

## **Minutes**

### **Indiana University**

#### **UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL**

**April 25, 2000**

**University Place Conference Center 137  
Indianapolis Campus**

**1:30 – 4:30 PM**

#### **Summary of Action Taken:**

#### **Agenda**

1. Approval of Minutes of September 14 and February 8  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/meetings/minutes/99-00/9-14-99/9-14-99.htm>  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/meetings/minutes/99-00/2-8-00/mainpage.htm>
2. Agenda Committee Business  
(Professors Rebecca Porter and S. James Sherman)
3. Question / Comment Period\*  
(Professors Rebecca Porter and S. James Sherman) (10 minutes)
4. Inter-Campus Transfers  
(Professors James Baldwin and Robert Eno, Educational Policies Committee)
5. Policy on Non-Tenure-Track Appointments  
(Professors Karen Gable and Theodore Miller, Faculty Affairs Committee)
6. Community College Update  
(Cheryl Sullivan, IUPUI Vice Chancellor for External Affairs)
7. Report on University Administration Revenue and Expenditures  
(Vice President Judith Palmer, Chief Financial Officer)
8. System Affirmative Action Report  
(Professors Paul Eisenberg and Gail Williamson, Affirmative Action Committee)  
(Julie Knost, Director, Affirmative Action)
9. By 4:15:  
Executive Session:  
Honorary Degrees to Be Awarded  
(Professor Paul Eisenberg, Honorary Degrees Committee)

## ATTENDANCE

**Members Present:** Jim Baldwin, Julie Bobay, Myles Brand, Mike Downs, Dan Drew, Paul Eisenberg, Bob Eno, S. Ed Fineberg, K. Michael Foos, Sara Hook, Steve Johnson, Juanita Keck, Marilyn Kintzele, Ted Miller, B. Keith Moore, Nancy Newton, Jim H. Patterson, Becky Porter, Victor Riemenschneider, Timothy (TJ) Rivard, S. Jim Sherman, Catherine Souch, Martin Spechler, Mary Stanley, James Tolhuizen, Frank Wadsworth, Kathleen Warfel, Nanci Yokom

**Members Absent:** Gerald Bepko, Bruce Bergland, Paul Blohm, Julia Bondanella, Carolyn Calloway-Thomas, Bernd Fischer, David Fulton, Tom Gieryn, Michael Gordon, Kenneth Gros-Louis, Dick Heinz, Loren Henry, Ryann Johannes, LaMaze Johnson, Paul Joray, Jacob Manaloor, Nathan Maners, David Oberstar, Kenneth Perrin, Ruth Person, F. C. Richardson, Dennis Senchuk, George Walker, Guy Wall, Michael Wartell, Jeffrey Watt, C. Kurt Zorn

**Members Absent with Alternates:** Bill Orme for Dolores Hoyt

**Visitors:** Ulla Connor, UFC University Planning Committee IUPUI Co-Chair; David Frisby, IUPUI Faculty Council Coordinator; Karen Gable, UFC Faculty Affairs Committee IUPUI Co-Chair; Julie Knost, Affirmative Action Director; Judith Palmer, IU VP and Chief Financial Officer; Richard Rogers, UFC Finances and Facilities Committee IUPUI Co-Chair; Cheryl Sullivan, IUPUI Vice-Chancellor for External Affairs; Gail Williamson, UFC Affirmative Action IUPUI Co-Chair; Marianne Wokeck, UFC Compensation and Benefits Committee IUPUI Co-Chair; Edwin Greenebaum, Law; Mary Fisher, IUPUI Vice President-Elect; Paul Galanti, IUPUI President-Elect; William Hurd, IUPUI Faculty Council; Stephen L. Keucher, University Budget Office; Albert Ruesink; Terri Combs, IUPUI Associate Faculty Coordinator

### **AGENDA ITEM #1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 14 AND FEBRUARY 8**

**PORTER:** I am going to call the meeting to order and welcome you all to the IUPUI campus. You will have noted that we are missing President Brand at the head table, he's at a meeting in Arizona and regrets that he cannot attend but said he had great faith in our ability to go ahead and do the good work of the institution. I also would like to introduce the new president of the IUPUI faculty which makes that individual the new UFC Co-Secretary starting in the fall of next year Paul Galanti was elected here at IUPUI. I think many of you know Paul from our Law School. [APPLAUSE] We have on the agenda our first item, approval of the minutes for September 14<sup>th</sup>. Are there any comments on the minutes? Hearing no suggestions for additions or corrections they will stand approved. We also have on the agenda approval of the minutes of February 8<sup>th</sup>. Are there any suggestions for changes, corrections, additions? Hearing no comments they will stand approved.

### **AGENDA ITEM #2: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS (Professors Rebecca Porter and S. James Sherman)**

**PORTER:** Agenda committee business. Well, the agenda committee had a lively discussion on issues that will be coming before us today so we are anticipating that we will have an even more lively discussion with even more of us here to talk about those items. Just some general

information, the March 2001 will be held at IU Kokomo, continuing our tradition of taking one of our meetings to a regional campus. Organizational meeting for UFC Agenda Committee and committee chairs is scheduled for August 29<sup>th</sup> here at IUPUI so we're already looking ahead at our schedule and thinking about getting organized for next year. I'm thinking about not having to be involved in the getting organized for next year but passing things off to Jim. In the Agenda Committee, we talked about the procedures that will be followed for the UFC Agenda Committee selections and so the faculty governance leaders from each campus will be helping us move through that process of identifying who has been elected to UFC and then moving ahead so that will be occurring. This month's trustees meeting items related to faculty governance we will do our begin our first annual, not first annual, our first required monthly report on inter-campus transfers so we're looking forward at reporting out the action that we take today. And also, in one of the committees there will be a discussion about TERA and whether or not the TERA awards should continue as they're currently constituted or whether or not there should be some changes. You may recall that each of the campuses had a survey that took place in the fall; that information has been compiled and will be presented to the trustees as part of their consideration. I think that's all I have in terms of agenda committee business, do you have any comments you want to make?

**SHERMAN:** Yes, um, just one item this being the April meeting, it's the last meeting of this year's UFC and in this case it means that it's Becky's last meeting on UFC. I know that all of us, especially those who will continue on UFC next year will greatly miss Becky's leadership and wisdom in guiding us for the last two years. So, on behalf of the UFC I'd like to express our thanks and recognition to you.

**PORTER:** By walking out right? [laughter] Thank you very much.

**SHERMAN:** It's easy, I did not make anything difficult to undo.

**PORTER:** Ha, ha. [laughter] It's great! It says to Becky and friends, Co-Secretary of the UFC [laughter]. I truly am sure that I have the most unique farewell present.

[inaudible]

**PORTER:** Well that was great, and more than enough!

**SHERMAN:** This is also easy because it just comes out.

**PORTER:** Oh my goodness. Oh that's beautiful. Thank you very much. There's another matching one, but I'm not going to open it up. It has just been a wonderful experience. OK I don't want to get showered with champagne. It's always a unique opportunity to be in a leadership position but I have appreciated having the opportunity to get to know individuals from each of the different campuses and work with them and am always impressed with what the faculty can do when we come together and move forward and the level of concern that we have about the institution as a whole. So, thank you very much these are wonderful gifts and I really greatly appreciate them.

[applause]

**PORTER:** OK, anything else?

**AGENDA ITEM #3: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD  
(Professors Rebecca Porter and S. James Sherman)**

**PORTER:** Our question and answer period. Jim and I will be delighted to try to answer any questions that you might want to pose or relay them on to Myles to attempt to come up with an answer. It's just not as exciting when we don't have the President here to drill is it? OK.

**AGENDA ITEM #3: INTER-CAMPUS TRANSFERS  
(Professors James Baldwin and Robert Eno, Educational Policies Committee)**

**PORTER:** Well that allows us to move onto the agenda item that we think, that certainly has the potential of generating some conversation and that's the document on inter-campus transfers. We have the co-chairs of the Educational Policies Committee, Jim Baldwin and Bob Eno here to help answer your questions and lead us through the discussion so I will turn it over to you.

**ENO:** We have a couple of amendments from the Agenda Committee. We have two amendments from the Agenda Committee

**PORTER:** Right, could you

**ENO:** If you turn to your blue sheet that has the Principles and Procedures for Undergraduate Inter-Campus Transfers at the top. We'll start with the changes on Section I. B, third line after the word procedural we've added two words "and academic". And the entire sentence reads, "Each campus shall designate an office to provide initial information to students considering transfers to other campuses, to ensure that prospective incoming ICTs are provided with appropriate procedural and academic guidance and advising, including guidance"...and so on and so forth. The other change is in section II. B. down below on the first page. The final clause after the semicolon has simply been struck. So the sentence now will end with the words "as long as intended goals are met." We discussed this at some length last month when we met and there aren't too many alterations to the draft that you have other than some reorganization trying to bring a little more clarity to it. In substance, in it essentially the same draft that you saw a month ago. In the interim we have introduced this to the trustees and a couple of trustees' committees and discovered that while they didn't express absolute confidence in the ability of the faculty to determine the content and comparability of courses they didn't really have anyone else to suggest. [laughter] So they have given us the go ahead to proceed on the policy of this sort of nature to do so, it is acceptable to them. You'll recall one of the [inaudible] to the policy is that in Section II. C we call for a year long process to rationalize course numbering titling for a certain portion of the 8 campus curriculum and that is we've asked that all course that have identical numbers and identical titles be reviewed to ensure that in fact the courses are comparable enough that they should be easily applicable from campus to campus without regard to campus of origin. And that simple idea is actually going to involve a complex procedure to work this out it's going to be a great deal of work. I'm sure you all were here a month ago when initially we had been thinking about a five-year procedure but we had narrowed it down to two and amended our original recommendation so that we could try to get this all done in one year. The Academic Officers Committee which consists of the Chief academic officer on each of the eight campuses has agreed to coordinate the process administratively and they have a graduate assistant who will help to collect certain data from various departments. And, our council the UFC is going to have to come up with recommendations for committees that will adjudicate any disputes that emerge as to which courses are comparable with other courses, not easily

applicable. And also to name a group that will work with the academic officers committee to determine how the master course list is to be used in the future [inaudible] and the Agenda Committee agreed that the best procedure for this second committee will be to use the UFC Educational Policies Committee next year as the committee that will work with the AOC to frame a new link and use the master course list to make sure that these comparably numbered courses and comparably titled courses are in fact comparable enough to be applied [inaudible]. I'm not sure there's a need to reintroduce the other aspects of the proposal since we talked about it a month ago. Should we just open it up for discussion?

**BALDWIN:** Just one impression, it wasn't an impression it was a message from the Board of Trustees the two sub-committees that were involved in this actually voted to be in favor of the policies. Their only problem was they didn't, they are not entirely convinced of the faculty's sincerity in this and the ability to get it done. Hence, the requirement now of the co-secretaries report every month on progress. So they underlined their interest in this. The Board of Trustees, I don't know how to say this without appearing arrogant, but some education on the issue and how complicated it is. The original suggestion was that perhaps just the Director of Admissions from each campus could make decisions about what moves across the campuses and there's a lot encompassed in that and this policy is an effort to rationalize it and the committee makes it like a rule of thumb.

**PORTER:** At this time we want to know what questions you have concerning the policy.

**ENO:** This is a policy being proposed for a vote today so not just questions, but suggestions.

**SPECHLER:** Well I think Jim and Bob have done a wonderful job on an always difficult issue. When we've been approaching but not attaining for a long time and we're under pressure to do the right thing and we have done the right thing. We'll continue. Now my question has to do with the practical implementation of this. My understanding is that this would require at least one face to face meeting among people in each discipline and I've been told that a certain amount of money will be allocated from the residence inter-campus exchange fund for this purpose but I wonder whether the Trustees could be requested to increase that allocation. I could easily see that a college from the more distant campuses might have to spend a day overnight either in Bloomington or Indianapolis or possibly on another campus in order to get complete agreement. And as this seems to be of great importance to them I think we should invite them to support it materially as well as spiritually.

**PORTER:** We really are at the just beginning to work through what will be the procedures for implementing this. I don't know that we've come up with any definitive assumptions about how that will move forward or what it will require.

**BALDWIN:** And it's not implied Martin that the groups will have to meet, I mean there are exchanges that can take place, phone conferences and mail and I can see where there would be cases might be helpful, but not as the first stage in the process. If there are problems in particular cases than maybe face to face would be called for. But I don't think it was envisioned that every discipline would have a colloquium somewhere in the state. It may be necessary to some but not to others.

**SPECHLER:** Well Jim, I think it will be necessary and having done something like this in the past I think it's just simply to complicated to among 8 campuses, 9 including Columbus, to do this by email or by telephone especially as we are under pressure correctly to do it promptly.

**ENO:** I think one thing to bear in mind is that in Section II. C. specifically requires that we make sure that when courses are identically numbered and titled that they be substituted, equivalent enough on campuses to be applied, and if not that they shouldn't be identically numbered and titled. The first round of this is going to be an exchange of information between departments on what courses are currently identically numbered and what the general contours of those courses are in terms of description and [inaudible] will be the next level down. It may be that there's a wide scale agreement first on some courses that, yes they're comparable and second on other courses that are not comparable and we really don't want them to be perceived as comparable so let's work out a renumbering system to make sure we don't give the impression of comparability and only the third group, they may be comparable or there's some disagreement about their comparability or they are not comparable and we'd like to see them comparable, in that third group you'll have a need for communication. Since we really don't know yet how many courses we have right now that have this identical numbering type thing and how much the area of dispute is I'm not sure, I have no idea whether this will be as scary a process as I think it's likely to be, but I think you are perfectly right Martin, you have to have the resources to do it right, to go and do it right and while we started out with the allocation of enough funding for a graduate assistant to help compile data, I'm not optimistic that will be enough. Nor is I think there any information that is the only funding that the AOC is going to receive and we have to make sure that we are an advocate throughout this process to raise the issue when funding is needed, what's needed to do it right.

**PORTER:** Other comments.

**DOWNES:** I'll repeat what I said at the Agenda Committee meeting, for me it's not a matter of having sufficient resources or estimating the number of face to face meetings that will have to occur or the number of disputes over these matters. Right now, we have what I consider to be a small system problem regarding the unwillingness or inability of some programs or departments to accept courses taught on other campuses. I think it's a symbolic and troublesome problem, but I don't think it's a large problem. What's being suggested here is much too large and ambitious a solution to be justified by the size of the problem. I anticipate that this will take, well let's put it this way...if we had a month to do it, it would probably be done right, we wouldn't spend a lot of time examining one another's syllabi, we wouldn't spend a lot of time wondering if one person teaches the course that way on that campus if all the people on that campus teach that course that way. We wouldn't be wondering about a lot of things if we had a month to do this it would probably be done right is the way I think. Right now I believe, I'm not going to move to amend the document, but I do think that the only syllabi that ought to be looked at by the AOC are the syllabi for the courses that currently are offered on any campus and are not accepted by programs or departments on other campuses. That way they'd be focusing their energy and their resources on the problems rather than on the whole nature of the system. This is a proposal which I think will condemn the innocent to suffer with the guilty and as someone who has always thought of himself as innocent I am opposed to that particular aspect of the problem. Only syllabi, only disputes, that the AOC office should [coughing] are the syllabi that are currently in dispute and we ought to expect as a given that the courses are transferring back and forth between campuses they are already equivalent enough. I really think that this is one of those tasks that will get larger and larger the longer we spend on it.

**ENO:** Let me respond very briefly, I think everything Michael is extremely cogent. I don't know what will be involved or how long the process will entail but trying to identify courses that are not currently transferable or applicable where there's been a history of having turned down

where courses where that hasn't been tested so we don't know if that is transferable. I thought a compromised approach which I'd like to see the AOC adopt as a first step and Michael didn't give a great compromise is that the initial that we send out and ask the AOC to distribute. Initially to identify courses that are identically titled and numbered and to send the course descriptions of those courses to the 8 campuses or however many campuses where they are taught and to inquire whether or not departments are satisfied on the basis of descriptions to acknowledge that courses would be directly applicable and then only to focus on those cases where departments said no. Michael very cogently responded that he felt that in many cases if it were a sleeping dog lying it would be fine but as soon as you raise the issue departments may respond by saying no we need to see more in order to make a judgment. I think that may be true as well but I can't quite see anyway of getting around it because I don't know that we can identify the courses you're talking about.

**BALDWIN:** One way we would never identify these courses, one unfortunate aspect of it is there is generally a student in the middle. There's a student caught in the middle of trying to do something, trying to transfer. The policy was to have these courses set up equivalencies before the student gets involved so that the student isn't left, well, come back in six months when we make a decision. I don't know if anybody has kept the records of courses which have been challenged in the past

**ENO:** The records are kept for positive equivalencies, but not for negatives.

**PORTER:** Mike and then Ed.

**DOWNS:** Let me impose my own inadequate but satisfactory compromise. That would be that the first solicitation that goes out from the AOC would be to departments asking them if they are aware of courses they teach which have not been accepted and what courses they're aware of that are being taught on other campuses that they have not accepted and would not accept. That way again you would be focusing your attention on the problems rather than on everything. It probably would be easier to get that information than all those syllabi which may or may not be on file for all the people that are teaching the course.

**ENO:** I think that's another good idea, the problem is we have first to identify, we're only constrained to deal at first at this level of detail to courses with identical numbers and titles. To ask departments to respond to that question you just framed concerning identically typed and numbered courses won't work because departments don't know where courses are being offered that are identically titled and numbered particularly since the master course list allows them to be offered in areas without having them posted in the bulletin at various times. So, in a sense you're expanding the range at first.

**DOWNS:** I wouldn't have any problem with that at all. Each campus has a Bulletin. In each Bulletin are the courses that are taught by that department, there is a master course list. Every number of course that we teach on that list has been taught somewhere, at some place in the system at some time. Moreover, if a student goes some place we hear about the complaint and we also know that there are programs that won't accept credits from other programs, they know what they will accept and what they won't accept because they've had that problem and it's there. Again, I'm suggesting that as a first solicitation for information, this makes more sense to me, than asking every department, and I'll use my own department as an example, for syllabi from everybody who's taught Introduction to American Politics to see whether the way it is taught on our campus and it's taught in a variety of ways by a variety of people to collect those

syllabi and have them look at those syllabi and the syllabi of all the American Government section taught throughout the Indiana University system to establish equivalency is a bootless task. Right now it's accepted everywhere by everybody and there seems to be no good reason to subject this multiplicity of syllabi to a careful examination of comparison and contrast.

**PORTER:** Ed and...

**FINEBERG:** First of all, I'm not confident that departments really know or keep tabs on which courses they actually turn down and I think that most, I agree, that the most practical kind of approach would be that when a student's course is turned down to be transferred rather than telling the student that it's turned down, it gets flagged and then a conference is set up between the two campuses that are involved to perhaps mediate the problem. I think otherwise it would be a monumental task to read each and every course and it did proactively perhaps the inter-campus transfer might be better done and with a student's [inaudible].

**PORTER:** Marianne

**WOKECK:** I have one comment that has not anything to do with course equivalency and that is here relegated to II. F and that is the question of residency. That at least in my school and in my field which is history the real problem that has occurred is that a student who has basically fulfilled the degree requirements in one place, moves to another campus, and basically does not hold that degree cannot be granted because of the requirements unless somebody takes quite a number of courses over again. That is a hardship for which I see in this document no real resolution except basically said [inaudible] That's where most of the student's dissatisfaction at least in my area of experience has come from.

**ENO:** Are you referring to the senior residency requirement that requires students on some campuses, perhaps all, to spend at least the last 20-25 hours on that campus, the campus of the degree granting?

**WOKECK:** Yes, the question is if somebody comes and can't fulfill the senior residency requirement but all their coursework is done in the major under the current circumstances that would not be recognized at the new campus and that is something that really doesn't work.

**ENO:** Coursework would be recognized to the degree that it is equivalent or applicable where there is coursework that has been deemed not equivalent or not applicable that is precisely where the student would have to do over the normal number of hours.

**WOKECK:** Well, the real problem is that the courses are equivalent and they are recognized that they are being equivalent but they're not done on the new campus.

**BALDWIN:** That doesn't matter.

**ENO:** This policy eliminates that as a problem.

**WOKECK:** Well, I hope it does.

**ENO:** It's specific in the policy.



**BALDWIN:** The policy doesn't address the residency thing, leaving as it is. It is generally assumed the later you are in your career the more courses you're taking in your major so there is some parallel development here but theoretically this policy will allow them to take all their courses, or almost all their courses in one campus, come to the other, although it's hard to see how it would happen.

**WOKECK:** It's happened often enough so I really know that it doesn't work.

**BALDWIN:** As long as the courses are equivalent and they're taught in one course and they will come for a degree and major on any campus.

**ENO:** Section II. D is where you'll find the phrase which specifies its regardless of the campus. So we're aware of that problem.

**PORTER:** Martin.

**SPECHLER:** I'd like to go back to what the purpose of this exercise is and I take it it's not just to get people off our back. One purpose certainly is to do this with minimum disruption of our other activities and other words at least cost. And in that regard I agree very much with Michael, that it requires some deep thinking before we get into this that we don't expand the job beyond all measure. I don't agree with his specific suggestion because in my department in economics we haven't the slightest idea whether our courses have been accepted here there or anywhere, we haven't the slightest idea, never recorded this. So that's really not possible, we're much too large to have the kind of personal knowledge that probably Michael does. Now, let me say what I think is the objective of this and that is to increase the ease of transfer among our campuses for the students. It could have disadvantages for our programs it's true and we probably as faculty would prefer to have the students with us the full four years or the equivalent but I think the presumption has to be that the student is right, the student has many demands upon him or her, many situations family and work situations and I think we should keep our eye on the main objective which is to arrange these procedures so that it maximizes the ease of students in getting a decent IU degree. That is the objective and I think that's what the legislature wants from us. I'm very much afraid that other objectives will creep in here which are ok but less important in my view than the main objective which is to conveniently offer a student a high quality IU degree.

**BALDWIN:** That brings up a point to that one of the principles underlying assumptions of this is that what grants the degree is the University.

**PORTER:** Michael.

**DOWNS:** I could be wrong, but my prediction is, that if we follow the procedure that the policy calls for there will be more courses being taught by more students that will not transfer after this process than will be the case before the process begins and thus it will fail to achieve what Martin says our objective is and what I agree with him in regard to this, that's what our objective is to make it easier, but instead as we examine syllabi and raise questions about comparability and increase the diversity of numbers under which courses are taught fewer courses will be transferring automatically and students will be at a greater disadvantage. Now that's my prediction, if I'm wrong I'll be the last one to admit it. [laughter]

**BALDWIN:** there is an oversight in this and we will be setting up some sort of appeals committee if two units can't disagree, one says these are equivalent and one says this is not, or they don't and the academic officers are on record as believing that the courses should transfer with great flexibility and great [inaudible] and that includes the vice chancellors on all the campuses so that might happen if it was an unrestrained environment but there are two restraints on it.

**PORTER:** Bob

**ENO:** I don't know, I suspect Michael, that if you tally it up in the end you may be right. I don't know whether the outcome will be that specific courses will transfer more often or less often but I suspect you may be right. I think the underlying goal of the policy is a little different from what Marty laid out. It isn't necessarily, we haven't been trying to make it easier or harder to transfer, but we've tried to make sure is that students will know in advance that the process will be transparent, that there wouldn't be any more flukes and that we would have control over the process so that we could encourage it to evolve in whatever policy direction we wish it to evolve. Right now there is no set mechanism for determining whether courses will be acceptable or not acceptable except for individual students to go request from individual department chairs who are governed by no particular policy over how they'll judge whether a course is equivalent or not and in some units on some campuses we have enormous numbers of problems and in some units on some campuses I have no doubt that it will become much easier to transfer courses. Whereas in other units, I think you may be predicting correctly, things are fine right now, but we may encounter people who suddenly decide to be defensive about their programs. I hope we can encourage departments not to do that. My principle concern through this whole process for the next year is that it's going to be such a large scale effort that the faculty will feel that this is a burden, they will feel it's coming from an administrative direction because it's associated with the Academic Officers' Committee and that they'll resist cooperating and become quite defensive about their courses. I think all of us need to spread the word on our campuses that this is a faculty initiative and we are trying to retain control over our curriculum, over the way students transfer, and that we're trying to make sure that IU has a system that will allow most easily to accommodate whatever state regulations are put into place without sacrificing academic viability and academic integrity. I think that's our goal and I think we do our best if we take control of it. I'm very concerned that this will be perceived as busy work, as burdensome, and as administrative initiative and agree that is true that faculty will worry about that. I think we have to worry about it on the ground as we go through the coming months.

**PORTER:** Ted, did you have a comment?

**MILLER:** Well, yes. With regard to II. C, the way I have read this basically what this policy does is to turn this process over to the Academic Officers' Committee. Is that correct? They are effectively charged to decide really how to do this? Is that correct?

**ENO:** They have been asked to coordinate.

**MILLER:** Is there something in the statement in II C that would prohibit them...let's suppose that this comes to their desks and they begin to think about this process seriously and come to recognize the magnitude of what might be put into play here...is there something in the policy that would prevent them from settling down on a Michael-approach to this? To essentially focus on the problem cases and approach it that way? Are we directing them by this language here to do this in some particular way that raises the kinds of concerns that we've talked about.

**PORTER:** My understanding is we have this policy is directing both the faculty and administration to work together to implement this policy. We have had and will continue to have conversations to interact. We've already began talking about the structure by which it will be a collaborative effort, so I don't know that we have, we don't language that specifies the procedure that is going to be followed, what we do have is our continuing thrust of working together to carry it forward. Bob, did you want to...

**ENO:** ok, yeah, the Academic Officers Committee has already responded to the likelihood of this policy and their initial response has been just along Becky's lines...let's try to figure out the best way to go ahead with this together and figure out what committees are going to be needed and they are not anxious to take over the process...because no one is really anxious...you're stuck with your responsibility, of you're stuck with the answer of all the units and you're troubled for information they'd much rather have faculty [inaudible] on these procedures. On the other hand, we're not going to be in great shape to manage this process over the summer because the UFC won't be in session so they will undoubtedly be taking the initiative so the best thing we can do is try to make sure that we fulfill the policy by saying that there is faculty oversight over the implementation of this policy and the AOC will be responsible for the managing the actual coordination and paperwork and [inaudible] We won't be in pain too long because it's a one-year process even if it fails.

**PORTER:** Is there somebody who hasn't yet spoken who wants to speak? I don't want to...

**RIVARD:** I was going to say in response to a possible splintering effect where no courses will transfer...on II B. if we're really committed to courses transferring we could change the language of II B. from "Courses at the 100 and 200 levels should apply to degree requirements" to "Courses at the 100 and 200 levels *will* apply to degree requirements" and that way at least at the freshman and sophomore level those courses are going to automatically transfer no matter what campus they go to and that also will help us in our fight against the community college at least in my perspective at IU-East and I will submit that at the 300 and 400 level an English degree from IU-East is not going to aim a student necessarily in the same direction that an English degree from Bloomington or elsewhere so I'm not sure even that once we get into this that I would want to go to the English department at Bloomington and say "the 300 and 400 level courses will all transfer equivalently" now the ones that we teach might, but the requirements of the English degree may be very different because they are guiding students in a very direction.

**PORTER:** You've picked up a sentence that indeed has probably one of the most discussed sentences [laughter] within the document.

**RIVARD:** I try

**BALDWIN:** We were hoping nobody would notice

**PORTER:** It has been written with many levels of directedness that one of the concerns that has been raised and I think the reason that you're seeing the "should" rather than a "shall" or a "will" as an absolute was a concern that's been raised about 200-level courses that might be an entry point into the major. And so there have been some concerns, some other issues that have been addressed and the sense coming out of the discussion in the Agenda Committee was that the word should would be retained because it does allow the possibility for an exception. So it's directing that they should but it's not being obligatory.

**BALDWIN:** It's also implying that the benefit of the doubt is given to the transferability of courses and that's the message but there are cases, that Becky points out, where there may be a reason and to say "will" could again make the student at a disadvantage.

**PORTER:** Bob

**ENO:** There are three different ways in which a 200-level course might be applied. One is undistributed credit which students don't like; that's what happens when it doesn't actually apply. Second is to fulfill various campus requirements, school requirements which we generally talk about as general ed or distribution requirements and so forth and the standard for that we expect to be very, very flexible. We anticipate that the speaking with the Educational Policy Committee which drafted the original version of this section we anticipated that courses at the 100 and 200 level used for distribution requirements ought to be transferable without any question at all. Some majors consider their 200-level courses to be general survey introductions that are loosely and are flexible and the major I teach in it's a very flexible course. It's not a big issue whether it's taken on our campus or not, but other majors configure their course sequences much more narrowly and the pre-requisite progression is much more carefully designed and in those cases the entry point is often a 200-level course which really is built to very explicit types of criteria where in fact a similar course taught on another campus may not prepare students for the upper-level courses that they would go onto. And that's the third type of course which it may not make sense for students to say ok we took the 200-level course on a different campus, how many of our 300-level courses...we don't have universal success among our students...

[End of Tape I, Side A]

**PORTER:** Martin, Ed do you still want to make a comment

**SPECHLER:** Well I agree with my friend Bob that we have to keep this as a faculty enterprise and that puts a lot of burden on our agenda committee faculty leadership to make sure that the procedures lead us in the right direction. But I have to say that the preamble of this and the whole nature of the document still does not satisfy me about the main objective of this enterprise. Perhaps I'm unfair, but I characterize one approach as maximum transparency, my approach is maximum transferability. And I think that the preamble could be read either way. Now, I think we just simply have not decided. But to use a *reductio ad absurdum*, following the principle of maximum transparency each campus could say we don't take anything from any other campus. This would be simple, neat, convenient, self-serving, and ultimately unacceptable politically. But it would maximize transparency. Now, I think we should not go that direction as Indiana University and I'd like to propose an amendment to the preamble after the word "requirements" to say "to the maximum degree consistent with IU standards" in other words to say we support the equivalent application to the maximum degree consistent with IU standards.

**PORTER:** Alright, we have a motion for an amendment, is there a second?

**FINEBERG:** I'll second

**PORTER:** Alright we have a second. The amendment is to change the introduction so it would read, "The faculty of Indiana University supports the equivalent application of comparable courses toward degree requirements to the maximum degree consistent with IU standards, regardless of the campus where the course was completed." Do I have that correct Martin?

**SPECHLER:** Yes, thank you.

**PORTER:** Discussion of the amendment?

**BALDWIN:** Can I just quickly make a suggestion that if that's where we're going we shouldn't repeat the word "degree"?

**SPECHLER:** To the "maximum extent"?

**BALDWIN:** Yes

**SPECHLER:** Thanks Jim

**PORTER:** Bob, did you want to respond?

**ENO:** I'm not too sure what an IU standard is.

**SPECHLER:** Well, I think IU standards Bob are very clear in your field and in my field and my objective here, and I'm sure we share this completely, is to level up the standards, to always raise the standards throughout the system consistent with the objectives of our various student audiences. I believe that an IU degree should stand for approximately the same thing wherever its granted, in the field in which its granted. And that's a matter of probably, that can't be defined in an abstract way, but it's certainly understood in economics or in East Asian Studies or in Spanish or whatever.

**PORTER:** Other comments?

**ENO:** I think that I am in sympathy with the general orientation that you have Marty but what I remember we had quite a discussion along these similar lines where we very well disagreed that at the first meeting of the year. What I recall from that discussion is that there were two different models how programs move on our various campuses. The model that I think highlight is when the program strives for the highest possible standards. And I recall through the process of that conversation that Jim Tolhuizen came in with a different way of framing it when he said that not every campus wants to be a Bloomington. The campuses may configure their ideas or how they want to organize their programs qualitatively different from the way that they may be organized on say the Bloomington campus which may seem like a very high quality organization but may not be the way that other campuses want to go with regards to the needs of their student body or with regards to the faculty in the departments. All of us certainly want to achieve the highest standard in our programs and have the highest quality education we can give our students but I feel it is important that our student audiences are significantly different on our various campuses. And that if we all strive to emulate say Bloomington we may be striving to deliver the students on various campuses the type of program that isn't necessarily what the kids there need for their aspirations. Let me give you an example. In the process of dealing with these issues I've had a lot of talks with the Business school, which is regarded as a difficult case [inaudible] and I wanted to learn more about their reasons for seeming so difficult and I found that they weren't as difficult as they were thought but when it came to certain courses people at the Business school in Bloomington who are in good touch with the Indianapolis campus because it is a two-campus school explained that in their view the Indianapolis campus was designed to try to train students for certain types of job opportunities but principally Indiana job opportunities, corporations that

were based in Indiana. And that the Bloomington campus was attempting to give students the type of training that would make them eligible for positions in Fortune 500 companies that have international businesses, that was one of their main tasks. And therefore, there were a lot of aspects built into the Bloomington program that simply weren't necessarily even relevant to the type of training that the Indianapolis program was aiming to provide. Now it might be that the Indianapolis program would want to change the focus of its training. It may be that it views its focus it might [inaudible] as a stage on the way towards what the Bloomington program is trying to do. And it may also be that the Indianapolis program feels that this is precisely what this campus should be offering and the range of courses, the way that they're taught can be precisely designed to give the maximum result to the audience that they really want to deal with, the students who want a different [coughing] and not at the Bloomington campus to go to for a different type of training with different objectives. That type of model may apply to more than just the business school it may apply to many of the schools on various campuses and I wouldn't want to put into this document something that suggests that it would be inappropriate for them to be tailoring their program to the needs that would differentiate campus by campus where the student audience and the goals of the faculty (tails off). So I would prefer not to see that phrase added.

**PORTER:** Are there...Juanita?

**KECK:** Becky it's been so long I forgot what the amendment is...would you read it to me again?

**PORTER:** Yes, if you look in the italicized introduction, after the phrase, in the second line, "toward degree requirements" would be "toward degree requirements to the maximum extent consistent with IU standards"

**KECK:** My question goes back to what my two esteemed colleagues may know what the IU standards are but in nursing I have no idea what they are and my concern with inserting that statement that suggests that somewhere there is a set of written standards that forces you to read comparatively and if that doesn't exist, what does this statement, it simply adds another degree of opinion about whether courses, some aspect of quality that's also not stated. I would be against the amendment.

**PORTER:** Michael.

**DOWNS:** Well, there's either that standard or that multiplicity of standards that Bob was talking about whereby the Indianapolis campus that its trying to keep with its programs, Fort Wayne has a standard its trying to keep with its programs, and Bloomington has another standard its trying to keep with its programs and that none of these are really Indiana University standards, they're Fort Wayne standards or Indianapolis standards, or Bloomington standards. And Bob thinks that the Bloomington standard, at least in theory from the Indianapolis standard and the Fort Wayne standard, that Bloomington shouldn't have to take as equivalents courses taught because the campus missions are so different or the departmental mission is so different or the purpose is so different. It seems to me that we're trying to do something on one hand, and at the same time we're setting up a structure that's going to make it impossible for us to do that on the other hand. Now that's alright...I like transparency. I like, ideally, the kind of transparency that you get with [inaudible] and credit, but there's another type of transparency and that is if somebody went to Defiance College they'd know in advance that if they transferred someplace else that they'd have to make as good a case as they could for the courses they took at Defiance College before any of

the rest of us will take them. The easiest way I think to handle this problem is to say that Indiana University system will treat each campus as well as it treats campuses belonging to other universities when students transfer there. And that every student will be on their own, will have to stand on their own two feet and will have to make their own case about the courses they were taking. I don't like that.

**BALDWIN:** That will never fly.

**DOWNS:** Of course it won't fly because what the state legislature thinks and what the higher education commission thinks, and this is the other objective we're trying to achieve here, is to keep people from complaining they have transferring courses. The 100 and 200 level, obviously since we said should, and may even want to say must, these are courses that we treat with full faith and credit. If you took that course anywhere at IU we'll settle. 300 and 400 level courses we're going to treat those courses the way we treat courses that are being transferred from Defiance College of Northwestern or someplace else. That's probably too simple. But that's what I see emerging from the discussion. Strong preference to treat 100 and 200 level courses as fungible; you can take them anyplace they can work anyplace. Even at Ivy Tech, even at any other Vincennes. But the 300 and 400 level courses because they are susceptible to somewhat different objectives to departments they're going to be handled differently. Now I don't think we want to take several steps backwards to where this system was when I came here thirty years ago in which in order to get my courses even in the book and even taught I had to go to Bloomington to get my directions and my course description and the textbooks I was going to use...we all wanted to get away from that, and I don't want to go back to that...I don't think we can go back to that.

**PORTER:** Was that speaking for or against the amendment?

**DOWNS:** I'm speaking...well, both.

**PORTER:** Alright, comments specifically about the amendment, because we are moving close to the time that we're going to vote on the amendment. Alright. Are you ready to vote on the amendment?

**SPECHLER:** One last comment. Of course, I'm for the amendment, but I say if you turn this down I think you have to conceive that there is no very clear objective to what we're trying to do, no guidance to the academic officers, no guidance to others who arrange this procedure and its ambiguous about what we're trying to do.

**BALDWIN:** Would it help to change "IU" to "academic"?

**SPECHLER:** It would be alright with me, but I want to put two things in it Jim. One is to make it clear that we like transferability, we're willing to make as much effort as possible to increase transferability (a), but not by reducing standards.

**PORTER:** Alright, the motion is to amend by adding the phrase "to the maximum extent consistent with IU standards" All those? Was it essential Paul?

**EISENBERG:** Well, I was going to try a friendly amendment to that which might remove some of the problems that a number of people are having with the vagueness of reference to standards.

But if you just want to move ahead...I was going to suggest would you find this acceptable “to the maximum extent consistent with the objectives of the various IU campuses”  
[no]

**PORTER:** The sense is that’s different. So we’re going to go back and we’re really going to vote this time, I’m not going to look up. “to the maximum extent consistent with IU standards” All those in favor of the motion signify by saying Ay [ay] those oppose no [no]. OK, the motion is defeated. Are there any other motions to amend?

**PORTER:** Paul

**EISENBERG:** Yeah, these are small points I think, but I do want to raise them before we have a vote on the document as a whole. It looked to me, it sounded to me, from things that are already a done deal that the Academic Officers’ Committee will be coordinating this whole process but the language we actually have is that it may be coordinated by that committee. Do we want something stronger that at least that it should be or maybe even stronger than that that it would be? I just offer that as a question, this is very weak language and what happens to this if the academic officers committee to say thanks but no thanks. Although I gather that in fact this is not the way things are going.

**ENO:** They have said thanks and they’re already geared up for it.

**BALDWIN:** They originated this whole thing in the first place and I guess maybe the reason is that it’s not the business of the faculty to command the administration to do this.

**EISENBERG:** So you want this.

**BALDWIN:** we want it. If another office wants to do it at a higher level...

**EISENBERG:** A couple of other things which may be more interesting to you in I. B first line, why do you have inclusion of the word “initial information” why not just say that this office is to provide information. It sounds as though a student could try exactly once to get information from this office and the second time around the office could say we’ve already helped you sorry  
[laughter]

**ENO:** The reason is because we envisioned [coughing] some campuses will set up a clearinghouse office that will receive the requests and will funnel students to the appropriate unit to handle their requests. Students who do this ICT procedure either are trying to sometimes they’re trying to transfer into a particular unit, they know where they want to go and they have to determine what the procedure is for them to answer or apply to get into that unit. Others are simply trying to move their campus.

**EISENBERG:** Yes, but even if the first office in question on a given campus refers the matter to another still a student could call and get the information that another office is now in charge of that. I really don’t get the point of including the word “initial”. Unless I’m missing something here that’s important.

**ENO:** Well, it’s possible that the campus will set up three or four different points, say three schools and say, each of you is responsible for this and that there is no office that’s in charge of



coordinating initial inquiries. The idea here is that there should be one unit which is posted on the website, this is the place.

**EISENBERG:** Where it would begin

**BALDWIN:** Which is not the case right now.

**EISENBERG:** OK, let that go, that's fair enough. Now what about this one. In II. C beginning at the bottom of the first page, continuing on to the first line of the second. We read about designing a procedure to realize this goal within a period of one year. Now it bothers me at least but maybe there's good reason that you don't say one year from what point. It's imaginable that most of the year could be occupied with the designing of the procedure and very little time left for the actual implementation of it, etc. Do you want to round that out and clarify it or again is this just the words that you want?

**ENO:** Would you like to suggest a friendly amendment to add "from the adoption of this policy" after that phrase?

**EISENBERG:** that would be fine if that's what you think would work best here or perhaps from the time that the procedure has been agreed upon. That may be too generous.

**ENO:** If we add that phrase that may push it a couple years down the line.

**PORTER:** From what we've heard from President Brand, the intent is one year from now that we will have accomplished this by May next year.

**EISENBERG:** OK, then here's the real problem here. Maybe it's not a problem at all, but one could imagine that the whole design phase could take up 9/10ths of that period and I don't think we want that to happen, at least most of us don't. So maybe we should say something about at least advising that the design period should occupy no more than half of the year-long period in question.

**ENO:** In practical terms, I think the Academic Officers Committee now is committed to getting the process designed and well under way by the end of the summer.

**EISENBERG:** so this is something that is actually going to take care of itself without tightening up.

**BALDWIN:** They've been working on this and thinking about how to do it and we're going to be hiring a graduate assistant over the summer to start gathering data which I hope is going to...committees are appointed in the fall and a lot of the data will be there at that time.

**PORTER:** Alright, any other amendments? If not we're going to move on to vote on the policy.

**ENO:** Do you want to add Paul's friendly amendment "from the adoption of this policy"

**PORTER:** You're the committee

**BALDWIN:** I think everybody that we know of that's involved is assuming this already up to the Board of Trustees. They're expecting this to be implemented quickly.

**PORTER:** I think that the committee is NOT speaking toward adding wording. You have not...

**ENO:** I think it would be harmless to add as a friendly amendment I have no problem with it

**PORTER:** Alright, so it would read, "In a period of one year from the adoption of this policy". Does everybody have the language that's now been added? Alright. This comes to us from the Educational Policies Committee reflecting a tremendous amount of work. All those in favor of adopting the Principles and Procedures for Undergraduate Inter-Campus Transfers signify by saying Ay [AY] those oppose no. This stands approved with many thanks and you will see how many people were placing bets on their various comments that...

#### **AGENDA ITEM #5: POLICY ON NON-TENURE TRACK APPOINTMENTS (Professors Karen Gable and Theodore Miller, Faculty Affairs Committee)**

**PORTER:** Alright, we are going to allocate no more than 15 minutes to the discussion of our next item, with my apologies but we do have a number of other items to make sure that we get through and this is an item that's introduced for conversation today so that you understand what is going on with being proposed so that you can consider it over the summer and then it can be adopted, we hope, early on in the fall semester. So, we have from the Faculty Affairs Committee, the co-chairs Karen Gable and Ted Miller to talk about the policy on non-tenure track appointments and Ted you want to introduce the person who's sitting there who you asked to come and help us out.

**MILLER:** Let me begin by saying just a bit about where we are in the process of adopting this policy. This policy has been discussed at this point in the Bloomington Faculty Council, it has been discussed by the UFC Faculty Affairs Committee and today it will be discussed here. It clearly it a fairly fundamental policy statement for Indiana University and it will have to be discussed on all of the campuses I would think both in the faculty affairs groups and in the campus senates. I'm not sure exactly where those committees and senates are in their schedules for the year where I know in Bloomington we have had our last faculty council meeting and if that's the case on other campuses this is something that will not be able to be discussed until next year and I see Jim shaking his head that Northwest is in that situation. Ed has had several conversations with the Academic Officers Committee so we have their perspective on some of the issues that they see here. The Trustees have been very interested in this non-tenure track policy matter for several years. They have not seen these documents yet unless they've been browsing the various websites where they're posted which I suppose is a possibility, but there hasn't been any discussion in the trustees about this and that of course is also going to have to happen. Hopefully that can happen sometime during the summer. In any event, we are hoping to have this policy at a point where we can act on it during the fall semester next year, hopefully as early as possible during the fall semester. That's kind of a sense of where we are here. Now we have with us today Ed Greenebaum who is a member of the UFC Committee and has really been the principle drafter of this document. Karen Gable who is the co-chair is with us, Kathy Warfel is with us, Sara Cook was with us, Professor Rivard is with us today, well we have a number of members of the UFC committee here to try to respond to questions that you might have but we're going to begin with Ed Greenebaum saying a few words about it since we don't have much time. Ed is experienced in making concise statements about this because we have been in this situation before.

**GREENEBAUM:** OK, to be concise, you have two documents in front of you, one of them has the title Academic Appointments up at the top of it. And that document is an effort to put in the format of the Faculty Handbook the material you agreed on when you met in February. And I don't, in light of the limited time, I don't propose to take you through that right now and a couple of the issues that are in that are also raised in the context of the other document. The other document, Regulation of Lecturer and Clinical Appointments, would plug into the first document at the place at the end of it where it says under Regulations of Non-Tenure Track Faculty Regulation of Lecturer and Clinical Appointments, this document would plug into the handbook at that place. The high points of things that we should certainly pay attention to in this effort to adapt the work that we did several years ago that adopted the policy for clinical faculty we'd like to include Lecturer and Clinical faculty. A high point to certainly pay attention to: One is that this policy would now apply to clinical faculty and lecturers whether they were full-time or employed less than one FTE; that was nearly a matter that was adopted in principle in February. But to implement that we've edited out of this document the references regarding clinical ranks so that limit it to full-time appointees. Another point we should certainly pay attention to is the fact that in the clinical ranks regulations as they were before we had and we debated this at great length a few years ago for those of you that are still with us. The business about CAPs and limitations of numbers. This draft strikes out the material on CAPs that was there and it has instead two pieces—one, the language in the first shaded paragraph uses Lecturer and Clinical Appointments that delegates two units the responsibility to the faculty units, the responsibility to determine how these appointments should be used, what sorts of functions they should be able to have, within the general limitation of their being teaching and service appointments...or primarily teaching and service appointments. The other to deal with the issue of CAPs that was previously dealt with on a system-wide basis. The other matter that we've done because we've taken out the CAPs we've, one of the functions of the CAPs was to protect faculty governance, and it keep that to a sufficient degree in tenure-track faculty with the protection that tenure-track members have so we've added language under rights and privileges saying that where lecturers and clinical appointees have voting privileges their voting participation must be structured in a way that reserves at least sixty percent of voting weight to tenure-track faculty. So, are you satisfied with the delegation of CAPs and issues to local determination and are you then happy with the particular of protection of faculty governance to [inaudible].

Another big issue I think there is the pervasive issue...do you think the general structure of the clinical ranks scheme as we did it before does actively fit the lecturer classification as we're now understanding it? The committee's in general had thought, yes, yes it does which is why we [inaudible]. There are none the less, differences between lecturers as there are diverse needs throughout the system and clinical appointments which are a more unified and more narrowly located situation. So there have been concerned raised we worked on this with the academic offices and explained the matter but still there are issues is this scheme adequately flexible in terms of the long-term contracts and so forth for these lecturers? Specifically the issue has been raised with us, as to whether or not once you survive the probationary period and go into a long-term contract scheme whether five, a minimum of five-year long term contract which is what we give to clinicians if an alternative scheme is not adopted is too long. We debated that at our last meeting among ourselves and I've decided that we did not take a final position on that so that's a matter on which we would like to hear from you. Another issue in which there is some diversity of opinion perhaps between Bloomington and Indianapolis but may exist elsewhere is the particular scheme of gradation of ranks for lecturers. The Bloomington position, which came out of the Bloomington Faculty Affairs Committee, was that one should attain Senior Lecturer status upon the appointment to the long-term contracts and it would be a matter of promotion in the same sense that we have promotion for the ranks of regular faculty. Our understanding is that the

position of Indianapolis is more the other way that there should be a scheme of promotion for the lecturer ranks that is analogous to the promotion scheme that we have for tenure-track faculty. The position coming out of Bloomington for the clinical ranks was that there should be an option of [inaudible] to have promotion to the ranks of assistant clinical professor onto full clinical professor whereas there is a unit that employs clinical faculty in Bloomington that uses clinical lecturer, which is more consistent with their ongoing scheme so we've not had a...but that's one of the schemes to be full lecturers when they finish. There are a few other more technical matters but I think I've hit the big ones so if you have any time left for discussion or comments.

**PORTER:** We'll take five minutes for questions to be raised or if you have directions that you want to give the committee for things to consider over the summer. Martin?

**SPECHLER:** Well I want to tell Karen and Ted and Ed and others that I think this is an enormous improvement. Really quite an achievement on a difficult issue. I just have one reservation about this business of automatic eligibility for long-term contract. Um, I think in...

**GREENEBAUM:** I'm not if I heard you correctly...it's not automatically eligible for long-term contract, the issue is the title and how you deal with the titles.

**SPECHLER:** Well, let me ask it this way Ed, because I haven't had a chance to study this as much as I should have. Could a person simply be renewed as part-time lecturer from year to year without ever being appointed Senior Lecturer or given a longer term contract?

**GREENEBAUM:** This, as we decided, this is a pretty straight forward adaption of the clinical ranks policy to this matter. The scheme that we adopted several years ago was that for clinical ranks like regular faculty there will be question that when a probationary period is coming to an end whether or not the person would be reappointed to the new status and the language here is...and you have language in here, if I can find the right place, I can't find it very quickly, but that says that should go through the ordinary faculty language about processes. So that it would not just be a matter of [inaudible word] but on the other hand the thought was that if people are qualified to work in these ranks for not only the probationary period but one wants to keep them than they should have the kind of protection of a long-term contract. And this decision was made with clinical ranks several years ago and its been our position that adapting it is appropriate [several inaudible words].

**SPECHLER:** I just simply want to express the feeling that might be a bit in principle for some other campuses. I'd rather have more flexibility of saying to a particularly excellent colleague, yes we will do a long-term contract, we will promote you to Senior Lecturer, but for others where we're not sure, and where it's mutually agreeable of course that continuation of a year-to-year contract is also a possibility.

**GREENEBAUM:** Well, I think that would be a rejection of the overall thing here. That they will be, as a policy matter, you and others consideration of this will have that opinion.

**SPECHLER:** Well, it's similar to...

**GREENEBAUM:** let me say this...the Trustees, the administration, and the faculty in general have been together on the goals of making our Trustees for a period of time are calling Associate Faculty, meaning the people who work with us in not tenure-track basis, more a part of the institution, more of a career track. More of a mutual loyalty, more of an interest in developing

themselves so that they will help perform the mission of the institution. That's obviously the intention with the idea of flexibility. As you look through the end of the Rights and Privileges material where we dealt with the flexibility issue of clinical ranks it's all still there, program changes, changing staffing needs are still appropriate exceptions. But, nevertheless, that leaves a degree where you can't have it both ways, you can't make them a part of the institution, have a career track and say you're temporarily expendable. That's what the tension is about and when push comes to shove you may want to give us directions to do it otherwise but the committees' position and the, I think I say the Academic Officers' Committee, has been happy, and the President as well, has been happy with this approach that we're taking when it comes to...you may decide we're wrong.

**PORTER:** Ed, one quick comment and then we've got to close this discussion.

**FINEBERG:** At the medical school we have a committee on Long-Term Contract and Clinical Promotion Committee and half of the committee are senior clinical professors who have long-term contracts but there is no guarantee that you become a clinical professor even though you are granted a long-term contract. There are certain requirements to be established and it is possible to get one without the other though I suspect in fact that it doesn't happen very often. Of course this is a very new adventure for us and we've only had it in place for a couple of years but I think it's more important to establish the long-term relationship than it is to...having a new title or promotion over [several words inaudible] this committee and people who have achieved full rank clinical professors who will serve on that committee and possibly [tails off].

**GREENEBAUM:** I do just want to be clear that the promotion issue is separate from the probationary long-term contracts.

**PORTER:** We really have to come to closure here because of the other individuals that are coming to [end of Tape I, Side B. About 10 words missed]

**MILLER:** We always love email because it's easy to forward.

**GABLE:** Becky, I simply wanted to tell you where this is on this campus and it's going to the Faculty Affairs Committee this Friday and it will be taken for discussion by the faculty council.

**PORTER:** So, to the extent possible it should continue to be discussed on the various campuses as you've already heard the intention is to bring this back for a vote early in the fall semester so that we can move forward on this item. Thank you Paul. Thank you Ed.

**AGENDA ITEM #6: COMMUNITY COLLEGE UPDATE  
(Cheryl Sullivan, IUPUI Vice Chancellor for External Affairs)**

**PORTER:** Alright we're going to move onto our next agenda item which is community college update. We've asked Cheryl Sullivan, who is the IUPUI Vice Chancellor for External Affairs, and who's been asked by President Brand to really coordinate on a system basis what's going on with the community college response by IU and Cheryl's going to give us a relatively brief update and then we'll have some time to ask her some questions and gather additional information. Thank you Cheryl.

**SULLIVAN:** Thank you very much for the opportunity to talk with all of you this afternoon. I know that Myles Brand was here last month and there was a robust discussion and he certainly

pointed on early on in the discussion that Indiana University supports community colleges and its very, very important that all of us are reminded of that. You may be aware that the Community College of Indiana will be in four sites this fall in 2000 in Indianapolis, Gary, Lafayette, and Evansville. And this follows closely behind in the fall of 2001 four additional sites which include Anderson, Marion, Muncie, and Lawrenceberg. The Commission very quickly points out that indeed this is a partnership between Vincennes and Ivy Tech but it is not a merger. And the purpose as stated by the Commission is to provide acceptable and affordable education and training and they are very clear in what the purpose is on some very, very specifics primarily to improve Indiana standings to meet the national average in the following four areas: first, adult participation in higher education; second, postsecondary participation among 22-49 year olds, very specific age group; third, the annual rate of associate degree production; and fourth [coughing] to be able to meet the national average with community college tuition which in our state will get through this six-year freeze as specified by the last budget bill. The primary population that the commission is addressing are those individuals 25-48 years old with no college experience or those with some college experience but do not have marketable skills. They're also going to target newly graduated high school students who do not have skills to immediately enter the workforce or have not planned on going to college. They are going to try to entice these individuals to have access to the Community College of Indiana. There has been a little been of money, about 2 million dollars that was appropriated during this biannual budget to 1.6 million dollars is being spent now on marketing campaign, very, very dedicated marketing campaign will go on between now and at least January of 2001, at least that's there timeline. A lot of print ads you've probably been seeing at least in the four respective sites. Large, half page print ads that are PSAs that the government has been involved in developing and they intend to spend a lot of time and effort on this one-on-one recruitment. If somebody contacts Ivy Tech or Vincennes or the Community College of Indiana in general someone will certainly be there to help to facilitate their enrollment. This fall what we will see is 25 new Vincennes courses in general education at each of the four sites and the intent is to have 20 students in each of these 25 general ed courses at each of the four sites. They hope to market and at least talk individually to at least 2500 students in order to attract the 500 students that they need in of the sites in order to build those 25 classes and if anyone is interested in seeing a list of those 25 classes I can certainly make that available to you. I think it's important to keep in mind that this entire initiative which is really is a train that has left the station and is gaining momentum every month was created through a very short couple of pages in the budget bill that was passed on the very last day of the 1999 legislative session so I think a lot of us are still coming to determine exactly what some of that language means. But the language was specific in the budget bill. It said it provides opportunities for students to earn associates' degrees that are accepted by four-year colleges and universities...that Vincennes University will offer Associate of Arts and Associate of Science degrees in very specific areas—liberal arts, general education courses, and 200-level mathematics. Ivy Tech, on the other hand, will offer Associate of Science and Associate of Applied Science degrees designed to prepare individuals for the job market. Again, some specific courses are listed in the budget bill, which is really interesting, anatomy, physiology, computer literacy, 100-level mathematics courses, and all remedial education. There was an additional bill that was enacted during this Year 2000 General Assembly for Ivy Tech to provide excessive training services for specific skill certifications and determining skills for these course-specific jobs. So there is very much an emphasis on Ivy Tech providing those assessment and skills training for the work force. It's interesting in looking at the documents provided that are around fiscal impact and most notably was that there was no fiscal impact on this new initiative. There was, a bid in appropriations for about 2 million dollars during the 1999 General Assembly that we are biannually and currently are in for start up expenses. But there was no fiscal impact that was developed through the budget agency and there is some information coming from the

commission, basically information that Stan Jones presented when he testified both last year and this year to the Senate means' committee. And in some of his documents he includes a page for fiscal year 2008-2009 we have really nothing to be [two words inaudible]. But it includes a total cost to the state of 76.3 million dollars which is about 3.6% of the overall 2.1 Billion dollar higher education budget and that includes the fee freeze of about 27 million dollars, enrollment change of about 42 million dollars and new facilities close to 7 million dollars. Some of the recent paper that has been distributed through the commission include often the quote "no new state funds requested" but when you look at the asterisk at the bottom of the page the little footnote it now reads, "excludes new state dollars that may be provided through enrollment change funding" and I think that's something that we obviously will be following very, very closely. We've really identified probably seven issues that we are grappling with, that I am grappling with. One was a piece of legislation that was introduced during this General Assembly by Senator Connie Lawson. It did not pass, it died because of a 4-4 vote but it was to establish local higher education centers where our main or regional campuses, or a state institution of higher education does not exist. And these centers would be governed by Boards of Trustees, appointed by School Corporations, municipalities, and executive decision and indeed these boards then would contract with the state educational institution to serve as a managing entity for the center and to make arrangements for general education courses to be provided leading towards an associates degree. So indeed we could have lots and lots of these local education centers that could be created. Again, this is a piece of legislation that did not pass through committee, but there was a resolution that was introduced towards the end of General Assembly this year calling for summer study that also did not pass, but it was the sense of the legislature that the group, the study committee couldn't [inaudible word] anyway. I fully expect them later in the summer that they will see legislators getting together and so this might be a, may very well come back during this next legislative session. Second area around associate degrees. I think you all have access to the inroads article written by Commissioner Stan Jones and he mentions that in Indiana all 14 public four-year campuses offer these associate degree programs indicating that one consequence of dispersing the associate degree function is that Indiana ranks poorly with respect to serving students ages 25-49, the heart of the state's workforce. And that we have achieved a fee rate structure that allows for no low fee option to students. Obviously Indiana University is interested in continuing to provide associate arts degrees particularly in those fields that are within our missions of our universities, business, health, information technology, law enforcement, that we really have those unique areas but we certainly do see our role to continue providing associate of arts degrees. One point that Myles Brand mentioned and certainly Gerry Bepko as well is that students who start at community colleges are much less likely to complete the baccalaureate degree than those who start in universities. There has also been recent survey data that indicates that 71% of Hoosier employers said they really want employees with four-year degrees and so I think we need to be careful which direction does the state want to go in mass production of associate degrees with perhaps even declining baccalaureate degrees. The commission is moving ahead aggressively, however, in creating new opportunities for students to access associates degree programs, in fact just this month they approved new degree programs to be offered through Vincennes in the following areas: psychology, sociology, history, political science, English, philosophy, liberal arts, and pre-law. And those will be in the four sites that have already been established for this fall. So again, they are moving forward very aggressively, the Commission is approving these new programs. The third area around remedial education the Inroads article again mentioned that the community college would concentrate on remedial instruction in the two-year sector and said that four-year institutions are shifting at least of their remedial instruction to community colleges; this trend is likely to accelerate as Ivy Tech expands its capacity to address deficiencies in basic academic skills. I think Indiana University need to be able to maintain that ability to offer the remedial instruction to work closely with some of the

general concerns of the Commission of Higher Education to ensure that we still are able to provide remedial education. This leads to another point about diversity on campus that if in fact we find ourselves as four-year universities prohibited from offering remedial courses we could see minority students would be required to go to the community colleges in disproportionate numbers and [several words inaudible] on all campuses with enrollment is looking like even now with minority populations as community colleges [one word inaudible]. The fifth area is just about the lack of general, the lack of regional planning and that we do not see the Community College of Indiana should be implemented in a rigid, one size fits all fashion. These foresights as you know were identified and they were approved by the legislative council and Indiana now works toward the new associate of arts degree programs being initiated and that there really was not regional planning and that we are talking with Stan very frequently about the needs for us to sit down at the table and to discuss exactly what the needs are of employers and others, and the students and prospective students in the area to allow for those variations for regional needs for particularly small communities to even support multiple institutions and this is one that's even more important than if we see a bill alternating those local education centers in each county. The sixth area, and I see Vice President Palmer just walked in, is around the budget in general. Carefully following, we'll be carefully following enrollment change and how do we address perhaps the loss of funds. This could happen in a couple areas, one is that we'll see a shift in dollars perhaps from comprehensive or the research campuses to the community colleges of Indiana as we may very well see a shift in enrollment in those, particularly in those four sites and in future sites that are identified. The second area is just in the shift of capitol funds from Indiana University academic buildings into Ivy Tech buildings, more bricks and mortar. At one of the policy committee meetings two months ago, when the question was posed to Commissioner Jones as to whether there would be new buildings created or new buildings that would be on the table for the Commission to approve [coughing, some words inaudible] there probably won't be any new buildings, but certainly that have been improved will be on a much more accelerated schedule. And again we know that the legislature approves not very many capitol projects throughout the state and if Ivy Tech is there table first and there is a prioritization for their buildings we may be at a disadvantage. And then the third around just around the budget is indeed we have seen a carve out of the higher education budget in order to accomplish this 3.6% by the year 2008-2009 or will the overall higher education budget be expanded to accommodate Community College of Indiana. So those three areas under the budget we'll be watching. And then the last area is what you just had a lengthy discussion about and that's on the transferability and articulation. There is an initiative that is moving forward through the Commission and that's to enable them to publicize by all appropriate means, their words, including an electronic website or a master list of course transfer credit in the program and articulation agreements that would be state-wide. A massive website that all of the colleges and universities would be required to have their courses listed on so that any student could call it up. And of course there has been no fiscal impact on that or identification of what [several words inaudible] this huge initiative or whether [several words inaudible]. So that's the information as we currently know it, but certainly the commission is spending a great deal of time and staff resources on the implementation of this. I think that you'll be anxiously awaiting to see in the fall whether they are successful in recruiting students in these four sites for the 25 courses and to see if they are able to recruit the 20 students. So there's just a lot of information that's coming to our attention very, very quickly and I'm trying to stay in touch with the appropriate people so we know what's going on.

**PORTER:** Let's take about five minutes, so make your question a succinct question. Bob?

**ENO:** I have a technical question...you used the term enrollment change funding several times and I don't understand the definition of that



**SULLIVAN:** The legislature appropriates dollars to higher education institutions based on head counts and obviously we are concerned when we start looking at lower tuition than we're able to offer, if you look at the increased accessibility, the increased advertising, that if indeed we start to see a shift in students who choose to go to Ivy Tech for their freshman and sophomore year, the dollars would in fact follow the student. And so those would be dollars coming out of our budget, our proposed budget and into the Community College of Indiana or to Ivy Tech.

**ENO:** When you use the term in terms of the asterisk on the 2008-2009 that means that no new funds into the system except in enrollment change funding, that means shifting funds.

**SULLIVAN:** Correct.

**SHERMAN:** Could I follow that up that at least in one place I believe I've seen an indication from the HEC of the desirability of perhaps campuses like IU-Bloomington and Purdue raising their standards and becoming more selective and therefore enrollment might decrease. Is that part of the shifting?

**SULLIVAN:** That was certainly alluded to in the Inroads article. But again there are not, there is not good data that we've seen publicly at least that we can...

**SHERMAN:** But that's something to keep an eye on.

**PORTER:** Jim?

**RIEMENSCHNEIDER:** In our local paper it said that IEC had frozen Purdue's freshmen class, have they done that at IU yet?

**SULLIVAN:** Has frozen Purdue's freshmen?

**RIEMENSCHNEIDER:** It said they did not accept anymore freshman over what they had now.

**SULLIVAN:** I am aware that that has happened within the last month at Purdue University but I'm not aware of that happening at Indiana University Bloomington. But I don't think that that's a factor of the community college.

**PORTER:** Jim and then Martin

**TOLHUIZEN:** I just wanted to ask, I know there was talk about it at one time is there any, is there still any time or is there any talk still about possibly looking at changing the funding formula for perhaps regional campuses which would directly be impacted by the community college.

**SULLIVAN:** Not at the Commission for Higher Education level. That's something that all the chancellors are looking at as we go into the next legislative session which would be when the budget is enacted but that not come to our attention but it's something that is a concern to the chancellors.

**PORTER:** Martin.

**SPECHLER:** Well I think the community college initiative has some very troubling aspects as you've pointed out maybe the overall concept is ok. I am worried though that we are reacting and reacting rather ineffectively to these things which threaten not only our budget but also the education of many Hoosier youngsters yet to come up to higher education and I wonder whether we couldn't take a more active approach by suggesting alternatives which Indiana University could offer. And I have two in mind. The first is that we be more active in expanding our associate and four-year degree programs into the smaller cities like Marion and Muncie where we haven't been or Anderson which are certainly important population centers where we haven't been or haven't been in any great extent. And offer ourselves as an alternative to Vincennes University; my personal opinion based on figures here at IUPUI and student opinion is the most regrettable aspect of this whole thing is the imposed participation of Vincennes University all over the state whereas Purdue and Indiana University are much better placed to serve the population in most areas of the state so the counter-initiative would be to offer associate and first part of four year degrees in a number of other population centers throughout the state. Possibly these learning centers which don't seem like terrible ideas to me. And the other idea would be to offer as I think my friend is suggesting, that we will take those students at the same rate that they're going to offer them at Ivy Tech-Vincennes University and we will offer them the same kind of remedial and other education and what's more we will offer them a better opportunity to continue their four-year education. It does seem to me that Higher Education Commission is setting up an unfair competition to students who probably can't afford tuition in any case and I think what we ought to do is compete with them on price even if it costs us something to make the point that we are willing to go head to head on price and beat them on quality.

**PORTER:** Alright. Last...

**BALDWIN:** One quick question, is the Commission on Higher Education considering what accreditation will mean for this new...I mean is it a new thing or the Community College of Indiana I mean what's the North Central going to think of this. Have they been involved in this?

**SULLIVAN:** They are, because it's not a merger and it really is a partnership. That they are still looking at Ivy Tech and Vincennes as stand alone entities, so the Community College of Indiana is just an overall term that is being used for marketing purposes and other purposes but they are very clear to the governor, just a couple weeks ago, that they are very, very clear that this is not a merger and at one point someone said it's just like IUPUI. You've got IU and you've got Purdue and it's a partnership.

[LAUGHTER]

**BALDWIN:** But it seems to be an associates' degree...what is that little piece of paper going to say? Ivy Tech for technical ones and Vincennes...so there is no such thing as a community college of Indiana? It's interesting that's it's a separate institution and you devote what is it about 80% of the budget to publicity.

[LAUGHTER]

**PORTER:** We really need to bring this to closure.

**SULLIVAN:** Thank you.

**PORTER:** Thank you Cheryl for updating us and I'm assuming that we will have opportunities to hear from you again as we continue to move forward on this trek.

**AGENDA ITEM #7: REPORT ON UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION REVENUE AND EXPENDITURES**  
**(Vice President Judith Palmer, Chief Financial Officer)**

**PORTER:** Our next agenda item is a report suggested to us by the Budgetary Affairs Committee so we asked Vice President Judith Palmer to come and really talk about what is fondly referred to as the system tax but maybe you'll enlighten us more on this.

**PALMER:** Well thank you very much for the opportunity to spend just a few minutes and I know your schedule is running a little long today so I'll try to be brief but I certainly would like to suggest that any of you if you have questions after this that I don't have a chance to answer please feel free to get in touch with me or my colleague here whom I'd like to introduce Steve Keucher I think many of you may know Steve as the Director of the University Budget Office and what he has just passed out to you is a brief report and I want to first of all just acknowledge the facilities and finance committee and particular Professors Bobay and Rogers for their assistance and all members of the committee. We met earlier this year, talked about some issues that we needed to address in terms of the university tax and this paper that is being passed out attempts to provide at least some beginning information about the tax. It's a little difficult to know exactly how to start the paper and even to start these remarks, but the way I tried to focus it and structure it was as follows. I tried to look at four primary questions that I thought would be really the foundation for any discussion about this. Number One—what is the university tax? Number Two—what does it pay for? How is it calculated and assessed? And then finally how has it changed and why? If you'll permit me I will just quickly go through this and I'll make reference to a couple of the attachments that are included with the paper.

Number One, what is it? Well it is clearly a charge that is assessed against campuses. But the university tax itself is only one component of four major components of if you will university administration or more centralized charges that are assessed. I think sometimes it gets a little confusing when we talk about the tax, exactly what component of those charges are being discussed. So let me try to bring a little clarity. Number one there are appropriations that are made to campuses in the form of allocations. Those are made to campuses because there isn't any other vehicle in the state budget under which to get money to Indiana University. There isn't a line in the state budget that says, Presidents' Office or University Administration. It's all monies that are allocated to the campuses. Currently we have two major appropriations that are allocated to campuses that we if you will transfer back in for centralized administration. Number one is the strategic directions initiative funding that was provided in the first years of Myles Brands' tenure at Indiana University and the second is the additional money we are receiving from the state for our information technology efforts. Now those are dollars that are collected and then channeled back out through programs and initiative and expenses that are then made on behalf of the campuses. So that's really simply an appropriation transfer. Number two is a benefit reserve transfer and we talked a little bit about this in the past in this forum and that's the really the benefit reserve for 18/20 payments. That's a mechanism that's used to collect those dollars so that we can pay the 18/20 benefits to those that are eligible and in fact pay the 20% incentive pay for those that may be receiving that. And the third area are direct service charges that are paid only by the Bloomington campus. Those first two are really transfers that affect all campuses. The third one is a transfer that only affects the Bloomington campus. And, very briefly what that is, is the Bloomington campus in some operational areas of administration

examples payroll, purchasing, and accounting, do not have separate offices for the campus. They use services provided by university administration offices. Whereas you would have an office or an individual that performs that function and we don't charge you anything except if you will the more centralized operational expenses in the form of the tax. So Bloomington campus picks up about 8 million dollars of direct charges that benefit only that campus. Now it's evenly divide out so it's not all of say Steve Keucher or all of a Judy Palmer, it may be a fraction of time, but it's done on some cost allocation basis that really tries to match up the services provided with the campus level of support. The remaining component then is what we call the university tax and for many of you you will recognize this is a new term, previously it was called the system service charge but it's one in the same. So if you have had any of your colleagues thinking that there's a new tax on top of the system service charge that's not the case it's just a name change.

Now what does that pay for? It really pays for costs associated with responsibilities and services which are provided in support for all campuses. And I provided in Attachment A a very broad list of the offices and some of the activities in those offices that are covered by, or paid for by, this university tax. There are certain activities that really have to be done at a university administration level. An example would be when the federal government looks at Indiana University in terms of contract and grant compliance, it is true that they look to the individual grant, but they look to Indiana University for compliance activities. The state of Indiana looks to Indiana University not to individual campuses for purposes of financial reporting, for purposes of investment management, for purposes of issuing debt, all of those things are reviewed in a more corporate nature in terms of a single body that is held responsible. In order to administer that we have to have certain offices that will perform those functions and will in fact in many instances take information or data from each of the campuses and put it into a form where it represents Indiana University at large. In terms of what you get for what you pay for in each case it would be different for specific offices. Let's take for example the University Counsel's office. If litigation were to be filed against you or your campus, you're acting in the scope of your responsibilities and duties, then that immediately is something that the university counsel's office would become involved in. And it may be a situation where she would use attorney's who are on her staff and it's not a large staff or she may elect to use outside counsel. So in some cases a university administration office may be a conduit for some services outside and in other cases they are actually delivering the services. In terms of what supports university administration financially speaking there are two components—one is interest income off cash balances and the second is the university tax. To give you a sense of size, let's talk about interest income first. Interest income represent about 9.5 million dollars if you will on a total budget for university budget of about 48 million dollars. I'm giving you this current years' numbers. If we look at interest income at 9.5 million dollars and you were to look at our balance sheet and you would say gosh, Judy, you've got reserves and probably cash balances that would exceed interest earnings at 9.5 million dollars you'd be right because university administration does not keep all the interest income that is generated off cash balances. A portion of that is shared back with the campuses so for the current fiscal year university administration keeps about 55% of interest earnings and the campuses receive about 45% or about 7.5 million dollars in income turned back if you will from the investment earnings of university balances. The university tax component then is the other major funding source for university administration; keep in mind university administration receives no direct support from the state in terms of state appropriations. And that tax is about 22 million dollars and one question that was forwarded to me from the finance and facilities committee was how much does that represent of the total operating budget for Indiana University and it's less than 2% just to put things in perspective. Now how do we then assess out and calculate what campuses are going to pay in terms of university tax? Well this was a point of discussion about four years ago with the campuses and we had representatives, generally the

Vice Chancellor from your campus would have served with us in looking at this particular issue. Because one of the things we clearly heard from the campuses was that we need number one a more stable and number two a more predictable way of measuring what the impact will be of the university tax or the previously called system service charge. So, Steve Keucher was heavily involved in these discussions and I will confess it took me a little while to figure out where the Vice Chancellor's and Steve were headed with this idea but what they came back with was they wanted to look at something that said Total Operational Activity. Now, I immediately focused on total expenditure activity, and they said no what we want to do is take out peaks and valleys where one year you might have expenditures up for a campus because of some unusual event or another, if you used a revenue base, you may have revenues increase for some reason and that's going to lead to a roller coaster effect potentially in terms of how well you divide out the share of the university tax for each campus. But we thought it was important to somehow focus this on size of campus and make changes only when growth changes occur so that if your campus is getting smaller you want something that's going to contract the amount of charges you have and if you're growing maybe you can absorb a little bit more. Not that taxes aren't in their own nature just painful, but the fact of the matter was something that was rationable and reasonable about how to assess it out. So the group came back and said the best way to do that is look at Total Operational Activity which is a combination of income and expense and that will in fact be historically and they did some modeling of this a better way to allocate that tax. And we all agreed that we weren't going to change it for a modest shift, it would really need to be assessed every year and determine whether it was a large enough shift to make all of the \$2.98 changes in a formula. We have re-based it I believe once since we did that and we are not rebasing it this year; everyone looked at the numbers and thought there wasn't enough change or movement. Next year we'll look at it again, if there's movement we'll change it back and make the adjustments. We then assess that out to the campuses, and at that point for those larger campuses that actually have established responsibility centers than they assess that through the allocation matrix. For the smaller campuses, even though the smaller campuses, regional campuses, have a responsibility structure when we look at our accounting system we know that they don't traditionally talk about it that way so there's some way of assessing those costs on the regional campuses. But at that point, then a responsibility center, or in the case of a regional campus, the regional campus, can make some decisions about how much of that to charge back to non-general funds. So, we are collecting university tax from some non-general funds, it doesn't all hit the general fund.

Now, how has the tax changed and why? And I know there has certainly been discussions and we've had discussions about the seven percent increase that is being assessed right now for university tax. What is changed, what's made that necessary? Well, there are two major factors. Number one I mentioned that our other source of income is interest earnings off cash balances and when the hospital consolidation occurred that took away from the university's cash balances approximately 100 million dollars. So depending on what our interest rate was at a particular point in time let's say an average of 6%, we lost 6 million dollars from the interest income revenue stream. Now, I want to point out that none of that is a loss for the campuses, they did not absorb that loss, all that loss was absorbed at university administration level. The other thing that happens when you lose, as we did, the hospitals from our balance sheet and from our budget, that was a major auxiliary so we not only lost the benefit of the interest earnings off that cash balance we lost them as a center against which to assess the tax and that was about another 1.5 million dollars. Now, you can say, well, then was the hospital consolidation a good move? Well, trade on that versus the viability of the School of Medicine from the standpoint of having adequate patients to do their instruction, their clinical work that has to be done, we could I am sure all of you have your own views about this, but at that point we were looking at a situation where we

needed to make some move with our hospitals. And some alternatives might have involved taking that off the balance sheet with or without consolidation. I recall having many discussions and some times pretty difficult discussions because the Dean of Medicine wanted that interest income and made a very powerful argument and not an unreasonable argument that to be competitive in today's health care arena if they weren't functioning as a hospital in that arena then we were sort of tying one hand behind their back with the loss of that interest income. So from my perspective as Vice President and Chief Financial Officer of the University I looked at that probably going away anyway and I also looked, as many of my colleagues in other institutions, are looking right now that still have academic medical centers on their balance sheets, the potential of joining a club that we really don't want to belong to and that's a club that is having to subsidize their hospitals. And I was told recently that there's something like 100 million dollar club because there are some institutions now that are seeing that kind of subsidization having to take place because of hospital cash difficulties or balance sheet difficulties. So that was a major loss. We stepped back at that time and we were also looking at changing the allocation of the tax and at that point we decided to take this whole issue to the committee and we worked through with them what would be a reasonable approach. And what came forth was a recommendation that there be a 7% increase for four years in the university tax and if you take the 7% increase in university tax, compound it over the four year period, it's about 8 million dollars that just about equals where we were with the hospital with the earlier numbers and we're on track with meeting that situation. We'll be going, as of July 1<sup>st</sup>, into the third year of the four-year formula. The other thing that has been a revenue loss for Indiana University has been the fact that we can only invest in fixed income instruments. We have through our Trustees approving our investment policy have really moved ahead to try to expand that as much as we feel comfortable doing under the statutory requirements of state law. And, but the fact [END OF TAPE 2, SIDE A, ABOUT 3:55 PM; approximately 10-20 words lost]. If you look at growth numbers, and I tried to include some of this in the material for you, if you look over ten years how is the university administration budget grown in comparison to the university budget. It's grown at about 3 percentage points less than the total university budget. That was over a ten-year period; we looked at it for a 5-year period, it's grown at about 2 percent less than the university budget. So it is growing at a slower pace, I was also asked to speak a little bit about some of the ways we do manage growth inside the university administration in addition to just the university tax and growing interest income. President Brand meets with each one of the directors or vice presidents of the units reporting to him each year, has budget conferences with them, we have reallocation requirements for many years we have had cash reallocation requirements. In addition I think sometimes almost as difficult to deal with are the programmatic reallocations that he has required of each unit. What he is really proposing and asking each of us to respond to and each unit has done so is to think about how we're going to handle new needs that we have without new money. And that means dropping some of the things we're currently doing and reassessing what is most important for university administration to do. One of the things that we wanted to do with the university tax which we started to see in the early 1990s beginning to creep up a little bit frankly and that was the idea of university administration units charging for services outside the tax or the system service charge—a user fee. You can get a lot of hydrolic effects when you start that, I mean, the tax may go down, but you may be or not increase as much, but then you end up paying more in user charges. In some cases that may be totally appropriate, but what we wanted to do was make sure we had a handle on that so it didn't just pop up in a serendipitous manner, that we knew exactly where it was occurring and why it was occurring. An example of that that we're now using, and some of you may have had some experience with this, is a couple of years ago Christopher Simpson, with the increased focus on communications and marketing. We have spent some additional dollars in that area, but the question was we were getting more and more requests, his office was, for publication documents.

And, frankly the budget was not going to accommodate all that. So how did we determine which publications to do and which ones not to do or what kind of sorting out process to use. Christopher asked people from our staff to work with people in his office to look at an activity based cost analysis which we did for him. And they came back with a proposal which is now in its first full year and its going into its second year of implementation that said for the university tax there's a certain level of assumed publications, these are the ones we had historically and traditionally done—catalogs for the campuses and the general documents. Anything over and above that there would be a fee for service. Everyone could get an estimate as to what that publication would cost and they could shop it outside or they could bring it to Christopher's office or do both and decide what the best price was. Now that's an example where it's probably a good idea to use a user fee as long as you don't erode what you're doing in terms of the very traditional publications that were really the basis for part of the university tax. I mentioned reallocation requirements, I'll give you an example from my area. I mentioned contracts and grants earlier and compliance issue there is something that we need to do to represent Indiana University on behalf of all of our campuses. As you know we've had tremendous success, thanks to many of you in the room, in terms of your efforts to attract federal grants and contracts. We've seen activity levels in the compliance area, the post-award area, that is housed in my office, increase by 38%. Our staff has decreased by 18%, on an FTE basis. Now, part of that we've been able to do through technology and part of it with just stretching. But the fact of the matter is we felt we could do it safely and we've been able to do it. Unlike many other institutions, all of the indirect cost funding that comes to Indiana University goes back to the campuses and you will find in several institutions they will keep a portion of that to support some of these administrative offices. I will just close by saying that all of us are quite mindful of the pressure that everyone's budget is experiencing and with Cheryl's report we're concerned about what the future holds for us, not just on that issue certainly, but on the economy generally and what we can expect. Therefore, I think many of you are probably aware, but there will be an article in HomePages this week really describing the Task Force the president has recently appointed to review non-academic administrative services for the university administration, Bloomington and IUPUI campuses. The goal of this is very simple, it is to look to see if we have opportunities for more integration where we can development a critical mass on administrative functions and do it and perform those functions a higher quality service environment plus a more cost-efficient environment. And, as you will see in the article, President Brand has indicated that cost savings that result from this on campuses will stay with those campuses to be reinvested into the academic missions. We clearly understand, and I say we because I am part of that administrative structure, we don't exist for any reason except to support all of you and to support what you need to get done. And, if we can do that better, undertaking a look at this review and implementing it, that's what we're going to do. And, with that I would just ask for any questions and would certainly welcome that now or later.

**SHERMAN:** First I'm really happy that you changed the name, I am a great believer in taxes, I like taxes. I dislike the very much the fact that tax is a dirty word in this country and that we believe that the fewer taxes you pay the better life you'll have which I don't believe so to call it tax is good, I like it. Now I notice, on the other hand with taxation I've always believed in progressive taxation and this is not progressive taxation. Can you comment on the fact that it's not? Does it not hurt the smaller campuses more?

**PALMER:** Well, everyone is having about...this represents about 2% for everyone

**SHERMAN:** So it's a flat tax.

**PALMER:** I don't know I feel a little awkward trying to respond on behalf of the regional campuses, I would say however and I haven't heard a lot about this directly. But when I do hear about it it's more than likely from a larger campus than from a smaller campus so I think it has to do maybe with the dollars as opposed to the percent sometimes. I don't really know, I guess I would really like to hear from others here...

**SHERMAN:** Well, I've never been a believer in flat taxes, and this is a flat tax.

**PALMER:** Yes, this is a flat tax.

**PORTER:** Martin.

**SPECHLER:** Well, thank you for coming and explaining this matter. I see an Attachment A and most of these activities are fairly well spread over the campuses and arguably should be centralized. But at the bottom we have the budget for the Graduate School including fellowship funding. Now, if I'm not mistaking Fellowship Funding is a rather large item in the 22 million. Can you explain why Fellowship Funding should not be at the campus level? Why it should be centralized in university administration?

**PALMER:** I believe, well I'm going to defer to Steve on this, but I believe that represents only a very small portion of fellowship funding.

**KEUCHER:** The Presidents' commitment to the Bloomington campus for that \$400,000 a year that's all that is represented in the university administration fund.

**SPECHLER:** So the central administration is in fact paying only a rather small portion of the graduate fellowships that are awarded each year.

**PALMER:** Yes

**PORTER:** Bob

**ENO:** I am very grateful that you came to do this; this is very clear information. I have a particular question but before I do it I'd like to comment on Jim's remark that I think that the university tax should be on profits

**SHERMAN:** on what?

**PORTER:** on profits.

**SHERMAN:** Well of course. And we'll all pay nothing.

[laughter]

**PORTER:** But we won't repeat that for the IRS

**ENO:** The thing I'd like to ask you about concerns the hospital consolidation. Myles mentioned to us at the beginning of this academic year also. When he described it, he described in much the terms that you did, but he described it as financially advantageous overall for the university. He mentioned the 100 million dollar of the total...I understand that we lost, from the standpoint of



the central administration the 6 million dollars approximately in interest income per year and also the assessment that is no longer, because that unit is no longer assessable. What is the financial gain that we received from the hospital consolidation at this point that might offset that? That might, fewer expenses in supporting the hospital to all the various other units on campus that makes this a good financial deal for the university.

**PALMER:** Well, that's a good question. One of the things that is not really reflected in here is that on the margin is that there were some savings in university administration, but I'm very careful to say that's very much on the margin because, and I'm going to look over this for a minute. That was the argument the hospital always raised with me, that they were paying for services that they really did not get and that we were overcharging them. It was back to this idea of system service charge; they were really gone before it was a tax and now they argued that they did a lot of those things for themselves and they didn't avail themselves of university administrations' services. Frankly, I don't think they were wrong about that statement. So it wasn't a dollar for dollar tradeoff. For instance, we do know now, in the architects' office, we no longer do the construction for the hospital so you don't need to spend as many dollars in that arena of university administration. Frankly I think there was more impact and the campus here saw more ability to restructure and in some case downsize some units that were providing service to the hospital. If you step back though and talk about what was the overall benefit I think the 100 million dollar club is one major benefit and I can only repeat what I've been told from the standpoint of academic support but having the right mix of patients, an available flow of patients, to do the teaching and the other clinical activities that really need to be a part of a major medical center is really a major plus for Indiana University and I'm not sure how you put dollar and cents figures with that, but I think it is a key ingredient of making Indiana University what it is.

**ENO:** So the answer is prospective future losses rather than any current savings.

**PALMER:** I think that's a fair statement. There were some savings that were on the margin, but I think it was the deferral of additional financial burden.

**PORTER:** I think the weight of the afternoon may be upon us. I see no other indication of questions. Thank you very much, we greatly appreciate it.

**AGENDA ITEM #8: SYSTEM AFFIRMATIVE ACTION REPORT**  
**(Professors Paul Eisenberg and Gail Williamson, Affirmative Action Committee)**  
**(Julie Knost, Director, Affirmative Action)**

**PORTER:** We do have one final item, if you're looking at your agenda you might note that it says by 4:15 we're moving into Executive Session however, the information that we needed to review to consider the honorary degrees was not available in sufficient time for us to consider honorary degrees today so you can anticipate that you will be receiving that information and a mail ballot. And as our final agenda item of today, and this academic year, we're going to have a report on Affirmative Action, giving us a system wide perspective...Paul Eisenberg and Gail Williamson are the co-chairs of our Affirmative Action Committee and Paul why don't you introduce the report and introduce Julie.

**EISENBERG:** I shall be happy to do so. Let me begin by asking if there is anyone here that hasn't yet received a copy to, that says data, along with the report will be the substance of it. OK, unfortunately, Gail Williamson could not be with us this afternoon and so I shall proceed to

make the introductory points. This is intended to be the first in an annual series of reports concerning affirmative action matters at Indiana University. For a number of years now, in Bloomington at any rate, there has been such an annual report and the Affirmative Action Committee decided early in this academic year that it would be quite appropriate that a comparable report would be issued here. But we are finding our way and if some of you think that other sorts of data needs to be provided or the kinds of changes made in the content of the report that will be issued please let me or Julie know. Let me begin with a few words about the enrollment of minority students on the various campuses. You have that information in one of the packets that you received this afternoon. As you can see such enrollments vary quite considerably from campus to campus at IU. For example, at Northwest the Hispanic student population is currently at 9.4, currently at Northwest and IUPUI the figures of enrollment for African American students are much, much higher than they are at other campuses. So it's extremely hard to offer a single brief statement that would serve as an adequate summary. That said, I think it has to be acknowledged that at most of our campuses we believe the numbers of minority students who are enrolled are very small. In a similar way the ratios between male and female faculty members on the various campuses also vary considerably. If I am reading the figures that Julie Knost's office has provided for me correctly than I think it would be the case that on our East campus there is almost equality in numbers of male and female faculty. On other campuses, that's very far from being true. Apparently, on all campuses, minority appointments for faculty are very skimpy in comparison to the number of faculty appointments overall. Let me, with full understanding that this is the University Faculty Council and not the Bloomington Faculty Council, add what I just said a few pieces of information about the situation in Bloomington, information which may or may not be applicable to all other campuses. There, according to the most recent report, almost 19%, but only at most 19% of women are in full professorial or distinguished rank, whereas 51.5% of the faculty of the men. And when one looks at new hires by sex and race for Bloomington in the most recent year, one sees that 14 appointments at full professorial rank, 12 went to White persons, and again of the 14, 9 were male and 5 were female. When one considers the information of associate professors on the Bloomington campus, there were 15 such appointments, 12 went to Whites, 10 males were appointed and 5 females. And even in the situation of lecturer, at the bottom of the traditional academic hierarchy, where 12 people were appointed, 9 of them were White, 8 males were appointed and 4 females. To the extent that these figures are characteristic it appears, not at all surprisingly, that more needs to be done if we want to promote the relative ratios of women faculty to male faculty on the various campuses and certainly we want to improve the number of minority faculty on the various campuses similar remarks of course apply to women and minority students on at least most of IUs campuses. Although the figures in many cases may disappoint us, it has certainly to be acknowledged and Julie will be emphasizing this in just a moment, that the central administration is simply firmly committed to Affirmative Action principles and on every campus as far as I know there is real effort being made to improve the situation. But it's not a situation that improves all that easily or all that rapidly. I think that's about all I want to say as an introduction and now Julie can supply some further information for us.

**KNOST:** Just a couple comments on the statistics. I realize that when I looked over these, that one of the things that's happening on the tables is that sometimes you're getting total numbers and sometimes you're getting percentages and it's important to actually try to figure out both and next year I will try to provide those. One example, that will make all of you feel really good I know, I'm being cynical of course, is that if you look at the total numbers both on minority and on male/female composition in the faculty you have to look at the fact that on, especially on the Bloomington and the IUPUI campus, we have shrinking faculties by fairly big differences

between 1998-1999. And so while your total numbers are not changing, as percentage of faculty you should have seen an increase. So it's very important to look at both the percentage increases as well as the total number of faculty. The same is true, Cheryl Sullivan mentioned with the student enrollments, and that is that if you track the enrollment patterns by campus, Bloomington enrollments were up this year and some campuses were down and these fluctuations because our numbers are very small on minority students are going to effect that percentage so that you see that sort of flat line occurring. And it probably also has something to do with recruitment strategies something I want to talk about with hiring issues too. Paul and I have given this report before at the BFC and we kind of balance each other out because he points out the need and I try to point out what the good work is that we're doing and I wanted to also really emphasize that the work that everyone does on the faculty with the Affirmative Action office and also particularly in your departments is essential to any success that we can possibly have. A couple highlights of what's been going on this year and then just to tell you about a few things that I think we need to focus on for next year. One is that besides entry-level hires, this year we've tried to look at more carefully, and need to continue to look at administrative appointments because there's a great deal of turnover going on on all of our campuses in administrative positions especially at the deans level. And so for example I know on many campuses we've had various deans, there have been multi-campus dean searches going on as well. The SPEA search is still outstanding and has a pretty good diverse pool. The School of Education search has been completed and that resulted in an appointment of a Cuban American man into that position. And that was a committee that worked very actively to seek out a very diverse pool of candidates and also a very balanced candidate list in terms of men and women. And, certainly there are going to be more of those. We've seen Chancellor searches very recently on campuses and we're going to continue to see many administrative searches going on. Second of all, that as of the end of this week, I think when budget construction is actually finally coming to a close we will have done peer reviews for all faculty and professional staff in regard to gender and ethnicity on all campuses. And for some of the campus I know this was completed already a couple years ago, the Bloomington and Indianapolis campus this will bring into the fold those last two campuses in completing that process. Another activity that began this year and will continue through the next couple years that you may have heard about, that you may not have heard about, is that all campuses are involved in a American with Disabilities Act Self-Assessment. And that self-assessment is quite elaborate. It's all campuses, all units, all programs. It looks not primarily at facilities, it does not look primarily at the building, it looks primarily at things like publications. It looks at employment, it looks at publicity out to students for recruitment, there are 730 unit contacts throughout the system cited in departments that are answering this self-survey and out of that we will be able to assess what we need to do as an institution which will be sort of phase two of next year. It's the most comprehensive survey we've done.

Moving onto next year there are a few highlights. I'm very interested in your conversations about the change in ranks and I am interested in many ways I think it's a very important piece of that and I've talked with Ted and with Ed Greenebaum about us continuing to include affirmative action as a primary goal and affirmative action monitoring in all ranks that are related to academic appointment. What we've seen with the proliferation of these sort of more marginalized ranks is that they fall outside that process and so it will be important for us to review that. A second place that's occurring is as shifting, as funding shifts for how we hire faculty, in particular, we're now involved in a very large endowment campaign so we're hiring distinguished ranks for named chairs. This all falls outside the affirmative action monitoring because they are exempted out. That may be something we want to do, it may be something we want to reconsider I'm just saying right now because of these things occurring we're not even

thinking about it. And so, we're tending to have faculties that are being staffed more at the higher levels without any real conscious thought about what impact that may have in our diversity issues. Similarly, a number of programmatic changes...funding that's coming from outside, in particular funding that's coming from either the state or specialized, the Lilly Grants, where we're hiring...I can think of Gerry Bepko just in the HomePages mentioned the IPCRESS hiring which are occurring, six full professor ranks on the Indianapolis campus and there will be six on the Bloomington campus. And again while it's wonderful to have this funding this is primarily funding where these people will eventually be cited on the faculty on campuses after the funding runs out and will be falling completely outside the process. So those are things we have to think about; there will be more initiatives like that that are going to occur simply because of the way that funding is coming into the university. Other things going on...human resources passed a policy last year requiring legal compliance training for all supervisors of employees. What does that mean? It means that in every department if people supervise they must go through a training period to learn about, not only affirmative action but compliance with discrimination laws, and so our office is assuming responsibility for that training. We're also working very collaboratively with Vice President Nelms on diversity training on all campuses and have tried to systematically implement that at various levels. It's a huge job because we have just so many people and small numbers of staff. And then finally we'll be working on as I said the ADA Phase II which will be implementing changes specifically to bring the university back into better compliance on Americans with Disabilities Act issues. There's lots to talk about, but I'll cut it off for today.

**PORTER:** Questions for Julie.

**BALDWIN:** Could you explain, I guess I didn't realize this, but individuals hired on grant money, soft money these positions are not required to do anything with affirmative action?

**KNOST:** Well, sometimes they're not. They are put through as a waiver of the affirmative action process so yes, for grants, examples would be specific lab funding or grant funding that would come through the sciences could be exempted out because they're considered unique individuals that may be being brought in as part of a lab process. It's not unusual for it also to occur where we're hiring a particular person especially at the advanced ranks either distinguished or full rank so literally are moving a lab with them so you're transferring people into a faculty; it's great for the academic mission, but it does sort of then bring into question whether you are filling slots without having any consideration on the diversity issue.

**BALDWIN:** Beyond diversity it encourages a continuation of the old boys network

**KNOST:** Well that is exactly what I mean. I'll be real honest it is a real Catch-22 because contacting people is very effective recruitment, the problem is making sure that people who are contacting people through that recruitment process are recruiting actively across a wide-spectrum of people not just calling whoever they happen to know as a colleague at a particular university and that does happen. The named chairs positions that certainly has been somewhat of a problem.

**PORTER:** Ted.

**MILLER:** Well how is it determined that a named chair position will be exempt?

**KNOST:** If you look of the academic guide there are examples of waivers and distinguished rank is one of them that it qualifies as a waiver.

**MILLER:** So we have a policy that identifies the kinds of positions that...and so it would be automatically granted in such a case.

**KNOST:** Usually what happens is that it's submitted as a waiver and they have to include a justification of why the waiver should apply. But sometimes what's happening, that I don't even know the hirings are occurring until the offers' been made and that makes it impossible for me to do anything about it. Now that most likely is going to happen where you have external funding that's driving the force so that it's kind of not incorporated into the formal departmental process although usually the department is involved somehow because they are generally having to take a vote on the tenurability of the person and generally it has to at least run through some sort of policy committee again for review at the school level. But it definitely occurs.

**PORTER:** Julie, you have responsibility as the affirmative action officer on the Bloomington campus. IUPUI has its own affirmative action office. You then have responsibility for each of the regional campuses.

**KNOST:** Yes, actually what we do is just work very collaboratively because there is just no way I can possibly know what's going on on campuses so we work on project specific. The ADA assessment is a good one it was designed and put together by all of the affirmative action officers on all of the campuses and some other people who are directly involved in student disability services or other very active roles on the campuses. So it started with that committee structure that set up the project and then from there went to a task force structure of administrators on campuses so I sort of coordinate those types of across the board projects. The second would be broad university policy questions that would ultimately come here whether it's the question of religious accommodations or I certainly think this rank is one of them that affects, because it's a policy that's across the board, it has to be discussed at that level and then reviewed at that level. I meet with all the affirmative action officers, we have meetings twice a year. Plus I have, it varies, but phone contact, I see people on campuses for various things periodically and I have phone contact. It varies but it's not unusually to have phone contact once a month.

**PORTER:** Any other concluding questions?

**MILLER:** I've got one more...you say that the ADA survey...when I think about ADA I always think about buildings...and you're saying that this goes beyond the buildings. What is the objective of this generally?

**KNOST:** It asks things like when you have an applicant to your department and they need to have an accommodation are you prepared to do that? Do you even know who to call? It's at all different levels. When you have an employee show up and needs to take a typing test in human resources do you have the ability to accommodate that person? On your publications do you include alternative formats? Do you provide parking? There are facilities parts to it, it does assess, the large facilities assessment which is part of a specific plan did everything up to the doorways into offices so for example none of the classrooms have been assessed, none of the computer sites have been assessed, the inside of the library was not assessed. All that's being done now. So we have questions like do you have computer labs...do you have control over a computer lab? If you do, how many are accessible to a wheelchair? How many have alternative technology equipment? In Jim Sherman's department if you have labs set up can they be

redesigned to accommodate a faculty member that has a handicap. Is there someone in your department that knows, if a request is made, how to arrange that? So, it's much more comprehensive.

**BALDWIN:** Is this survey also addressing students? Relationships to faculty and classrooms?

**KNOST:** Yes.

**PORTER:** Well President Brand is always good about making sure that we are done on time and I want to keep that tradition alive so thank you all for being here and thank you for a very productive year and please identify where the attendance sheet is...thank you very much we stand adjourned.

[There was no Agenda Item #9 due to papers not getting distributed.]

Adjournment, 4:28 pm