

Minutes
Indiana University
UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL
Peterson Room -- IU Foundation
September 9, 1997

Members Present: Gerald Bepko; Myles Brand; Kenneth Gros Louis; F.C. Richardson; Ellen Brantlinger; Patrick Brantlinger; Ann Bristow; Thomas Broadie; William Burgan; Lewis Ciminillo; Karen Cobb; Luis Davila; Michael Downs; Paul Eisenberg; John Findling; Edwin Fineberg; Bernd Fischer; Michael Foos; Richard French; Paul Galanti; Laura Ginger; Richard Heinz; Steven Hollander; Sara Hook; Dolores Hoyt; Paul Joray; Jan Keffer; Gerald Marker; Thomas Mawhinney; Theodore Miller; Julieann Nilson; Richard Peterson; Rebecca Porter; Victor Riemanschneider; Linda Rooda; Carl Rothe; William Schneider; Dennis Senchuk; Richard Vaden; Marion Wagner; Walter Wagor; David Zaret; David Orensten.

Alternatives Present: David Nordloh for Robert Arnove.

Members Absent without Alternatives: David Fulton; Emita Hill; Kenneth Perrin; Hilda Richards; George Walker; Michael Wartell; Michael Cochran; Donald Cunningham; Stuart Hart; Margo Sorgman; Thua Barlay; Steven Chiagouris; Thomas Mulcahy.

Visitors Present: Wayne Craig; Edwin Greenebaum; Gerald Bepko; Donald Warren; DeAnna Hines; Patrick Furlong; Margaret Joseph; ()Robinson; Kevin Burkett; Mike Wright; William Foster; Rurele Violetti; (); Julie Baby; Sarah McNabb; Robin Gress; Peter (); Susan Moby; Linda (); Cindy (); () Duff.

AGENDA #1 PRESIDING OFFICERS BUSINESS:

BRAND: The first item is a note of sadness, the death of James Patillo from IU, South Bend, who was a member of this group. We honor his contributions to the counsel, as well as his representation on the campus on the Agenda Committee and he chaired the Styles and Rules committee. We express our sympathy for this loss, to both the campus and the family. Please join me in a moment of silence. (Moment of silence). Thank you. You will find at your place a very nice, brief description of the memorial resolution for Dr. James Patillo. The second item of business, is that this year, I elected to do something different with the state of the University, rather than read it as a speech, I have circulated it in advance and I presume that each of you have a copy. It is also on the Web, as of this morning and it will appear in home pages later this week. In order to facilitate discussion of those topics, I ask that the rules be suspended and you will probably need a formal motion. The rules be suspended, in so far that any one in the room can ask questions, without special written permission. During that segment of the... We can do that by conscious, are there any objections. Seeing and hearing none, for that section the rules will be suspended and that ends the Presiding Officers business.

AGENDA #2 AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS

BRAND: Please, Bill.

SCHNEIDER: Yes it is a pleasure as the first item to introduce to you, my colleague the co-secretary of UFC from the IU Bloomington campus, Ted Miller. He is a member of SPEA faculty and he has been here at IU Bloomington, he says forever, but I think it is 20 years or so and he is of course a veteran of The Faculty Governance on the Bloomington campus. For this member, Laura Ginger is going to serve (027). She is the other person here at the head table. I would also like to call your attention that the Agenda Committee has finally finished the naming of the standing committees by approving the four members of the Honorary Degree Committee. They are listed on the list of University Council committees. They are Paul Eisenberg from Bloomington, Ed Fineberg from IUPUI, Paul Galanti from IUPUI and Bernd Fischer from IUP Fort Wayne. That was approved at our meeting this morning. The rest of our meeting this morning discussed the agenda for the year. There is plenty of business to be done, so enjoy talking about the president's "State Of The University" today, because we will have plenty of business next meeting in October.

BRAND: Thank you Bill.

AGENDA ITEM #3: QUESTION AND COMMENT PERIOD:

BRAND: Any questions or comments from members of the UFC. Okay. Let us go on then to Item 4 on the Agenda, which is the State of the University presentation.

AGENDA #4: STATE OF THE UNIVERSITY PRESENTATION

BRAND: Rather than try to summarize what was in the narrative that you received, let me give you some background, what led me to say what I did in that and the context in which I am trying to make these various points. It is useful to review what happened to higher education since the end of second World War. American higher education prior to the war did not have prominence in the world, as it does today and it involved far fewer proportion of students than it does now. About 15% of the students, high school graduates went onto the post secondary education. Now if you include the 2 year institutions it is over 60%, without two year institutions it is about 30% so the proportion of students has enlarged tremendously. During W.W.II the US used the research universities in the cause of national defense. MIT developed radar, the HAT project evolved from the University of Chicago and may other less famous instances as well. That led to after the war the so called, Bush Doctrine, Van Bush was secretary, I think, of state, after the war and the US made a decision to invest in research and development in its higher education system, unlike going to a place in other developed countries, which used either the corporate sector or the governmental sector or both. Also after W.W.II higher education became far more accessible in virtue of the GI bill which brought, as you well know, many people, onto campuses. It took a time for research investment, as well as the increased access to affect higher education in this country, consequently. It finally, did that in about the middle 1950's. This so called golden era of higher education in this country was about '58-'68. There are some you in this room who experienced that golden era. I myself entered the academy as an assistant professor in '67, so I was at the tail end of it. But that was a time of massive investment in

American higher education. Both in its research mission and as accessibility and the public university spectrum particularly grew dramatically. Prior to the war, about half of the students were in private universities and half in public. Presently close to 80% of our students are in public higher education. So you had a shift from private to public, in terms of proportion of students, as well as massive investment and the research enterprise and large growth because of increased accessibility, mainly subsidy reports through the GI bill and related programs. The major research and intensity universities that we have grown to know and love and IU among them, were essentially, essentially built their foundations during that time, the golden age and that is true about all of the big ten institutions as well. Towards the end of that period, the late 60's higher education began to experience a down turn, part of it was that because of social upheaval due to the Vietnam war and another part of it was due to economic change of circumstances, always the single most important variable in the support of higher public education is the state of the economy, other variables are important, no doubt, how well you are regarded in the state, how well you do your job, and so on, but the state of the economy is the single most important variable. During the last few years of the 60's and through most of the 70's higher education experienced a down turn economically, though access and interest by students continued. That situation continued until the early 80's in which we saw a reinvestment in higher education and the economy was doing a little better. It was not quite the second coming of the golden age, but we saw continued growth, including federal reinvestment to higher education during the early 80's and a number of institutions, IU included did very well during that period. As we move then from the early 80's into the late 80's and the early 90's we saw again a down turn in part for recessionary reasons, but also for another set of reasons, namely that America was becoming dissatisfied with its institutions, it did not matter rather it was the courts, the church, government, the schools, you name it, institutions, banks, they all came under attack, health care, which still remains a prominent issue and higher education, as well, did not escape the concerns of the American public, perhaps it might be said that some people who experience the late 60's were still angry at America higher education, but I think that the economic down turn, as well as the focus on the internal nature of our institutions was the driving force. Higher education, during the 80's during a period of growth and financial strength, in fairness built some walls around herself and became less conscious and sensitive to the needs of its constituents and some of the criticism that impacted the Universities during the late 80's and early 90's was justified, some of it was an exaggeration, brought on perhaps by other agendas, some of it was the result of the general difficulty in dealing with American institutions, but much of that was justified. The best Universities in the countries, IU included understood what part of the criticisms made sense what was justified and what part was mere attack for other reasons. The strategic directions show, in part, but only in part, was a response to the justified criticisms, not only IU but America higher education in general faced. Obviously it was worse outside the big ten arena, than it was, look at what happened in California and New York State, two examples, in the midwest, I think that Indiana University was moderate in its approach of criticism, but none-the-less there was criticism. And so, one of the functions of the strategic directions was to create the necessary reforms to be responsive to the criticism. This strategic directions charter focused on student learning and communities of learning which students, particularly undergraduates were put at the center. That is something that we should be doing, come what may. But it was also a response to the criticisms. Similarly the charter focused on better activity between our constituents, including the business committees, local government,

K-12 and during the first two rounds of funding a number of pilot projects in those areas of student learning, as well as partnerships without constituents evolved. The charter also was designed to focus on academic excellence, which is a key element in our continued development.

When I talk now about the next step in the development in our long range strategic plan, I need to say that we have undertaken our reform work well, I suggest to you as well it not any better than any other major university in the country. The reform work is not complete and we still need to look at other student related issues such as retention. We still need to continue to build our relationships with external constituents such as K-12, none of that is complete, but we have made excellent progress. For those universities, now who are in a state or region that is economically strong, as we are, and who have done their reform work well, as we have, I believe that there is a window of opportunity, not large, but it is open in which we can refocus on the multiple missions of the university and bring back to center stage, a number of issues that during the critical period of the late 80's and early 90's may have been lost, mainly both of our teaching and our research missions. By research I include creativity and scholarships. We need then to refocus our energies as part of our long range charter of continuing the reforms for bringing back to center stage, the mission of research intents of a university. Not all universities have this opportunity. In part because many of them have not been as successful as we have in the reform activity. And others do not have the security of a sound financial base and strong instruction that we do. Additionally, I believe that Indiana University has an apparatus advantage in that it is a multi campus, statewide single university. All of our campuses are to be involved. We are a single constellation of synergistic strong campuses. The next step does not involve one campus only, it is not a Bloomington plan, it is not a IUPUI plan, it is an Indiana University plan; IUPUI is gaining the reputation, appropriately so of being a national model for urban universities. It is a university that does not merely sit in the city, as does some private universities of Indianapolis, but is a part of the city and the city's success, depends crucially on the success of IUPUI and conversal. Our smaller, regional campuses, provide community based, learning opportunities, partnerships and from their faculty appropriate scholarship research and creative activity, without those regional campuses, neither of the two large campuses could succeed to the extent that they have. Similarly without the two larger campuses in Bloomington and Indianapolis, the regional campuses would not have the quality recognition, the ability to attract faculty and students, the physical facilities that they do have, each is stronger because of the whole. At Bloomington, we have a traditional residential campus and that too plays a key role in the constellation. We continue to struggle with autonomy versus the unity of our campuses. On the one hand, we see ourselves as a single university, geographically located in several places, but on the other hand, we also see ourselves as individual campuses, each with a separate identifiable mission. The way I think about this is in addition to the synergistic relationships I just mentioned there are two guiding principles and I tried to articulate this at an earlier time. One guiding principle, respect to infrastructure commonality of support purpose for one university and we should act that way. Let me give a few examples. With respect to networking information technology it makes not sense whatever to build eight separate networks we have to have one. With respect to our presentation to the legislature, we would be defeating ourselves if we went with eight separate stories rather than one for Indiana University. With respect to our financial information systems, if we ran eight separate financial information systems, we could never do our business. So with respect to infrastructure, the presumption is that we will act as one university. However, with

respect to academic decisions the presumption is that we will localize those as much as possible. Individual faculty, departments, schools, divisions, campuses are in the best position to understand where their strengths and weaknesses are, to design their curriculum, to begin to build expertise in certain areas. It should be best position to serve the kinds of students that they attract and one must be very careful about looking at university wide approaches where local decision making and academic matters take precedence. Having said that, we have to recognize as well that there needs to be academic articulation between our campuses, even though there is local decision making we need to coordinate so that our students and indeed our faculty are advantaged by it. And wherever possible we should look for joint endeavors. Sometimes you get a critical mass in some particular sub-discipline, we should not restrict our search for colleagues among one campus only, but be prepared to cross boundaries and some of the activities that Rugs has promoted for example, falls into that framework. So I see the next step in our strategic direction development is to continue the reform movement, which we have done as well as anyone, not neglect that, but simultaneously bring back to the forefront the multiple missions of a research intensive university and I include there, research creative activity and scholarship. And given the window of opportunity that we have, it is hard to tell how long it will be open, or indeed how wide it is open now, to try to advance the academic excellence of Indiana University, that is not an easy job to. It involves us being thoughtful, selective, in our approach. I believe it is hard, but not impossible, and I also believe that it is a long-term effort, not a one or two year effort, but a long term effort; five to ten years. But I am also convinced, that if we don't do it now that opportunity may evaporate and we are not the only ones that have the opportunity, we are not unique, there are other states, other major public universities and a few private ones as well which will have that opportunity and we compete with those universities, the very best universities in the country. We compete with them for faculty employment, grants and contracts, students and so we need to take advantage of this opportunity while it is present. That is what led me to talk about the next step. Again, we have moved far enough along in our reform movement, that we are now positioned to take a leadership role and raising again the importance of American higher education in this country. Getting us past the unwarranted criticism and the justified criticism to which we already responded and focusing on academic excellence, which after all is the most important thing for Indiana University. That's the context of the talk and my thinking that lead to the talk or narrative. With that I am happy to open the discussion for questions or statements or whatever else you care to make.

DAVILA: On page ten of the written address you sent us, you very rightfully, inspirationally referred to how important it is to continue to increase our number of (244) and professorships and I very, very much agree with that in terms of nourishing us. I don't know that if in the next paragraph, after that is said, and after you mentioned earlier the importance of balance between the search and how we must consider that for tenure, I presume that is an illusion in part to a subtext of balanced cases and to the ramifications thereof. But what I know and possibly this was inadvertent, that neither in your oral remarks to us as faculty, nor this written statement is there any link of this academic freedom that we so much would like to assure our students and our faculty. If there isn't that link of academic freedom to the concept of tenure. Which in part has been a great sustenance for the evolving of the American university also, in terms of discovery, inventiveness, a certain gutsiness that allows you to work service, teaching and research and I wonder if that might have been an inadvertent, or especially in light of that very

sterling defense made of tenure at the AUP meeting at the Law School here in the Spring. I wonder if this is a question of waiting for the right moment, for the public to properly understand that tenure is not just job security.

BRAND: You are right to point out that it is not in here, I didn't include everything I have ever said in here. I have been on record, quite clearly on a number of occasions, you pointed to one the AUP meeting in the Law School, I think about a year ago, in which I argued forcefully for tenure as an institution within the academy and must continue. I presumed that discussion in this and I did not take this opportunity to discuss the tenure issue. I did allude to it through academic freedom which is I think that justification both historically and substively for the tenure system. So no I did not discuss it, but there are a lot of other things that I did not discuss here in this paper, as well, but I think that I have been quite clear on record a number of times, contrary to a number of my colleagues amongst university presidents on the importance of tenure as an institution and I certainly don't retract any of that. But I did not discuss everything here. I was trying in this narrative to direct us towards the next step in the evolution of our university.

DAVILA: Thank you very much sir, for the affirmative.

BRAND: You're very welcome.

HOYT: You mentioned on page nine about the Strategic Directions Charter and the new methodology about appropriate advisory committees on their campuses and you're not defining those committees, so it is whatever a committee's host campus is set up and this would be an ongoing thing as opposed to the ad hoc. Then there will not be a central committee, I guess as there has been in the past. And I think that ... after that process.

BRAND: Let me clarify, I didn't go into, in this narrative all of the details, because I wanted the readers not to have to but let me answer your question. I think that we have been through two rounds of strategic directions and I believe that we have reached the stage as we can, as it were institutionalized that process, rather than using an ad-hoc process, that is to rely on normal existing procedures as much as possible. And so I will ask each chancellor through whatever is appropriate on his or her campus and it differs from campus to campus, to come forward with a limited number of proposals in consultation with the appropriate faculty advisory committees and then seek advice for the research creative activity proposals from Rugs through their existing mechanism and to seek advise on the teaching proposals, perhaps using some of the faculty members who also serve on the Steering Committee of facid, but maybe in another way and to some extent to use the existing Steering Committee to adjudicate any difference amongst the proposals, but the basic idea is we are institutionalizing it and presuming that when the chancellors come forward with proposals it is something supportable. So it is much more campus based in terms of the normal advisory functions on each campus and rather than having a single group and an ad hoc panel replicating as a model what is done at the federal level for grants and contracts. We are not doing that again, we are using the normal process now. And that will continue year after year as long as we have money.

HOYT: There is still no (315) percentage of money per campus or anything, or is it still (316) together after that point.

BRAND: There will be some proportionality to the size of the budgets. So one can expect the largest campuses, because their budget is much larger and far more faculty, to have several more proposals accepted than the smaller campuses. So there is some proportionality to budget. There will not be an RFP, we will not ask faculty members now to write proposals in the way that we did in the first two rounds, but rather ask the chancellors to design on campus an appropriate mechanism for eliciting the best proposals and how, now an individual chancellor will handle it I am not sure but they will have a chance to talk amongst themselves to decide what may work best.

DAVILA: (329) a question and it is again from page ten of the document. When you refer to the one hundred new positions, is that the (332) from that from the chairs and professorships, or is it just 100 new positions period. Because it seems preceded by that we have been (335) the bottom and funded chairs and professorships.

BRAND: Funded chairs and professorships.

DAVILA: So we have 100 new funded chairs and by professorships, those aren't distinguished professorships.

BRAND: They are named professorships. At one level it is five hundred thousand dollars, that is a professorship right, share is a million dollars or more and it is just the income of course of that. A number of them will be the quest and so they may not come fully to fruition immediately and in fact some cases we hope that they don't come to fruition for a long time, because they are good friends of the university. Nonetheless there are some opportunities for matches to start early. Some of the chairs or professorships may be allocated permanently or for a portion of the time to faculty already on board, some of them will be used to attract new faculty, those will be local decisions. But it will give us the opportunity, I think, to reward our very best faculty here, as well as in areas that we can find this kind of support, attract the very best to campus. I think that is one of the disadvantages we have had in the past and we have not had enough of those and the IU foundation board of directors in particular saw this as an important need of the university and they and a number of others have really risen to the occasion and I think that we should be very pleased with the volunteer support we have received in this regard.

HINDBERG: These 100 new positions in chairs and professorships will be from the Bloomington campus or spread around.

BRAND: It depends where the (363). But they will not all be on the Bloomington campus. Medical School in fact, may at this point, I am not sure about this, may actually have the majority of the new ones, but I am not positive about that. But no, it is intended for the entire university and we are counting, although it is the Bloomington campaign, we are using the Bloomington

campaign to leverage this. It will be university wide.

SCHNEIDER: I am certainly delighted to see you bring the research mission of the university back to the forum of this talk. I'm sure all the rest of the faculty are delighted to see you stressing the importance that faculty compensation be competitive with our peers. The question of peers raises another question, maybe you can talk about this, you allude to some of the rankings of the universities and a lot of those are campus specific, in fact I think that most of them are campus specific and I am not aware anyway of rankings of something comparable to Indiana University as a whole. Could you address something as to how we might measure that, or how we might...

BRAND: Indiana University is unique, in at least this way. We are not like the University of California. We are not like the State University of New York, in which there is just a mere coordinating office of separate campuses. We are not like Michigan in which we give our campuses very little flexibility in autonomy. We are unique. So there really is no ranking in that regard, but when you look at the national rankings they include Arts and Sciences, Professional School of Medicine, and so on. How good is Indiana University in Arts and Sciences? It is as good as all of its Arts and Sciences departments in all its campuses. How do you get that number? Well, I think that you really just have to give it a good guess. There really aren't solid numbers here and a lot of this is looking for a lot of information, trying to compile it and see the direction it points in. We have to be extremely cautious about rankings, particularly if you are looking from like 1 to 100, as US News and World Report does, that makes tiny little statistical differences seem to mean a lot and they don't. You can look at the top ten percent or the top quarter or the top third and that sort of thing makes sense. Professional rankings, again, not number by number, but in general tone, maybe in five categories or eight categories seems to make sense. So we need to be very cautious of that, but I do believe in measuring what we do, this is not the best way and there is no better way, however, but we should be measuring what we do and in certain disciplines departments are ranked for various reasons both informally and formally and people take that very seriously and you know about that and that is information, again you have to be cautious about that. But if you add all of that together from all of the disciplines from all of the professional schools, some professional schools, business and SPEA to name two examples stretch across more than one campus, so you have to build all of that in and get a good guess and that is all that we really have. We know that there is a lot of strength in the big ten public universities, it is really the heart of public higher education in this country and those institutions really are our peers and so we need to look at them, but look at them from our own unique perspective. Not easy to, but I think in part is referring to the synergy between our campuses.

MILLER: Let me ask, page six, in the second paragraph, you talk about the idea of balance within academic units. Balancing teaching and research and the language that you use here is that each academic unit must balance teaching. Perhaps you can talk a bit about your conception of this situation as it currently exists and whether there are mechanisms that you have in mind for leading us in some direction here or...

BRAND: We expect each of our faculty members to be engaged in teaching research and

appropriate professional service, but over the lifetime of a faculty member he or she may be stressing one area more than another, we don't always recognize them. I recall when I finished a book, while I was working on it I needed a lot more research time than I had, when I finished I needed a break from research and I should have been teaching more, but the fact of the matter is I was teaching the same when I was writing as when I was finished and on the one hand it put a strain during the writing, on the other hand the institution was not receiving the full use of my services on teaching which I could have done a little bit more while I recouped my creative energies at the other end. We seem to require of everyone exactly the same, at all times in the career, so my suggestion is that the individual is the wrong unit of analysis. The right unit might be the department, or the school or college or even a campus, particularly for the smaller campuses. Now the campus or the school or the department has a certain set of responsibilities to teach students and that is where the decision should be made, not that everyone does the same thing at every time and we should have reflected administrative flexibility at all levels in order to enable our individual faculty members to best utilize their time, as long as the overall job gets done. I think that there is general recognition of that, perhaps the teaching capacity model in college lends support to that, to some degree, but I don't believe that we have evolved administrative processes yet, that fully respect that concept and it is something that I would like to see us work on.

WAGNER: (476) five other campuses at the last faculty meeting (477), perception, and (479) of lack of diversity among honorary degrees and I notice (482) have been appointed to the committee here. I was really glad to see your remarks that you once again talked about the importance of diversity and I guess if you have not yet appointed your four I guess I would like you to pay attention to (485) appointments.

BRAND: That committee is a filter, not the nominating committee. That is very important because that committee, as do the trustees, reacts to nominations and you are right there was a lack of diversity in the last honorary degrees amongst all campuses. I agree with that, unfortunately the nominations never came forward that would add that diversity. Who can nominate for an honorary degree? Everyone in this room, every member of the Indiana University community. So the fact of the matter is that we need to generate nominations so that committee then has the ability to put forward more diverse slate.

WAGNER: (500-501.) Encourage that. I know we all received memos on this, but apparently some of us are more likely to (503). I would just suggest that (505) particular encouragement for units that have been done in the past.

BRAND: Has not come forward and the fact that it has not come forward is disturbing, but yes there has been encouragement and I hope that enough people notice, as you did, the lack of diversity and so maybe that will encourage additional people to come forward with nominations for honorary degrees. I am positive that there are highly qualified people who we have not yet tapped and we will add that element to our honorary degree group. So, it is not the committee, the committee is important, it's I think all of us.

SENUCK: I applaud your support for the need for diversity on campus, both in faculty and

students alike. Pardon my (521) assault on affirmative action, but I was wondering if you could elaborate a bit on some of the things that might present and encourage diversity among faculty and students. You do mention the need for (528) under certain things. I was wondering if there were any other types of problems which you could see in certain to attract more minority students such as African Americans to Bloomington (532).

BRAND: I think recruiting is important, but I suggest that one of our major problems, speaking about Bloomington in particular right now, is the retention to graduation of minority students, African American students in particular. It's very hard on a campus that has less than 20% of a racial or an ethnic group, for those individuals to feel entirely comfortable. This is a statement that I think you would see confirmed time and time again. And why, for example, the historically black colleges do better than, for example, the Big Ten universities on graduation rates. What that means is we need to go out of our way and be sensitive to the needs of individuals on our campuses who might not otherwise feel comfortable. The campus must be a caring and sensitive place. And we must be well organized in how we do that. In this case, I don't think it's a budgetary issue at all. I think it's more of an issue of how we organize ourselves and how well we do our job. I believe Indiana University as a whole, and you're from Bloomington, and Bloomington campus in particular, has invested over many years in academic programs that are supportive to minorities. But yet, we find that we're not reaching the level of success that we like. That's not a criticism of the people involved in those programs, because I know ...

Tape 1: Side B

BRAND: ... campuses come from Indiana, so we're not going to get that kind of mix that is supportive of minority groups. But again I think that presents us with a challenge, and shouldn't be an excuse. I'm not about to try, off the top of my head, to name which particular programs we should institute. Because it depends a lot on the local situation. And it depends a lot on what will work for the group, the population, that you're trying to recruit and retain. What worked last year may not work next year. So we've got to continually have some of our best people look at the kinds of programs that are essential.

PETERSON: Some of the other issues that relate to the diversity and ethnic groups are related to other issues that I don't totally understand. And maybe they should be studied by the University. As we look at the different people in our society, there may be different propensities for wanting to go to universities or for being released in atmospheres where it would encourage them to go onto higher education. And looking at that, and looking at the number of students that we have at Indiana University, do we have an appropriate proportion for those that want to go on, number one. But obviously we want to look further than that to try to increase that. But in order to increase those numbers, the percent of people, it seems that we have to go down to lower levels and encourage the societies from which those people are coming from, so that we can encourage more incentives for higher education.

BRAND: I think that's right. There are a number of state programs, for example 21st Century Scholars, that are providing financial (017), as well as other kinds of incentives for students to

succeed. And I think people are becoming more aware that it is a societal problem. It takes a whole state, not just a university, to graduate someone. And I agree with that. Incidentally, we are talking about minority students. But I also need to include, for example, women in underrepresented areas. Women in science. Now the biological sciences, as you know, have done better than for example, the physical and computational sciences. We have on our various campuses, Women In Science programs to encourage young women through high school and then on to college to participate. And I think that is important too. Our society is in the need of bright good people, men and women, all races and ethnic groups, and we can't afford to let any of them not have an opportunity. Part of that is what it means to be a public university. I think we have a special responsibility as a public university in that regard.

PETERSON: I guess the question that centers that. How can we as a university be involved in influencing those people at younger ages, when they really have that opportunity to change.

BRAND: I think we are involved in a myriad of programs. The School of Education, for example, is engaged in many such programs. Each of the campuses has programs in the schools to do that. Individuals, through their volunteer work, do that. We promote through state government, and sometimes through local government, the kinds of programs that will be attractive. I think we are engaged. And could we do more? You can always do more. But in fairness we can't carry the full burden. And I think that was part of your point. I think it has to be a general commitment, and here, and I feel quite unhappy about this, here we are in part swimming against the tide. Because in some quarters, for example 209 in California, we see a backing off of some of the earlier commitments. And that makes it difficult. Now you won't see a 209 in Indiana. That can't happen. Because Indiana never took the steps that California did, that California is backing off from.

REMENSCHNEIDER: (043) in addressing the minority issue, one kind of different way, suppose a minority faculty member was very good in working with members of the community of his or her peer group. But yet, in the university system, when it comes to promotion and tenure, what we measure is research and teaching. And yet this is kind of a service component that may take time from their research and teaching in trying to encourage members of their peer group to come into their university. Is there some way we could address this particular issue in giving that person credit without penalizing them in the promotion and tenure process?

BRAND: We expect a certain level of confidence and accomplishment in teaching and research for promotion. What we do permit, under our tenure system, excellence to occur, for example, in professional and public service. That is harder to do. It must be demonstrated excellence. But it is permissible. And there are mechanisms, again, by which that kind of effort can be rewarded in the tenure system. Now I add quickly to that. The primary body that decides upon promotion and tenure is the local academic unit, the department or for some campuses -- the division. And it's those colleagues, not upper level administrators, but those colleagues who make the primary decision. And clearly our procedures and system permit just what you said. But whether the colleagues in the academy will accept that sometimes is controversial.

WAGOR: Returning to some questions about the future of SDC funding, kinds of issues, my

understanding is that for SDC, many of the campuses, like these for example, used to get what was called Quality Improvement moneys, that were allocations spent on our campuses based on campus initiatives and campus needs and similar things. With the SDC funding of the last two years, that money went away. And my understanding, concededly not wrapped up. Either way, that raised a question. And then you can correct me on that. I'd appreciate that, because I'm a bit confused. The real question was that with the SDC funding of the last 2 years, something was on limited terms. And we are now getting to the point 2-3 years down the road, where our campuses are having then to significantly, particularly on campuses like these, significantly alter (075) base budgets in order to pick up the funding which had been allocated under SDC. And I'm wondering, as we look down the road, once we institutionalize, if I may, are there going to be any changes in that? Because this is, in terms of our campus, we're really coming up against a significant barrier in 2 year funding, if we propose projects which are good but they're given to us in a sense limited term money. And then down the road we have to find alternations on our base budget.

BRAND: The source of the funds is absolutely critical here. There's an essential distinction. Quality Improvement money was state money, money we received from the state during our biannual request. And it was based upon particular projects that campuses or the university as a whole put forward. The state has stopped giving us Quality Improvement money in general, although this past year they gave us cash one time money for each of two years, for technology. But the state was the source of Quality Improvement money. The state has not, in my expectation, will not in the future allocate funds to us in that respect. So that source of funds is absent, and will be, my guess, is absent. They may well allocate it in projects specific funds, such as for technology or some other areas we come up with. But they won't give us the same flexibility they have in the past. The Strategic Directions money is one-time-money, cash, that I gathered from various sources within the University that I felt weren't working for the university, were sitting in accounts, that I had access to. And I felt it was best to give that money to the various campuses and faculty members and groups of faculty members to put to good use. It is not base budget money. It is one time cash that has been made available through the president's office. And during the Strategic Directions Charter funding, it was made crystal clear that it was one-time money. And it was to be used for projects the campus thought were extraordinarily important and would be supportive of, in the long run. This was to give the campus a running start. If the campus now begins to back off from its commitments to continue funding a number of these projects, then I question whether, in the original grant proposal, they were being sincere.

WAGOR: What about the future of the SDC funding? We were talking earlier about institutionalizing and the campuses. Where is that money going to be coming from? There is.
..

BRAND: That was Strategic Directions money, and that was, I think, three years ago. I was able to convince the legislature that they should provide specific Strategic Directions money. And that is a continuing base budget item. Now it's not very much actually. But that will continue, and I've tried to institutionalize, under the process of it, so that it will be given out on a normal bases . But at one time funds again. But that was state money. So except for that small

amount of state money, which will allow us to continue this process, we're running out of cash. Anyone else? Okay. Thanks for your comments. With that, we'll move to Executive Session.

AGENDA ITEM #5: EXECUTIVE SESSION

FINEBERG: For those of you that are members of the Faculty Council committees that will be meeting later on, please note the blue signs around the table here. That is where the committees will be meeting, as well as a couple of others that are outside. We should be done before 3:00, I would think.