the discipline, one based on the profession, and one based on the institution. Some definitions of professional service are limited simply

to discipline-based knowledge. But, ours say disciplinary and professional. We talk about institutional expertise as part of the knowledge. I think we allow for those forms but it may not be as rich as what you are indicating, but I think that is part of the structure we have inherited. Only four academic units that we could find have criteria for service at IUPUI or at least reported that they had criteria. We are trying to put into place some of the mechanisms that would at least allow a faculty member or librarian to be recognized in various forms. I think we also have to keep in mind that we are not just talking about excellence for promotion. It can also be satisfactory performance for promotion or merit.

One final point and this was a point of discussion that we didn't resolve -- should some level of university service be necessary regardless of what forms of service one might do whether at a satisfactory level or at an excellent level? I would appreciate any feedback you have about that. Somebody does excellent professional service but is not on one university committee. Should they be able to claim excellence in service?

PORTER: I would like to request that the Task Force continue to look at this document keeping in mind the discussions that will be going on on this campus related to post-tenure review. I don't think this document can be viewed just as addressing younger faculty or faculty up to the point of mid-career and then it longer influences assessment. Also, the discussions that will be going on in relationship to assigning faculty work where the value placed on service will not only have the potential to influence decisions made by the individual but may impact on the decisions that are made on a departmental level as how the individual will spend their time.

WARFEL: Part of the document talks about the timetable for the work of the Task Force and coming up with a handbook that will be useful for the faculty on this campus. One thing that isn't in that time line is bringing the parts of this document that really might have the force of policy back to the Council for approval. For example, what we had already talked about for promotion and tenure cases based on service a faculty member must engage in such and such. That sounds like policy to me. If we as a campus are going to behave according to this, I think those core policies statements should be brought to the Council for approval before they are distributed for use.

VESSELY: It was our assumption that anything beyond a draft or revisions of the draft would come to the Council.

TURNER: Thank you. The Task Force needs to continue to hear from you. If we have time, we can continue this discussion at the May meeting. The discussion is not meant to happen only here; the Council has an investment and you, as members of the Council, I hope that you get in touch with the Task Force often.

AGENDA ITEM VIII: PROPOSED CHANGES IN THE IU STUDENT CODE (Circular 96-08)

TURNER: We will now turn to the next item on the agenda. I would like to call your attention to IUPUI Circular 96-09 which is the Proposed Changes in the IU Student Code. This is a document that came out

of the Bloomington Faculty Council Student Affairs Committee. It was produced there and now it has been sent to the University Faculty Council and these are proposed changes to the IU Student Code of Students Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct. Our task for today is to discuss this to gather our own reaction to it, our own suggestions, and to send them along to the discussion at the University Faculty Council.

PETERSON: I will lead off the discussion. I guess the main concern that I have is that we have a very detailed, extensive document here which presumably will be a University document which may restrict us as individual units, individual campuses, individual units within campuses, and individual departments from forming documents that may be specific for the needs of a professional school, as an example. I am concerned that we have this much detail from a University Faculty Council level document. This is to be an all-university umbrella document under which everyone else will produce their own individual students rights documents. That may vary because of the individual needs of schools.

MANNAN: I assume that IUPUI has a Student Affairs Committee.

TURNER: Yes, they do have such a committee.

MANNAN: Have they had a chance to read this document? If not, it may be useful to have the Student Affairs Committee's recommendations and comments before we undertake it?

WARFEL: We have complained in the Agenda Committee of the UFC about how this whole process has been undertaken. This is accurately represented as something that the Bloomington Student Affairs Committee has spent a year or more coming forward with. Now, here in April, the rest of us are supposed to rush, rush, rush and approve it so it can be approved by the end of the year. I have a lot of problems with that process. Our Student Affairs Committee on this campus has had no more time to look at it than we, the Council members, have had to look at it. I think Dick Peterson's point is also a very good one. We have done much better as a university when the university policy is like the salary policy. The University level is a broad statement of basic principles. The campuses work under that umbrella and the schools under those two umbrellas. That is a much better way of getting along in a complex institution.

The response to those very wise and salient points has been, "Yes, but they have worked so hard. It seems a shame not to pass it at this point." I can also tell you that the Bloomington Faculty Council talked about it last Tuesday. They had four motions; three of which passed or were informally accepted by the Student Affairs Committee. Those motions had to do mainly with the Campus Grievance Commission, how it was formed and who sat on it, whether or not the members remained mostly tenured faculty. There were some other amendments as well. So, even the Bloomington Faculty Council has problems with this document.

MANNAN: I would still like to suggest that we send it to our Student Affairs Committee.

WARFEL: It has been sent there.

MANNAN: Then we should request the University Faculty Council not to take action on this one until we hear from our Student Affairs Committee and we discuss it and then we can send it there.

WARFEL: Would you like to make a motion?

MANNAN: Yes, I would. I would like to move that we send this document to our Student Affairs Committee and after receiving their recommendations then we can send our recommendations to the University Faculty Council.

WARFEL: I will make a different version of that. Given that it has already been sent to our Student Affairs Committee, but they have not had time to report back to us, therefore we move that the University Faculty Council not consider it until our campus has time to look at it.

TURNER: Is there a second to that motion?

BALDWIN: I second that.

TURNER: This motion is open for discussion. Is there discussion of the motion?

PORTER: I speak in support of it and also that the Faculty Affairs Committee would like the opportunity to look at this since it is a procedure that will impact significantly on faculty members.

TURNER: It is good to get the Faculty Affairs Committee asking for work. [laughter] Is there any more discussion of the motion? Hearing no more discussion, I would like to ask for a vote on this motion. All in favor of the motion, say "Aye." Opposed? Abstentions? The motion passes and we will convey our sentiments to the University Faculty Council.

AGENDA ITEM IX: QUESTION / ANSWER PERIOD

TURNER: The next item on the agenda is the Question and Answer Period. I will turn now to Chancellor Bepko to answer the questions.

VESSELY: I understand from a couple of different meetings that I have in that there have been some other meetings, one recently with the Staff Council that referred to the RCB process as the reason that there is no campus unity or something to that affect. For example, the annual students' spring dance, which faculty and staff attend regularly, is that type of event. From one of these meetings they were planning some other event to bring the campus together as if this dance wouldn't do it or as if the most recent workshops or whatever wouldn't do it. In asking that question about, "Why do we need this event?" The response was that in Staff Council it was said that RCB has made competitors out of all of

us. It is unit against unit fighting for the same pot of funds that we always fought for. In the old days everybody felt beholding to the Chancellor. Now you feel beholding to your RCB supervisor as the connection for the most immediate funding source. So, instead, of things focusing all the way up in the same direction it is a bunch of little directions. I guess the reason I bring that up is one to ask your response, but the other is that before this thing takes on a life of its own and people's perceptions starts becoming reality I feel we should take about it.

BEPKO: I wasn't at the Staff Council meeting where this came up and haven't heard about it, so I can't comment on it.

VESSELY: It has been within the last day or two.

BEPKO: I can say that we have more campuswide unifying events than we have ever had before. I think that has steadily increased. I am not sure that it is fair to talk about needing more events without acknowledging in any way that we have more all the time.

VESSELY: You will hear about this because I guess the end result was that they decided that somebody will be sent to visit with you about a source of funding for this campuswide event. We talked about the events that we had at the zoo in conjunction with our birthday celebrations and a variety of things. Those seemed to go right past everybody there. I agree with you that we have more of those events. It is just interesting that we have a perception that we don't have, but even more interesting that RCB is the reason we don't.

BEPKO: The Responsibility Center Budgeting gets blamed for almost everything that has happened that is negative after the inception of Responsibility Center Management. We have even had a couple of broken marriages blamed on RCM. [laughter] I will have to wait and hear what actually went on, Jeff. I don't really know about this, but I do think it is important to recognize that while we have tried to move financial responsibility and authority into the academic units where we think it belongs, because that is where the important decisions are made, we have simultaneously tried to do more unifying things at the campus level because we think that is an important feature of life in the university and we think we will all be better off if the campus is strong as a campuswide unit.

KOLESKI: My grandfather told of the analogy that went something like this. People aren't coming to a dance because RCM is like a leaky faucet in Allentown causing the Johnstown flood. [laughter]

NG: Jerry, can you up update us on what is going on with the Student Activities Center? Is there a definite schedule to move UEC from its present location into its new location?

BEPKO: I can't tell you a definite schedule, but there is lot of impatience on the part of quite a number of people, including me, on why it is taking so long for us to get this moving forward. I think it would be a good idea if we gave you a definitive report on that at the May meeting. Would that be okay?

NG: Yes thank you.

AGENDA ITEM X: UNFINISHED BUSINESS

TURNER: Is there any Unfinished Business?

BANTA: I would like to say that the Faculty Survey we promised at the last meeting is in the mail. We do hope you will complete it. It is long, but I think it will help us evaluate quite a number of campus services.

KOLESKI: Can you tell us how it is going to be used?

BANTA: There will be a report on the contents given to every committee that can conceivably have an interest in it. Integrated Technologies and other services have given us questions to be in it so they can look at the ratings of their services. They will be very interested in those responses and we will try to follow up.

KOLESKI: The intention of the feedback is for what purposes from your department?

BANTA: I would hope that there would be some things here that would result in improvements in services.

KOLESKI: Thank you very much.

AGENDA ITEM XI: NEW BUSINESS

TURNER: Is there any new business? [None]

AGENDA ITEM XII: ADJOURNMENT

TURNER: I would welcome a motion to adjourn. [Motion made and seconded]

Approved: September 5, 1996

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY INDIANAPOLIS

Faculty Council Meeting

May 2, 1996

School of Dentistry, Room S115

3:30 p.m.

Present: Administration: Trudy Banta, Chancellor Gerald Bepko, Dean William Plater. Deans: P Nicholas Kellum, David Stocum, George Stookey. Elected Faculty: Larry Abel, W Marshall Anderson, Margaret Applegate, Susan Ball, Joseph Bidwell, Lynn Broderick, Paul Brown, David Burr, Kenneth Byrd, Lucinda Carr, Karen Gable, Patricia Gallagher, Robert Havlik, Nathan Houser, Dolores Hoyt, M Jan Keffer, Michael Klemsz, Missy Kubitschek, Miriam Langsam, Golam Mannan, Rebecca Markel, Bart Ng, William Orme, Fred Pavalko, Richard Pflanzner, Edward Robbins, Jane Schultz, Mark Seifert, Erdogan Sener, Stephen Stockberger, Kathryn Wilson, Richard Wyma, Charles Yokomoto. Ex Officio Members: James Baldwin, Henry Besch, S Edwin Fineberg, Paul Galanti, Carlyn Johnson, Robert Lehnen, Byron Olson, Carl Rothe, Martin Spechler, Richard Turner, Rosalie Vermette, Harriet Wilkins, Marshall Yovits.

ALTERNATES PRESENT: Deans: J M Kapoor for Roberta Green, Najja Modibo for Kathy Krendl, Shirley Ross for Angela McBride, Pat Fox for Doris Merritt, Dolores Hoyt for Philip Tompkins. Elected Faculty: Robert D. Rigdon for Charalambos Aliprantis, Julie Fore for Dana McDonald, Connie McCloy for Rebecca Porter. Ex-Officio Members: Melinda Phillabaum for Virgie Montgomery.

ABSENT: Deans: John Barlow, A James Barnes, Trevor Brown, Robert Holden, Norman Lefstein, John Rau, Robert Shay, Donald Warren, Charles Webb. Elected Faculty: Merrill Benson, Diane Billings, Ulf Jonas Bjork, Jana Bradley, Zacharie Brahma, Thomas Broadie, Timothy Brothers, Timothy Byers, David Canal, Michael Cohen, Jeanette Dickerson-Putman, Paul Dubin, Naomi Fineberg, Joe Garcia, Bernardino Ghetti, Carlos Goldberg, William Hohlt, Antoinette Hood, Elizabeth Jones, Henry Karlson, Raymond Koleski, Stephen Lalka, Debra McDonald, Debra Mesch, Michael Penna, David Peters, Richard Peterson, Ken Rennels, Virginia Richardson, Bernadette Rodak, Brian Sanders, Mark Seifert, Anantha Shekhar, Jay Simon, Akhouri Sinha, Jerrold Stern, Karen Teegarden, James Wallihan, Karen West, Mervin Yoder, Susan Zunt.

VISITORS: J. Herman Blake (Vice Chancellor (Undergraduate Education)), Erwin Boschmann (Faculty Development), Chuck Gilkerson (Sagamore), Mark Grove (Registrar), Robert Martin (Vice Chancellor

Administration/Finance), Beverly Ross (Nursing), William Schneider (History Department and newly elected President of the Faculty), Larry Wilkins (Chair, Budgetary Affairs Committee).

AGENDA ITEM I; Call to Order

TURNER: I would like to call this meeting to order.

AGENDA ITEM II: Approval of Minutes: March 7, 1996

TURNER: The second item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes of March 7 which have been submitted for your approval. Is there any corrections to these minutes? (The motion was made that the minutes be accepted. That motion was seconded.) All in favor of approving the minutes, please say "Aye." Opposed? The minutes will stand as approved.

AGENDA ITEM III: Administrative Report: Chancellor Gerald Bepko

BEPKO: There is something I would like to do at the end of the meeting, and that is to say a few words of praise and congratulations to Richard Turner and Kathleen Warfel as they retire from their roles in the Faculty Council.

For right now, let me make three quick points. The Strategic Directions funding for proposals that have been made will be announced tomorrow at the Trustees' meeting in Bloomington. We have gone over the proposals and have some preliminary indication that quite a number of proposals are going to be funded. I think it looks good. I will mention one of those that we are quite confident will be funded in a few moments. By tomorrow afternoon there should be word all around campus about the successful proposals. There will be quite a number of people on this campus who will receive word that their proposals were funded.

Last Wednesday night, as many of you know, the Campaign for Medicine was concluded and the celebration which took place at Eli Lilly and Company with a gala dinner was marked by a couple of announcements -- one of which was an announcement by Randy Tobias, the CEO of Eli Lilly, that Lilly's total gifts, which were expected to be about \$7 million, and that were announced at the beginning of the Campaign, also held at Eli Lilly, those total gifts had grown and in fact Eli Lilly was responsible for \$24 million for the Campaign for Medicine. The total of the campaign was just a shade under \$211 million. There was a goal of \$130 and we missed the goal by over \$80 million. *[laughter]* There is a news release that is available for the Campaign for Medicine if you are interested. It has more of the details on the campaign.

Finally, I apologize for being late today, but the Trustees earlier this afternoon in their meeting in Bloomington approved in substance the definitive agreement for the consolidation of the IU and Methodist hospitals. Following that, there was a news conference up here in Indianapolis at 3 p.m. in the Conference Center that announced that the Methodist board had earlier (one week or ten days ago)

approved the same definitive agreement. There was a ceremonial signing reflecting the agreement in substance to the voluminous definitive agreement that reflects an important next step in the consolidation of IU and Methodist hospitals. I hope this won't offend anyone, but we have been talking about this in terms of a "marital" metaphor. In 1994 there was a courtship that began between IU and Methodist hospitals. In March of 1995 the engagement was announced. Once the engagement was announced, there had to be a thoroughly prolonged period of meeting each other's relatives, which has taken place over the last 14 months. Today, the marriage ceremony was performed, at least most of it was performed. There is a period now of what sometimes is called 'legal due diligence' with information that could not be shared before between these two organizations. *[laughter]* The reason the information couldn't be shared before is something called "anti-trust laws" which Paul Galanti can tell you more about if you are really interested. It is not likely - it is very unlikely, that anything will be discovered that is new in this final stage of examination of each other's books -- things that couldn't be revealed before without violating anti-trust laws -- it is the highest kind of probability that on January 1 the consolidation will be completed.

The new organization will begin to operate the hospitals and the marriage will be consummated. We believe the step is a good one for everyone. It will be very important for the School of Medicine. We think that this step will position the IU School of Medicine to move truly to the forefront in academic medicine. It may be the most important thing that will happen in this era of academic medicine. Other medical schools are having a very difficult time figuring out how they are going to deal with an extraordinarily complex healthcare market that is focusing more and more on competition and making it more and more difficult for academic medical centers to generate the patient flow that is necessary for medical education. This puts Indiana University in a very, very good position -- much better than most of the other medical schools in the country. It will also be good for the city and the state. It will keep in Indiana home-grown management and control of one of the state's and one of the country's most important healthcare organizations. It will keep in Indiana this extraordinary nationally distinctive and powerful center for complex medical care that will result from the merger of the IU and the Methodist hospitals. I think it is a very important step and one that will be studied for the next seven or eight months before the date on which the switch is thrown and the new organization starts to actually operate the hospitals. There was a news release on that subject as well. I thought it would be good for you to have copies of this. If you are interested, you will know everything and perhaps a little more than was discussed at the press conference today.

TURNER: Thanks, Jerry.

AGENDA ITEM IV: President of the Faculty's Report: Kathleen Warfel

TURNER: The next item on the agenda is the President of the Faculty's Report with Kathy Warfel who will present her "swan" song.

WARFEL: There will be extra points for anyone who can explain to us why they call it a "swan" song. *[laughter]* I want to clarify something about the constitution amendment that is out for a vote at this

time: the constitutional amendment about Academic Unit Organization. When it first went out, we heard from the University librarians that there was a significant problem from their point of view in that the language, if taken absolutely literally, would exclude them from serving as elected members on the Faculty Council. They suggested some alteration to this document which was already in mid stream. I consulted with the Constitution and Bylaws Committee and their response is IUPUI Circular 96-20. While they saw the point of the librarians, they felt that in terms of process we should go ahead with the vote on this amendment but then the first thing next year will be to clarify the librarian language. For the record, I think we should all operate by the guidelines that it was certainly not the intent to exclude librarians from membership on the Council because they do not use the terms "teaching, research, and service." For the sake of moving things along, if we do have a vote that this constitutional amendment is accepted, then we will look for the Constitution and Bylaws Committee next year to go ahead with the librarian clause so that everything is in good shape.

Annually the President is supposed to report about the Faculty Boards of Review. At this time, Board #3 is still in the process of a formal hearing. This is the "old" Board #3. The other two Boards, as newly constituted for this year, have very recently each received a grievance. As of today another grievance has been submitted to me. They are all pending and that's about the extent of the report I can give on Boards of Review.

This time of year could be an appropriate time to look back and see what we have accomplished. I hope you all know what we have accomplished. I will focus on what we didn't get done and what we can expect to do in the coming year, or years, should the Executive Committee next year think that these are important topics.

We need to expect reports from some administrative review committees. At the University level, not our level, the review of Chancellor and Vice President Bepko should be winding up soon. Next Fall, I guess, will be the first time we will be able to officially hear about a campus review of the work of Vice Chancellor Herman Blake. Other administrative review committees that got initiated by this campus are actually more Bloomington oriented.

We have some campus search and screen activities still pending for the Director of Athletics, the Dean of the School of Dentistry, and the Dean of the School of Engineering and Technology.

We had another item that we thought about putting on the agenda today, but, as you can see, the "adjournment" category would have fallen off the page and we would not have been able to adjourn. *[laughter]* Therefore, we decided to save it for next year. It is a draft document principles or guidelines for this campus regarding Copyright, Publication, and the General Research Dissemination Practices. I think it will be a very important document for the Council to discuss and adopt and it should come up first thing in the Fall.

Then, there is a cluster of items which are all related and need to be woven together. One of them is the concept of Post-tenure Review or Post-tenure Accountability that we will be revisiting in a general way

starting today. But, in terms of possible actual policy adoption, will be deferred until next year.

At the same time, we are continuing our discussion about Faculty Work. At the instruction of the Board of Trustees, we are discussing the reward for faculty teaching. From our Task Force on Service we are talking about the reward for faculty service. At the UFC level, there is a discussion of restructuring faculty governance. So, we have a lot of things pending all of which really center around defining and clarifying and redefining possibly the nature of faculty work -- how it should be assigned, how it should be rewarded, and how faculty should govern the institution for the sake of making the institution as good as it can be. These are changing times. There is some unhappiness with the climate in terms of not feeling so collegial, not feeling so much like the "old academy." I think it the process of moving from being the "old academy" to being the "new academy" we really have to be very careful and use our faculty governance structure to protect the best of what we have always been and had as we move into something that looks a little different and feels a little different. We have to be careful to say the essence of what it is we are about.

Those of you who were at the Honors Convocation last Friday heard the IUPUI Campus Campaign presentation, and although the Campaign is not over, the Campaign this year, with donations from faculty and staff, has raised \$138,000+ which is up dramatically over the previous years. While on the one hand we hear about poor morale and unhappiness with the campus climate, on the other hand there does seem to be a real willingness on the part of faculty and staff to give to the institution to make it better. I congratulate everyone who worked on the Campaign and everyone who donated. With that, I think I will turn it back to you, Richard..

AGENDA ITEM V: Election of Executive, Nominating and Promotion and Tenure Committees

TURNER: The next item on the agenda is the election of the Executive, Nominating, and the Promotion and Tenure committees. I will turn this over to Dolores Hoyt, the chair of the Nominating Committee.

HOYT: The committee members are distributing the ballots. I would like to thank everyone who was willing to stand for this election. It is an important process and we appreciate your willingness to be slated.

[The results of the elections were as follows:]

Executive Committee: Henry Karlson, Bart Ng, William Orme, and Charles Yokomoto

Nominating Committee: Sara Hook, Paul Galanti, Jeffery Vessely, and Harriet Wilkins

(Harriet Wilkins will be Chair of Nominating Committee for 1996-97)

Promotion & Tenure Committee: Meredith Hull

[Following the election, Dolores Hoyt requested permission to have the ballots destroyed. The tally sheet will remain in the Council Office. Permission was granted for destroying the ballots.]

AGENDA ITEM VI: Report of the Budgetary Affairs Committee: Lawrence Wilkins

TURNER: The next item on the agenda is the report from the Budgetary Affairs Committee with Larry Wilkins.

WILKINS: Thank you, Richard. The Budgetary Affairs Committee has dealt with several important issues this year, not the least of which is something that you already are well aware of and I won't dwell on. We have been quite active in developing the proposed policy and procedures for dealing with matters of financial exigency on campus and its affect on faculty members which was passed by this body and forwarded to the Chancellor and approved and will go into effect in July.

Another item that the committee has been concerned about for some time and we have made significant strides with this year is the improvement of financial planning data. The committee wishes to thank and commend Vice Chancellor Bob Martin for his assistance in helping us develop that information. The committee has benefited greatly from documentary assistance from Bob Martin. He has also been an enthusiastic and energetic participant in the committee discussions and has been very responsive to the comments and questions coming from the members. We believe that we have moved the committee in very positive directions toward an assessment of budgetary matters on campus from a perspective of management of total resources. The quality of information that has come from Bob Martin's office has been quite good. Therefore, we wish to publicly thank him for his efforts. We are continuing the dialogue with Bob in developing that information.

With respect to the budget hearings process, it has been a matter of consideration for a little over one year; at the suggestion of Dean Plater, to consider ways in which the budget hearings process can be streamlined and made more meaningful, again with a perspective on planning and management of total resources and a review for the purpose of determining what a given unit's objectives are and how well they have accomplished those objectives from their own perspective from. It is under consideration by the committee and Dean Plater to coordinate the hearings process with the state biennial budgetary process.

The committee plans to work closely with Vice Chancellor Banta in developing guidelines for submissions of information and documents to the committee for unit deans and directors. A traditional function of the committee has been to participate in the annual hearings on budget requests by unit deans and directors. We did that this spring. The process involves a considerable amount of time and effort on the part of the committee as well as the other participants. We have made a report to the Chancellor with our recommendations for funding of some initiatives. A copy of that report is going to be attached to this report for review by this body. The committee has made some specific recommendations about improving the process in general and with respect to the review of the Strategic Directions Charter proposals which were a significant part of the submissions by deans and directors this year. Those

proposals produced an extra reading load as well as an extra load in terms of the review and discussions by the committee. A portion of those proposals are still under advisement by the committee as that process continues to evolve and proceed.

The committee has also made some recommendations about improvements in the review process for Strategic Directions proposals. Specifically, the committee made recommendations for budget requests independent of Strategic Directions Charter proposals totalling just over \$500,000. The committee made recommendations to the Chancellor for approval of one-time cash expenditures for programmatic improvements in six different units in that amount. It also recommended one base increase of \$20,000 for one unit to fund the conversion of a part-time faculty position to a full-time position. So, in terms of its traditional function, the committee has continued to perform in that way. In cumulative form that is the essence of the committee's recommendations. The details of those recommendations are included in the report that was forwarded to the Chancellor.

One issue that has been banging around in the committee for some time has been the issue of infusion of new monies and reallocations for non-academic initiatives in service or support units in comparison to infusion of new funds for reallocations for academic programs. More specifically, that issue has been whether the collective budgetary growth in support units that stems from such initiatives might be outdistancing growth in academic units.

Patrick Rooney, who is a Special Assistant to Chancellor Bepko, has conducted a study of administrative overhead as a percentage of academic expenditures, creating a ratio. At the committee's request, he reported his analysis and findings from that study and participated in a lengthy discussion with the committee about his findings. Again, this study is attached to this report. In summary, his analysis indicates that from August 1989, at the start of Responsibility Centered Management, through August 1995, the ratio of administrative expenditures to academic expenditures has remained fairly steady. The range is plus or minus two percent of the mean for that five-year period. In the last three years it has actually declined by a couple of percentage points. As a result of that discussion and a subsequent discussion with Chancellor Bepko, who has opened a dialogue with us on that issue, the committee plans to further refine the study and maybe conduct a couple of spinoff studies. The committee plans to continue the dialogue as well with Vice Chancellor Martin on that issue.

That is sort of an introduction in the future business of the committee. The committee already has on its calendar four significant issues, including the one I just mentioned. More specifically and concretely (1) to review the methodology for campuswide assessments of academic units, (2) a continuing dialogue with Pat Rooney on the subject of administrative expenditures, (3) what I have already mentioned in connection with the budgetary review process, continuing dialogue and working with Vice Chancellor Banta on ways to improve the hearings process, and (4) a review of budget implications with plans for new academic initiatives that have surfaced in recent months including a proposed center for Earth and Environmental Science and a proposed school for public health.

With that I will stop with my remarks and open it up for questions and discussion.

E. FINEBERG: You mentioned the ratio of administrative/academic budget has been relatively stable. What proportions do they currently have and what percentages?

L. WILKINS: The ratios that have persisted, according to Patrick Rooney's study for example we take all support responsibility centers, including pass throughs and unavoidable -- the ratio has been 34 percent to 36 percent with an average in the five-year period of 35. The total, including all support centers, excluding University Library, without pass throughs and unavoidable, ranges from 21 percent to 24 percent with an average of 23 percent. Within the last three years there has been a decline of one percent and two percent in those two categories respectively.

YOKOMOTO: Is there a goal that has been set as to what would be a good figure?

L. WILKINS: This represents the first stage of assembling concrete database and that only in part, Charlie.

YOKOMOTO: Do you think that there is anything in the past to try to establish some reasonable goals?

L. WILKINS: I would think so.

LEHNEN: Have you had any experience about what the ratio is with our peer institutions?

L. WILKINS: That is one of the spinoff studies that we would like to look into.

LEHNEN: Might I suggest that you try to relate whether the administration has anything to do with the performance measures of the institution?

L. WILKINS: That is also a matter of continued concern on the part of the committee.

LEHNEN: This is a very familiar issue of K-12 education.

SPECHLER: I believe in last year's report of the Budgetary Affairs Committee it was pointed out that the method for setting the assessments because of the lag in that method have caused some particular difficulties to schools when your enrollment falls. You are familiar with that issue. Under Subir Chakrabarti's chairmanship, it was suggested that that assessment method be changed to be more sensitive to the ability of schools to pay. Obviously, with many fixed costs when a school suffers a decline in enrollment they are going to experience financial difficulty in any case. But, if the assessment does not fall, that aggravates the problem. Have you made any progress in making these assessment tools more current in order to avoid this difficulty?

L. WILKINS: I guess the short answer is, no, we haven't made progress in terms of reformulating rules. It is a matter of significant concern on the part of the committee. We have had discussions with Bob

Martin on this. The committee is aware of some anomalies in the methodology that can produce some "glitches" for the lack of a better term. The committee is aware that the lag time between the data that forms the basis for the cost allocation drivers can produce some apparent disparities. We are going to actively pursue a review of that methodology and development of perhaps some revisions of the algorithms that are used. In that sense, we are making some progress, but in terms of developing concrete revisions of formulations for algorithms we have not reached that stage.

BESCH: It is rumored that there is a small campus south of here that builds ships and flags and that they adopted the model of RCM that was generated by IUPUI with significant changes. Is it possible to compare the data from that campus compared to this main battleship campus?

L. WILKINS: I believe that it is possible. At the moment, we don't have the data but there have been inquiries made about generating those data.

WARFEL: This is not only the battleship campus, this is the Star Campus. *[laughter]*

TURNER: Thanks for all the good work of the committee. Your committee has worked very hard.

AGENDA ITEM VII: Promotion and Tenure Committee Report

TURNER: We will now move to the next agenda item which is the report from the Promotion and Tenure Committee. Jerry Powers was supposed to give this report but I don't see him here today. Is there someone from the Promotion and Tenure Committee here today? Are you going to give the report, Bill [Plater]?

PLATER: I would just observe, on Jerry's behalf, that he was chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee this year. This is the second year of the new format of the committee with the combined promotion and tenure committees and the new means of representation. This is also the first year under which Panel E cases were considered by the campuswide committee. Last year was the first year in which librarians were considered by the campuswide committee. So, there have been some significant changes, in addition to structure. I would observe that the procedures (the committee processes) worked extremely well. I think all of you would be very pleased and proud of the way in which the committee operated and of the base on which decisions were made.

I have distributed to you a summary of the cases that were considered. This is information that you can look at your leisure. We provided last year's data as well as this year's data. I know that there is one question that you probably would like to raise. I very carefully laid out the information so I could bring it and give you the exact answer, but I forgot it. The question is, what difference was there between the recommendations of the campus Promotion and Tenure Committee and the recommendations made by the Dean of the Faculties and the Chancellor? The brief answer to that is there was only one case where there was a difference in the recommendation that was made. In fact, that case was a divided recommendation where the Promotion and Tenure Committee had recommended tenure without

promotion and the Chancellor and I recommended to the President neither promotion or tenure. Otherwise, there was agreement between the Promotion and Tenure Committee and our recommendations to the President and to the Board of Trustees. That accounts for the difference in the summary. For example, looking at the very top line of 'Promotion Only', there were 36 cases considered; 31 of which were approved by the Board of Trustees. That means that 31 cases were recommended by the Promotion and Tenure Committee; 31 were recommended by the Chancellor.

Bill Orme was on the committee. Bill, did you want to add anything to this? [Shaking his head no.] I would be happy to answer any questions you may have. [There were no questions.]

AGENDA ITEM VIII: Preparing for the Post-Tenure Review Discussion

TURNER: We will move on to the next item which is the discussion of Post-Tenure Review. As Kathy suggested and as we mentioned last month, we are essentially bringing this part of the Task Force report on the table with the expectation that we will get the discussion started now, hear your questions and concerns, and then in the Fall be ready to look at a formal document and a policy on Post-Tenure Review or at least take up the discussion.

What has been distributed are the documents that came out of the Task Force on Faculty Appointments and Advancement regarding Post-Tenure Review. The first is the draft resolution, the second is an implementation document, a form for Post-Tenure five-year review, and then the last part of that Draft Document, Draft Document 18. In addition to that, there is a memo from Becky Porter from the Faculty Affairs Committee raising some questions and looking at some issues. Then there are some assumptions about Post-Tenure Review that were gathered first by Kathy Warfel when the matter came up a couple of years ago and then recast somewhat by me.

The committee of the Council discussing this right now is the Faculty Affairs Committee and they have already begun. Becky Porter could not be here today, but Charles Yokomoto is going to talk to you about what the committee has discussed so far.

YOKOMOTO: In actuality, we really haven't begun formal discussion of the Post-Tenure Review documents. We have begun discussion and primarily we have raised questions rather than come to conclusions. We are a long way away from coming to conclusions.

I think I was selected to give this report because I was the most confused about the committee's current position on the collective documents surrounding post tenure review. The post tenure review documents are IUPUI Circulars 96-18a, 18b, 18c, and 19. Since we have only a few minutes reserved for this discussion, I will get to what I consider the main point that we should be aware of now.

Remember we just finished talking a bout Incompetence, Financial Exigency, and Misconduct. Those three documents took a considerable amount of Faculty Council time, and in those cases, we only debated the process -- they already existed as concepts. Now, we have the concept of post-tenure review

to discuss as well.

The current position of the committee, as best as I could tell from the discussion, is that there are many questions that must be answered and research that must be done before the committee will be ready to make its recommendations.

During a hurried discussion at its latest meeting some points of view were shared, including the following:

1. Has the lifting of the age cap really caused faculty members to stay beyond their period of satisfactory performance, requiring a major change in the review process for tenured+ faculty?
2. If the lifting of the age cap is not a problem, what other problems or problems does post-tenure review address, and are there other ways to solve them? Is it for faculty development (formative) or faculty evaluation (summative)? If the purpose is faculty development, should the process be different than if it is to weed out non-productive faculty?
3. To what extent do schools on campus conduct annual reviews of tenured faculty (not be confused with the filing of an annual report)?
4. How will the "cost" of this additional review process be absorbed, especially in departments with large numbers of tenure faculty? If a department has 25 tenured faculty and five are reviewed each year in addition to the review of probationary faculty and tenure/promotion review, could this time be put to better use?
5. With the already approved process for dismissal for incompetence, would a more informal review process serve us better, triggering a formal review only for just cause?
6. Can the current system of incentives be tweaked to achieve whatever goals post-tenure review would achieve?
7. Have acceptable faculty roles at different stages in an academic career been clearly established such that a peer committee, perhaps years younger than senior faculty, can make the right decision on post-tenure review?

As you can see, the Faculty Affairs Committee has more questions than answers. Let the fun begin! We will be glad to hear your comments and take them back to the committee.

TURNER: This is the point at which we would like for the Council to instruct and give some direction to the Faculty Affairs Committee about the kinds of things it wants them to address.

WILSON: I think it would be a good idea to look around at other universities that have adopted this.

There have been some articles in the Chronicle of Higher Education covering, for example, what Ohio State has done regarding this and they haven't fired anyone in all the time they have ever done it. That kind of data might tell you that you are doing this for faculty development purposes. You could find out what their results are and their experience.

YOKOMOTO: It would be good to know why an investigating university like that ... At Ohio State they are very generous. Ohio State has coupled it with an earlier than normal retirement plan.

LEHNEN: In the document I see a reference to the formative versus summative approach. If this is viewed as faculty development, I hope the committee will be sensitive to the somewhat conflicting purposes of those approaches.

YOKOMOTO: I am sure it will. Rebecca Porter did go to an AAHE conference where this topic was discussed at length by representatives from other universities. Some say it should be used for formative purposes and some say for summative purposes. I guess we have to determine what problems we are trying to address.

WILSON: You mentioned department chairmen and what their roles are. I guess the question was, "Isn't what department chairmen doing right now good enough?" Is that what you are saying.

YOKOMOTO: I have heard from at least two department chairs who say they would like something like this because I can't get certain people to work. Is it because they are ineffective as chairs? What is wrong with the old system that someone would want something that applies to everyone, but they really want it for a few people. So, is there something in that system that could be tweaked rather than putting a whole new layer on top of everything. That is why I put that question in.

E. FINEBERG: I think it would be important to define what the problems really are. We need to perhaps even survey the campus department chairs, administration, and the faculty to see how they define the problems.

MANNAN: Charlie, would it be useful in the sense that we could come up with a list of objectives for the review process and the intended consequences of the review process? Do we know what the objectives for this post-tenure review and what are the consequences of this post-tenure review?

YOKOMOTO: I never really got a handle on that issue in the ten minutes that we spent discussing it at the last committee meeting. My answer is, I don't think we know. Martin, do you know?

SPECHLER: Charlie, you gave a very good summary of our Faculty Affairs Committee discussion, but let me say that our committee was talking as if the purpose would come down from some mountain in the desert. I believe that that mountain has spoken and is now silent. *[laughter]* Therefore (CHANGED TAPE AT THIS POINT) I think we should enunciate about what the purposes ought to be.

TURNER: If you will remember, the recommendations that we are looking at now came from the Task Force on Faculty Appointments and Advancement. Therefore, a lot of the search for information and deliberation has already gone on in that committee. I am sure the Faculty Affairs Committee would probably want to return that document and to get the input of those who were on the TFFAA. That is on the table. The Faculty Affairs Committee will be dealing with this and we will pick it up off the table in the Fall.

AGENDA ITEM IX: Proposed Changes in the Student Code

TURNER: We will turn now to the Proposed Changes in the Student Code. If I may remind you, we distributed that document with the agenda for the April meeting and we discussed it briefly. We thought at that time that we might be able to return to it in the Fall. We may be able to return to it in the Fall, but not for very long. Therefore, we need to talk about this document at some length and in some detail today since it is scheduled to come up before the University Faculty Council at the first UFC business meeting in the Fall.

WARFEL: It was on the UFC agenda at the last meeting in April subsequent to our last meeting. You will recall that our discussion at this Council pretty much amounted to sending the IUPUI UFC representatives to the UFC meeting to say, "Wait a minute. You will have to table this until we have time to look at it." That is basically what happened. We do have this month and probably September for our Council to comment on it further before it comes up for further discussion and possible action at the UFC meeting.

It was tabled with one exception which I shall explain to you. The Bloomington Faculty Council and subsequent by the UFC Faculty Affairs Committee came up with a number of concerns and motions regarding the Student Code. When word of one of those motions in particular got out, there was a lot of concern. The particular concern that caused all of the fuss was a concern over the composition of the Commission that would hear a student's grievance against a faculty member. There was such a disturbance that the President was very interested in settling in some way that tumult particularly between the students and the faculty. So, the whole code was tabled except for the discussion and action regarding that concern and motion. Martin can speak to this in a while.

The actual motion addressing the concern was that when hearing grievances against a faculty member the Campus Grievance Commission shall consist of four tenured faculty members and one student from the campus involved. This would have been a change from three faculty members and two students and it would have been a change from faculty members to tenured faculty members. So, there was a fairly lengthy discussion at the UFC about the wisdom of this, but the upshot is that the motion to alter the document was defeated. It is at least President Brand's understanding that when the document, as a whole, is taken back up off the table in the Fall, that this part of it will be considered done with and it will just be the remainder of the document that is up for discussion.

Martin, do you want to say anymore about that Faculty Council meeting?

SPECHLER: I just want to say that we owe Kathy a debt of gratitude that she was able to delay this. Subir Chakrabarti told me that our Student Affairs Committee has had very little chance to look over a quite corpulent document. Our Student Association has been advised. So, we have not really been full partners in the development of this document at all. Kathy Warfel, I think, in her usual way has made it clear that that is not acceptable in the future. But, we did get about a five month reprieve on this document. Therefore, it is really important that we made up our minds about this before the Fall so that we can bring amendments and in a moment I will tell you the amendments that your Faculty Affairs Committee is recommending.

WARFEL: Subir could not be here today but I have a written report which I just got and which sharing with you isn't going to be easy because it just says, for example, "Line 186....." Therefore, it is hard for me to share this with you today, but we do have suggestions from our Student Affairs Committee in hand. Maybe our Faculty Affairs Committee should be the focus for today.

SPECHLER: We read this document carefully. Let me tell you, for those who haven't had the chance to read this, that is a largely technical revision and updating which we find to be to the good and not very controversial. Let me tell you about one thing, first of all, that we find favorable in this change and something that we probably should have done years ago. This document calls for a much more stringent attitude towards amorous and sexual advances/relations between a faculty of any type and a student under that faculty member's responsibility. In the past, only if an advance was turned down was it considered sexual harassment. This document, I believe quite properly warns people that romantic relations between students and faculty members is highly inappropriate. It is likely to make trouble for all concerned and should be avoided. I believe that is a big advance and something we should welcome as part of professional conduct in a university.

There are some other matters, some big and some small, that your Faculty Affairs Committee would like to call to your attention. The first three have to do with the Campus Grievance Committee. That Campus Grievance Committee, after various administrative instances, may hear a complaint from a student against a faculty member for racial, sexual, or other kinds of harassment and properly so. But, what should be the composition of that Campus Grievance Committee about a matter that could unsettle a colleague's career very seriously? It is a settled matter that the Campus Grievance Committee will have five members (3 faculty and 2 students). That was voted overwhelmingly in the University Faculty Council, though we opposed it. Bear in mind that these campus grievance committees are really an extreme measure. Almost all of the complaints will be settled long before and we hope in a discreet and fair minded way. This is really an extreme situation where the controversy can't be settled easily. We are suggesting that the chair of the campus grievance committee be a tenured faculty member not engaged in full-time administration. Let me say that the AAUP, in which many of us are members, has collected a lot of unfavorable experiences on this matter especially where the administrator in charge, with Affirmative Action, are very much deeply involved on a full-time basis. We feel that the chair of the grievance committee should be a tenured faculty member. They should be tenured because these are controversial matters which often take a lot of time. They should be a faculty member because only a faculty member is aware of normal discourse and conversation in a classroom. As you will see, we want

the Code of Student Ethics to allow maximum free and open discussion of controversial matters in the classroom. Only a faculty member can judge when a discussion, something that comes up, is normal in a class over a controversial matter or whether it represents a breach of professional ethics. That is really the purpose of 1,2, and 3. The chair should be a tenured faculty member. A quorum requires at least two faculty members so that we don't appear at a grievance committee with one faculty member and two students and proceed. That seems inappropriate. Thirdly, that clinical faculty, now a part of our faculty, could be considered for membership on the grievance committee. That is the purpose of the first three. We would invite your approval so that members of the UFC next fall would be instructed to vote in that direction. If you approve any or all of these five, we will let the various authorities know and try to get a friendly amendment made. I think the first three are rather small revisions. Relatively uncontroversial compared with 4 and 5. Richard, do want to pause here to talk about 1,2, and 3 and then we will go to 4 and 5?

TURNER: It is a motion.

SPECHLER: The Faculty Affairs Committee would move this resolution that (1) the chair of the Campus Grievance should be a tenured faculty member not engaged in full-time administration, (2) that a quorum would require at least two faculty members be present, and, (3) that clinical faculty would be eligible to participate. Those are related matters so let me pause here to see if there is any reaction or questions.

ROBBINS: I had a question about #2 -- the quorum requirement of at least two faculty. Would that be the only requirement for a forum?

SPECHLER: I think a quorum is three - a majority.

ROBBINS: There is some other language that establishes a quorum. This is just amends it to include at least two faculty members?

SPECHLER: I think the normal expectation, because I wasn't able to find any language about the quorum, but it does not require that all five members be present. So, the normal expectation, wouldn't you say, Ed, is a majority have to be present to conduct business?

ROBBINS: I would think so.

BALDWIN: So, no hearing will be held unless a majority of the members of the grievance commission are present.

NG: So, the meeting can actually have a quorum as a quorum with no student present?

SPECHLER: That is correct according to this language, but we can rely on the Student Affairs Committee to look at that. That is a good point.

ORME: The language in the packet that was handed out last month says that a hearing may not be held without the presiding officer being present. Would that provision be set aside if there were a quorum with that officer?

SPECHLER: No. The chair has to be present. So, it would be the tenured faculty member who is the chair and one other faculty member at least have to be there. That prevents there being a clear majority of non-faculty on a grievance committee.

LANGSAM: Aren't there some time lines involved in this activity that might be, say for example, that this board has to act within a certain time? If two students and one faculty member show up and the chair or whoever don't show up don't you then violate the time lines?

SPECHLER: That is correct and that is included. We had no dispute about that.

S. FINEBERG: I think after the discussions at the last University Faculty Council meeting that language would have to include at least two faculty members and one student in order to constitute a quorum. I think you are going to have to amend that.

SPECHLER: I think that is a good point, Ed.

TURNER: You will take that as a friendly amendment?

SPECHLER: Yes. That is fine. I would think that the Student Affairs Committee would press that matter. It is not inconsistent. I think Ed is perfectly right about chances for passage without a student being present. It would then say that a quorum would require at least two faculty members and one student be present. Can we proceed with the more controversial matters?

TURNER: There is a motion on the floor. The motion is that this body urges the Faculty Affairs Committee to pursue the first three items. The second one having been amended as described. Is there further discussion on this? Hearing no further discussion, I would like take a vote on 1,2, and 3 bundled together. All in favor of instructing the Faculty Affairs Committee to go forward with these three changes to the document, say "Aye." Opposed? Abstentions? The "Ayes" have it. you want 4 and 5 funneled together?

SPECHLER: No. We will do them separately.

TURNER: The motion now on the floor is that this body approve and urge the Faculty Affairs Committee to go forward and recommend this change to the University Faculty Council. That the use of alternative campus procedures, (Section II.F.3, line 1279ff) for handling racial and sexual harassment complaints cannot be approved until they are examined and approved by faculty governance.

SPECHLER: Unless you read this very carefully, you wouldn't have noticed that on about the 40th page of the document it envisions an alternative set of procedures. Alternative to the ones that are explained in the first 20 pages or so of the document. But, there is no description of these alternative procedures. It is said that those were procedures which could be used in particularly sensitive matters of sexual and racial harassment. We recognize and accept these are particularly difficult cases and that it may require more discretion, it may require more secrecy, it may require different procedures. But, we can't accept the idea that a faculty member (a colleague of ours) would be subject to this disciplinary action under procedures which we have never seen. The Bloomington Faculty Council's Faculty Affairs Committee has voted an amendment similar to this one. If you vote for this, what we would do is advise Ellen Brantlinger, Subir Chakrabarti and the Affirmative Action officers that we must be able to examine their procedures. If they are found acceptable under the circumstances, we will advise you. But, we simply are not willing to take what my great English teacher used to call 'a pig in a poke' which means we don't know what we are getting. It seems to me common sense that you can't be judged on procedures which nobody has ever seen. So, I ask your approval for this provision. It is not really an amendment. It is a provision that we must see and approve those alternative procedures. We are not saying that we won't take them. We are not saying that they are not appropriate. We don't know.

TURNER: I read this as 'handling' instead of 'handing.' [Correction on handout]

S. FINEBERG: I think the wording ought to be positive. In other words, we should basically review the procedures for handling cases of racial and sexual harassment.

SPECHLER: Ed, Number 4 is not wording for the document. It is just a provision. I agree. It is better to put it forth positively. You can put it anyway you want it, but let us see the procedures and then we will tell you whether they are okay.

BURR: I want to make sure that I am in the right place. Assuming that I am, it doesn't say anything in here about judging a faculty member. The way I read this is that there is a process for negotiation which involves the Affirmative Action Office to try to resolve a complaint without having to go to the extent of the grievance procedures. I am not sure there are any procedures. It doesn't indicate that there are any procedures. There is certainly is no judgment indicated here. I don't really see what is wrong with this particular passage. I think you have over interpreted it.

ORME: I have sort of a different a question. The Affirmative Action Officer clause caught my eye as well. I wonder, because I don't know, whether procedures might be followed through that office or whether some of this might not be mandated by law. If it is statutorily or mandated, the approval of this body doesn't matter.

SPECHLER: We really should get informed better from the Affirmative Action Office. I have been in touch with Shirley Boardman about this and have asked repeatedly. We have just not received it. These two points are good points. We would like to know what is this alternative procedure and what could it possibly mean?

BALDWIN: Just a question of clarification. These are the Affirmative Action procedures that are in place generally governing the staff and the working conditions of everybody for the university. Is that what we are talking about here? So, the question is whether those are appropriate for student / faculty disputes? If they are designed for employer / employee disputes, can you really "box" a student / faculty thing into the same area?

ROBBINS: Martin, I have a question as to whether #4 really relates to procedures under the Grievance Committee process or if it relates to general procedures for handling charges of racial or sexual harassment?

SPECHLER: It is general procedures. It is an alternative to the grievance procedure. What we don't want is an "in camera" procedure under rules that may or may not be fair.

ROBBINS: Alternatives to the Grievance Committee procedures or the grievance procedures? Under the first three we were talking about the Grievance Committee function. Under #4, it is not clear to me whether we are talking about the way in which the grievance would be handled or it would be an alternative to having a Grievance Committee handle it which is implied in the first three.

SPECHLER: I believe it is the second one. It is an entirely different section of the document.

LANGSAM: Martin, there is another question that bothers me. Are you saying that if the campus developed an alternative procedure, that procedure for every instance would be considered or are you talking about approving generically an alternate?

SPECHLER: It is the second one, Miriam. That is the usual procedure. If, as somebody has suggested, this campus needs a slightly different procedure because of the importance of health and medical schools on this campus, of course, this body would be the one to approve it and that is provided for in the document.

LANGSAM: But, if a student went to the Affirmative Action officer and demanded action, would you consider that to be a new case or a new procedure? Because that would trigger the Affirmative Action officer involved in investigating a grievance.

SPECHLER: Would I consider that a new procedure? I imagine it has been done before. I think it is of interest to us, as a faculty assembly, to know what the Affirmative Action officer is doing and what sanctions could be possibly be invoked.

ORME: It strikes me that, to address that issue, that the wording is that this isn't an alternative in the sense of either/or. It is supplementary in the sense that a Grievance Committee procedure could be proceeding but the student could also go through this procedure. It is not opting in or out of one or the other. This is in addition to what take place with the Grievance Committee.

SPECHLER: I think you are right.

TURNER: Martin, do you want to go ahead with the vote?

SPECHLER: It would be helpful. This is advice. This is not language to be placed in any document. This is simply going along with our Bloomington colleagues to request 'Let's see your procedures before we approve them.'

TURNER: The Faculty Affairs Committee is asking that we approve the suggestions and go forward with this. All in favor of approving this provision, please say "Aye." Opposed, say "Nay." The ayes have it. Martin, we can do one more in a few minutes.

SPECHLER: The fifth one is perhaps the most controversial of all. It requires that you have read the document carefully. Let me take you through one of the three provisions in this document which raises some questions in my mind. Let me say that our committee did not have a chance to discuss this at length. I am making this motion on my behalf as a member of this body and not as spokesman for the committee. If you are looking at your document at lines 179 to 182, you will see that this document legislates a kind of student code which could chill discussion of some rather controversial matters in the American society and in the state of Indiana. Let me show you how this works. It works the same way with respect to sexual harassment, racial matters, and also matters of sexual orientation. Essentially, the same. Lines 179-182 points out that harassment, based on sexual orientation, I don't have to tell you -- a very controversial matter, that a student's harassment would include (reading beginning with line 161) -- *Harassment includes any behavior, physical or verbal, that victimizes or stigmatizes an individual on the basis of sexual orientation.* Then, at line 179, it says: *If the conduct has the effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual's work or academic performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working for learning environment.*

It seems to me and some others on the committee that this coming pretty close to foreclosure of all discussion of things which, in my estimation, must be discussed on this campus and other campuses in America. Racism, prejudice against people of certain sexual orientations, matters of conflict between the sexes, etc., all of these are highly controversial matters today and could very well come up appropriately in this or that class. In a religion class, the prohibitions against homosexuality are appropriate academic matters. These controversial matters could, and I believe should, be fully discussed. That discussion, I believe, might well make some members of the class uncomfortable. Some things that a student or even an instructor would say could be exceptional to someone. We have many examples of this. If we accept the Student Code which says that verbal behavior which stigmatizes an individual and creates a hostile learning environment is something that could be sanctioned under this, we are coming, I think, too close. Too close to limiting the kind of discussion which, in my opinion, will be liberating and progressive. If we appear to limit that, we are going to drive it underground and we are going to create a lot of resentment among people who feel that their opinions, religiously or otherwise based, are no longer acceptable in the university forum. I think that is wrong.

Two years ago the University Faculty Council turned down a similar proposal against fighting words, something that would make somebody feel uncomfortable. Unfortunately, in a university that does want to discuss controversial matters, some people will feel uncomfortable some of the time. I think it is the price we have to pay for free and open discussion. Therefore, I recommend to you #5, that in the truth of this code and not subtracting from this code, we add *one provision -- that nothing in the code shall be construed as limiting free and open discussion of matters of morality and public policy*. So, that if a teacher or a student wants to discuss the appropriate role of women, of homosexuals, blacks, or Jews, in American society that may make some of us uncomfortable, but I think we have to sit still, listen, and respond.

TURNER: That is the motion on the floor. Is there any discussion of this motion?

ORME: It seems to me, Martin, that the upshot of the assumption here is that someone who disagrees with the curriculum or the special part of the curriculum will jump on this clause to try to shut down that conversation. I am not sure that is a fair assessment of what this says. I think there is a big difference between being uncomfortable and being in an intimidating, hostile or offensive working environment or learning environment. I understand the concern that this could be an open door to quieting who disagree or to keep from hearing things that you don't want to hear, but it seems to me that there would be a burden of proof for someone making that allegation. I think there are many more potentialities that there might be such an audience that couldn't be shut down if you don't have this kind of clause. While I recognize the danger that you are talking about, I have faith that the process will whittle out those without merit.

GABLE: I would like to support Bill in that contention by pointing your nose in the direction of line 179 which says *The conduct has the effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual's work or academic performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working or learning environment*. I think 'unreasonably' is the key word. That goes back to the logic direction in a reasonable process.

WILSON: I don't think we can underestimate what can offend some students. It would surprise you. I taught freshman biology classes for many years and talked about eggs and sperm and people's faces turned red. There are some people who are highly embarrassed by that. If you mention evolution in a biology class, every year it raises questions like "What about Jesus?" They immediately see a religious issue and it is offensive to some people. You have to treat it very carefully, but you cannot underestimate how easy it is to offend some students.

LANGSAM: As someone who works with students, the particular clause that Martin is concerned about, has served as a very helpful safeguard to faculty and what their goes on in their class. Because what you can have is a student harassing other students and the faculty and as long as you can say to the faculty member, "You must continue to provide a healthy, good learning environment for all students." We had a student two years ago who sat in a group introduction and said as people were introducing themselves, "I think that person is a fag. I think that person is a queer." Under what circumstances do

you remove that student? This statement, because it is 'unreasonable' and creates an uncomfortable situation, can be the tool in which you can evict a student who is acting in a horrible sort of way. I have some fairly strong feelings about preserving this.

We have recently also had another issue come up in a religious class where a student's concept of what an open discussion means is their right to stand up and dominate the class discussion and say whatever they want. I understand where you are coming from, Martin, but I don't it gets us to the place that you are talking about. In fact, I don't want in my class a discussion which somebody else has the right to decide is the appropriate, unlimited, open discussion about a topic. Do you want people to spend the rest of the semester talking about Jesus in your class, Kathryn, or do you want to get on with it?

S. FINEBERG: I think there is merit in most of what everyone has said, but I do think that there are people in our classes who are very thin skinned and could, in fact, mistake free and open discussion for personal attack. I don't think #5 precludes the other wording. It is an additional protection which I would like to have in my classes should I make an inappropriate remark which would offend someone. I think it is very easy to offend overly sensitive individuals. That could be mistaken by that individual as being a creation of an unfavorable learning experience.

TURNER: I think we need to move on and take a vote on this. Before we do that, I would like to make sure that the attendance sheet is still moving around. Could we now move to a vote? The proposal before us is that we instruct the Faculty Affairs Committee to bring to discussion the Student Code at the University Faculty Council, # 5, as it has been presented to us. All in favor, please say "Aye." Opposed, say "Nay." [a few] The ayes have it.

If anyone has other comments to make about the Student Code, you need to get them to the Faculty Affairs Committee and/or the Student Affairs Committee as soon as possible. Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM X: IUPUI Personal Completion Compact (Circular 96-21)

TURNER: We will now move to the next item of the agenda which is the IUPUI Personal Completion Compact. You have Circular 96-21 that you should have picked up as you came into the room today. This is for your information. The chair of the Personal Completion Compact Commission, Stuart Hart is here and ready to answer your questions. We have five minutes to do this. Stuart, could you introduce the Personal Completion Compact and tell us what you want. This is not for a vote. This is for your information.

HART: This is clearly at the information item stage. You have a copy of it and I hope you have had a chance to look at it. If not this time, you probably looked at the material we have been disseminating for comments throughout the last year. Certainly you have months and you may very well have years to raise issues, to make recommendations, etc., because it is our intent and we have stated it clearly, and you will find on the next page in fact, the page after the memo that went to the Council on Undergraduate Learning, it says "effective date to be determined." It is our point of view that date is to

be set only when the Commission, the Council on Undergraduate Learning, and the Faculty Council consider the Personal Completion Compact design and is _____ the support sufficiently well developed to make implementation appropriate.

What we have done is we have launched a process which is basically an exploratory experimental process to determine what might be the best form of a design for this campus to provide assurances to all who are interested that our students will be able to pursue their studies in a responsible manner and in good, strong, cooperative relationships with us they will be able to complete their program in a reasonable period of time.

All of you know that this was stimulated by President Brand's initiative which has come to be known as the 'Grad Pac' at Bloomington. As the CUL and the Commission it formed looked at that initiative and we looked at it with a collection of people who started out with _____ it all the way from feelings of strong antagonism to wonder, amazement, and to really fairly positive feelings about it. As we have worked through the different issues, we have come to agree that moving in this direction makes sense to the Commission and that our design would have to be special to the conditions and potentials associated with IUPUI and not another campus. So, that is why ours looks different from the Grad Pac policy statement that many of you have had a chance to look at. The Council on Under-graduate Learning endorsed this as the working document for the next period of development. It did not approve it as IUPUI's commitment, but endorsed it as the general direction that we believe makes sense which will then be further refined through the work that occurs. We have three schools which have already decided to join in this experimental or exploratory process --- Engineering and Technology, SPEA, and the School of Education. We would welcome other schools. We would very much like to have other schools, other academic units, to join us in this exploratory process so that we can identify those particular principles, those mechanisms, etc., that are going to be most effective and that we feel most comfortable with.

The only point that was raised at the last meeting of the Council on Undergraduate Learning was that it might be a good idea to change the name from Personal Completion Compact to Personal Achievement Compact, which also makes a nicer acronym. We would be happy to have your advice on that and every element of this two-page overview and advice for the principles and assurances document that we have developed which now is simply waiting further review and what might be _____ logically from the experience that we have in the next few months and in the next few years. I would be happy to take any questions now and certainly in the future.

YOKOMOTO: In #6 it says "*IUPUI will pay for the coursework...*" does it really mean that the department will pay for the coursework?

HART: What it means at this point is that we aren't quite sure how that is going to work out. The Commission wanted to make the point that we believe this design we are developing should have a strong commitment from the campus and that we would need to find funding methods and some support for the campus in general and determine in this exploratory process just what level of responsibility

individual units might assume. That question has come up repeatedly and in the CUL meeting before the last one I asked for advice in regard to just where we might place financial responsibility when a school that is offering the program is unable to or finds that it is not going to offer the program that it had promised the students versus the situation in which the school that has promised the program is able to offer its courses, but those other programs that provide support courses have taken steps that mean they are not offering those particular courses that are needed for students. No one had a ready answer and I think that we all recognize that we have a good deal to learn as we work through these early attempts to implement the design and the intent.

STOCUM: Regardless of what unit is going to be responsible for planning the coursework that needs to be taken by students, I think all should be aware that under the current concept of RCM, other students will pay a hidden tax in the fee remissions that are given to students for lack of being able to take courses. I will give you an example. It is totally hypothetical and it probably would never work out quite this way. If the tuition per year is \$2,400, based on \$100 per credit hour and 24 credit hours, the hidden tax would be \$960. You would remit that student \$2,400. The rest of the students in the unit would collectively have to pay \$960 for that student. I think that is something that we should be aware of when we are trying to work through this thing. I think it is going to pose a tremendous challenge to everyone because of the enormous bureaucracy that is represented in this document.

SPECHLER: I think David is right especially when you realize that this procedure is to apply to every student, whereas Grad Pac is voluntary. A few students may do it, other students will not. The burden on advisors, already heavy, is going to increase. I believe that the weakest point of our academic programs is our academic advising. That continues to be the case. When you talk to students, that is their chief complaint, after parking. *[laughter]*. If this procedure will lead us to get serious about academic advising, by faculty, not by people who know little about what is going on in our academic programs, then I would say it is good. But, if it is just another piece of paper that is floating around for every student the costs, over and above what David Stocum said quite rightly, is going to be too high.

HART: Some of the schools plan to make it purely voluntary. Students may choose to use the plan or not. There is a very strong component within this which gives the schools and academic units the right to determine the manner in which they will develop and offer this.

AGENDA ITEM XI: Report on the UEC, the Old Library, and the New Student Center/Multipurpose Building

TURNER: I would like to apologize to Bob Martin. I hope that the report on the use of the old library and the UEC can be done at the beginning of next year, or if there is a paper version which can be distributed, maybe we can do that.

AGENDA ITEM XII: Question / Answer Period

[Time did not allow for this agenda item.]

AGENDA ITEM XIII: Unfinished Business

BEPKO: I think it is important that we observe the work that the leaders of our faculty governance organizations do; particularly, the leaders of the Faculty Council. I would like to say a word of special thanks to Richard and Kathy. Richard has been an excellent Chair as he demonstrated today, holding the gavel with gentleness but yet firmness, and with very good humor and a very sharp wit as well. He has also been a person who has demonstrated really sound judgment in all of his work as a faculty leader. He has been tapped for a variety of responsibilities above and beyond his role as Vice President of the IUPUI Faculty Council. Just within the last year, he was a member of a Task Force for the Strategic Directions project. He also served as a member of one of the review panels on the Community of Learning. So, if your proposal went there and you didn't get a very good score, you will know one person to blame. *[laughter]* More seriously, he is a wonderful and good friend and colleague, a great conversationalist and companion, and, I think, one of the key members of our IUPUI academic community. I have a plaque to present to him and it reads as follows: *Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis recognizes Richard C. Turner for superb service as IUPUI Faculty Council Vice President, 1994-1996. [applause]*

Kathy Warfel has been leading faculty governance for four years as Vice President and President. I think in that four-year period she has presided over the Faculty Council in a time when faculty governance on this campus has really matured and flowered. She has also become a leader of the University Faculty Council as co-chair. She has been a major influence to all of Indiana University's activities. She has been involved in the Strategic Directions process in a very fundamental way as a member of the Steering Committee, helped to select all of the task forces who have helped shaped policy with respect to the final Strategic Directions proposals. She also has made a major mark in the University by shepherding a number of very important projects through faculty governance and policy in the University. The most recent was the Clinical Ranks proposal, which was so important to this campus. It had such difficulty at the UFC, and Kathy's leadership was indispensable in achieving the good results that we had. She has also shepherded the results of that now long ago active Task Force on Faculty Appointments and Advancement. A number of the proposals have come forward and become University policy. In the process of this, she has earned the respect and the affection of everyone at Indiana University.

When she began her work as the leader of the Faculty Council, we talked about one special interest of hers, which was the status of women at IUPUI. In a moment I will say a couple more things about this, but it is clear that there will be a number of developments from Kathy's work in faculty governance, but one of those and perhaps the most important of those, will be that she will have changed and reshaped Indiana University and IUPUI in terms of the status of women and the way women play roles, leadership roles in particular, at IUPUI. I had the pleasure of writing a letter of support for Kathy in hopes that she could be appointed to the Commission for Higher Education. This is something that was discussed in the last Faculty Council meeting. I can't say anything that would be better than to read a couple of things that were written about her in that connection.

"Kathy has been an excellent faculty leader, spokesperson, and advocate for good causes both at the

campus and university level. As President of the IUPUI Faculty Council and Co-Secretary of IU's University Faculty Council, she has guided discussions of several complex issues to a very successful conclusion. In the course of these discussions, she has demonstrated a superb ability to encourage constructive dialogue and harmonize initially different points of view. She is thoughtful and articulate and has been especially effective in expressing the concerns of faculty. The reason she has been so effective, in my view, is that she has an exceptional depth of understanding of the work and interests of faculty. There are special sets of sensibilities and textures in the life of faculty. They derive from the solitary nature of much of faculty research, the extraordinary personal sense of accomplishment that flows from helping students grow intellectually, and the unique collegiality that comes from dedicating one's self to the life of the mind. Kathy understands these phenomena in a way that few faculty leaders do and she has been very effective in expressing the fundamental needs of our faculty culture to various different persons and groups. This may be the most important reason for selecting Kathy as a member of the ICHE. It seems that one role that is played by the faculty member of the ICHE is to help lay persons understand our particular culture, to help them appreciate those features that are inherent to the learning process. As a leader of the Indiana University faculty, Kathy has been particularly good at dealing with Trustees and members of the public, not just as an advocate, but as a person who describes our work clearly, directly, and culturally."

I have heard more than one person say that they have not understood the work and needs of faculty until they had engaged Kathy on a particular point. For all the things that Kathy has done, I think that we could create no better recognition than to see the work of the Task Force on The Status of Women come to fruition. I am pleased to be able to say that the Center for Women, which is one of the principal recommendations of the Task Force, will be created in very short order. I can't say a whole lot more because you will find out about that tomorrow when the official announcements of the Strategic Directions funding are made, but needless to say the Center will be created and a variety of activities will spread greatly across our campus that really were initially generated by Kathy's work. I am especially pleased to be able to say that there has been created, through pledges from anonymous persons, an endowed fund that will be used for professional development for women and that will be awarded in the form of Warfel Fellowships for women who are interested in professional advancement and interested especially in executive leadership. The Warfel Fellowships will be a permanent memorial to the outstanding work that Kathy has done. In recognition of this, we have a plaque that reads: *Indiana University - Purdue University Indianapolis recognizes Kathleen A. Warfel for superb leadership as IUPUI Faculty Council President, 1994-1996. [applause]*

AGENDA ITEM XIV: New Business

[Time did not allow for this agenda item.]

AGENDA ITEM XV: Adjournment

TURNER: The meeting is adjourned.