

FC970904 MINUTES:  
APPROVED FC980115.

Indiana University - Purdue University Indianapolis

Faculty Council Meeting Minutes

September 4, 1997

School of Dentistry, Room S115

3:30 - 5:30 p.m.

**Members Present:** Simon Atkinson, James Baldwin, Trudy Banta, Gerald Bepko, Henry Besch, William Blomquist, Linda Brothers, David Burr, Janie Canty-Mitchell, Ellen Chernoff, Edward DeSchepper, Jeanette Dickerson-Putman, Joseph DiMicco, Nancy Eckerman, S Edwin Fineberg, Mary Fisher, David Ford, Julie Fore, Janice Froehlich, Paul Galanti, Linda Gilman, Lawrence Goldblatt, Richard Gregory, Dean Hawley, Sara Hook, Dolores Hoyt, Maymanat Jafari, Elizabeth Jones, Juanita Keck, Robert Keck, M. Jan Keffer, Bruce Long, Thomas Luerssen, Steven Mannheimer, Edward Mannix, Angela McBride, Byron Olson, William Orme, David Peters, Richard Peterson, William Plater, John Pless, Rebecca Porter, Amanda Porterfield, Gerald Powers, Frederick Rescorla, Maher Rizkalla, Jean Robertson, Beverly Ross, Carl Rothe, William Schneider, Martin Spechler, David Stocum, Susan Sutton, Soren Svanum, Rosalie Vermette, Jeffrey Vessely, Marion Wagner, Kathleen Warfel, Jeffrey Watt, Dorothy Webb, Robert Weetman, Charles Yokomoto, Marshall Yovits, H. Oner Yurtseven.

**Alternates:** Dolores Hoyt (for Philip Tompkins), J. M. Kapoor (for Roberta Greene), Miriam Langsam (for John Barlow), Rebecca Porter (for Richard Fredland), Simon Rhodes (for Dring Crowell).

**Guests/Visitors Present:** Victor Borden, Alan Crist, Mark Grove.

**Members Absent:** Stephen Allen, A. James Barnes, Paul Bippen, Ulf Bjork, Thomas Broadie, Trevor Brown, Karen Cobb, Michael Cochran, Michael Dalsing, Dan Dalton, Jeremy Dunning, John Eble, James Faris, Naomi Fineberg, Carol Gardner, Sanjiv Gokhale, Robert Hall, Stuart Hart, Robert Holden, Henry Karlson, P. Nicholas Kellum, Stephen Leapman, Norman Lefstein, Yan-Yun Man, Najja Modibo, Bart Ng, Michael Parsons, Melinda Phillabaum, Robert Shay, Robert Tarver, Donald Warren, Charles Webb, Harriet Wilkins.

### **Agenda Item I: Call to Order**

**Porter:** Welcome to our first Faculty Council meeting for this academic year. Those of you who are returning members may recall that last year we started off by modeling the "Starship IUPUI" tee-shirts. In the tradition of a new piece of apparel every year, this year you all noticed that the people at the head

table are now attired in the IUPUI University College caps commemorating the establishment of University College.

If you will allow me, I would like to introduce the individuals at the head table, although I believe most of you know them. Starting to your right, we have William Schneider (President of the IUPUI Faculty), William Plater (Executive Vice Chancellor and Dean of the Faculty), Gerald Bepko (Chancellor), Rebecca Porter (Vice President of the IUPUI Faculty) and, acting this semester as Parliamentarian, Carl Rothe, who is a long time member of this body and also a member of the Executive and Constitution and Bylaws Committees, and Bernice Chumley, Administrative Secretary for the Faculty Council and the Staff Council. Welcome to all the returning members and a special welcome to those of you who are joining the Faculty Council for a new term.

## **Agenda Item II: Memorial Resolutions**

**Porter:** It is the tradition of the Council to acknowledge individuals who have served at IUPUI and who have died. Faculty members have memorial resolutions presented. We have two memorial resolutions: K. Mildred Bearss from the School of Nursing and Eugene Debs Selmanoff also from the School of Nursing. Since we are in the School of Dentistry Building we also thought it would be appropriate to note a tragic accident this summer that claimed the lives of two School of Dentistry library staff -- Elizabeth J. "Lilly" Halpin and Mark E. Fitzgerald. I would ask that you stand for a moment of silence.

## **Agenda Item III: Approval of Minutes: April 3, 1997 and May 1, 1997**

**Porter:** Included with your agenda were minutes of the last two meetings of the Faculty Council -- April 3 and May 1. Are there any additions or corrections to be noted to the April 3 minutes? Hearing none, are you ready to approve the minutes of April 3?

**Mannheimer:** So moved.

**Langsam:** Second.

**Porter:** We have a motion and a second to approve the minutes of April 3, 1997. All of those in favor, say "Aye." Opposed, "No." The minutes are approved.

Are there any additions or corrections to the May 1, 1997 minutes? Hearing no additions or corrections, is there a motion to approve these minutes?

**J. Keck:** So moved.

**Watt:** Second.

**Porter:** All of those in favor of approving the minutes of May 1, say "Aye." Opposed, "No." The

minutes are approved. Thank you very much

#### **Agenda Item IV: Administrative Report: Chancellor Gerald L. Bepko**

**Bepko:** I would like to start by asking Bill Plater to give our annual report on enrollment as we begin the new semester and also to comment on some plans that we have that are an outgrowth of the Task Force on Research and Graduate Education chaired by T. K. Li and that involve the potential of recruiting a new campus officer for Research and Graduate Education.

**Plater:** Thank you, Jerry. I am very happy to bring good news about enrollment, though, as I said at this time last year, most of you could tell by the parking lots last week that there was not a decrease in enrollment. I am pleased to confirm that. The headcount enrollment for IUPUI was up ever so slightly by 25 heads, 18 of which were here in Indianapolis. The other 7 were in Columbus. But, it is significant that our actual person count continues to creep up. We have not yet reached the record point that we did in, I believe, 1992, but in the last three years we have made appreciable progress back towards that record enrollment. The most significant news is that the credit hours continue to go up. This year overall we had an increase of two per cent. At the official census point we were teaching 5,042 credit hours more than we did last year. In general, the enrollments are up in all schools, at least in terms of credit hours, although there are four schools where there are some concerns that may be due to particular issues, but there are some enrollment decreases. These are in Education, Physical Education, Nursing, and Journalism. Otherwise, most of the schools are either showing appreciable increases or holding steady.

There were significant changes in the headcount in most schools with most schools experiencing a decrease in the number of students, but those losses were made up, of course, by the increased credit hours. There were two schools that were atypical. These were the schools of Library and Information Science (an entirely graduate program), and the Herron School of Art. Both of those schools had significant headcount increases. Otherwise, there were decreases which mean that we continue the pattern of more full-time enrollments. In fact, this fall we have almost 52 percent full-time enrollments. At this time last year we had just barely crept over the 50 percent mark. Again, this reflects a trend that has been going on for several years.

Within all of these enrollment figures, I think it is important to note that we would have had a 420 person drop at the undergraduate level if there had not been a significant increase in the Undergraduate Education Center. Let me remind you that this will be the last year of the UEC. Next year students will be admitted to University College and we will make appropriate adjustments. The point I wanted to call to your attention is that the increase in UEC, as opposed to UECP, was 381 students. We had only a 19 student increase in the UECP. So, there was an appreciable increase in the students in UEC as opposed to UECP.

One area of concern for us in the enrollment picture is at the graduate level, in particular, graduate non-degree. This is an area that should be, I think, a growth area for IUPUI, but for the last three years we

have had a pattern of decrease. Again this year there was a slight drop in graduate non-degree. There are some changes that may be possible for us to make in this area by more aggressive marketing and by paying attention, perhaps, to increased recruitment of masters level students. We are going to take a serious look at recruitment of master's and graduate non-degree students. This is probably a good point for me to note that with Gene Tempel's departure, Trudy Banta is assuming responsibility for the Enrollment Management Committee. This is a group that has worked during the past 18 months to help guide the campus in an overall enrollment strategy and to guide our marketing efforts with appreciable results -- as we have seen in the past two years.

As a consequence of some of these changes, other factors that have occurred might be of interest to you. The average age of our student body continues to decrease a little each year. The average age of a student at IUPUI is now 27.1 years of age as opposed to 27.4. But, if you have noticed, as I have in my classroom, I have a hard time finding older students. There is a higher proportion of students who are of traditional age. In fact, it is the 18-20 year old cohort at IUPUI that has increased most significantly. That 18-20 year old group increased by 8.7 percent this year over last year. I think significantly the average credit hour load in this group, the 18-20 year olds, was 12 credit hours. On an average, that group of students is a full-time population.

There are two other enrollment matters in which I think you will be interested. We had a truly significant increase in the number of international students this year. That group increased 18.6 percent. This happened without any appreciable effort to recruit these students. Word has gotten out that IUPUI (Indianapolis) is a good place to come for a lot of reasons. I think this is, again, a potential area of real growth for us. It is one that we need to begin to think about managing actively and paying a great deal more attention to. This is a subject that the Enrollment Management Committee will take up during the year.

The enrollment of our minority students has also continued to increase. The total population of minority students this year is 14.9 percent, a one percent increase over last year. The population of perhaps most interest here in Indianapolis is the African American student body, which has increased by a little over eight percent this year from last year.

In past years, you have asked about the quality of the students and we have not had much information. I am not sure that we have a great deal more this year, but I would like to give you at least some basic information that is now available about the quality of our students. One indicator that we are drawing more well prepared students is that we had a significant decrease in the number of enrollments in the 000-099 course level associated with remedial courses. This is the first time that I know of in a number of years where there has been a decrease in the enrollments in that level of course.

We can report on SAT scores, though, as always, we would caution about using SAT scores as an actual indicator of quality. This is something that we have paid attention to and that the faculty has expressed interest in, in the past. There are three categories that I can summarize. First, those who are directly admitted to schools. Their average SAT score this year was 1,055 which is up very slightly from the

previous year when it was 1,041. Second, the students who were directly admitted to UEC had average SAT scores (combined math and verbal SAT scores) of 1,005 which is up even more slightly from 1,004 for the previous year. And third, the UEC Population, which had a combined SAT score this year of 874 which was up slightly from 855. If you put all of these together and combine the three rather distinct populations of students, the combined average is an SAT score of 941 which is up from last year's score of 926. In other words, we are attracting more full-time students and, at least by this one indicator, slightly better prepared students.

The final comment that I would make about enrollments has to do with the retention. Here the news is less good. As I think everyone knows, we were successful in receiving the grant from the Lilly Endowment for addressing retention issues. We have made some very significant promises to the people of Indiana about improving retention and, unfortunately, we begin this year with an actual drop in retention of first to second year students. The decline is a retention rate of 55.8 percent of students retained this year from last year. This is in comparison with the previous rate, 57.2 percent. It is not a large drop, but there is reason for us to be concerned, particularly in light of the commitment that we have made to increase significantly retention from first to second year. There are some variations within the populations of students. As you might expect, the overall retention rate for full-time students was not nearly as bad as that for part-time students, but with the Lilly Retention Grant and with the formation of University College, I believe we have some measures in place to address this problem. At this time next year I hope that we will all receive news about an increase in our first to second year retention rates.

That probably is far more information than you would like to have about enrollments, but if you have questions, we have two experts in the back who would be happy to answer your questions. Victor Borden and Mark Grove, both of whom have a great deal of detailed information, would be happy to provide it after the meeting or at your leisure if you have inquiries. If there are questions, I would be happy to answer them.

**Spechler:** I think it is wonderful news that we have received this grant to address one of the most serious problems -- Indiana University's retention of students and reduction of their frustration -- and I know we intend to do that without compromising our academic standards. Could you very briefly outline what you see as our strategy and besides the promises, what kind of strategy we had in mind to win this grant?

**Plater:** We, in cooperation with the other seven campuses of Indiana University, have developed a broad framework that we have all agreed to live within. The framework allows considerable variation from campus to campus, but the strategies have to do with increasing the engagement of students in the academic life of the campus through greater social activities, learning communities, service learning, and all kinds of other things that will draw the students into the life of the campus. We have developed a series of supplemental instruction activities that are, what I think of as 'co-curricular,' and that involve mentoring and tutoring outside of the classroom, but in coordination with the departments and schools. I think the most substantive and important piece will be curricular measures that are to address the introductory courses, in particular courses that tend to be the most difficult for students to master such as mathematics, writing, the basic skills courses, and the large introductory lecture courses where it is difficult to create a sense of community and engagement because of the numbers. There will be other

activities built around the academic program, but I think the most important ones will involve those key first-year courses. University College will be the center of the activity but many, many of the departments and schools will be involved in this. The proposal itself, Martin, is some 200 pages long of which the IUPUI portion is probably 30 pages, outlining in significant detail the programs and ideas. I would just say that we have a lot of good ideas at the beginning. However, we are also committed to assessing the results frequently and have made a commitment to ourselves, as well as to the Endowment, to change strategies if it appears that things are not working. I think this body, and certainly other groups on campus (faculty, Faculty Council Academic Affairs Committee, the Council on Undergraduate Learning), will be paying close attention to the results.

**Ng:** When was the SAT score recentered?

**Borden:** We started reporting these recentered scores last year. It was recentered the year before and so, half the population could recenter and half the population took \_\_\_\_ [inaudible].

**Ng:** So, this increase in SAT scores has nothing to do with recentering?

**Borden:** Nothing. We are evaluating the increase all on the basis of recentered SAT scores.

**Plater:** If you have other questions, Victor and Mark would be happy to comment later. Let me very quickly mention the development of a search committee which we are in the process of forming. We are discussing with the Faculty Council leadership possible participants in the committee. The charge to this committee will be to search for a new campus level officer who will hold the title of Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Education and Associate Vice President of Research for Indiana University. This office grows out of the report of the committee chaired by T. K. Li. That report was distributed to the Council late last spring, and hopefully, it is in your files. If not, we would be very glad to make copies available. The report will be discussed at the October meeting of the Council. Certainly by that time the committee will be formed and, hopefully, will be underway. The office will have a number of significant changes. It will combine overall responsibility for Graduate Affairs on this campus along with the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs that was headed by Dean Wendell McBurney. Since Wendell's retirement, Doris Merritt has been acting as the Dean of Research and Sponsored Programs and has begun to work with George Walker in the coordination of Research and Graduate Activities as they relate to Indiana University, and with Louise Perenza as they relate to the Graduate Affairs of Purdue. We have begun, therefore, to implement, on a trial basis, some of the merged activities of the proposed new office.

The other activities that are underway are to take a fresh look at the committee structure. Some of you who serve on the Graduate Affairs Committee know that this body is about to have some minor adjustments in anticipation of a very careful look at the way this committee can serve our interests with graduate education at IUPUI as we look forward to the future. This is a great moment for us because of the very impressive results we have had in external funding for research and a commitment to continue this growth in the decade ahead as many of the traditional sources of funding diminish and are replaced

by other growth opportunities. This campus is ideally situated to participate in some of these new funding opportunities coming through contracts and other opportunities at the state and local government level as opposed to the federal level. Having an officer who is attuned to the relationship of graduate and professional education and research should enable us to take advantage of these opportunities as they come up. We will have a fuller discussion of the restructuring and the implications of this when the task force report is presented in October, but we wanted you to know that we believe the search will be underway by the time that discussion takes place here.

**Bepko:** Just one footnote to the discussion about enrollments. Bill mentioned that the one area in which we had some drop was in graduate non-degree enrollment. Victor Borden just sent an e-mail around last night that puts this into perspective. In non-degree enrollment we are 12th in the United States -- of all 1,568 accredited colleges and universities, we are 12th in non-degree enrollments. At the graduate level, generally, we had some interesting positions for IUPUI. We are in the 14th position nationally out of all 1,568 institutions in terms of first professional enrollments (Medicine, Dentistry, Law, veterinary science, divinity, and related graduate programs.). We are 14th out of all those universities. Ahead of us are NYU, Georgetown, Harvard, Ohio State, Southern Cal, Minnesota, Pennsylvania, Iowa, and 13th is Michigan. Right below us is the University of Illinois at Chicago, Boston University, University of Florida, and George Washington University which are all interesting institutions, if you think of them as counterparts. The total of graduate and professional enrollments puts us 49th nationwide which is still in the top 50. That is interesting for IUPUI. Certainly, we think of ourselves as being where we ought to be, but it reflects a perspective in context of the graduate credit and non-degree enrollment.

I think there is even a broader perspective of the campus that we ought to start the year with. Enrollment issues are something we ought to be happy about, but I think there are many other things as well. I don't know how many of you were involved in the new faculty orientation this year, but the impressions that were created by the new faculty that came in were overwhelmingly positive. We have another bumper crop of new faculty to enliven and enrich the institution generally. The orientation program was better attended, I think, this year than it has ever been before. One by one, in meeting the new people that have joined us this year, I was as impressed as I have ever been by any group of new faculty. We have an enthusiastic faculty in general. We have always had a good standard of collegiality on the campus. I think that continues in this body this year. We will take up some issues, including the ones that are on the agenda for today, that I think put us into the forefront in terms of faculty discussion and faculty renewal. The Policy on Faculty Review and Enhancement in particular, I think, is something that we should be proud that we have voluntarily put on our agenda. The administration has attempted to maintain this level of collegiality and high spirits by continuing our progress of administrative reviews.

Just a word on that. The Rosentraub review is completed and we have finished discussions about it. There will be a report on it shortly. The reviews on Bill (Plater), Lillian Charleston, and Scott Evenbeck are just about finished and ready to be reported on. Earlier today we agreed on a panel of people to be reviewed for the coming year. We will announce that and have the committee appointments ready at the next October Council meeting.

The faculty has generated tremendous excitement in the community and that is reflected in the number

and volume of gifts that have been made to the University. Our gift income is up again by a very substantial percentage over last year. We are in the high teens of millions each year now and I think we will probably break through the \$20 million per year barrier in pretty short order. This morning we had a four hour discussion on the Campaign for IUPUI in which IU Foundation Vice President Phil Hardwick said that he thought that over the next five years we should break through to the \$30 million a year mark in annual giving as a result of the Campaign for IUPUI.

Our research figures, as Bill mentioned, continue to go up. This past year we had over \$128 million in grants and other awards for faculty work. The first month of the new year was what I think was an all time record for any one month. We had over \$23 million in awards for the first month of the year which, if extrapolated out for the full year, would move us up to Johns Hopkins. [laughter] We have all kinds of facilities developed and underway. There are eight different projects in some stage of development. Some of them are about finished. We will dedicate later this month the Indiana University Cancer Research Institute which is an enormously important addition to the School of Medicine and to the whole university. Included in those eight projects is campus housing which I know is something that you have been interested in and have asked questions about along the way. We did have a meeting of the IU Board of Trustees in June that resulted in some publicity about housing that made it sound as though we were not probably as far along as we really are. I think the financing of this project has become an issue. I think we can resolve it, but we are working on that and I hope sometime during the fall term the Trustees will give approval to a final financial plan so that we can go ahead with this first phase of a new era of housing for IUPUI on the west edge of the campus.

In addition to our own facilities, people who come to campus not only talk about how extraordinary our own physical facilities development has been, but they also talk about our surroundings. Everything around us is flowering. If you haven't been in the White River Park since the river walk and all the other amenities were finished, you ought to take advantage of that. It is really a superb adjoining property for the university. It is seamless. You can walk into White River Park without knowing you are off campus. I think right now, more than ever before, you can see, as I did today at noon, we had a concert on the mall or the Wood Plaza in front of the library where the fountain is, and there was a jazz group there that played at noon today. Sitting here on the steps, the grand staircase leading up to the library, looking at the Wood Plaza in the foreground and the cityscape in the background, I think that we have the most beautiful urban campus in the world today. That might have seemed like an over statement some years ago, but I think right now it is a very fair assessment of what is out there.

We have taken further steps with respect to the Clarian consolidation. Notwithstanding an article that appeared in the Indianapolis Business Journal this past Saturday or earlier this week, depending on when people read the IBJ, I think that the consolidation is still well on track. The hospital part of it is going extremely well. In fact, we just won a national award for the manner in which the human resource issues were handled by Indiana University and IUPUI in making the transition for thousands of employees from the Indiana University payroll to the Clarian payroll and all the incidental arrangements that had to be made -- all the personal human problems that arose from that kind of a transfer. It was done so well that we won a national award. The physicians are still working their way through the issues that will inevitably arise when we not only confront managed care on the one hand, but also the tendency toward



consolidation of practices on the other with previously Methodist oriented physicians and our IU faculty thinking through all the implications of associations of different kinds. We must keep an identifiable faculty for the School of Medicine and for the university. That is the thing that we are working on most of all. Making sure that we have the same commitment to teaching and research that we have always had among the physician faculty at IU.

We can take pride in the start of University College this fall. University College has gotten a lot of attention throughout the Indiana University system. The Indiana University Trustees have been very excited about this. They put on their agenda a special visit to University College when they come here in December for their regular meeting. University College, along with all the wonderful things that have gone on have continued to create attention for IUPUI around the country and in the world of higher education. We have a whole bunch of people that have been out this summer at seminars, conferences, institutes, and colloquia of various kinds dealing with higher education and addressing the major issues in higher education today. One of the first institutions mentioned in almost all of these various higher education forums is IUPUI. We can be thankful to all the people who have taken the message about IUPUI out to the higher education community, but in particular Bill Plater has gained great recognition and brought a lot of attention to IUPUI for the papers that he has presented and the thinking that he has done about higher education. All of this leads to things like the grants that we have been getting.

Yesterday we received news of Housing and Urban Development grants that were given to a handful of universities nationwide for community partnerships. We were at the top of that list. It also contributes to the sorts of things that we see each year in the rankings. We haven't yet made it into some of the ranking systems because some of the ranking systems are based on different types of criteria, but the one that gets read the most and I think influences the way people perceive higher education institutions is the U.S. News and World Report ranking of colleges. That just came out about two weeks ago. IUPUI, along with lots of urban universities, ranked in the third tier of national universities with other urbans like the University of Alabama/Birmingham, the University of Illinois/Chicago, Virginia Commonwealth, and Temple as well as with other campuses that are not particularly urban in their orientation like Arizona State, Louisiana State, the University of Oregon, South Carolina, and Utah. In the fourth tier we continue to see right below us other urban universities like Cleveland State, George Mason, Colorado/Denver, Missouri/St. Louis, Louisville, the University of Memphis, and some of our Indiana institutions which don't have an urban orientation such as Ball State and Indiana State. I think people will come to realize that these urban institutions are becoming more important and really are now center stage in American higher education. We are, at IUPUI, one of higher education's hot spots. The key to all of this, I believe, is the IUPUI spirit reflected in this body more than anywhere else over the years and that high level of collegiality that permits us to stay focused on the most important goals and objectives of the institution and not be distracted.

To make our little contribution to continuing that collegiality today, we wanted to resurrect something that existed some years ago, which we have not observed in recent years, but which was designed to recognize the new members of the Faculty Council. We had a reception after the first or second Faculty Council meeting each fall term. The reception was in honor of new Faculty Council members. We would like to resurrect that. We are hosting a reception in the cafeteria downstairs. I think any stairwell

will get you there. If you end up in a room with dentists working on patients, you can try a different stairwell. [laughter] It is in the cafeteria which has doors that open out onto a patio. On such a beautiful day we can either be inside or outside. We look forward to seeing you at that reception to congratulate the new members and to greet everyone for another new and, we hope, even more successful academic year in 1997-98.

**Porter:** Thank you very much.

### **Agenda Item V: President's Report: William Schneider**

**Schneider:** As usual the Chancellor and the Dean of the Faculties have given you all the good news. I am not going to give you bad news, but I thought I would say a little about the work that lies ahead of us. The Executive Committee and the chairs of the standing committees of the Faculty Council got together last week and went over the agenda items we hope to be working on for this year. The UFC committees had a similar meeting. We will be meeting in three weeks with the Presidents of the Faculties of the schools on campus (the campus governance leaders). In fact, if any of you are Presidents of the schools on campus, would you please let me know or let Bernice know.. There is a long list of matters that we will take up. I will tell you a little about them in groups.

There are a number of items having to do with faculty governance changes and improvements in the existing structures of committees. For example, at the end of last year the Budgetary Affairs Committee recommended the creation of a Technology Committee. Given the amount of money and the use of technology, it seemed to be a matter that was not clearly enough or directly enough amendable to advise from Faculty. The Executive Committee has decided to create at least an ad hoc committee for the year to look into the matter of establishing a more permanent committee by interviewing the various parties involved. There is a description of the new charge attached to the agenda for today describing what that committee will be doing. It turns out to be particularly timely given the changes that will be taking place this year with the new Vice President for Technology at Indiana University.

We also have revised the composition of the Planning Committee and given it a charge that will emphasize our longer range planning and exchanging of information. This will help it advise Vice Chancellor Banta in developing the goals and mission for the campus. We are also asking for a report after one year to see what that committee might recommend.

The school budgetary affairs committees were not able to meet with the campus Budgetary Affairs Committee for a workshop last year, but that is high on the agenda early this fall. Bob Keck, along with help from Patrick Rooney, will undertake this for a variety of reasons, not the least of which is the overall goal of trying to coordinate Faculty Council and the school faculty governance more closely.

One other task which we hope to accomplish this year is to develop campus wide search procedures. I hope that will be coming to the Council by the end of the year.

There also will be some changes in support for Faculty Council, both in personnel as well as technology. The Web Page is still alive and well although it needs to be updated. The goal is to facilitate information both to you and from you in the course of the year.

Two other things. The IU Academic Handbook was revised last year and, as they say, is in the mail. You should also be receiving a copy of the revised Indiana University Academic Handbook. As luck would have it, our supplement is not far behind. For a while we were actually ahead, but it is undergoing some last minute editing and, after twisting a few arms, I got a date for projected arrival in October, though that may be subject to change.

Under the heading of 'Faculty Affairs,' one of the most important and probably an item that will take up a good part of our time, is the Proposed Policy on Faculty Review and Enhancement known in other states and other quarters as Post Tenure Review. In fact, we will begin discussion of that item today.

There are a couple of other Faculty Affairs items that we will be taking up, if not completing, this year -- such as a Policy for Merger and Elimination of Programs which is a carry over from the policy adopted the year before last on Financial Exigency. Another item that came out of the (TERA Awards) last year was the allocation of funds for faculty development. The decision on how to allocate those funds, plus the work on the Faculty Review and Enhancement, convinced us that the question of investing in faculty and improving the quality of faculty is one that is worthy of examination. Under the heading of 'development' the Faculty Affairs Committee will be taking a look at the activities that already exists as well as new activities and funds that could help achieve this goal. Part of the funds, for example, that came in conjunction with TERA, will go to faculty development of part-time faculty. We are going to be looking at that much more broadly.

There will be a few items coming our way as usual from the University Faculty Council and the Trustees. Some of them we have already begun. The question of non-tenure track faculty (formerly called Tenure and Ineligible Faculty) was not completed last year though much progress was made and continued to be made over the summer. That will, I am sure, be coming back to this body before going to UFC for action and ultimately to the Trustees. We may need to make some strategic decisions about taking parts of it in order because it is a very large task. It is one that doesn't only affect us, but it affects all areas of the workforce in America today, as you know, if you paid attention to the UPS strike.

There is a proposed change in the sexual harassment policy which initially was thought to be fairly minor but it appears there are some more significant problems. That may come to the campus for a review.

The Policy for Partial Family-Related Leave, which was approved by UFC, was actually presented to the Trustees at their June meeting and some questions were raised which we are going to be trying to iron out with the Trustees.

The Chancellor mentioned the Trustees. They will be meeting on this campus on December 5, 1997 and

February 27, 1998. The University Faculty Council will be meeting here at IUPUI on October 14 and November 11. All of those meetings are open to the public and at the UFC meetings you can even speak if you wish. I would urge you to come.

One thing has already been alluded to about the next meeting in October of the Faculty Council. I will mention two items in particular that will be coming up. The Proposed Move to the NCAA Division I, though you think we may have finished with it. We will probably have a more formal resolution to act on before it goes to the Trustees later that month. That meeting in October will be held in Kokomo. We will also continue to talk about Faculty Review and Enhancement, and we will begin to take up the Research and Graduate policy report with either Doris Merritt and/or T. K. Li to respond to questions about it.

**Porter:** No doubt we will have a busy year.

### **Agenda Item VI: Question and Answer Period**

**Porter:** Consistent with our tradition, we have listed a Question and Answer Period. We would like to limit it to no more than 10 minutes. I would like to remind you, but particularly to provide emphasis with this new arrangement, it is going to be very difficult for those of us at the front table to know who is speaking. As Martin Spechler demonstrated, would you please indicate who you are when you wish to speak. To catch the eye of someone at the head table you may have to really raise your hand and wave more vigorously than in the past because there are some of you who I am not seeing. If I appear to be ignoring you, it is not intentional. Are there any questions?

**Warfel:** Earlier we were talking about the problem we have with student retention. Martin was asking about our very practical strategies to do something about that. I would be remiss if I didn't remind the Council of a fairly mundane but very important issue and that is the issue of child care. A recent survey of students who did not return to IUPUI showed that three percent put down as their reason, problems with child care. We do have plans for a newer and larger child care facility on campus which will help, certainly not solve, but will help with the child care situation. I was wondering if we could have an update as to the status of that new facility.

**Bepko:** Unfortunately, we have not made good progress on this. I think it is at this stage something that we are embarrassed about because we haven't made better progress. It is tied, in its current plan, to the housing project. It will be dependent on our progress with the housing project. If we can't proceed with the housing project, we have to spin it off altogether and just build it or renovate a building for it. The variables have been such that even though we have been more and more eager because the time has come and gone since we should have done this, the variables have been so numerous and some of them so uncertain that we have not made better progress. One of the other variables is the State Board of Health Building which is still being discussed with the State Budget Agency. We have been talking to them for over a year now about taking over the facility (actually we proposed discussions years ago but we have been talking for a year) and have not been able to resolve the future of that building. That is interrelated with child care as well because it could be that if we don't have the option of building the

child care in connection with housing, that we could move something into the State Board of Health Building. That would free up space in an appropriate building that could be easily renovated for child care. The most likely candidate for that would be the AO Building. It is a matter of frustration for all of us that we don't have this finished yet. I am sorry that we don't have better news.

**Warfel:** I know that you understand the sense of urgency there is out there on this issue. I think we should be embarrassed if we don't have something for child care soon.

**Bepko:** I think that is a fair comment.

**E. Jones:** This is an issue which I brought up last year and it was sort of left as sensitive and that has to do with the selling of tobacco products on campus. Given the activity this summer with lawsuits and settlement with the tobacco industry, is that an issue we could now deal with more directly?

**Bepko:** I don't know whether that is a question for the University administration or whether that is a question for the group here at large.

**E. Jones:** I know they sell tobacco products in the bookstores. That seems kind of counterproductive.

**Bepko:** We have indicated that it would be no great loss for the University although there would be some lost revenue, I believe. But, the revenue loss would not be great enough to cause us to want to resist the notion that the campus should be totally smoke free, as it is, but also free of any sale of tobacco products. I think this body itself is divided on that issue. There are a lot of people who feel strongly otherwise. In that type of situation, if this body gave us a mandate, I think we would follow it with no question. But, I think the groups that advise us and set broad policy, especially on issues like this that are part of the ethic of the institution, I think that we ought to hear from you. I think this group is divided.

**Schneider:** We can take that up at the Executive Committee and see whether and how we might want to resolve it.

**E. Jones:** I will look forward to that. Thank you.

**Porter:** Are there other questions? If not, we will move forward to the next item.

## **Agenda Item VII: Unfinished Business**

**Porter:** Our next item relates to IUPUI Circular 97-03 which is in your packet. We provided this to you ahead of time so that you would have an opportunity to read through it and understand the background. This is coming to you from the Executive Committee and Bill Schneider will present it.

**Schneider:** The background of this is that last year you, as Faculty Council, acted favorably on a report

by an ad hoc committee to revise the Board of Review procedures and include a mediation process. The mediation process called for a committee that would act as an informal and, in some cases, somewhat more formal, mechanism to resolve disputes before they went to the Boards of Review. The problem was that procedure was to start July 1, but we didn't have the committee available to receive requests. We needed time to work out election procedures. What the Executive Committee agreed to do was to appoint an interim group in case any matters came up before we could devise the election procedure. Although we promised to do that in September or October, what we decided to do was to put it on the same election cycle as the Boards of Review which is in January. Therefore, what we are asking you to do is to formalize the interim mediation committee that is listed on Circular 97-03 and allow us to wait until January to create the more formal mechanism for election.

**Porter:** Therefore, the Executive Committee is bringing forward the motion as printed on the circular. Is there any discussion on the motion to create a five member faculty mediation committee to serve until January? Hearing no discussion, we will move forward to a vote. All of those in favor of the motion before you, say "Aye." Opposed, "No." The motion is carried.

You have before you the slate that the Executive Committee is presenting. As we indicated, there is an opportunity for nominations from the floor if you have consent of the individual and they meet the criteria of having experience. Are there any nominations? Hearing no nominations, the nominations will be closed. We are suggesting that we elect these individuals by acclamation.

**Langsam:** Second.

**Porter:** All of those in favor, say "Aye". Opposed, "No." [Motion carried.] Thank you very much.

### **Agenda Item VIII: New Business**

**Porter:** Now we will move to what should be the more interesting discussion. We are going to move into a discussion of a document that has been put together by the Faculty Affairs Committee. Sara Hook is chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee. We thought it would be a good idea to begin with Sara giving you a few comments of introduction and then we can have a discussion so we have a sense of what this body thinks about this proposal.

**Hook:** You have before you a document entitled Faculty Review and Enhancement. This document was prepared over the past few months. Most of the work took place in the spring semester. We started with a small subcommittee from the Faculty Affairs Committee. We reviewed an extensive number of Post-Tenure Review policies from other colleges and universities around the country. We did a lot of reading. We talked to other faculty. We then made some philosophical decisions about what we might want such a program to look like here at Indiana University and particularly IUPUI. From there, after we drafted our policy and circulated it through our subcommittee, we went to our full Faculty Affairs Committee and had them look at the document and give us feedback. At the same time, Dean Plater was kind enough to meet with me and look through the policy. Toward the beginning of June our Faculty Affairs

Committee met for a final time before the summer break. We approved sending forth the policy as we had finished it up at that time. Over the summer Becky Porter was kind enough to meet with me and, while we made no substantive changes, we did move some paragraphs around and did some general word changes to make it more compatible with other policies that are already in the Handbook.

I would like to say some preliminary words about Post Tenure Review before we address the document. I have done a lot of study of this issue and I know it is an extremely contentious one. It was a very difficult one to face myself, being a tenured, full rank faculty member. The thought of having to put together dossiers every few years was really not too attractive to me. As I started looking at the full issue, I realized there are ways to accomplish the kinds of things we want to accomplish, I believe, with this document in a very positive proactive way. One form of Post Tenure Review is the 'every five years all faculty will' type of policy. The other is what we might call an 'initiating mechanism' or a 'triggering mechanism. I like the word 'triggering', but some other members of the committee didn't care for that so I was willing to make that change. In these types of policies, only in the event of chronic substandard performance, would such a review be triggered. So, we are not doing a broad brush 'everybody has to do it.' We are only catching the few faculty members who maybe do need some special assistance. I was reviewing some tapes this summer and the consensus seems to be nationally (this was a whole session devoted to Post Tenure Review), the consensus is, when we are talking about chronically deficient faculty members, we are talking about one to three percent of the full faculty population. So, it seems silly to some people that we have to have a broad policy -- everybody has to do it every five years -- to catch one to three percent of faculty members who may need some special assistance.

Another aspect of our policy is that we decided we wanted to be very, very positive, not punitive. So, our policy is a two-track policy. There is the consideration of a faculty member who, through annual reviews and reports, is shown to be chronically deficient, and a mechanism whereby that faculty member will sit down with a peer committee and have a faculty development plan developed for them. The other track of this is for the faculty member who really would like a change. Perhaps they want a rebalancing of their efforts; perhaps they have a new research interest and they know that it could be several years before this will begin to bear fruit in terms of their productivity and they also need faculty peer assistance in not only guiding them in the appropriate activities they should seek in order to reach their goals, but also the Dean's commitment for funding or release time or whatever there may be.

You will notice that this is quite a lengthy document. We have tried to build in a very positive proactive stance. You will notice that it is very heavily tied in with the need for faculty development and I think this blends well with our new commitments coming through the TERA program for faculty development. Only in the case of a faculty member who at the end of their faculty development plan still was not getting with the program would there be significant sanctions. These are already taken care of in some of our existing policies on Dismissal for Misconduct and Incompetence.

We have worked extremely hard on the document. I think it serves our purposes well. I think another statistic I heard is that 69 percent of universities and colleges either have a Post Tenure Review, have been thinking about Post Tenure Review, or in fact are drafting Post Tenure Review. I feel that it is the

kind of an issue that is there to stay. I would rather see us draft something that fits our specific needs here within our own campus and university than have something else adopted that might not address our specific needs and issues here. If anyone has any questions, I would be happy to answer them.

**Vessely:** I didn't actually read all of this but did you talk about the person who is one of these chronically deficient people who says, "Well, maybe if I just change my disciplinary course of action I will get better." This is a person who maybe has done faculty development and hasn't been going anywhere with that and says, "I will just change courses here" and the University then would make some investment and they would become chronically whatever. Was there a provision that said at least that one enhancement piece would not be available to you if you had already been identified as chronically deficient?

**Hook:** There are numerous safeguards built into the policy; not only in terms of safeguards for the individual faculty member so today they don't just suddenly decide that 'I am deficient in some area.' There are also safeguards built in for the University's interest. I think what became particularly clear was not wanting a development plan where suddenly the University was investing significant amounts of money or perhaps granting generous release time and then nothing came out of it. There is that protection. Also, the plan does envision benchmarking steps along the way. So that if a faculty member one year into their plan still has not achieved the benchmark, then at that time there could be some sanction. So, what we are trying to avoid is 'today I decided I want to do this,' then big money gets invested and three years later I haven't done that. We put in those safeguards and we are very cognizant of not wanting investment that was not going to be returned.

**Vessely:** That is something that I noticed in my years on sabbatical leaves -- that is that the University did make investments and people would come back with a new plan because they didn't get very far with the old plan. So, I can see that same possibility.

**Schneider:** There is a peer review committee that makes the judgments of whether or not the request is reasonable. So, there is that safeguard. I wanted to add one thing to Sara's comments which is what we are going to do with this. We obviously want to hear questions, feedback, problems, etc. that have to do with this. We would also like to hear some suggestions about the best way to make sure that all the faculty know about this because this is something that will affect all the faculty. If you have some suggestions along those lines, please make them known. Finally, up the line the University Faculty Council, the Trustees, and the President of the University are very interested in this. It may very well become part of our overall University policy. We have tentatively made the commitment not to enact it immediately for both our sakes, in case there are some changes up the line that would require revisions. We are going to start discussion, but we are also going to give them a chance to see whether or not this may become a university policy. In that case we may have to wait for them to catch up with us.

**M. Fisher:** I have two comments after having read this in depth. One concern I have is in the multiple places where a lot of decision points are left to schools. That would leave a lot of potential for great variability from school to school and then the fairness issue comes in as to how it can be done equitably



and I think that would also put some legal concerns on the University if there was not fairness across schools. The second comment is that there was a comment concerning directors and department chairs being provided training on leadership and personnel management. That was one sentence. It seems to me that that is a weakness that really needs to be expanded and formalized within this process and assured so that the initiation mechanism is emphasized.

**Hook:** Your point is very well taken about the personnel training. We felt absolutely convinced that that is a problem because when you don't feel confident of your knowledge of human resources management or labor law, you don't feel confident to go ahead and make these decisions. So, we were very cognizant of the need for that type of training and assistance.

**M. Fisher:** Could that be expanded?

**Hook:** I have made a note of that.

**Slocum:** There are a couple of things that stood out to me that I think need to be perhaps changed or slightly modified. One is the use of the term 'academic freedom.' That is a very vague term. We don't really know what 'academic freedom' means. Some people think that it means anything that a faculty member wants to do or doesn't want to do inside the classroom. That is academic freedom. In other words, there is no limit to that whatsoever. The second point is that it says review criteria and the level of performance which might result in a faculty review shall be determined by each school, with a written policy available to all faculty of the school. However, the definition of "unsatisfactory performance" must include the concept of lack of effort, rather than merely the lack of results." Unless we have some definition of what 'lack of effort' means, I don't think anyone would ever be able to prove that there is a lack of effort on the part of the faculty member.

**Hook:** Your point is very well taken. I think that what the committee was cognizant of, in that case, was in terms of not penalizing someone for lack of results when, perhaps, the research had not yet come to fruition, when perhaps the teaching had not fully come to development. This is truly trying to get away from that and look more at what inputs had this person made to try to be productive.

**E. Jones:** On the last page of the document, Item #8: "The faculty member shall have the right of appeal and retains all rights of appeal ...." To what body did you envision that going to? Would it be the Mediation Committee or Board of Review, or Promotion and Tenure? Where would that go? Did you identify that?

**Hook:** I would think it would be the Board of Review.

**E. Jones:** Somehow that ought to be stated.

**Spechler:** I think this is splendid work on the part of the committee. I speak as a member of the committee. There are two serious points. One has been alluded to that the schools, as far as I know, do

not have a very definite policy for this concept of a minimum acceptable level of performance. Does that mean that if one aspect of one's performance is unsatisfactory, that the Balanced Case is somehow deficient? I don't know, but that seems to be the crux of the matter. It will require a lot of work on the part of the schools to define that. I myself don't think that these criteria have to be comparable across schools given the enormous difference in expectations of the various schools. But, my colleague may know more about the legal situation than I do.

It is envisioned that a faculty member's record will be examined, at least in part, by an elected committee at the school level. That is very familiar to us in another context -- Promotion and Tenure -- which some of us are going through now. As chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, I can tell you it is a very difficult and arduous task even for people who have been in academic life only a few years. When we are talking about people who have been around for quite a few years, the record will be more extensive, more complicated, complex. It will certainly involve some health considerations, family responsibilities, and a whole host of things. My question is, on what basis will this elected committee evaluate such a complicated record, and, I must say in human terms, often very sensitive questions.

Generally speaking, even in the School of Liberal Arts, and we are all liberally educated people, it is very difficult for somebody in one part of the school just because he or she is elected, to evaluate work in another part of the school. I imagine that is true in most of your schools as well. So, [inaudible] reference will be made to outside evaluations. This is my main point and the one that came home to me again and again this week in a long meeting on promotion and tenure.

These procedures have become very burdensome. It is particularly difficult to get outside letters the way we do for promotion and tenure. It will be far more difficult, I predict, to get outside letters in this kind of context because the record is far more complicated, more lengthy, and because of the human aspect of it. We don't pay for outside letters for promotion and tenure. We probably could never pay enough to get letters from the outside on such delicate matters and they will be delicate. Even though the committee has done splendid work up to now, Sara, I think we have some more splendid work to do.

**Porter:** As you are reviewing this procedure, I would remind you to look at the policies that are in place for dismissal for tenured faculty for academic misconduct and incompetence because you need to understand what is already in place to see how the review process could lead into a dismissal process for incompetence.

**Langsam:** In the section that talks about Guiding Principles, there is a statement which states: "A corollary of this policy is a fair and equitable early retirement system which provides faculty with the opportunity to retire from their positions in a dignified manner." I have two or three questions. One is, do you have any more sense of what that means? Does that mean that I can get tenure at 30 and then retire at 32?

Second, it worries some of us older people in the room, since any attempt to make changes in the 18/20 rule would, according to the IRS, endanger the 18/20 for everyone. So, any modification to allow

retirements earlier than 64 under 18/20 would have disastrous results. So, can you be more specific about what this exactly means?

**Hook:** Your points are very well taken. The committee made a conscious decision that retirement was clearly far outside of the realm of this document. We did want to make it very clear that there has to be some examination of retirement. What I would not want to see happen is this document used as a hammer to force a more senior faculty member to retire. Certainly, there has to be a better way. I look at employment models. I look at the corporate models. It is cruel, it is heartless. We could be the new employer of the 21st century in terms of our humanity and our permitting the employees to not only work with dignity but also to leave that work with dignity. That was just philosophical but we do see that as needing to be worked on.

**Weetman:** This touches on what I was going to comment on. I am not commenting so much on chronic deficiency -- I think that is clear -- but on how this relates to an individual having some uncontrollable change in their situations, say disability or that sort of thing. A faculty member may need to change their role due to disability.

**Hook:** We didn't really, in our deliberations, address the issue of disability. This is more for the faculty member who wants a change in their career or research or teaching -- new venues of activity rather than one precipitated by ill health, family reasons, or disability. This was not even within the realm of our consideration.

**Weetman:** So, I think it needs to somewhat be in the realm of your consideration.

**Mannheimer:** I agree with Marty. This is splendid work and very informative. I have a comment, mostly a suggestion. It would seem the stress or flex in this system is going to come at a managerial level, at the level of the dean or the chair. These people are going to need some sort of personnel management skills or training or such. I would further suggest that, at least in the case of Herron, and I would suppose in other schools, there is a need for unit mission statements that accommodate this kind of a concept, to talk about selected emphasis or de-emphasis of teaching, research and service over the course of the faculty member's career -- and how the individual's evolution may dovetail with an evolving unit mission. Without a mission statement written with these considerations in mind, and without some managerial skills at the mid-management level, we're going to have some real problems. Again, I think it is wonderful work, but when we enact it, and I hope we do as expediently as possible, there is going to be some need for an administrative directive perhaps to the chairs and the deans to get this stuff done quickly. I don't know how much of a process that is going to turn out to be, but it's necessary, I think.

**Chernoff:** I had a concern about how this program meshes with, as you mentioned, the existing rules about incompetence or academic misconduct. The way I read this was that you had two academic annual reviews and then perhaps the constitution of the committee, which then made recommendations that will probably take a year, and then a couple of years to try to do what the committee suggests you should

do. If you have somebody who is genuinely incompetent or doing something really awful, that sounds like they have got five more years before you can get rid of them. My own department has run into that with a former chairman.

**Hook:** You have identified a major tension in the document, the tension to balance faculty protection with administrative ability to act in a timely fashion.

**Porter:** However, if you do something that is really awful, the policies can be enacted without going through the review process. That is why I was encouraging you to go back and look at those two documents so that you could go back and see if it is clear how these different situations would play themselves out.

**Chernoff:** I think there may be lesser situations where somebody may simply not be filling their obligations properly as a teacher, etc. They could say, "Well, I insist on going through this process."

**Schneider:** It is not meant to substitute for it. It is meant for the kind of gray area in between. But, that is clearly where it falls. It falls between the faculty doing their job as they are supposed to and the dismissal.

**Wagner:** I am also on the committee and was on Charlie's subgroup. There is a point here that would really relate to us and that is that many of these situations should not [inaudible]. We are now talking about Plan B. Plan A is voluntary so that is a different issue. But, for Plan B, in order for that to happen there should be two negative annual reviews. I think part of what the committee wanted was for the folks who were being paid big bucks to be administrators, to do that in order to enter t his process, the person would twice not meet a minimal standard in an annual review. One would think that someone who gets an annual review that says 'you are not doing well' would understand the need to make changes. If in fact it happens twice in a row, then this process starts. We believe that many situations could be dealt with administratively if the administrators had that information. It is not just Human Resources. Some of the administrators became administrators because they are really good teach ers or researchers and maybe they should get some training in administration. But now, if in fact this process has occurred, we would move into Plan B, but often this should be dealt with at the school or department level before that time.

**Porter:** If possible, we would like for you to think about bringing the discussion to conclusion so we do have time for our reception following the meeting, but I am not indicating that I am going to cut you off..

**Rothe:** On the question of annual reviews, the implication is this is done by the chair of the department. It seems to me that this is dangerous to have these annual reviews only by the chair. There should be some kind of departmental peer review as well because sometimes a chair can go along with incompetence and this can go on for years and years. So, in addition to being particularly critical of a faculty member's performance, they can be particularly not critical. So, it seems to me that the need for some departmental peer group annual review might be added.

**Hook:** You have raised a point that I think is similar to what Steven Mannheimer has raised in terms of schools now needing to do some fairly significant work in a lot of different areas in order to make this kind of a policy work. Schools really do vary on what they have already in place. For instance, our school already has a career plan and a faculty annual summary report and there is an effort to match the mission of this school with the individual research goals, teaching goals, and service goals of the faculty member. I do think there is great variation in schools and schools will have to do some work to make this policy effective.

**E. Fineberg:** My department in the School of Medicine has developed a mission statement and performance criteria. In order for this policy to come into play I think that one additional element would have to be added and that is the requirement that departments and schools develop mission statements and criteria performance so that, in fact, the addition performance could be judged against those.

**Spechler:** I would just like to add that this document should be read along with the two documents that were mentioned and also the Teaching Capacity Model, which has been accepted as policy at Indiana University. That Teaching Capacity Model envisions a substitution between teaching effort, research, and service efforts. Also when it was discussed and passed in this body about two years ago, it called for something along these lines and particularly that people who are asked to teach more because their research efforts have been less successful than in the past, should be extended the opportunity to revive their wish if at all possible. I want to emphasize this, we had particularly in mind, female faculty members who may have spent quite a few years serving the teaching and service needs of this university and would like to get promoted. But, if they are teaching a great deal, it may not be possible for them to restart their research efforts. Of course, that can apply equally well to men. The important part of the Teaching Capacity Model is reversibility and I think that is a principle that we should continue to embrace.

**Porter:** Are there any suggestions about ways for distributing this among the faculty so that indeed we have the faculty informed and this could be widely discussed?

**Robertson:** I am not sure how to distribute it, but I do think when it is widely known to the faculty, Plan A and Plan B ought to be clearly separated in the way that they are explained. I think Plan B is going to be so overwhelmingly punitive in tone that Plan A is going to be swept up in the negative attitude towards Plan B and people will be reluctant to participate in Plan A for fear of being stigmatized.

**Hoyt:** I am assuming that it would be best going to the individual faculty councils for their schools and let each school report back to the Council or perhaps that has been done.

**Schneider:** We will take this up when we talk to the presidents of the school councils. I wonder if it has been useful in the past to have open campus wide forums. Do you think that might be appropriate?

**Peterson:** I would suggest a blanket mailing on the one hand, but on the other hand, to hand something out to everybody on campus that is multiple pages long and as complex as this is, I am sure you are not

going to get very much reading of it. One of the things that might be done, if you are going to send this out, is have a discreet summary that might peak people's interest at the beginning of that document that would be balanced, obviously, but they would get the main points. The document would be there to clarify the points and to have them read if they really have a specific interest in it.

**Mannheimer:** I further suggest that this be posted on the Web and perhaps presented in a workshop of the chairs of the schools' tenure and promotion committees.

**Porter:** We will continue discussion of this and keep you informed of what is happening at the UFC and other levels. We will have continuing opportunities. Is there any other new business to bring before the group?

### **Agenda Item IX: Adjournment**

**Porter:** Hearing no other items of new business, we will stand adjourned as long as you promise to go downstairs to the cafeteria for the reception. Thank you.

**[Minutes prepared by David Frisby, Coordinator, UN 403, 274-2215 (Fax 274-2970),  
[fcouncil@iupui.edu](mailto:fcouncil@iupui.edu) : <http://hoosiers.iupui.edu/faccoun/faccou.htm> ]**

FC971009 MINUTES

APPROVED FC980402

Indiana University - Purdue University Indianapolis

**Faculty Council Minutes**

**October 9, 1997**

School of Dentistry, Room S115

3:30 - 5:30 p.m.

**Attendance Record.**

**I. Voting Members (104):**

Absent---: Allen, Stephen (Elected: Medicine 6/99);

Present--: **Atkinson, Simon** (Elected: Medicine 6/99);

Present--: **Baldwin, James** (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Banta, Trudy** (Elected: At Large 6/99. Ex Officio: Chancellor's Admin. designee);

Present--: **Barlow, John** (Ex Officio: Dean of Liberal Arts);

Absent---: Barnes, A. James (Ex Officio: Dean of Public & Environmental Affairs);

Present--: **Bepko, Gerald** (Ex Officio: Officer: Chancellor of IUPUI.);

Absent---: Besch, Henry (Elected: Medicine 6/99);

Absent---: Bippen, Paul (Ex Officio: Dean of IUPU Columbus);

Absent---: Bjork, Ulf Jonas (Elected: Journalism 6/99);

Absent---: Blomquist, William (Elected: Liberal Arts 6/98);

Absent---: Broadie, Thomas (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/99);

Absent---: Brothers, Linda (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Absent---: Brown, Trevor (Ex Officio: Dean of Journalism);

Present--: **Burr, David** (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Canty-Mitchell, Janie** (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Chernoff, Ellen** (Elected: Science 6/99);

Absent---: Cobb, Karen (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/99);

Absent---: Cochran, Michael (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98);

Absent---: Cronin, Blaise (Ex Officio: Dean of Library & Information Science)  
(Bloomington);

Present--: **Crowell, Dring** (Elected: Science 6/99);

Absent---: Dalsing, Michael (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Absent---: Dalton, Dan (Ex Officio: Dean of Business);

Present--: **DeSchepper, Edward** (Elected: Dentistry 6/98);

Absent---: Dickerson-Putman, Jeanette (Elected: Liberal Arts 6/98);

Absent---: DiMicco, Joseph (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Absent---: Dunning, Jeremy (Ex Officio: Dean of Continuing Studies) (Bloomington);

Absent---: Eble, John (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent---: Eckerman, Nancy (Elected: Medicine 6/98);

Absent---: Evenbeck, Scott (Ex Officio: Dean of University College),

Absent---: Faris, James V. (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Fineberg, Naomi** (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Fineberg, S. Edwin** (Elected: At Large 6/98. Ex Officio: UFC Representative  
6/98);



Present--: **Fisher, Mary** (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Absent---: Ford, David (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Fore, Julie** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Alternate: Fredland, Richard (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98)--

[via **Rebecca Porter** (Allied Health Sciences)];

Absent---: Froehlich, Janice (Elected: Medicine 6/98);

Present--: **Galanti, Paul** (Elected: Law 6/98. Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/99);

Alternate: Gardner, Carol (Elected: Liberal Arts 6/99)--

[via **Bob Sandy** (Liberal Arts)];

Present--: **Gilman, Linda** (Elected: Nursing 6/99);

Alternate: Gokhale, Sanjiv (Elected: Engineering & Technology)--

[via **M. Erdogan Sener** (Engineering & Technology)];

Absent---: Goldblatt, Lawrence (Ex Officio: Dean of Dentistry);

Alternate: Greene, Roberta (Ex Officio: Dean of Social Work)--

[via **J. M. Kapoor** (Social Work)];

Present--: **Gregory, Richard** (Elected: Dentistry 6/98);

Absent---: Hall, Robert (Elected: Science 6/98);

Present--: **Hamant, Celestine** (Elected: Allied Health Sciences 6/99);

Absent---: Hart, Stuart (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98);

Present--: **Hawley, Dean** (Elected: Medicine 6/98);

Alternate: Holden, Robert (Ex Officio: Dean of Medicine)--

[via **Meredith Hull** (Medicine)];

Present--: **Hook, Sara** (Elected: At Large 6/98. Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98);

Absent---: Hoyt, Dolores (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98);

Present--: **Jafari, Maymanat** (Elected: University Libraries 6/99);

Present--: **Jones, Elizabeth** (Elected: Physical Education 6/98);

Absent---: Karlson, Henry (Elected: At Large 6/98. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/98);

Present--: **Keck, Juanita** (Elected: At Large 6/99. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/99);

Present--: **Keck, Robert** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent---: Keffer, M. Jan (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/99);

Present--: **Kellum, P. Nicholas** (Ex Officio: Dean of Physical Education);

Absent---: Leapman, Stephen (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent---: Lefstein, Norman (Ex Officio: Dean of Law);

Present--: **Luerssen, Thomas** (Elected: Medicine 6/98);

Absent---: Man, Joyce Yan-Yun (Elected: Public & Environmental Affairs 6/98);

Absent---: Mannheimer, Steven (Elected: At Large 6/99. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/98);

Present--: **Mannix, Edward** (Elected: Medicine 6/99);

Present--: **McBride, Angela** (Ex Officio: Dean of Nursing);

Absent---: Modibo, Najja (Elected: Continuing Studies 6/98);

Absent---: Ng, Bart (Elected: At Large 6/99. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/98);

Present--: **Olson, Byron** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent---: Parsons, Michael (Elected: Education 6/98);

Absent---: Peters, G. David (Elected: Music 6/98);

Present--: **Peterson, Richard** (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98);

Present--: **Plater, William** (Ex Officio: Chancellor's Administrative Designee);

Present--: **Pless, John** (Elected: Medicine 6/99);

Present--: **Porter, Rebecca** (Elected Officer: Vice President 6/98. Ex Officio: UFC Rep. 6/98);

Present--: **Porterfield, Amanda** (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Powers, Gerald** (Elected: At Large 6/98. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/99);

Absent---: Rescorla, Frederick (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Present--: **Rizkalla, Maher** (Elected: Engineering & Technology 6/98);

Present--: **Robertson, Jean** (Elected: Herron 6/99);

Present--: **Rogers, Richard** (Elected: Business 6/99);

Present--: **Ross, Beverly** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Present--: **Rothe, Carl** (Elected: Med 6/99. Ex Off: Exec C. 6/99, & UFC Rep 6/99);

Present--: **Schneider, William** (Elected Officer: President 6/98. Elected: At Large 6/98.);

Absent---: Shay, Robert (Ex Officio: Dean of Herron);

Absent---: Sothmann, Mark S. (Ex Officio: Dean of Allied Health Sciences);

Present--: **Spechler, Martin** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent---: Stocum, David (Ex Officio: Dean of Science);

Present--: **Sutton, Susan** (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Absent---: Svanum, Soren (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent---: Tarver, Robert (Elected: Medicine 6/99);

Absent---: Tompkins, Philip (Ex Officio: Director of University Libraries);

Present--: **Vermette, Rosalie** (Elected: At Large 6/99. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/99);

Absent---: Vessely, Jeffery (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent---: Wagner, Marion (Elected: Social Work 6/99. Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/99);

Present--: **Warfel, Kathleen** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent---: Warren, Donald (Ex Officio: Dean of Education);

Present--: **Watt, Jeffrey** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent---: Webb, Charles (Ex Officio: Dean of Music) (Bloomington);

Present--: **Webb, Dorothy** (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Weetman, Robert** (Elected: Medicine 6/98);

Absent---: West, Karen (Elected: Medicine 6/98);

Alternate: Wilkins, Harriet (Appointed Officer: Parliamentarian 6/98. Elected: At Large 6/98)--

[via **Carl Rothe** (Medicine)];

Present--: **Yokomoto, Charles** (Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/98);

Present--: **Yurtseven, H. Oner** (Ex Officio: Dean of Engineering & Technology).

## II. Non-Voting Members (3):

Absent---: Phillabaum, Melinda (Ex Officio: Staff Council President);

Absent---: Barlay, Thua (Ex Officio: Student Assembly President);

Absent---: Yovits, Marshall (Ex Officio: Senior Academy President).

## III. Guests/Visitors/Others (non-voting):

Present--: **Bartlow, J. Douglas** (UITs Audio Engineer: Recorder);

Present--: **Chumley, Bernice** (Faculty Council Secretary);

Present--: **Chumley, Bill** (Retired: Purchasing);

Present--: **Chumley, Jonathan** (Guest);

Present--: **Grove, Mark** (Registrar);

Present--: **Kulsrud, Bill** (Business);

Present--: **Merritt, Doris** (Research & Sponsored Programs);

Present--: **Moore, Mike** (Athletics Department);

Present--: **Rogers, Richard** (Business);

Present--: **Suhre, Vernon** (Guest).

**Agenda Item I & II: Call to Order & Memorial Resolutions.**

**Porter:** Good afternoon, I think we are ready. We would like to start the meeting with our memorial resolutions. You have them listed on the agenda. We are remembering today Joseph Ingram, Alice Lynn, Bernard Morrell, Charles Slemenda, and Virgil Stolting. Would you please stand for a moment of silence.

Thank you.

**Agenda Item III: Recognition of Bernice Chumley, Faculty Council Secretary.**

**Porter:** We have an opportunity this afternoon to recognize an extended period of service to the Faculty Council and I am going to turn the meeting over to President Schneider to make the presentations.

**Schneider:** Thank you. The item on the agenda - Recognition of Bernice Chumley, left out one important part. The recognition is upon the occasion of her retirement. So, believe it or not this will be the last council meeting that Bernice at least will be at the table, she's invited to come for old time's sake and see how things will go. But that will certainly be something new. Bernice came to IUPUI back in the 1960's before there was IUPUI. She worked in the Purchasing Department and in the School of Education before 1980 when she took up the job that she's been in since-- mainly providing support to the IUPUI Faculty and Staff Councils. I've tried to count it up and I'm not sure I have it correctly, but at least nine presidents [Miriam Langsam ( Liberal Arts), P. Kent Sharp (Engineering & Technology), Glen Sagraves (Dentistry), Henry Besch (Medicine), Susan Zunt (Dentistry), Jeffery Vessely (Physical Education), Richard Peterson (Medicine), Richard Fredland (Liberal Arts), Kathleen Warfel (Medicine), William Schneider (Liberal Arts)] or as they were called, secretaries of the faculty, she has served or put up with as the case may be. She has suffered us with patience and with good spirit all that time and with good work. As the faculty and the campus have grown in size she's managed to

take it all in stride. Now we've asked a number of the past faculty presidents or secretaries to come here. I thought it might be appropriate for them if they could come up in fact to the front so that we can show something more than just a token of our appreciation. Would you please come down if you are a past president.

\*\*\*\*\*

And here's a nice silver bowl. I'll read the inscription. Bernice Chumley in grateful recognition of 30 years of dedicated service to IUPUI. IUPUI Faculty Council October 9, 1997.

**Bernice Chumley:** Thank you. [Applause]

**Chancellor Bepko:** Can I say something to Bernice? You've been a good friend to all of us and a wonderful colleague, but there's somebody else in the Chumley family who's here that I think we ought to recognize. Because I guess you met your husband, Bill, in the Purchasing Department. [Laughter] Bill Chumley spent a career with IUPUI as well and retired just a couple of years ago. And Bill looks terrific--he looks younger now than he did when he retired.

**Bernice Chumley:** I want to introduce Dr. [Jonathan] Chumley and my good friend and neighbor, Vernon Suhre. And I'll have a couple more coming a little later.

[Applause]

**Bepko:** I think this is one of those wonderful situations where more than one person in a family is a part of the IUPUI family. Congratulations and best wishes.

**Bernice Chumley:** Thank you. Thank you.

**Agenda Item IV: Administrative Report: Chancellor Gerald L. Bepko.**

**Porter:** Thank you and we'll now move on to the administrative report. Chancellor Bepko.

**Bepko:** Just a couple of very brief things. I'm going to have to slip out in just a few minutes to take a break, probably 15 minutes or 20 minutes, because the Commission for Higher Education is meeting today and tomorrow on campus and they're going to tour the Cancer Research Institute which was just dedicated last Friday. And I'm going to go over to greet them as

they arrive. But a couple of things: there were questions asked about the timetable for childcare and we have a document here that lays out the timing of the events that we project will take place this year leading to the start of construction next summer for an independent childcare facility. This is a timetable that has been created independent of the housing that we have been talking about for the last couple of years. We think that the housing is stalled for the moment. I don't think it's going to be derailed altogether, but it's stalled and we can't wait any longer for the housing to go forward. We will build the childcare building as a separate independent facility on the west end of campus. It will be built in such a way that the housing can be built around it. It will be compatible and connected with the housing when it comes, but we think that we cannot wait any longer. This is the time table that we now will follow. The need for an economic model and a new program statement is related to the fact that this will not any longer be part of the larger housing project.

Also, I wanted to report on the reviews that are contemplated for the year. We have four people who have been designated to undergo academic reviews this year. There are two deans: Dean Lefstein in Law and Dean McBride in Nursing, and two university officers: Mark Grove who's here, and Trudy Banta, vice-chancellor. Those will be the four for this year. I just found my paper that says that. We still have reviews pending and reports are in, or a report is in for one of these--the others are due any day-- for Bill (Plater), for Lillian Charleston, Scott Evenbeck and Mark Rosentraub. Finally, if I can just take a moment, we've been asked, or I've been asked, to represent the universities called the Urban 13, now 22 strong--sort of like the Big 10, getting bigger. The Urban 13 includes the urban public research universities across the country and I think we've talked about that group before. But we've been asked to testify before the Commission on Costs that Congress appointed and we're going to make some points on behalf of these public institutions that we think will show that we still offer a lower cost alternative because our tuition is lower and the cost of studying at these urban campuses generally is lower because students are commuting students and don't have to pay the same housing costs that they would on pastoral campuses. Not only do we provide a lower cost option, and don't have some of the problems of sticker shock that have been associated with going to some universities -- we also have greater costs in a number of ways which means we have used resources more efficiently and wisely than other universities. For example, we have greater costs because we are generally open to the public in areas where the public will come more often than they would at other types of universities. That's particularly true with respect to libraries. And in the case of Indiana University, our library is open to the public and we are the research libraries for the Indianapolis metropolitan area. We also know that inflation and the cost of living generally is higher in the center city areas where most of these urban universities are located. The higher education price index is also

higher for us than it is in smaller communities. We do have more responsibilities to provide preparatory training, preparatory educational experiences, for those students who have some deficiencies, such as not taking all the math classes that they should have in high school, and that is a cost that some other institutions do not have in the same manner that we do. We also have greater costs for parking and security. We have, we believe, greater costs associated with a larger number of students with disabilities who come to study at urban campuses. The last years, I think, the last several years since the enactment of the Americans with Disabilities Act, have seen a larger and larger number of students with disabilities coming to the universities. This is a wonderful condition. It's a wonderful development, but we think that more of those students are coming to urban campuses so we have more accommodations to make, and as a result our costs may be higher. And we also think that some of the cost figures that are showing for higher education in general are distorted because they use full-time equivalent students as the unit of measurement. And all of us know from working on campuses where there are part-time students that while in some ways they may be appropriately measured by a full-time equivalent standard, for many purposes each part-time student consumes as much and sometimes more of other types of services as full-time students would: counseling, advising, business operations, the Bursar, Admission's Office, Registrar, Financial Aids. All these offices provide just as much service in many cases, in most cases, to part-time students as they would to full-time students. So, the FTE formula disadvantages us in an important way. And finally, many of the Urban 13 are relatively new campuses and they are young enough so that they were not extant at the time when funding was more plentiful from state governments than it has been in the last 20 years or so. We've grown up in a time when higher education funding from the state was declining. And as a result, we may not be in as good a position to deal with some of the financial issues that have been raised. In any case, we think that the urbans look good. We charge less, we do more, and we've had some built-in disadvantages in financial terms. And that's the message we're going to convey to the Congressional commission on university costs. If you have any thoughts about this, about any of the points that I've just very quickly gone over or other ideas about cost issues that may affect urban institutions differently than others, please get in touch with us. We'd like to make this statement the best possible statement that can be made and we can use your help in making it better.

**Porter:** Thank you. Before we get into the administrative report, let me remind you the attendance sheet should be circulating among you, so if you could keep it moving so that we can record attendance that would be very helpful. A quick question .

**Spechler:** Martin Spechler, Professor of Economics. I'd like to go back to



the childcare proposed time table which I think is a wonderful announcement, the proper thing to do, something we've been urging for years. I'd like to ask in principle whether the child-care facility will accommodate so-called drop in child-care or dealing with children who are not well? My experience, mainly with parents, especially single parents, is that they are absent from class not because their ordinary day-care breaks down, but because--well, not because they don't have ordinary day care, they do--but because that breaks down in some way, or because the child is sick, and that causes the student to be absent, perhaps on an exam day. So, my question is whether the facility in principle will accommodate the occasional child in an emergency situation, or even as some do an unwell child.

**Bepko:** I don't think that the program is complete, and a definitive answer isn't possible at this time, but we are determined to have some kind of urgent care that's available, not only for the sorts of situations that you've described, but I'm told that there was an incident that took place just within the last couple of weeks where a student with a very young child, maybe 3 or 4 years old, left the child in a car while the student was attending class. It was discovered. There was an issue of whether there had been enough nourishment during the day that the child was found. It was a tragic situation. And we want to make sure that we have services that can be available so that people are never put in that kind of position.

**Porter:** Thank you. On to the President's report.

#### **Agenda Item V: President's Report.**

**Schneider:** Yes, I'll try to make this as brief as well. We have a long agenda today. First. There's an article that I'd like to report on which was raised at the last meeting. It was actually a reminder of an item raised at an even earlier meeting about the sale of tobacco on campus. The issue was taken up by the Executive Committee, and finding no standing committee that we could refer it to, we've asked Betty Jones to form a small committee to look into the matter, including representation from students and staff and then report back to the Faculty Council on that. The UFC will be meeting next Tuesday the 14th here on our campus over in the Conference Center. It starts at 1:30. The meetings are public and you can even speak if you get permission ahead of time and you're not a member of UFC. Among the matters that will be taken up is the proposed policy on Faculty Review and Enhancement. I think it's being called post tenure review there to attract attention. It's going to be the initial discussion at the University level before it goes to the other campuses in the system. Finally just to let you know what's coming for our November meeting, I think we'll have some matters to take up, there'll be for example a

continuation of the report on research in graduate education at IUPUI. We'll look at graduate education today, the research part probably in November. We will take up a matter of copyright and fair use, a proposal that has been developed--we'll need University sanction. You'll be seeing that between now and the November meeting. And finally, once in every President's term, the infamous matter of the number of "N" will be before us, appropriately in November. So, that will be coming, hold your breath if you want, but I'll let you know what we think about that then.

**Porter:** Thank you.

**Agenda Item VI: Athletic Affairs Committee Resolution Regarding Move to NCAA Division I.**

**Porter:** We'd like to then move on to the next agenda item which is the Athletic Affairs Committee resolution regarding the move to NCAA Division I status. A copy of that resolution is included in your packet. It is being presented by the Athletic Affairs Committee. Bob Sandy will present this.

**Sandy:** The resolution reads: "The IUPUI Faculty Council endorses the move of IUPUI from the NCAA Division II to Division I."

**Porter:** Alright. That is the motion before you. Do we have any discussion? Did the Budgetary Affairs Committee wish to make a comment on this?

**R. Keck:** I have told the people on the Budgetary Affairs Committee by means of email and I can tell you that the people that responded are in support of this.

**Porter:** Thank you. You are going on record in order that the position of the faculty can be expressed to the Trustees as they consider this. Martin [Spechler].

**Spechler:** I'd just like to ask Bob, what appears to me in his reply, whether the Budgetary Affairs Committee has examined the report and has come to this conclusion on the basis of examination or otherwise?

**R. Keck:** We have seen previous drafts. We saw this draft that you have, I assume the same one that you have, we saw this draft Monday and we have had a chance to read this, I guess we'll say final draft, most current draft. I'm trying to respond to your question, is that not sufficient? I'll try it again.

**Spechler:** Well, if we can't monitor our students' reading I don't suppose

we can monitor our committee members' reading. Bob, if you find a way to do that, please let me know.

**R. Keck:** No, I'm relying on you.

**Plater:** I might comment, because it may not be clear to all the persons on the Council, that there have been a series of drafts of this document. I'd ask Bob [Keck] and Bob [Sandy] to correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe that both committees have seen the various versions of this that have gone through rewriting as we've tried to improve both the format for presentation and the accuracy and the completeness of the information. They've participated in these discussions. It's not as though there wasn't a time to shape and help form the documents. Both committees have had great impact on the document that's now before you. And it was only in an effort to ensure that we had the best possible presentation that we waited till Monday to give the final version to the Board of Trustees. So, there has been a lot of talk and analysis that's gone into this report.

**R. Keck:** Okay. The reason I hesitated a little bit is we continue, well this year of course, there are new Budgetary Affairs Committee members and whether or not all the Budgetary Affairs Committee members have a similar understanding is probably, that's probably not the case. Some have a better understanding than others because of their interaction.

**Sandy:** I imagine the Athletic Affairs Committee saw an earlier draft, discussed it, forwarded comments, and voted unanimously in favor of this resolution.

**Burr:** Could someone just briefly review for me what the advantages are of the personal campus with no residency populations moving to Division I and also how much it's going to cost?

**Sandy:** The advantages are to attract and retain students, even though we're not a residential campus, or not yet a residential campus. The goal is that we'll attract athletes themselves. The figures refer to 273 athletes under the Division I program. A substantial share of those will be paying their own way. And there are also some state funds that are attached to any new student--a capitation fee. And a further attraction of students who are the friends of the athletes or just interested in following a varsity program.

**Burr:** It doesn't seem to me we've had any trouble this year attracting students. Had some trouble retaining them, but I suspect that getting more athletes isn't going to help our academic credentials a great deal.

**Sandy:** On the contrary, the athletes we have attracted have a higher SAT

score than the entry pool of IUPUI students overall. And that's perhaps not the case nationally, but we're better off by trying to attract varsity athletes--better off in academic terms. The figures are in this report.

**Plater:** I can certainly comment, but it may be appropriate to invite Bill Kulsrud who is the faculty representative to the NCAA and Mike Moore who is the Director of Athletics for IUPUI to also have an opportunity to comment with the permission of the Council.

**Kulsrud:** Well, I can comment on a number of those items, but with respect to the latter item, we have an item in the report that indicates in fact, that not only are the SAT's of the student athletes better than the overall SAT of our students, but the retention rate is far better. There was a study done at the University of Alabama in Birmingham years ago--this is the only study we're aware of that addresses this document--that [claims] on the average every student athlete brings 4 other students with them. I could add evidence in that regard: Jason Collier, at Bloomington, is a basketball player--they estimate that he brought over 40 people from the surrounding communities. With respect to the other items, why we should be going to Division I? I can probably go on about those--I'm not--I think that as a practical matter, it's something that will help this campus gain an identity in the city of Indianapolis, and within our Central Indiana community as well. It's something to rally around. It's part of the educational experience. It's something our students want. I think if you take a look at this document, it pretty well addresses a lot of the points. This document's built for now. It's been evolving over the last five years. It's probably been longer.

**R. Keck:** It specifically responds to the questions about SAT and retention and grades and so on. You can take a look at page 13 of this document. Listen, that also shows you that I've read it. [Laughter]

**Kulsrud:** The other comment was about, I mean the other question was with respect to cost. And if you look at it, page 80, it gives you a complete budget that's been analyzed and reviewed and then reanalyzed. And without actually having money in the bank we think we can run a program that puts into balance the initial studies into numbers so you can see the year 2001, 2002 it will cost us 2.76 million dollars to run the athletic program. Which is a road in which particular the entire conference could plan and arrange this.

**Porter:** Betty, introduce yourself, please.

**Jones:** Betty Jones, Physical Education. I have a question about information on page 5 in the report, about gender equity, and it speaks to working

toward that in terms of creating opportunities for female student athletes? What's to be done in terms of the female coaches? At this point there are a lot more men than there are women coaches. Is there any plan to try to bring more women onboard as coaches?

**Moore:** In terms of bringing.

**Porter:** Identify yourself please.

**Moore:** Mike Moore, in charge of Athletics. It's a real good plan. We will be adding, our program will expand to nine female programs and seven male programs by the year 2000. Which in terms of gender--I'll address the coaching issue--in terms of gender the Athletic program will then closer, more closely reflect the makeup of our student body in terms of male versus female enrollment. Which is one of the tests meeting the gender equity requirements. We are, we will be creating additional coaching positions, for example women's basketball next year, should this come to pass. We'll be creating another full-time assistant coaching position, which our first charge has been in going out and trying to recruit. For example we just hired a new women's volleyball coach. And we're finding in athletics particularly, we're finding the pools of applicants, especially on the female side, for female coaching positions in the sports, the pools are very small. Our first choice is to include female coaches to coach female programs and that will be our first choice, but if you look at the number of scholarships that we will be offering in the year 2000, you'll see we'll be offering, I don't have the exact figure, we'll be offering 56.8 scholarships to the women as opposed to 37 full scholarships for the men. A fact of life in athletics is for any particular program 10 men will walk on without a scholarship as opposed to one woman. So, we're being forced to do as many other programs. What we're doing is to put more scholarship moneys into the women's side of the program to attract more female student athletes. So, I think we have an advantage over programs that are more mature in terms of tradition and in terms of their structure and that we're able to add increment ally to our program. If you look at our budgets you'll find that like sports mirror each other in terms of operating budgets and those types of things. So, I feel very comfortable with our gender equity plan for the program.

**Spechler:** I don't have any problem as an economist with the intangible benefits of this. I think that they're conjectural, but living in a sports mad world as we do, I think that this might have some marginal effect. Personally, I'm not dissatisfied with the IUPUI image as it is and I'm not sure that this will improve it marginally, but if people want it, the benefits to students are good. I think that the benefits are modest, but probably constant. Now the thing that's always bothered me is the cost of the thing, and before we vote for this I think we should be clear on what

those costs are to the rest of the campus. As I read the appendix B Budget--and of course like all of you, I've had about 5 minutes to do this--it contemplates a 1/4 to a 1 /3 of a million dollars from Foundation money for this program. I assume that that's unkind money that could be devoted, at least in part, to other objectives of the campus, and there are some other needs.

**Kulsrud:** No. That's not correct. That Foundation money is money raised by the Metro Athletic Club, raised solely for athletics.

**Spechler:** Probably the gentleman who interrupted me has looked into the eyes of the people who give this money and knows exactly what they would do if it weren't going for athletics. So, I accept that. But then, another item here 5 times larger is the student athletic development fee. Now, I'm not a student and I assume that I won't have to pay this. We're talking about a million two. About half the budget as outlined, about 50% of the budget, is from the student athletic fees. If my division is right it means about \$50.00 or so per undergraduate per year on a mandatory basis. Are we sure that the students will accept this for this purpose? By endorsing this we're telling the students this is okay, this is something that they should do. They have representatives and I wonder about that myself. Altogether, budgets are somewhat speculative. As they reach into the future they're even more speculative and you wonder who makes them up. But I think those are the big items that are more speculative than most. People, who have been at IUPUI sporting events, as I have, know that attendance has been rather low and the idea that we can increase ticket sales by a factor of seven in four years is something wonderful to think about. The students I've talked to are not enthusiastic about this, but maybe it's just a random sample. So, I'd like to really raise these questions, because if we endorse this we're saying that these costs are the thing that IUPUI would like to do now as opposed to other things that we need on the campus. I have come to a conclusion about that, but I think before we vote we should face the figures rather squarely.

**Plater:** I think Martin [Spechler] is correct to call attention to the budget. I think that's the area that will be of greatest concern to the trustees and I want to assure you, but I also want the Budgetary Affairs Committee and the Athletic Affairs Committee and other Faculty Council representatives who've been involved in this process to verify what I'm about to say. We paid a great deal of attention to the development of a budget and have consulted as fully as we can with the student leadership, not only this year, but in previous years, and while it's fair to say I think that students are not enthusiastic about paying fees of any kind, there is general broad support for the development of the athletic program here for many of the reasons that have already been described. I think that we have not taken a survey of students though there have been some

samplings taken that are more than random sampling by stopping students in the street or asking students in your class what they think about it. We believe that the student body is prepared to endorse this and indeed will speak favorably at the meeting with the trustees. They have on previous occasions and have had quite an impact in affecting the trustees' perspective on this move for IUPUI. I also would like to comment on the development of the budget, again I think Martin [Spechler] is correct, it's one thing to plan a budget here and to project it out 5 years and know what it's really going to be like, but we have been as realistic as we can, and this budget is being developed without general fund monies. That is an important distinction to make, which means that there is not the latitude that we might otherwise have in redirecting those monies elsewhere. And it's true that the presumption of the fund raising perhaps could be influenced to go somewhere else, but those people who have been involved in fund raising with athletics from the conference in which we hope to join and from other consultants at other universities whom we've employed to advise us on this are really very clear. People who give to athletics want to give to athletics and not to other programs. So, it's not likely that we would be able to persuade them to give to scholarships. However, one of the things that underlies the development of athletics here is a very close tie-in. Without academic programs, and for example, one of the scholarship programs will relate to community service so that athletes who accept a scholarship will agree to mentor. Young people at middle schools who aspire to be athletes can be influenced to pay attention to studies. Our student athletes can stress the importance of succeeding in school, so that they can in fact go on to college. There are a number of measures that have been taken to tie the athletic program into the academic purposes of the campus. In large part, because we have the opportunity to create a brand new program. This is not something that has been in existence for fifty years that we're trying to adjust to current trends and current ideas, but we really are building it for the future to support all of IUPUI.

**Porter:** Sir, is there a question?

**Hook:** I specifically requested to be on the Athletic Affairs Committee for this academic year because I still strongly believe that this move is the right one for IUPUI's future and particularly its identity. And even though I was predisposed to believe that, at our first Athletic Affairs Committee meeting I was more persuaded, in fact by the comments of the gentleman sitting to my right. Again reiterating the importance of IUPUI making this move, but also the danger if we do not in terms of our ability to place competitively in a variety of sports. And I wondered if they would be able to repeat some of those comments for us here today. I think that might be helpful in our discussion.

**Kulsrud:** Well I did basically summarize it in terms of where we are right

now with relation to the program. I'm sure many of you've heard this many times before, but at present with the Division II program we're an independent. We're not in the conference, which means we presently have 175 student athletes who are ineligible to be in a conference championship or to lead in any post season competition at the end of the season. It has in terms of costs, if you run some of our basketball season ticket brochures and think you all have for your informational purposes, hopefully you buy a few season tickets. It does have the schedules in there. Presently with our men's program we're playing Panhandle State. I'll be honest with you, for a year and a half I've had to look in our directory every time to see if the schools the coaches give me are actually [unintelligible]. We play down, if there's any graduates of these schools I do not mean to slight you but I mean my whole career has been in Division I athletics. For at least [unintelligible name], Oklahoma, Panhandle State, Western New Mexico, and in many of these instances we had to travel there to appease. Our men's soccer program is--for many of you who don't know--is eleven and one at this point this year. We should be twelve and zero. We're ranked nationally in Division II rankings but we're ineligible for any post season competition, the one thing that Division I does do for us. We talked about game receipts and I've talked to a lot of students also, in fact I met with the Executive Council of student government which endorses this proposal again. We endorse it the way it is. And we talked about us playing Butler on December 10th. And next year if we are in Division I, Miami of Ohio will be playing in the Natatorium gymnasium which will happen by Division I and I submit to you that pride and attendance and all those types of things are tied to the ability to compete for conference championships, the ability to create rivalry to which we have not had any at this point with anyone. And the ability to wear your school colors, whatever they are, and feel the pride of the institution and we said forever. And I've said since I've been here, our goals have our athletic program nearer the national recognition than the academic program has. And Division I athletics is something that can accomplish this.

**Porter:** Did Council members wish to continue the discussion or are you ready to vote?

**[Unidentified]:** I was just getting ready to attempt to call a question.

**Porter:** Well, if you won't call it, then we won't have to vote on it. If people, if I get a sense, are you ready?

Yes.

**Porter:** Okay. The motion on the floor is that the IUPUI Faculty Council endorses the move of IUPUI from NCAA Division II to Division I. All those in favor say "Aye". Oppose "No". Thank you. The "aye's" have it and we will



forward that to the Tru stees. What? Do you want to hand vote? Could we have, do we have to count the ayes.

[Unidentified]: Do you call it? If you don't call it you don't have to have it. If you want it, you have to call it.

**Porter:** Alright. Yes.

**Schneider:** Anybody call for a hand vote please? A hand vote.

**Porter:** We would like to be able to report.

**Schneider:** Since it wasn't unanimous.

**Porter:** All those in favor please stand and we'll begin a count off.

\*\*\*

That's forty-eight for and one against, with two abstaining.

**Agenda Item VII: Report on Research and Graduate Programs.**

**Merritt:** Those members of the faculty here who've been elected to the IU graduate faculty will serve on this committee where there has not been that kind of elected faculty's involvement before. We think that will be helpful. The other thing that is a little bit new is that every school now has matured to the point where there is some person in the Dean's office that has the responsibility for graduate programs. And we think it would be very useful to have those people with a pseudo administrative responsibility discussing policies together with the elected faculty members. So, that is indeed a change in that it brings a different kind of discussion to the floor. The subcommittee structure will remain essentially the same. There will be a subcommittee on scholarships. Financial Aid which has always existed. There will be a subcommittee on curriculum that will, that if you will, the changes in curriculum, the new curriculum that will come through to be recommended to the various graduate campaigns at IU and West Lafayette. Another partially new thing, it is not exactly new, but it teases it out of the structure to give it a little bit more prominence is the notion that one of the things that will be very important in the future on this campus is the development of interdisciplinary degrees particularly at the Masters level which will involve more than one school. And we have a group that is specifically charged with helping people tease out those subjects, develop new degrees, and serve our population a little bit better. As an example, I would talk about Public

Health, which you all know and is now on its way. Another one that most recently has been just bruited about not even at the discussion stage is something in criminal justice. So, you can just guess how many opportunities there are on campus that in fact can be developed with a little nurturing. So, while I have said there are really no changes, I guess there really are. Perhaps the more things change, the more they stay the same.

Yes.

**Baldwin:** Doris, on the reconstitution of the Graduate Affairs Committee, am I to assume that under *ex officio* members there would be a member from the Library?

**Merritt:** You may if you like.

**Rothe:** I mean when we talk of equal forums and resources to support them, probably the most important of these is library resources, and I think there should be some voice there.

**Merritt:** Not a problem. I would say there was one item in these recommendations that was not carried out because the times have changed a little bit and if you've read that carefully you'll notice that there was some suggestion that there be a person appointed to represent the Purdue graduate programs. It happens when I talk to the people in Science and Engineering and Technology that they have really soothed their differences and that they can do very well relating with the entire Graduate Affairs Committee and the liaisons that they have set up with Purdue. And we don't need to have still another administrator for people to report and to feed through. And that we suppose two Purdue school choices.

**Rothe:** What fraction of the membership of the Committee are administrators and what fraction are full-time faculty?

**Merritt:** I'm happy to tell you there are more full-time faculty than administrators.

**Rothe:** And the reason for both the chair and the vice-chair to be administrators?

**Merritt:** So we can get things done.

**Porter:** Well, I don't want to rush you along, but on the other hand, so we can demonstrate that faculty too can get things done, are there any other

questions? If not, thank you very much for coming to the meeting.

### **Agenda Item VIII: University College Report.**

**Porter:** The next agenda item is a report from University College. And in order to give the report, I have to turn the gavel over to President Schneider because I'm giving the report.

I'm here on behalf of University College faculty by virtue of being the only member of the University College Faculty Executive Committee who didn't have a conflict during this meeting. The Faculty Council charged University College to regularly report to the Academic Affairs Committee and this is being implemented in the form of sharing minutes with the Academic Affairs Committee and also sending a representative to their meetings as requested. The UC Executive Committee and the IUPUI Faculty Council Executive Committee thought it would be appropriate to briefly update the members of the Faculty Council on the activities of the UC faculty since they were appointed last spring. The University College founding faculty were appointed and charged with the implementation of the University College concept. The first students will be admitted to University College this summer although with the movement of UEC [Undergraduate Education Center] to the University College building and the transitions that are occurring during the academic year, the presence of University College is already being felt. During the last summer the UC Steering Committee served as a screening committee for the University College dean candidates which led to the appointment of Scott Ev enbeck as the first dean of the University College. A search and screen committee was appointed for the positions of Associate Dean, Assistant Dean, and we also planned a faculty retreat, which was held in August. At the faculty retreat, the UC faculty completed the first draft of the University College Mission statement and a statement of principles which are both still in the revision process, but nearing consensus on the wording. The UC faculty elected a five member executive committee consisting of: Barbara Jackson, Raima Larter, Bart Ng, Richard Ward and Rebecca Porter. The UC faculty also began the process of establishing the culture, which will influence the operation of this new academic unit at IUPUI. The faculty are engaging in moving beyond a business as usual approach into a new vision of what University College as an academic unit should be. The search and screen committee chaired by Doug Lees has reviewed approximately 150 applications for the Associate and Assistant Deans positions. And those of us who were working this summer and assured them that it was going to be an easy task did not anticipate the level of interest in those positions and the number of applications that would come from outside of IUPUI. Interviews for the Associate Dean position will be conducted in the near future. The University College faculty are meeting on a monthly basis. We're in the process of establishing a committee structure to deal with a

number of issues. The structure is in the process of evolving as we sort through the integration and overlap with existing committees. It is the intent of the University College faculty to avoid duplication of effort. At this time, the UC faculty are being appointed to the following committees: Resources and Planning (that's going to be our budgetary affairs type committee), Faculty Roles and Responsibilities, Advising committee, and First Year Studies committee. The advising committee, which had been previously appointed by Dean Plater and is chaired by Joe Kuskowski, will continue with the addition of UC faculty. The existing committee will focus not only on the advising within the University College, but also within IUPUI so that we make sure that we remain an integrated and in-touch component, and so that we can smoothly move students through the advising process. The UC faculty are in the process of requesting that the existing first year studies committee which currently reports to CUL be transferred to UC, so that we can use the expertise of those individuals, and again avoid duplication of effort. The Student Placement and Assessment Committee appointed by Dean Plater in September will collaborate with UC but will maintain a campus-wide focus. Clarification of the relationship with the committee on service learning and University College appointed by Dean Plater in August is in the process of being addressed. A member of the UC Executive Committee has been appointed as the liaison with the committees on Assessment and Placement, Advising, and Service Learning. Before you have a brief opportunity to ask for clarification of any of the information I've presented, I want to extend to each of you an invitation to visit the new location of the University College. The second and third floor of the former Library building have been extensively remodeled into a very inviting space for our students. You're welcome to drop by any time to see the office spaces on the floor and the student and classroom spaces on the second floor. Once the carpeting is replaced on the lower floors, University College will be having an open house and each of you will be invited. Are there any informational items that I can clarify for you on what's happening with University College?

**Schneider:** Let me exercise my power of the gavel by thanking Becky for that very concise and informative report. I want to add one thing to it, mainly that the Executive Committee has received a request about possible representation of University College and/or its dean on Faculty Council and we referred it to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee to look at it. Second thing I want to ask is if the Chair of Academic Affairs, Beverly Ross, has anything she would like to add to the report?

**Ross:** No, not really. Becky's going to report or a representative will report to our first meeting. We have not met yet. We meet on the 17th.

**Schneider:** Okay. Any questions? Martin [Spechler].

**Spechler:** I would like to ask if this proposed Associate Dean position and Assistant Dean position is something new for the campus, or is it essentially a reassignment of a position with new personnel?

**Porter:** My understanding is that these are not new funds. That the positions were funded from vacancies that had not been filled when they occurred within UEC. So, the titles are new, the responsibilities are going to be different than in the past, but it did not require new funding.

**Baldwin:** As a person who used to haunt the old Library, I commend what's been done with it. It's sorely too bad nothing was done to it back then years ago. I see why, but I'm curious about what work is going to be happening on the connector with the Business/SPEA building? It looks like something's happening, but I can't tell.

**Plater:** That is proceeding. It was to have opened this month, but due to construction delays (not our delays, it was the company), it won't be finished until November. But it should be done in time for the really bad weather. It will be a glass connector. Those of you who've seen the construction know what it will look like, but it will join the hallway on the west side of the glass hallway in Business/SPEA and come directly into the third floor of University College. You may recall when it was the Library, that the buildings didn't quite match up and there was an awkward set of stairs and it was not handicap accessible. And that has been addressed by making that entryway very attractive now as a set of connected ramps. And it's quite a handsome space. It really will be enjoyed by everyone when it is connected to the rest of the second floor level of Business/SPEA.

**Baldwin:** I just hope the administration keeps in mind that it would be nice to link University College, Lecture Hall and Cavanaugh too.

**R. Keck:** I have a comment. I'd like to congratulate the people who wrote the two grants, or the two quotes that were funded by the two grants that the University College started with. That's a great start and I hope that that continues. I do have however, a question, and that is on the four committees that you mentioned. I didn't hear the responsibility of Assessment. Now I may not have been listening carefully enough. Which committee of those four committees would be working on assessment?

**Porter:** Dean Plater had appointed in September a committee called Student Placement and Assessment Committee. And we're going to start collaborating with that crew, and then figure out whether or not that would be adequate to look at assessment within University College, or whether or not we are going to need to have a subcommittee or different group to look at

University College per se. When we think about assessment particularly in student persistence it's the bigger picture, it's the campus picture with University College only as the start. So, we're going to start with the big picture, see what measures are going to be in place, and then look at how we need to address those specifically within University College. For the founding faculty (several of you in the room are on the founding faculty), this is indeed a somewhat awesome responsibility, and it might have been easier if we were starting from scratch. We're looking at taking in an existing structure. We've clearly heard that we don't want this just to be business as usual. We don't want it to be UEC just with a new name, and so we're being rather deliberate in trying to be very careful about what is the culture. What's the new culture? How are we going to proceed? On the other hand, the founding faculty also have all the responsibilities within their home academic unit. So, we're working, all of us wish we were making progress faster, but on the other hand, we've accomplished quite a bit. Once a mission statement is out, I don't think we'll be finished with it, but we're ready to disseminate. That's taken a significant time, because we think it's important that we be able to keep that as a view of where we are going. We also have another full day faculty retreat in January We're looking for that to be another opportunity of getting a lot accomplished.

**Schneider:** Other questions? Comments?

**R. Keck:** Another question. I've noted that there has been some, what I would call some mutual training, among the administrators and among some of the people who are responsible for this. Are we going to have also faculty involved in the first year experience that are not on University College faculty? Will they be also instructed on new and better ways?

**Porter:** Well the first year studies committee will continue to have members not only within University College, but members from the other schools who are also offering first year courses. I think that that is the intent, although off the top of my head I can't tell you there's a specific plan. The idea of faculty development developing the advisors preparing people to do their jobs, giving them the tools that are needed I think are all important aspects that are valued among the faculty and the staff. So, I think we're looking in that direction.

**Schneider:** Anything else? Well, again thank you, Becky. The best I can do is give you back your gavel and contention.

**Porter:** Why, thank you.

**Agenda Item IX: Proposed Policy for Faculty Review and Enhancement:  
Continued Discussion.**

**Porter:** Alright, our next item is to offer an opportunity to continue our discussion on the proposed policy for faculty review and enhancement. Sara Hook is here as chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee and I think we'll ask her to come down since she tends to be the focus of the questions.

**Hook:** I was saying to someone a couple of weeks ago, I'm going to need to change my initials from SAH for Sara Ann Hook to PTR for post tenure reviews. That's what I'm becoming known for. I want to date you a little bit on what's happened with the document. The document now circulating has not undergone any kind of changes, although I continue to gather comments from our meeting last month as well as other comments from various sources. About two weeks ago I met with the various presidents of the school faculty councils to give them some background on the document and I've already heard now from two schools on campus, their responses to the document. The document will be coming up for discussion at University Faculty Council next week. At that time, it will be primarily a brief introduction to the document and again a solicitation of comments and concerns. Then our UFC Faculty Affairs Committee will take that information and develop a cover letter or a list of guiding principles to accompany the document and that will then go to the different campuses for discussion. I've also been invited to have lunch with the AAUP chapter down in Bloomington in two or three weeks. So, I'm hoping also that that will initiate some good discussion and some good ideas. I'm still very much in the information gathering standpoint. Many of the concerns, the same concerns, seem to keep coming up again and again. One of these is of course the responsibility that schools will have as with most policies. The devil is in the detail and schools really are going to have to put some policies and procedures in place, particularly relating to such things as how do we define unproductive, chronically unproductive, minimum standards, that sort of thing? Another issue that's become quite important is the idea of looking at the early retirement system and how that might be changed to make retirement more attractive and more dignified for those faculty who choose that route. Does anyone have any questions, and any further comments? I'm becoming the conduit for information. So, if anyone does have any comments or questions or concerns I ask that you route these through me. I'm coming up with quite a list. And I imagine as we go through this process, we'll want to look at some of these again, concerns that keep coming up, and see how we might best handle them, either in the document or through other procedures.

**Peterson:** One of the comments that I've heard from the University and Faculty Council and some of the other campuses is that as this document goes forward in its present form it doesn't really meet all of their needs. Are we going to produce a document sooner or later that is a University Faculty Council document or how or what's our plan on that for approval?

**Schneider:** We're not going to, University Faculty Council may. What we hope is that what we have here will fit within whatever University Faculty Council chooses to decide upon. Inevitably, I'm sure the university-wide policy will be broader and establish, be much broader than ours, and the trick will then be for each campus to have the flexibility to meet certain minimum standards, and then have a policy appropriate for their campus.

**Hook:** And I will say that as you look at our document in it's present form, it really kind of splits into two distinctive pieces. The first is of course the guiding principles, the rights and responsibilities and the over arching theme of how faculty review and enhancement might work. And this I think could easily be tailored to fit the overall University. However, the second half of the document is where we get very, very specific as to procedures. Those are things I think are going to need to be looked at, not only campus by campus, but maybe even school by school. But at least it's functioning as a discussion document and I think what we want is to at least get the discussion going and also not for IUPUI to pass a policy and then for the University-wide group to say: No that's totally wrong we'll have something else. So, I think we're just slightly ahead of the overall UFC discussion, and again I would urge anyone with comments or questions to let me know.

**Plater:** I would just like to comment that this is a matter of which this Council should take some pride in exercising real leadership within Indiana University. And I think we have an opportunity to influence a policy rather than having it imposed upon us. And this body should be particularly proud that it is leading the way for all of Indiana University. We've had the new president of the American Association of Higher Education here, I think it was just last week, and she talked about post tenure review and gave a kind of a national overview. She made very favorable comments about our document and helped place our work into a national context. I don't remember the statistic that she cited, but I think it was something over 60% of the four-year institutions in this country already have some form of post tenure review. And it's appropriate that IUPUI take leadership within the state with Indiana being one of the first, if not the first, public university to come up with a meaningful policy. So, I'd like to commend the Council and the committee for it's great work.

**Spechler:** Those of you who are not members of the AAUP probably won't know that the American Association of University Professors recently published a lengthy survey of post tenure review, together with a number of recommendations. Sara knows about this, as do other members of the committee. I'd like to say briefly that our document as it stands is roughly consistent with the recommendations of AAUP. AAUP has cautiously endorsed the idea of post tenure review with certain provisions for fair procedure. There are one or two exceptions that as a member of the



committees involved I'll try to work on. I think that the most important issue that we have to face is in principle, what is the standard that would justifiably force a faculty member to re-evaluate his or her worth, or in extreme situations, terminate their relation with the University. That's something we have to be very careful about. And I'm not sure that we want to delegate that completely to the school level. That's something that I think we should really think about. We may want to have some raw principles of what would invoke certain negative consequences and to enunciate those principles at the University or the campus level, rather than to delegate to the schools which have very different, and sometimes not too satisfactory, decision making procedures.

**Hook:** Martin's point is well taken and there was some language in one of those articles I particularly liked and it was related to burden of proof. And it said something along the lines of prior to tenure, the burden of proof is on the faculty member to say I'm worthy of tenure at this institution. But to me the important thing was, once tenure is granted the burden of proof is on the institution to show why that individual should no longer have tenure, and I think as long as we can have that as the underlying theme of the policy, that that proof does not (after tenure) still rest with the faculty member to continue to prove why they should have tenure, but rather the burden then shifts, they must now be proven negative on the part of the institution. I thought that was extremely important and I thank you for sharing that document with me. Does anyone else have any questions? Yes.

**Burr:** I don't have a question, but I'd like to read for us one thing that was brought up last time. I don't know if the Committee is going to rework this again before we see it or what happened. Bill was absolutely right, Peg Miller was very positive about this document, but she did raise one issue which was raised at the last meeting and that's this phrase, it says: However, the definition above of satisfactory performance must include the concept of lack of effort. She raised a very pertinent question and her question was "Would we accept that in our students?" And I dare say that the vast majority of us would not accept that in our students, and I hope that that phrase can be closely examined before we see this document for a vote.

**Hook:** Your point is very well taken. And I think a lot of the reason for that phrase was that a lot of times, particularly with grants being so very, very competitive, for a lot of journal submissions being very competitive, that we don't want to penalize someone just because, for a couple of years maybe, they don't have as many things getting accepted or funded. But rather, we also want to make sure that we look at the effort, and certainly if there's no effort and no results, that's clearly a case of non-production. However, if there's not results but we can see a good

solid, true effort, then that's a different question that needs to be looked at perhaps more carefully.

**Spechler:** Well, I take issue with this. I think it's an important issue that's been raised by our friend here, but it's really inappropriate. The parallel between students and tenured faculty is not in place. Faculty members have already had a great effort and sacrifice to themselves -- proved that they are capable of doing work at Indiana University. We've already proved that. We've very rigorous standards and procedures. Students have not proved that. They have not proved that they are worthy to be a graduate of Indiana University, much less a faculty member at Indiana University. So, I do not accept at all the parallel between what we see as appropriate for students and what we see as appropriate for reestablishing faculty members at an advanced stage in their career.

**Porter:** Any other issues that members would like to bring forward? Are we still working toward a faculty forum for a discussion?

**Hook:** Yes, thank you for reminding me. I'm currently working on putting together a faculty forum on this document and I would hope I will have that scheduled within the next four to six weeks. I'm planning on having that over the noon hour. So, you might be watching for that and encouraging your faculty to attend.

**Porter:** Thank you.

**Peterson:** Peterson. We were going to, we talked last time I believe, about mailing out something, distribution of this to the faculty in general. I'm not sure if that's been done since I get all these things routinely. Are faculty receiving a mail-out of some sort, or have they received a mail-out of some sort?

**Hook:** I don't believe the faculty overall have, but that's one thing that I'm working with Marshall Collins on -- publicity for the forum as well as distribution of materials.

**Porter:** And it has been provided to each of the school faculty presidents for distribution. Thank you.

#### **Agenda Item X: Question/Answer Period.**

**Porter:** We have our traditional ten minutes for question and answer period, if there are any questions? Yes.

**Baldwin:** Jim Baldwin. My question relates back to the NCAA thing. I think somebody asked it before, but I don't know how the winds are blowing now. What do you think the attitude of the Board of Trustees is on this? I mean off the record, because I think of it as symptomatic of the attitude of people like that, as far as the campus in general.

**Bepko:** Well, I think that we should be optimistic and I don't think it would pay any dividends, especially in public to go through person by person and analyze the members of the Board of Trustees. But I think if I were to describe the chemistry of the board in general, I think they view this as a very important and a major step. Now, I don't think that people inside the university view it as being that major a step, but they do. And I think they're reflecting the public's attitude about the importance of intercollegiate athletics. So, they're viewing it as a very major step and they're interested in being very careful in making sure that the case is very solid for going ahead. We anticipate that in the final analysis, even if they have some reservations, they will be convinced that this is the right thing to do. It's necessary for this campus to achieve its potential. It's necessary to build pride among our students, particularly undergraduate students who I think are not as proud as they ought to be of themselves and for that reason sometimes sacrifice part of their educational future. We want them to stop doing that. We want them to be proud, look to the future, defer gratification, and get the very best education that is available. That's here. So, we think, I think, that's what will happen, but we can't be sure and we are probably not well advised to say any more.

**Schneider:** Let me add one thing. I have been asked, and I anticipate I will be asked at the meeting at the end of the month, what the faculty at IUPUI think about it. And as a result I'm very pleased that we had the opportunity here to discuss it and to vote on it. So, that will be, I think, meaningful to them.

**Bepko:** I'd also like to mention that, if I could Dorothy [Webb], just one second, one of the issues has been whether we could raise money to support the program from outside the university. And the early returns are very good. We are not yet a Division I school. So, I think we haven't had the opportunity to show how well we can really do. We'll only be able to show that after we are Division I and able to go to people and explain that the investment in us is an investment in the Division I program. But already as a Division II institution, we've done pretty well. We're ahead of our projections, and we have one anonymous million dollar pledge to be paid over a period of years, a guaranteed pledge for intercollegiate athletics. It is however, conditioned on our going to Division I.

**[Unidentified]:** The Board of Trustees will know this?

**Bepko:** Yes. You think we ought to tell them? I guess we will.

**D. Webb:** This is still a procedural matter, I don't know how many of you members of the Council are new this year. It would be very useful for those things that have been going on in the previous year, which documents have been generated, if we could be provided those so that we could kind of come up to speed before asked to vote on this.

**Bepko:** Is that a question for me?

**Porter:** We will certainly try to do that. Any other questions?

**Peterson:** I did have a question regarding the changes that are going to be occurring in Research and Sponsored Programs in the graduate school. I've seen in the past that the Board of Trustees and Commission for Higher Education are very resistant to developing new graduate programs on campus. Do you feel like this is going to really enhance new graduate programs, or do you think this will be a form by which new graduate programs may be more easily developed on this campus?

**Bepko:** Bill [Plater] should comment also on this, but I see it as a way of facilitating the development of graduate programs. And I think it will be helpful in a couple of ways. One, it will put more focus on the development of programs within the framework that we have worked in for a number of years. That is, we've published papers on graduate education and we've said what we think the future will be, and within that framework I think we'll be much better able to create the programs and move them forward. And I think that in the process we're going to also discover and develop proposals for graduate programs that are not within the framework that we've worked within. And I think we'll have a better opportunity of moving outside the framework to create new graduate programs as well. But I would not look for an avalanche or some rescission of the framework that we've worked in. I think that framework will be part of the understandings on which we'll base this work.

**Porter:** Yes, Mary.

**Fisher:** Mary Fisher of Nursing. At Monday's Budgetary Affairs Patrick Rooney was giving us an update on the equity study that's going to be done. And one of the comments he made was that the way the equity study's going to be geared is to look at the inequities that reside within schools, but not necessarily across schools. And those of us in primarily female professions are very disturbed about that. He doesn't feel there's been a long-standing lack of looking at issues across schools or between schools.

And so I thought I could comment on that and how can this problem be resolved?

**Bepko:** Well, I think that we have tackled the most obvious issue. That is the inequities that may exist within the units, and I think that's probably all we have the ability to do now. I think the question you're raising, Mary, is much more complicated and I don't know whether we can study it within our institution. It is related to the world outside the institution. And I'm just not sure. I don't have a good answer to the question. I think all we can say is that we're going forward with what we think is the most important thing to do now and have not chosen to go ahead and try to establish what fairness would be between academic disciplines. The least well-funded academic disciplines are funded at a much lower level; that is, salaries are lower than those for the highest paid faculty. And I'm not sure we can solve it by looking only inwardly. We'd have to do something that would be revolutionary and involve the markets that each of our disciplines relate to. We will, I think though, be addressing that not in the sense of internal equity, or gender discrimination and race discrimination, but I think the university is poised and ready to look at the position that we occupy in terms of salaries vis-à-vis our peer institutions. When we get into that I think we can say that faculty in our School of Nursing here are not paid as well as the Schools of Nursing that are its peers. I think that would be a better way of addressing the issue that you've identified.

**Fisher:** Can you see that on the horizon?

**Bepko:** Yes.

**Porter:** Betty.

**Jones:** Betty Jones. This is a question or a comment about driving to campus each morning along 10th street and coming by the Cancer wall, the area there by Wishard. There's a cutout there where people could stop and that has become a parking lot now. Some people have some free parking in that spot every day. Every morning it has four or five people parking there. That's one issue and the other is: there is a gentleman who I assume is a homeless gentleman who seems to make that his home each evening, because he's waking up as I come to campus and driving by along the wayside. And I'm wondering if there's, I'm concerned about that gentleman, and one who uses that place to sleep. I don't know. It bothers me, that as a campus of, how we can respond to his needs, or I don't know, just general thoughts about that. It's free parking and free sleeping I guess.

**Bepko:** I think that's on city property -- Health and Hospital Corporation

property -- but we'll look into it. We shouldn't have. This is a place of caring and a place of healing, and we shouldn't have people who have no homes. I don't mean we should throw them out. I mean we should try to find a way of solving the person's problem.

**Porter:** Yes.

**Ross:** I can speak to the homeless person, because I had concern, the same concern that you did. And I tried to find out a way to try to get someone involved with that person. The idea is someone needs to work with him and try to get him into the system. I did call the Homeless Initiative project. And the gentleman's not there today, because someone else apparently called before I did. And there were three police cars out there yesterday morning, and with their lights going, and he was forced out. And I saw him going across the street with his bundles. I called the Homeless Initiative project again today and they know he is there, or has been there. And they looked for him and he was gone. They will continue to look for him and try to find a way to get him in the system.

**R. Keck:** I have a question on campus sponsored housing. And I understand that timing is terribly important, but I was wondering if there's anything that the Faculty Council can do if it's their desire to continue to speak to the issue of campus housing. And I want to put that into the form of a question. Is there anything else that we can do to continue to keep this on the agenda?

**Bepko:** Well, I don't know whether we've ever taken the time to develop a position of the Faculty Council with respect to housing, but it would not hurt for us to have a resolution of the Faculty Council urging that we continue our efforts to develop housing.

**Porter:** Yes, in the back.

**Galanti:** Paul Galanti, School of Law. Is it just my impression, or is the parking this year worse than ever? And someone asked me at the Law School the other day saying "What will happen if and when the Law School, when the new Law School starts getting built and a good chunk of parking disappears? My answer was well we'll find out. Is there anything, is parking worse this year than in the past?"

**Bepko:** We think so. there's no scientific study, but we have done some sampling and we've found this year for the first time that we've had hours, usually those peak hours like 10:00 in the morning or 5:45 at night, when every parking place was full. And we have not had that before. Mark?

**Grove:** One part that relates to that Chancellor, of course, is that as the average credit hour rate of enrollment has gone up, students are taking more classes, they're here longer. So, there may not be any more students here, but they're here longer making a struggle for those high peak hours at 10:00 and 5:45.

**Bepko:** That's the reason for the problem. In fact, we had 55,000 more credit hours this fall generated than we did -- 5500, not 55,000, wishful thinking -- 5500 more credit hours this year than last year. That represents quite a number of people here more than there would've been last year. Even though, the head count went up only about 50 or so.

**Galanti:** Any chance of my getting my free parking space back by the tennis courts.

No.

**Bepko:** You can get a free parking place, if you join the National Institute for Fitness of Sport and pay the fee to them, but no, that's in the same area. There's no such thing as a free lunch, and there's no such thing as free parking.

**Schneider:** When's the next garage going up?

**Bepko:** The second question that Paul [Galanti] asked has to do with what happens when the new Law School building construction starts next summer. Won't that make parking even worse? It may. We're going to have to do some work to try to create more surface parking on the north side of Michigan. There is some area there that's available and not yet developed into surface parking. One hope is that we would have a garage finished by that time, but I don't think that's going to happen. It's already so late that it would be difficult to finish it in time. And there is a substantial disagreement about where the garage should go. The aesthetic people want the garage to go on the north side of Michigan and the safety people want it to be on the south side of Michigan. The reason being that students who'll park in that garage will have to, if it's on the north side of Michigan, walk across Michigan and I think Michigan Street is becoming very dangerous. And it worries us a lot that students in greater numbers will be walking across that boulevard at the same time traffic is greater, and people drive altogether too fast on Michigan. So, I think that there's still some debate about how parking is going to be built. And that's what's holding it up right now .

**Porter:** We'll take two more questions. Martin [Spechler].

**Spechler:** Have you noticed that the clocks on campus are not coordinated? I personally think that this is an attempt on IUPUI to establish a new type of daylight savings time, or possibly a fifth time zone for the state of Indiana. Now, this, if it were just a minute difference, would have no affect, but actually because the clocks in the Business and Social Work wing are roughly five minutes, at least five minutes faster, than the clocks in Cavanaugh Hall. That means if you are going from a cla ss as a teacher or a student from Cavanaugh Hall to the Business building, instead of having fifteen minutes you have nine or ten minutes. And that often means if you're a teacher answering a few questions after class that you're barely on time and on occ asion even late for class. Of course go the other way, it's fine. So, I wondered if we had considered establishing an international date line in the middle of campus, or some accommodation, or failing that, how about getting the clocks to say the same tim e all over campus?

**Bepko:** That's a good point.

[**Unidentified**]: There's the same thing in Cavanaugh. From the first floor to the second floor needs to be changed in Cavanaugh.

**Barlow:** They really are a mess. There's no doubt about it.

**Bepko:** Who's the dean over there, John?

**Barlow:** A while ago I called the time setting people, they say no, they're correct. We recognize it's a problem.

**Bepko:** Do we have time setting people? Do we have a department of clocks?

**Barlow:** No one else will set them.

[**Unidentified**]: What's their number?

**Porter:** Maybe we should invest in a watch for them.

**Bepko:** I think it's a good point. We ought to make sure those clocks are all synchronized. I remember when I was at public schools in Chicago they were all set and were all centrally controlled, so that people could rely on them all throughout t he building complex. I don't know how much that would cost us to do, but we ought to have them reasonably synchronized.

**Porter:** Dick



**Peterson:** I have a couple of comments about the parking and people movement across campus. The first is as our campus becomes more attractive to students and the fact they spend more time here, I think we're going to even have more of a parking problem. We want a campus where people feel that this is a home. And this is a place where they center a lot of their activities as our undergraduate center is developed further. And as other activities on campus including the Division I might come here, we're going to have more people here. So, we're going to have to make serious attempts to deal with this parking issue and I think it has to be done sooner rather than later. The other issue, related to north and south of Michigan, is we need to have at least some blinking lights for crosswalks. It's almost impossible and I would prefer to have the punch so that you could get a green light to walk across Michigan Street. It's not always convenient coming from the garage to go to a corner to cross. And there are crosswalks there, but there's not a blinking light at those crosswalks. There's no stop sign at those crosswalks. All it says is crosswalk and I don't think anyone in this state recognizes that when a pedestrian's in a crosswalk, they have the right-of-way. It's just not recognizable, but most of us who are driving [tape not clear]. You didn't know that?

**[Unidentified]:** Especially when the car's trying to get that tough parking spot.

**Peterson:** So, I think we need to do something about the traffic going across Michigan road either by putting in some lights or stops or some kind of lights there so that when you punch the button you'll eventually get a light to cross over the street safely.

#### **Agenda Item XI: Unfinished Business**

#### **Agenda Item XII: New Business**

#### **Agenda Item XIII: Adjournment.**

**Porter:** Well, we will. We'll bring this to a close. Are there any items of unfinished business? Are there any items of new business? Hearing no business items, we will stand adjourned. Thank you very much.

**Attachment:** Agenda for Faculty Council Meeting, October 9, 1997

[Minutes prepared by David Frisby, Coordinator, UN 403, 274-2215

(Fax 274-2970) [fcouncil@iupui.edu](mailto:fcouncil@iupui.edu) : <http://www.hoosiers.iupui.edu/faccoun/faccou.htm> ]

Indiana University - Purdue University Indianapolis

Faculty Council Meeting

**October 9, 1997**

School of Dentistry, Room S115

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

A G E N D A

I. Call to Order

II. Memorial Resolutions: Joseph Sterling Ingraham, Professor Emeritus of Microbiology and Immunology, School of Medicine (IUPUI Circular 98-07) **1**; Alice Gorman Lynn, School of Nursing (IUPUI Circular 98-08) **2**; Bernard B. Morrel, School of Science (IUPUI Circular 98-09) **3**; Charles W. Slemenda, Professor of Medicine (IUPUI Circular No. 98-10) **4**; Virgil K. Stoelting, Professor Emeritus of Anesthesia, School of Medicine (IUPUI Circular No. 98-11) **5**.

III. Recognition of Bernice Chumley, Faculty Council Secretary

IV. Administrative Report: Chancellor Gerald L. Bepko

V. President's Report: William Schneider

VI. Athletic Affairs Committee Resolution Regarding Move to NCAA Division I (IUPUI Circular 98-12) **6 (ACTION ITEM)**

VII. Report on Research and Graduate programs: Doris Merritt (**Circular 98-13**) **7 (INFORMATION ITEM)**

VIII. University College Report (**INFORMATION ITEM**)

IX. Proposed Policy for Faculty Review and Enhancement: Cont. Discussion - Sara Hook (IUPUI Circular 98-04) **8 (INFORMATION ITEM)**

X. Question / Answer Period

XI. Unfinished Business

XII. New Business

XIII. Adjournment

Attachments

Memorial Resolutions for:

- 1** Joseph Sterling Ingraham, School of Medicine (IUPUI Circular 98-07)
- 2** Alice Gorman Lynn, School of Nursing (IUPUI Circular 98-08)
- 3** Bernard B. Morrel, School of Science (IUPUI Circular 98-09)
- 4** Charles W. Slemenda, School of Medicine (IUPUI Circular No. 98-10)
- 5** Virgil K. Stoelting, Professor Emeritus of Anesthesia, School of Medicine (IUPUI Circular No. 98-11)
- 6** Athletic Affairs Committee Resolution Regarding Move to NCAA Division I (IUPUI Circular No. 98-12)
- 7** IUPUI Graduate Affairs (IUPUI Circular 98-13)
- 8** Faculty Review and Enhancement (IUPUI Circular 98-04)

FC971106 MINUTES:  
APPROVED FC98050.

Indiana University - Purdue University Indianapolis

**Faculty Council Minutes**

**November 6, 1997**

School of Dentistry, Room 115

3:30 - 5:30 p.m.

**Attendance Record.**

**I. Voting Members (104):**

Absent---: Allen, Stephen (Elected: Medicine 6/99);

Present--: **Atkinson, Simon** (Elected: Medicine 6/99);

Absent---: Baldwin, James (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Absent---: Banta, Trudy (Elected: At Large 6/99. Ex Officio: Chancellor's Admin. designee);

Absent---: Barlow, John (Ex Officio: Dean of Liberal Arts);

Absent---: Barnes, A. James (Ex Officio: Dean of Public & Environmental Affairs);

Present--: **Belcher, Anne** (Elected: Nursing 6/99);

Present--: **Bepko, Gerald** (Ex Officio: Officer: Chancellor of IUPUI.);

Present--: **Besch, Henry** (Elected: Medicine 6/99);

Absent---: Bippen, Paul (Ex Officio: Dean of IUPU Columbus);

Absent---: Bjork, Ulf Jonas (Elected: Journalism 6/99);

Present--: **Blomquist, William** (Elected: Liberal Arts 6/98);

Absent---: Broadie, Thomas (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/99);

Present--: **Brothers, Linda** (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Absent---: Brown, Trevor (Ex Officio: Dean of Journalism);

Absent---: Burr, David (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Canty-Mitchell, Janie** (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Chernoff, Ellen** (Elected: Science 6/99);

Absent---: Cobb, Karen (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/99);

Absent---: Cochran, Michael (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98);

Absent---: Cronin, Blaise (Ex Officio: Dean of Library & Information Science) (Bloomington);

Present--: **Crowell, Dring** (Elected: Science 6/99);

Absent---: Dalsing, Michael (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Absent---: Dalton, Dan (Ex Officio: Dean of Business);

Absent---: DeSchepper, Edward (Elected: Dentistry 6/98);

Notice---: Dickerson-Putman, Jeanette (Elected: Liberal Arts 6/98);

Absent---: DiMicco, Joseph (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Absent---: Dunning, Jeremy (Ex Officio: Dean of Continuing Studies) (Bloomington);

Absent---: Eble, John (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Present--: **Eckerman, Nancy** (Elected: Medicine 6/98);

Absent---: Evenbeck, Scott (Ex Officio: Dean of University College),

Absent---: Faris, James V. (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Fineberg, Naomi** (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Fineberg, S. Edwin** (Elected: At Large 6/98. Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98);

Present--: **Fisher, Mary** (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Absent---: Ford, David (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Fore, Julie** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Alternate: Fredland, Richard (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98)--

-----[via **Rebecca Porter** (Allied Health Sciences)];

Present--: **Froehlich, Janice** (Elected: Medicine 6/98);

Absent---: Galanti, Paul (Elected: Law 6/98. Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/99);

Present--: **Gardner, Carol** (Elected: Liberal Arts 6/99)--

Present--: **Gilman, Linda** (Elected: Nursing 6/99);

Alternate: Goldblatt, Lawrence (Ex Officio: Dean of Dentistry);

-----[via **Chris Miller** (Dentistry)]

Alternate: Greene, Roberta (Ex Officio: Dean of Social Work)--

-----[via **J. M. Kapoor** (Social Work)];

Present--: **Gregory, Richard** (Elected: Dentistry 6/98);

Absent---: Hall, Robert (Elected: Science 6/98);

Present--: **Hamant, Celestine** (Elected: Allied Health Sciences 6/99);

Absent---: Hart, Stuart (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98);

Absent---: Hawley, Dean (Elected: Medicine 6/98);

Alternate: Holden, Robert (Ex Officio: Dean of Medicine)--

-----[via **Meredith Hull** (Medicine)];

Present--: **Hook, Sara** (Elected: At Large 6/98. Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98);

Alternate: Hoyt, Dolores (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98);

-----[via **Jonathan D. Makepeace** (University Libraries)]

Absent---: Jafari, Maymanat (Elected: University Libraries 6/99);

Present--: **Jones, Elizabeth** (Elected: Physical Education 6/98);

Absent---: Karlson, Henry (Elected: At Large 6/98. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/98);

Absent---: Keck, Juanita (Elected: At Large 6/99. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/99);

Absent---: Keck, Robert (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent---: Keffer, M. Jan (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/99);

Alternate: Kellum, P. Nicholas (Ex Officio: Dean of Physical Education);

-----[via **Sue Barrett** (Physical Education)]

Absent---: Leapman, Stephen (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent---: Lefstein, Norman (Ex Officio: Dean of Law);

Present--: **Luerssen, Thomas** (Elected: Medicine 6/98);

Absent---: Man, Joyce Yan-Yun (Elected: Public & Environmental Affairs 6/98);

Absent---: Mannheimer, Steven (Elected: At Large 6/99. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/98);

Present--: **Mannix, Edward** (Elected: Medicine 6/99);

Alternate: McBride, Angela (Ex Officio: Dean of Nursing);

-----[via **Shirley Ross** (Nursing)]

Absent---: Modibo, Najja (Elected: Continuing Studies 6/98);

Present--: **Ng, Bart** (Elected: At Large 6/99. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/98);

Present--: **Olson, Byron** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent---: Parsons, Michael (Elected: Education 6/98);

Absent---: Peters, G. David (Elected: Music 6/98);

Absent---: Peterson, Richard (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98);

Present--: **Plater, William** (Ex Officio: Chancellor's Administrative Designee);

Present--: **Pless, John** (Elected: Medicine 6/99);

Present--: **Porter, Rebecca** (Elected Officer: Vice President 6/98. Ex Officio: UFC Rep. 6/98);

Absent---: Porterfield, Amanda (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Powers, Gerald** (Elected: At Large 6/98. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/99);

Absent---: Rescorla, Frederick (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Present--: **Rizkalla, Maher** (Elected: Engineering & Technology 6/98);

Present--: **Robertson, Jean** (Elected: Herron 6/99);

Present--: **Rogers, Richard** (Elected: Business 6/99);

Present--: **Ross, Beverly** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Present--: **Rothe, Carl** (Elected: Med 6/99. Ex Off: Exec C. 6/99, & UFC Rep 6/99);

Present--: **Schneider, William** (Elected Officer: President 6/98. Elected: At Large 6/98.);

Absent---: Shay, Robert (Ex Officio: Dean of Herron);



Absent---: Sothmann, Mark S. (Ex Officio: Dean of Allied Health Sciences);

Present--: **Spechler, Martin** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent---: Stocum, David (Ex Officio: Dean of Science);

Present--: **Sutton, Susan** (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Absent---: Svanum, Soren (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent---: Tarver, Robert (Elected: Medicine 6/99);

Absent---: Tompkins, Philip (Ex Officio: Director of University Libraries);

Present--: **Vermette, Rosalie** (Elected: At Large 6/99. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/99);

Absent---: Vessely, Jeffery (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Present--: **Wagner, Marion** (Elected: Social Work 6/99. Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/99);

Present--: **Warfel, Kathleen** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent---: Warren, Donald (Ex Officio: Dean of Education);

Present--: **Watt, Jeffrey** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent---: Webb, Charles (Ex Officio: Dean of Music) (Bloomington);

Present--: **Webb, Dorothy** (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Weetman, Robert** (Elected: Medicine 6/98);

Absent---: West, Karen (Elected: Medicine 6/98);

Alternate: Wilkins, Harriet (Appointed Officer: Parliamentarian 6/98. Elected: At Large 6/98)--

-----[via **Carl Rothe** (Medicine)];

Alternate: Yokomoto, Charles (Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/98);

-----[via **David Bostwick** (Engineering & Technology)]

Present--: **Yurtseven, H. Oner** (Ex Officio: Dean of Engineering & Technology).

## **II. Non-Voting Members (3):**

Absent---: Phillabaum, Melinda (Ex Officio: Staff Council President);

Absent---: Barlay, Thua (Ex Officio: Student Assembly President);

Absent---: Yovits, Marshall (Ex Officio: Senior Academy President).

## **III. Guests/Visitors/Others (non-voting):**

Present--: **Bartlow, J. Douglas** (UITs Audio Engineer: Recorder);

Present--: **Frisby, David** (Faculty Council Coordinator);

Present--: **Grove, Mark** (Registrar);

Present--: **Kulsrud, Bill** (Business);

Present--: **Martin, Robert** (Vice-Chancellor for Administration & Finance);

Present--: **Palmer, Judith** (Indiana University Vice-President & Chief Financial Officer);

Present--: **Rooney, Patrick M.** (IUPUI Administration Special Assistant);

Present--: **VanVoorhis, Rebecca** (Social Work).

## **Agenda Item I: Call to Order**

[The meeting was called to order by Rebecca Porter.]

**Porter:** I would like to introduce the newest member of the front table. This is David Frisby, the new Faculty Council Office Coordinator who will be here at all of our meetings and we hope giving us an opportunity to enhance some of the services that the Faculty Council Office provides. Let's welcome David. [Applause]

## Agenda Item II: Administrative Report

**Porter:** We will move on to the Administrative Report from Chancellor Bepko.

**Bepko:** We will have a report as part of the question and answer session responding to questions about safety and traffic light issues raised by Carl Rothe and some questions that we assume will always be asked about our progress on child care. The reason that we will do this as part of the question and answer period, if you don't mind, is that Bob Martin, who is involved in a project that he can't break away from right now, will be here a little after 4:00 p.m. By the time we get to questions and answers, he will be here to talk about those two things. What we do have today is a report on the faculty that Bill Plater is going to give.

**Plater:** We have a summary of the faculty that has been prepared in accord with the wishes of this body. I'm sorry that I forgot to bring the copies with me. They will be mailed to you. This is a report that this body asked be prepared as part of our early discussions regarding the formation and changes in the clinical rank. What it does is display the campus summary of faculty by professorial rank, by tenure status, by status in terms of gender and minority status, and includes faculty who hold appointment beyond the tenure and tenure related ranks--those of scientist, instructor, lecturer and so on--and gives us a fairly complete snapshot of the total faculty. We have as a summary representation of the full report, 1,327 faculty on our campus who hold tenure or are eligible for tenure, and an additional 487 faculty who are full-time but hold rank as scientists, clinical professorial rank or another rank such as lecturer. This means that roughly 73% of all the full-time faculty on campus are tenured or eligible for tenure. This report will be sent to you in the mail. A full and complete breakdown by school has been distributed to each of the campus deans and a copy will be sent to the Faculty Council Executive Committee. I would note, because we are going to later on the agenda discuss N, that we are recording the same information in different ways, because this body includes as faculty eligible for participation in faculty governance, scientist ranks which are not tenured or tenure related ranks. You will see some discrepancy in the numbers but they all add up; it's just a matter of where we place faculty in terms of the use of the term. Whether it's for the purposes of determining participation in faculty governance or the more technical terms we use, the report I will distribute is limited to those faculty who have tenure or are currently earning credit towards tenure.

**Spechler:** Bill [Plater], if you were to add to the full-time faculty the part-time faculty on a full-time equivalent basis, even approximate, how would that 73% change, if you could guess?

**Plater:** I'm really hesitant to say, Martin [Spechler]. We have in any year about 800 individuals who may be appointed part-time but most of those are appointed for teaching one course or a summer course or little more. It is just very difficult to judge by the numbers. We are continuing to look at the relationship of part-time faculty to full-time faculty and are trying to prepare systematic data collection. I should indicate that this report, of course, is a snapshot. It is one moment in time. A week later the numbers may change by five or ten or even fifteen faculty. It is far more difficult to pin down associate faculty because of the ways in which those appointments are processed. Some of them come in very late

and the faculty member may be teaching but we just don't have the information and so on. We are trying to create a mechanism to have some systematic and regular way of capturing that data. Perhaps by the end of this year we will be able to give you a better report on numbers. If you will allow me to beg off, I would prefer not to put a percentage to it because I think that would stick in people's mind and I could be off by 100%.

**Warfel:** Could you comment specifically on how we're doing with increasing the number of unrepresented minority groups in our faculty?

**Plater:** In particular, for the minorities of African-American and Hispanic minorities, we are increasing. I think very slightly, but if you were to look at a several year trend, it's fairly flat. There has been some increase in Asian faculty and a larger number of those faculties. The rate of increase is smaller but the absolute numbers are greater. I think the overall trend is positive but we are working with such a small number that the percentage increase fluctuation can vary a lot from year to year.

One of the additional reports that has been requested is the same information being displayed in historical terms and we are working on that report as well. It's not available yet. That will give us some indication by the categories of, in particular, minority and women ranks that we will be interested in.

**Bepko:** Bill [Plater], isn't it true that if you count all minority faculty, we have a pretty high percentage--16 or 17 percent? The predominant minority that is not under-represented is Asian. And the African-American faculty component, which is the one we spend the most time working on, is not growing nearly fast enough.

**Plater:** That is correct. Among the tenured faculty, the minority faculty constitute 11%. On the untenured but tenure eligible faculty it is almost 20% and there's a similar number among all other faculty ranks--about 20% are minorities.

**Bepko:** We do have set-aside money for minority faculty recruitment. Almost all of that goes to under-represented minorities and it has been recycled quite a number of times. It usually involves our paying the first three years of a new appointment from a central pool. We have created some positions with permanent funding as well, for minority faculty. However, it is a problem because what we do on the front end to recruit is eroded by what happens at the other end when we lose people who are recruited away. Our success in maintaining the faculty and resisting recruitment efforts from other institutions is pretty good, over all. We report our balance of faculty trade every year and we usually recruit more people away from other universities than are recruited away from us. But I think our record is not as good among minority faculty.

**Spechler:** I can't resist asking because, as Jerry [Bepko] knows, this has come up in the U.S. Supreme Court this week--what are the under represented minorities as far as IUPUI is concerned, and what is the standard for being under-represented?

**Bepko:** I'm not sure.

**Plater:** In our particular situation, the communities that we think of and the population of Indiana that is under-represented, is predominantly African-American. There is a growing Hispanic population here which in terms of numbers of students and numbers of faculty is a population that is still under-represented. There is a very small Native American population in Indiana and I think we are talking in the range of 1% or 2% so it is very hard to have a comparison there.

**Spechler:** The standard of under-representation for students and faculty is the percentage in the State of Indiana?

**Plater:** And particularly, our service region: the nine counties that we serve.

**Bepko:** If there are no other questions, there are a couple of other things that I would like to mention.

First is the Trustees meeting that took place last Thursday at New Albany. Four items came up that might be of interest. The first you will be hearing a good deal more about in the next year or so. The Trustees adopted a plan to evaluate and address problems with respect to faculty compensation in three areas.

First, a university-wide compensation equity study, modeled on the IUPUI study now in place will be conducted this year. Kathy Warfel, who has provided general oversight for the development of our own IUPUI compensation equity study as the head of the Office for Women, will be providing overall leadership for this university study at a policy level. Each campus will do its own equity study, but Kathy will be involved as the President's person overseeing the policy that the Trustees have developed. The next couple of years will be spent in that equity review as we are doing it on this campus--again modeled after what we are doing here--and correcting any equity problems that are unearthed in the study.

The second part of the compensation analysis will be a study of peer institutions with the idea of bringing the Bloomington campus to the 60th percentile of the Big Ten and all other campuses to the 60th percentile of their relevant peer group. You'll be hearing more about peer groups. We have, actually on our own, decided that we should have one peer group that serves for all purposes. The specific question that has been raised on a couple of occasions is whether you can have one peer group for retention issues and another peer group for salary issues. The answer is no. We think we should have one peer group for all purposes. We have a list of peer institutions now. It's the urban campuses. We will be talking about that more as the study goes forward, but there will be the same kind of three or four year effort to bring salaries up to that 60th percentile.

And finally, a third compensation issue that will be analyzed are retirement benefits, specifically how to pay for the existing 18-20 benefits that are now locked into place. This is not a suggestion that there will be any examination of existing 18-20 relationships. Everyone who is entitled to 18-20 benefits will

remain entitled to 18-20 benefits. No 18-20 benefits will be diminished and certainly not taken away. But there is a problem, as many of you know, in funding this unfunded retirement benefit. Over the next eighteen or twenty years, the cost of funding this benefit will increase at a very rapid rate until somewhere between 2011 and 2015 it will reach its peak at a very substantial number and then will drop off because all of the people who are eligible for 18-20 either will be retired or will have gone off in some other way which will make them ineligible for 18-20 benefits. [Laughter].

The irony of all this is that we're putting money into the 18-20 program at an increasing rate, and we have also started the new early retirement program so that if you look at the cost of our retirement benefits, this is going to ramp up dramatically until about 2011 to 2015, and then fall off precipitously. Now that will create a windfall for those who are on the faculty in the year 2020 or so when we don't have to provide the base funding for this unfunded 18-20 benefit any longer. The university will be awash in money. We have a little trouble getting passionate about helping people in 2020 when we have this very large increased cost now. In other words, we could strangle our academic programs paying for these retirement benefits only to have this windfall in 2018. The result is that the committee will go to work on figuring out how to either shave this hunk and distribute the costs over a longer period of time, or look at benefits for new appointees that would be reduced in order to help avoid having the cost of this program become prohibitive. The numbers will be presented at the appropriate time. That's the third committee on compensation that will be appointed. You will hear more about that I am sure. Again, I repeat what I said in the beginning, there is no jeopardy to any 18-20 benefits that are now accruing to any member of the university family.

We now have administrative review reports for Mark Rosentraub, Scott Evenbeck and Bill Plater (whose report is excellent I am pleased to say). We are still waiting for Lillian Charleston's review committee to be finished. We will have at least the three reviews that are finished and, I hope, the fourth review summarized for you at the December meeting.

Also from the Trustees meeting, there was discussion about University College and the Trustees approved naming the old Library Building as University College, so henceforth the building will have that name officially in the university.

And finally, as you may have read in the papers, the Trustees approved by a vote of seven yes and one no (there was one Trustee not present; there were no abstentions) IUPUI's move from NCAA Division II to NCAA Division IAAA. So as of July 1, 1998, IUPUI will be an NCAA Division I program. Monday and Tuesday of this week, in anticipation of a favorable vote by the Trustees, we were visited by the representatives of the Mid-Continent Conference and they conducted their review of the campus and the athletic program and have enthusiastically recommended that we be made a member of this Mid-Continent Conference. I think as we're meeting right now the conference Presidents are voting to accept that recommendation and we'll join the Mid-Continent Conference in the NCAA Division I starting in the 1998-99 academic year. I want to thank all of you for the wonderful way in which you represented the campus both in your conversations with people and in voting overwhelmingly to recommend the move to Division I. Trustee Jim Morris, at the meeting, in a moment that I think can fairly be described as emotional, said that he thought this was one of the important points of history at Indiana University,

that this was a time when the people of IUPUI came together on some thing of major importance to the university community here and conducted themselves in a dignified and proud fashion. They convinced the Trustees that this was the very right step for this campus to take. I think that if you were there you would have shared in the pride that we felt, being there and hearing Jim Morris talk about the university and the campus in that way.

Finally, we will have an event or two coming up in connection with the MIR space station. As you know, David Wolf is one of our alumni. He has an M.D. from the Indiana University School of Medicine. He is also a graduate of Purdue University, and we have been asked to arrange here a family video conference that will probably take place on Thanksgiving weekend. The discussions are now whether to beam the videoconference from IUPUI to Huntsville or from IUPUI to Moscow to be beamed up to MIR. We'll have the whole family--his father Harry Wolf is an M.D. who graduated from the Medical School--here on campus to have this live videoconference with space station MIR.

In addition, they have asked for there to be an item of IUPUI memorabilia that will be taken by NASA and sent up with the shuttle that goes to MIR to pick up David Wolf in January. It will be on the MIR space station and will come back down. We'll have an IUPUI pennant sent up apropos of moving the athletic program to Division I. [Laughter] We will have it blasted back from outer space to hang up somewhere on campus sometime in January.

**Porter:** Carl [Rothe] suggested that you should have sent one of our starship T-shirts. [Laughter]

**Bepko:** We had to be a little careful of what we sent up. [Laughter] We want to get just enough publicity. [Laughter]

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

**Porter:** We'll move on to President Schneider's report.

**Schneider:** I have a couple of fairly routine matters to report to you. There has been a resignation from the Executive Committee. Bill Orme has found his time taken over by all sorts of other commitments and so we are in the process of selecting a replacement and we'll have that for you by the next meeting.

The committee preference sheets should arrive in your mail for committee service. This year the Executive Committee has decided to do two stages. The main reason is that there is a vote for a number of committees in January and then there are some votes in March and April. At the same time, the faculty don't know about plans for the following year until somewhat later in the spring semester and so we often have to replace people because of sabbaticals or research leaves. Therefore, this preference sheet will be the first chance for you to express your interest in service on the following kinds of committees: the faculty boards of review, the new mediation committee, the President of the faculty, the promotion and tenure committee, and the Vice-President of the faculty. So please pay attention to that when it comes and try to get it in by the date that we asked you to turn it in which is the end of next

week. The second preference sheet will go out later next spring, primarily to determine interest in serving on standing committees.

One of the reasons that David Frisby was hired was for a certain expertise that he has. I should mention that in addition to having two bachelor's degrees and two master's degrees from IUPUI, prior to working here he worked in the Library and actually served on both the Staff Council and was a representative on the Faculty Council. So he knows whereof he speaks. Part of his expertise, is in electronic distribution and archiving of materials. One of the things that we will be trying out on you is electronic distribution of information like minutes as well as posting items to the Web. We aren't going to do it abruptly. We'll try to ease you into it. Raise your hand if you could receive minutes by e-mail, please. If you could, yes. O.K. Thanks. Maybe we will get it done by the end of the year so be watching.

I was at the Trustees meeting that was reported on by the Chancellor. It really was memorable and I wish all of you could have seen it regardless of your views on athletics. It was, certainly for me, a very important moment as far as IUPUI is concerned. The Chancellor orchestrated quite an effective presentation of the campus, both from the faculty, students, athletic staff, as well as the community, state legislators, and board of advisors. All of us can be proud of that.

The next Trustees meeting, incidently, is in Indianapolis December 5--that's a Friday. Those meetings are open to the public and although I don't think there will be anything to compete with the last one, it might be interesting for you to drop in.

The next University Faculty Council meeting is next week--next Tuesday--in Indianapolis. That's November 11 at 1:30 p.m. Among the things that will be coming up, in case you want to attend, is a consideration of the copyright policy that we will actually be talking about later on this afternoon and possibly approving. UFC will have it on its agenda to approve and send to the Trustees. We also will hear a fairly extensive report on non-tenure track faculty. This is an issue that we started talking about last year. It has been under some study and what we're going to probably decide next Tuesday is just what we can do effectively this year, or at least by the end of this academic year. That will definitely be coming to this Council at the beginning of next semester. The post-tenure review matter is out to the regional campuses and of course it's out to the schools and into the departments of this campus. This was reported on and discussed at our first two meetings. Along those lines, Sara Hook has asked to announce a meeting that is coming up for the general faculty. Sara.

**Hook:** There will be a faculty forum on faculty review and enhancement policies. That will be November 21 from noon to 1:30 p.m. in the University Library Auditorium. In addition, for some background material and supplemental policies and other information on post-tenure review, go to the IUPUI Faculty Council Web Site and then find the Faculty Review and Enhancement document link. I will be updating it routinely, and in addition if you do know of other sites that might be good for me to add, please let me know. I'm watching for new material that might be helpful to our faculty. Also, I am meeting with various faculty groups at the different schools, so if your school is going to discuss the policy and if you would like me to be present offering any comments or background information, I



would be happy to do so.

**Schneider:** Finally, if you have the time and want to stick around after the faculty forum on faculty review and enhancement on Friday, November 21, from 12:00 to 1:30 p.m., in that same Auditorium there will be a workshop on school-level budgetary affairs committees from 2:00 to 4:00 p.m. We are trying to make sure that representatives from each of the schools are there but it is open to any faculty who want to know more about it. So, make it an afternoon. [Laughter] That's it.

**Porter:** Thank you very much. We will now progress on to our biannual discussion of  $N$ . You have before you a grid and Bart is going to help explain this fascinating number to us. You will note that we have added now a podium with a mike [microphone]. We are asking, if you are going to speak for a prolonged period of time, in order to help with the transcription, please come up here and speak, so that the mike can pick it up. Also, as a reminder, it would certainly help David if you will identify yourself verbally when you make comments.

**Ng:** I don't know why I got stuck with this job but I suppose it has something to do with numbers. I'm pleased to report that such a number exists but is not unique. [Laughter] I think Henry Besch always reminded me, my predecessor two removed, was the real passionate person on this subject. In any case, you should have a copy of this in front of you. I think the number  $N$  is just simply that you take  $N$  to be equal to say 53. That's the number we are using now. That means that in your school for every 53 faculty members or fraction thereof, you will get one unit representative. So it is very simple. On the sheet that is in front of you, what I have put down is the present situation, that is 1996 and 1997. The number of unit representatives for each school is based on the number of faculty members in the various schools. And then on the right hand side of that sheet, in the table, the total number of faculty is really the tally based on this academic year: 1997 and 1998. Then I worked out for various values of  $N$ , ranges of values of  $N$ , the number of representatives to which each school is entitled. You will see that if we pick  $N$  to be a number anywhere between 53 and 56, then we are basically preserving the status quo. That is exactly what we have at this point despite the fact that there are a few additional faculty members sprinkled among various schools. If you look at the so called road--the road is the IUPUI total--if you see that the change from one bracket to another is more than one, that means that by choosing, by changing the range, you affect more than one school. Basically that is what it is. So, other than that, I think that it should be fairly self explanatory. I will be happy to answer any questions that you have on  $N$ .

**Porter:** If you could, you would like to make a motion on behalf of the Executive Committee?

**Ng:** Yes.

**Porter:** You were going to make a motion on behalf of the Executive Committee that  $N$  remain at 53.

**Ng:** Yes, I will move that and especially I like prime numbers. This is a very nice prime number. You can choose between 53 and 56 but 53 is a wonderful number.

**Porter:** Thank you very much. And now that we have that motion on the floor we will open it for discussion. Martin [Spechler].

**Spechler:** When you come up with a total number of faculty of 1,451, on the basis of which you allocate representation, who counts this faculty?

**Ng:** This information was given to us from Shirley Nusbaum's office.

**Porter:** The number comes from the Faculty Records Office. It is verified by the Faculty Council Office in conjunction with discussions with each of the schools. It includes those individuals that by our Constitution are included in the count. Those who are research rank are included. There are some individuals that are recognized in the School of Medicine as being geographic full-time that are counted, but it is a process which is Faculty Records in conjunction with the Faculty Council Office.

**E. Fineberg:** I assume that clinical faculty are included?

**Porter:** No.

**E. Fineberg:** In my opinion, that conflicts with the views that we had when we passed the clinical ranks legislation a year or so ago. There was an explicit recommendation that clinical ranks be included in faculty bodies. They have at least as much right to be here as any other ranks that you mentioned. Not that I know much about those ranks but it seems to be wrong and contradictory to our intent of the legislation to exclude them.

**Porter:** However, we have not yet changed our Constitution and Bylaws sections to represent that view.

**E. Fineberg:** Well, I would suggest that the Executive Committee look into this, because we have had this legislation already for a year and a half, and its clear intent was to include clinical ranks in our faculty assemblies, wasn't it?

**Warfel:** Well, they are included in the School of Medicine elections but my understanding is that at least in the past they have not been included at IUPUI.

**Porter:** Correct. That's correct.

**Warfel:** I would like to say to Martin [Spechler], that my memory of the discussion was a little different from his memory of it. And while there was a strong urging for further consideration of the matter, it certainly was not a decided matter at the time. In fact, there was considerable resistance to having them participate in the Faculty Council on a one-to-one basis. My original question had to do with the number of units that are listed in the table. One thing that I had in the back of my mind was that we had 20 academic units. Also, I had in the back of my mind that at one point there was a discussion about whether or not Columbus should be represented on the Council as a unit, and I can't remember where

the status of that is.

**Rothe:** It is my impression that with Columbus the faculty have membership elsewhere as well as in Columbus. They have membership, for example, in the schools here in Indianapolis. That has been under discussion though. You are quite right.

**Rooney:** The faculty in Columbus have voted every year for the last couple of years to ask to be represented by direct representation, and not through the schools. They just felt that that representation is ineffectual at best.

**Schneider:** Is this one of the questions the Constitution and Bylaws committee is looking at?

**Rothe:** It was about a year ago. We did once, about a year ago. We'll do it again.

**Schneider:** Okay. We will straighten it out.

**Yurtseven:** As far as Engineering and Technology's N representatives, there is 3 rather than 2 from last year, if my addition is correct. Is it possible to make a change so that the additional number is reflected on the sheet?

**Porter:** We will be delighted to verify the count. We don't want to lose any faculty members. Any other comments or questions? I take it then that you are ready to vote. All of those in favor of setting N at 53 say "aye". Opposed "no". Thank you . [The motion passed.]

#### **Agenda Item IV: Copyright and Fair Use Proposal**

**Porter:** We are now going to move to the next agenda item which is the discussion of the copyright and fair use proposal. We have asked Kenneth Crews to lead this discussion for us. You will note that a circular was attached to the agenda. We have some wording changes for consideration that are going to be distributed to you.

**Crews:** Thank you very much. My name is Kenny Crews and it is certainly a pleasure to be here with you. I am a faculty member both in the School of Law and the School of Library and Information Science. I wondered, as I saw the sheet, how much of that "one" I am under the faculty column for Library and Information Science. I'm split between the two schools. I am also Director of the Copyright Management Center which addresses many of these issues, particularly issues of fair use as they relate to our teaching, research, and learning here at the university. So it certainly is my privilege to come before you as your guest, as a colleague, to present this policy--this proposed policy, I should make clear--on the question of fair use at the university. You will also have a single page coming around that is a proposal of a very important amendment to the proposed policy. I think that like the rest of it, I would like to believe, it is really strongly in favor of supporting you in your pursuit of teaching and research here at the university. This is really an extraordinary proposal for fair use policy. It is quite unlike what

is available at other universities around the country. A typical university policy on the question of fair use, if the university has one at all, generally falls into one of two categories. It is either a policy that says you will comply with the law, end of story, or, it is a policy that attempts to articulate in some detail what fair use means under at least one or two specific, perhaps commonly occurring situations.

There are serious problems with both of those approaches--either one of those approaches. One is to say you will comply with the law and it is certainly not very helpful and doesn't give you any kind of commitment by the university of support along the way which this policy really provides--extraordinary support, support unlike what is present in the policy at any other university. Second, the attempt to articulate details is highly problematic. Faculty members over the last couple of decades have perhaps been the loudest in calling for details. Will somebody please answer my question? Is this, is this not fair use? And, I can really report after studying these issues for many years and in many contexts, that that effort to demand answers from other sources has backfired thoroughly on us. I can offer up one report, for example, that I have here. This is a report newly issued just within the last month or so from the Conference on Fair Use, an attempt to bring people together of different points of views--publishers, authors, librarians, educators--to negotiate what does fair use mean under certain specific circumstances. A small portion of this report is a set of proposed guidelines that attempts to detail "here's what fair use means". The bulk of this report, at least ninety percent of it, is a set of responses from interested diverse parties around the country saying yes we like or no we don't like these proposals for what is fair use. Indiana University joins most of the other research universities and professional societies around the country in strongly opposing this kind of approach and the specific outcome of this negotiation because, in fact, what we have learned from the past and from what we can learn right here and now, is that this effort to quantify, to detail, to prescribe, what fair use means, has been one that has done nothing more than lock us in, inhibit our use of resources, hinder our educational efforts, and really undermine the fair use that Congress gave us. So, the proposed policy before you is at once radical in the sense that it's a sharp move away from that kind of ad hoc effort to lock us in--making clear that we won't be pulled into that--and it is also a very conservative policy in that it sends us right back to what fair use really is. And that is, an evaluation, a balancing of four factors that Congress gave us in the fair use statute, that we were meant to experiment with and apply to our particular circumstances. The law also gives us considerable support for the reasoned, good-faith judgements that we make based on those four factors. So with that introduction, I'll pause and offer it back to you, opening it for questions.

**Porter:** We are bringing this before you for discussion. If, based on our discussion, the body chooses, we would entertain a motion to endorse the policy so that that information could be taken forward to inform the UFC discussion next Tuesday.

**Schneider:** Do you want to explain the change you just handed out?

**Crews:** Yes, I certainly will and I hope that you also have one other change that I believe has gone to this group. The Bloomington Faculty Council, just by circumstance of calendaring, did get to review this first, and the Bloomington Faculty Council approved the policy quite overwhelming with two words inserted. On that point three: "avoid adopting or supporting policies or agreements that would restrict Fair-Use rights". It is "avoid whenever possible adopting..." Again, we don't want to lock ourselves in

too rigidly as well.

And then, the other single sheet that I'm distributing today is a point four added to this list of numbered paragraphs. It is an outgrowth of the presentation of this proposal to the University Faculty Council and presents some very strong well-reasoned articulated demands or requests that we include a statement of indemnification in this policy. I'm happy to support that addition. It is one that we are providing here referenced to the existing, and I must say by comparison again to other universities, extraordinarily generous indemnification policy that we have at this university that we are all beneficiaries of (in reference to that policy). This is a big step. Many of the senior administrators of the university did not want that reference in here. Not that it would not be true without the reference, but referring cross-references to other policies is just simply unorthodox. It creates a ripple effect. If you change one then you have to go in and change the other. And so, it also means that as this goes before the Board of Trustees--assuming you allow us to take it to that level--that it will also raise the question of indemnification with the Board of Trustees, which we may or may not want to do, but there it is. It is their policy and so we will certainly raise it indirectly at least. It is an important point and we are glad to add it.

**Porter:** Questions or comments.

**Schneider:** Just one final point about this change. If you notice the organization of materials, there is the three-point policy with the Bloomington amendment, and then there are nine supporting principles. This additional fourth point grew out of principle number nine which says: "If a member of the IU community acts in good faith, etc... the IU indemnification policy will also likely offer protection..." and this amendment strengthens that considerably. It says it will, and by the way, Kenny, you should change that principle number 9 as well.

**Crews:** That will be something that we will have to re-articulate. Now we need to make clear that no policy such as a fair use policy can change the standard of the indemnification policy and so we have to be very careful about that. The indemnification policy, again I'm taking a risk at paraphrasing--paraphrasing is always risky--but it essentially says that if you reasonably believe that you were acting within the scope of your duties and reasonably believe that what you were doing was within the law, the university is really here to indemnify you against losses that you incur on the job. So, we've always had a duty to ourselves and to others to reasonably believe that we are acting within the law, and the law is what Congress and others give to us. We try to have some effect on that but in the end we have to listen to what is handed to us.

**E. Fineberg:** I am a little bit curious as to why you chose not to include the four points that are made in the law. From these guidelines, since you do refer to them, they are in fact part of the guidelines and a person who is trying to use these policies would like to have those principles, if you will, in the law--included so they don't have to refer elsewhere. I don't see any sense in doing it the way you have.

**Crews:** I think that is a very important point. We really tried, and it is a deliberate effort, to not put this

substance--not even the basic substance--of fair use into the policy. For example, there is a bill in Congress right now that may effect a few changes in the fair use law. Suppose that bill were to come to pass, then we would have a policy that really didn't articulate what fair use is with precision. We would then be compelled to go back and go through the process again to update and revise our policy to reflect new law. There is always that hazard of articulating the substance. I agree entirely that reading the policy itself is not going to begin to answer your particular question. We, in fact, deliberately make no pretense that it will. Instead we say that the university will, through these various offices, including mine, be available and make available to you a wide variety of materials starting with articulations of those points, and I have a stack of diverse materials that we've prepared, and we have access to other sources to make available.

**E. Fineberg:** Then I suggest to you that those particular points be attached to this document as a rider, if you will, and you can change the wording in such a way to say that it would basically be the law, or modifications thereof (current versions, if you will). I think it should be attached because otherwise it is not a document that can be easily used.

**Crews:** I'm perfectly happy to include attachments in a variety of ways. I just want to be careful not to articulate something in the policy that requires your approval, that requires the Board of Trustees approval, that would require our going back and getting that approval again every time Congress changes something.

**E. Fineberg:** I think that's easier done in the context of the wording as it is and basically just changing it to "the current law or modifications thereof, attached below."

**Crews:** Again, I'm foreseeing different kinds of problems with the attachments. Imagine if we put this into a handbook that is good for two years. In the middle of those two years we have the Congressional change. Now the handbook is. . .

**E. Fineberg:** Then a supplement might need to come out all the time. I see.

**Crews:** These are all good ideas.

**Spechler:** Well, I agree that this policy is a very conservative and careful document, and I appreciate the reasons for that, but suppose that a junior colleague who was without experience in this area comes to deal with other senior members and says, "Is it okay to Xerox three chapters out of this book and distribute it to students?" That is the sort of thing that happens every semester. Now I would like to know what is going to happen, what kind of concrete advice we can give. Do I understand that the purpose of this policy is to keep everything oral and not printed? [Laughter]

**Crews:** No, not at all. In fact, we are constantly documenting all sorts of things.

**Spechler:** So what kind of help are you going to give me, or, indirectly, this junior colleague, in this

situation?

**Crews:** We have these questions all of the time. I had one strikingly similar to it yesterday afternoon. It may result in a phone conversation, a memo, a set of very short materials that aren't going to overwhelm you that say here's the stuff that can help you answer that question, and work you through it. And, if that is not satisfactory with you either in terms of the content or the process, I and my colleagues are readily available to help you through this in whatever way is comfortable to you. So you would come to me and the way that we would approach it is by going right back to those four factors. And it is interesting that I use the word conservative, and I did use the word conservative, in the sense that it's conservative of going back to what Congress said the law really is, and not what some guideline developers pretended to know regarding what the law really is. I have very scathing things to say about those. But it is not conservative in its adherence to those guidelines. We are interested in making sure that you really understand that fair use exists to help you in furtherance of your teaching and research. We are very interested in helping you exercise fair use for that purpose. And so, therefore, we go back to some questions. Those four factors can be summarized very nicely: what is the purpose of your use? Your non-profit educational purpose tends to be favored toward fair use. What is the nature of the material? Non-fiction kinds of material, which is typically the case of photocopying, tend to weigh in favor of fair use. What's the amount? Those three chapters, are they a whole lot of that textbook or are they a tiny part of an enormous book? We are going to weigh that in the balance. The effect on the market. That is the fourth factor. How does what you are doing have inroads on the possible sales of that book, for example. And that is exactly the exercise, in a nutshell, that Congress asks us to go through. That is exactly the exercise that actually best serves your educational needs relative to anything else that's ever been offered up.

**Spechler:** I would say that our secondary objective (I've agreed with what you've said so far) is to avoid a brush with the law. And surely between the vague intent of Congress and guidelines which may have been jiggered up by publishers, there must be some legal precedence in this area.

**Crews:** Let me give you a good example. Let me rephrase your question. What is "the law" on whether it is fair use for me to photocopy these three chapters. If we could rephrase your question into "is there law that says yes or no to that", the answer is clear. "No there is not." Almost any fair use situation that you can think of, there is no law to answer whether that is or is not fair use.

**Spechler:** No controlling authority, huh?

**Crews:** Exactly. Exactly. The controlling authority that we have, is the statute from Congress. There are a few remotely relevant cases involving non-universities. Like Kinko's has been sued for photocopying. But under the fair use analysis, that's not us. And so we are really compelled, necessarily, to go back to those four factors.

**Rothe:** Ed [Fineberg], particularly before, earlier on, I fully agreed with you and also Martin [Spechler]. But it seems to me, that as I look at this more, and look at the details, I begin to see the wisdom of

making this language general. And the important thing is these documents that go along with it, these nine principles and some other things, and then this particular part that they have included on our part for IUPUI about the material available on the Web. This gives us the clues. This gives us the stuff we can give to our colleagues. This gives us the stuff we can look at. Those go on for pages and pages and examples go on for pages and pages. and pages. And so I was convinced that this is the way, the right way to go, because we have these materials that will be with the documentation with our minutes.

**Bepko:** Since the law was enacted by Congress, has there been any case in which a higher education institution has been found to be in violation of the copyright laws and not at the same time engaging in fair use?

**Crews:** No. One of the common questions that comes up in different fora that I conduct, and I conduct them all over the country from Dartmouth to Stanford to Seattle to Florida. I conduct these sessions and all over this campus and all over this State and let me ask you something. I am prepared to come to your departments and talk about some of these issues. I'm more than happy to do it. It is a central function that I can provide. In all of those fora, one of the common questions that comes up or remarks that comes up, is that "but universities are being sued more and more". And I pause there and I say "name one". And it generally brings the conversation to a dead halt.

**Bepko:** Well, we're being sued, but for other things. [Laughter]

**Crews:** Exactly. Not this one. Not this one. Thank you. I can name one. New York University in 1982 was sued over the issue of photocopies for classroom use and there was no court decision. The parties settled it out. I can name another one. UCLA was sued in 1989 over a much more flagrant issue of multiple copies of software. Thirty students in the class, just crank out thirty copies of the software on disk and hand it out. It was sued and I'll spare you the long legalistic story, but UCLA went in on a constitutional ground and said we are a state institution (sounds like us), and under the Constitution of the United States, you can't sue a state institution in federal court for monetary damages. The copyright law says you have to go to federal court. And the federal court said you, UCLA, you are right. Case dismissed. [laughter] And the software companies said we're not going to tolerate that. Let's appeal. They went to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. This is a horrible decision, they said. The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals looked at the law and said, you're right. Case dismissed. They appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court and the Supreme Court said, "we don't even want to hear this case". Certiorari denied. And so we had that and a couple of other cases that have done the same. The reality is that we are at a point also in the law where we're not even sure they can reach us. Now I don't say that to try to throw the floodgates open; I say that this is a really refreshing time for us to be able to say to outside groups that are trying to get us to buy into something that gives away our rights that we can take a deep breath and wonder if we're doing the right thing. Even reasonable people will differ. This policy is a chance to accept those differences and to accept the uncertainty that goes with fair use. This is an incredible gesture supported by the central administration of the university to say, "we trust you." This is an important issue that we trust you to learn something about and to make that right, balanced, reasoned decision. And, extraordinarily, we are ready to back you up in writing. So I offer it back to you.



**Porter:** With the other items on the agenda, it would be helpful if we could think about moving forward. Does this body wish to make a statement about how we feel about this policy on fair use of copyrighted works?

**E. Fineberg:** That we endorse it?

**Porter:** That we endorse this policy.

**Fore:** Which one? The Bloomington amendment?

**Porter:** What we would be endorsing is what you see with items 1, 2, and 3 and our addition of 4. That is my understanding.

**Crews:** Be sure to add the two words that were added to item 3.

**Porter:** With the addition of the "whenever possible" in item number 3.

I heard a motion [Ed Fineberg]. Do we have a second?

[Seconded by Mary Fisher]

[The vote was taken by Dr. Porter and the motion passed unanimously.]

## **Agenda Item VI: Report on Research and Graduate Education at IUPUI**

**Porter:** We are going to move on to the Report on Research and Graduate Education at IUPUI and ask T. K. Li to come to the podium. As you recall, last month we were talking about the graduate education portion of this, so our intent was to focus more of this discussion on the research aspect. There was a circular previously distributed. I will turn this discussion over to you. Do you have some opening remarks that you want to make based on the report?

**Li:** I'm presuming that the report was distributed and read and Professor Schneider informed me that the graduate affairs aspect has been taken care of. So today what I want to do is just respond to any questions that people may have concerning the recommendations that the committee made for research and scholarly activities in faculty development. And I also have some analysis of some more recent data on research support that this campus now has. For example, currently, as of the last academic year we have 128.2 million dollars. And so that has gone up since the report was based on the latest data from 1994-95. I will be happy to discuss with you the trends in external grant and contract support that the university as a whole is receiving in the last several years versus IUPUI and how it breaks down by schools. I have some data here.

**Spechler:** I'd like to support, instead of asking questions, and just say that I think the recommendations are very good. It will strengthen our representation in the Graduate Council of the University Graduate School to have our representatives there, also, members of the Graduate Education Committee on this campus. In the years that I served on the Graduate Council we sometimes didn't know some of the things that were occurring on this very diverse campus and to our membership it would be very helpful in our work, helpful to the Graduate Education Committee, to know what is going on in the Graduate Council and vice versa. So I think it is a very good step.

**E. Fineberg:** One of the trends that we would like to encourage, and I don't know if it's evident in the data that you've accumulated, is the increasing interaction between the campus Medical School and outside commercial ventures. And I wonder whether that has in fact increased in the recent past.

**Li:** This is certainly a desirable goal. I have to say that any increase between whatever we do versus commercial concerns is reflected in the growth of the research grants and contracts, because part of our external funding is from commercial sources. Developing interdisciplinary programs is a little more complex and it is something that we have been trying to work toward and I think the recommendation that is contained in that report is aimed at trying to further that goal. What one needs to remember is that this campus, in terms of research dollars, is fairly heavily dominated by the Medical School and that trend has not changed. Even though total dollars have gone up in the last six years or so--five to six years--all the growth in dollars has been in the Medical School. Now I think what's happening, and that's not reflected in this report because I don't think the analysis of either committee went that far, is that, I think in terms of developing research and interdisciplinary research, we may have plateaued out a little bit and you may ask why. One reason I think is really faculty development. We have reached a certain limitation and we are not going to grow at the rate that we did from 1984 to 1994 unless we put more emphasis on faculty development. The basic development of infrastructure is occurring very well, I think, because of the RIF dollars that Chancellor Bepko and our former President so wisely created. I think what we are seeing is the benefits of that. But I think now the limiting stuff may be just the faculty and to be able to give faculty release time to do the kinds of things that would promote interdisciplinary research.

**Bepko:** I think the success of the medical research on this campus is directly responsible for something that may be a part of this forthcoming Trustees meeting here in Indianapolis in early December. We think that the policy seminar may be devoted to the subject of medical research, the objective of creating conditions which will permit our health schools in particular to be solidly ranked in the top tier, for medicine to be among the top ten public medical schools in the country. It hasn't been scheduled yet, but we are optimistic that the Trustees will want to hear about this while they are here in December. It is all based on watching what has happened here over the last dozen years or so and moving the Indiana University School of Medicine to front rank in terms of attracting research support and of academic medicine in general.

**Porter:** You might mention what is being distributed.

**Li:** What is being distributed is actually data from the FMS database. What I have listed here are the external grants and contract dollars for IU, all eight campuses, which has grown from 1991, 1992 to 1996, 1997 from 166.6 million to 205 million dollars. The amount brought in by IU Bloomington hasn't changed too much so they have flattened out pretty much as the situation with most universities around the country. IUPUI has grown from 87.9 to 128.2. Now if you were to factor out the School of Medicine, which is the fourth column, yielding the fifth one, IUPUI, depending on what you take as base, has grown a little bit or it has flattened out a little bit. I think we just need to look at the trend over longer periods of time. It jumps up and down a little bit because of the funding for the Center on Philanthropy from the Lilly Endowment. That's why the fluctuation from 24 to 16 and then up to 31 and down to 23.

**Schneider:** I was a member of the committee so I'm going to ask a question that I partly know the answer to but I think it might be useful for the Council to hear what you have to say about it. Actually two points.

First is the recent appointment of the committee to hire an officer to take charge of Research and Sponsored Programs. A new Associate Vice-President and Vice-Chancellor for Research on campus. What do you think the effect of that will be? The second question is about the recommendations for changing the committee structure that came out of the task force.

**Li:** The committee was silent.

[A request came forth for the question to be repeated.]

The question was what was my response to, I guess now it is formal that we will be searching for an Associate Vice-President (I'm sorry that the qualifiers confuse me). The Associate Vice-President for Research and Graduate Education who I think will report directly to the Chancellor. Now, the committee was silent on this point because we really didn't understand what a person in that position might be able to do unless there is commitment of additional resources from the President. I hope that will come with the appointment and that it won't be just reshuffling of current resources. I think that if that occurs, I think that is very very salutatory. Now with regard to the issue of providing faculty input, I think that is really a very important point. And, I think that what this does is it gives ownership in terms of planning for the scholarly activities of this school to the faculty. We do certain things. We sit on promotion committees and so forth. We don't take as much control of faculty development. I think that is really a very important aspect because having the resources to do research and scholarly work is necessary but not sufficient. The other part that is needed is faculty. The growth that you see in the School of Medicine, I have to say because I have had a hand in it, is not only developing the infrastructure which was decaying in the Medical School, and that's what the RIF dollars provided, but the very conscious effort to recruit faculty who will do research and then giving them the release time. You can not develop your own faculty and ask them to do research and do scholarly work without giving them the release time. So this is then a commitment by the faculty, by the university for this purpose.

**Bepko:** I think space also played an important role in this. We have the good fortune of being able to construct some facilities, the Medical Research and Library Building was probably the most strategic, but I think the two cancer buildings are also going to be important. The other thing that I was going to say is that I think there is hope that there would be resources to go along with this office. In fact, the reason why the Trustees may take up the subject of medical research and Top Ten status for health schools and some of these issues when they meet here in December, is with the idea in mind that there would be a special initiative at the 1999 General Assembly for health science research. We would argue to the state that it is crucial to having high quality health education for the state of Indiana to have an investment at this time in the quality and in research, which is also indispensable to the future of the health industry in Indiana. They have the same type of investment made now. It will both promote the finishing of the Van Nuys Med Science Building Project and add base funds for medical research.

**Li:** What I believe is the most important contribution of the committee or the task force is the issue of faculty development. I think that is really the critical factor now at the current time versus let's say maybe ten years ago when we really had neither. We now have better space than before but I think an example of this is one of the efforts we have undertaken to develop a center on aging. This is completely multidisciplinary across different schools and we have had a very good response from all schools across the campus. And that is very good. But, and here is the problem, if you go to any one school you will find that there is not a plentiful availability of people who can do this kind of work. So we do have to recruit faculty in order to do this interdisciplinary work.

**Chernoff:** Being from the School of Science, I always feel a twinge when I see the School of Medicine factored out in the campus, and then "the school" referred to as having plateaued in its ability to attract more research money. I would like to call attention to just three specific things. One is that I think everyone would acknowledge that there is always going to be some areas that aren't research grant big bucks areas. I personally don't know a lot about, in fact I can't imagine, let's say that you're teaching in romance languages that you have the opportunity to bring in grants with huge amounts of indirect costs. I haven't come across these kinds of things. There are, so I would expect to see that sort of flack pertaining to teaching grants, travel grants, individual scholarly development grants. But if you look at some schools like the School of Science, there have been substantial increases and a substantial amount of increases in Science, and there the development is still increasing. And there's a third area that I always think about, which is in Engineering, which has tremendous potential to develop as a research entity. And so while I agree (my own research is biomedical) that biomedical research is very important, I really encourage people not to just present to the Trustees that this is the one area where we're going to bring in big bucks for the university so only develop that faculty, only give us space. The rest of the university while a school that is very much smaller, there are areas, I think, of great potential.

**Li:** Well, I think if you read the recommendations from the task force it says exactly that.

**Chernoff:** But I think there is a tremendous emphasis that "Yes, but the Medical. . ."

**Li:** That was not the consensus of the committee. And that is why we had in there a structure where one

was the Research Advisory Committee and the other was the Academic Development Committee. And we recognize the fact that scholarly activities are not related to dollars. However, the university likes to see indirect costs and that is going to be generated out of hard science research because that is what gives you the indirect cost. But that isn't the only scholarly activity that we acknowledge. We recognize that the other faculty in the other schools, Liberal Arts, will do just as important work and they need much less resources and that is why we have that second committee which together form what we call the strategic academic planning committees to that development committee.

**Bepko:** The approach of the university administration does not do what you think it does. I think that we have been thinking about how to broaden this. In fact, the creation of the office itself is a broadening of the focus for research on the campus. I think when you hear people talk about medical research, they are playing to something that will be more likely to attract new state resources. It is broader than just the School of Medicine.

**Porter:** We have time for one more comment. Is there another comment? Thank you very much. We appreciate you providing some additional information.

### **Agenda Item VII: Commission on Women: Action Agenda and Pay Equity Study**

**Porter:** Our next agenda item is some information sharing from the Commission on Women. The Director of the Office for Women is Kathy Warfel and the other name that you see listed, Paul Carlin, co-chair of the Pay Equity Working Group, is here to help explain the relationship to the Pay Equity Study.

**Warfel:** Thank you Becky. As you know, in January of last year the IUPUI Commission on Women was formed. The mission of this group is to improve the work place and learning environment for all faculty, staff and students here at the IUPUI campus. A mission reflected in the motto "IUPUI: A Good Place for Everyone". Of course the group does have a particular focus in improving the campus climate for women and for minorities as well. During the spring semester last year, the Commission went through an organizational and research phase. It now has over 200 volunteer members working in eight working groups. Having spent time talking about what needs to be done, researching how things have been done elsewhere, the working groups and Commission as a whole have come up with what you have before us. It is an action agenda for this academic year for the campus and it is a working document which will undergo some evolution as the year goes on. This document takes us as a Commission and as a campus from all of the things that we might have done or tried to do to a list of things that we believe were feasible so that we can focus the energy of the Commission and the campus on accomplishing some tangible progress this year. As this agenda was being formulated, we met with campus administration and sought and received their endorsement. And at this point we would like to share the agenda broadly on the campus and though much of this work is being done by specific working groups and other offices, certainly every part of the campus can be aware of issues and can make progress on these issues and other areas. You can see in the document the general categories in which work is being done. The one that we came to speak to you about today in particular is the area of pay equity. We have already heard

that the university-wide President has made pay equity--gender and minority equity--a very high priority for the university. We jumped the gun a bit by starting our own faculty pay equity study in July of this summer and the second attachment from our groups gives you more information about that pay equity study. Paul Carlin who is here as our chief investigator of that study will be available to talk about it as well.

I would like to point out some general things about the pay equity study. It is looking at the payable full-time faculty and full-time librarians except for those in the School of Medicine whose pay is complex. That is, it comes partly from the university and partly from patient care income. That group is not being included in this round of studies although certainly we will be getting to them.

The objectives of the study are to see if there is any significant evidence of systematic discrimination, but also to establish departmental salary benchmark models against which individual salaries can be compared. Not for the purpose of saying that there is clearly a problem in an individual case, but for the purpose of identifying individual cases that warrant further investigation. You have this to read through so I won't say anything more about it. I will invite Paul Carlin up to say anything by way of general comments that he would like and then if you have questions we can talk about them.

**Carlin:** Thanks, Kathy. I'm Paul Carlin from the Department of Economics and as Kathy said co-chair of the pay support equity group. As she indicated on the last two sheets of the handout that you have, it describes the pay equity study that we are undertaking. Kathy mentioned the objectives of the study. This first step is basically a statistical analysis of salaries across the campus for faculty members. We are undertaking this with the advice of a technical advisory group that we put together. At least one member of whom is out in the audience, but it includes Paul Bayless from Affirmative Action, Vic Borden and Kathy Burton from Institutional Research, Naomi Feinberg from the Department of Medicine, Linda Griffin from the School of Medicine and Siu Hui from Biostatistics and Chris Keeley from Human Resources, Patrick Rooney from the Chancellor's Office, and I believe there have been some recent suggestions for additions to that and if any of you have any suggestions of people who have some expertise that could help to inform our study, that would be great.

For the most part, I want to leave time for you to ask questions. The basic methodology, or question we are just trying to ask and answer, to the extent that we can, given the statistical approach: Is there a significant evidence of gender inequity in salaries at IUPUI? And, what we are trying to do is to say, I think all of us know from looking at salaries, that the salaries of women faculty--if you look strictly at the averages--are lower at IUPUI, as they are in virtually every institution of higher education. Then the question is, there are a number of reasons why that might be so and we will try to control statistically for as many of those as we can and see if that does indeed provide a sufficient explanation for the salary differences.

**Porter:** I'd like to acknowledge that we have with us Judy Palmer, the IU Vice President, and Chief Financial Officer, and also to note, because when I checked with Chancellor Bepko to determine that I had the correct title, that she is a graduate of our Law School on campus. Always we are proud of our

IUPUI graduates. Are there questions that you would like to ask either on the Commission on Women Action Agenda or in relationship to the gender equity study?

**Fore:** I'm just curious, on salary are you going to be pulling that information off of the Human Resources database or will you be soliciting that from department chairs and that sort of source?

**Carlin:** Actually the total data is a mix of those two. The basic data on salaries and many of the characteristics that we would be looking at such as rank, years at IUPUI, years since you have attained a Ph.D., things like that. Basically the Office of Institutional Research and Affirmative Action have combined to help us gather that data and verify and clean it and make sure that it is accurate. There is some supplemental data: one of the issues in asking about faculty salaries is "does the individual possess the terminal degree?" That is the kind of information we are seeking at the department level. So there are some things we are getting from the department and some things we are getting from the institutional data base.

**Froehlich:** How far back will we be looking?

**Carlin:** The basic part of the study is strictly a snapshot. We are looking at the salaries for the 1996-97 year. There is a supporting part of the study where we will be taking a longer historical look at issues such as turnover and promotion rates to see if those are equitable as well. But the main part of the study is strictly a snapshot of what were conditions in 1996-1997.

**Froehlich:** Haven't you done a study like this, several years ago?

**Carlin:** About ten years ago, it must have been.

**Froehlich:** Is there information still available, or do you intend to use that information in the current study, to see if there's been any progress in the last ten years?

**Carlin:** Yes, thank you for that question. It is true that a study was done about ten years ago I would guess. We will include some comparisons using exactly the same methodology that was used then but we believe that there have been some advances in the methodology, and so the study this time that we will in some sense finally issue is our best scientific judgement about what the situation is. Maybe not directly comparable but at one of the stages along the way we will look at a direct comparison of those two studies.

**Froehlich:** Was use made of that earlier study?

**Carlin:** Was use made? I think maybe I should defer that question. [Laughter]

**Bepko:** A number of years ago, about ten, there were ethnological issues raised about the study, but the results of it were turned over to the academic units with the admonition that any inequity was to be

investigated on the basis of individual comparisons and resolved. I think the School of Medicine, as a matter of fact, did a further study of data. In fact Siu Hui, who is on your technical committee, was I think the one who put together the further study, and there were cases identified where there was gender inequity and they were corrected. Now I don't know how complete that was. I don't know how much it satisfied people, but there was some follow-up activity. There were a number of salaries that were changed as a result of that. I don't know if I can tell you as much detail about other schools, but that was the pattern that was followed. It was left to the schools to investigate and address the apparent inequities that surfaced in the study.

**Froehlich:** How powerful will this study be, and how do you intend to use the results of it, given that this has become a topic of interest statewide. Do you think this is a useful time to take this on? Do you expect any more changes to occur than what we saw in the study 8 years ago?

**Bepko:** Probably in the year 2000 we will have eliminated any gender inequity.

**Froehlich:** [referring to the tape recorder] Is that on, did you get that? [Laughter]

**Carlin:** I think part of the intent of this is in fact that we can sort out the issues of inequity and be confident that we have addressed and have a system in place to address any inequities so that in some sense we can go forward in a united way and not have to worry about issues of festering feeling of inequity that we can indeed, hopefully put that to rest and then move forward on a broader front on issues of salary and compensation.

**Froehlich:** Fine.

**Spechler:** I have a question but I do want to say that I think it is very impressive that IUPUI is able to muster such a high powered committee to deal with this issue. I can't think of someone better qualified than you Paul [Carlin] to carry this out and you are going to have the cooperation of some very good people. I think we can have a lot of confidence in the results of this. What I see looks like the state of the art in doing this kind of work.

My question has to do with ten versus twelve month salaries. Some members of the faculty on occasion get an administrative supplement of essentially twenty percent, an extra two months' salary for carrying out various administrative duties. And that's roughly accepted. Now in your salary study are you going to include those salary supplements? This is important for a gender and pay equity study because it could be said, and I think it has been said, that access to these supplements might itself be subject to some bias. So how do you propose to deal with the question of base ten-month salary versus full twelve month salary for some members?

**Carlin:** As far as I know at this point, what I would say is, that we are controlling for ten month versus twelve months in the data. That is we will include as in some sense as a righthand-side variable the number of months for the appointment whether it is a ten-month or a twelve-month appointment. We



will also control for whether there is any current administrative duty.

On the issue of whether there is equal access to those kind of things, except to the extent that that is covered in our historical review of promotion rates and things like that, I'm not sure that that would be directly addressed. But the basic question of ten month versus twelve month will certainly be addressed and the question of whether there is an administrative supplement--that will be addressed.

**Schneider:** Let me ask a follow-up to Jan Froehlich's question, being a little more specific. Where are you now in the study and what is your timetable? And, finally, perhaps Judy Palmer may want to come and answer this, where will the money come from to address the inequities that are found?

**Carlin:** O.K. I'll defer that third question. But the first questions, and I'll let Jerry [Bepko] talk to that. If he is going to solve the 18-20, then he can solve anything. That's clear. [Laughter]

In terms of the timetable, we're essentially in the midst of the study in terms of having acquired some of the basic data. Now it has taken longer than I thought to in some sense clean the data and verify it, but we are doing some of the preliminary steps. We do hope to have a preliminary report ready by January with a final report due out by the end of February. At this point, I think that goal is still obtainable, so that is what we are hoping for. We do still need to obtain some of this supplementary information. We are working at this point in some sense in some early statistical runs with information on terminal degrees which we are not fully confident of and we need to get that information from the chairs on what the terminal degree is. But that is where we are at this point.

And then the second question had to do with the funding, right? Or was there a second question?

**Schneider:** Is the February deadline deliberate so as to be of use for the salary recommendations that are coming up next year?

**Carlin:** I think we had that roughly in mind but I'm not sure about the fine tuning but I think that is roughly what we had in mind in setting that.

**Schneider:** The next question was funds to take care of problems.

**Bepko:** Eventually I feel that will be funded out of our own resources. One could argue that we should go to the state and say we have systematically discriminated against some people and we would like for you to help us bail ourselves out of this. [Laughter] I don't think that would be a very powerful argument to get new funding. We could ask the Bloomington campus to provide the funding, but I don't think that's a very likely possibility. So, it will come out of our own funding. I don't think it's time yet for us to address exactly how that would be done, but I think it will probably be done by the units that are responsible for setting salaries. In other words, if you are in the School of Law and the School of Law is found to have three cases of salary inequity, the funding to address those inequities would have to come right out of the Law School budget.

**Carlin:** Just as an example, and it's partially also a response to the earlier question about what happened with the earlier study. John Barlow and the School of Liberal Arts, shortly after that, set up a system where one of the categories for salary that is investigated every year is equity adjustment and that of course does come out of the school budget.

**Porter:** Vice-President Palmer, do you have anything that you would like to add?

**Palmer:** No, I thank the Chancellor for answering that question. Even though I'm a graduate I don't have a printing press here. Maybe just another comment for those of you who may not be aware of the action taken by the Trustees. Not only was the issue of the compensation equity brought up to the Trustees and certainly it was reported that IUPUI was at the forefront of beginning this process, the President is now asking all the other campuses to join in and look at their own situations and follow a similar set of steps that have been outlined in general terms first, but then at specific cases as it is determined that there are inequities that appear to be showing up in the initial review.

The second part of the President's presentation, though, to the Trustees involved competitiveness. That will be an issue that will be considered as well during the coming months and while the peer groups for IUPUI and for the regional campuses are still in the process of being established, Bloomington did have a peer grouping of the Big Ten institutions, or the AAU. We presented information on both, but a conclusion was reached that they would attempt to get in the case of Bloomington, and similar goals would be set for other campuses when those peer groups are established, but Bloomington will attempt to reach the 60<sup>th</sup> percentile or fourth place in the Big Ten in terms of faculty compensation. That is to address the competitiveness issue. And of course there are issues related to inequity that will have an impact on the overall salaries that are used to make comparisons. We are going back to the Trustees with that report later this year but it will be in place then for all of the campuses and I think that is a very important step that we were able to take with the Trustees in the meeting last week.

Finally, as has been referenced very quickly, all of you know that we have an 18-20 issue with regard to funding. Let me be very explicit. There are no changes being proposed in 18-20, and I will say that over and over again. But there are no changes being proposed. There will be a committee that will be established to look at how we are going to fund it because we have a gap between resources available as we do modeling and resources needed to meet the out-payoffs that will be required under 18-20 through the conclusion of that program which we estimate now to probably have the last person leaving that program about the year 2031. The real peak year is 2011. That sounds like it is a long time away but in terms of when we start seeing this gap hit us, it is right now. We need to address that so the President is asking and putting together a committee to look at this and take recommendations back to the Trustees later this academic year.

**Warfel:** Before we leave the topic of the pay equity study, I would like to stress, and I think that one of the most important benefits of this study, aside from making things right for individuals who have been in a bad situation, one of the most important things that will come out of this study is that it will focus our attention on how important it is to be up front about how salary decisions are made. In particular,

what has been meritorious in terms of salary. We passed a salary policy at the university in 1989. Schools have adopted salary policies in line with the university policy. The important aspect of those policies has to do with each unit or each department setting out its mission in writing what their local salary decision-making process is going to be. This was all to evolve with the participation of the faculty at the local level or with their elected representatives. I know that some of our departments have simply not followed that policy and this will be a good time for this all to come to our attention. I think we have to be very fair in our salary procedures so I hope that one of the benefits of this whole process will be that each department is very up front about how their salary decisions are made.

### **Agenda Item VIII Question/Answer Period**

**Porter:** We are now going to use our concluding five minutes to give the Chancellor an opportunity to answer the two questions that were submitted in writing, if there are no objections.

**Bepko:** Bob Martin is here now to answer those questions; one on safety and one on child care.

**Martin:** The first issue had to do with pedestrians moving across University Boulevard at North Street which would be just north of the hotel conference center as it t-bones into the outpatient clinic area of University Hospital. That is one of three sites that we have been working with the City on, for more traffic signals. I know personally that I have been working on it for over ten years. We have gotten approval from the City for two of those sites. One of them is that site at North and University Boulevard. It has been engineered. We have gotten a variance from Clarion because we have to go onto a little bit of University property. There will be a traffic signal. It is our expectation that the City will be installing that light in the November/December period. The second light will be at Vermont and University Boulevard which is back by the Dental School. That is another one of our highly congested areas because of all of the pedestrian traffic from the parking lots across University Boulevard to Cavanaugh Hall. That has been engineered as well. I think the timetable on that is early spring. So, although I reported this in the past, I feel more confident that we're actually going to get it done this time because I do know that the engineering has been done and the light has been ordered. [Applause]

On the child care center, I think a calendar of events was presented to you in a meeting in the last couple of months but let me give you a quick status of where we are. We have completed what we call the economic analysis on the operation of the child care center. The reason that we did that was to give us the capability of determining from an operational standpoint--what we can financially afford to do. That has been completed. That is now being translated into a program statement which is really just describing now what type of child care center do we need, and this is also preparatory to architectural design. That will be completed within the next week. We will not go through an architectural selection process as we typically would on most construction projects because they are much larger. This being a smaller project, we will simply select one. Our next step after the program statement is done will be to select that architect so that we can begin the preliminary design. My original timetable was to be in that process by November.

**Porter:** Any questions? We have an opportunity for a thirty second question to the Chancellor.

**Spechler:** Has the Chancellor noticed just how many more informational notices are being taped to our elevators, walls, and restrooms this year than in the past, and does he think that this is making the campus uglier than any date before?

**Bepko:** I'd be happy to answer but the thirty seconds are up. [Laughter]

### **Agenda Item IX Unfinished Business**

### **Agenda Item X New Business**

### **Agenda Item XI Adjournment**

**Porter:** I certainly don't hear any items of Unfinished Business or New Business. Do I?

Therefore, we stand adjourned (5:30 p.m.). Thank you.

**Attachment: Agenda for November 6, 1997 Faculty Council Meeting.**

**[Minutes prepared by Faculty Council Coordinator, David Frisby, UN 403, 274-2215**

**(Fax 274-2970), [fcouncil@iupui.edu](mailto:fcouncil@iupui.edu) : <http://www.hoosiers.iupui.edu/faccoun/faccou.htm> ]**

---

**[Attachment for FC971106 Minutes]**

Indiana University - Purdue University Indianapolis

Faculty Council Meeting

School of Dentistry, Room 115

November 6, 1997

3:30 - 5:30 p.m.

AGENDA

I Call to Order

II Administrative Report: Chancellor Gerald L. Bepko

III President's Report: William Schneider

IV Vote on N - **ACTION ITEM**

V Copyright and Fair Use Proposal: Kenneth Crews

**DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION** IUPUI Circular 98-13<sup>1</sup>

VI Report on Research and Graduate Education at IUPUI: T.K. Li

**DISCUSSION ITEM** IUPUI Circular 98-14

[Previously distributed. If copies are needed, contact the Council Office at 274-2215.]

VII Commission on Women: Action Agenda and Pay Equity Study:

Kathleen Warfel, Paul Carlin **DISCUSSION ITEM** IUPUI Circular 98-15<sup>2</sup>

VIII Question / Answer Period

IX Unfinished Business

X New Business

XI Adjournment

Attachments:

<sup>1</sup>Copyright and Fair Use Proposal (IUPUI Circular 98-13)

<sup>2</sup>Commission on Women: Action Agenda and Pay Equity Study (IUPUI Circular 98-15)

FC971204 MINUTES:  
APPROVED FC980507.

Indiana University - Purdue University Indianapolis

**Faculty Council Minutes**

**December 4, 1997**

School of Dentistry, Room 115

3:30 - 4:00 p.m.

**Attendance Record:**

**I. Voting Members (104)**

Absent---: Allen, Stephen (Elected: Medicine 6/99)

Present--: **Atkinson, Simon** (Elected: Medicine 6/99)

Absent---: Bailey, Darrell (Ex Officio: Dean of New Media)

Present--: **Baldwin, James** (Elected: At Large 6/99)

Present--: **Banta, Trudy** (Elected: At Large 6/99. Ex Officio: Chancellor's Admin. designee)

Present--: **Barlow, John** (Ex Officio: Dean of Liberal Arts)

Present--: **Barnes, A. James** (Ex Officio: Dean of Public & Environmental Affairs)

Present--: **Belcher, Anne** (Elected: Nursing 6/99)

Present--: **Bepko, Gerald** (Ex Officio: Officer: Chancellor of IUPUI.)

Present--: **Besch, Henry** (Elected: Medicine 6/99)

Alternate: Bippen, Paul (Ex Officio: Dean of IUPU Columbus)

-----[via **Patrick Rooney** (IUPUI Administration Special Assistant)]

Absent---: Bjork, Ulf Jonas (Elected: Journalism 6/99)

Absent---: Blomquist, William (Elected: Liberal Arts 6/98)

Absent---: Broadie, Thomas (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/99)

Present--: **Brothers, Linda** (Elected: At Large 6/99)

Absent---: Brown, Trevor (Ex Officio: Dean of Journalism)

Absent---: Burr, David (Elected: At Large 6/99)

Present--: **Canty-Mitchell, Janie** (Elected: At Large 6/99)

Absent---: Chernoff, Ellen (Elected: Science 6/99)

Absent---: Cobb, Karen (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/99)

Absent---: Cochran, Michael (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98)

Absent---: Cronin, Blaise (Ex Officio: Dean of Library & Information Science) (Bloomington)

Present--: **Crowell, Dring** (Elected: Science 6/99)

Present--: **Dalsing, Michael** (Elected: At Large 6/99)

Absent---: Dalton, Dan (Ex Officio: Dean of Business)

Absent---: DeSchepper, Edward (Elected: Dentistry 6/98)

Notice---: Dickerson-Putman, Jeanette (Elected: Liberal Arts 6/98)

Present--: **DiMicco, Joseph** (Elected: At Large 6/99)

Absent---: Dunning, Jeremy (Ex Officio: Dean of Continuing Studies) (Bloomington)

Absent---: Eble, John (Elected: At Large 6/98)

Alternate: Eckerman, Nancy (Elected: Medicine 6/98)

-----[via **Rick Ralston** (Medicine)]

Absent---: Evenbeck, Scott (Ex Officio: Dean of University College)

Absent---: Faris, James V. (Elected: At Large 6/99)

Absent---: Fineberg, Naomi (Elected: At Large 6/99)

Absent---: Fineberg, S. Edwin (Elected: At Large 6/98. Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98)

Present--: **Fisher, Mary** (Elected: At Large 6/99)

Absent---: Ford, David (Elected: At Large 6/99)

Present--: **Fore, Julie** (Elected: At Large 6/98)

Alternate: Fredland, Richard (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98)

-----[via **Rebecca Porter** (Allied Health Sciences)]

Present--: **Froehlich, Janice** (Elected: Medicine 6/98)

Present--: **Galanti, Paul** (Elected: Law 6/98. Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/99))

Alternate: Gardner, Carol (Elected: Liberal Arts 6/99)

-----[via **Suzanne K. Steinmetz** (Liberal Arts)]

Absent---: Gilman, Linda (Elected: Nursing 6/99)

Present--: **Goldblatt, Lawrence** (Ex Officio: Dean of Dentistry)

Alternate: Greene, Roberta (Ex Officio: Dean of Social Work)

-----[via **J. M. Kapoor** (Social Work)]

Present--: **Gregory, Richard** (Elected: Dentistry 6/98)

Absent---: Hall, Robert (Elected: Science 6/98)

Present--: **Hamant, Celestine** (Elected: Allied Health Sciences 6/99)



Absent---: Hart, Stuart (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98)

Absent---: Hawley, Dean (Elected: Medicine 6/98)

Alternate: Holden, Robert (Ex Officio: Dean of Medicine)

-----[via **Meredith Hull** (Medicine)]

Present--: **Hook, Sara** (Elected: At Large 6/98. Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98)

Present--: **Hoyt, Dolores** (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98)

Present--: **Jafari, Maymanat** (Elected: University Libraries 6/99)

Present--: **Jones, Elizabeth** (Elected: Physical Education 6/98)

Absent---: Karlson, Henry (Elected: At Large 6/98. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/98)

Present--: **Keck, Juanita** (Elected: At Large 6/99. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/99)

Present--: **Keck, Robert** (Elected: At Large 6/98)

Absent---: Keffer, M. Jan (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/99)

Present--: **Kellum, P. Nicholas** (Ex Officio: Dean of Physical Education)

Absent---: Leapman, Stephen (Elected: At Large 6/98)

Absent---: Lefstein, Norman (Ex Officio: Dean of Law)

Notice---: Luerssen, Thomas (Elected: Medicine 6/98)

Absent---: Man, Joyce Yan-Yun (Elected: Public & Environmental Affairs 6/98)

Present--: **Mannheimer, Steven** (Elected: At Large 6/99. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/98)

Present--: **Mannix, Edward** (Elected: Medicine 6/99)

Alternate: McBride, Angela (Ex Officio: Dean of Nursing)

-----[via **Shirley Ross** (Nursing)]

Absent---: Modibo, Najja (Elected: Continuing Studies 6/98)

Absent---: Ng, Bart (Elected: At Large 6/99. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/98)

Present--: **Olson, Byron** (Elected: At Large 6/98)

Absent---: Parsons, Michael (Elected: Education 6/98)

Present--: **Peters, G. David** (Elected: Music 6/98)

Present--: **Peterson, Richard** (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98)

Present--: **Plater, William** (Ex Officio: Chancellor's Administrative Designee)

Absent---: Pless, John (Elected: Medicine 6/99)

Notice---: Porter, Rebecca (Elected Officer: Vice President 6/98. Ex Officio: UFC Rep. 6/98)

Absent---: Porterfield, Amanda (Elected: At Large 6/99)

Present--: **Powers, Gerald** (Elected: At Large 6/98. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/99)

Absent---: Rescorla, Frederick (Elected: At Large 6/98)

Absent---: Rizkalla, Maher (Elected: Engineering & Technology 6/98)

Present--: **Robertson, Jean** (Elected: Herron 6/99)

Present--: **Rogers, Richard** (Elected: Business 6/99)

Present--: **Ross, Beverly** (Elected: At Large 6/98)

Present--: **Rothe, Carl** (Elected: Med 6/99. Ex Off: Exec C. 6/99, & UFC Rep 6/99)

Present--: **Schneider, William** (Elected Officer: President 6/98. Elected: At Large 6/98.)

Absent---: Shay, Robert (Ex Officio: Dean of Herron)

Absent---: Sothmann, Mark S. (Ex Officio: Dean of Allied Health Sciences)

Absent---: Spechler, Martin (Elected: At Large 6/98)

Absent---: Stocum, David (Ex Officio: Dean of Science)

Present--: **Sutton, Susan** (Elected: At Large 6/99)

Present--: **Svanum, Soren** (Elected: At Large 6/98)

Absent---: Tarver, Robert (Elected: Medicine 6/99)

Alternate: Tompkins, Philip (Ex Officio: Director of University Libraries)

-----[via **Dolores Hoyt** (University Libraries)]

Absent---: Vermette, Rosalie (Elected: At Large 6/99. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/99)

Present--: **Vessely, Jeffery** (Elected: At Large 6/98)

Present--: **Wagner, Marion** (Elected: Social Work 6/99. Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/99)

Present--: **Warfel, Kathleen** (Elected: At Large 6/98)

Absent---: Warren, Donald (Ex Officio: Dean of Education)

Absent---: Watt, Jeffrey (Elected: At Large 6/98)

Absent---: Webb, Charles (Ex Officio: Dean of Music) (Bloomington)

Present--: **Webb, Dorothy** (Elected: At Large 6/99)

Absent---: Weetman, Robert (Elected: Medicine 6/98)

Present--: **West, Karen** (Elected: Medicine 6/98)

Alternate: Wilkins, Harriet (Appointed Officer: Parliamentarian 6/98. Elected: At Large 6/98)

-----[via **Carl Rothe** (Medicine)]

Absent---: Yokomoto, Charles (Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/98)

Present--: **Yurtseven, H. Oner** (Ex Officio: Dean of Engineering & Technology)

## **II. Non-Voting Members (3)**

Absent---: Phillabaum, Melinda (Ex Officio: Staff Council President)

Absent---: Barlay, Thua (Ex Officio: Student Assembly President)

Absent---: Yovits, Marshall (Ex Officio: Senior Academy President)

## **III. Guests/Visitors/Others (non-voting)**

Present--: **Bartlow, J. Douglas** (UITs Audio Engineer: Recorder)

Present--: **Boschmann, Erwin** (Faculty Development Office; Science)

Present--: **Crews, Kenny** (Law, SLIS, Copyright Office)

Present--: **Elmore, Garland** (University Information Technology Services)

Present--: **Frisby, David** (Faculty Council Coordinator)

Present--: **Gray, Ralph** (Liberal Arts)

Present--: **Grove, Mark** (Registrar)

Present--: **Hamilton, Sharon** (Liberal Arts)

Present--: **Johnson, James** (Economic Model Office)

Present--: **Manlove, Kim** (Academic and Faculty Records)

Present--: **Martin, Robert** (Vice Chancellor of Administration & Finance)

Present--: **Nehf, Laura** (?) (Visitor?)

Present--: **Plater, Gail** (IU Foundation)

Present--: **Rand, Leon** (IUPUI Administration)

Present--: **Ryan, Robert L.** (?) (Visitor?)

Present--: **Sullivan, Cheryl** (Vice Chancellor for External Affairs)

### **Agenda Item I: Call to Order**

**Schneider:** I'm calling this meeting of the IUPUI Faculty Council to order. I am not Becky Porter, in case you didn't notice. She had to be out of town today and left strict orders just what to do. I got the approval of the Executive Committee that as President I could sit in for her. I certainly can't replace her, but I told her when she comes back in January she will be greatly appreciated. This is an unusual meeting in another respect, mainly it is a short Faculty Council meeting prior to the Chancellor's "State of the Campus" address which will begin at 4:00. I want to make one comment about the agenda. You may have noticed that we tried this time to distribute it electronically as well as by paper. And the intention of the Executive Committee is eventually to move to electronic distribution of the agenda and attachments by email and or by the WEB. I'm curious if you could show me by hands how many people got the agenda electronically. Who did not get the agenda electronically or is incapable of doing that? Okay. We need to know that. Please tell David Frisby, who'll be working the bugs out and trying to figure out the least painful way to phase this in, of course with your approval.

### **Agenda Item II: Administrative Report**

**Schneider:** The second item on the agenda is an administrative report from Chancellor Bepko. It will be brief, because he says he has some things to tell you much later. So, Chancellor.

**Bepko:** I want to update you on two matters and Bob Martin will do that. Bob.

**Martin:** Thank you, Jerry. One was to give an update on where we are in regards to the child care center. I think I reported last time that we were completing what we called the economic analysis for the child care center which would lead to the development of the program statement. We have completed that and we're awaiting the final draft of the program statement, which is really just an expression, a written expression of what it is that we'd like to do. That will be done in the next two weeks. That will be forwarded to the University Architect's office. And at the same time we're in the process now of compiling a list of potential architects for the child care center and that selection will be made in January. The process after that will then of course be the architect sitting down with the working team and beginning to design the child care center. So, that's where we are with respect to that.

The other item that the Chancellor asked me to report on was the unfortunate drowning incident that occurred in October, the latter part of October at the Natatorium--kind of where we were with respect to our review of that. The one report that has been completed and filed is just the police report. We have

that. What we are waiting on is the coroner's report, the internal Risk Management report, and a report from a firm called Ellison and Associates. They are worldwide lifeguard status consultants. Their office is located in Ft. Lauderdale and Houston. We have employed them before and they have been employed this time to come in and review our lifeguard standards, review our process to assure that we ourselves have done everything correctly. All of those reports are to be filed within December. So, I'll know a little bit more about a month from now. The preliminary report is I feel comfortable that we've done everything that we should've done, that our lifeguards were properly certified, and we had the proper number there. It is unfortunate that we had an incident like this to investigate, but we will continue to investigate it.

#### **Agenda Item IV: Report of Administrative Reviews**

**Bepko:** If there are any questions, I'm sure Bob would be happy to respond? If not, as you have already discovered, there are copies of three of the administrative review summaries available in the back of the room: the administrative review for the office of the Associate Dean of the School of Public and Environmental Affairs, Mark Rosentraub; the review of the office of then Associate Vice-Chancellor of Graduate Education, the Director of the Undergraduate Education Center, now Dean of University College, Scott Evenbeck; and the review of the Office of Executive Vice-Chancellor and Dean of Faculties, Bill Plater. You can read these summaries for yourself. I'd like to just take a moment to read the last paragraph of the review for Bill Plater, which I'm very proud of in terms of the work that Bill has done. And the paragraph is a summary. It says, "The committee concluded that the overwhelming character of the testimony gathered finds the Executive Vice-Chancellor to be an impressive champion of the university and an administrator whose loyalty, dedication, and talents have served the campus well. The committee agrees that he has real stature as a most extraordinary university administrator, one of the best to be found in the United States, and that IUPUI is fortunate to have Dr. Plater here in office." Oh, yes. To repeat what we have explained before and what's in the policy on these administrative reviews, the policy is to have the report of the committee itself be confidential and made available only to the university administration. We have developed a practice of then writing a summary of that full report and making the summary available to the relevant constituent groups. In preparing that summary, we provide a draft of the summary memorandum to the Chair of the Review Committee and also to the President and the Vice-President of the Faculty Council, and to the incumbent. And we also give each of those persons a copy of the original report in confidence so that they have both the original report and our draft of the summary. The persons that I've mentioned all review the draft summary to make sure it's faithful to the full text of the report, so that these summaries that you're reading are not just a product of some process that may skew the summary in some way. They've been reviewed by several persons to make sure they're faithful to the original report. Not that any of you would be cynical in the least. But we do those extra things to make sure that everyone has complete confidence in the final documents that are distributed.

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

**Schneider:** Okay. We've gotten a little bit out of order on the agenda, but we'll come back later to a question and answer period after the president's report. And I won't change chairs. I have a couple of

things mostly to warn you about and report on. First is to report on an action by the Executive Committee to replace Bill Orme who has resigned from the Executive Committee. Following procedures of going back to the most recent election of the Executive Committee members, we have found and got the agreement of Steve Mannheimer to serve out the rest of the term of Bill Orme. Steve is here taking his place as an *ex officio* member of the Faculty Council. So, our thanks to him. A couple of matters coming up have to do with elections. The preference sheets that you have all filled out have come back in and will be the basis for drawing up some slates. I want to thank you all for it. Remember that we're doing this twice, a new policy this year. The first round had to do with preferences, primarily for the Boards of Review and Mediation Committee. And there'll be another request coming around in a couple of months. On Monday there will be a roster sent around that concerns nominations for IUPUI Faculty Council at-large elections, so that a slate can be drawn up in January to be sent out for voting. And faculty governance leaders in each of the schools will also be notified that they're to hold elections for unit representatives to the IUPUI Faculty Council as well as nominations for UFC representatives.

As far as the next meeting of the Faculty Council in January, it will be January 15<sup>th</sup>, not January 8<sup>th</sup> as you might be expecting. The reason for this is that school doesn't start until the 11<sup>th</sup>, and we thought it might be a little difficult to hold a meeting before school started. Make a note of that now, but of course you'll be advised of that both electronically and by paper. We're going to have a fairly full agenda, mostly housekeeping matters. In addition to the elections for Boards of Review and Mediation Committees, we'll have a report on the next step in the NCAA division I change where it will be conducting a self-study. As part of that, we may have a policy on faculty governance of NCAA Division I Athletics that is being finalized at the university level. I also believe that we'll probably have a policy on sexual harassment. We may have a policy for search and screen committees for campus administrators as well. Most of these will be by way of trying to get this business done before the February and March meetings which will take up the more substantive matters that we've preliminarily discussed, especially the question of faculty review and enhancement and some policies on non-tenure track faculty which have been around for a while. At the last meeting of the UFC the policy was passed that you amended here on Fair Use of Copyrighted Materials for Research and Teaching. That passed unanimously at the University Faculty Council. It was sent to the Trustees and as soon as tomorrow they may in fact act on it to make it University policy.

Speaking of the Trustees, the meeting of the Trustees is at IUPUI beginning this evening at nine. Business meetings will be tomorrow. One item of interest to you perhaps is there will be a presentation by the Medical School at 10:00 tomorrow at University Place Conference Center. I believe it's called the Policy Seminar. And then there'll be the regular business meeting of the Trustees at 4:00 tomorrow afternoon. Those are open to the public and you're invited to attend. That concludes my report from the President.

### **Agenda Item V: Question and Answer Period**

**Schneider:** Now is the question and answer period. Are there any questions? Any answers?

**Bepko:** How would you like "Jeopardy"? Give the answer and then state the question.

**Schneider:** I'm advised by the parliamentarian that it might be in order to have a motion that we have received the reports of the summaries of three administrative reviews. Does it please the group to make such a motion? [Besch] Okay is there a second? [Keck] Okay. It's been moved and seconded that we have received these summaries. Any discussion? All in favor say aye? All opposed? Okay.

**Bepko:** Apropos of the issue of summaries of the administrative reviews. I thought I should mention that the administrative review of Lillian Charleston, Affirmative Action Officer, is still not finished. That's owing to the fact that the Chair of the Administrative Review Committee, Barbara Fischler, had surgery this fall, which delayed the process, but I'm optimistic that we'll have that report soon enough to have the summary for the January meeting of the Faculty Council.

**Schneider:** Okay, last chance for questions and answers.

**Bepko:** I have a question that I had before. Are we into that? People asked about the men's basketball team and the game that they played the other night at Miami of Ohio, which is a notable Division I school. As you probably read in the paper, they lost the game. It was a pretty lop-sided loss, but there were a number of IUPUI fans there who could report better than I, but during the first moments of the game IUPUI was ahead by about 10 points. And it sent shock waves through the Miami fans. But the eventual outcome was fairly lop-sided in favor of Miami. The question was also asked about: Are there tickets yet for the Butler game on December 10<sup>th</sup>. The men's basketball team plays Butler, and yes there are tickets and you can call the Alumni Office, I think, here on campus if you're interested. And finally just a footnote. We were told the other day that the men's basketball team will play Georgetown next year, which is really notable. And I wouldn't bet on IUPUI in that game, but it's exciting to see that kind of opponent being booked by our men's basketball team. The women's basketball team is having similar invitations from major universities and is doing very well. Those are the two featured sports of the IUPUI intercollegiate athletic program. Hope you'll make an effort to come to the Butler game.

**Schneider:** Okay. I think the Chancellor should wager the Chancellor of Georgetown. We'll have to think of an appropriate thing that we produce and an appropriate thing that they produce next year for Georgetown. [Laughter]

## **Agenda Item IX: Unfinished Business**

## **Agenda Item X: New Business**

**Schneider:** Alright, moving on to the next item. Is there any unfinished business to come before the body? Is there any new business? Then a motion for adjournment is in order.

**Bepko:** Can I ask Dean Yurtseven to mention something? We talk a lot about intercampus collaboration. And I'll help say a word about that too, but there was a very important grant that was received from the



Whittaker Foundation to support biomedical engineering at West Lafayette and here in Indianapolis, and that may be something that would be of interest for others to hear about.

**Yurtseven:** I assume that most of you know about the Biomedical Engineering Program which is run by a coalition of Purdue University at West Lafayette and the schools of Medicine, Dentistry, Science, and Engineering and Technology at IUPUI. The joint proposal sent to the Whittaker Foundation was one of 42 submitted proposals, and only 7 were funded. Our BME coalition received a funding of close to \$1 million for three years. This gives us an opportunity to compete in the future for one of the Biomedical Engineering Center grants from Whittaker Foundation, a possible funding of \$6 million.

### **Agenda Item XI: Adjournment**

**Schneider:** Any other news? Okay, then we'll turn back to the matter of adjournment. Is there a motion for adjournment? [Besch.]. Ok, all we need is a second. It's seconded. [Powers.] Before we adjourn let me tell you what's going to happen. This meeting will adjourn and then we will reassemble it at 4:00 for the State of Campus address. So, keep that in mind. I see people outside ready to come in. All in favor of adjourning say aye. All opposed. We stand adjourned (3:55 p.m.).

**Attachment: Agenda for the December 4, 1997 Faculty Council Meeting.**

**[Minutes prepared by Faculty Council Coordinator, David Frisby, UN 403, 274-2215**

**(Fax 274-2970), [fcouncil@iupui.edu](mailto:fcouncil@iupui.edu) : <http://www.hoosiers.iupui.edu/faccoun/faccou.htm> ]**

---

**[Attachment to FC971204 Minutes]**

[NOTE: Electronic distribution of agenda, attachments, and minutes for Faculty Council Meetings is being initiated. Dual distribution is being used until the Faculty Council determines its preference. Anyone who is unable to receive email or access the Faculty Council web page (<http://www.hoosiers.iupui.edu/faccoun/faccou.htm>), and who needs to receive paper copies, should contact David Frisby, Faculty Council Coordinator (UN 403; 274-2215; [fcouncil@iupui.edu](mailto:fcouncil@iupui.edu); fax = 274-2970).]

Indiana University - Purdue University Indianapolis

Faculty Council Meeting

School of Dentistry, Room 115

December 4, 1997

3:30 - 4:00 p.m.

AGENDA

I Call to Order: **Promptly at 3:30!**

II Administrative Report: Chancellor Gerald L. Bepko

III President's Report: William Schneider

IV Report of Completed Administrative Reviews on Associate Dean Mark Rosentraub,

Dean Scott Evenbeck, and Executive Vice Chancellor and Dean of the Faculties William Plater

V Question / Answer Period

IX Unfinished Business

X New Business

XI Adjournment

---

Indiana University - Purdue University Indianapolis

Faculty Meeting

School of Dentistry, Room S115

December 4, 1997

4:00 p.m.

I Call to Order

II State of the Campus Address

III Adjournment

FC980115 MINUTES:

APPROVED FC980903.

Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis

**Faculty Council Minutes: January 15, 1998**

Dental School Building, Room 115: 3:30 - 5:30 p.m.

**Attendance Record.**

**I. Voting Members (106):**

Absent---: Allen, Stephen (Elected: Medicine 6/99);

Absent---: Atkinson, Simon (Elected: Medicine 6/99);

Absent---: Bailey, Darrell (Ex Officio: Dean of New Media);

Absent---: Baldwin, James (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Banta, Trudy** (Elected: At Large 6/99. Ex Officio: Chancellor's Admin. designee);

Present--: **Barlow, John** (Ex Officio: Dean of Liberal Arts);

Absent---: Barnes, A. James (Ex Officio: Dean of Public & Environmental Affairs);

Present--: **Belcher, Anne** (Elected: Nursing 6/99);

Present--: **Bepko, Gerald** (Ex Officio: Officer: Chancellor of IUPUI.);

Present--: **Besch, Henry** (Elected: Medicine 6/99);

Absent---: Bippin, Paul (Ex Officio: Dean of IUPU Columbus);

Absent---: Bjork, Ulf Jonas (Elected: Journalism 6/99);

Absent---: Blomquist, William (Elected: Liberal Arts 6/98);

Absent---: Broadie, Thomas (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/99);

Absent---: Brothers, Linda (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Absent---: Brown, Trevor (Ex Officio: Dean of Journalism);

Present--: **Burr, David** (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Canty-Mitchell, Janie** (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Chernoff, Ellen** (Elected: Science 6/99);

Absent---: Cobb, Karen (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/99);

Absent---: Cochran, Michael (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98);

Absent---: Cronin, Blaise (Ex Officio: Dean of Library & Information Science) (Bloomington);

Present--: **Crowell, Dring** (Elected: Science 6/99);

Absent---: Dalsing, Michael (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Absent---: Dalton, Dan (Ex Officio: Dean of Business);

Absent---: DeSchepper, Edward (Elected: Dentistry 6/98);

Present--: **Dickerson-Putman, Jeanette** (Elected: Liberal Arts 6/98);

Absent---: DiMicco, Joseph (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Absent---: Dunning, Jeremy (Ex Officio: Dean of Continuing Studies) (Bloomington);

Absent---: Eble, John (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Present--: **Eckerman, Nancy** (Elected: Medicine 6/98);

Absent---: Evenbeck, Scott (Ex Officio: Dean of University College);

Absent---: Faris, James V. (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Fineberg, Naomi** (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Fineberg, S. Edwin** (Elected: At Large 6/98. Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98);

Present--: **Fisher, Mary** (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Ford, David** (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Absent---: Fore, Julie (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Present--: **Fredland, Richard** (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98);

Absent---: Froehlich, Janice (Elected: Medicine 6/98);

Absent---: Galanti, Paul (Elected: Law 6/98. Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/99);

Alternate: Gardner, Carol (Elected: Liberal Arts 6/99) --

-----[via **Subir Chakrabarti** (Liberal Arts)];

Present--: **Gilman, Linda** (Elected: Nursing 6/99);

Present--: **Goldblatt, Lawrence** (Ex Officio: Dean of Dentistry);

Alternate: Greene, Roberta (Ex Officio: Dean of Social Work);

-----[via **J. M. Kapoor** (Social Work)];

Present--: **Gregory, Richard** (Elected: Dentistry 6/98);

Absent---: Hall, Robert (Elected: Science 6/98);

Alternate: Hamant, Celestine (Elected: Allied Health Sciences 6/99) --

-----[via **Bruce Long** (Allied Health Sciences)];

Absent---: Hart, Stuart (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98);

Present--: **Hawley, Dean** (Elected: Medicine 6/98);

Alternate: Holden, Robert (Ex Officio: Dean of Medicine) --

-----[via **Meredith Hull** (Medicine)];

Present--: **Hook, Sara Anne** (Elected: At Large 6/98. Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98);

Present--: **Hoyt, Dolores** (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98);

Present--: **Jafari, Maymanat** (Elected: University Libraries 6/99);

Present--: **Jones, Elizabeth** (Elected: Physical Education 6/98);

Absent---: Karlson, Henry (Elected: At Large 6/98. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/98);

Present--: **Keck, Juanita** (Elected: At Large 6/99. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/99);

Present--: **Keck, Robert** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent---: Keffer, M. Jan (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/99);

Present--: **Kellum, P. Nicholas** (Ex Officio: Dean of Physical Education);

Absent---: Leapman, Stephen (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent---: Lefstein, Norman (Ex Officio: Dean of Law);

Absent---: Luerssen, Thomas (Elected: Medicine 6/98);

Absent---: Man, Joyce Yan-Yun (Elected: Public & Environmental Affairs 6/98);

Present--: **Mannheimer, Steven** (Elected: At Large 6/99. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/98);

Present--: **Mannix, Edward** (Elected: Medicine 6/99);

Present--: **McBride, Angela** (Ex Officio: Dean of Nursing);

Absent---: Modibo, Najja (Elected: Continuing Studies 6/98);

Present--: **Ng, Bart** (Elected: At Large 6/99. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/98);

Absent---: Olson, Byron (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent---: Parsons, Michael (Elected: Education 6/98);

Absent---: Peters, G. David (Elected: Music 6/98);

Absent---: Peterson, Richard (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98);

Present--: **Plater, William** (Ex Officio: Chancellor's Administrative Designee);

Present--: **Pless, John** (Elected: Medicine 6/99);

Present--: **Porter, Rebecca** (Elected Officer: Vice President 6/98. Ex Officio: UFC Rep. 6/98);

Present--: **Porterfield, Amanda** (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Powers, Gerald** (Elected: At Large 6/98. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/99);

Absent---: Rescorla, Frederick (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Present--: **Rizkalla, Maher** (Elected: Engineering & Technology 6/98);

Notice---: Robertson, Jean (Elected: Herron 6/99);

Present--: **Rogers, Richard** (Elected: Business 6/99);

Present--: **Ross, Beverly** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Present--: **Rothe, Carl** (Elected: Med 6/99. Ex Off: Exec C. 6/99, & UFC Rep 6/99);

Present--: **Schneider, William** (Elected Officer: President 6/98. Elected: At Large 6/98.);

Absent---: Shay, Robert (Ex Officio: Dean of Herron);

Absent---: Sothmann, Mark S. (Ex Officio: Dean of Allied Health Sciences);

Present--: **Spechler, Martin** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Present--: **Stocum, David** (Ex Officio: Dean of Science);

Present--: **Sutton, Susan** (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Svanum, Soren** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent---: Tarver, Robert (Elected: Medicine 6/99);

Alternate: Tompkins, Philip (Ex Officio: Director of University Libraries) --

-----[via **Dolores Hoyt** (University Libraries)];

Present--: **Vermette, Rosalie** (Elected: At Large 6/99. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/99);

Present--: **Vessely, Jeffery** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Present--: **Wagner, Marion** (Elected: Social Work 6/99. Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/99);

Present--: **Warfel, Kathleen** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent---: Warren, Donald (Ex Officio: Dean of Education);

Present--: **Watt, Jeffrey** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Alternate: Webb, Dorothy (Elected: At Large 6/99) --

-----[via **Elizabeth Goering** (Liberal Arts)];

Present--: **Weetman, Robert** (Elected: Medicine 6/98);

Present--: **West, Karen** (Elected: Medicine 6/98);

Absent---: Wilkins, Harriet (Appointed Officer: Parliamentarian 6/98. Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent---: Woods, David G. (Ex Officio: Dean of Music) (Bloomington);

Present--: **Yokomoto, Charles** (Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/98);

Present--: **Yurtseven, H. Oner** (Ex Officio: Dean of Engineering & Technology).

## **II. Non-Voting Members (3):**

Alternate: Phillabaum, Melinda (Ex Officio: Staff Council President) --

-----[via **Peggy Weber** (Nursing)];

Absent---: Barlay, Thua (Ex Officio: Student Assembly President);

Absent---: Yovits, Marshall (Ex Officio: Senior Academy President).

## **III. Guests/Visitors/Others (non-voting):**

Present--: **Bartlow, J. Douglas** (UITTS Audio engineer: Recorder);

Present--: **Boschmann, Erwin** (Faculty Development Office; Science);

Present--: **Frisby, David** (Faculty Council Coordinator);

Present--: **Grove, Mark** (Registrar);

Present--: **Martin, Robert** (Vice-Chancellor for Finance & Administration).

## **Agenda Item I. Call to Order: Rebecca Porter (Vice-President of the IUPUI Faculty)!**

Vice-President Rebecca Porter called the meeting to order at 3:34 p.m. and welcomed the membership back for the start of the spring semester.

## **Agenda Item II. Memorial Resolution (see attachment\*): Carmen S. Sharp, RN, MA, Associate Professor Emeritus, School of Nursing.**



The council rose for a moment of silence.

**Agenda Item III. Minutes for September 4, 1997 (see attachment\*), to be approved.**

Watt moved and Powers seconded that the minutes for September 4, 1997 be approved. The motion carried.

**Agenda Item IV. Chancellor's Report: Gerald Bepko (IUPUI Chancellor & IU Vice-President).**

Porter explained that Vice-Chancellor Plater would give the administrative report since Chancellor Bepko was at a meeting and would be delayed. Bepko gave his report in the question and answer period (see below).

Plater mentioned four items. The first was a progress report on spring semester enrollments. There was good news for the campus. Comparing this year with last year, there was a slight increase of 117 more students and 3,900 more credit hours.

Second, Plater distributed an announcement of the 1998 Teaching Excellence Recognition Award (TERA) campus guidelines. Each school will develop its own more specific guidelines, and is to submit names of recipients of the award to his office by March 20. He pointed out that the restriction of the award to an individual only once every three years had been lifted; frequency will be determined by the school.

Third, given Vice-Chancellor Blake's departure (officially beginning his duties at Iowa State on January 1, 1998), he distributed a document that described the plan for the transition period. Working with the Student Affairs Committee, the Faculty Council, the Academic Policies and Procedures Committee, and the Honors Council, it was hoped that the search for a Dean of Students would be completed by May 1998. Given the creation of University College, this vice-chancellor's portfolio was changed. An interim Vice-Chancellor for Student Life might be named, otherwise a national search will be launched. A progress report was promised for the next meeting, and close contact with the Executive Committee would be maintained.

Last, a handout was distributed inviting faculty, administrative officers, deans, and department chairs to attend a workshop on February 5 to begin looking at online staff and faculty development training programs. There are a wide variety of educational developmental programs that can be delivered to the desktop.

**Agenda Item V. President's Report: William Schneider (President of the IUPUI Faculty & Co-Secretary of the UFC (University Faculty Council)) -- Executive Committee Report\* on the # of Unit & At-Large Representatives to Elect (see attachment\*).**

Before moving to the president's report, Porter welcomed Harriet Wilkins on her return to the council as parliamentarian, and thanked Carl Rothe for his service in this role during her absence while she was teaching in Malaysia.

President Schneider also thanked Carl Rothe, especially for his work with the constitution. He then referred the council to the attachment and reported on the number of unit and at-large representatives to be elected. He also noted that Ray Koleski (Social Work) had resigned from the Nominating Committee and that the Executive Committee had replaced him with Golam Mannan (Education).

Schneider announced that an orientation session would be held again this year for those who were to be elected to the Board of Review pool later, and an organization session for those elected to the new Mediation Committee. He thanked those leaving the Board of Review pool for their service, and highlighted its importance for the faculty.

Last, Schneider said a word or two about upcoming agenda items for the spring semester, including the move to Division I NCAA status, the new Technology Committee, the revised Sexual Harassment Policy, Family-Related Partial Leave policy, the Post-Tenure Review policy (or Faculty Review and Enhancement), and a policy regarding Non-Tenure Track Faculty.

With regard to Post-Tenure Review, all campuses are considering the possibility of an overall university policy. The UFC Faculty Affairs Committee and the campus Faculty Affairs Committee have discussed and revised the original draft, and both will be coming to a decision.

The Non-Tenure Track Faculty discussion has been continuing for a year and a half at this campus and by the UFC as well. Data has been gathered and deliberations about what might be done have begun. The UFC Faculty Affairs Committee is planning on moving forward this month with some specific recommendations on the matter. It will then come before this body.

In response to a question from Warfel, Schneider clarified that it was possible the UFC might decide to not have a university-wide policy. In response to a question from Besch, Schneider agreed that the Bloomington people probably intended there to be no university-wide policy, at first, but that it may be different now that their AAUP chapter has taken it up. He opined that any eventual policy would most likely not look much like the one this campus is now considering.

**Agenda Item VI. Election of Mediation Committee and Faculty Boards of Review -- ACTION ITEM --: Nominating Committee (slates distributed in advance with agenda (see attachment\*) -- ballots distributed at meeting).**

Karen West, assisted by the members of the Nominating Committee present, conducted the election. The results of the election were as follows: elected to the Mediation Committee for a one-year term were James Baldwin, Henry Besch, and Jim Wallihan; elected for a two-year term were Pat Blake, Dick Fredland, Sara Hook, and Carl Rothe. Elected to the Board of Review pool for a two-year term were Naomi Fineberg, Karen Gable, Jeffrey Grove, B. Keith Moore, Gerald Powers, Sherry Queener, Judith Richter, Brian Vargus, Patricia Wittberg, and Enid Zwirn; elected for a one-year term were Carol Gardner, Christian Kloesel, Robert Lehnen, Marguerite Shepard, and Roy Westcott. Permission was granted to destroy the ballots and keep the tally sheet in the faculty council office.

**Agenda Item VII. Report (see attachment\*) on NCAA Self-Study: Cheryl Sullivan.**

Dean Plater introduced Cheryl Sullivan as the new Vice-Chancellor for External Affairs who will be leading IUPUI into its new NCAA participation. Sullivan described the plans for the NCAA self-study, approved by trustees last October. The athletic program must be one of integrity while also consistent with the campus mission. NCAA certification standards require the campus to conduct a plan for self study consisting of four

areas or operating principles: governance and commitment to rule compliance, academic integrity, fiscal integrity, and commitment to equity. A committee of over 50 members, comprised of faculty, students, staff, and members of the general public (community leaders) will conduct the self-study, which is required within five years. The goals of the self-study are to establish strong connections between the mission of IUPUI's athletics program and the campus mission, to educate our campus and the citizens of Indianapolis about what our expectations are for our Division I athletic program, to identify the existing and potential strengths and weaknesses in our athletics program and the means for correcting the weaknesses, to establish meaningful and realistic standards and benchmarks for future development, and to ensure that we have an organization that will carry out IUPUI's vision for intercollegiate athletics. Sullivan requested the council's participation as the self-study process continues. Deliberations will be posted to a website (to be developed), and articles will be published in "Campuscape" and the "Partnership" newsletter. She introduced Vice-Chancellor Trudy Banta as the leader of this activity, and Mike Moore as the Athletic Director.

In response to a question from Sothmann regarding the standard for gender equity, Sullivan spoke generally of a consistent proportionality between the ratio of males and females in the student body and the ratio of males and females in the athletes who are playing. She also spoke of a proportionality of participation. She highlighted the issue of needing to meet gender equity standards, saying they would closely follow the recruitment process, campus advertisements, and maintenance of grades.

Moore added that in working to correct the gender imbalance, they were forced to cap the squad sizes for male programs, an effort not welcomed with open arms by the male coaches. The gap was closed significantly but at the expense of providing aid to the young men. He also pointed out that the gender equity report doesn't distinguish between those who came to only one practice and those who competed the whole year--all that come out are included as on the squad. He also mentioned a need to improve our recruiting efforts by putting more emphasis on recruiting the female side and even converting some female part-time coaching positions into full-time. It's hard to recruit for two hours on the phone after you get off your eight hour job. Recruiting is a full-time job.

### **Agenda Item IX. Universal One Debit Card: Vice Chancellor Robert Martin.**

With the permission of the council, Vice-President Porter changed the order of business so Chancellor Bepko could be present for the discussion of the search and screen procedures. Vice-Chancellor Martin distributed a document on the Universal One Debit Card. Before discussing it he gave an update on the progress of the childcare center. During January three things will happen. An architect will be selected, perhaps the architect who designed the Ronald McDonald House and who is now employed by Schmidt and Associates. Second, Beth Jeglum is forming a building design team to work with the architect in designing the facility. Third will be an evaluation of the financial impact of the construction of the facility.

Warfel added that Beth Jeglum would be presenting detailed information about the plan for the childcare center at the meeting of the Commission on Women on February 27.

Martin then discussed the document he had distributed on the IUPUI one-card system, a preliminary draft. Beginning about three years ago ID cards became mandatory at the undergraduate level. They will remain voluntary at the graduate and professional levels. Since then the card has been extended beyond identification to an access card to certain facilities, and a debit card in some areas. If a department or school or faculty or staff

member chooses to have an ID card, or if a building chooses to have access electronically by a card, that card will be the One Card.

Martin explicitly addressed the use of the card to access facilities. Currently there are several facilities on campus that have installed a variety of electronic access systems. To ease the problems of managing these various systems, all future installations of electronic entry systems will be accessed by the One Card. On the use of the One Card as a debit card, Martin explained that the cards already serve as debit cards at vending machines; future plans may include their use at copy machines and bookstores. Any further recommendations were encouraged.

In response to a question about the use of the One Card to access electronically controlled parts of the hospital and medical school, Martin conceded that those areas are under Clarion's control, so for those personnel and students there will be two cards: the One Card and Clarion's identification card.

In response to a question from Powers about the possible limitations or liabilities of the One Card, Martin mentioned the possible perceptions of invasion of privacy and how the cards may be used by the administration. Also electronic systems all have downtimes. Backup systems should be in place to respond to system failures. Martin could not think of a downside to the debit uses of the card, since it provides money up front to the university, which receives the interest it generates.

Shirnoff asked if the animal facilities were going to be secured. Martin said he did not know if the Animal Use Committee planned to address it, and that it was up to facilities to request the use of that technology. Shirnoff then raised the security concern about the lack of picture identification on access cards whose owners have lost them; Martin suggested there would be a problem if the owner does not cancel the card when it's lost.

Spechler provided three points from an economist's perspective on the use of the One Card as a debit card. The first was the idea of breakage—money left over on the card after its owner has left the institution. While this unused money would be a benefit to the university, it would be seen by the owner as a loss of an investment, particularly if it were difficult to get the money back, and would be a disincentive to putting much money on the card. Second, if the card is used without a PIN number it would operate the same as cash, a downside for some. Third, there was a possible inconvenience factor. If the card gains widespread use, users may be in the position of having to use a card even for small purchases, which would make them have to invest in the cards. Martin responded that PIN numbers may be used in the future for certain transactions, and that cash would always be accepted in the bookstores. Lost cards can be cancelled and, since the system keeps track of the transactions, the balance can be transferred to a new card.

In response to concerns from Mannheimer about the cost of the security systems and possible invasions in privacy as the times of a person's movements in and out of facilities are tracked, Martin said costs are recovered in a monthly maintenance fee from the schools. The transactions and times recorded by the system are only made available to the relevant unit dean or chairperson, e.g. only the bookstore receives information about transactions made there. The security system that operates at Ball Residence in the evenings has been a success.

Yokomoto asked what the primary motivation was to develop the card. Martin responded that it was convenience, now that student identification was mandatory on campus: it is a convenient method for both identification and a means for access to facilities, and secondarily for its convenience in using vending machines.

**Agenda Item VIII. Search & Screen Procedures for Campus Administrators (see attachment\*) (also posted on the web, under "Documents" on the Faculty Council Homepage: <http://www.hoosiers.iupui.edu/faccoun/faccou.htm>).**

Schneider commented that the background and justification for the procedures could be found on the cover memorandum. It represents a stage in a process that has also included the development of written procedures for the review of campus administrators.

The adoption of the procedures was recommended by Chancellor Bepko on behalf of the administration.

After some discussion of the Faculty Council's leadership role in promulgating these procedures, Vessely moved that the search and screen procedures be adopted. The motion carried.

**Agenda Item X. Question / Answer Period.**

Chancellor Bepko began the session with a few comments, since he had been absent earlier in the meeting. He reported that a terrible incident had happened at the law school: a racist document had been placed in some students' mail folders. In response, the administration was going to reissue a statement on civility and diversity with added emphasis on the administration's desire to eliminate this kind of racist commentary; a shortened version will be published in "Campuscape." Next Monday, Martin Luther King Jr.'s birthday, Benjamin Hooks will appear as the speaker at the campus's Martin Luther King Day Dinner. The next morning he will address the scandalous document in a special session at the law school in an effort to address the students' concerns and help in the healing process. There will also be a vigorous investigation to search for the identity of the person or persons responsible for the hate letter. Money is being raised for a cash reward for information leading to the identification and discipline of the person.

Bepko next discussed the ongoing pay equity study. Some of the criteria used in analyzing faculty salaries included objective factors, such as rank, time since terminal degree was awarded, and years of service to the university. An attempt was made to use other criteria that were aimed at evaluating the quality of work done, such as the number of refereed publications and recognition for teaching excellence, but this attempt proved to be unworkable. Instead, the study adopted a strategy used by Bowling Green State University to ask each department (or each school if there are no departments) to group the faculty in that department into certain classifications to allow an analysis of how well each faculty member was contributing to the goals of the university. This has been controversial. One problem may have been a deadline that was too short, so it may be extended. Another concern was that some departments' Promotion and Tenure Committees may have trouble fitting their faculty into the classifications. Departments were encouraged to do the best they can. A further concern was whether the information gathered would be used for some other purpose; Bepko stipulated that the information would be inadmissible in any other evaluative exercise. At the end of the study, the information will be destroyed.

Porterfield commented that having the departments rank the faculty according to the study's classifications would simply be legitimizing and reiterating the pay inequity that already exists.

Warfel clarified that at this stage, the pay equity study is attempting to evaluate how the institution is doing as a whole, not to address possible remedies for individual situations. The inclusion of a merit factor in the pay equity

study was intended to be a study within the study, that is, to enable a comparison of a set of statistics with a merit factor against another set of statistics without a merit factor. The study within a study has three stages. First, the deans and chairs have been asked to submit a copy of their written salary policy. Then the members of the Promotion and Tenure Committees (who as part of their committee function have already been evaluating the faculty) have been asked to individually and anonymously (not as a committee) rank their colleagues in a set of gross categories. The third stage involves the principal investigator matching up the data for each faculty member without merit ranking, to data with merit rankings. It is an internal test for consistency and is a totally separate process from analyzing whether or not an individual is receiving enough pay.

To end the question and answer period, Rothe complimented the administration for its plans to install a traffic light at the North Street entrance to University Hospital.

### **Agenda Item XI-XIII. Unfinished Business, New Business, and Adjournment.**

There was no unfinished or new business. The meeting was adjourned at 5:00.

**Attachment to FC980115 Minutes: Agenda for January 15, 1998 Faculty Council Meeting.**

[Minutes prepared by Faculty Council Coordinator, David Frisby,

UN 403, 317.274.2215 (Fax 4-2970), [fcouncil@iupui.edu](mailto:fcouncil@iupui.edu) : <http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil>]

---

[Attachment for FC980115 Minutes (FC980115 Agenda)]

Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis

Faculty Council Meeting: Thursday, January 15, 1998

School of Dentistry, Room S115: 3:30 - 5:30 p.m.

### A G E N D A

- I. Call to Order!
- II. Memorial Resolution:\* Carmen S. Sharp, RN, MA, Associate Professor Emeritus, School of Nursing.
- III. Minutes\* for September 4, 1997, to be approved.
- IV. Administrative Report: Chancellor Gerald Bepko
- V. President of the Faculty Report: William Schneider
- Exec Comm Report\* on the # of Unit & At-Large Reps to elect.
- VI. Election of Mediation Committee and Faculty Boards of Review -- ACTION ITEM -- : Nominating Committee (slates\* distributed in advance with agenda -- ballots distributed at meeting).
- VII. Report\* on NCAA Self-Study: Cheryl Sullivan
- VIII. Search & Screen Procedures for Campus Administrators\*(also posted on the web, under "Documents" on the Faculty Council Homepage: <http://www.hoosiers.iupui.edu/faccoun/faccou.htm>)

- IX. Universal One Debit Card: Vice Chancellor Robert Martin
- X. Question / Answer Period.
- XI. Unfinished Business:
- XII. New Business:
- XIII. Adjournment.

\*Attachments:

(IUPUI Circular 98-01) Memorial Resolution for Carmen S. Sharp, RN, MA, Associate Professor. Emeritus

(IUPUI Circular 98-02) Minutes for September 4, 1997

(IUPUI Circular 98-03) Exec Comm Report on the # of Unit & At-Large Reps to elect

(IUPUI Circular 98-04) Slate for Mediation Committee and Boards of Review

(IUPUI Circular 98-05) Report on NCAA Self-Study

(IUPUI Circular 98-06) Search & Screen Procedures for Campus Administrators

Next Faculty Council Meeting: Thursday, February 5, 1998

FC980205 MINUTES:

APPROVED FC980903.

## **Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis**

### **Faculty Council Minutes: February 5, 1998**

**School of Dentistry, Room S115: 3:30 - 5:30 p.m.**

#### **Attendance Record.**

##### **I. Voting Members (106):**

Absent---: Allen, Stephen (Elected: Medicine 6/99);

Absent---: Atkinson, Simon (Elected: Medicine 6/99);

Present--: **Bailey, Darrell** (Ex Officio: Dean of New Media);

Present--: **Baldwin, James** (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Banta, Trudy** (Elected: At Large 6/99. Ex Officio: Chancellor's Admin. designee);

Absent---: Barlow, John (Ex Officio: Dean of Liberal Arts);

Absent---: Barnes, A. James (Ex Officio: Dean of Public & Environmental Affairs);

Present--: **Belcher, Anne** (Elected: Nursing 6/99);

Present--: **Bepko, Gerald** (Ex Officio: Officer: Chancellor of IUPUI.);

Present--: **Besch, Henry** (Elected: Medicine 6/99);

Absent---: Bippen, Paul (Ex Officio: Dean of IUPU Columbus);

Absent---: Bjork, Ulf Jonas (Elected: Journalism 6/99);

Absent---: Blomquist, William (Elected: Liberal Arts 6/98);

Absent---: Broadie, Thomas (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/99);

Absent---: Brothers, Linda (Elected: At Large 6/99);



Absent---: Brown, Trevor (Ex Officio: Dean of Journalism);

Present---: **Burr, David** (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Canty-Mitchell, Janie** (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Chernoff, Ellen** (Elected: Science 6/99);

Absent---: Cobb, Karen (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/99);

Absent---: Cochran, Michael (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98);

Absent---: Cronin, Blaise (Ex Officio: Dean of Library & Information Science) (Bloomington);

Present--: **Crowell, Dring** (Elected: Science 6/99);

Absent---: Dalsing, Michael (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Absent---: Dalton, Dan (Ex Officio: Dean of Business);

Present--: **DeSchepper, Edward** (Elected: Dentistry 6/98);

Notice---: Dickerson-Putman, Jeanette (Elected: Liberal Arts 6/98);

Absent---: DiMicco, Joseph (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Absent---: Dunning, Jeremy (Ex Officio: Dean of Continuing Studies) (Bloomington);

Absent---: Eble, John (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Present--: **Eckerman, Nancy** (Elected: Medicine 6/98);

Absent---: Evenbeck, Scott (Ex Officio: Dean of University College);

Absent---: Faris, James V. (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Fineberg, Naomi** (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Fineberg, S. Edwin** (Elected: At Large 6/98. Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98);

Present--: **Fisher, Mary** (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Ford, David** (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Fore, Julie** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Present--: **Fredland, Richard** (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98);

Absent---: Froehlich, Janice (Elected: Medicine 6/98);

Present--: **Galanti, Paul** (Elected: Law 6/98. Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/99);

Alternate: Gardner, Carol (Elected: Liberal Arts 6/99) --

-----[via **Jonathan Eller** (Peirce Edition Project)];

Present--: **Gilman, Linda** (Elected: Nursing 6/99);

Present--: **Goldblatt, Lawrence** (Ex Officio: Dean of Dentistry);

Alternate: Greene, Roberta (Ex Officio: Dean of Social Work) --

-----[via **J.M. Kapoor** (Social Work)];

Absent---: Gregory, Richard (Elected: Dentistry 6/98);

Absent---: Hall, Robert (Elected: Science 6/98);

Alternate: Hamant, Celestine (Elected: Allied Health Sciences 6/99) --

-----[via **Bernadette Rodak** (Allied Health Sciences)];

Absent---: Hart, Stuart (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98);

Present--: **Hawley, Dean** (Elected: Medicine 6/98);

Alternate: Holden, Robert (Ex Officio: Dean of Medicine) --

-----[via **Meredith Hull** (Medicine)];

Present--: **Hook, Sara Anne** (Elected: At Large 6/98. Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98);

Present--: **Hoyt, Dolores** (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98);

Present--: **Jafari, Maymanat** (Elected: University Libraries 6/99);

Present--: **Jones, Elizabeth** (Elected: Physical Education 6/98);

Absent---: Karlson, Henry (Elected: At Large 6/98. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/98);

Present--: **Keck, Juanita** (Elected: At Large 6/99. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/99);

Present--: **Keck, Robert** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent---: Keffer, M. Jan (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/99);

Present--: **Kellum, P. Nicholas** (Ex Officio: Dean of Physical Education);

Absent---: Leapman, Stephen (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent---: Lefstein, Norman (Ex Officio: Dean of Law);

Absent---: Luerssen, Thomas (Elected: Medicine 6/98);

Absent---: Man, Joyce Yan-Yun (Elected: Public & Environmental Affairs 6/98);

Present--: **Mannheimer, Steven** (Elected: At Large 6/99. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/98);

Present--: **Mannix, Edward** (Elected: Medicine 6/99);

Alternate: McBride, Angela (Ex Officio: Dean of Nursing) --

-----[via **Shirley A. Ross**];

Present--: **Modibo, Najja** (Elected: Continuing Studies 6/98);

Absent---: Ng, Bart (Elected: At Large 6/99. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/98);

Present--: **Olson, Byron** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent---: Parsons, Michael (Elected: Education 6/98);

Alternate: Peters, G. David (Elected: Music 6/98) --

-----[via **Darrell L. Bailey** (Music)];

Absent---: Peterson, Richard (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98);

Present--: **Plater, William** (Ex Officio: Chancellor's Administrative Designee);

Present--: **Pless, John** (Elected: Medicine 6/99);

Present--: **Porter, Rebecca** (Elected Officer: Vice-President 6/98. Ex Officio: UFC Rep. 6/98);

Present--: **Porterfield, Amanda** (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Powers, Gerald** (Elected: At Large 6/98. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/99);

Present--: **Rescorla, Frederick** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent---: Rizkalla, Maher (Elected: Engineering & Technology 6/98);

Present--: **Robertson, Jean** (Elected: Herron 6/99);

Absent---: Rogers, Richard (Elected: Business 6/99);

Present--: **Ross, Beverly** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Present--: **Rothe, Carl** (Elected: Med 6/99. Ex Off: Exec C. 6/99, & UFC Rep 6/99);

Present--: **Schneider, William** (Elected Officer: President 6/98. Elected: At Large 6/98.);

Absent---: Shay, Robert (Ex Officio: Dean of Herron);

Absent---: Sothmann, Mark S. (Ex Officio: Dean of Allied Health Sciences);

Present--: **Spechler, Martin** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent--: Stocum, David (Ex Officio: Dean of Science);

Present--: **Sutton, Susan** (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Svanum, Soren** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent---: Tarver, Robert (Elected: Medicine 6/99);

Alternate: Tompkins, Philip (Ex Officio: Director of University Libraries) --

-----[via **Dolores Hoyt** (University Libraries)];

Present--: **Vermette, Rosalie** (Elected: At Large 6/99. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/99);

Present--: **Vessely, Jeffery** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Present--: **Wagner, Marion** (Elected: Social Work 6/99. Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/99);

Present--: **Warfel, Kathleen** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent---: Warren, Donald (Ex Officio: Dean of Education);

Present--: **Watt, Jeffrey** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Alternate: Webb, Dorothy (Elected: At Large 6/99) --

-----via **Elizabeth Goering** (Liberal Arts);

Absent---: Weetman, Robert (Elected: Medicine 6/98);

Present--: **West, Karen** (Elected: Medicine 6/98);

Present--: **Wilkins, Harriet** (Appointed Officer: Parliamentarian 6/98. Elected: At Large 6/98);

Present--: **Yokomoto, Charles** (Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/98);

Present--: **Yurtseven, H. Oner** (Ex Officio: Dean of Engineering & Technology).

## **II. Non-Voting Members (3):**

Absent---: Phillabaum, Melinda (Ex Officio: Staff Council President);

Absent---: Barlay, Thua (Ex Officio: Student Assembly President);

Absent---: Yovits, Marshall (Ex Officio: Senior Academy President).

## **III. Guests/Visitors/Others (non-voting):**

Present--: **Boschmann, Erwin** (Faculty Development Office; Science);

Present--: **Charleston, Lillian** (Affirmative Action);

Present--: **Duffy, Tom** (Education);

Present--: **Frisby, David** (Faculty Council Coordinator);

Present--: **Groeger, Sharon** (University Counsel);

Present--: **Grove, Mark** (Registrar);

Present--: **Kulsrud, Bill** (Business);

Present--: **Levy, Ike** (Research and Sponsored Programs);

Present--: **Lorentz, Donald** (UITs Audio Engineer: Recorder);

Present--: **Quaid, Kimberly** (Medicine).

**Agenda Item I: Call to Order!**

Vice-President Rebecca Porter called the meeting to order at 3:37 p.m. She remarked on the problem of lost nametags at meetings. Since they cost \$4.00 each, it was advised that members take care of their nametags.

**Agenda Item II: Minutes Update.**

Coordinator David Frisby gave a status report on the minutes. October, November and December are almost ready. Portions still need to be reviewed by some individuals. They will be put in campus mail for approval at the March meeting.

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

Chancellor Bepko remarked on a couple of recent events that reflect the life, vitality, and quality of the university family. The IUPUI Chapter of the National Society of Black Engineers, based at IUPUI's School of Engineering and Technology, was presented the "Chapter of the Year" designation from the NSBE regional organization of chapters. The administration is very proud because it is believed that the School of Engineering and Technology will play a very important part in the future of the State of Indiana, and it will be extremely important for us to attract, encourage and see the success of persons who are underrepresented in the engineering field.

The previous weekend was IUPUI Homecoming weekend. There was a homecoming gathering, including a basketball game, which our IUPUI Metros won by a handy score. President Myles Brand was on hand and about 1,000 people watched the game, the largest attendance at any sporting event that we've ever had at IUPUI. This type of excitement is important for the university, since the growth of sports as a rallying point for undergraduate students helps to encourage them to bond more with the institution. More important than that, the Intercollegiate Athletics Department just posted its grades. The GPA for intercollegiate athletics was 2.72 on our four-point scale, which is well above the overall average for undergraduate students. No less than three teams—volleyball, women's tennis, and men's tennis, had GPA's above 3.0.

**Agenda Item IV: President of the Faculty Report: William Schneider.**

President Schneider remarked that the new Indiana University Academic Handbook had been distributed. The plan was for the IUPUI supplement to come out at the same time, but it is not out yet. The final proofs are done and it is at the printer, waiting on some cost estimates. There will be a status report on them at the next meeting.

Because of the time of year, the agenda today is patterned to interconnect to University Faculty Council (UFC) agenda items. The next meeting in March will be more campus-specific.

UFC will meet next Tuesday afternoon at IUB. UFC members can meet after this meeting to arrange ride sharing.

The trustees will be meeting here at IUPUI on Friday afternoon, February 27, at the Conference Center; it is a

public meeting.

**Agenda Item V: Elections Update (Slate Announced for President and Vice-President, 7/98 - 6/00; FC At-Large & UFC ballot): Nominating Committee Chair, Harriet Wilkins [INFORMATION ITEM].**

Wilkins reported that the slate for president and vice-president is not yet complete, as it is still waiting the consent of a nominee. By Monday the slate for president and vice-president should be sent out along with biographical information on the four people, in anticipation of the vote at the March meeting. The slate for the UFC is complete, and the slate for at-large candidates should be in the mail by Monday.

The delay this year was caused by the time it takes to verify people's willingness to run. The hard work of the Nominating Committee and the coordinator is much appreciated. The slate so far is very strong.

**Agenda Item VI: IU Policy on Research Integrity and Guidelines for Establishing Procedures for Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct (see attachment\*): Kimberly Quaid & Ike Levy [On web at <http://www.indiana.edu/~resrisk/mispol.html> and compare IUPUI Committee on Ethics in Research at <http://www.iupui.edu/it/rspinfo/ethics.html>] -- [DISCUSSION & VOTE: 20 Minutes].**

President Schneider introduced the policy under discussion. It is a university policy that has already been in effect as an interim policy and under which our campus has already developed procedures. It has not yet been approved by the UFC or the trustees; the IUPUI Faculty Council's vote today will be the start of the process of making the policy official. Next week it will go before the UFC, and then hopefully to the trustees by the end of the month. Kimberly Quaid and Ike Levy will provide some background.

Levy reported that there have been policies on this campus for 10-12 years. The development of the policies has gone in reverse from the norm. The federal government first addressed this roughly in 1986. Meanwhile, IUPUI developed policies because of concerns from the medical school. The federal government subsequently adopted regulations. After the federal regulations were passed, IUB concluded there should be an all-university policy. This policy adopts the federal regulations. In addition to the regulations, a federal commission came up with a series of recommendations which have not been adopted yet; many of these unadopted recommendations have been included in the handouts. A lot of those recommendations focussed on the definition of research misconduct. For instance, in the definition of research misconduct (page 3 of the handout), an indented paragraph is included from the federal regulations as they currently exist—regulations which IUPUI had previously adopted and what this policy is adopting. At the bottom of that page, however, are several guidelines recommending how to interpret this definition. These recommended guidelines have not been adopted in any official way, and it is not known if they are going to be adopted. Levy stated that his inclination was to wait and see what is adopted and then adopt whatever is finally put in the regulations.

Quaid commented that the recommendations have the potential to expand the scope of what the committee is supposed to investigate. Levy agreed, saying that as a member of the committee he has a vested interest in its scope and direction.

Robertson asked if the definition of misconduct on page 2 applies to all disciplines. Levy was not sure, but stated that the intent of the policy was to address scientific misconduct.

Baldwin expressed concern about vagueness in the definition of misconduct in research, particularly the phrases like fabrications or falsifications that seriously deviate from those that are commonly accepted within the research community. Levy responded that this is why the commission was convened and came up with the recommendations to help interpret the definitions. They may not represent a consensus of the scientific community, and they have caused a lot of controversy.

Besch commented that the NIH and the National Academy of Sciences have some other wording that differs from these recommendations. Their principles and these documents have not been resolved into one policy.

Chancellor Bepko explained that the canon of interpretation of legal passages like this are known by the Latin expression *generalia specialibus non derogant*, which suggests that when you have a list of things followed by a general proposition like "other practices that seriously deviate from those that are commonly accepted," the general language takes its meaning from the list of specific things that comes before it. This means that this probably should be read as saying "fabrication, falsification, plagiarism, or other practices that are like fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism." In other words the theme of this is some kind of misrepresentation, and the language "other practices" has to be defined in that way.

Wagner wondered why "scientific misconduct" is addressed rather than "research misconduct." Schneider responded that this is a question for the UFC. The IUPUI Committee on Ethics in Research can also address this, and the campus grievance procedures may also address this since they must conform to university policy.

Spechler asked whether the situation of a professor who decides to publish the results of a study under his or her name without attributing the names of the graduate students who contributed research would be a violation of the policy. Levy said probably yes under the expanded definitions of research misconduct that include "Misappropriation"-- taking someone else's ideas and not giving appropriate attribution to them.

Baldwin asked if the phrase "misappropriations of physical material" also includes misappropriation of funds, and if so, can "funds" be written in for clarification. N. Fineberg agreed. Chancellor Bepko responded that there are other policies that cover misappropriation of funds. Besch commented that the writers of the policy were careful not to include criminal activities, which are already forbidden. He also recommended that the word "immediately" in the phrase "inquiring immediately into an allegation" on page 7 item 2 be changed to "promptly."

Porter asked for a motion for either general support or non-support to allow UFC representatives to be directed in how they should represent our campus.

E. Fineberg moved and Rodak seconded that the council support the policy. The motion carried.

**Agenda Item VII.** This agenda item was postponed until later. See below.

**Agenda Item VIII: Faculty Affairs Committee Progress Report: Sara Hook [15 Minute Limit].**

Hook reported that she has provided information to and received feedback from the campus (including a website) on the Faculty Review and Enhancement Policy. The concerns and questions seem to focus around four or five



main issues. The sub-committee from the Faculty Affairs Committee will begin the process of creating a second draft. She also has distributed from the UFC Faculty Affairs Committee a request to the regional campuses for their feedback on the document asking more generally whether there are some overreaching guidelines and principles that can be adopted university-wide. This will be discussed at next week's UFC meeting.

The Faculty Affairs Committee will also be addressing the question of non-tenure track faculty. The UFC Faculty Affairs Committee has been gathering information, including information from Laura Neff, who is the part-time faculty liaison on this campus, and co-chairs Pat Brantlinger and Bill Burgan, and is making a second attempt at a policy for non-tenure track faculty. It will be discussed at the UFC.

Spechler commented on post-tenure review. Colleagues from the IUB branch of the American Association of University Professors are not convinced that we need post-tenure review at all. Ken Gros Louis, Vice-President for Academic Affairs of Indiana University, indicated that if competent annual reports were made on a regular and reliable basis, he did not see much of a reason for post-tenure review. President Brand also stated at a meeting of the UFC that he would like to look at intermediate sanctions to assure reasonably satisfactory performance by faculty.

Spechler went on to state that the committee has not stated why post-tenure review is needed when many departments already regularly review professors in the annual review process, that there's no evidence of outside pressure to address post-tenure review, and that post-tenure review may turn out to be time-consuming and difficult. The annual review process is much more helpful; it is done by department committees with ad hoc support by the dean. Problems have been solved this way with discretion and sensitivity. The post-tenure review document adds another layer of review, when what should be done is an incremental investigation of the earlier stage—the regular reports done by colleagues.

Porter noted that there was only time for clarification of Hook's general progress report; there will be other opportunities to actively discuss the issue.

Hook responded that intermediate sanctions are being considered. The plan also already assumes existing annual review procedures are being used; the added level is only for those few individuals who are deemed to be chronically unproductive. She complimented the dean of her school, Dean Goldblatt, for its annual review procedures. Other schools may need to beef up their processes.

E. Fineberg agreed that the need for post-tenure review needs to be investigated, particularly how it's addressed on a national level.

**Agenda Item IX: IU Intercollegiate Athletics Policy (see attachment\*): Kathy Warfel & Bill Kulsrud [DISCUSSION & POSSIBLE VOTE: 30 Minute Limit].**

Schneider explained the process the report has gone through. The report came from a university-wide committee co-chaired by Warfel, and passed through the UFC Agenda Committee to this campus. The IUPUI Athletics Committee will want to take a look at it, so unless there is just universal agreement of this council now, the report will go to committee and return to the council for a more formal vote in March. It will be discussed at UFC next Tuesday, but not voted on. Bill Kulsrud, chair of the IUPUI Athletics Committee, was also on the university-wide committee.

Warfel reported that the document describes how the intercollegiate athletics programs at Indiana University are going to be governed and to a certain extent how they will relate to one another. The document begins with a statement of mission and goals, and goes on to develop the distinction between the campus teams and the university teams. The IUB teams are considered the Indiana University Intercollegiate Athletics Teams, and the president plays the role of the governor for those teams. For the teams on the other campuses, the president generally delegates responsibilities to the campus chancellor. The campus athletics committee's structure and functions is at the heart of this document. The language reflects a balance between the needs for faculty governance and the very practical needs of administrators in this day and age of intercollegiate athletics. A new structure created by this draft document is the Athletics Coordinating Council, a small body that would serve mainly as a forum for development of consistency and conflict resolution between the Division I programs. The report was generated for two reasons: IUPUI's move to Division I which created two Division I programs at Indiana University; and the need for IUB to update its old athletics policy in which faculty governance had a significant role, and which has since become unworkable. The study committee was charged to formulate a policy that balances the need for faculty governance and the needs of administration. The study committee is satisfied that this is a good product.

Banta noted that the NCAA requires that in the self-study for approval of Division I status, the mission and goals of the athletics program must be related to the mission and goals of the campus. She asked if the report, if adopted, becomes the IUPUI goals. Warfel responded that generally IU policies have to be consistent with campus mission statements. She and Banta then debated whether the writing in the report's mission statement was sufficiently linked to IUPUI's or IU's mission statement. Kulsrud noted that the campus Athletics Committee had recently re-written its goals at the same time that the Athletics Governance Committee was meeting, so they are virtually indistinguishable from one another.

Baldwin wondered why the IUB teams are considered university teams under the president, while the others are considered regional teams.

Spechler asked if the policy would continue to allow dissenters on athletic policies to be excluded from being elected to campus athletic policy committees by a veto from the president or chancellor. (He cited Professor Sperber as an example.) President Schneider said no, the policy calls for the faculty council to establish the means of selection. Chancellor Bepko remarked that Mark Rosentraub, an IUPUI faculty member and known dissenter, was made co-chair of the steering committee for the NCAA visit. There was further brief discussion of the selection process.

Schneider noted that traditionally there have been two committees--a council committee and the chancellor's committee—and that the two should be reduced to one.

**Agenda Item VII: Final Report of the President's Advisory Committee on Distance Education ("Distributed Education and Indiana University: Strategic Pathways and Windows of Opportunity"--compare website at <http://www.indiana.edu/~disteduc/iu/index.html>) (see attachment\*): Tom Duffy [DISCUSSION: 30 Minute Limit].**

President Schneider explained that this is another item that came from the UFC from a study committee that was created by the president, and it will be taken up at the UFC meeting next week. It does not require a simple vote

up or down, but rather is the beginning of a process of review. Tom Duffy presented a report.

Duffy gave a 15 minute overview of the work of the Distance Education Committee (now the Distributed Education Committee), which began work February/March of 1997 and concluded its business in December. President Brand's charge to Blaise Cronin was to start the committee and address three questions: 1) should IU be involved in the distributed education environment. If so, 2) which direction should we proceed; and 3) what infrastructure changes are needed. Duffy then summarized the activities of the committee and of the long-range strategic plan, which has been completed.

In the report, the concept of distributed education was supported; some factors in the report were changing U.S. demographics: the deregulation of higher education, digitalization, and the growing interactivity between students. Seven areas were selected for consideration, using the Strategic Directions Charter as criteria for how distributed education can serve the State of Indiana: corporate partnerships, coordination of the campuses, coordination of broad-based programs, determining the readiness of campus units, enhancing the prestige of the university (particularly in a leadership role in knowledge management), quality of teaching, and lifelong learning.

Infrastructure issues are pressing, and it was recommended that an administrator at the vice-presidential level be appointed to implement the program. Chancellor Bepko added that a group was asked to provide input into these suggestions, and it recommended that an appointment be made at an associate vice-president level and that the office be located at IUPUI, with reporting lines to the Vice-President for Information Technology Resources, Michael McRobbie, and to the Vice-President for Academic Affairs. A broad-based advisory committee was also recommended.

Spechler raised concerns about the lack of attention to quality and evaluation of productivity.

J. Keck asked whether faculty development needs and issues would be addressed. Duffy replied that it would be addressed by the Center for Teaching and Learning, and an Applied Research Center would be involved in the evaluation of courses and provide feedback in the design of courses.

Rothe asked why there was a need to centralize control of this project in the form of another vice-president; he stated that distributed education already exists on this campus and can move forward without centralization. He also expressed concerns about what topics will be covered and whether the faculty will be downgraded in favor of outside specialists. Duffy suggested that UITS (University Information and Technology Services) is an example of a similar program.

R. Keck asked about the lack of specific statements of costs in the report. Duffy responded that at this stage that ability is limited.

President Schneider concluded the debate by noting where the discussion will be continued. The Executive Committee has found several faculty council committees that this report is relevant to, with academic affairs as the point committee, with the involvement of the planning, technology, and budgetary affairs committees.

**Agenda Item X: IU Sexual Harassment Policy--Proposed Changes (see attachment\*): Rebecca Porter, co-chair, UFC Affirmative Action Committee [DOCUMENT INTRODUCTION: 10 Minute Limit].**

Porter introduced the document for discussion and invited comments so that a more final version can be presented at the March council meeting. The current IU Sexual Harassment Policy was passed by the UFC in April of 1988; two years ago a revision was drafted and the Sexual Harassment Working Group of the Commission on Women served as a campus-wide group that looked at that document. Their report went to the UFC Affirmative Action Committee, which then re-drafted this version, with the assistance of Julia Lamber, from the university Affirmative Action Office, and Dorothy (Dottie) Frapwell, of University Counsel. The 1997/98 membership of the Sexual Harassment Working Group has also reviewed this and generated some comments. The primary issue that has originated on the IUPUI campus was the inclusion of visitors in the policy.

Sharon Groeger from the University Counsel's office explained why the University Counsel is opposed to the idea of including visitors. Groeger stated that the primary objection to including visitors in this policy is that our obligations to protect our students and employees from sexual harassment are very clear, fairly well defined, and mandated by both state and federal law. That is not the case for visitors--there is no similar law that prevents specifically sexual harassment towards visitors. We do not want to either be interpreted as diluting or diminishing our obligations to our students and our employees, nor do we want to elevate our obligations to visitors. Additionally, there is a potential problem that if one takes on an obligation they don't already have, if one voluntarily assume some responsibility toward somebody, they can actually expose themselves to legal liability they would not have otherwise. That is clearly something that we do not want to do.

Ford asked if a prospective employee would be considered a visitor, particularly in the more informal situation where a colleague is invited to a university just to be looked over. Groeger said generally no, prospective employees of that type are not considered to be visitors and so are protected under employment laws: if we subjected a candidate for employment to sexual harassment, that would be the same as subjecting an actual employee.

Warfel asked about University Counsel's position on whether or not the Affirmative Action Office must investigate all situations, or whether some types of situations can be handled by others. Groeger deferred to the Affirmative Action Office to define its role, but suggested that in some situations common sense would allow minor problems to be dealt with without contacting the office. When in doubt however, it's best to go through the Affirmative Action Office.

Porter clarified for Yokomoto where the existing policy can be found to allow a comparison with the proposed changes.

Porter asked that suggestions or comments be forwarded to her over the next month, so they can be brought before the drafting committee.

### **Agenda Item XI: 1998 Campus Campaign: Kathy Warfel.**

Warfel reported that the kickoff of the IUPUI 1998 Annual Campus Campaign occurred on IUPUI's birthday, January 28. The campaign will run through much of the spring semester. The Steering Committee of the campaign has identified some campus-wide priorities, including the Division I Athletics Program and University College, with an emphasis on student scholarships. Donations may also be designated toward anything that might be of personal interest. There is a website and a hot-line telephone number. There will also be a series of raffles,

and those pledge cards that are returned early will have three separate chances to be the winner of some nice prize.

### **Agenda Item XII: Question / Answer Period.**

Canty-Mitchell asked the Chancellor about the status of the law school investigations of the hate letters. Chancellor Bepko said there is an ongoing investigation, that there are some leads, but he did not think that anyone had been identified yet. A reward has been offered, which has now grown to \$4,000, for information leading to the identification of the person who is guilty of distributing this scandalous piece of paper. The more important thing, though, is the welfare of the students who are in school. The dean's office has made an effort to meet with students to reassure them that there is no jeopardy to them, and to start a better dialogue within the school about issues of cultural diversity and race so that there will be the right kind of openness should anything else happen there. Galanti added that the dean has appointed a committee that will be working on the diversity issue in the law school. The law faculty has been very upset about this and has communicated to the students their absolute disgust at what has happened, both in class and in correspondence. Bepko noted that Benjamin Hooks visited the law school only about ten days after the event. At a special breakfast meeting open to everyone he discussed this sort of thing, how to react to it, and how the community is afflicted by this kind of terrible act, but it can bring itself back together and start a healing process.

### **Agenda Item XIII-XV: Unfinished Business, New Business, and Adjournment.**

There was no unfinished or new business. Vice-President Porter adjourned the meeting at 5:30 p.m.

### **Attachment to FC980205 Minutes: Agenda for February 5, 1998 Faculty Council Meeting.**

[Minutes prepared by Faculty Council Coordinator, David Frisby,

UN 403, 317-274-2215 (fax 4-2970), [fcouncil@iupui.edu](mailto:fcouncil@iupui.edu) : <http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil> ]

---

[Attachment for FC980205 Minutes (FC980205 Agenda)]

Indiana University - Purdue University Indianapolis

Faculty Council Meeting: Thursday, February 5, 1998

School of Dentistry, Room S115 (DS 115): 3:30 - 5:30 p.m.

### AGENDA

- I. Call to Order!
- II. Minutes Update.
- III. Administrative Report: Chancellor **Gerald Bepko**.
- IV. President of the Faculty Report: **William Schneider**.

- V. Elections Update (Slate Announced for President and Vice-President, 7/98 - 6/00; FC At-Large & UFC ballot): Nominating Committee Chair, **Harriet Wilkins** [INFORMATION ITEM].
- VI. IU Policy on Research Integrity and Guidelines for Establishing Procedures for Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct (see attachment\*): **Kimberly Quaid & Ike Levy** [On web at <http://www.indiana.edu/~resrisk/mispol.html> and compare IUPUI Committee on Ethics in Research at <http://www.iupui.edu/it/rspinfo/ethics.html> ] -- [DISCUSSION & VOTE: 20 Minutes].
- VII. Final Report of the President's Advisory Committee on Distance Education ("Distributed Education and Indiana University: Strategic Pathways and Windows of Opportunity"--compare website at <http://www.indiana.edu/~disteduc/iu/index.html> ) (see attachment\*): **Tom Duffy** [DISCUSSION: 30 Minute Limit].
- VIII. Faculty Affairs Committee Progress Report: **Sara Hook** [15 Minute Limit].
- IX. IU Intercollegiate Athletics Policy (see attachment\*): **Kathy Warfel & Bill Kulsrud** [DISCUSSION & POSSIBLE VOTE: 30 Minute Limit].
- X. IU Sexual Harassment Policy--Proposed Changes (see attachment\*): **Rebecca Porter**, co-chair, UFC Affirmative Action Committee [DOCUMENT INTRODUCTION: 10 Minute Limit].
- XI. 1998 Campus Campaign: **Kathy Warfel**.
- XII. Question / Answer Period:
- XIII. Unfinished Business:
- XIV. New Business:
- XV. Adjournment.

**\*Attachments:**

(IUPUI Circular 98-07) IU Proposed Policy on Research Integrity and Guidelines for ....

(IUPUI Circular 98-08) Distributed Education and IU: Strategic Pathways and Windows of Opportunity

(IUPUI Circular 98-09) IU Intercollegiate Athletics Policy;

(IUPUI Circular 98-10) Sexual Harassment Policy;

(IUPUI Circular 98-10b) Sexual Harassment Policy Replacement, was distributed at the meeting.

**Next Faculty Council Meeting: Thursday, March 5, 1998!**

[Agenda Prepared by Faculty Council coordinator, David Frisby,

UN 403, 317.274.2215 (Fax 4-2970), [fcouncil@iupui.edu](mailto:fcouncil@iupui.edu) : <http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil>]

FC980305 MINUTES:

APPROVED FC980903.

Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis

**Faculty Council Minutes: March 5, 1998**

School of Dentistry, Room S115: 3:30 - 5:30 p.m.

**Attendance Record.**

**I. Voting Members (106):**

Present--: **Allen, Stephen** (Elected: Medicine 6/99);

Present--: **Atkinson, Simon** (Elected: Medicine 6/99);

Absent---: Bailey, Darrell (Ex Officio: Dean of New Media);

Present--: **Baldwin, James** (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Absent---: Banta, Trudy (Elected: At Large 6/99. Ex Officio: Chancellor's Admin. designee);

Present--: **Barlow, John** (Ex Officio: Dean of Liberal Arts);

Absent---: Barnes, A. James (Ex Officio: Dean of Public & Environmental Affairs);

Present--: **Belcher, Anne** (Elected: Nursing 6/99);

Present--: **Bepko, Gerald** (Ex Officio: Officer: Chancellor of IUPUI.);

Present--: **Besch, Henry** (Elected: Medicine 6/99);

Absent---: Bippen, Paul (Ex Officio: Dean of IUPU Columbus);

Absent---: Bjork, Ulf Jonas (Elected: Journalism 6/99);

Absent---: Blomquist, William (Elected: Liberal Arts 6/98);

Absent---: Broadie, Thomas (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/99);

Alternate: Brothers, Linda (Elected: At Large 6/99) --

-----[via **Karen Teeguarden** (Physical Education)];

Absent---: Brown, Trevor (Ex Officio: Dean of Journalism);

Present---: **Burr, David** (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Absent---: Canty-Mitchell, Janie (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Chernoff, Ellen** (Elected: Science 6/99);

Absent---: Cobb, Karen (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/99);

Absent---: Cochran, Michael (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98);

Absent---: Cronin, Blaise (Ex Officio: Dean of Library & Information Science) (Bloomington);

Present--: **Crowell, Dring** (Elected: Science 6/99);

Absent---: Dalsing, Michael (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Absent---: Dalton, Dan (Ex Officio: Dean of Business);

Notice---: DeSchepper, Edward (Elected: Dentistry 6/98);

Present--: **Dickerson-Putman, Jeanette** (Elected: Liberal Arts 6/98);

Absent---: DiMicco, Joseph (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Absent---: Dunning, Jeremy (Ex Officio: Dean of Continuing Studies) (Bloomington);

Absent---: Eble, John (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Present--: **Eckerman, Nancy** (Elected: Medicine 6/98);

Present--: **Evenbeck, Scott** (Ex Officio: Dean of University College);

Absent---: Faris, James V. (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Fineberg, Naomi** (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Fineberg, S. Edwin** (Elected: At Large 6/98. Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98);

Absent---: Fisher, Mary (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Ford, David** (Elected: At Large 6/99);



Present--: **Fore, Julie** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Present--: **Fredland, Richard** (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98);

Absent---: Froehlich, Janice (Elected: Medicine 6/98);

Present--: **Galanti, Paul** (Elected: Law 6/98. Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/99);

Alternate: Gardner, Carol (Elected: Liberal Arts 6/99) --

-----[via **Jonathan Eller** (Peirce Edition Project)];

Present--: **Gilman, Linda** (Elected: Nursing 6/99);

Alternate: Goldblatt, Lawrence (Ex Officio: Dean of Dentistry) --

-----[via **LaForrest D. Gamer** (Dentistry)];

Alternate: Greene, Roberta (Ex Officio: Dean of Social Work) --

-----[via **J.M. Kapoor** (Social Work)];

Absent---: Gregory, Richard (Elected: Dentistry 6/98);

Absent---: Hall, Robert (Elected: Science 6/98);

Alternate: Hamant, Celestine (Elected: Allied Health Sciences 6/99) --

-----[via **Bernadette Rodak** (Allied Health Sciences)];

Absent---: Hart, Stuart (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98);

Absent---: Hawley, Dean (Elected: Medicine 6/98);

Alternate: Holden, Robert (Ex Officio: Dean of Medicine) --

-----[via **Meredith Hull** (Medicine)];

Present--: **Hook, Sara Anne** (Elected: At Large 6/98. Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98);

Present--: **Hoyt, Dolores** (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98);

Present--: **Jafari, Maymanat** (Elected: University Libraries 6/99);

Present--: **Jones, Elizabeth** (Elected: Physical Education 6/98);

Absent---: Karlson, Henry (Elected: At Large 6/98. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/98);

Present--: **Keck, Juanita** (Elected: At Large 6/99. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/99);

Present--: **Keck, Robert** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent---: Keffer, M. Jan (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/99);

Present--: **Kellum, P. Nicholas** (Ex Officio: Dean of Physical Education);

Absent---: Leapman, Stephen (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent---: Lefstein, Norman (Ex Officio: Dean of Law);

Notice---: Luerssen, Thomas (Elected: Medicine 6/98);

Absent---: Man, Joyce Yan-Yun (Elected: Public & Environmental Affairs 6/98);

Present--: **Mannheimer, Steven** (Elected: At Large 6/99. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/98);

Present--: **Mannix, Edward** (Elected: Medicine 6/99);

Present--: **McBride, Angela** (Ex Officio: Dean of Nursing);

Absent---: Modibo, Najja (Elected: Continuing Studies 6/98);

Absent---: Ng, Bart (Elected: At Large 6/99. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/98);

Notice---: Olson, Byron (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent---: Parsons, Michael (Elected: Education 6/98);

Present--: **Peters, G. David** (Elected: Music 6/98);

Present--: **Peterson, Richard** (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98);

Present--: **Plater, William** (Ex Officio: Chancellor's Administrative Designee);

Present--: **Pless, John** (Elected: Medicine 6/99);

Present--: **Porter, Rebecca** (Elected Officer: Vice-President 6/98. Ex Officio: UFC Rep. 6/98);

Absent---: Porterfield, Amanda (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Notice---: Powers, Gerald (Elected: At Large 6/98. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/99);

Absent---: Rescorla, Frederick (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Present--: **Rizkalla, Maher** (Elected: Engineering & Technology 6/98);

Present--: **Robertson, Jean** (Elected: Herron 6/99);

Absent---: Rogers, Richard (Elected: Business 6/99);

Present--: **Ross, Beverly** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Present--: **Rothe, Carl** (Elected: Med 6/99. Ex Off: Exec C. 6/99, & UFC Rep 6/99);

Present--: **Schneider, William** (Elected Officer: President 6/98. Elected: At Large 6/98.);

Absent---: Shay, Robert (Ex Officio: Dean of Herron);

Absent---: Sothmann, Mark S. (Ex Officio: Dean of Allied Health Sciences);

Present--: **Spechler, Martin** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent--: Stocum, David (Ex Officio: Dean of Science);

Absent---: Sutton, Susan (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Svanum, Soren** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent---: Tarver, Robert (Elected: Medicine 6/99);

Alternate: Tompkins, Philip (Ex Officio: Director of University Libraries) --

-----[via **Dolores Hoyt** (University Libraries)];

Present--: **Vermette, Rosalie** (Elected: At Large 6/99. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/99);

Present--: **Vessely, Jeffery** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent---: Wagner, Marion (Elected: Social Work 6/99. Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/99);

Present--: **Warfel, Kathleen** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Alternate: Warren, Donald (Ex Officio: Dean of Education) --

-----[via **Michael Cohen** (Education)];

Present--: **Watt, Jeffrey** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Present--: **Webb, Dorothy** (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Weetman, Robert** (Elected: Medicine 6/98);

Notice---: West, Karen (Elected: Medicine 6/98);

Present--: **Wilkins, Harriet** (Appointed Officer: Parliamentarian 6/98. Elected: At Large 6/98);

Present--: **Yokomoto, Charles** (Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/98);

Absent---: Yurtseven, H. Oner (Ex Officio: Dean of Engineering & Technology).

## **II. Non-Voting Members (3):**

Absent---: Phillabaum, Melinda (Ex Officio: Staff Council President);

Absent---: Barlay, Thua (Ex Officio: Student Assembly President);

Absent---: Yovits, Marshall (Ex Officio: Senior Academy President).

## **III. Guests/Visitors/Others (non-voting):**

Present--: **Bartlow, J. Douglas** (UITS Audio Engineer: Recorder);

Present--: **Bayless, Paul** (Affirmative Action Office);

Present--: **Boschmann, Erwin** (Faculty Development Office; Science);

Present--: **Frisby, David** (Faculty Council Coordinator);

Present--: **Grove, Mark** (Registrar);

Alternate: Hehman, Jennifer (Constitution & Bylaws Committee Chair: University Libraries) --

-----[via **Paul Galanti** (Law)];

Present--: **Kulsrud, Bill** (Business);

Present--: **Larter, Raima** (Academic Affairs Committee: Science);

Present--: **Lorentz, Donald** (UITS Audio Engineer: Recorder);

Present--: **Scodro, Joe** (Indiana University Counsel).

### **Agenda Item I: Call to Order: Rebecca Porter (Vice-President of the IUPUI Faculty)!**

Vice-President Porter called the meeting to order at 3:34.

### **Agenda Item II: Minutes Update.**

Vice-President Porter apologized for the delay in minutes and noted that the Executive Committee is working on the problem. The council's patience was appreciated.

### **Agenda Item III: Administrative Report: Gerald Bepko (IUPUI Chancellor).**

Chancellor Bepko introduced Vice-Chancellor Robert Martin for a report on the childcare center.

Martin reported that the design team has been assembled, led by Beth Jeglum, the current director of the childcare center. The architect's office has narrowed the architectural firms down to four, and it is anticipated that the selection process will be complete in the next thirty days. The next step will be actual detailed designs as the architect sits down with the internal team to literally start designing the childcare center.

Bepko asked if there was a construction timetable for the childcare center; Martin said the construction timeline on the facility right now is about 14-18 months, so from the time the detailed design starts to the end of construction is about 18 months, or in other words by the fall of '99. The childcare center is on a fast track.

Bepko reported on a document (distributed at the meeting) listing data on the peer institutions for IUPUI. The list will be used for a variety of purposes, including improving retention rates (which IUPUI has committed itself to improve as a part of the Lilly grant), and determining the 60<sup>th</sup> percentile for faculty salaries. The goal is to move faculty salaries to the 60<sup>th</sup> percentile of this peer group—currently only IUPUI's assistant professor category meets the 60<sup>th</sup> percentile. Since it is doubtful that there will be any extra money from the state to help us get to that 60<sup>th</sup> percentile, and since the funding necessary to meet the 60<sup>th</sup> percentile in disciplines and in ranks will be a part of a real location process within the academic units, it is probably not as exciting as if there was new state money coming. The trustees still need to approve the peer group. Then the administration can present a plan whereby we will move over the next couple of years to the 60<sup>th</sup> percentile, or the top 40% of the peer group, in each of the salary classifications: professor, associate professor, and assistant professor. Bepko added that this process is right on the heels of the gender and race equity salary study, so a good deal of attention will be paid to faculty compensation in the next couple of years.

Bepko next reported on recently published higher education rankings in the *U.S. News and World Report Best Graduate Schools* issue, in which IUPUI programs were frequently cited. Nursing moved up to 12<sup>th</sup> nationally. The medical school was rated 20<sup>th</sup> in the group of medical schools that have a special capacity for primary care. SPEA was ranked in terms of specialties 10<sup>th</sup> in the US for its not-for-profit management program. The law

school was ranked in the second tier nationally along with Southern Methodist, SUNY Buffalo, Syracuse, University of Alabama, University of Kansas, Maryland, Miami, Nebraska, and Pittsburgh. Schools in the third tier for law schools included University of Arkansas, University of Mississippi, University of Missouri (Columbia), Oklahoma, South Carolina, and West Virginia--major state universities. There was also a fourth tier. The law school held its own well and was mentioned among specialties as 9<sup>th</sup> in the country in terms of health law. "I have some special laurels that I would like to have Bill Plater mention that I think are further evidence of the national impact that IUPUI is having."

Executive Vice-Chancellor and Dean of the Faculties William Plater announced that the campus has moved closer to fulfilling Chancellor Bepko's bold claim that IUPUI would become a new national model of successful urban higher education. Two achievements evidence our place among the nation's leaders in defining the role of the urban university for education and research, and they reflect the work of a lot of faculty and colleagues. Two of our colleagues have been singled out for a national award in their areas of competence: the first is Scott Evenbeck, the Dean of University College, who was selected as the outstanding educator for first year experiences, and was recognized by his peers at a recent conference in South Carolina. The organization is based on the work of John Gardner and has become perhaps the most important group nationally for focussing attention on undergraduates' first year experiences. Second, Robert Bringle, the Director of the Office of Service Learning and Center on Public Service and Leadership, will be recognized by Campus Compact as its outstanding educator for advancing service learning at the AAHE meeting that will take place in Atlanta later this month. Service learning is one of the areas that is expected to have a positive impact on undergraduate education, especially in retention of students. As an institution as a whole, IUPUI just received word that it will receive a \$2.6 million grant from the PEW Charitable Trust to work with other urban universities to identify the characteristics in identifying student success and to measure the actual work of our faculty at teaching students. The goal is to identify those characteristics to which urban universities should be held accountable, and to promote them nationally. IUPUI and five other institutions will be working together to help define the national model for urban education. This will provide some perspective on the *U.S. News and World Report* lists and other rankings. Plater mentioned as an example the issue of holding the campus accountable for six-year graduation rates, when in fact the standard used by traditional residential institutions may not be the appropriate measure.

Bepko commended Plater's leadership in the grant application and among the provosts of the other participating urban universities, and in the larger group called the Urban 13. There will be a special program on this PEW Grant and the role IUPUI is playing in helping to define these criteria at the NASULGC annual meeting this November.

Bepko announced that Charlie Nelms, formerly Chancellor at IU East in Richmond and now the Chancellor of the University of Michigan--Flint, will rejoin the Indiana University family around July 1 of this year. He will be a special assistant to the president on the subjects of retention, completion and success for students across the eight campuses. He will play a special role at IUPUI. He is considering living in Indianapolis and the administration will ask him to serve as acting Vice-Chancellor for Student Life (his particular specialty) while Herman Blake's office is re-defined and transformed. The office was once devoted to undergraduate students but those functions are now being managed by University College. "Charlie will shift the focus on student life on campus a little bit to develop another model that we can use to advance IUPUI."

Bepko then reported on his visit to one of IUPUI's remote programs—the school of medicine program in Eldoret, in northwestern Kenya. A couple of faculty members and some students are there in residence. It was an extraordinary experience to visit both that part of the world and the school program there. The students that go

there, both fourth year medical students and residents, spend about six weeks working in the Moi University Medical School seeing patients, working with the physicians in training and the physicians in Kenya. It is an extraordinary international experience for the students. It is a wonderful learning opportunity to communicate across the numerous languages in that part of the world, including tribal languages, Swahili and English. They also cross medical practice cultures, because they must communicate face-to-face with patients, without the batteries of tests that are so much a part of medical practice in the United States; face-to-face diagnosis is according to some physicians the real core and heart of the art of medicine. "The students also further develop the commitment to service that we hope is part of the education received by every student in our university."

Finally, Bepko announced the Chancellor's Convocation to be held that evening at 7:30 in the Conference Center. The presentation was to be from John Werner of Virginia Commonwealth University [one of IUPUI's peer institutions]. The topic of the convocation was "The Collaborative Department," and Professor Werner, who is widely published in the field of faculty work and faculty dynamics, talked about "the continuing effort for all of us to transform ourselves to meet the new challenges of higher education."

#### **Agenda Item IV: Faculty Report: William Schneider (President of the IUPUI Faculty).**

President Schneider reported that the elections are completed for next year's University Faculty Council (UFC) and for the at-large faculty council representatives. Those who have been elected will be contacted to verify they can in fact serve, then the results will be distributed.

Schneider reminded members that half of this meeting's agenda came from the UFC. The action taken by the council on the sexual harassment and intercollegiate athletics policies will be very relevant to next Tuesday's UFC meeting.

Schneider introduced a just-received e-mail document from Patrick Brantlinger, co-chair of the UFC Faculty Affairs Committee, summarizing the proposed policy for full-time non-tenure track faculty that will be introduced at the UFC Tuesday. The Executive Committee will put it on the agenda for the IUPUI Faculty Council's April meeting. The campus Faculty Affairs Committee will introduce this particular policy and give us its recommendation. A policy for part-time non-tenure track faculty will be developed separately.

Schneider next reported on the recent meeting of the IU trustees. There Schneider provided the trustees with copies of the IUPUI Supplement to the Academic Handbook, which will immediately be sent out to Faculty Council members. The trustees were quite impressed with it. Schneider thanked all the members of the Faculty Handbook Committee, in particular past chair Norman Hudson and current chair Rick Ralston.

#### **Agenda Item V: Election of President and Vice President of the IUPUI Faculty (slate distributed earlier via campus mail--ballots provided at meeting): Nominating Committee Chair, Harriet Wilkins [ACTION ITEM].**

Vice-President Porter announced that Nominating Committee Chair Harriet Wilkins would run the election. Wilkins thanked the nominees before introducing the slate: Naomi Fineberg and Rebecca Porter were nominated for President. Nominees for Vice-President were Ronald Britton and Paul Galanti. The ballots were arranged according to a couple of traditions that have developed over the last five years. One tradition is having two people nominated for each office. The other tradition is to arrange the slate so that one of the offices is held by

someone from the medical side of the faculty and the other office is held by someone from the non-medical side of the faculty. Ballots were distributed and returned. Later, Wilkins read the results of the election. 54 valid ballots were received and counted. Porter was elected President of the Faculty, and Galanti was elected Vice-President. Wilkins moved and Watt seconded to destroy the ballots, keeping the tally sheet in the faculty council office. The motion carried.

**Agenda Item VI: Current Revised IU Sexual Harassment Policy (Draft)--NEW Proposed Changes (see new attachment\* replacing old circular 98-10b): Rebecca Porter, co-chair UFC Affirmative Action Committee [DISCUSSION & VOTE ITEM: 20 Minute Limit].**

Sitting in for Vice-President Porter as presider for this agenda item, President Schneider gave the history of this revision. It came out of the University Counsel's Office. It was discussed thoroughly by the UFC Affirmative Action Committee and has been reviewed on this campus by both the Affirmative Action Officer and the Commission on Women's Sexual Harassment Working Group. From here it will go to the UFC next Tuesday for consideration.

Porter noted a language change in the first paragraph: "up to and including discharge" was changed to "up to and including discharge or expulsion" to reflect the fact that the policy applies to students as well as employees. "Or expulsion" was also added to another reference to discharge on page 3 item 7.

Porter reported that the IUB Faculty Council recommended that the UFC endorse the policy.

Spechler spoke approvingly of the policy, noting its consistency with the Code of Student Conduct in discouraging consensual romantic relationships between faculty and students as well as unwelcome sexual advances. Porter added that faculty-student relationships are also covered in the IU Academic Handbook's Code of Academic Ethics.

Spechler then asked if there were any procedures in place to implement the sexual harassment policy when complaints are made. Porter said IUPUI's existing sexual harassment policies and complaint procedures could be found on page 74 of the revised policy. Once the IU policy is passed, the current IUPUI policies will have to be checked for consistency with the overall policy.

Paul Bayless (Affirmative Action Office) clarified the language used in the draft. It comes from the federal guidelines' definitions of the two types of harassment: quid pro quo and hostile environment. Liability for a hostile environment, as recently upheld by the Supreme Court, occurs when the employer or entity has knowledge or should have had knowledge that harassment was occurring; then the employer or entity is liable.

Porter noted that the Commission on Women Sexual Harassment Working Group is in the process of developing a brochure to provide more information on sexual harassment.

A discussion followed on whether there was a need to define who is in a position of authority and why it was necessary to include language about possible disciplinary actions. Porter responded that the language concerning authority was deliberately left open because attempts to specify those positions that are positions of authority would likely not be able to include all instances of authority. The language on potential disciplinary action was intended to make it clear that those kinds of behaviors and the condoning of those kinds of behaviors by others



will not be tolerated. Schneider suggested UFC members to raise these language questions at the next UFC meeting.

N. Fineberg moved and Vessely seconded that the council endorse the sexual harassment policies. The motion carried.

**Agenda Item VII: IU Intercollegiate Athletics Policy (see IUPUI Circular 98-09, distributed by campus mail with agenda for February 5th meeting): Bill Kulsrud [DISCUSSION & VOTE ITEM: 20 Minute Limit].**

Kulsrud reported on two changes to the proposal made by the Athletics Advisory Committee. The first change described the rationale behind the name of the IUB program. The changed text reads: "Because of its historical position and the size of the program, the athletics programs at the Bloomington campus shall be called the University Athletics Program and be governed by the president, the university athletics director, and the Bloomington campus Athletics Committee."

The other change was near the bottom of page 2. Section II, "Functions of the Campus Athletics Committee," identifies the roles and responsibilities of the Campus Athletics Committee. In item 4 ("Participates in the development and recommends approval of general athletics policy relating to academic matters"), "approves" is added in addition to "recommends."

Rothe asked if the second change meant that all athletics policies would come through the committee, so that the council will have no more say in the future of athletics policies. Kulsrud responded that the ultimate authority rests in the hands of the president, while the campus Athletics Committee will be responsible for the development and approval of general athletics policies, which ultimately come before the Faculty Council. Schneider noted that the wording only suggests that the committee wants to make sure that policies receive the committee's approval, not that it would be the only body with authority to approve policies.

R. Keck asked if the policy is in compliance with NCAA guidelines. Kulsrud said the policy, including the recent changes, reflects the NCAA guidelines that were given to the athletics committees across the eight campuses.

Mannheimer asked about the authority of the athletics director over the IUPUI campus. Kulsrud responded that it is unclear exactly how much authority that person has over the day-to-day operational activities of the program. Although the details are unresolved, the IUPUI athletics director does report to the IUB athletics director, but the IUB director does not have day-to-day operational control over the IUPUI campus. They have worked well together.

Jones asked whether the campus committee was constituted to include representatives from the school of physical education. Kulsrud said key players are represented, including representatives from the Natatorium and the Track and Field Complex. Jones reiterated that there ought to be *faculty* representatives from those areas.

Schneider commented that he hoped this program would resolve the problem of two athletics committees on campus, one from the Faculty Council and one from the administration. He then raised two issues that will be brought before the UFC. The first comes from a concern from the IUB committee who wanted it explicitly stated that the members of the Personnel Sub-Committee (responsible for selecting and dismissing coaches) will be

selected from the faculty of the Athletics Committee (as proposed on page 3, item 7(b)). The second item is a request from the regional campuses that there be two representatives rather than one from each regional campus to the Athletics Coordinating Council. Feedback can be addressed to the UFC.

Porter said the committee moves that the council endorse the adoption of the Indiana University Intercollegiate Athletics Program policies. The motion carried.

**Agenda Item VIII: "Proposed Descriptions of the Principles of Undergraduate Learning" (see attachment\*) -- Academic Affairs Committee: Raima Larter, Associate Dean for General Education [DISCUSSION ITEM: 15 Minute Limit].**

Larter submitted the attached document from the Council on Undergraduate Learning (CUL) that defines six principles of undergraduate learning. The principles had been endorsed by the CUL, and Larter expressed hope that the Faculty Council would also at some point endorse the principles. Eventually they will be included in literature for incoming students, especially by University College in its descriptions of its programs.

Porter clarified that the Executive Committee put this document on the agenda, and that the CUL is a group that has representation from all schools, including the professional schools, from each school's administration and faculty.

E. Fineberg commended the principles of the CUL on behalf of the medical school.

Sutton wondered why principles 1 and 2 were so much more fully developed than 3, 4, 5, and 6. Larter responded that in the first principle the intent was to delineate all the core skills, and in the second principle "critical thinking" was a concept which many faculty representatives had been excited about defining. In fact, the definitions had been intended to be brief, and only represent what a large diverse body could agree on; individual departments were encouraged to elaborate and add to the definitions.

Baldwin commented that he would like to see some mention of an international dimension to undergraduate learning. Larter responded that wording changes may still be made at the Faculty Council's committee level.

Spechler agreed that an international dimension ought to be emphasized so the principles will meet the needs of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, and that the international dimension should have two aspects: the traditional comparative cultures aspect (generally satisfied by foreign language or foreign culture requirements), and the aspect of the relationship between American culture and what's going on in the world.

Pless expressed concerns that the library should be mentioned somewhere.

N. Fineberg, addressing number 5, expressed concern that knowledge of the actual content of diverse cultures is being displaced by mere acknowledgment that there are many diverse cultures.

Porter ended the discussion by reporting that the Academic Affairs Committee in conjunction with the other drafters will refine the wording, and a new draft will be presented at the next meeting.

**Agenda Item IX: Introduction to Proposal for Constitutional Changes: Overview by Jennifer Hehman, Constitution & Bylaws Committee Chair [INFORMATION ITEM: 15 Minute Limit].**

Galanti reported on the draft changes to the Constitution and Bylaws of IUPUI on behalf of Jennifer Hehman who was out of town draft. The Constitution and Bylaws Committee has prepared revisions to the first four pages of the document, with the balance of the pages to come later. The Constitution and Bylaws Committee was charged by the Executive Committee to resolve certain matters. One was to define the eligibility of membership on the Faculty Council for deans and faculty of academic units composed of faculty from existing units, i.e., University College, School for New Media, and IUPUI Columbus. The document distributed today reflects the proposal to make any representatives of those academic units non-voting ex officio members of the Faculty Council (Article IV.A.4.a).

Wilkins clarified that all deans and heads of academic units are already covered under the provision that deans of academic units are voting members of the Council. The provision at issue here provides for faculty representation from these units which are composed of faculty who also have an appointment somewhere else. The current practice was that faculty with joint appointments were counted in one place or the other, but not both. But for the new units on the council, this would mean that they would have no faculty voice, because the faculty would all be representing their home schools. The recommendation is that there would be representation but without vote from the faculty organizations of these units. The reason for these people not having a vote in the council is that they are represented elsewhere by representatives from their home schools.

Mannheimer expressed disappointment that section 4a does not state anywhere a rejection of the practice of double representation. Wilkins responded by quoting from the section that says "The voting rights of each IUPUI faculty member shall be vested solely with the department and school or college of his or her primary academic appointment."

Mannheimer then suggested that the committee examine how Article I Section A will address provisions for the new lecturer rank, which was about to replace the instructor rank.

Galanti reported that the committee is also clarifying the role of the faculty council coordinator in relation to the nominating committee and the executive committee, regarding technical matters of who is responsible for getting names, ballots, and nominating petitions out to the faculty.

The committee will also put the latest version of the constitution and bylaws on the faculty council website so it is easily accessible by everyone on campus.

Another charge to the committee was to clarify the operations of the nominating committee and the dates for elections, in response to problems with soliciting names for various elections on a timeline. There will also be a discussion of "N" and the problems created by the increase in the number of administrators on the Faculty Council as well as the effect of the ex-officio members on the representation of the different schools.

Porter commented on the process for becoming entitled to representation. The existing process says "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 IUPUI Faculty Council." (IV.A.1) Therefore, University College, along with each of the other new institutions, would have to

first file its faculty organization documents, then each would have to appear individually before this body for a determination as to whether or not that entity should have representation. The intent of the bylaw change is to provide direction for new units as a group, so that we would not be acting on each of those requests.

Wilkins noted that the version on the web is the version with the proposed amendments.

Warfel asked for clarification on the representation of University College and the IUPUI Columbus campus. Porter addressed the University College issue, saying its administrators will vote on behalf of the interests of that unit, but the faculty will not be represented there; they are represented by the unit where they have a primary appointment. N. Fineberg responded to the IUPUI Columbus issue, saying that the Columbus faculty have appointments in the departments and schools up here, so they are represented through them. Porter added that the administrative head of IUPUI Columbus automatically has a seat on the council.

**Agenda Item X: Introduction to "Policy Statement on Curricular Disputes" (see attachment\*) -- Beverly Ross, Academic Affairs Committee [DISCUSSION ITEM: 15 Minute Limit].**

Porter clarified that this policy on developing a process to resolve curricular disputes originally came from a subcommittee of the Council on Undergraduate Learning (CUL) and then moved to the Academic Affairs Committee and the Academic Policies and Procedures Committee.

N. Fineberg commented that the dean should mediate the disputes, but in those disputes where the dean is unsuccessful there should be something in the document that names an authority that can hear the dispute and make a determination. Ross responded that that responsibility rests with the Dean of Faculties. E. Fineberg suggested it would be more clear if the first sentence read "The Dean of Faculties at IUPUI has ultimate authority for the resolution of undergraduate curricular decisions."

A discussion followed on the impact of this document on the CUL. Plater stated that the CUL will continue to be the principle body for the dissemination of information about new or proposed degree programs, so that all of the represented schools will have a chance to comment on them. It would be similar to the way information about graduate professional programs is disseminated through the Graduate Affairs Committee.

Larter expressed concern about the Academic Affairs Committee's proposal to give the administration, rather than faculty members, a final say in curriculum disputes. Porter commented that the CUL had discussed the issue and had not yet come to a decision about it.

Larter further commented that specific guidelines for dispute resolution had been included in the original draft, but the Academic Affairs Committee had removed them. There was discussion on whether there was a danger of arbitrary decision making if there were no stated guidelines. Ross pointed out that the committee decided it would be very difficult to create guidelines that would cover all the potential kinds of disputes. Instead, it was felt that guidelines should be developed and tailored to specific disputes as they arise on a case by case basis; then after a period of time there may be enough to collect and formally promulgate.

Spechler made two suggestions: the first was that the language ought to be explicit that the dispute resolution policy covers all schools on campus, including the schools and programs of Purdue or any system-wide programs. The second point was that the parallelism implied by Plater between graduate and undergraduate

instruction and curricular disputes does not really exist, but it should. The graduate school regularly publishes a list of new courses so there is an opportunity for remonstrance. At the undergraduate level this does not occur, so problems arise when new courses creep in and attack the enrollment of another unit, albeit unconsciously. He proposed the development of an information system that would advise schools and programs that new courses are being offered which may impact the enrollment of their students for better or worse. Plater responded that such a system is in place. A remonstrance list for all undergraduate and graduate courses, and all degree programs graduate and undergraduate, has been provided to every school for 10 or 15 years. The list is distributed to the schools, not the individual faculty, and includes university-wide course developments that may be of interest to that particular school. There is also an effort underway in the Academic and Faculty Records Office to put this information on line at least for all courses that originate on the IUPUI campus, so that there will be not only information instantly available, but also a tracking of the remonstrance process.

Vermette, who serves as liaison for the Executive Committee to the Academic Affairs Committee, seconded Larter's concern that the rights of the faculty in the decision making process not be bypassed by the administration. She discussed the composition of the committee that would hear curriculum disputes. The difficulty with a standing committee is that even if they are using a certain set of principles, each type of dispute will have its own facts and circumstances that may require faculty with the appropriate expertise. But whether the committee is a standing committee or an ad hoc committee, the Dean of Faculties will ultimately have the final say. As it now stands there will be an ad hoc committee, and the members of the committee itself will come from the faculty as selected by the Executive Committee; there will be no administrators on the committee.

Schneider noted that these issues of guidelines and standing vs. ad hoc committees will have to be resolved as the implementation of the policy evolves. He suggested that there be an ad hoc committee report after a year or three years, and if there are a sufficient number of disputes and a standing committee is warranted, then at that point the policy can be changed.

#### **Agenda Item XI: Question / Answer Period.**

J. Keck said the new paper towel dispensers recently installed in the nursing school don't work, and she asked was there any plan to fix or replace them. McBride responded that the problem has been brought to the manufacturer's attention and they plan to look into the problem.

#### **Agenda Items XII-XIV: Unfinished Business, New Business, and Adjournment.**

There was no unfinished or new business. The meeting was adjourned at 5:26 p.m.

**Attachment to FC980305 Minutes: Agenda for March 5, 1998 Faculty Council Meeting.**

[Minutes prepared by Faculty Council Coordinator, David Frisby,

UN 403, 317.274.2215 (Fax 4-2970), [fcouncil@iupui.edu](mailto:fcouncil@iupui.edu) : <http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil>]

[Attachment for FC980115 Minutes (FC980115 Agenda)]

Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis

Faculty Council Meeting: Thursday, March 5, 1998

School of Dentistry, Room S115 (DS 115): 3:30 - 5:30 p.m.

### AGENDA

- I. Call to Order!
- II. Minutes Update.
- III. Administrative Report: Chancellor **Gerald Bepko**
- IV. President of the Faculty Report: **William Schneider**
- V. Election of President and Vice-President of the IUPUI Faculty (slate distributed earlier via campus mail--ballots provided at meeting): Nominating Committee Chair -- **Harriet Wilkins** [ACTION ITEM]
- VI. Current Revised IU Sexual Harassment Policy (Draft)--NEW Proposed Changes (see new attachment\* replacing old Circular 98-10b): **Rebecca Porter**, co-chair UFC Affirmative Action Committee [DISCUSSION AND VOTE ITEM: 20 Minute Limit]
- VII. IU Intercollegiate Athletics Policy (see IUPUI Circular 98-09, distributed by campus mail with agenda for February 5<sup>th</sup> meeting): **Bill Kulsrud** [DISCUSSION & VOTE ITEM: 20 Minute Limit]
- VIII. "Proposed Descriptions of the Principles of Undergraduate Learning" (see attachment\*) -- Academic Affairs Committee: **Raima Larter**, Associate Dean for General Education [DISCUSSION ITEM: 15 Minute Limit]
- IX. Introduction to Proposal for Constitutional Changes: Overview by **Jennifer Hehman**, Constitution & Bylaws Committee Chair [INFORMATION ITEM: 15 Minute Limit]
- X. Introduction to "Policy Statement on Curricular Disputes" (see attachment\*) -- **Beverly Ross**, Academic Affairs Committee [DISCUSSION ITEM: 15 Minute Limit]
- XI. Question / Answer Period:
- XII. Unfinished Business:
- XIII. New Business:
- XIV. Adjournment.

\*Attachments:

(IUPUI Circular 98-11) Current Revised IU Sexual Harassment Policy (Draft)

(IUPUI Circular 98-12) Proposed Descriptions of the Principles of Undergraduate Learning

(IUPUI Circular 98-13) Policy Statement on Curricular Disputes

Next Faculty Council Meeting: Thursday, April 2, 1998!

FC980402 MINUTES:

APPROVED FC980507.

Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis

**Faculty Council Minutes: April 2, 1998**

Dental School Building, Room 115: 3:30 - 5:30 p.m.

**Attendance Record.**

**I. Voting Members (106):**

Absent---: Allen, Stephen (Elected: Medicine 6/99);

Present--: **Atkinson, Simon** (Elected: Medicine 6/99);

Absent---: Bailey, Darrell (Ex Officio: Dean of New Media)

Present--: **Baldwin, James** (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Banta, Trudy** (Elected: At Large 6/99. Ex Officio: Chancellor's Admin. designee);

Absent---: Barlow, John (Ex Officio: Dean of Liberal Arts);

Absent---: Barnes, A. James (Ex Officio: Dean of Public & Environmental Affairs);

Present--: **Belcher, Anne** (Elected: Nursing 6/99);

Absent---: Bepko, Gerald (Ex Officio: Officer: Chancellor of IUPUI.);

Present--: **Besch, Henry** (Elected: Medicine 6/99);

Absent---: Bippen, Paul (Ex Officio: Dean of IUPU Columbus);

Absent---: Bjork, Ulf Jonas (Elected: Journalism 6/99);

Absent---: Blomquist, William (Elected: Liberal Arts 6/98);

Absent---: Broadie, Thomas (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/99);

Alternate: Brothers, Linda (Elected: At Large 6/99) --

-----[via **Ed Schilling** (Physical Education)];

Absent---: Brown, Trevor (Ex Officio: Dean of Journalism);

Present--: **Burr, David** (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Absent---: Canty-Mitchell, Janie (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Chernoff, Ellen** (Elected: Science 6/99);

Absent---: Cobb, Karen (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/99);

Absent---: Cochran, Michael (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98);

Absent---: Cronin, Blaise (Ex Officio: Dean of Library & Information Science)  
(Bloomington);

Present--: **Crowell, Dring** (Elected: Science 6/99);

Notice---: Dalsing, Michael (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Absent---: Dalton, Dan (Ex Officio: Dean of Business);

Present--: **DeSchepper, Edward** (Elected: Dentistry 6/98);

Notice---: Dickerson-Putman, Jeanette (Elected: Liberal Arts 6/98);

Absent---: DiMicco, Joseph (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Absent---: Dunning, Jeremy (Ex Officio: Dean of Continuing Studies) (Bloomington);

Absent---: Eble, John (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Present--: **Eckerman, Nancy** (Elected: Medicine 6/98);

Present--: **Evenbeck, Scott** (Ex Officio: Dean of University College),

Absent---: Faris, James V. (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Fineberg, Naomi** (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Fineberg, S. Edwin** (Elected: At Large 6/98. Ex Officio: UFC Representative



6/98);

Absent---: Fisher, Mary (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Ford, David** (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Fore, Julie** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent---: Fredland, Richard (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98);

Absent---: Froehlich, Janice (Elected: Medicine 6/98);

Present--: **Galanti, Paul** (Elected: Law 6/98. Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/99);

Alternate: Gardner, Carol (Elected: Liberal Arts 6/99)--

-----[via **Jonathan R. Eller** (Liberal Arts)];

Absent---: Gilman, Linda (Elected: Nursing 6/99);

Absent---: Goldblatt, Lawrence (Ex Officio: Dean of Dentistry);

Absent---: Greene, Roberta (Ex Officio: Dean of Social Work);

Present--: **Gregory, Richard** (Elected: Dentistry 6/98);

Absent---: Hall, Robert (Elected: Science 6/98);

Alternate: Hamant, Celestine (Elected: Allied Health Sciences 6/99) --

-----[via **Bernadette Rodak** (Allied Health Sciences)];

Absent---: Hart, Stuart (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98);

Absent---: Hawley, Dean (Elected: Medicine 6/98);

Alternate: Holden, Robert (Ex Officio: Dean of Medicine)--

-----[via **Meredith Hull** (Medicine)];

Present--: **Hook, Sara Anne** (Elected: At Large 6/98. Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98);

Present--: **Hoyt, Dolores** (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98);

Present--: **Jafari, Maymanat** (Elected: University Libraries 6/99);

Absent---: Jones, Elizabeth (Elected: Physical Education 6/98);

Absent---: Karlson, Henry (Elected: At Large 6/98. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/98);

Absent---: Keck, Juanita (Elected: At Large 6/99. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/99);

Absent---: Keck, Robert (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Present--: **Keffer, M. Jan** (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/99);

Absent---: Kellum, P. Nicholas (Ex Officio: Dean of Physical Education);

Absent---: Leapman, Stephen (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent---: Lefstein, Norman (Ex Officio: Dean of Law);

Notice---: Luerssen, Thomas (Elected: Medicine 6/98);

Absent---: Man, Joyce Yan-Yun (Elected: Public & Environmental Affairs 6/98);

Present--: **Mannheimer, Steven** (Elected: At Large 6/99. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/98);

Present--: **Mannix, Edward** (Elected: Medicine 6/99);

Present--: **McBride, Angela** (Ex Officio: Dean of Nursing);

Absent---: Modibo, Najja (Elected: Continuing Studies 6/98);

Present--: **Ng, Bart** (Elected: At Large 6/99. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/98);

Present--: **Olson, Byron** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent---: Parsons, Michael (Elected: Education 6/98);

Present--: **Peters, G. David** (Elected: Music 6/98);

Present--: **Peterson, Richard** (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98);

Present--: **Plater, William** (Ex Officio: Chancellor's Administrative Designee);

Absent---: Pless, John (Elected: Medicine 6/99);

Present--: **Porter, Rebecca** (Elected Officer: Vice President 6/98. Ex Officio: UFC Rep. 6/98);

Absent---: Porterfield, Amanda (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Powers, Gerald** (Elected: At Large 6/98. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/99);

Absent---: Rescorla, Frederick (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent---: Rizkalla, Maher (Elected: Engineering & Technology 6/98);

Absent---: Robertson, Jean (Elected: Herron 6/99);

Present--: **Rogers, Richard** (Elected: Business 6/99);

Present--: **Ross, Beverly** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Present--: **Rothe, Carl** (Elected: Med 6/99. Ex Off: Exec C. 6/99, & UFC Rep 6/99);

Present--: **Schneider, William** (Elected Officer: President 6/98. Elected: At Large 6/98.);

Absent---: Shay, Robert (Ex Officio: Dean of Herron);

Absent---: Sothmann, Mark S. (Ex Officio: Dean of Allied Health Sciences);

Present--: **Spechler, Martin** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent---: Stocum, David (Ex Officio: Dean of Science);

Absent---: Sutton, Susan (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Svanum, Soren** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent---: Tarver, Robert (Elected: Medicine 6/99);

Alternate: Tompkins, Philip (Ex Officio: Director of University Libraries) --

-----[via **Dolores Hoyt** (University Libraries)];

Present--: **Vermette, Rosalie** (Elected: At Large 6/99. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/99);

Absent---: Vessely, Jeffery (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Present--: **Wagner, Marion** (Elected: Social Work 6/99. Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/99);

Absent---: Warfel, Kathleen (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent---: Warren, Donald (Ex Officio: Dean of Education);

Present--: **Watt, Jeffrey** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent---: Webb, Dorothy (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Absent---: Weetman, Robert (Elected: Medicine 6/98);

Absent---: West, Karen (Elected: Medicine 6/98);

Absent---: Wilkins, Harriet (Appointed Officer: Parliamentarian 6/98. Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent---: Woods, David G. (Ex Officio: Dean of Music) (Bloomington)

Present--: **Yokomoto, Charles** (Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/98);

Absent---: Yurtseven, H. Oner (Ex Officio: Dean of Engineering & Technology).

## II. Non-Voting Members (3):

Absent---: Phillabaum, Melinda (Ex Officio: Staff Council President);

Absent---: Barlay, Thua (Ex Officio: Student Assembly President);

Absent---: Yovits, Marshall (Ex Officio: Senior Academy President).

## III. Guests/Visitors/Others (non-voting):

Present--: **Boschmann, Erwin** (Faculty Development Office; Science);

Present--: **Elmore, Garland** (UITs);

Present--: **Frisby, David** (Faculty Council Coordinator);

Present--: **Grove, Mark** (Registrar);

Present--: **Helman, Jennifer** (Constitution & Bylaws Committee Chair; University Libraries);

Present--: **Hoff, Beth** (UITs);

Present--: **Lorentz, Donald** (UITs Audio Engineer: Recorder);

Present--: **Nusbaum, Shirley** (Dean of the Faculties Office).

**Agenda Item I. Call to Order: Rebecca Porter (Vice-President of the IUPUI Faculty)!**

Vice-President Rebecca Porter called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

**Agenda Item II. Minutes Update.**

Spechler moved and Watt seconded that the minutes for October 9, 1997 be approved, with the following corrections: Slemenda for Slimenda and Morrel for Morelle on page 3; conjectural for trajectoral on page 9, and Hook for Jones on page 11. With those corrections, the minutes were approved.

In reference to IUPUI Circular 98-18, "Proposal Regarding Faculty Council Minutes" (distributed at the meeting along with Circulars 13b, 15b, and 19), President Schneider moved on behalf of the Executive Committee for the approval of the proposal. The proposal called for Minutes up through December 1997 to continue as verbatim but that from January 1998 on they be synoptic (topics and actions). Spechler supported the motion but questioned whether faculty opinions can be boiled down without feedback. Besch voiced concern that the verbatim minutes be saved, and pointed out that both the University Faculty Council and the IUPUI Faculty Council have tried this before only to later overturn it. Both he and Mannheimer stressed the importance of preserving the wit, humor, and even laughter (using brackets) of the meetings. Baldwin, Galanti, and Yokomoto also raised concerns regarding archival procedures, the value of having transcriptions, and the difficulty of transcribing years after the event. The motion carried with 23 standing in favor and 16 against.

**Agenda Item III. Chancellor's Report: Gerald Bepko (IUPUI Chancellor & IU Vice-President).**

Given that Chancellor Bepko was in Vietnam, giving the keynote speech on the consolidation of institutions of higher education, Executive Vice-Chancellor Plater gave the report. Regarding the budget, the Trustees approved a tuition increase of 4% last Friday (3-27-98); 1/2 of 1% of undergraduate tuition will be designated to individual campus programs for quality improvement initiatives. The increase in salaries will be in the 3 to 4 percent range. Budget requests will be submitted by the schools next week.

Plater then introduced Garland Elmore (Associate Vice-President for Teaching and Learning Information Technologies) and Beth Hoff (Director of Teaching and Learning Technologies), to speak of the "enterprise license agreement" between Indiana University and Microsoft Corporation. They defined the contract, outlined the benefits, went over the products included, explained the provisions, and pointed to the following URL to go for more information: <http://www.indiana.edu/~msela/>. They also pointed out that 5000 CDs were distributed (free) the previous Tuesday (3-31-98) on all campuses. In response to questions, they answered that bookstores and libraries will receive more copies in two weeks to sell, that faculty can use the software at home or on campus, and that students can take the software with them when they graduate.

Dean Plater distributed a handout re-announcing the position for the director of the center for teaching and learning, and reported that the search will continue with the expectation of being completed by fall.

Also last Friday (3-27-98), the Trustees approved Robert Stern, an architect out of New York, to begin the

preliminary design of the new Student Center. A series of town meetings on the new center are scheduled. Student fees will be increased to pay for the center. Housing on campus will be reviewed this summer. There will be a meeting on the design of the new Child Care Center next week.

A brochure was distributed on Dr. Samuel Betances, a motivational speaker on diversity, who would be visiting the campus the following week with something truly substantive to say. Also distributed was a brochure on the annual Edward C. Moore Symposium being held the following day.

**Agenda Item IV. President's Report: William Schneider (President of the IUPUI Faculty & Co-Secretary of the University Faculty Council), & Agenda Item V. Elections Update: Report on the Results of the "UFC" and "FC At-Large" Elections (see attachment\*): William Schneider.**

President Schneider reported that the 1997-1999 IUPUI Supplement to the Indiana University Academic Handbook has been distributed. There was a cost of \$3.31 each for printing and copying.

He also reported that the slates for the Executive and Nominating committees were not ready yet but that they would be emailed to the members as soon as possible.

He also reported that Ted Mullin gave a status report to the Executive Committee regarding the task force he chairs on faculty and senior staff development. Subcommittees have been set up and the final report will be ready in May or June.

The UFC will hold its final meeting of the academic year on April 14 at IU South Bend. Included on the agenda will be reports on salary and retirement studies, problems with TERA, non-tenure-track faculty, and post-tenure review. Also to be discussed is a proposal from the Medical School regarding titles for clinical faculty, a topic which will be on the May Faculty Council agenda too.

President Schneider also pointed out that the results of the faculty council at-large and UFC elections were in a document attached to the agenda (IUPUI Circular 98-14).

**Agenda Item VI. "Proposed Descriptions of the Principles of Undergraduate Learning" (distributed at meeting, IUPUI Circular 98-19): Beverly Ross (Academic Affairs Committee Chair) [CONTINUED DISCUSSION AND VOTE ITEM: 20 Minute Limit].**

Vice-President Porter relinquished the gavel to President Schneider in order to take the podium and present the history of this proposal (as the co-chair of CUL). Along with Vice-Chancellor Banta, they made a case for the urgency to approve this proposal (as a means of developing assessment measures), given the external pressure of accreditation beginning in two years, with the report due in 2002. Therefore CUL and the Academic Affairs Committee together urged the council to finalize these principles.

Beverly Ross pointed out that the latest version is not available; the committee has more changes to make but will present it for approval at the May meeting. The committee reached a consensus that the six do incorporate the nine, so they'll go with the six. They plan to make all six about the same in length, to deepen #5, and to fine tune the document with an eye to diversity and international concerns.

In response to Chernoff's question concerning the Bulletin of the School of Science, Porter pointed out that each school will still have to implement the ideas individually. Banta pointed to the website listed on Circular 98-19 for more information (<http://www.hoosiers.iupui.edu/gened/gnedprin.htm>). Plater urged the council to conclude by May for the good of all involved. Spechler suggested the new wording be put out on email so a consensus could be reached before the May meeting. Vermette challenged any professional schools unhappy with the international principle to speak up now, but there was no response. McBride emphasized that the health sciences must take a global perspective today, and Powers reiterated the point for Social Work.

Ross withdrew the motion for approval, taking the document back to committee, but will come to the next meeting with the final wording seeking approval.

**Agenda Item VII. "Policy Statement on Resolution of Curricular Disputes" (distributed at meeting, IUPUI Circular 98-13b): Beverly Ross (Academic Affairs Committee Chair) [CONTINUED DISCUSSION ITEM AND VOTE: 20 Minute Limit].**

Ross reported that the committee took under advisement the comments from the last Faculty Council and University Faculty Council meetings. She read aloud the new version, making some comments while reading, and explaining the changes. There was some discussion of the motion to approve the policy, with Ng recommending an amendment or change to the wording. His change was accepted by the committee. Porter called for a vote to adopt the statement as amended. The motion passed.

The approved policy reads as follows: "Resolution of undergraduate curriculum disputes between two or more academic units is the ultimate responsibility of the Dean of the Faculties at IUPUI. When such a dispute cannot be resolved by other methods within 45 days, the Dean of the Faculties, in consultation with the IUPUI Faculty Council Executive Committee, shall appoint a committee, composed primarily of faculty without major administrative responsibilities. This ad hoc committee shall include one representative from the Academic Affairs committee of the Faculty Council and one representative from the Academic Policies and Procedures Committee. The committee shall not include persons who are party to the dispute. The committee shall, in a timely manner, make a written recommendation for resolution of the dispute to the Dean of the Faculties, with copies to the disputants. The Dean of the Faculties shall maintain a written record of the dispute, issues addressed, and actions taken. The following guidelines should be considered in resolving issues: 1) decisions should reflect consideration of what is in the best interest of students; 2) historical precedent should be a consideration; and 3) financial issues are "legitimate" concerns but need to be viewed in terms of the interested parties and the University as a whole."

**Agenda Item VIII. Proposal for Changes to the Constitution and Bylaws (see attachment\* -- see also IUPUI Circular 98-15b, distributed at meeting): Jennifer Hehman (Constitution & Bylaws Committee Chair) [DISCUSSION ITEM AND VOTE: 20 Minute Limit].**

After going through the proposed changes page by page, noting the changes and providing explanations to questions, Hehman moved on behalf of the Constitution and Bylaws committee that the Faculty Council approve the amendments to the constitution and adopt the constitution as amended. The vote was in favor of adoption. Hehman then went through the same process with the Bylaws, and again the vote was in favor of adoption.

The constitution, with its additions and deletions noted, will be sent to the full IUPUI faculty as soon as possible,

and after 30 days a mail ballot will be conducted. The amendments shall become effective at the beginning of the 1998/99 academic year if the faculty vote to adopt it.

**Agenda Item IX. Resolution on Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty: Sara Hook (Faculty Affairs Committee Chair) [STATUS REPORT].**

Hook reported that she brought this item to the UFC March meeting where a lively discussion ensued. It was decided to deal with both full and part time at the same time, and to discuss the renaming of clinical medical faculty in accord with the distinction between salaried and volunteer persons at the April UFC meeting.

**Agenda Item X. Revised Proposal for Faculty Review and Enhancement: Sara Hook (Faculty Affairs Committee Chair) [STATUS REPORT].**

Hook reported that each campus will be developing its own policy. The sub-committee has taken its concerns back to the Faculty Affairs Committee, and a revised policy will come before the Faculty Council for approval in May.

**Agenda Item XI. Question / Answer Period.**

President Schneider reported that the UFC adopted the Athletics Policy including both of the IUPUI Faculty Council's changes, and sent it on to the Trustees for their consideration.

**Agenda Item XII. Unfinished Business? & Agenda Item XIII. New Business?**

Mark Grove, speaking for Garland Elmore, announced that a brochure was available at the back, listing frequently asked questions (and answers) regarding the IU/Microsoft agreement, and including a website to access.

**Agenda Item XIV. Adjournment.** The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

**Attachments: Agenda for April 2, 1998 Faculty Council Meeting;**

[Minutes prepared by Faculty Council Coordinator, David Frisby, UN 403, 274-2215

(Fax 274-2970), [fcouncil@iupui.edu](mailto:fcouncil@iupui.edu) : <http://www.hoosiers.iupui.edu/faccoun/faccou.htm> ]

---

[Attachment to FC980402 Minutes]

Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis

Faculty Council Meeting: Thursday, April 2, 1998



School of Dentistry, Room S115 (DS 115): 3:30 - 5:30 p.m.

## A G E N D A

- I. Call to Order: **Rebecca Porter** (Vice-President of the IUPUI Faculty)!
- II. Minutes Update.
- III. Chancellor's Report: **Gerald Bepko** (IUPUI Chancellor & IU Vice-President).
- IV. President's Report: **William Schneider** (President of the IUPUI Faculty & UFC Co-Secretary).
- V. Elections Update: Results of the "UFC" and "FC At-Large" Elections (**see attachment\***): **William Schneider**.
- VI. "Proposed Descriptions of the Principles of Undergraduate Learning" (attached to agenda of March 5, IUPUI Circular 98-12): **Beverly Ross** (Academic Affairs Committee Chair) [CONTINUED DISCUSSION AND VOTE ITEM: 20 Minute Limit].
- VII. "Policy Statement on Resolution of Curricular Disputes" (attached to agenda of March 5, IUPUI Circular 98-13): **Beverly Ross** (Academic Affairs Committee Chair) [CONTINUED DISCUSSION ITEM AND VOTE: 20 Minute Limit].
- VIII. Proposal for Changes to the Constitution and Bylaws (**see attachment\*** -- Proposed Changes also on the Faculty Council Homepage): **Jennifer Hehman** (Constitution & Bylaws Committee Chair) [DISCUSSION ITEM AND VOTE: 20 Minute Limit].
- IX. Resolution on Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty: **Sara Hook** (Faculty Affairs Committee Chair) [STATUS REPORT].
- X. Revised Proposal for Faculty Review and Enhancement: **Sara Hook** (Faculty Affairs Committee Chair) [STATUS REPORT].
- XI. Question / Answer Period.
- XII. Unfinished Business?
- XIII. New Business?
- XIV. Adjournment.

### \*Attachments:

(IUPUI Circular 98-14) Election Results for Faculty Council At-Large & University Faculty Council (for 1998/99 - 1999/00 term).

(IUPUI Circular 98-15) Proposal for Changes to the Constitution and Bylaws.

(IUPUI Circular 98-16) IUPUI Faculty Council Membership Information (send changes to Faculty Council coordinator).

### [Further Attachments Mailed Separately or Distributed at Meeting:

(IUPUI Circular 98-17) Minutes for October 9, 1997 Faculty Council Meeting

(IUPUI Circular 98-18) Proposal Regarding Faculty Council Minutes

(IUPUI Circular 98-19) Principles of Undergraduate Learning

(IUPUI Circular 98-13b) Resolution of Undergraduate Curricular Disputes

(IUPUI Circular 98-15b) Further Constitutional Changes

**Next Faculty Council Meeting: Thursday, May 7, 1998!**

[Agenda Prepared by Faculty Council Coordinator, David Frisby, UN 403, 274-2215

(Fax 274-2970), [fcouncil@iupui.edu](mailto:fcouncil@iupui.edu) : <http://www.hoosiers.iupui.edu/faccoun/faccou.htm> ]

FC980507 MINUTES:

APPROVED FC980903.

Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis

**Faculty Council Minutes: May 7, 1998**

Dental School Building, Room 115: 3:30 - 5:30 p.m.

**Attendance Record.**

**I. Voting Members (106):**

Present--: **Allen, Stephen** (Elected: Medicine 6/99);

Absent---: Atkinson, Simon (Elected: Medicine 6/99);

Present--: **Bailey, Darrell** (Ex Officio: Dean of New Media)

Present--: **Baldwin, James** (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Banta, Trudy** (Elected: At Large 6/99. Ex Officio: Chancellor's Admin. designee);

Present--: **Barlow, John** (Ex Officio: Dean of Liberal Arts);

Absent---: Barnes, A. James (Ex Officio: Dean of Public & Environmental Affairs);

Present--: **Belcher, Anne** (Elected: Nursing 6/99);

Present--: **Bepko, Gerald** (Ex Officio: Officer: Chancellor of IUPUI.);

Absent---: Besch, Henry (Elected: Medicine 6/99);

Absent---: Bippen, Paul (Ex Officio: Dean of IUPU Columbus);

Absent---: Bjork, Ulf Jonas (Elected: Journalism 6/99);

Absent---: Blomquist, William (Elected: Liberal Arts 6/98);

Absent---: Broadie, Thomas (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/99);

Present--: **Brothers, Linda** (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Absent---: Brown, Trevor (Ex Officio: Dean of Journalism);

Absent---: Burr, David (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Canty-Mitchell, Janie** (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Chernoff, Ellen** (Elected: Science 6/99);

Absent---: Cobb, Karen (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/99);

Absent---: Cochran, Michael (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98);

Absent---: Cronin, Blaise (Ex Officio: Dean of Library & Information Science) (Bloomington);

Present--: **Crowell, Dring** (Elected: Science 6/99);

Notice---: Dalsing, Michael (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Absent---: Dalton, Dan (Ex Officio: Dean of Business);

Present--: **DeSchepper, Edward** (Elected: Dentistry 6/98);

Present--: **Dickerson-Putman, Jeanette** (Elected: Liberal Arts 6/98);

Absent---: DiMicco, Joseph (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Absent---: Dunning, Jeremy (Ex Officio: Dean of Continuing Studies) (Bloomington);

Absent---: Eble, John (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Present--: **Eckerman, Nancy** (Elected: Medicine 6/98);

Present--: **Evenbeck, Scott** (Ex Officio: Dean of University College),

Absent---: Faris, James V. (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Fineberg, Naomi** (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Fineberg, S. Edwin** (Elected: At Large 6/98. Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98);

Present--: **Fisher, Mary** (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Ford, David** (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Present--: **Fore, Julie** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent---: Fredland, Richard (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98);

Present--: **Froehlich, Janice** (Elected: Medicine 6/98);

Present--: **Galanti, Paul** (Elected: Law 6/98. Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/99);

Present--: **Gardner, Carol** (Elected: Liberal Arts 6/99);

Present--: **Gilman, Linda** (Elected: Nursing 6/99);

Present--: **Goldblatt, Lawrence** (Ex Officio: Dean of Dentistry);

Absent---: Greene, Roberta (Ex Officio: Dean of Social Work);

Present--: **Gregory, Richard** (Elected: Dentistry 6/98);

Absent---: Hall, Robert (Elected: Science 6/98);

Alternate: Hamant, Celestine (Elected: Allied Health Sciences 6/99) --

-----[via **Bernadette Rodak** (Allied Health Sciences);

Absent---: Hart, Stuart (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98);

Present--: **Hawley, Dean** (Elected: Medicine 6/98);

Absent---: Holden, Robert (Ex Officio: Dean of Medicine);

Present--: **Hook, Sara Anne** (Elected: At Large 6/98. Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98);

Present--: **Hoyt, Dolores** (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98);

Present--: **Jafari, Maymanat** (Elected: University Libraries 6/99);

Present--: **Jones, Elizabeth** (Elected: Physical Education 6/98);

Absent---: Karlson, Henry (Elected: At Large 6/98. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/98);

Present--: **Keck, Juanita** (Elected: At Large 6/99. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/99);

Present--: **Keck, Robert** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent---: Keffer, M. Jan (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/99);

Present--: **Kellum, P. Nicholas** (Ex Officio: Dean of Physical Education);

Absent---: Leapman, Stephen (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent---: Lefstein, Norman (Ex Officio: Dean of Law);

Absent---: Luerssen, Thomas (Elected: Medicine 6/98);

Present--: **Man, Joyce Yan-Yun** (Elected: Public & Environmental Affairs 6/98);

Present--: **Mannheimer, Steven** (Elected: At Large 6/99. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/98);

Present--: **Mannix, Edward** (Elected: Medicine 6/99);

Present--: **McBride, Angela** (Ex Officio: Dean of Nursing);

Absent---: Modibo, Najja (Elected: Continuing Studies 6/98);

Present--: **Ng, Bart** (Elected: At Large 6/99. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/98);

Absent---: Olson, Byron (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent---: Parsons, Michael (Elected: Education 6/98);

Present--: **Peters, G. David** (Elected: Music 6/98);

Present--: **Peterson, Richard** (Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/98);

Present--: **Plater, William** (Ex Officio: Chancellor's Administrative Designee);

Present--: **Pless, John** (Elected: Medicine 6/99);

Present--: **Porter, Rebecca** (Elected Officer: Vice President 6/98. Ex Officio: UFC Rep. 6/98);

Alternate: Porterfield, Amanda (Elected: At Large 6/99) --

-----via **Jonathan R. Eller** (Liberal Arts);

Present--: **Powers, Gerald** (Elected: At Large 6/98. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/99);

Absent---: Rescorla, Frederick (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Present--: **Rizkalla, Maher** (Elected: Engineering & Technology 6/98);

Present--: **Robertson, Jean** (Elected: Herron 6/99);

Absent---: Rogers, Richard (Elected: Business 6/99);

Present--: **Ross, Beverly** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Present--: **Rothe, Carl** (Elected: Med 6/99. Ex Off: Exec C. 6/99, & UFC Rep 6/99);

Present--: **Schneider, William** (Elected Officer: President 6/98. Elected: At Large 6/98.);

Absent---: Shay, Robert (Ex Officio: Dean of Herron);

Present--: **Sothmann, Mark S.** (Ex Officio: Dean of Allied Health Sciences);

Present--: **Spechler, Martin** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Alternate: Stocum, David (Ex Officio: Dean of Science) --

-----via **Kathryn Wilson** (Science);

Absent---: Sutton, Susan (Elected: At Large 6/99);

Alternate: Svanum, Soren (Elected: At Large 6/98) --

-----via **Bethany Neal-Beliveau** (Science);

Absent---: Tarver, Robert (Elected: Medicine 6/99);

Present--: **Tompkins, Philip** (Ex Officio: Director of University Libraries);

Present--: **Vermette, Rosalie** (Elected: At Large 6/99. Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/99);

Present--: **Vessely, Jeffery** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Present--: **Wagner, Marion** (Elected: Social Work 6/99. Ex Officio: UFC Representative 6/99);

Present--: **Warfel, Kathleen** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Absent---: Warren, Donald (Ex Officio: Dean of Education);

Present--: **Watt, Jeffrey** (Elected: At Large 6/98);

Alternate: Webb, Dorothy (Elected: At Large 6/99) --

-----via **Elizabeth Goering** (Liberal Arts);

Absent---: Weetman, Robert (Elected: Medicine 6/98);

Present--: **West, Karen** (Elected: Medicine 6/98);

Alternate: Wilkins, Harriet (Appointed Officer: Parliamentarian 6/98. Elected: At Large 6/98) --

-----via **W. David Bostwick** (Engineering & Technology) & **Carl Rothe** (Medicine);

Absent---: Woods, David G. (Ex Officio: Dean of Music) (Bloomington)

Present--: **Yokomoto, Charles** (Ex Officio: Executive Committee 6/98);

Present--: **Yurtseven, H. Oner** (Ex Officio: Dean of Engineering & Technology).

## **II. Non-Voting Members (3):**

Absent---: Phillabaum, Melinda (Ex Officio: Staff Council President);

Absent---: Barlay, Thua (Ex Officio: Student Assembly President);

Absent---: Yovits, Marshall (Ex Officio: Senior Academy President).

## **III. Guests/Visitors/Others (non-voting):**

Present--: **Boschmann, Erwin** (Faculty Development Office; Science);

Present--: **Carlin, Paul** (Liberal Arts);

Present--: **Frisby, David** (Faculty Council Coordinator);

Present--: **Grove, Mark** (Registrar);

Present--: **Larter, Raima** (Science);

Present--: **Lorentz, Donald** (UITs Audio Engineer: Recorder);

Present--: **Martin, Robert** (Vice-Chancellor for Administration & Finance);

Present--: **Nehf, Laura** (Coordinator, Associate Faculty Affairs);

Present--: **Rooney, Patrick M.** (IUPUI Administration);

Present--: **Sullivan, Cheryl** (Vice-Chancellor for External Affairs).

## **Agenda Item I. Call to Order: Rebecca Porter (IUPUI Faculty Vice-President)!**

Vice-President Rebecca Porter called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

**Agenda Item II. Approval of Minutes for Nov 6, 1997, Dec 4, 1997, and Apr 2, 1998 (attached\* to agenda).**

Watt moved and Powers seconded that the November 6, 1997 minutes be approved. Watt moved and Ng seconded that the December 4, 1997 minutes be approved. Watt moved and Ng seconded that the April 2, 1998 minutes be approved. All three motions carried. The minutes will be posted on the Faculty Council webpage as approved.

**Agenda Item III. Chancellor's Report: Gerald Bepko (IUPUI Chancellor & IU Vice-President).**

The Chancellor's report was deferred since he had not yet returned from the Board of Trustees meeting at IUB.

**Agenda Item IV. President's Report: William Schneider (IUPUI Faculty President & UFC Co-Secretary).**

President Schneider reported that at the previous day's Trustees meeting the Partially Paid Family Leave Policy was adopted. The new pamphlet on the revised grievance procedures (taken from the new IUPUI Supplement to the IU Academic Handbook) is available to interested parties; several hundred have already been requested.

**Agenda Item V. President's Annual Summary Report on the Boards of Review: William Schneider.**

President Schneider presented the constitutionally mandated annual report on the Board of Review activities (since last May). The new Mediation Committee is in place and operating. Two Boards of Review have been completed, one regarding administrative discipline (which the board upheld), and another regarding the administrative punitive action for a faculty member (the board found for the faculty member, but a settlement was negotiated). There is also one case pending. The Mediation Committee successfully mediated one case, and began another which was subsequently dropped by the faculty member before resolution.

**Agenda Item VI. Election of Nominating, Executive, and Promotion/Tenure Committees (see attachment\* for slates -- also distributed earlier via email): Harriet Wilkins (Nominating Committee Chair) [ACTION ITEM]**

Assisted by Sara Hook, Karen West (substituting for Harriet Wilkins) conducted the election. Elected for a two-year term (1998/99 - 1999/00) to the Executive Committee were Robert Keck, Steven Mannheimer, Byron Olson, and Jeffery Vessely. Elected to the Nominating Committee for the same two-year term were Mary Fisher, Elizabeth Jones, Marion Wagner, and Harriet Wilkins; elected for a one-year term (1998/99) was Richard Pfile. Elected to the Promotion & Tenure Committee as an at-large member for a three-year term (1998/99 - 2000/01) was Ulla Connor. The council approved shredding the ballots and keeping the tally sheet in the Faculty Council Office.

**Agenda Item VII. Academic Calendar Status Report: Academic Affairs Committee: Beverly Ross (Chair) & Mark Grove (Registrar) [VOTE ITEM: 5 Minute Limit]**

Beverly Ross, speaking for the Academic Affairs Committee, recommended that the Faculty Council approve the



academic calendar (no second was necessary). Spechler raised a question regarding a comparison of the calendars of IUPUI and IUB. Grove responded by saying the fall semester begins on Wednesday because of the Labor Day and Thanksgiving holidays, but that whereas our fall and spring semesters have the same number of school days, IUB has less in the fall than the spring. Grove also reported the calendar was set through 2010 with the new Martin Luther King, Jr. holiday being the only major change. The Faculty Council voted to adopt the academic calendar.

**Agenda Item VIII. "Proposed Descriptions of the Principles of Undergraduate Learning" (see attachment\* -- latest version): Beverly Ross (Academic Affairs Committee Chair) [CONTINUED DISCUSSION AND VOTE ITEM: 20 Minute Limit].**

Beverly Ross introduced the latest version saying the description of the six principles had been shortened, some had been made clearer, and that some had been expanded so that one is not seen to be more important than the others. The international concerns have been addressed, and definitions and outcomes have been added for each principle to facilitate assessment. Speaking for the Academic Affairs Committee, she recommended adoption by the Faculty Council (no second necessary). After some discussion the motion carried unanimously.

**Agenda Item IX. Revised Proposal for "IUPUI Faculty/Librarian Review and Enhancement" (see attachment\*): Sara Hook (Faculty Affairs Comm. Chair) [DISCUSSION AND VOTE ITEM: 20 Min Limit].**

Speaking for the Executive Committee, President Schneider moved that the Faculty Council approve the document. He explained why the Executive Committee, rather than the Faculty Affairs Committee, was bringing the motion: the document has been under discussion a long time, and it does represent a reasonable and responsible response to the call for accountability. He pointed out that IUPUI's document allows the schools individually to define chronic unproductivity, compared to IUB's approach, which has defined academic misconduct without the schools' having a say. President Schneider contended that this proposal puts responsibility where it should be, with the unit, and argued that even if the document is not perfect it can later be modified. After he gave some more background and supplementary information, there was considerable discussion, a summary of which follows.

Spechler argued that IUB has already turned down this version of the policy, there is no urgency, a university-wide policy is needed, schools should not be defining unsatisfactory performance, the policy needs to account for the changing phases of an academic career, we need to protect our colleagues, we already have policies regarding academic misconduct and incompetence wherein we can act immediately, this new policy's sanctions would only be intermediate (not including dismissal), and so he moved it be deferred until the fall.

At Porter's request, Spechler's motion was postponed to allow more discussion. Warfel took the opportunity to agree with the Executive Committee and disagree with Spechler, arguing that this is an important document for the campus, it's been worked on for over ten years, and it will do the campus proud to approve it. Even in a worse case scenario it offers protection and opportunity.

Wilson (alternate for Stocum) supported Spechler and spoke against approval, arguing that the policy drags out dismissal for three more years and encourages chronic underperformers.

Mannheimer voiced the issue of whether the policy was too hard or too soft, and reminded everyone that tenure should be regarded as sacred, and therefore should be both awarded and removed only with all due care.

Hook, speaking as chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, reviewed what the committee had done. It had struggled with defining terms, eventually deciding that the schools should define the terms. It had argued over the number of years to wait (two or three) before sanctions. It had argued over the necessity of input from the full faculty. Meanwhile, committee members began to dwindle. After two years nothing more can be done and so it's now brought before the Faculty Council for a vote.

Warfel addressed Wilson's point regarding the prolongation of incompetence. She distinguished those faculty who are unable versus those who are unwilling. The current policy for dismissal still applies to the latter. This pending policy applies to the former.

E. Fineberg outlined the review process, emphasizing the departmental level of involvement, and argued that the policy is fair. In contrast with IUB's version, which focuses on more drastic cases, IUPUI's aims to help.

In response to Spechler's contention that IUB had already turned its version of the policy down, Schneider gave his understanding of UFC's and IUB's efforts regarding this matter. The UFC will formulate a university-wide policy based on what the campus es have adopted. IUPUI should therefore not wait to adopt this policy in hopes that UFC will do so. He also pointed out that IUB did adopt a misconduct policy.

Spechler corrected Wilson's support, pointing to Item #12 and emphasizing the words "dismissal only if" -- that is, she is mistaken if she thinks even this policy will allow dismissal. He then moved that the document be sent back to committee for consideration, and that the document be circulated among all the faculty. Ford seconded the motion.

The motion was defeated. The council returned to the motion to adopt the policy.

Rothe responded to Spechler, contending his reading was incorrect. He pointed to lines 53-57 and argued that the word "may" there does not preclude sanctions. This policy allows for discretion, especially on the part of the chair, as to whether help or dismissal is due.

Spechler responded to Rothe on this very important matter of the dismissal of faculty. Hook supported Spechler's reading but pointed out that dismissal can occur regardless of this document. Wilson reiterated her claim that this policy fails because it helps the bad cases remain.

Porter called an end to the discussion and proposed an extension of ten minutes but there was no support so the council moved to a vote. The motion to adopt the document as policy was approved.

### **Agenda Item III. Chancellor's Report: Gerald Bepko (IUPUI Chancellor & IU Vice-President).**

For a change of pace, the council returned to agenda item III, the Chancellor having arrived during the previous discussion. Chancellor Bepko asked for a report on the new childcare facility from Vice-Chancellor Robert Martin.

Martin reported that an architect, CSO Associates, has been hired, and that under Beth Jeglum the design team is at work. Preliminary drawings are now available. The site remains on the western perimeter of the campus, and the design might be ready around the first of July. Martin stated the campus is very pleased with their progress. In response to R. Keck's question of the footprint and its physical coordination with housing, Martin affirmed that the Ronald McDonald House, Student Housing, and the Childcare Facility are being jointly coordinated. In response to Spechler's question regarding emergency fixes (e.g., dropping one child one time for one class), Martin affirmed that the facility will address this student need. It is anticipated that one-third of their service will fit this category of one-time drop-off for one to four hours. Mannheimer added that architects rise to their client's expectations, so IUPUI should be proactive with regard to CSO's work.

Chancellor Bepko called on Executive Vice-Chancellor Plater to report on faculty demographics and on the annual Promotion and Tenure document which was distributed at the meeting. Plater presented a summary of the document which demonstrated its usefulness and called attention to item #3 on excellence.

Bepko then called on Vice-Chancellor Banta to report on the draft of the 1997 IUPUI Performance Report which was also distributed at the meeting. Banta summed up the report saying this year was a little better than the year before. She said the Planning Committee is now reviewing the data and will possibly modify the report.

Bepko reported on the IU Board of Trustees meeting. A new Tourism degree was approved. The track and soccer stadium will be named after Michael A. Carroll in honor of his extensive contributions to IUPUI athletics before his untimely death (airplane crash). The Capital Request to the Indiana General Assembly will include a request for \$22 million for IUB classroom space as its top priority. Also requested will be funds for a new IUPUI Communication Technologies Complex, \$33 million to replace the old IUPUI Mary Cable classroom building, \$80 million to complete the renovation of the IUPUI Medical Science Building and to renovate other facilities around the state (like Gary and South Bend) used by the Medical Center. The Trustees also recommended the appointment with tenure of Gene Tempel to the School of Education, and of Herman Saatkamp as Dean of the School of Liberal Arts. Saatkamp will be coming from Texas A&M where he was the chair of the philosophy department and involved in the humanities and medicine. As he was editor of the Santayana Project there, the possibility exists of bringing the project here to IUPUI to join with the Peirce Edition Project in a Center for American Thought.

Bepko pointed out that it will not be possible for Saatkamp to replace Liberal Arts Dean John Barlow, who has made a lifetime contribution to the university community with his thirty-one years of dedication to our becoming a high class urban university. Since he has "aged considerably" according to the recent Sagamore article on his retirement, and since he upon his retirement will likely return to New York, and since he is here attending his last IUPUI Faculty Council meeting, it is fitting that the Faculty Council recognize John Barlow. [There was extensive applause.] Bepko invited everyone to Barlow's retirement reception the following afternoon, and as a capstone, announced two grants that Barlow helped bring to the campus: \$6.5 million for the Center on Philanthropy and \$3.5 million for POLIS to conduct studies in American religion.

Bepko also applauded the big role the School of Liberal Arts played in the report of the Mayor's High Tech Task Force, which is helping to lead the state into economic growth through the application of technology.

Bepko announced that the Davis Cup quarterfinals, a worldwide event between the U.S. and Belgium, will be held at IUPUI in July.

Bepko closed his report with one last word on the action of the Faculty Council today. He found it admirable and thinks it puts us in the forefront of higher education today, and he's proud of the council.

Vice-President Porter took the opportunity to acknowledge President Bill Schneider's last Faculty Council meeting as its leader. She pointed out that the office of president demands an enormous time commitment of which the actual Faculty Council meeting time is minor. Working on behalf of the IUPUI faculty requires serious dedication, so on behalf of the council she presented him with a plaque in recognition of his contribution to faculty governance. He was also presented with his own gavel. [Applause.]

Chancellor Bepko commented that these have been two great years and much credit is due to Bill's leadership. He is a symbol of the accomplished IUPUI scholar, an inter-disciplinary explorer, an advocate for the faculty's interests while yet sensitive to institutional interests, one who gets things done, and one who engenders high spirit. Speaking for the Administration, he also made a presentation, although an intangible one. He announced the William H. Schneider Fund, allocated by an anonymous donor, to be used by the History Department as they see fit (scholarship, grants, etc.). He closed with the hope that Bill Schneider stay involved.

Porter returned the council to its regular programming and asked E. Fineberg to provide some background for why the proposal of agenda item 10 was being requested.

**Agenda Item X. "Proposed Changes in Titles for Clinical Faculty (Medical School)" (see attachment\*) -- Ed Fineberg [DISCUSSION AND VOTE ITEM: 20 Minute Limit] [also at <http://www.hoosiers.iupui.edu/faccoun/titles~1.htm>]**

E. Fineberg reported that this proposal is a big issue for the School of Medicine that was decided a year and a half ago but got bogged down. The problem is that the School of Medicine has both volunteer faculty persons and clinical faculty persons, and they have the same titles but different roles. The difference between the two is a matter of obligation and employment: volunteers serve the school and get recognition, but it's not a job; clinicals teach and do service for monetary compensation. We need to distinguish them, they are both very important but are two different classes. So, this is a simple proposal. We retain the ranks of professor, associate professor, and assistant professor. Full-time medical school faculty members would use the title of Professor of Medicine, for example, while a clinical faculty person (one who is paid) would use the title of Professor of Clinical Medicine, for example, whereas a volunteer faculty person (who receives recognition but is not paid) would use the title of Clinical Professor of Medicine. It's a subtle difference but one the medical faculty want in the handbook and used.

Schneider presented some context for the proposal. The request for new titles was sent to the Executive Committee last summer and the UFC was asked to approve them. Because the UFC was working on a policy for non-tenure track faculty including changes of title, the request from the Medical School was sent to the UFC Faculty Affairs Committee working on new titles. Unfortunately, they did not complete their work. It is hoped the UFC will move forward on it next year, but if we act on it now, it will still have to go to the UFC since it involves a change in titles.

In response to Baldwin's question regarding clinical ranks at other schools, Dean Sothmann of Allied Health responded that Allied Health also utilized clinical faculty, but that with Clarion and the consolidations they

thought it best for now to go with the Medical School proposal.

Spechler contended the new proposal does not convey the distinction they want to make. The distinction between a professor of clinical medicine and a clinical professor of medicine is unclear and doesn't serve public understanding.

Fisher added that Nursing has adjunct faculty that aren't paid so this approach doesn't clarify how they do things.

E. Fineberg responded that the proposal was only for the School of Medicine and not for other schools. He called attention to the last sentence and emphasized that the Faculty Handbook should define these terms.

N. Fineberg added that this convention is presently used at other medical schools.

Yokomoto commented that this proposal just moves the confusion from one place to another, and that we need to clarify the confusion for everyone everywhere.

Warfel pointed out that the handbook does define adjunct faculty and that the term "clinical" already means something, so that this proposal would result in three types of clinicals in the Pathology department.

Mannheimer supported the proposal. The Medical School valued it, and the public won't care about the confusion.

J. Keck asked what impact there would be if individual schools get to come up with their own titles, and also questioned why the issue is before the Faculty Council if it is a medical school issue.

Schneider replied this proposal will help clarify the non-tenure track faculty issue, which is now before the UFC.

Pless spoke against the proposal on behalf of many of the medical faculty on the grounds that it does not distinguish the two properly. Another member supported Pless.

Spechler moved to table the proposal until UFC considers it.

The motion passed 29 to 21 with 5 abstaining.

Warfel added as a clarification that the medical faculty had not yet approved it.

#### **Agenda Item XI. Report on IUPUI Salary Equity Study: Paul Carlin [INFORMATION ITEM]**

Carlin succinctly presented a preliminary report that the tenure and tenure-track faculty salaries have been examined, and that the next phase would include the salaries of lecturers, librarians, and scientists. Gathering data has taken more time than anticipated, but eventually a salary model will be built which will include all variables that affect equity such as rank, years since terminal degree, years at the institution, school appointed to, and many others. The new model will increase our power to predict. He cut to the chase saying that with this new model,  $R^2$  (or the coefficient of predictive power) will increase from 64% to 81%, and that a benchmark will be set that

will make it possible to provide explanations to questions like why males earn more than similarly qualified females. He hopes to have a final report ready for the council in the fall. He added that the study does want to ensure that underpaid faculty are considered while yet conserving faculty resources, and therefore they will be automatically reviewing only those within plus or minus one standard deviation, or 87 individuals (67 males and 20 females).

Warfel clarified for the council that this go-round did not include the 700 or so medical faculty.

Porter pointed out that there is no opportunity for all members of the Faculty Council to ask questions so she pointed out two other individuals, Chris Keeley and Pat Rooney, to whom members could direct their questions. She thanked Carlin and said the council looked forward to the final report.

### **Agenda Item XII. University College Status Report: Scott Evenbeck (University College Dean) [INFORMATION ITEM]**

Evenbeck distributed a document dated May 7, 1998, titled "University College 1997-98: The Planning Year" and explained that he has functioned as a liaison with the Academic Affairs Committee. The Budgetary Affairs Committee of University College and the Faculty Council Budgetary Affairs Committee have also collaborated. He pointed to other models for collaboration including the various instructional teams (including faculty, librarians, technology consultants, student mentors, and academic counselors) who helped plan syllabi for courses, as well as the first year teams. Collaboration has proved to be the key. He reported that University College has the strongest faculty from all the schools and is matching them with some of the weakest students. Whereas before a student might meet with an advisor once a semester, now it's once a week. Proud of those involved, he mentioned Associate Dean Barb Jackson, Assistant Deans Phil Seabrook and Gayle Williams, and especially, now part of University College, the Honors Program under Director Ted Mullen.

Evenbeck explained that the document lists accomplishments and projects plans for next year, yet is merely the beginning of his annual report. He extended an invitation to all to visit the newly remodeled building (LY). The whole building is designed to let students focus on learning. He remarked that a great vitality exudes throughout. Herron students have been commissioned, and exhibitions will be shown this summer. October 2 will be the official dedication. He closed with the prediction that as the collaboration continues to gather the eventual impact will swell.

### **Agenda Items XIII -XVI. Question / Answer Period, Unfinished Business, New Business, & Adjournment.**

Vice-President Porter concluded the meeting and ended her role as presider by thanking Parliamentarians Wilkins and Rothe for their whispered words of wisdom, the faculty council coordinator for the changes so far and for the anticipated changes for the coming year, the administration for its support, especially its support of the Executive Committee, and the Faculty Council membership for their hard work and participation. She wished everyone a great summer. There was no time for questions or old or new business. The meeting adjourned promptly at 5:30 p.m.

**Attachments: Agenda for April 2, 1998 Faculty Council Meeting;**

**[Minutes prepared by Faculty Council Coordinator, David Frisby,**

[Attachment for FC980507 Minutes]

Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis

**Faculty Council Meeting: Thursday, May 7, 1998**

Dental School Building, Room S115 (DS 115): 3:30 - 5:30 p.m.

**A G E N D A**

- I. Call to Order: **Rebecca Porter** (IUPUI Faculty Vice-President)!
- II. Approval of Minutes for November 6, 1997, December 4, 1997, and April 2, 1998 (**attached\*** to agenda).
- III. Chancellor's Report: **Gerald Bepko** (IUPUI Chancellor & IU Vice-President).
- IV. President's Report: **William Schneider** (IUPUI Faculty President & UFC Co-Secretary).
- V. President's Annual Summary Report on the Boards of Review: **William Schneider**.
- VI. Election of Nominating, Executive, and Promotion/Tenure Committees (see **attachment\*** for slates -- also distributed earlier via email): **Harriet Wilkins** (Nominating Committee Chair) [ACTION ITEM]
- VII. Academic Calendar Status Report: Academic Affairs Committee: **Beverly Ross** (Chair) & **Mark Grove** (Registrar) [INFORMATION ITEM: 5 Minute Limit]
- VIII. "Proposed Descriptions of the Principles of Undergraduate Learning" (see **attachment\*** -- latest version): **Beverly Ross** (Academic Affairs Committee Chair) [CONTINUED DISCUSSION AND VOTE ITEM: 20 Minute Limit].
- IX. Revised Proposal for "IUPUI Faculty/Librarian Review and Enhancement" (see **attachment\***): **Sara Hook** (Faculty Affairs Committee Chair) [DISCUSSION AND VOTE ITEM: 20 Minute Limit].
- X. "Proposed Changes in Titles for Clinical Faculty (Medical School)" (see **attachment\***) -- **Ed Fineberg** [DISCUSSION AND VOTE ITEM: 20 Minute Limit] [also on web at <http://www.hoosiers.iupui.edu/faccoun/titles~1.htm> ]
- XI. Report on IUPUI Salary Equity Study: **Paul Carlin** [INFORMATION ITEM]
- XII. University College Status Report: **Scott Evenbeck** (University College Dean) [INFORMATION ITEM]
- XIII. Question / Answer Period.
- XIV. Unfinished Business?
- XV. New Business?
- XVI. Adjournment.

**\*Attachments:**

Unapproved FC Minutes for November 6, 1997 (verbatim);

Unapproved FC Minutes for December 4, 1997 (verbatim);

Unapproved FC Minutes for April 2, 1998 (synoptic);

(IUPUI Circular 98-20) Slate for Election of Executive, Nominating, and P&T Committees (also distributed earlier via email);

(IUPUI Circular 98-21) "Principles of Undergraduate Learning" (latest version);

(IUPUI Circular 98-22) "IUPUI Faculty/Librarian Review and Enhancement";

(IUPUI Circular 98-23) Proposed Changes in Titles for Clinical Faculty.

**Next Faculty Council Meeting: September 3, 1998!**

[Agenda Prepared by Faculty Council Coordinator, David Frisby, UN 403, 274-2215

(Fax 274-2970), [fcouncil@iupui.edu](mailto:fcouncil@iupui.edu) : <http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil> ]