

**Minutes**  
**Indiana University**  
**UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL**  
**Kelley Center 130**  
**Kokomo Campus**  
**March 27, 2001**  
**1:30 - 4:30 P.M.**

**AGENDA**

1. Welcome to the Kokomo Campus  
(Chancellor Ruth Person)
2. Presiding Officer's Business  
(President Myles Brand)
3. Agenda Committee Business  
(Professors Paul J. Galanti and S. James Sherman)
4. Question / Comment Period\*  
(President Brand and Professors Galanti and Sherman) (10 minutes)
5. Review of Course Descriptions for Inter-Campus Transfer of Credit  
(Professors Robert Eno and Kenneth Rennels, Educational Policies Committee)
6. Report on 18/20 and  
Report on the Review of Non-Academic Administrative Services and the Arthur Andersen Report  
(Vice President Judith Palmer, Chief Financial Officer)  
<http://www.indiana.edu/resources/admreview/>
7. Vote on Academic Classification and Non-Tenure-Track Faculty  
(Professors Karen Gable, Edwin Greenebaum, and Theodore Miller, Faculty Affairs Committee)  
(Circular U6-2001)  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/circulars/00-01/U6-2001.htm>
8. Report on Trustees' Teaching Award  
(Professor Paul Galanti, Agenda Committee)
9. Report on Transfer of Credit and Articulation with Colleges and Universities Outside of IU  
(Professor Rebecca Porter, Educational Policies Committee)  
(Circular U8-2001)  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/circulars/00-01/U8-2001.htm>
10. By 4:15:  
Executive Session:  
Honorary Degrees to Be Awarded  
(Professor Paul Eisenberg, Honorary Degrees Committee)

**ATTENDENCE**

**Members Present:** Simon Atkinson, Jim Baldwin, Henry Besch, Chris Bjornson, Julianne Bobay, Myles Brand, Paul Eisenberg, Robert Eno, Brian Fife, K. Michael Foos, David Frisby, Janice Froehlich, David Fulton, Karen Gable, Paul Galanti, Paul Joray, Juanita Keck, Marilyn

Kintzele, Anna McDaniel, Ted Miller, B. Keith Moore, Judith Palmer, Ruth Person, Mary Pagliero Popp, Rebecca Porter, John Ross, Suzi Shapiro, S. Jim Sherman, P. Sarita Soni, Martin Spechler, Mary Stanley, James Tolhuizen, Kizhanipuram (Vinod) Vinodgopal, David Vollrath, Frank Wadsworth, Richard Ward, Nanci Yokom

**Members Absent with Alternates:** Jeff Wuslich for Michael Scott Witoszynski

**Members Absent without Alternates:** Andrew Abdul, Hasan Akay, Gerald Bepko, Bruce Bergland, Erwin Boschmann, John Brennan, Clifford Brooks, Carolyn Calloway-Thomas, James Capshew, Ulla Connor, Andre DeTienne, Jeremy, Dunning, Dottie Frapwell, Ann Gellis, Kenneth Gros-Louis, Michael Hamburger, Marie Harf, Ngoan Hoang, Charles Horowitz, Kathy Johnson, Rachel Kipp, Julie Knost, Sara McNabb, Nicholis Mutton, Nancy Newton, Jim H. Patterson, Kenneth Perrin, Ken Rennels, F.C. Richardson, Elyce Rotella, Albert Ruesink, Bob Sandy, William Schneider, Catherine Souch, Meredith Suffron, Cheryl Sullivan, George Walker, Michael Wartell, Gail Williamson

**Visitors:** Ed Greenebaum, Steve Kircher, Dan Rives, Karen Whitney

### **AGENDA ITEM#1: WELCOME TO THE KOKOMO CAMPUS** (Chancellor Ruth Person)

**BRAND:** Okay. I have a note here that I'm going to read to you. The microphones are in the middle of the room, please remind everyone to identify themselves and speak up. Ruth would you like to welcome?

**PERSON:** People are so far away, I'm going to have to put my glasses on. Thank you very much. I'm Ruth Person. I'm the Chancellor here at Indiana University Kokomo. I'd like to say welcome to everyone that is here and to all of you that have come here from across the state I know that some of you have visited here on other occasions, some of you may be new to the campus, so I thought I'd just give you a few little tidbits of information about our campus here in Kokomo. We have about three thousand students, most of those are undergraduate students with a few limited master degree programs and we also have Purdue students on this campus, we are the largest contingent of Purdue students in the Purdue School of Technology on any of the regional campuses, about three hundred seventy-five. We have eighty-three full-time faculty members that are organized as a senate of a whole and Marilyn sitting next to me is of course the President and representative of that group. I would like to call your attention to our campus as you look out the back door you will see something that looks like a giant yellow building, it's really not going to be a yellow building. It's really going to be a gray stone building, that is our new seventy-two thousand square-foot science building that is under construction currently. We're expecting that building to be completed before the beginning of the Fall 2001 academic year. That building will be housing our science programs, our math programs, information science, and allied health programs, as well as some physical plant activities. Some of our important issues that we have going on here on campus currently, obviously budget discussions as all of the campuses are undergoing, completion of our science building, which is an integral part of the campus infrastructure, and the development of a plan to reallocate the space that is being vacated by that science building in our main building. We have some important faculty service and administrative service that are continuing to go on or have just been recently concluded. We are in the middle of developing a marketing plan for this campus. We are going to be involved in organizing some of our technology activities and services and of course we are

working on the enhancement of academic programs, our retention efforts, and some of our student life issues that we face, particularly on a regional campus. Next time all of you meet here, I hope to be able to give you a tour of that science building, it's not open for business and it's not even open for tours at this point because they're in there putting up drywall and laying some of the stone in place. Again, welcome to campus and I'm very happy to have you here and I hope you have a productive meeting here this afternoon. Thank you.

**AGENDA ITEM #2: PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS**  
(President Myles Brand)

**BRAND:** Thank you Ruth, we appreciate your helpfulness. Let me begin with the presiding officers business. As you know we're in the midst of a budget cycle with the legislature. Just to remind you, the cycle started last October when the Commission on Higher Education came forward with a set of recommendations for all of the college higher education institutions. We have worked with the Commission for approximately a year before that. It was a good recommendation, very good indeed. Unfortunately the economy took a downturn soon after that recommendation was made and the Governor's budget that has come forward called the State Budget Agency recommendation, SBA, was not kindly towards higher education. The Governor's priorities included things such as all-day Kindergarten and pre-school as well as the community college budget. The operating expenses for higher education were not one of the priorities. From there it went to the House Ways and Means Committee that is chaired by Representative Pat Bower of South Bend. The Governor's Budget was significantly improved upon for higher education in the House. The two priorities in the House's budget were K-12 and higher education. Given the economic situation was a strong recommendation for higher education. From there it goes to the Senate Finance Committee chaired by Senator Larry Borst. The Committee is recommending, and I do not believe it has been voted on by the whole Senate at this time, but my expectation is that it will be accepted at the recommendation. It resembles in many ways the Governor's original budget, it takes out all the capital funding, all the building, zero percent raises for the first year one percent for the second year, no supplies and services. It did reinstate the whole technology fee; it does have repair items in it. In a few places it is better than the House's budget, but overall it much resembles more closely the Governor's original budget. Once it leaves the Senate, because there is a difference between the House and Senate budgets it goes to conference committee. In conference committee we can expect that will lie between the House's budget and the Senate's budget. I really can't predict for you what that will be. Those discussions are clearly very important to us. We follow them carefully and they have not begun yet, they will begin shortly. At what point will we get a budget recommendation? Normally we would get it in April sometime, but the Legislature has several other issues that it must deal with, including reapportionment, namely the changing of boundaries because of the recent census the state will lose one congressman. In addition, the boundaries for legislative districts in the state, both Senate and House, will change. That determines to a large extent who will be elected. You can imagine that the legislators take this very seriously. Will they release the budget before they can deal with that issue? That's not clear, it could go either way. We may know in May and it may not be for several months after May. The economy has gotten tighter, that will definitely affect us. I've told many people that the most important variable in determining support of public institutions of higher education, not only in Indiana but in every

state, is not the President of the University, not the Governor, it is the state of the economy. That is the single most important variable on how well public higher education institutions do. The economy is tight and is particularly tight in this state because we are basically a manufacturing state. We need to diversify the economy more than there is now so we won't feel these ups and downs as much. That is yet to be done even though it's started. In Kokomo in particular is an assembly plant and manufacturing city, Kokomo probably feels it as much if not more than other parts of the state. Any questions on that? It's a very brief summary. Okay. I'll turn to Paul and Jim now for Agenda Committee Business.

### **AGENDA ITEM #3: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

(Professors Paul J. Galanti and S. James Sherman)

**SHERMAN:** I don't have really have much business to report, just to remind you that, I believe that since we last met, there have been two additions to the IU family that I think are significant to all campuses. One is we have a new athletic director, I believe the athletic director does play a role on other campuses other than IU Bloomington, that involved a rather large collection of committee member. You can all be pleased with the choice. Mike McNeely will do a very good job as Athletic Director and represent the University very well. More important from the faculty perspective is we have a new Chancellor on the Bloomington campus and Vice-President for Academic Affairs of all the campuses, that was announced last week. Sharon Brehm, the current Provost at Ohio University, will be Chancellor. Again it was a very large and diverse search committee, thirty-four people representing student, staff, and faculty. There were several different campuses represented and it is a very good choice. She certainly impressed all on the search committee. The community people, students, staff, and faculty are very excited about that. I suggested to members of the Agenda Committee that they get in touch with Sharon, to E-mail her, she's very good at responding, and welcoming her to the University. Those fall under Myles' good news. Maybe we can set it up so that we give the good news and the bad news is given at the Trustee meetings. Paul do you have anything?

**GALANTI:** I'll just say that the Trustees are meeting in Indianapolis next week. I will be there. I am making a report to the Trustees about what is actually going on with the UFC.

**BRAND:** Thank you.

### **AGENDA ITEM #4: QUESTION / COMMENT PERIOD**

(President Brand and Professors Galanti and Sherman)

**EISENBERG:** Somewhat belated actually, but inspired by this reference to the Trustees, it occurred to be to ask Myles, will it be the case that the Trustees says we'll have to wait to make a decision about the tuition increase for next year until all these budget matters have worked themselves through the Legislature?

**BRAND:** Yes.

**EISENBERG:** So the announcement may come indeed for that, too, very late.

**BRAND:** Yes, and that presents some problems to package the financial aid. The budget officer has been working with Don Hossler on the Bloomington campus to package that aid. Frankly,

it's a range, a guess. The Trustees will not take the issue until we know what is available from the state.

**SPECHLER:** Myles, you probably know, although I know you've been terribly busy lately that a letter from a number of University Presidents was recently published in national media calling attention to the fact that more and more of our scholarship aid at America's Universities both public and private is being distributed, not on the basis of need, which was the traditional way, but rather on the basis of so-called merit and that there is a competition, a very expensive competition, among America's Universities for the ablest young people who very naturally come from all ranges of society but often from families who don't qualify for need. I know that we compete for the best students and we do it in a number of ways, one way we do it is through scholarship aid. I wonder if you've reflected on this and whether it would be possible in cooperation with the other Big Ten Universities or public universities to address this issue, which seems to be one of the main avoidable causes for the increase in tuition and university costs throughout America.

**BRAND:** The merit-based aid?

**SPECHLER:** Right.

**BRAND:** That's a difficult set of issues. Arguments can be made on both sides. Some facts help put it in context. The vast majority of financial aid comes from the Federal and State governments, not from public institutions. Indiana has, hard to believe, one of the best financial aid state systems in the country. I think the last I looked it was ranked number seven. The rule of thumb in Indiana is if your family income is under forty thousand dollars all tuition will be paid even if tuition goes up. That is really respecting the needs of low to moderate income families. From forty to sixty I think it is partially paid. There are lots of exceptions and complicated formulae, so there may be someone that is making eighty thousand dollars and gets a little and someone making forty-five thousand dollars and doesn't get that much. Basically the rule of thumb is low and middle income families in the state of Indiana will have their tuition paid. Federal Government's primary aid now is in terms of loans. Three quarters of it comes in terms of loans. Guaranteed loans are given with lower interest rates on the basis of family income and so forth. The allocation of the loans is need based and of course the most important need based federal programs are the Pell Grants. That's entirely need based. In fact, the Federal Government has very few undergraduate merit-based opportunities. The state doesn't have any merit-based opportunities. A university like IU offers merit-based scholarships primarily from donors. Donors will accept scholarship funds and say I want to support the highest ranking students. A lot of merit-aid comes from that. Some universities and our dear friends to the north of us have decided to increase for example the national merit scholars who are coming to the campus by giving them merit based aid. IU has not done that at the advise of Don Hossler feeling that it's not a big draw and would not increased our merit-based scholarships that much and would be very costly to the institution. Most of the campus based non-donor funding is merit-based on the Bloomington campus. Most of our merit-based aid is from donors. We have as a university have been far more attune to the need-based approach, although if it is a Well's Scholarship or a Kelly Scholar we do have special programs for the highest performing students, but we have not given up as a university the need-based aid in favor of the merit based aid. We haven't followed that path. A discussion needs to take place about whether we should continue the approach we have taken, an approach that tends to pay more attention to access and success than one would ordinarily find. I think those are good and difficult questions but as a factual matter, IU and the state still have need based aid. We raise a very difficult set of issues.

**SPECHLER:** I know that in order to preserve our share of the best prepared students we may have to extend more merit based aid in the future and we would be doing that under the whip of competition. It does seem that all over the country that an increasing amount of money from various sources is going to children of families that really don't need it.

**BRAND:** Well, what the reference there mostly is the Hope Scholarships in the state of Georgia. That's entirely merit-based; you have to have a B-average. It does not matter what your income is. The Hope Scholarships really are the merit-based extreme and what's happening in a lot of states, but has not happened in Indiana is that they are following the pattern of the Hope-based Scholarships giving out the money on the basis of grades as opposed to family need. In the state of Indiana it is based entirely on need-based programs. There has not been any serious discussion to my knowledge in the state to move away from a need-based program to one similar to the one in Georgia, which essentially is a middle class and upper class subsidy. We as a state and we as a University, while we certainly have many merit-based scholarships, the Wells Scholars, Kelly Scholars, we keep getting them, a lot of the donors want to provide support for our best performing students and we do provide multi-million dollars along those lines every year. The fact of the matter is the state is oriented towards the need-based programs. Are there any other questions during this question and comment period? Let's go on to item number five. Bob, will you take that for us?

#### **AGENDA ITEM #5: REVIEW OF COURSE DESCRIPTIONS FOR INTER-CAMPUS TRANSFER OF CREDIT**

(Professors Robert Eno and Kenneth Rennels, Educational Policy Committee)

**ENO:** This is basically a report on the status of the inter-campus transfer initiative. The part that the UFC mandated, all faculty on all campuses address this term, is the part that requires us to review courses that are identically numbered across campuses and make sure that they are roughly comparable so that they can be used for comparable degree requirements on all campuses as students transfer from campus to campus. Last time I talked to you about this was in our meeting in February. I think I said on that day was that the materials that would enable us to do that were on their way out on that day as I understood it, of course my understanding is very weak, and the materials did not make it out of the office until a full week later. From what I gathered they arrived at different points in the IU system at wildly diverging points of time. I'm a committee officer in my department, I got mine last Thursday. The deadline was March 15. The deadline was extended to March 30<sup>th</sup>. I haven't been able to track when those messages of the extension actually got there. Basically at one time about a year ago I was hopeful that this process would help us do some very intense cleanup of the way that our courses are arrayed across campuses on our various campuses in the system. My attitude now is looking at any good that we can do as we move on it's probably going to make the situation a little bit neater. I'm hoping that each step that we take produces a little more good than it drains from faculty time. I'm not sure that this step is moving in that direction. All that we're asking people to do at this step is to take a look at all the one-hundred and two-hundred level courses and confirm that our mandate that these courses transfer automatically starting in the fall is not going to create a tremendous problem around any particular course that is uniquely figured and built into a central role in a major program on any one campus. So far we haven't gotten any reports of units that want to explore courses further of these courses comparability because it appears that it might be

the case. The course that I particularly had in mind as a course where this might occur turned out not to be an issue when the materials were circulated. I have heard about a couple of courses that are identically numbered but are on different topics. There are things like that that may crop up in this first round and we should straighten that out. Basically we can continue to straighten this out forever as long as it takes incrementally to make things better. We have a deadline of this which is very short but it's not a real deadline, it's just a deadline for the first hit that we do it this time. It's the only deadline that we have between now and the time courses become automatically transferable. We can continue to work on communicating among campuses. If you have any complaints about the process, if you've heard them from your campus, if there are things that people who are coordinating this process like me, ought to know, please send me an email at eno@indiana.edu and let me know because it's very hard for me to track information about how all this is going. I think one thing that has become clear is that we really don't have very smooth faculty to faculty communication set up among our various campuses. I'm not sure how to get that going and how often we would need it in this sort of form, but it would probably be useful if we could get something a little bit better in place. Let me follow up on the ICT issues by talking about a related issue that is at least as important and perhaps more important, all of these ICT reviews that we are doing right now for identically numbered courses refer only to courses that are listed in bulletins on various campuses and not the courses that may be offered on an ad hoc basis on campuses being borrowed off the master course inventory. We have not way to track those courses that would allow us to do it in a reasonable amount of time and we simply moved them out of this process and we're looking the other way because we can't deal with them. The master course inventory and the way that it currently functions is the largest problem that we have to address in terms of making sure that once we get some reasonable course transfer comparability in place for identically numbered courses that it stays in place. Current regulations permit any of us on any campus to offer a course that is listed on the master course inventory by going through a basically cursory remonstrative procedures on our own home campuses not letting other campuses know what we are planning to do. Right now the master course inventory gives us vital information about the course we are planning to pick off the list and offer pretty much only the title, number of credits hours and information on that level. It's very small. There is no way as an eight campus faculty that we could responsibly keep our courses aligned so that students transferring from one campus to another are equalized by using this master course inventory system. The educational policies committee has had a teleconference to begin addressing how to deal with this problem. One of the obstacles in dealing with it is the fact that there are about thirty-thousand courses on the master course inventory, how that happens I don't know, but there they are. We don't know what many of those courses are, when they were last offered, whether they are still on the books or not. The problem is complex enough that the EPC is creating a subcommittee trying to sort through these issues. We think that in gauging the process of review that we have right now is a starting point. We may be conceptually able to divide the master course inventory in a year and a half after we have completed the full review. We may be able to conceptually able to divide it into course that have been reviewed in this process, we know they are current, we know they are on multiple campuses and we know that we have gone through some process of alignment, courses that have been looked at in this process that are being offered on campuses and then courses that are not being offered right now but are on the master course inventory, we don't know what those are. By sorting this into categories conceptually working through how we can review courses gradually over time through processes like this we're trying to design a procedure that over time

the ultimate result will be that there will be a master course inventory available on the web where you can check what courses are offered in an area that you are interested in that you teach in and you can get basic information about course requirements, the educational outcomes that are aimed at, prerequisites and so forth on the web for any course. There is a disagreement in the subcommittee as to whether that is as far as we want to go or whether we want to have some multi-campus remonstrative procedure where the new course is offered on a campus that hasn't offered it before. We hope to have more information for you at our next meeting when we get our material together in a good enough form we might even try to make a voting matter for you. It is more likely at this point that we will continue this area of the ICT issue into the fall, which unfortunately means we'll have to do a lot of it again to get everyone on the council.

**BRAND:** Thank you Bob. Questions for Bob?

**SHERMAN:** Bob, I know at the end you seemed to be giving a timeline of sorts could you try to do that again for me because I have a feeling that next week someone is going to ask me what the timeline is.

**ENO:** Basically the timeline for the ICT review that we're doing is the timeline that we agreed upon with the Trustees, this process of reviewing one hundred and two hundred level courses for better or worse is going to come to an end so that they automatically transfer at the beginning of the fall term. I hope that there are few enough problems that are cropping up now that we can actually get what we set out to do done for the one hundred and two hundred level courses, which wasn't setting out to do very much. We have a full year after that to review three and four hundred level courses conscientiously and make sure that they line up. That will take us to the fall of 2003 when the automatic transferability for identically numbered courses will kick in. As far as the master course inventory goes, this is a future work in progress that's going to take several years to complete, it's not part of the deal that we discussed with the Trustees right now, it is built into our UFC policy that we should reform the master course inventory and its use so that it doesn't create ICT problems. I expect that we'll have an initial proposal of some format at least to show you a month from now. The plan is to take that proposal before that time to the academic affairs committee on the IUPUI campus and to the educational policies committee on the Bloomington campus and they're going to have some input into that by the time we get here next month the proposal might be in good shape, it might be straight forward enough that people will agree, a consensus movement and we can adopt it. I think its more likely that it will be in a little rougher shape and there may be some disagreements.

**SHERMAN:** You do plan to be here next month in some sort.

**ENO:** Either with some sort of proposal or report about why we haven't quite gotten the proposal completed.

**SHERMAN:** You don't need to appear before the Trustees anytime?

**ENO:** I don't see that being there.

*[Laughter]*

**SHERMAN:** You mentioned that next fall we'll be starting on the three and four hundred level courses.

**ENO:** All of us now have three and four hundred level course review materials in our hands. The deadline for responding to a request for more information about specific syllabi and specific courses is set for October. That process should be completed in the next academic year. At that point courses will become automatically transferable if they have identical numbers.

**SHERMAN:** You mentioned that in Fall of 2003, did you mean 2002 or did I hear incorrectly?

**ENO:** 2002, I'm sorry. Your ears were right and my speech was wrong.

**SHERMAN:** I knew one of us had our year wrong. Thanks Bob.

**PORTER:** Bob mentioned that we would disseminate the information so that the faculty councils on IUPUI and IUB would have the opportunity to respond. We'll disseminate it to all the campuses so all the campuses have the opportunity to look at it.

**BRAND:** Any other questions for Bob? Becky I'm going to ask you to give your report. It's item number nine but its relevant to what Bob said. It's probably best to do it with the other one.

**AGENDA ITEM #9: REPORT ON TRANSFER OF CREDIT AND ARTICULATION  
WITH COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES OUTSIDE OF IU**

(Professor Rebecca Porter, Educational Policies Committee)

(Circular U8-2001)

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/circulars/00-01/U8-2001.htm>

**PORTER:** I'm involved with the Committee from the Commission on Higher Education looking at the transfer and articulation among the state supported institutions. We are in the process of working through determining how the most frequently taken courses in the fall semester, that's the data set that the commission identified, how those courses would transfer among the different state institutions. I think they identified 150 different courses that we're working on, so we're doing these in waves. Eventually the idea is to look through all the courses on all the campuses so that a student who was interested in transferring from one institution to another could go to a website and say these are the courses I've taken at institution X, I'm interested in going to institution Y and it would say here is how that data set would go. The commission is interested in having this website developed, they are at the moment on hold waiting for a determination from the state legislature as to how much money will they get in order to support the development of the website. They're optimistic that this will go forward. The determining how courses transfer among the state institutions while it's time consuming, it's not terribly problematic in that the institutions have been accepting students in transferring. It's simply a process of going through collecting the data and that basically involves the work of the admissions offices. Where faculty are being much more involved is dealing with articulation agreement. Right now the focus is on the eight degrees that are being offered by the Community College of Indiana. The state institutions are being asked to determine how each of those AA and AS degrees would articulate to a four-year degree in the public institution. The commission would like us to be able to say to the student, this is course set that you will take and that we will guarantee that we will complete that degree within four years. Now that would be laid out, that framework. If you followed that framework it is doable within two years. We are in the process then on each of the different campuses in working through that information. If you haven't heard about this on your campus particularly if you are in the area of the liberal arts, you should be hearing about it because it should be the academic departments that are laying out this framework. On the IUPUI campus as our departments were trying to work through this we found that we really need to have a conversation with our Vincennes colleagues in order to really understand the content of some of their courses and make sure that we were making the right decisions in terms of the progression. We've had a preliminary conversation which is followed up with a more detailed exchange with the Vincennes faculty. However, as you can imagine, now we have potentially all the IU campuses as well as the other four year state institutions who are wanting to have the same conversation with the Vincennes colleagues, so they are feeling a

little pushed at this time. We're moving forward and it'll be a process that faculty are being involved in setting up this promise that if a student comes in with a certain set of courses then you will accept them and then they can progress on through the major.

**BRAND:** Questions for Becky?

**MILLER:** Becky, I have seen several documents that suggest that the Kelly School of Business is in some kind of process, an articulation process, with Vincennes. Is that something that is being done under this process that you are talking about or is that a separate deal that they're involved in?

**PORTER:** Setting up articulation agreements is nothing new, we have I know at the IUPUI campus we have a number of articulation agreements set up with both VU and Ivy Tech. This is not a new phenomenon. The new phenomenon that the commission is focusing on is the concept that we are setting up agreements with CCI. Many of the articulation agreements in the past have been site specific so IUPUI would set up an agreement with the Indianapolis Campus of Ivy Tech because we thought we knew what was going on and we could have conversations and we felt comfortable with the content of the courses. That did not carry over to Ivy Tech site at another location. The agreement we're setting up with CCI will not be site specific. They will be in place regardless of the CCI campus where the student completed their degree. It is a broader issue. But my understanding is that the Kelly School of Business has established an articulation agreement with Vincennes University.

**BRAND:** Other questions?

**EISENBERG:** Becky, I understand Roman history is the motivation for the text of the policy, which I think you talked about directly, coming as it does, but I do wonder why apparently the concern is to block the transfer of low level graduate level to a high level at IU for et cetera, et cetera but not for generally do that. Or, is the policy in fact meant to be a very general policy which will also cover in particular issues we were just addressing? In other words, suppose we had a student who has taken under level courses at Harvard and wants now to transfer to IUB. On the face of it, there would be no particular reason that a hundred level course at Harvard could be the most available course at Bloomington.

**PORTER:** The policy would not address that. This policy is coming about because of a particular issue, but once we identify the issue in a particular department...

*[Tape changed, some words may have been lost]*

**PORTER:** ...Our concern is that some of our degrees are configured, some of our departments have configured their curriculum so that there may not be many courses offered for example at the two hundred level. For some reason when they are progressing their majors through their major courses sort of start at the three hundred level. You have students that are taking courses at a two year institution, while they've taken some courses that are at the two hundred level, the question is should those courses taken at an institution that's only formatted for only offering one and two hundred level courses should we bring those in and assign them three hundred level numbers. That just did not seem to be a wise policy.

**EISENBERG:** Right. Has there any thought been given at all? Should any thought be given at all?

**PORTER:** Probably we should think about it, because no I don't think we have thought about it. We had not identified in the past any problems with transferring courses from four year institutions, that had not been identified as an issue. We hadn't explored it because nobody had come up with any problems.

**EISENBERG:** No real squeak then?

**PORTER:** No real squeak. I guess we just looked at the mission of a four year institution versus the mission of a two year institution and our concern was transferring courses from campuses that have very different missions. We can certainly go back and talk with the admissions offices and see if they've received or had any problems.

**BRAND:** Martin.

**SPECHLER:** Becky, I know how important it is to appear cooperative and not snobbish about it, but I haven't heard too much about how we're going to assure the quality of the courses which we are accepting as equivalent to courses offered at IU. I'm from a discipline, economics, which like many other disciplines, foreign language and so on, builds up from level to level. A student who doesn't have adequate preparation in the first level will have great difficulty and frustration in the second level. We are not alone; there are many disciplines like this. I wonder what is the, what measures are you taking to make sure that in terms of substance of preparation these credits that we're going to accept are really equivalent and if we have not prior safeguard are you milling any posterior evaluation to see that we're not getting into trouble and leading these students into a false impression that they're accurately prepared for a four year institution.

**PORTER:** I'm going to answer this kind of on two prongs. One is that we're going to look at the transfer of credits from the two year institutions within Indiana the same way we look at the transfer of credits from two year institutions regardless of where they are located in the United States. We have a review process that has been used through all our institutions for a long time. Different campuses handle it somewhat differently, but they do have a lot of reliance on our admissions officers to go through a review process and if they have questions then they refer it to the academic departments. This will not change that process. On the other avenue, yes I think we are looking at ways of establishing special relationships in part as I suggested at IUPUI what we want to do is have a conversation with our colleagues, we want to find out what's going on, and of course we want to talk about what our expectations are, we want to establish a collegial relationship so that we can build for the success of our students. It's a process that IUPUI and the Indianapolis campus of Ivy Tech use in order to establish an ongoing relationship. I think that there is another thrust within the institutions where we really are going to, where we have been and will continue on the different campuses to track the success of students coming out of Vincennes and Ivy Tech and CCI so that we have an understanding of how well these students are doing so that we can continue to build towards success.

**SPECHLER:** There is nothing in these articulation agreements that would prevent us from having some kind of test to see say in Spanish whether a student is ready for the second year Spanish. Is there?

**PORTER:** The agreements that I've seen I do not believe say if you. The agreements I've seen are saying if you have taken this level course that we will give you credit for having taken that level course and you will go to the next level. It's not if you can go to the next level course if you pass a performance test. I do not believe that is a component. It's not how we. It's like if we had a student transfer to an IU campus from Purdue who had taken a second level language course.

**SPECHLER:** So a department if it feels that it should give some kind of test for the purpose of counseling and tell a student well you're really not ready for our second year, could do that?

**PORTER:** Well, I suspect doing something for counseling versus doing something for credit maybe very different issues and it probably would be important that a unit would do this for all transfer students, not transfer students from a particular institution. That is off the top of my head.

**BRAND:** I think Martin, one of the things that we've been trying to get away from were barriers were set up by some departments, including some language departments, automatic tests which discourage transferability. So I suppose when we look at a text book and say well that unknown text book might offer some test, but not systematically. This is an attempt to ease articulation and transferability. Now, look what is going on here. Let's keep the larger picture in mind, Bob and his colleagues are working on transferability amongst all our campuses, one and two hundred level. Becky, at the state-wide level with all her colleagues, is looking at transferability between institutions at the one and two hundred levels. What is going to happen at the end of the process is that students will be able to move at the one and two hundred level between campuses and institutions of the state very easily without barriers. That is the goal. Three and four hundred level will come, but at least the one and two hundred level is the goal. Bob.

**ENO:** I think this is certainly what we're aiming for. Marty's issue, I think it's an important issue. We discussed this at some length when dealing with the question of transferring within IU, intercampus transfer, because to use your example of language courses, language courses are taught differently on our different campuses and students achieve different levels of proficiency in different types of skills in the same language group and they move around. We've decided essentially in talking about this that there is no real compliment in a department saying we'd like to give incoming transfer students proficiency tests to determine what you can do and best advise you. But, there is no, proficiency tests don't constitute a prerequisite for admission. Students can make their own mistakes if they want to, but we can provide them with the best guidance so they understand whether they'd be likely to be making mistakes and when they're likely to be taking a good shot at a challenging course sequence. It's not a solvable problem. It's appropriate at different campuses for different student bodies to do different things, our mission is actually varied and this is even more true in state-wide configurations of institutions. What we want to do is to allow students with the least possible barriers to appropriately move among institutions, to do so without discouraging them and to get the most out of all of those students. Students that are inappropriately transferring can either look at admissions issues or we can simply more intensively advise them to make the best choices that they have. Ultimately we can't do their choice making for them.

**BRAND:** James

**BALDWIN:** I'd just like to clarify something. None of what this statement is doing will override any of the existing articulation agreements, right? So, if that is true, should various units be seeking to come up with more articulation agreements if they are concerned about the details with that you're doing?

**PORTER:** Well, the articulation agreements that we're talking about establishing will be approved or reviewed by the faculty, they're not going to be at least in the IU system are not going to be established without the faculty of that department being involved. But, remember we're only looking at the eight CCI degrees that are currently being proposed. I think on the whole, looking at articulation agreements is advantageous in that it allows us to set up a framework for the students to understand what they need to do at the two year institution in order to prepare to transfer. What we're finding is the student would have an array of choices and if they make the right choice then it prepares them to enter into the three-hundred level courses, if they don't make the right choice, then they're going to have to pick up some additional coursework.

**BALDWIN:** One of the advantages in working articulation agreements is it give the people involved get to know each other's programs in some detail and I think that's advantageous to the students.

**BRAND:** Other questions and issues? Bob.

**ENO:** I think we need to vote on this proposal.

**BRAND:** Okay. The proposal that you have before you is on a blue piece of paper.

**ENO:** UA2001

**BRAND:** It's UA2001. It doesn't need a second. Are there any questions or comments about this proposal? All in favor please say aye. [*Aye*] Opposed? [*None*] Steve, are you going to report and include Judy?

**KIRCHNER:** She actually hadn't given me the materials she planned to use for the Arthur Anderson Report.

**BRAND:** Okay. How about the 18/20? Who's reporting on 18/20?

**RIVES:** I came to support Judy, but I'd be glad to.

**BRAND:** Do we know if Judy is coming?

**KIRCHNER:** She plans to be here, this fax was for her.

**BRAND:** Let us pass by that and we'll come back to item six. We're going to juggle the agenda a little bit and go to number eight.

#### **AGENDA ITEM #8: REPORT ON TRUSTEE'S TEACHING AWARD**

(Professor Paul Galanti, Agenda Committee)

**GALANTI:** This will be quick. I hope everyone is aware that thanks to... It's not in my documents here that thanks to some very persuasive action by part of the University administration that the Trustees were willing to change the Trustee's Teaching Award to extend the eligibility to lecturers and clinical faculty submitted at the last Trustees Meeting I was not sure that it was going to be changed until the vote was actually passed. The change was basically from the level that would select seven percent of the tenure-track faculty would be eligible for the award. The current policy that was adopted by the Trustees, it's six percent of the tenured tenure-track and six percent of the total full-time lecturers and clinical ranks are eligible for the award. The award is still basically twenty-five hundred dollars, although there might be sometimes where this might not be achievable result. The major change was the change that extended the award eligibility to lecturers and clinical ranks, which was very significant from the vantage point of the regional campuses and from IUPUI. I think this is something where it's a progress occurred and the process should be going on in the schools for determining who is eligible and for making the selection of what faculty members would be receiving the Trustees Teaching Award. The goal is to have the vouchers in Faculty Records Office no later than April 1<sup>st</sup>, but I think that might be a little bit rushing things. There have been changes and I think that it is significantly better now than the approach than the Trustees Teaching Award initially passed by the Trustees.

**BRAND:** Questions?

**BOBAY:** So, when you say lecturers and clinical, is that lecturers in what frameworks, does that include adjuncts and...?

**BRAND:** Any person who does full-time teaching. So, it would be a lecturer devoted to teaching, clinical person who is a teacher, but not for example someone in the medical school

who's clinical activity is solely devoted to working with patients. It's a teaching award and its available to both tenure and non-tenure-track faculty.

**BESCH:** I think the answer is clear, but just for the record I want to remind us, since we are going to be talking about, that this would continue to exclude assistant scientists, associate scientists, as well as scholars, even ones who may happen to be a better teacher.

**BRAND:** That's not their primary assignment. The answer is yes. Any other questions? I take it this is going to be implemented so in the next salary period going up these awards will be there.

**GALANTI:** My understanding and I haven't heard anything to the contrary.

**BRAND:** I believe that is the timeframe.

**SHERMAN:** Is there anyone here who is the department chair? I just wonder about the information that has gotten out. I don't know how you select faculty for this award.

**VINODGOPAL:** We have a process, but you know it's still. It's not going to be in this pay period.

**ANONYMOUS:** That's right, we have a process and it's underway but it's not going to be.

**VINODGOPAL:** It's not going to be in this pay period.

**BRAND:** I'm talking about this academic year, starting July 1. Not April 1.

**SONI:** Is anyone on the Bloomington campus is being a memo from Wimbush to the department chairs.

**SHERMAN:** Okay. I believe

**BRAND:** Right.

**GALANTI:** This semester I think it's the same problem that Bob referred to in the documents that don't get out as rapidly as people think they're getting out.

**BRAND:** Please Paul.

**EISENBERG:** What I understand from what you've been saying Myles is that unlike the earlier awards, these will be added to the base salary?

**BRAND:** No. One time.

**EISENBERG:** I thought we could talk about the July 1<sup>st</sup>.

**BRAND:** They're significantly larger and therefore fewer people can win them. It includes anyone in the University whose full-time duties are directed towards teaching. Let's go back now to item six and pick that up. Judy will you report on the 18/20?

**AGENDA ITEM #6: REPORT ON 18/20 AND REPORT ON THE REVIEW OF NON-ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES AND THE ARTHUR ANDERSEN REPORT**

(Vice President Judith Palmer, Chief Financial Officer)

<http://www.indiana.edu/resources/admreview>

**PALMER:** My apologies, I was actually in the parking lot looking for a parking place. Thank you. I have two reports this afternoon. The first will be an update on 18/20 and Dan Rives, the director of University Benefits is distributing to each of you now a copy of that report. It is presented to you in the same format that was used a year ago when we reported on this. For those who may not be familiar with this, I think most of you are, about two years ago a committee developed a set of recommendations that were ultimately adopted which were designed to help review the funding pressures with the 18/20 retirement plan. There were three

primary elements to that funding plan. The first was a reduction in the overall base retirement for academic and professional staff employees and the discontinuation of the IU supplemental early retirement program which was put into place in the 1980's. The second element was a retention initiative. The third element was a budget reallocation in terms of positions that have actually been vacated by an individual opting for the 18/20 plan. I'm going to review those very briefly and give you a report on the progress to date. I think it's important to continue to keep in mind that this is really the second report in the second year of this process. It is too early at this point to declare any of these initiatives as total success or conversely failures. We will need to monitor this on an annual basis, you'll recall the last eligible recipient would go off the 18/20 in the year 2031. This financing plan was a long term business plan by any standards. I think there is very good news to report. On the ten percent retirement plan, remember that takes us to essentially the middle point of where most institutions are in terms of where that's really where we find most Big Ten institutions, they're at this ten percent level. We were higher than that for a number of years. We expected savings in the first year of this plan to be in the range of nine-hundred thousand dollars. You will see that we came within ninety-eight percent of that figure. Now, that confirms a couple of things for us. This confirms, number one, that our attrition rate is running just about what we expected it to be because that's where the value of this particular initiative arrives from. We're on schedule with that. That was the single largest element in the financing plan for 18/20, so that one is definitely a needing-mark that was established for it. The other two initiatives, the retention incentive and the base reallocation, were not anticipated to have generated any real savings to the 18/20 financing plan in the first year of operations. So it's important to point out here that anything that was generated over the course of the last year is really an advance payment on the plan itself. We can see that a couple of things are happening. In terms of the retention initiative, if we forget that last year was not a year that we expected savings and we apply this retention initiative to the first year of the actual savings we expected, we're running about forty-three percent of the first year's projections. One of the reasons for that may be that people are still getting used to having this option available. Dan Rives has recently in the last couple of months sent out a reminder again to all Deans and academic administrators that this option in fact exists and is at their disposal. This was where the faculty member or the professional staff member works with the dean or the director and agrees on an annual basis to extending their service one more year and there is the ability then to pay a salary supplement for that or in the case of a staff employee there is a professional development fund established. It may be that people are just getting accustomed to using this. It may be that there are not as many people interested in doing this as originally thought, or as many offers being issued by deans and others who are in a position to do so. We will continue to monitor this as the task force that reviewed these recommendations consider this particular initiative they thought it would also largely depend upon an individual's personal circumstances and what they desire to do in their retirement year. All of that needed to be factored in. In terms of the base budget reallocation, if you think of this as just the other side of the retention issue, if a person elects to take 18/20 then at that point twenty percent of the value of that person's position must be paid in as an additional payment by that unit to the 18/20 fund. Why was that established you may recall we talked about that at some length with this body when the recommendations were brought forward. The primary reason for that really was to recognize in some cases that this burden was being spread across units that had very few people who were actually opting for the 18/20 plan or were even eligible for it. It was a really a bit of a fairness or an equity issue. It also recognized something that in many institutions is more commonplace than it's been at

Indiana University and that is a vacant position caused by a retirement is often sometimes frozen for a period of time or the value of that position has been reduced, we have not done that generally at Indiana University. As you can see we're on target again, this was not one that we expected to generate anything from in the first year, but because people began to take advantage of it, we're looking right now at about seventy-six percent of that having materialized in the first year. In summation I would just point out that not only do we review this with you once a year, we review this with the Trustees on an annual basis, but Dan Rives and Steve Pucher, University Budget Director, is also here to answer any questions before you this afternoon. Monitor this on a regular basis. We have made this a very high priority in the finance area to make sure that this financing plan is working because obviously the burden of funding the 18/20 program and maintaining the integrity of that program is a very expensive proposition for all units of the University. It is hoped that this will enable this particular plan as it works will enable more resources to be made available over the next thirty years to academic units for primary mission as opposed to having to use it to fund the increase in the cost of 18/20. We're going to see these costs grow significantly in the next ten year period.

**BRAND:** Okay, why don't we stop there. Questions? Yes.

**SPECHLER:** If I understand the figures correctly, roughly a hundred ten individuals have either initiated 18/20 benefits or taken the retention incentive plan. Of this hundred ten, ten percent are receiving the retention incentive plan rather than roughly a third, which was the original projection. Can you tell us how many of these hundred ten were offered the retention incentive plan by their supervisors and of those, how many took it?

**PALMER:** We do not have records that show how many offered it. We have left that in the hands of the recommendation of the committee that worked on this that would be a department or a school by school judgment. The only way Dan Rives knows if an offer has been made is if a department or the school takes the step to either finalize it or lets us know they're making an offer. Dan do you care to add to that, is that correct?

**RIVES:** That's correct. I get the request to process the transactions, but I'm not really knowledgeable of those that are offered. These are communications that take place within the departments as opposed to maybe some kind of formal sit-down offer being made to individuals thinking about their 18/20. It appears to be more of a mutual interest has derived or a conversation has taken place. I don't believe they are offers per se.

**SPECHLER:** As you know I have always been very skeptical that significant number of faculty would be offered this or would accept it if offered based on soundings that I've made before. Let me ask you this, suppose an eligible faculty member decides to take 18/20 and therefore there is a budget base allocation. How much more expensive is that to IU than if the same faculty member were offered and took a retention incentive plan. In other words, how much is riding on this decision to stay on teaching past 65?

**PALMER:** Well the missing variable in that is if they fill that faculty line, what is the salary of the person filling the faculty line? That will have some implication in all of that. I don't know. Steve or Dan, have we done any analysis of that?

**SPECHLER:** Is my question clear to you?

**PALMER:** Yes.

**SPECHLER:** So, in other words if the faculty member takes the 18/20 and you replace the faculty member with a fairly expensive person then it's going to cost IU quite a bit, but if they replace the retiring faculty member with a very junior person, then it might be rather inexpensive?

**PALMER:** There could be a difference there. There would be a number of factors to consider. The other thing that isn't stated here, but the campuses and departments are going to see this showing up in some of the new fringe benefit information has to do with the number of people, who for whatever reason may not be opting to exercise the 18/20 benefit notwithstanding whether or not there's a retention payment made.

**RIVES:** That's a good point Judy. There are around three, approximately three to four percent of our faculty do not exercise the 18/20, they continue to work for other reasons, maybe to collect health care, benefits for health care.

**SPECHLER:** These are people that would have been eligible for 18/20, they just continue to teach? It's going to happen.

**RIVES:** Yes.

**BRAND:** Please.

**KECK:** I wonder if the incentives are changeable if we find that they don't turn out to be an incentive, the colleagues that I'm familiar with who retired last year found that I think one person was offered approximately three thousand dollars for faculty development but when you're five years from retirement, if you're five years from being 70, three thousand dollars for faculty development at that part of your career life is not much of an incentive. You're not going to be developing much more than that. Our colleagues who didn't take the incentive found it to be absolutely no incentive whatsoever. It was almost an insult that this is what you're going to give me to stay; there was really nothing that they could see to do with this extra money. They decided that they would benefit far more greatly from the early retirement rather than the incentive. I was curious why the incentive is so strange for at age 64 then it goes to 20 percent of base salary the year after that? You're not going to get anybody after that first year.

**RIVES:** 18/20 runs for sixty months or age seventy, whichever comes first, so you could actually start at age 65 and still get the full value of 18/20. In essence deferring entering retirement from 64 to 65 would not save the University anything, in fact it might actually increase your salary a bit. You don't get the savings if you will until you start at age 65.

**KECK:** So you'll just let the faculty go at 64?

**RIVES:** Not necessarily.

**KECK:** We come from a discipline where junior faculty are often, it's not unusual for a junior faculty to make more than our senior faculty because nursing depends on the job market so sometimes they can make more in practice than they can in education, so it doesn't always save anything to lose senior faculty. It is often more expensive.

**RIVES:** Judy, I believe it is our intent to come back and evaluate this program. To answer your first question, it may be possible...

**PALMER:** One of the suggestions I know was made by someone around the table last year. It was to try to allow people to do better retirement planning, earlier retirement plans. I know that information was provided to begin to think about using this retention plan initiative at age 64 or 63 so people begin to think about as opposed to getting right up to the final few months and then trying to decide whether or not this was appropriate.

**BRAND:** Other questions? Please.

**JORAY:** Is anyone in this retention plan from any of the small or regional campuses? The reason why I ask is I have not heard anything on our campus. I would be very surprised if a single offer has been made to anybody on our campus. We don't have a lot of faculty, but if you add up all of the smaller campuses it might make a difference. Is there anyone from a regional campus that has in fact taken the incentive?

**PALMER:** I believe the answer is yes, but Dan is looking right now to confirm that.

**RIVES:** My instinct was affirmative, but as I look at the list it appear that right now they are all from Bloomington or IUPUI. Maybe this is the curve setting, maybe I was thinking of last year.

**JORAY:** I just haven't heard anything about it on our campus except when people came to make a presentation. That's why I was wondering if the administration had even thought about making the offer to some people. I don't know.

**RIVES:** As Vice-President Palmer indicated we communicate with Chancellors and especially the Vice-Chancellors of Administrative Affairs. We could probably do more as well.

**BRAND:** Good point. Please.

**BESCH:** I recently had a discussion with [*inaudible*] regarding how part three is actually assembled. I think the question can be probably crystallized best by looking at page three where it says, "Actual IU savings through September 30, 2000, a 15-month period, equaled \$796,486." The question that comes there is did all of this eight hundred thousand reallocated from departments to the central fund, or is some of it from some other place? In other words, the phrase IU savings suggests that someplace not quite identifiable. I assume it's identified very clearly coming from the departments.

**PALMER:** Those dollars are traceable back to the campus and to the department. I think the use of the word savings here is a mute point. We probably need to rethink that but we were looking at it from a stand point of a savings of the additional cost that departments would bear to support the plan.

**BRAND:** Any other questions? Paul.

**EISENBERG:** Judy do you think that at least in the near future it will become important to have bookkeeping with regard to point two. That is, to actually have a record of offers extended to people, people in program and the number of persons who accept. You reported it right now that you yourselves don't know until there's been acceptance. It seems to me that if you monitor this carefully you need to have some idea of the number of offers extended versus the number of offers accepted.

**PALMER:** I suppose arguments could be made on both sides of that. I think the committee felt that at that point really this was more of an academic issue than a staff issue. There are discussions that go on like this all the time in academic departments, not a retention incentive necessarily but other decisions impacting compensation, offers to faculty to join the department. Nobody really keeps a record of all those, so that is why there was no plan to do that. One could make an argument as you have that in order to monitor this. But actually it's immaterial as to how many are made, the savings of the resultant plan is how many are accepted. Now if a sufficient number aren't being made, that's an issue I would suggest would probably need to be a discussion within the department or the unit or with the campus. I know that in the case of Bloomington, because I spoke to the Bloomington Faculty Council recently about this, I believe Ken Gros-Louis indicated at that time that he had had some discussion with the deans about this particular issue.

**BRAND:** Some of these discussions, Paul, I'm sure you realize are quite informal and so what do you really count as an offer and what you don't, people are exploring with their chair and others what the retirement plans are.

**EISENBERG:** I realize that it might be very difficult to get data. You would love to have hard data.

**BRAND:** I think Judy's point is that let's look at the results and base the success of this part of the program on the results.

**MILLER:** Well Myles, as was suggested earlier, if there are campuses where this is not being pursued then it is something that should be known. At least, that kind of information should be known.

**BRAND:** I agree. Or there should be further education to the Chancellors and department heads about the program and what opportunities there are. I agree.

**PALMER:** We can do that.

**FULTON:** If I might say, we are very much aware of it I believe and we have discussed it very thoroughly on our campus. It's an individualized situation. We are aware of the possibilities and I think the faculty are as well.

**BRAND:** So you think that faculty on campus are aware of it.

**FULTON:** Yes.

**BRAND:** Would you say the same?

**PALMER:** I think something to keep in mind on the regional campuses too is the number of people who are eligible in a timeframe.

**BRAND:** Clearly that is the area of the program that needs to be monitored. Please.

**GALANTI:** I was going to say that if we don't really get savings until we get into people getting beyond 65, I think that the offers at 64 are important because if they're not being made people are going to say well I might as well retire at 64, I might be willing to extend it to 65, but without an offer maybe I'm getting a signal from the administration. It might be the administration is not aware of it or it might actually be a signal.

*[Tape Changed, some words may have been lost]*

**BRAND:** This is the hardest part. Anyone else? Please

**ATKINSON:** Is there any data or anecdote about the effect of the switch to the ten percent place retirement fund improvement?

**PALMER:** I haven't heard of any. Dan, have you picked up anything?

**RIVES:** Interesting enough more on the professional side than the academic component, but I have nothing quantitative.

**BRAND:** Judy, would you mind turning then to the second part, report then on non-academic administrative services.

**PALMER:** I hope most of you have had an opportunity to take a look at the website related to this issue that you'll recall that approximately a year ago President Brand established a task force to review the non-academic administrative services. The first charge to that group was to identify if you will the components of administrative services that might be reviewed and then to recommend the selection of an outside consultant who will do a review of those administrative services. Maybe just to give a bit of background, the goal here was to look at the administrative services for the purposes of identifying additional cost efficiencies and productivity that might be generated from such a review, looking at the possibility of a more collaborative working relationships. I hasten to point out the supply to the Bloomington campus, the Indianapolis campus and University Administration. Those were the three areas, if you will, or entities of the University that would be covered by this review. Indiana University as you all require here has done a lot in recent years for reallocating funds and avoiding the costs in the administrative area. Some might even point out that in some units it has gotten down to the point that they are concerned about some of the services that they're able to deliver. That notwithstanding, one of the things that has changed our lives significantly in the last two to three years frankly is the availability of technology. About two and a half years ago when the technology plan, the IT plan, Vice-President McRobbie proposed was adopted, it included two major system

development projects, they're called enterprise wide projects, one in student services and one in human resources. Those were also considerations in this review because we learned even more than what we knew initially going into this, that if one doesn't change the way one does work and look at your structure for processing work and you put in a new technology system you're going to come to the end of that implementation and look back and look at those budgets and in all probability you're going to see it was more expensive than where you were before. Now, that is not a reason not to do it because our students first of all are going to expect us, they're going to be making decisions about where they go to school in part based upon how efficient we are in moving them through those administrative processes. The same thing with employees and the amount of time that is involved in just making some fairly minor adjustments to employee records and information, that now has to require a lot of processing time on the part of people in HR that could be handled more in a self-service environment. There are all sorts of reasons to do these technology projects, but many institutions don't recognize what has to accompany those and that is a real step back and look at how you are organized and how you're functioning. That was a major part of the task forces review in the first few months, where do we want to make the investment of consultant's time to look at those issues. We advised that the student areas and the HR areas would be two key components. We didn't omit a number of other areas in the business and finance and auxiliary areas because all those have an impact on the cost of administrative services. We recommended to President Brand that Arthur Anderson's Higher Education Consulting practice be engaged in this project. He accepted that recommendation and they were engaged for a rather short term review. Some institutions get into very lengthy, twelve, eighteen months and twenty-four month reviews. It was felt that we already had a great deal of this effort done, but it would be more beneficial to get an initial review by the consultants and then let the University look at those recommendations and make some judgments about the way it should implement those suggestions. That's where we are today. The recommendations have been submitted to the University, they're available on the website. We have been meeting with faculty and staff groups, have met with all of them on the two campuses that are involved in this initial review. There are sixteen recommendations, some of those contain alternatives or options within a given recommendation. For instance in the student area, the consultants focused a lot of time on what we call back-house functions, it's not the student contact part, that will have to be done on every campus, it'll have to be done with Bloomington and in Indianapolis. But, the back of the house, the transaction processing, the compliance reporting, that is the same from one campus to the other. Frankly, right now we're doing that at seven different places. Every time the federal government, which it wants to do almost every year, changes something in the federal financial aid arena seven different offices have to understand what that change is as they're filling out report forms. Obviously they need to know it on the packaging side for students, that's not the issue here. The question is couldn't we improve the efficiency and actually save future costs if we were to have all of that back of house processing thought up collectively. Three years ago, that discussion would have been very difficult because the technology didn't enable us to do it. Now technology enables us to do some of those things. That is a very strong focus in this set of recommendations. There are other things in here, for example, preferred vendor purchasing, we do that both in Bloomington and in Indianapolis, but we have separate purchasing departments between those two campuses. The consultants recommendation speaks not to an organizational structure per se but it speaks to the point of doing more preferred vendor contracting and to recognize that the priorities of Indiana University and some of our contracting needs certainly will look at the value of the goods and services and

how that would be done. They demonstrate by their financial analysis that significant savings could result and the President's goal in this is to reallocate either current resources as the case in perhaps purchasing or to avoid future administrative costs so those dollars can be invested in the academic units on those campuses. How will this affect speaking to the University Faculty Council, how's that likely to affect the regional campuses? Right now those campuses are not directly involved in this review process but as the systems development projects develop continue, these initiative in the HR and student area will be incorporated into the steering committees that are working on those systems. It's likely that some of the opportunities that have been identified for Indianapolis and Bloomington maybe just as appropriate for the regional campuses in those systems development projects. Right now in phase two of this, the second phase will be to have these recommendations reviewed by some small work teams that will involve individuals who are actually operating many of these functions and we will begin to move forward with some implementation strategy designs. We'll be assisted by a consultant who will not be an Arthur Anderson type consultant as really looking so much at substance but really helping us facilitate this review process. It's likely some of these recommendations can be incorporated into our business practices rather quickly. Others will take much longer. Obviously the systems development projects will take the longest in all probability because they will have to go in parallel with the implementation of the new technologies. Overall the consultants found that Indiana University had done an effective job in controlling administrative costs. They gave the University very high marks for undertaking the project at this time rather than waiting until we've done an implementation of these enterprise wide systems and then going back and repeat the process and making the changes as many institutions have and some of you can probably name some of them that are going through that right now. There is about twenty-eight million dollars in this overall savings that was identified as future cost avoidance just involving those two systems development projects. That's a large number so I think that is an area that the task force is going to be focusing a significant amount of attention in the next few months. The process will be as public as we can possibly make it. Every thing is going to be available on the website, all of the materials as well as the appendices, I will warn to not hit the print button, we try to put a big cabby out because the appendices are about this thick so be selective as you open that and print section. We welcome your input on this; we need your input on this. The period for comment will be through the end of this academic semester, but on the other hand, some of these work teams will be working much longer than that. We expect there will be a lot of opportunity for input throughout the course of the summer and probably into the fall. That's basically a very quick summary of it.

**BRAND:** I'd like to invite you read the executive summary on the web, it will elaborate somewhat more on what Judy said. Read the appendices at your own risk. Questions? Issues? Yes, Bob.

**ENO:** I think the report, which I've read through but haven't absorbed. I certainly haven't read the appendices. I think the report is very informative and reflects a lot of good work. I think this is going to have an excellent outcome in the long run as compared to what would have happened had we not done it. I know a number of faculty members down in Bloomington have been concerned about particular some aspects of the projected plans. I think probably activity on all campuses once they alert to certain features of this. When you talk about student services as one of the major units under review and were central to the SIS project, some of the features of student services that are involved are features that are associated with for example the registrars offices. Registrars offices are while they serve students they are also faculty services. They are

faculty service units that are very central to what we do, they do classroom allocation; they do registration, prerequisite enforcements; they implement academic policies; they help us configure our degree requirements in complex ways that sometimes require them to deal with programming time and so forth. These are all features that are really basic to our ability to implement the academic mission and to the degree that these are potentially overlooked or potentially put into a second priority in the way that the implementation that SIS goes for and the way that these work teams review the locations of the Anderson Report. I think we would probably be losing our efficiency and we would probably be saving money that would probably be better spent. These are difficult issues to discern and few faculty, and certainly not me, are capable of understanding the ways in which decisions will leave an impact on future functioning or academic mission if we make those decisions incorrectly. I really hope that the work teams take this very seriously. All of these other services that are nonacademic are to support the academic mission and one thing that we don't want to do is try to make those more centralized or streamlined or effective in some way that in fact has a negative impact on our ability to fulfill the academic missions.

**PALMER:** I appreciate that and I think that one of the guidelines that President Brand gave to the task force, there were two in terms of how this report was constructed and presented. One was that there will be no diminishment of services. The outcome is to at minimum maintain, but hopefully improve, the quality of services. That is the issue you're addressing. The other one that I think does not apply as much to faculty but you will certainly hear about it, that is a concern about possible risk to the University as a result of this. That is very important because one of the messages in this report is future cost avoidance. One could suggest that those are positions that had not been created so those are not subject. One of the advantages that we have by doing it in this timeframe is that normal attrition and the ability to upgrade the skills and expertise of staff so that they are able to fill positions of additional responsibility or reassignments are all much more easily to accomplish at this stage in the process than they would have been had we waited until the end of the implementation and said, "Oh my, this is costing us twenty million dollars more than we thought it would." We'd have to go back and make a lot of adjustments. Your point about service is very key. I know that Don Hossler and Bill Plater who are leading that student information system development are very much aware of those issues and very concerned about them. They've been working very closely with the consultants on these recommendations.

**BRAND:** We're not the first University to do this even in the Big Ten, which I think is the right thing to do if we want to learn from what others did right or did wrong. We purposefully waited a while. Some of our sister institutions, Ohio State, Minnesota, Illinois, to take the three examples, that are either in the middle or have completed this project, have found that the sequence that we did that we expect that we should be able to do this a quarter to a third the total cost that they had. That is a major cost avoidance issue for us. I think it was wise to wait and learn. Please.

**BALDWIN:** One concern that people have expressed in conversations I've had is that, and I think it's being covered by this, is that there always be a human face on your campus who can solve your problem. I don't think that idea is out there as much as it should be. I can understand making the administrative cogs move, and it doesn't really matter where those cogs are moving as long as you've got that link to it, but the person that makes the decision has to always remain local because that is the person that knows the situation and that's the person who the students or employees are interacting with. I think we have to make that clear.

**PALMER:** Yes.

**BRAND:** That's a good point because as Judy described it before the interface between students, those folks are on each campus.

**BALDWIN:** And have the ability to make decisions.

**BRAND:** That's going to remain intact, but you're right it needs to be reinforced because people may think that. Other questions? Comments? Please.

**BOBAY:** I was a little involved in this report as a member of the advisory committee which was another group that provided input into this process. I think I understand about cost avoidance and that it's really good that we started this early on but I have to say that in the end I was disappointed that what I had hoped would come from this study, which was cost, money, dollars to reallocate to the academic units that did not come through in this report. What we saw instead were the promise of future cost avoidance that we would have spent if we hadn't done this, but I didn't see what I had hoped for from this process.

**PALMER:** I think that is kind of a good news and a bad news. The bad news is you didn't see it. You see some in their recommendation, there's a few in there, but nothing like we have showing up in cost avoidance. I think the good news is that we've done a lot of things right, not everything, but a lot of things. That is the good news story. What may happen for us is this may jumpstart some other thinking. We didn't have time, nor did we want to invest enough to have Arthur Anderson with us for a year or a year and a half, but hopefully as these work teams begin to work they may identify some other areas. Maybe this will be a beginning rather than just a one step process in terms of these recommendations.

**BRAND:** What is the total amount of savings?

**PALMER:** Just savings? The range is from 4.3 million to 17.5 million.

**BRAND:** It's not tiny. And that's annual?

**PALMER:** Yes.

**BRAND:** That's annual base budget. That's not small. It's not hundreds of millions, but it's still major money.

**PALMER:** The other problem as the consultant said, "The higher that number gets, the harder it is to make the changes that will produce that number." These things move in direct opposite. It doesn't cost too much in terms of emotional expense and organizational expense to do the lower number, it'll cost more to the department.

**BRAND:** Please.

**SPECHLER:** Did we ask the consultants to consider the very expensive area of book purchasing, serials purchasing, and catalog purchasing? No?

**BRAND:** No, that actually is being taken up on a more national basis. A number of efforts are under way, of which we are major players in through our own libraries and through other things as well. In fact, I chair a national task force on it. That is to deal with book publishers, serials in particular. No one University can do that alone.

**SPECHLER:** Because I felt for a long time that there is too much duplication in our IU library system and too little complementarity and movement of books, which have become much more expensive. In recent years, serials and books have become very expensive. The only alternative is to share the resources more easily.

**BRAND:** The big expense is in serials, journals. Another way to deal with it is through electronic means. That turns out to be not as technologically difficult, but in terms of copyright laws and approach it is very difficult. Some progress is being made, but no one University could tackle that by itself. Really it is a national issue.

**BALDWIN:** We are not ignoring this Martin. There are a number of initiatives in the IU system where we share expenses for complicated, expensive electronic books throughout the system. We get a better price. We are doing things, it just was not part of this project.

**BRAND:** We need to move on to other critical issues. If there's a last question here? Good. Judy, would you come back again in maybe the beginning of the fall?

**BALDWIN:** Let me know. Thank you.

**BRAND:** Thank you. Let me now turn to item number seven. That is the Academic Classification and Non-Tenure-Track Faculty.

### **AGENDA ITEM #7: VOTE ON ACADEMIC CLASSIFICATION AND NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY**

(Professors Karen Gable, Edwin Greenebaum, and Theodore Miller, Faculty Affairs Committee)  
(Circular U6-2001)

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/circulars/00-01/U6-2001.htm>

**BRAND:** Who will take the lead on this?

**MILLER:** Let me start. Karen Gable is here today, who is the co-chair of the UFC faculty affairs committee. Ed Greenebaum is here, a member of the committee. Jack Brennen is here, a member of committee. Rick Ward is here, a member of the committee. Ed has done a great deal of work on this. I think far and away most of the work has been done by him. We owe him a great debt of gratitude I think. We had this on our agenda last month and we had an introduction to it. I don't particularly want to say what I said then over again. The idea in terms of our process was that we were going to take these documents to the campuses for discussions. That happened. We had certain things come back to us from some of the campuses. There were some items from IUPUI that came back. There was an item or two from Bloomington that came back. The committee had a final meeting last week Friday where we talked about whether we should incorporate some of these ideas that came back from the campuses and decided basically to hold off on a number of them feeling that they were just going to be distractions in our discussion. There were things that we could pick up and work on subsequently rather than risk getting bogged down on a few controversial things.

**EISENBERG:** One bomb is big enough.

**MILLER:** The document that you're looking at here is really very similar to the one that you had a month ago. There have been a few changes and I will point those out to you. Most of them I think are fairly minor and really editorial type of thing. On line 23, there is a sentence beginning there that says, "the faculty of each school shall specify the minimum proportion of tenured and tenure-probationary FTE faculty for that unit, with the base of the proportion derived from the total FTE tenured and tenure-probationary, clinical and lecturer appointees, and the dean of the school shall file this specification with the campus academic officer." The idea that has changed there, really it's a word, is the word "school" in the previous version of this document we used the phrase "academic unit." That turned out to be the single thing that Trustee Richardson, who as many of you know was the driving force behind this particular effort that we're following. That was the phrase that concerned him. The committee has adopted the word "school" to be used in this context, trying to make it clear that this decision and specification should not be done at the departmental level rather it should be done at some higher level of faculty.

**BRAND:** It is lowercase so it includes the colleges.

**MILLER:** It includes colleges; it includes divisions; it includes various things that are school-like. *[Laughter]* In other words it includes the things we call academic units. *[Laughter]* Okay. Line 35, in that section there is a consolidation of some language regarding reporting. In the previous version there were some reports specified in a couple of different paragraphs, we tried to bring these together and state them one place. We're still asking for the same kind of report that we were asking for previously. Line 237, this is one of the places where the committee, you'll recall the previous document there was in this place a version one of the policy and a version two of the policy, the committee decided to put forward version two of the policy. We have kind of stacked our membership here to the person who was going to propose to amend to substitute version one for version two we can have a debate. Last time if you recall, it was the item in this policy that we had the most discussion over. This is something that I think we are simply going to resolve by a showing of hands or a counting of votes at this particular point. We'll just see what happens. The idea is that we are going to have a vote on whether to adopt version one or version two of these types. Line 696, this is basically the other place where what you see here is language for version two, there is a substitute version one that will be substituted here if you wish to adopt version one. One point I did want to make about this particular paragraph because this came up in our discussion on Friday, there seemed to be some potential misunderstanding in various places about the intention of this particular version two language. I call your attention to line 705. This is talking about the promotion process, if a campus adopts a scheme where there are lecturer, senior lecturer 1, senior lecturer 2, with the idea that there would be some promotion process that would take people from one to the other. On line 705, we made clear that our proposal here is that this promotion scheme would be done like our other promotion schemes have done and that there would be campus level review on these promotions. This would not be something that would be done internally to a school that there would be a promotion process like that for the clinical appointees, like that for tenure track appointees, et cetera. That is the intent of this version two. Line 731 and 735, this is a change that we made because Julie Knost, I ran into her several days ago and she indicated that she felt that there was some confusion about the terms dismissal and non-reappointment and people didn't seem to understand the difference between dismissal and non-reappointment. So on line 731, we've added this phrase "which has not expired" so we're talking about a dismissal. What is a dismissal? It's "dismissal of a lecturer holding a longer term contract which has not expired." There are certain conditions and certain criteria that govern such action. Non-reappointment, we added the phrase "to a new contract term" just to try to clarify the difference between these two terms. Those I think are the places that we kind of made some changes.

**BRAND:** This is now on the table.

**MILLER:** Let me say one other thing. Ed Greenebaum is going to have to leave us in about ten minutes because he has vehicular difficulties.

**GREENEBAUM:** Vehicular difficulties.

**MILLER:** Do you want to add? Say what you want to say.

**GREENBAUM:** Ted said some nice things about me with regard to the project. There have been quite a lot of people involved for quite a long time. We adopted the clinical regulations in my first year as co-secretary. That seems like a long time ago. I'm grateful to a lot of people that made contributions to this.

**BRAND:** Karen, would you like to add?

**GABLE:** From my perspective as a chair of the IUPUI faculty affairs committee, I've been involved with this for four years. I would be absolutely delighted to have resolution to this situation and really to provide our lecturers with a structure and some protections that I feel are in this document.

**BRAND:** This is on the table now, it doesn't need a second. Discussion is open including amendments. Please, Bob.

**ENO:** I'm the guy who has often stacked up amendments. What I'd like to do is suggest that we return to version one rather than version two. I don't know how many people have copies of version one with them. I didn't bring mine but fortunately Paul Eisenberg did. Version one the section that goes in the place where currently are lines 698-711 sit is what I'd like to propose as an amendment fortunately it's much shorter than version two. Perhaps it would be a good idea if I read it out loud. It is instead of suggesting that campuses have the option for selecting one or two systems of appointment and advancement, it prescribes a single system for the entire IU system. It reads like this, "Initial lecture appointments should be at the level appropriate to the experience and accomplishments of the individual, the process for appointment with probationary status or appointment with a long-term contract shall go through the ordinary procedures for faculty appointments. Lecturers shall be promoted to senior lecturers upon their being appointed to long-term contracts following a probationary period. And, along with moving to amend the current section of appointment and advancement in this way. I will simultaneously move to amend the earlier brief notice on lines 237-8 specifying the nature of titles with the phrase "Titles: senior lecturer and lecturer."

**BRAND:** Did you all hear that? Do you need me to repeat it? Did you get the sense of it? Second?

**SPECHLER:** Second.

**BRAND:** Thank you. The amendment is open for discussion.

**SPECHLER:** I'd like to speak in favor of my friend Bob's amendment. I was the IUPUI faculty affairs chair before Karen. This is exactly the proposal that we brought at that time though some people have suggested this three tier system. I'd like to suggest five reasons why the amendment is superior to the version that you see before you. The first is, before Ed Greenebaum leaves, his great contribution was to clean up the ranks and titles of Indiana University and give us a kind of uniformity around the system. This proposal as written would take a step backwards and allow local preferences, local options, which is what got us into this trouble a long time ago. Of course, local option is common practice around Indiana University when there are special circumstances. I hear no special circumstances in this case. There is an advantage to uniformity in understandability around the state. The reason I've corresponded with many of the people who feel otherwise, the reason for the three tier proposal, local option proposal, is to recognize better teaching and longevity. That's reasonable but it's not special to IUPUI or IU Northwest or Bloomington or any other. We all have the same desires. There are no special local circumstances which justify a local option in this case and therefore uniformity is to be preferred. Secondly, the proposal envisions that we can distinguish between what is being called a senior lecturer 1 and senior lecturer 2. I suggest that making such distinctions will become highly formalistic. It gets rather difficult when we already endorse this persons teaching as a superior teacher to distinguish between one and two and then it will become formalistic. What's more, it'll be more work for the people on these campus-wide committees that are supposed to pass on. Those committees are already overburdened; they already are difficult to recruit to; now you're giving them what I would suggest is a fairly meaningless job of reviewing people who are

already excellent teachers for promotion to the whichever is the higher unit. It's more work for us for very little purpose. The last thing is that these designations which have now changed twice since they were first proposed. We once had assistant lecturer associate then we had senior lecture roman one, now we have senior lecture Arabic two. These designations are peculiar to this proposal. No other University that I know of has such as title where as lecturer and senior lecturer is known as a distinction throughout the country. If you have local option and on one campus there are senior lecturers no number and on other campuses there are senior lecturers one and two what is the public to make of this? I think just confusion. I don't know whether two is better than one or the reverse. In the army, second lieutenant come before first lieutenants. In the proposal two comes before one, or is it one before two? I really don't know and I don't think the public will know and therefore it deprives the whole thing of its value and recognition of valuable service to Indiana University in teaching. If we want these titles to mean something in the state of Indiana, may I suggest Senior Lecturer A, Senior Lecturer 2A, Senior Lecturer 3A, and Senior Lecturer 4A in a state that plays a lot of basketball that will work, but this will not. *[Laughter]* Therefore it has no purpose, it destroys the uniformity that we have worked so hard, especially Ed Greenebaum, to establish. Therefore, I endorse my friend Bob's amendment.

**BRAND:** Any further comments on this?

*[Tape Changed, some words may have been lost]*

**BRAND:** ...But, please Bob. Becky did you want to say something?

**PORTER:** I'm waiting for one of my IUPUI colleagues. Karen do you want to speak?

**GABLE:** Yes I will. First of all, I would like to say by coming with the titles we felt that there was a standardization. Even if campuses chose either the two or three choices you still have a standardization of titles. Secondly, my comment, Martin this is not the military so in civilian life, one tends to come prior to two. I understand your categorization of Lecturer A, B, C, D but that is going even beyond even what we've done. I would suggest strong consideration all of the time and effort the committee put forward.

**BRAND:** Let's restrict our comments to new information because we conveyed this last time.

**WARD:** The IUPUI faculty council did vote to support the choice in this document. New information is that in conversation that our campus committee had with lecturers their impression was that after talking to several lecturers was that they would also prefer the three levels.

**BRAND:** Bob.

**ENO:** A piece of new information is the Bloomington Faculty Council also voted on this choice and it voted unanimously in the other direction. I'll just mention again that among the reasons that I gave last time we met were reasons that Martin didn't restate this time and have to do with academic freedom, the protection of academic freedom and the fact that a promotion system that is overly complex ultimately restricts academic freedom to the degree that people desire promotion rather than focusing on their profession directly. I'm concerned that generally in Universities there is a great value that is placed on prestige. Perhaps there is value placed on prestige, prestige in terms of title, prestige in terms of worth by themselves. Perhaps there is value placed on prestige because we're short of some very important materials. We might be short on money but we're not short on rewards in the profession itself. There are great rewards in teaching; there are great rewards in research and we get positive feedback in many different types of forms. I feel that the degree that we make these prestige markers focuses for people to strive for what we do is create potential to have rifts in the faculty. We don't just promote people because they've done good work; we have to make decisions sometimes not to promote people because they haven't done the work that we're demanding that they do. Whether or not

we are making a good dividing line between those we promote and those we don't promote is a question which we always have to take with extreme seriousness. We do this in tenure where there is an enormous amount at stake, but I'm not at all we do this effectively in promotion among faculty ranks now because there is much less at stake. I've had plenty of experience in the time I've been at this University where promotion decisions that were viewed by the faculty member involved was contritious, retaliatory, and the promotion decisions split departments down the line and didn't seem to undergo the careful type of scrutiny appealing on the part of the institution that the institution was at risk for making the wrong decision. I think all of those problems are tremendously enhanced in a system where there is so much prestige and power differential between those who make the decision for tenured or tenure-track faculty and those who are subject to the decision, who are not tenure-track faculty. I think we should do everything we can to make sure the decisions of evaluation are made with the utmost scrutiny of times when the institution has something at stake. There is something at stake in the conversion from a probationary short-term contract to a long-term contract. If we decide to not give someone a long-term contract, that person will be gone and replaced, if we make the wrong decision, we've lost a good person. We have to be careful when we do that. If we decide to retain a person and keep them on for the long-term contract, we're going to be keeping them on, in most cases, probably for a very long time. We have to have great scrutiny on that decision. The third step is going to replicate all the negative features we now have of promotion of associate to full professor. I think that this is a significant trap that is going to be a problem for units throughout the system. It will be very difficult for campuses that elect to go to three step direction to change that in the future as it will be extremely difficult for the University now to go to a two-step system for faculty generally. I think we should take a stand right now that only when the institution has something that greatly at stake, only when scrutiny should be maximized to the pass judgment on our colleague to make sure that those judgments are accurate and are called for at that time. In terms of rewards, we give people rewards that are substantive in the profession in which they are engaged in. We give them rank, we let them understand what is good about their teaching and how we appreciate them. We check on them teaching. We go and participate in their classes. We treat them as full colleagues and give them the types of academic freedom protection that this document does not have.

**BRAND:** Thank you Bob. One more comment on this, preferably for the other side.

**PORTER:** Preferably for the three?

**BRAND:** For the three.

**PORTER:** We're talking about initiatives in which we're going to take part of our tuition increase and augment the number of individuals who are at the full-time lecturer ranks. This is an ever increasing number of individuals that play a very important role. Those of us who are tenure-track believe that we ought to go through three levels and that there is an important step to move from the associate to the full professor. Bob said all problems that may bring about but I haven't heard any of us calling for a decrease in the number of levels. We're talking about bringing individuals to this institution and having a really long-term relationship with them. It is important in that long-term relationship that we recognize when they have increased their contribution to the institution. I think it's important for us to extend to them a possibility of having that promotion even though they're in a long-term rank and is the reason why IUPUI because of our experience with having larger numbers of individuals in lecturer positions strongly supported having the option for the three categories.

**BRAND:** I got a sense that the arguments are on the table. Does anyone have a totally new argument? If not I think we should be ready to vote on this amendment. Okay. Could someone call the question for amendment?

**BRAND:** All in favor of the amendment as read by Bob Eno please raise your hand. We're going to count just to make sure. Those who oppose it? I've got 21 to 12 for the amendment. So it passes. We're now returning to the main document as amended. Bob please make sure you submit that with the secretary so we can have a final version. Is there any discussion? Yes.

**SPECHLER:** Just a question on Ed's first point. The school who versus the unit is supposed to be clear. Is on a smaller campus if it's the School of Education or SPEA and so on is it that unit on that campus is that a school or is it the School of Education the school that you're talking about.

**MILLER:** Well, this is a decision that would be transmitted by a dean, that's what this says. Let me just ask a question about take say the Kokomo campus. Are there deans on the Kokomo campus?

**KINTZELE:** Yes there are.

**MILLER:** Which deans are there?

**KINTZELE:** There is a dean of Business. There is a dean of Arts and Sciences. There is not a dean of Education because the Education division is too small; there is a certain number you have to have of faculty before you can have a dean. That does not have a dean, so it has a chair.

**MILLER:** Well Martin, I would say that the intention of this is to proceed along the lines that the clinical appointee decisions have been made previously. If you recall that there was a mandated clinical policy for each academic unit to make some decisions about how many of its faculty there would be. My sense is that, I'm trying to think about SPEA. My sense is that SPEA made that decision as a faculty for the whole system.

**SPECHLER:** Ted, I'm wonder, this is not a matter of just clarification but really of concept. It does strove me that when it does come the appropriate number of lecturers there are budgetary and instructional matters recruitment and so on. So different between the smaller campuses and the larger ones when it comes to the Business School and SPEA. Would it be wise to say to Kokomo's Business program you people decide what you want to do and that's irrespective of what will happen on the Bloomington or the IUPUI campus? Wouldn't that be wise?

**MILLER:** I don't think that's not a very good example I don't think because the Bloomington Business Dean has no purview over the Kokomo program's business at all as far as I know.

**SPECHLER:** Okay. Well take SPEA which is more of a system program and you know that well. We've heard countless time how different the situations are on the smaller campuses with respect to recruitment, budget, instructional load, and all the rest of it. Wouldn't it make sense to say to the SPEA faculty say at South Bend, "You people decide what is appropriate for you that could be different from the Bloomington decision?"

**MILLER:** I think the intent of this language Martin is to put into the hands of the tenured and tenured-probationary faculty this decision. If you take SPEA as an example, SPEA is what we call a system-wide school. The faculty as a whole are authorized under the governors system in SPEA, the faculty as a whole is authorized to meet and make decisions. There is nothing in this language that would prevent the SPEA faculty from saying that alright we're going to work on this particular problem on a campus by campus basis. I think that would be tolerable under the language.

**BRAND:** I think that is the main answer right there. It's up to the faculty of the school.

**MILLER:** It's up to the faculty of the unit, the school, to decide how they are going to do this and make the specification. It's got to be something that they are comfortable with.

**SPECHLER:** Okay.

**BRAND:** Please.

**SHAPIRO:** My concern about the term school is that we may understand now what it means but for example we do not have any schools on the East Campus.

**MILLER:** I understand that.

**SHAPIRO:** Having that particular word in this document, we understand it now and it's all cool, what about ten years from now.

**BRAND:** I think the answer is just a short sentence. It's the school life. I'm serious about that. It stands for academic unit but it's not using those words so on the East campus I believe divisions would be the academic units and we should take that into reason.

**MILLER:** There is a more substantive aspect to this question. If you go into your academic handbook and you go to the most fundamental document in the academic handbook for faculty is the Constitution of Indiana University Faculty. You will find in that document a allocation of authority to the faculty. The University faculty has certain authority. Campus faculty have certain authority. In the constitution the word "school" is used, "school faculty" has certain authority. That's the term that is used in our most basic document. Really, that is why we chose that word here. It's meant in the spirit of the use of "school" in our constitution. We could put a little footnote in here about that I suppose to make that clear.

**BRAND:** I think it's clear enough.

**SHERMAN:** Let me just ask one last question. The use of the word "school" rather than academic unit is chosen on whatever line that was.

**GALANTI:** Twenty-four.

**SHERMAN:** Was that specific only to that paragraph that you wanted to use that word.

**MILLER:** Yes.

**SHERMAN:** And any where else in this document "academic unit" is perfectly fine?

**MILLER:** Yes. [*Laughter*]

**GALANTI:** I assume that the word unit on the next line...

**SHERMAN:** Yes.

**GALANTI:** Line twenty-five.

**BRAND:** Any other questions or issues about the document? We're ready for a vote on this. Someone call the question.

**WADSWORTH:** Call the question.

**BRAND:** Okay. All in favor please say "Aye." [*Aye*] Opposed. [*None*]

VOTE

*Unanimous in Favor*

**BRAND:** We're there and I want to thank all those who worked on it over the years. Karen and Ed certainly and Ted, not just those. We have one more item of business and that is the executive session on the Honorary Degrees.

**Adjourned 4:01PM**

**AGENDA ITEM #10: EXECUTIVE SESSION: HONORARY DEGREES TO BE AWARDED**

(Professor Paul Eisenberg, Honorary Degrees Committee)