Minutes
Indiana University
University Faculty Council
University Place Conference Center 132
Indianapolis Campus
November 9, 1999
1:30 – 4:30 P.M.

1. Agenda Committee Business
(Professors Rebecca Porter and S. James Sherman)

2. Question/Comment Period
(Professors Rebecca Porter and S. James Sherman)

3. Discussion of Issues Related to Development of Policy on Non-Tenure-Track Faculty
(Professors Karen Gable and Theodore Miller, Faculty Affairs Committee)
http://www.indiana.edu/~deanfac/acadhbk/appnuniv/acappoints.html
http://www.indiana.edu/~deanfac/acadhbk/appndxa.html

Report on Golf Course/Country Club Planned for the Bloomington Campus

Attendance

Members Present: Jim Baldwin, Henry Besch, Paul Blohm, Mike Downs, Dan Drew, Paul Eisenberg, Robert Eno, S. Ed Fineberg, Bernd Fischer, Michael Foos, Michael Gordon, Dick Heinz, Loren Henry, Sara Hook, Dolores Hoyt, Ryann Johannes, Steve Johnson, Paul Joray, Juanita Keck, Marilyn Kintzele, Ted Miller, Keith Moore, Jim Patterson, Rebecca Porter, Victor Riemenschneider, Timothy Rivard, Jim Sherman, Martin Spechler, Frank Wadsworth, Kathleen Warfel, Nanci Yokom, Kurt Zorn.

Members Absent With Alternates: Robin Crumrin for Mary Stanley

Members Absent Without Alternates: Gerald Bepko, Bruce Bergland, Julianne Bobay, Julia Bondanella, Myles Brand, Carolyn Calloway-Thomas, David Fulton, Tom Gieryn, Kenneth Gros-Louis, LaMaze Johnson, Jacob Manaloor, Nathan Manners, Nancy Newton, David Oberstar, Kenneth Perrin, Ruth Person, F.C. Richardson, Dennis Senchuk, Catherine Souch, James Tolhuizen, George Walker, Guy Wall, Michael Wartell, Jeffrey Watt.

Visitors/Guests/Others: J. Terry Clapacs, Lynn H. Coyne, David Frisby, Karen Gable, Marianne Wokeck, (three guests did not sign the attendance sheet).

Tape # 1, Side A

Agenda Item # 1: Agenda Committee Business

REBECCA PORTER: I would like to call the University Faculty Council into session. As you will notice, we have President Brand here in spirit if not in body. He is on the West coast, and I really have to apologize, but I can't remember exactly where he is or the reason that he needed to be gone, but it was really important and was not an opportunity that, it was an opportunity that he needed to take, and he is, was reluctant not to be here, but we thought that we would be able to carry out our business without him, even though we know we will miss him. In terms of the Agenda Committee business, the Agenda Committee met prior to this meeting, just a couple pieces of information that we wanted to share with you. I was at attendance at the last trustees meeting. One of the items that we have all been interested in is the review the trustees are undertaking of degrees that fall into a category of infrequently used degrees or seldomly granted degrees. A list was generated by the Commission on Higher Education, and the trustees are looking at reports that have been generated by the administration on each of the campuses. Each of the campuses have made a case as to whether or not this is a degree that indeed should be eliminated or a degree that should be retained. The discussion took place in the University Policies Committee of the trustees. They looked at the degrees from the regional campuses, and at their December meeting will be reviewing the degrees from the I.U.P.U.I. and the I.U. Bloomington campus, and then the trustees as a whole will take action based on their review. Anther item that we wanted to let you know about is a new format or a slightly revised format for chancellor's reviews is going to be tried this year in the review of the chancellor from I.U. East. President Brand talked with the Agenda Committee, and the Agenda Committee thought it would be a good idea to try this time having a consultant to assist the committee in their review of the chancellor. The consultant will be reporting to the Review Committee, so this is not, there's the review committee and there is the consultant, and these are two separate processes, but should be a way that committee has someone to assist them in the review. The Agenda Committee talked about a number of questions and procedures that will have to be worked out. We are in the process of kind of developing some guidelines as we go through. We will use the I.U. East experience to help us understand what those guidelines should be. They will then be referred to a committee for an opportunity to consolidate, change, adjust, and then will eventually come to this body as we decided we need a document that will formalize the role of the consultant. Jim, is there anything else you want to add? Well, that completes the Agenda Committee business, and moves us into the question and comment period. Are there any questions you all would like to ask? Marty?

Agenda Item # 2: Question/Comment Period

MARTIN SPECHLER: Well, at the end, I guess I missed the chance to make a little trouble for the president in public, but,

REBECCA PORTER: But you don't have to take the opportunity to make trouble for us.

MARTIN SPECHLER: No. I think we should take advantage of this very intimate meeting to think about what the will of the faculty is for a change, and I'd like to ask Becky and Jim whether you've considered making any kind of independent representation of faculty opinion about the

community college initiative. This community college initiative is quite a threat to some of our campuses in the short run, and to all of our campuses in the long run, not only our financial stability, which is very obvious, but also our academic standards, which are precious. As you probably all know, there's now a quarrel between our administration and the Higher Education Commission, a quarrel that seems to get wider and wider with the weeks, and I think we're loosing sight in this sort of personal dispute of the real issues involved, which are, is primarily the education of young Hoosiers, and I understand that there are now hearing, maybe adjourned, but hearings in the Senate Finance Committee about the IVY Tech-Vincennes operation, and I wondered whether you thought it would be appropriate, Jim and Becky, to represent faculty opinion directly to the legislature, or whether we have to be content with voicing our opinion only through our top administrators?

REBECCA PORTER: The Agenda Committee did ask the University Planning Committee of the U.F.C. to discuss and follow the community college discussions and look at their impact on the I.U. campuses, and that was discussed in a meeting of the University Planning Committee. They have not brought anything forward for this body to act on, so we do not at this point have a motion or a statement to adopt. I would hope that the faculty on each campus have been involved in their campus-wide response to the community college initiative, and those responses, I understand, are being consolidated for a system-wide response.

MARTIN SPECHLER: Well, I hope you'll have some kind of role in that consolidation.

JIM SHERMAN: I would say that I'll know better after next week. Next week there's a meeting in Indianapolis, at which a number of I.U. faculty will attend, and that'll be the major topic of discussion, and then I know the day after that, Stan Jones is coming down to the Bloomington campus to speak to a number of faculty about community college issues. So I think once I'm able to get more information, and more feeling for what's going on and what role faculty could play, I'd be in a better position to answer your question. I think it, yes, faculty should play a role, I'm not sure exactly what that is at this point. I would add to that that I'm equally concerned about the faculty role in the program evaluation that's going on. I've said this before. I think what's happened historically in terms of this program evaluation, was that, you know, the A.T.C. made a list of all these programs that it wanted looked at, and Stan Jones was going to be the point person to do it, and then again, one of these power struggles, and suddenly it's the trustees that are going to be doing it, and, you know, from what I understand, I wasn't at the trustees' meeting, but the kinds of information that they're asking faculty to provide are a little bizarre, to say the least, and while the A.T.C. and the trustees are fighting over who should tell what programs to keep and not, who's left out of the picture? The faculty. We're playing no role in this except providing information that other people can use to decide on the worth of programs that faculty should have the greatest degree of control over. I'm very concerned about that. You know, community college initiative is not something that is generated from the faculty. This, the curriculum and programs should be. So in some ways, I'm more disturbed by that than I am about the community college, although I agree, it's a threat, potential threat to all the campuses.

MARTIN SPECHLER: If I may, Jim, follow up on that since you brought up the question of the program evaluations. I think people should realize that what you call program evaluation is consideration only of fairly marginal programs, which are being reviewed only because of the

small number of graduates. I would that we were reviewing the programs which have a lot of students, and which are the sum and substance of our effort, but in fact, this, what you call program evaluation is a fairly marginal enterprise.

JIM SHERMAN: I think some of the programs that are evaluated are far from marginal. They may be, they may involve relatively small numbers of people for various reasons, but I think a lot of them are far from marginal.

REBECCA PORTER: Henry.

HENRY BESCH: I would agree with the last comment, just because all of our programs, indeed programs in the School of Medicine, for example, fall into this marginal category, and we're pretty proud of the hundred and thirty-nine doctoral students that have graduated from our program, but the comment I wanted to make, was, actually the question, are you sure that the Higher Education Committee Meeting, the next A.T.C. meeting is next Wednesday instead of tomorrow? I had it on my calendar for tomorrow in this building. I believe that the speakers Coolidge has invited to that meeting is also coming here tomorrow.

JIM SHERMAN: There may be an additional meeting tomorrow. Bob, this is a different meeting?

ROBERT ENO: Different meeting.

JIM SHERMAN: This is not an A.T.C. meeting. This is a,

ROBERT ENO: A.T.C. sponsored meeting with faculty around and from around the state.

JIM SHERMAN: Now, evidently,

HENRY BESCH: But there is a regularly scheduled A.T.C. meeting tomorrow, at which the topic is not especially one that'll be discussed tomorrow. In fact, it's not on the schedule.

JIM SHERMAN: Yes. This is a different meeting. I'm sorry, can be confusing.

REBECCA PORTER: Any other questions? Yes?

NANCI YOKOM: Our faculty from the I.U. Southwest campus in Greenwood have questions about how politically active they can be in community college campus. This was raised also that -202- need to be, and so a lot -203- common union is appropriate or -204- at some point, or -205- an appropriate way that we can get involved in -206-.

JIM SHERMAN: I'd certainly be open to it. I don't know.

REBECCA PORTER: Certainly if there's a position brought forward to the U.F.C., we could consider it. I had a discussion with President Brand about was he concerned about faculty speaking out, and my interpretation of our conversation was he did not express concern about faculty speaking out. He felt certainly faculty had a wealth of knowledge, and it was appropriate

for them to share that knowledge in structuring how we can best, as I think Marty said, how we can best serve the needs of our students. There may be different structures that fit different locations. I mean, we may need to have some variations along the way, but I did not hear any reluctance, that there was any reluctance from the administration to have faculty engaging in this conversation.

TED MILLER: Well, it's often difficult to, it's sometimes difficult to know and to understand exactly what one is saying to -221- <laughter>. It was my, it was my definite impression that, I believe it was the last U.F.C. agenda meeting that President Brand actually expressed some concern about the lack of activity and the involvement and interest being shown on the part of the faculty in this community college, in what I heard him to be saying was that he would encourage us to be more interested.

REBECCA PORTER: Yes

MIKE DOWNS: He did that, and I was at that meeting when he said a couple of other things as well. He said that his position on the community college was that problem structures and targeting was a good idea. He said there are areas of the state where what a community college can do would be good for education in the state. He said the second reason that we should, that we needed to understand, is that there's going to be a community college system, and the important arguments would be as to how it was structured, and what it did, and where it was located, and he certainly encouraged the faculty to -239- in regard to those matters.

REBECCA PORTER: I think it's, sorry, I haven't quite scanned that far.

ROBERT ENO: It seems to me that one of the problems we have responding to this, regardless of whether or -243- do so or not, is that we don't have good information gathering -244- process going on in the U.F.C. -245-. Do we have a committee that's considering the community college issue, a way for us to decide whether or not we want to take this on as part of our voice and gather information, -246- recommendation, -247-?

REBECCA PORTER: It was assigned to University Planning Committee, also with a, it was assigned to University Planning Committee. So we asked them to, you know, be our official watchdogs, but it is difficult to stay up on all the information and try to funnel. So I think if you have concerns coming out of particular campuses, it would always be helpful to provide that information to that group. Jim?

JIM BALDWIN: The problem with the community college issue is this, there's no bear there yet, you know. I mean people are reacting to rumors, and, you know, the thing is sketched out so poorly that it's hard to get a notion of it. We know some things that they want to do. We don't know if they're going to do it. Apparently, there's some second thought in the legislature about it. So it might be held up even further. One of the point, when President Brand was talking in Agenda Committee about the lack of interest in this, he was specifically referring to the Bloomington faculty <laughter>. I mean, -262- the other campuses -263-. <laughter>

TED MILLER: Did I neglect to mention that? <laughter>

JIM BALDWIN: I mean, I would have a series of town meetings on that very issue, discussing what we know about it, what our reaction is, will it be good or bad for us, what we have -266-. So I think this campus is very much aware of that, particularly since they want to start here in our front yard or back yard.

HENRY BESCH: Is the meeting that, in which it's confirmed, is that public or private, or organized by faculty or by,

ROBERT ENO: It's organized by the H.E.C. This year, there's a faculty member of the H.E.C., okay, and there has traditionally been, as I understand it, an invitation to faculty leaders to join, leaders of faculty, -272- from various universities. This year there's been a somewhat broader number -273- faculty member, but the invitation is, it's narrow enough so that -275- rather than open to the public, but some of us will be going and -277- sharing information. I have a feeling it is more a one-way information sharing effort on the part of the H.E.C., but we might be able to make a -279-.

REBECCA PORTER: Okay. Now I've scanned the whole room, correct? Is there anything else? Alright, we will then move on to discussions of the issues related to at one time what was referred to as the policy on non-tenure-track faculty, but is undergoing some additional redefinitions along the way. So Ted Miller is here as Co-chair of Faculty Affairs Committee, and I do not see Karen Gable.

Agenda Item # 3: Discussion of Issues Related to Development of Policy on Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

TED MILLER: Karen thought she might be a few minutes late, but I think she'll be coming. Well, I have provided you with a document today that I hope that can be used to give you a sense of what the Faculty Affairs Committee is thinking about. The way we're thinking about the issue of non-tenure track faculty is -296-. This document is a reprint of several pages of the Academic Handbook. It comes to you in two parts, one of them is a section entitled Academic Appointments, as you can see, and there's a reference there right at the beginning to an appendix to the Academic Handbook, in the Academic Handbook, and it's an appendix, but actually focuses on benefits, apparently, but it also provides in more technical language, the classification system for academic personnel that the university is using. Now, the section beginning on page forty-one is broken up into a number of parts, as you can see. The first part of this is titled The Purpose and Use of Academic Ranks, and this is a section that, I think at least, you will be asked to amend. There'll be certain amendments proposed in this initial section. One of the things that this section now calls for is the reporting mechanism. If you look at page forty-two in the left-hand paragraph down toward the U.F.C. Agenda Committee Comment, the sentence that says, "The chief academic officer and the faculty governance body on each campus will review each year the use of all academic ranks in the academic units on that campus, and each January they will issue a report to the chief academic officer of the University and the University Faculty Council." Well I, well I'm, a bit obvious to me that this is a report that we actually see or even may not even be a report that produced. I'm not sure, but it's clearly a report that I think is of critical importance to us as we think about the future of the university, and that at the very least, I think we would want to ensure that this particular report is produced and reviewed by the Faculty Council. I'm expecting that the Faculty Affairs Committee will recommend certain changes in

the reporting also to focus on some issues that I believe they will want to emphasis. So this initial section is one that I think we will be talking about a minimum, appropriate minimums to -340-. On page forty-three, there is a section titled Tenured or Tenure-Probationary Appointments. My sense as we sit here is that we're not, Faculty Affairs Committee is not really removing, reviewing any policies regarding those academic ranks. Our focus clearly is this year on certain elements of the next section titled Non-Tenured, Non-Probationary Instructional Appointments. If you look toward the bottom of page forty-four, you'll see that there is the beginning of Clinical Ranks section. That Clinical Rank -352- of course is the brother to the recent orator, and Faculty Affairs Committee will not, does not really anticipate doing anything with that section this year, but the material -356-. The material focusing on particularly on the category Lecturers, and this part-time category, those are sections that I think we will be seeing alternate language for, and it's really particularly in this category titled Lecturers that the Faculty Affairs Committee, I believe, intends to spend most of it's effort trying to develop that particular category, if you will more generally. That's a term that at least is going to be proposed as a term, as a title that could be used to cover what we think of as non-tenure track faculty in the more general sense as a classification, and this document makes clear, of course the Clinical Ranks are also non-tenure track faculty. -372- talk about, and over the last three years we've talked about developing policies for non-tenure track faculty. We haven't been talking about the Clinical Ranks. We've talked about another group, and in seeing here, it really is this Lecturer group that would, I think, turn out to be the major focus of our activity. If you go past the Clinical Ranks on to page forty-eight, you'll see there's another section here titled Research Appointments. That's a section that I am not anticipating that there's going to be a proposal to change that. I mean, there may be issues there that need some attention, but it's not the intention of the committee this year to focus on that. We then have a section titled Additional Academic Appointments, and it would not surprise me if that section would be subject to some -394-. One of the main, perhaps the main idea underlying the consideration of the academic, classification of academic personnel is really to try to simplify it to the extent that we can and standardize it across the university system. I think that at least the members of the committee would very much like to produce a classification scheme that could be used on all the campuses and facilitate the development of standard reports for each campus so that we could all kind of understand as the years go by what kind of university we're actually viewing and what the trends are in various -407- categories. That's something that -408- at this point in time because campuses have developed their own terminology, their own categories, their own ways of developing reports, and we really would like to focus a lot on trying to get ourselves in a better position -413- understand what this university is really like. So there are certain categories that I think we would probably recommend be discontinued. We have quite a long list of personnel categories that were -418-, and certainly it is my hope that we'll end up with a -421-. There is a section on page fifty titled Appointments to Graduate School Faculty. This, it is not the intention of the Faculty Affairs Committee to mess around with Appointment to Graduate School Faculty. It probably is the, really the prerogative of the Graduate Council to, you know, to develop policy for that particular activity, but one thing that did strike me as I was looking at this material is that this section of the Academic Handbook really strikes me in a way to be misplaced somehow. I think we should be able to find a better home for this Appointment to Graduate Faculty, this particular section of the Academic Handbook. It strikes me as being -437-. Then a lot of people seem interested in so-called Student Academic Appointment, but that clearly is part of the structure that we're reviewing. I'm not sure that we're planning to, you know, to offer proposals for, you know, redoing this, but I think it is certainly part of the

structure of the academic personnel. Well, so I'm, you know, I'm doing this, just trying to acquaint you with the status of our current policies, by just what they are and where they are in the Academic Handbook, and the new classification system that's going to be proposed will certainly have some indications for a variety of these existing categories. Maybe I'll just stop there and see if there are questions. Kathy Warfel is here. She is a member of the U.F.C. Faculty Affairs Committee -456-. Bob Eno is a member of the E.F.C. Faculty Affairs Committee. He's been involved with a number of these discussions as well. So if there are questions, concerns that people have -458-.

REBECCA PORTER: Marty?

MARTIN SPECHLER: Well, Ted, I like very much the direction that you're taking with respect to lectureships. It's certainly about time. We've had many proposals over the last six years for regularizing the lectureship appointment, and I'm optimistic with you and Karen working that we will this time get to something that can be voted, and it seems to me that in our discussions over the last six years or so, we've been, on lectureship questions, we've mainly been concerned about establishing some kind of long-term contract without tenure or, for these people. I, most people here will know that there are quite a few people now holding the rank, supposed rank of Lecturer. Very few of them actually fulfill the requirements of the Academic Handbook. It's a total chaotic situation with respect to that rank. I think the long-term contract issue is one. What, another is some kind of judicious limit on the number of lectureships so that the tenured faculty and the tenure-eligible faculty retain principle responsibility for academic programs, and then we're very concerned about promote ability and incentives for Lecturers who succeed. A proposal has been made here at I.U.P.U.I., and not for the first time, that Lecturers be promotable to Senior Lecturer, a title that is being used at other universities, and we think would be suitable recognition of Lecturers who perform very well in their function. It wouldn't carry tenure, but it would carry recognition as well as higher salary, probably those things you're going to consider. Now, one thing that you did not mention, Ted, and that's because it's hardly mentioned here at all, but it's the predominate form of non-tenure track faculty on our campus and on all of the non-Bloomington campuses, and that those are what we call Associate Faculty. So people are not tenure eligible, not Lecturers, and probably would not be appointed to full-time or part-time lectureships. These are what we refer to affectionately here as part-timers. People who are teaching classes, often very well, are terribly under-compensated, and have little by way of guarantees of their academic freedom or their conditions of work. Now, from the point of view of the effectiveness of our instruction and the burden on tenured faculty as well as the research output, it seems to be very important, Ted, that your committee consider the role of these people, the Associate Faculty, who would not be Lecturers, but who are nevertheless teaching from twenty to fifty percent of the courses on our various campuses. These people must yet be compensated. They must be guaranteed their academic freedom, and decent conditions of work. If not, we're not providing the kind of instruction that Indiana University should be providing.

TED MILLER: Could I ask why such people would not be eligible to be Lectures?

MARTIN SPECHLER: Oh, everybody's eligible, including you and me, Ted, to be Lecturers, but I dare say that the vast majority, we're talking hundreds now, hundreds, hundreds of Associate Faculty, not graduate students, but people who are brought in for one or two or three courses a year. They're teaching between twenty and fifty percent of the courses at Indiana

University depending on the campus, and I very much doubt that we will even be able to afford or want to name these people Lecturers, but we cannot dispense with their services, and many of them are excellent, in fact they're self-exploiting individuals, who give us far more benefit than they're compensated for.

TED MILLER: Well, I certainly think that it is the intention of the Faculty Affairs Committee to produce a simpler classification that would do something with these people. <laughter> My impression from sitting in a meeting that I'd been sitting in on, is that I think we would be tempted to call them Lecturers.

MARTIN SPECHLER: Well, classification is fairly important, but in my mind, far more important are their conditions of work.

TED MILLER: But what the Lecturer category would, you know, would, the idea is to develop a set of policies that would structure the work environment for the category to be called Lecturer. Whether they're full-time Lecturers, whether they're part-time Lecturers, they will be Lecturers, and they would have the same rights and responsibilities at that, and that's the concept I think that we're working on.

MARTIN SPECHLER: Well, I don't that's a workable concept with respect, and here's the reason, in our view on this committee for a number of years, the idea would be that some category, call it what you will, would have long-term contracts. These people would have a major responsibility for instructional programs in a given department. They would be given the expectation of continuing their employment during good behavior, effective teaching, and so forth, and perhaps on a full-time basis, but our campuses need a certain amount of flexibility in bringing people in more or less at the last minute and covering classes. I don't think, I wish we could avoid such a thing, but I don't think we can on most of the campuses, and so I think whatever you call it Ted, we need a distinction between those relatively few people who are to have long-term connection with the university in a major role in our instructional effort, and then those other people who are often part-time, employed for a few years, perhaps at will, in a rather flexible way on both sides. That is, they neither commit to us, nor we commit to them very far in the future. Alas, I think we do depend on such people, and we have to continue to do so, and many of them are excellent.

MARILYN KINTZELE: I think what Marty's talking about is the Adjunct classification. Right? And that is part of what the Faculty Affairs Committee is looking at, and that is distinct from the lectureship. Is it not?

MARTIN SPECHLER: Well,

TED MILLER: Well, the Adjunct category under our current thinking is distinct from the Lecturer category. The idea of the Adjunct category is to include people who are part-time instructors, you know, who, you know, who are working say out in the, in your case Marty, out in Indianapolis somewhere. They have a job that they're pursuing, but they're also coming to I.U.P.U.I. They have some skill. They can teach a class a semester.

MARTIN SPECHLER: Well, I wouldn't mind calling them Adjunct as Marilyn suggested. I

think the cleaning up the title is very nice. We call all agree on that, but I think we have to recognize that there are distinct groups around the university, and the group that we were thinking about with these long-term contracts, major responsibilities for instruction in say, foreign languages, very different from those we can say more or less casual. I don't mean to insult these people because we really depend on them in a huge way, but their appointment is in a technical term, casual, and I think we have to go on depending on these people to some degree, and we need a separate classification that also guarantees for their academic freedom and conditions of work.

REBECCA PORTER: Other points or questions in the direction that Faculty Affairs is going?

Tape # 1, Side B

ROBERT ENO: There is a number of important category distinctions that it is important not to, it's important to separate out -001-. One is between part-time, full-time. Another one is between long-term contract, short-term contract. Another being suggested is between Senior Lecturer and Lecturer, and among those different categories there may be ways under an umbrella of lectureship, which provides certain guarantees about working conditions, academic freedom, and perhaps about salary increment, approaches to salary increment, so that there would be salary increments over time. We may be able to look at a single category using those various dimensions built in both very strongly committed but non-tenured, non-tenable full-time faculty that you're thinking of and also those who are not full-time and don't have the same -008- responsibilities, but have a constant pattern of association with the university that establishes a standard of expectation of reappointment on a long-term basis. I think that's the direction that the committee's going. So I think that these concerns are being addressed.

JIM SHERMAN: Let me, can I add something? Ted, I think I had mentioned to you that last week I was at a C.I.C. meeting, and all eleven Big Ten schools were represented, and one of the issues I think across virtually all of the schools that have either recently been addressed or was in the process of being addressed was this issue of so-called non-tenure-track faculty, and so we did go around the room and talk about what the different institutions did, and it ranged from, I think I mentioned to you, one school that had an hundred thirty-one designations <laughter> of different titles to make sure one was not confused with another to others that I found much more concerned with issues that Marty raises about conditions of work and academic freedom rather than with what they're called. I think the, Russome Schneider, who was one of the C.I.C. representatives was going to collect that information and send it to all of us, and I don't know whether you have any interest in seeing what other places do, you may not, but if you are interested within a short time I should have that information. I think we're all working on it, and we'll probably arrive at, I don't know, different solutions to the problem, but you may see something that one of the institutions have done that strikes your fancy.

TED MILLER: Well, I, it's not that I'm disagreeing with Marty's thrust here. I mean, it's very clear that the major point of all of this rather than our policies governing tenure or non-tenure-track faculty is, you know, is some reasonable form. We, you know, we really don't, we're not working with anything now, and, clearly we need something to that, but it also seems very clear that we've got a problem across our campuses in terms of terminology and definitions and so forth, and it seemed to the committee that if we could get the categories straight, that that

would actually help us a lot to figure out exactly what we need to do next. It would give us a sense of who we're actually talking about.

REBECCA PORTER: Nanci?

NANCI YOKOM: Ted, I talked you about this a little bit earlier, but looking at this document on Clinical Rank, they do state here that it applies to the health sciences groups then -039- to say -039- the other schools. The maximum number of full-time salaried Clinical Rank faculty in other schools should be determined by the vote of the tenured faculty. Are those other schools -041- might be referring to? I know at I.U.SB, we have people who are teaching our English program, that are contracted. They do hold contracts, and I think -043-, and I think these are the people we're talking about in addition to those in the health sciences. So do you see that that Clinical Rank policy is covered?

TED MILLER: My own sense is that that faculty in that, who are doing that probably should not be called Clinical Rank faculty, but to the extent that they are, it seems to me that it's because we don't have anything else to call them that's reasonable.

NANCI YOKOM: I don't think they're not, they're called Lecturers.

TED MILLER: Yes.

NANCI YOKOM: But who are the other, who are these people in the other schools -050-, and does it, was it put in, I remember when they went through this policy. I know English Literature or education people doing student teaching had that Clinical Rank, and this seems to me that some of these people who are going to be here full-time, but maybe not in health sciences, but -052- people.

REBECCA PORTER: Marty?

MARTIN SPECHLER: Well, some of the background which people may remember is that when we accrued Clinical Ranks, we certainly had the health sciences primarily in mind, but it was pointed out to us at that time that the law schools, for example, have a clinical -057- program, and that Clinical Ranks might fit there, but I think that the legislative history will show the intent of this body was to limit the application of Clinical Ranks. Is that the way you remember it Paul? Nonetheless, I do think that some of the principles adopted with respect to Clinical Ranks would be helpful in, for these other ranks. There is one, I mean, I welcome Karen's and Ted's ambition to clean up the terminology, and I do think it will be helpful, but at this time, I still think that conditions of work and academic freedom are more important, and yet, a third thing that has not yet been mentioned is the number and proportion of these people. Some of you may remember that when we started this discussion about six years ago, we did a survey, and then another survey was done, and a third survey was done indicating the extent of use of non-tenure eligible faculty on the various campuses of Indiana University. It was quite high, very high in places of the smaller regional campuses, and amazingly high on the larger campuses, and then another survey showed that the use had been increasing, not dramatically, but still in all, increasing. We had talked, even though the university declared it's intention to replace part-timers and to limit the use of non-tenure-track eligible faculty. So I do think that a

third thing if we're to preserve the integrity of Indiana University and our programs, we can't let the category Professor go into extinction like the dodo <laughter>, and I think that's what's gradually happening, and you see it when a school such as the School of Business undertakes a major increase in their student body. They do it by increasing the number of part-timers, very dramatically there if I'm not mistaken. So that's a third issue, which I think is just as important as academic freedom and conditions of work is, well, who are the instructional personnel at Indiana University? Are they casual employees at will, or are they lifetime, dedicated academics?

REBECCA PORTER: Jim, go.

JIM BALDWIN: I was going to mention the same thing that Marty mentioned, but I see it -085- the committee in a logical way, is that the classification, getting to know what's out there comes first. Considerations of compensation, academic freedom, and, will follow, and the third thing, which you're right, we haven't talked about it, is what is, is there a maximum, an optimal number of such faculty? I just read some place, I think in the Chronicle, and I can't remember where, but it was one of I.U.P.U.I.'s urban peer institutions, I think it was Georgia State,

MARTIN SPECHLER: Georgia State.

JIM BALDWIN: just decided as the result of something like this to drastically increase the number of full-time faculty, tenure-track faculty in order to get a handle on this, and I think they went through the same sort of procedure that we're in the early stages of. So at least in that case it bore some fruit. It was Georgia State?

MARTIN SPECHLER: Definitely Georgia State. My memory is a little bit different from yours, Jim. It was initiated by a very determined dean, not by the Faculty Affairs Committee, and the other thing is that it didn't make them into tenure-track, it made them into full-time Lectures predominately, and there were certainly some looser in that process as well, but it was about a month ago in the Chronicle.

REBECCA PORTER: Ted, you want to kind of share with us what you see as the timelines for developing this?

TED MILLER: Well, I would hope that we would have the proposal for the classifications scheme at the next meeting of the U.F.C. -101-. I'm hoping that we will have a proposal or the Lecturer category involving the issues of, you know, academic freedom, pay, -104- etcetera. I am here because that's my goal. I would like to have it done by the end of this year. We've been doing this year after year after year, and I think we -106-. The question of the quota, if you will, you know, we've gone around on that one previously, now several years ago, and it really -109- strikes me as being something that, I'm really not prepared to answer myself and be quoted, but I think you're -111- to what you were saying, and indeed if you look at this section of the Academic Handbook, The Purpose and Use of Academic Rank, I mean, the language there, you know, essentially is designed to bring -115- the importance of the tenure and tenure-track ranks, and it seems to me that it would be very reasonable for us to at least incorporate into this document a statement that would support movement of the non-tenure-track faculty ranks to the extent that we can do it, and to the extent that it is appropriate to do so, into the tenure-track rank.

I mean, it certainly is true I believe that President Brand in his statement, the university speech earlier this year, made a very strong statement about that very matter. I mean, it seemed very clear that he would be very sympathetic to that. Now whether, what that translates into, I don't know, but it seems to me that it's an opportunity for us to put ourselves on record here, and we're really not right now, in terms of this language. It really doesn't say anything about, you know, about the, you know, the increasing numbers of different kinds of -128-.

MARTIN SPECHLER: I would like to say just that I don't associate myself with the quota notion. I think that proved to be unworkable in previous deliberations, but there are at least two other approaches. One is the planning consideration. That is, each school, each unit, should face the issue of how, what is the appropriate number, and the tenured faculty ought to have a role in determining what is the appropriate balance at any school. That's one, and the other is the incentive approach. By increasing the salary and compensation of the excellent part-time faculty we have, it reduces the incentive administrators simply for the purpose of -132- to increase those numbers beyond all measure. So both the planning and the incentive approach would be alternatives to the quota approach, and I agree with my friend Ted that the quota approach is just not going to work.

REBECCA PORTER: Alright, we're going to close our discussion and wait for our February meeting where we have a document that we can look at and move forward with, and timed perfectly in the arrival, the next item is on the agenda as an information item, so that those of you who are on different campuses know what's going on in this discussion or the bits and pieces of information that you've heard about concerning a golf course to be developed on the Bloomington campus. As the Agenda Committee talked about this item, we're using it as a jumping-off point for some discussion in terms of how the university goes about making decisions on land use and how faculty are involved the process of making those decisions. We'll gather some information and then we'll see whether or not we need to expand into other kinds of discussions. Lynn?

Agenda Item # 4: Report on Golf Course/Country Club Planned for the Bloomington Campus

LYNN COYNE: -156- I'm sort of wandering -156-.

REBECCA PORTER: I, yes, we're kind of -158-. You can sit right here,

LYNN COYNE: I'll sit next to Jim.

REBECCA PORTER: would be just fine. Since I don't have written down in front of me your official titles, will the two of you introduce yourselves to the group? And then we'll make sure we have the correct title.

J. TERRY CLAPACS: I'm Terry Clapacs, Vice-President of the University for Administration.

LYNN COYNE: I'm Lynn Coyne, and I'm Assistant Vice-President for Administration. I have responsibility for real estate and some economic development issues. We're on?

REBECCA PORTER: You're on.

LYNN COYNE: Okay.

REBECCA PORTER: If you can just give us,

LYNN COYNE: Sure.

REBECCA PORTER: some information so we understand what's going on.

LYNN COYNE: I'll give you as much as you want or maybe more than you care to have. Can you hear me okay? I can certainly hear myself, so that's why I'm asking that question -170-. Going back for deep background, in the 1950's, give or take, Indiana University acquired several parcels of real estate to the east of campus. They were formerly farm area and so forth, for campus expansion, recreation, and so forth. The area of campus that we're considering here contains a golf course, a trap and skeet area, cross country course. It used to contain a rifle range, otherwise known as the Sycamore Valley Gun Club, and contained a police training range. I think they had, like, ten stations where law enforcement agencies throughout the state would come and train. The firing ranges have been closed down, and this area has been used for a variety of purposes over the years. Now, secondly, the Athletic Department for many years has tried to find a way or an alternative to develop additional playing holes. The area to be developed would be this area. It's immediately adjacent to an existing eighteen-hole golf course that's been on the Bloomington campus for a long time, many years. That is a cost issue. It's expensive to do, and looked at opportunities over the years on how to do that. The Athletic Department had a master plan of all their facilities, and expansion of the golf facilities in this area was part of that master plan. Oh, I guess about a year ago, and you'll have to forgive me, don't hold me to dates, I just sort of do approximations, the university was approached by a private party who came to the university and said that they believe they could develop an eighteen-hole championship golf course to be designed by Jack Nicholas Design, and that they would do that at essentially no cost to the university on this area that I've described to you. They would ask the university to lease the land to them. They would then build the course. Our goal, we have several goals in looking for additional holes, and have for many years, and that is this is the home course of the men's and women's golf teams, and that's the opportunities we were trying to expand. At the moment, the golf teams practice on the existing course, but actually play their matches at a different course. The existing course experiences about forty thousand rounds a year of play. It's overplayed. It's the only course we have. So it's very difficult to take any of it out of service to rebuild it, maintain it, and so forth. So having a second eighteen is the opportunity that the Athletic Department was looking for in terms of the golf teams and competition. At any rate, that proposal, inasmuch as it did not involve investment by the university of a new eighteen, was attractive. So we thought we would, for want of a better word, vent it a little. So we developed a request for a proposal and sent it out nationwide to see if there's anyone else who would bring that kind of a transaction to the table. There was not. This original company, it's known as the Indiana Club L.L.C. came back with a response to our request for proposal much like what they had originally said, and this is, they're associated with a company called University Clubs of American, which is developing similar facilities at Louisville, University of Kentucky, Auburn, South Carolina, Nebraska, I understand Wisconsin, and there may be others that I've forgotten, but they're doing this at various

universities around the country. So after we got the response, we started to seriously evaluate this possibility. There were two obvious issues that we wanted to clear up as quickly as possible. The first is that this site, this area where the golf course would be constructed lies in what is known in Bloomington as the Griffy Watershed. Many years ago the city of Bloomington build a reservoir they call Lake Griffy. I don't know who Griffy was, but must have been important at the time, and that was the water supply for a while, and then they moved on to another lake, Lemon, Flash, Bean Blossom, then moved on to another lake, Monroe, as the water supply for the city of Bloomington. The, for, I don't think for many years, they hadn't considered Griffy as anything but recreational when it went off-line as a water supply, but it, Griffy experiences some problems, as many man-made lakes do. It, you have sedimentation that washes down through the creek beds and so forth, as well as putrefaction, you know, excess fertilizers and so forth. So it begins to fill up, and then it begins to get that green stuff in it. I'm obviously not a scientist. So the eastern portion of Lake Griffy has experienced that. It's a problem, and the city pays very close attention to that. Also in Griffy, the, I believe it's the south shore of Griffy was designated a nature preserve. So it essentially goes untouched. This facility, as is the existing golf course, the firing ranges, the trap and skeet, and everything else is in the Griffy Watershed. The Griffy Watershed encompasses a good portion of the eastern portion of Bloomington. So if the golf course is to be built there, one, it has to be very, very careful how it uses chemicals, and it has to use state of the art management techniques to, one, don't use chemicals unless you have to, two, if you use chemicals, they have to stay on site. They have to be biodegradable, have short half-lives, and so forth, so that they do not end up in Lake Griffy, so they don't contribute to the putrefaction problem or pesticide, fungicide, or something like that doesn't poison the water or anything that like. So in our discussions with the Indiana Club L.L.C., that has been top of mind. Can this course be installed in this environment in a sensitive way? We, in order to understand this better, the university hired independent environmental consultants from Indianapolis to come down and conduct a complete environmental assessment of the area so that the university would have a baseline understanding of the area. Naturally, we could have perhaps sent our own staff out or something, but we wanted someone that does that for a living, that's their realm, and so they did do that, and we have an environmental assessment, which we have shared. Also about the same time, three professors from the School of Public and Environmental Affairs came forward, well, that's not fair. Keith Clays is biology. Forgive me, Keith, for putting you in S.P.E.A. Bill Jones and Dan Willard from S.P.E.A. came forth and said that they had spent a lot of time studying Griffy, were also familiar with the area of campus that we were looking to develop, and Keith also was familiar with the area, ask if they could participate in this process, and most certainly, they could. They have a lot of knowledge, a lot of understanding and background that would be very valuable. So what we did is we did a walk-through. We had from the company that wants to build the course, did a preliminary plan of where they might put holes, took it and laid it on a topographical map of this area of campus, and then we all walked it. The walk-through took place with Professors Clay, Willard, and Jones. We had Steve Kotter, city parks and rec, was responsible for Lake Griffy. That's his area of responsiblitiy. We had our environmental consultant. We had representatives of the golf course builder, their environmental consultant, representatives of the I.U. Student Association, representatives of the Student Environmental Action Coalition, and we took the map, and we walked the course. We went out and said, "Okay, where are these holes going? What does it look like out here?" And we walked it. Professor Clay drafted a report after that. I'll be glad to share it with you. I don't want to characterize it one way or the other, but the way I understand it and interpret it is, yes, you can

build a golf course, but you need to be careful how you do it, which is our intent, is to be careful how we do this. There were suggestions. They're very, very good suggestions. It was a very productive walk-through. It was a preliminary design, and when we got done, they'll be a second level design, but there were some holes that someone sitting with a piece of paper in Ohio put down that won't work. We have to do it over. So we're doing that, but it was very, very productive. What I'd like you to understand is that where these holes are going are, for the most part, open areas. They're areas, for example, in what is known as Sycamore Valley, was the area where the gun clubs were formerly located, where there were rifle range, that was the area where the police forensic range, or whatever you call it, combat range, something like that. These have been used for forty years for that purpose. I think Professor Clay estimated that deforestation, which I take to mean cutting trees, would be only two percent of the total construction area here. In our discussions with the builder, you know, our position is that each hole will be custom fit to it's environment. There are different soil types. There are different configurations. There are areas you don't touch, and so forth, and that has to be addressed hole by hole as this gets constructed. They seemed very comfortable with that. They have very good consultants and feel that they can move forward. So that's how we're going to look at that. We're going to look at issues if you do feel you absolutely have to take a tree that's a significant, and by that I mean not a scrub or a third or fourth growth tree, but if you feel you have to, then what are you going to replace it with? Mitigation is a big issue with us. Also in terms of the environment and talking about Lake Griffy, after we walked the valley, although it's all watershed, and the valley is very significant, it's very open. I mean, you could see where screen bank was falling in. You could see where the sedimentation is coming from. It's just simply, it rains, it races downstream, and dumps it all in Griffy and fills it up, and what we have learned since that walk-through is there are probably opportunities in constructing the holes in the valley to create different structures that will impede and collect that sedimentation, provide some means of slowing upstream, in other words, water off site that comes through our valley, slowing that down, collecting that, creating some wetlands and a few other things that personally, my goal is that that be a net positive. In other words, that we not only prevent something from making, in other words, we keep what's on our site on our site, but to perhaps we can actually keep other things from Griffy, and so we're looking at that. That's going to be one of our objectives. I can't make that promise to you, but that's certainly what it appears to be now, is things that golfers think make a golf hole very attractive, such as water hazards and things you have to hit your ball over, actually may provide a net environmental plus, and that's sort of what we're looking for. Also in terms of habitat, we asked the consultants to look at wildlife habitat, plant habitat, everything. We want to know what's there. The only endangered species habitat that we've identified is the Indiana bat. Those of you who are familiar with the Indiana bat and it's habitat, what it does is it nests in the bark of tree like the shag bark hickory, and if you're going to disturb that in any way, you mitigate that, you replace it. So our consultant will be working with us to evaluate what the builder proposes to do for it's environmental sensitivity. I don't want to belabor all those environment issues, but I will be glad to answer questions.

J. TERRY CLAPACS: Let me add just a bit to that Lynn. In terms of land use, the trustees have deemed all of this land that we're talking about to be land bank for any future use, academic use that the university, Bloomington campus might require. A couple of years ago when the Athletic Department was first considering spending a million and a half or so to improve the existing course, the Athletic Department actually wanted to know how long they could count on the existing golf course being a golf course, and we gave assurances to the Athletic Department

two years ago through the trustees. The trustees gave the Athletic Department assurance that they could count on that as a use as a golf course for thirty years. That looking at the land use requirements of the campus down the road, that that land bank would be in place for, and used in that way for a thirty-year period. This is a piece of ground that is even further out than the course that exists there today, and that was done through a committee appointed by the president, a taskforce that Miles appointed and had representation from Maynard Thompson, for example, from the Bloomington campus served on that committee, but also trustees, and that taskforce made a series of recommendations about the use of land that is essentially east and north of the bypass as we think about it on the Bloomington campus. So that is where we are. It was actually through that taskforce, by the way, that the decision was made to ask the Sycamore Valley Gun Club after fifty years of very safe use, however, to, that it was time to terminate use of the land as a firing range for high-powered weapons because residential growth had occurred in the region, immediate vicinity, and so that's one point I wanted to get across, and second, to say that having thirty-six holes of golf is fairly common, and for a university like Indiana University and Bloomington campus. You may recall that a year ago, Purdue opened up a second eighteen holes of golf that essentially were funded by the Campton family, at Purdue. This keeps the Athletic Department from having to raise those monies, and that's an important consideration because the Athletic Department is now bring on three new women's sports in order to put us in compliance with gender equity requirements, and so with the addition of a new field hockey course, with the addition of a new course for women's crew, and some small capital investment for women's water polo, that's where the Athletic Department has placed their fundraising goals for the next few years. So this one, relieves the Athletic Department from having to raise money for a golf course, obviously we couldn't use university funds to do that, and two, it actually will be a revenue producer because we will receive royalties, and percentages, and ground lease income from the developer over some course of time, plus we will have the right to sell the holes, the naming of the holes, the naming of the courses, the naming of the clubhouse, etcetera, and there are other models that have been used around the country. One that comes to mind, that I'm familiar with is the development at Duke University. They put a hundred thousand dollar naming opportunity on each golf hole, and very quickly sold it out, and raised a million, eight, which was then reinvested in that course. So those are all pluses as we see it to this particular transaction. We invest no money. We do loose the use of that ground for a period of time. We do fill a need that the university has, or the Athletic Department has, and in fact, we do generate new revenue for Indiana University and for Indiana University Athletics. I wanted to add those two points to your,

LYNN COYNE: I want to pause here and describe the project. I think I may have gone, spent so much time worrying about the environmental issues that I may, I need to describe what the project is. It is an eighteen-hole Jack Nicholas Signature course. Nicholas Design does two types of courses. A Signature course involves Jack Nicholas' personal supervision and involvement in the design. These tend to be very high quality, very challenging courses. It's one of the attractive features of this. It will consist of a clubhouse. The clubhouse will have the usual amenities, the restaurant, locker rooms for players, the locker rooms for the teams. It will have probably some, a swimming pool. I don't think it'll be all that big size. It's an amenity, and perhaps a tennis court. There is the possibility of a conference center either attached or adjacent to it. That would not, at least in my vision of it, would not be huge. It would be proportionate to the building and allow the university to conduct some conferences, seminars, and so forth, gatherings at the facility. In terms of housing, there's been a lot of

misunderstanding about that. There is proposed to do housing that would be short-term housing. That is lodging, I would call it, not housing, associated with the course itself or the conference center itself. The maximum proposal is twenty-seven units. Those are most likely to be phased, and what they are, are units that, I think they're five bedroom the current configuration, and each bedroom can be separate such as a motel room suite, so that you could configure it to have a group of five take one unit, and then use the common areas inside that unit such as the living areas, lounge, or whatever, or you could have three and two, or five individuals, and so forth. So it's a lodging concept, and it's adjacent to the clubhouse. In addition, there'll be a driving range, practice facilities, the usual putting and chipping facilities and so forth associated with it. As part of this project, and with some of the funds that we believe can be raised with this project, there will be renovation of the existing eighteen-hole course. Nicholas Design will do that. It will not be a Signature course, but the renovations will be designed by Nicholas Design. So it will be as the hierarchy of designs go, it will be under the Signature course, but that would include renovation of the tees, the green, some installation of fairway bunkers, and so forth, to substantially redesign that course, which will remain open to the public in the same way it is now. No operational changes are anticipated in that, other than upgrading the course. The new course will cost up to, one estimate is somewhere between twelve and eighteen million depending on some of the construction issues. That will be funded by the builder. That will not be funded by the university. I read a letter to the editor in the Indiana Daily Student that said the Foundation is funding it. The Foundation is not funding it. This is the builder's obligation to fund and pay for, and as I understand it, they do have the funding in place. They will have to have the funding in place before they begin digging on our property. We do not want to go in and finish a golf course. This is going to be complete. There'll have to be assurances that this will get done. I think that describes the facility. Sure.

JIM SHERMAN: Let me start because I think people here recognize that at the, at the meeting of the Agenda Committee, it was correctly pointed out that a lot of people didn't come here from South Bend and Fort Wayne to talk simply about a golf course in Bloomington. It really involves a very general and important question, and I'd like your take on it, and that is what is the appropriate role of faculty and/or students in land-use decisions, such as this when alternatives might be available? The answer might be simply none, but I think it is a question that people ask.

J. TERRY CLAPACS: Well, I'm not sure I'm the right guy to answer. I think you ought to ask that question to Miles Brand.

JIM SHERMAN: Okay. <laugher>

J. TERRY CLAPACS: I mean I, I think it's that, I mean we came to talk about the proposal and the philosophy of land use. Basically the final decision of course, as you know, gets down to the trustee decision on the use of land at all of our campuses. The interplay of where the faculty is and all of that, I think you and Miles and Ken Gros-Louis and, ought to sit down and talk through that.

JIM SHERMAN: Okay. <laughter>

ROBERT ENO: I have a comment I'd like to make along those lines. Down in Bloomington,

one of the issues that is important for faculty is always the environment, the city environment, the cultural environment in which the faculty live. A lot of the, whether that's implicit to this or not depends on the relationship of the university to this community, say with issues of land use. You mentioned the closure of the -501- as a practical -503- golf course, and as many people may know, those of you who don't live in Bloomington may not know, they've created a great deal of -506- other aspects probably -507-. What comes to my mind when you're talking about the golf course, I'm very impressed with the detailed description of the environmental scrutiny that's been -512-. I'm concerned about the way in which our manner of use of land down in Bloomington is -515- inconsistent with the policies that have been develop for areas under the control of the city and country government and their zoning constraints. -517- make sure if you were going to do something that -518- aware of -519- applicable to those areas under city and county control, but if we're doing anything that's not in conformity that we do it in such a way that signals that the university is a good citizen -523- features of this development. I'm mentioning this because, as you mentioned, -525- and did not discuss -526- these issues of -526- zoning issues. So I'd be concerned with how this plan has been designed in such a way that it can be presented to the community as something that will be a benefit to this community, not something simply -529- university clientele -531- Indiana Club L.L.C. if there's any non-conformities -532-.

J. TERRY CLAPACS: It's a very good question, and Lynn, I know you had spent a lot of time thinking through those issues, so why don't you take it?

LYNN COYNE: It is a very good point, and we spend a great deal of time worrying about that issue. Let's talk about the golf course in and of itself. The, first of all, the clubhouse and the lodging are going to be built outside of any sensitive areas. You may know there's the University School complex, where, gosh, we have all kinds of uses out there. It will be closer to that on open flat area, where it doesn't present, I don't think, any issue. Any building might be built there. Secondly, as to the lodging issue, I took pains to say lodging and not housing. I think a lot of people are concerned when we say golf course. They see these big houses around, you know. This environment would not sustain that. We're being very careful how we put grass in this area, and in some of those areas, it wouldn't sustain structures. Plus in terms of the university, to do housing where you might buy a home, or Jim, or someone, would require partying a title in some way that we're not prepared to do in that that, that does take it out of the hands of the university and pits us against individual owners. So it presents a philosophical problem. The lodging will be done on leased land, and have parallel lease with the golf course. So it comes back to the university. As to the sensitivity to the plans of the city, I know that I spent some time talking with the city planning officials. I met with their entire staff and described the golf course to them. I shared our environmental study with them. We work together with the city in many, many ways. For example, the expansion of the 45-46 bypass. I don't think we have a meeting that the city isn't at that meeting. We're working with the city on a potential parking garage to mitigating it's parking lots, and do something jointly with that. I spent a great deal of time talking about what our plans are because here at Bloomington, one of the issues is traffic. I spend a lot of time with the city engineer talking about traffic. When we have construction on the new School of Business, what happens to traffic, how we're going to work that out, and we do that, and I think we're very sensitive to that, and I think we're, I like to think we're successful at it, but we do reach out to them and do listen, do talk to them about these issues.

JIM SHERMAN: Just to follow up on Bob, when someone in the city develops a project, if they don't meet the constraints, then the project doesn't go forward. They won't get building permits, etcetera. In this, if you say to the builder, "These are the environmental constraints," what happens if they don't do it? Is there some, is something in the contract where the lease doesn't go through?

LYNN COYNE: Sure. There are constraint on the builder to how it will be build, inspections during building, by the university. First of all, it's our land. It's going to be built in our environment. We want to know it's done right, and they're adhering to the contract. We have the ability to do that. Okay? We intent to do it. I would be part of the transaction. Secondly, it is not beyond governmental regulation. They'll have to file for rule five permit, erosion control, and so forth, D.N.R. permits for some of the activity in the valley and some of the structures they want to put in, regarding sedimentation control, and so forth. So not only will we be carefully watching them, it will be Indiana Department of Environmental Management oversight on some of the activities as well. So it's in our best interest to watch them very carefully.

J. TERRY CLAPACS: Let me also say that university and private partnerships are not unusual. We're sitting in one. I think you all know that the hotel at, and conference center was a partnership between Indiana University and a private developer, and the private developer maintains ownership for a period of fifty years, beginning in 1986, and so it's been a very successful way to generate a conference hotel facility on the I.U.P.U.I. campus without university investment, and it's been done. It was done well. It's been successful. This will be another, yes, go ahead.

JIM BALDWIN: One thing that occurred to me, I'm trying to think was -622-. One difference, it seems to me, is that this isn't operated as a private club, which seems to be, unless I'm wrong, that's the way this thing in Bloomington's going to be operated.

Tape 2, Side A

J. TERRY CLAPACS: Memberships in the club are open to anybody. It's not that they're restricted in any way. Anyone can buy a membership in the club, and there'll be certain categories and different fee structure for faculty, for staff, for students, for the general public, and yes, it will be operated in that way, but,

JIM BALDWIN: But are the facilities,

J. TERRY CLAPACS: but those memberships are open to everyone.

JIM BALDWIN: Are the facilities going to be open to your average, undergraduate student? I mean,

J. TERRY CLAPACS: There will be times every month when the undergraduate student can come out and play golf, and simply pay a greens fee.

LYNN COYNE: And remember the other course will be renovated and just as available as it is today for play. So it adds a course. It doesn't take away a course.

J. TERRY CLAPACS: And makes the other course a better course -009-.

STEVE JOHNSON: I'd like to follow up on that last question. Do I understand from your remarks that this will not be a members-only course, it will also be daily-fee golfing?

J. TERRY CLAPACS: Not every day, but we are insisting in our negotiations with the developer that if an undergraduate student is a golfer, and we're going to have a Jack Nicholas course on this campus, then it should be part of every undergraduate student's life who wants to, to be able to go out and play that course without having a membership there. So we're insisting upon some times each month where students and faculty and staff can go out and play simply by paying a greens fee. It won't be every day for sure, because after all, those who pay those membership fees will need to have access to the course, but we think for our students in particular, they should be able to go out and play the course, and make that part of their undergraduate life.

STEVE JOHNSON: Is this also true for staff and for faculty?

J. TERRY CLAPACS: It will be. It will be, but probably not to the same degree where we're trying to protect the students.

STEVE JOHNSON: And what are these degrees? How often each month -019-?

J. TERRY CLAPACS: Well, we, that's part of what we're negotiating now, and we haven't reached a conclusion on that, but that's part of what we're insisting.

STEVE JOHNSON: What is the university's negotiating position?

J. TERRY CLAPACS: Well, our position is that there should be times,

STEVE JOHNSON: Approximately how many times?

J. TERRY CLAPACS: Well, we haven't got to that point in our negotiations. I can't answer your question. I'm not trying to be evasive, just that that's one of the items we have yet to discuss, and we haven't reach a common point of view on what we're going to insist on.

STEVE JOHNSON: Do you have a goal in mind?

J. TERRY CLAPACS: No. I don't, and that's the same question that you're asking, and I don't have an answer for it.

JIM SHERMAN: -027- <laughter>

REBECCA PORTER: Other inquest?

NANCI YOKOM: How much is it going to cost to play on this golf course?

J. TERRY CLAPACS: Well, how much are the memberships going to be, to a degree?

NANCI YOKOM: As a student -030-.

J. TERRY CLAPACS: I don't think they've set those yet.

NANCI YOKOM: Even fifty or sixty dollars?

J. TERRY CLAPACS: Oh, I wouldn't be surprised. That's what it pays, that's what it costs to play almost any golf course. You go out to the Bloomington Country Club. Today I think it's fifty dollars to play there if you're not a member. So, my guess is that it would be in that range, which is, which actually in the world of golf would be, certainly wouldn't be the average, I don't think. Yes Ma'am?

DOLORES HOYT: You said that -035- monies program. Would that mean -036- negotiate for some kind of specific timeframe -037- teams then?

J. TERRY CLAPACS: The men's and women's team will have priority use of the new golf course, you bet.

JIM SHERMAN: It's their course, in that sense?

J. TERRY CLAPACS: That's correct.

JIM SHERMAN: It's the home course.

J. TERRY CLAPACS: Yes, ma'am?

SARA HOOK: You mentioned that there would be times for students, and faculty, and staff. Does that include students, faculty, and staff from the other I.U. campuses as well as Bloomington?

J. TERRY CLAPACS: I think today if you go down to the existing course, and you are a faculty staff member or a student from any campus, you can play at the special rates, yes. We may tie it into having to purchase a few football tickets. <laugher> Just kidding.

PAUL EISENBERG: May we quote you -044-? <laughter>

J. TERRY CLAPACS: No. <laughter> We're among friends, Paul.

REBECCA PORTER: But we might work out a bonus of tickets for Jaguar events right here on our campus.

J. TERRY CLAPACS: Well, that's pretty exciting.

REBECCA PORTER: Are there other questions?

J. TERRY CLAPACS: I think we're not getting things in the sense that this has been done at other universities, and I think we're going to see more university-private partnerships in a variety of areas. I think that was one of the goals that we established through the strategic directions chart, that we look for ways to leverage investment, and the investment from the public and Indiana University, and this is one of them, maybe not a very important one. I wouldn't sit here and say golf's the most important thing in the world, and it's certainly not what our university's all about, but it's one small piece of it, and we think it will work without causing us to make any investment. I fact, if we do it right, it will actually create new opportunities for use and also generate new income for the university. We haven't really said that all the income that's coming from royalties and ground lease is all going to the Athletic Department either. So we think that there are things to talk about, that we'll all be beneficiaries of that. It's not an easy deal to do, and you're question is a very good one about what are you going to do with people who just want to play, and we're worried about that too because there is a line that you cross when you make something too private that's a public piece of ground, and I, we agree, and we're aware of that. It's, where is that bounds, where that you strike when an outside firm is investing ten million dollars and needs to recover that investment verses just opening it up and letting others play, and we're trying to find that point that makes it right, and we are doing our very best, particularly for the students, because faculty, other faculty and staff will be able to afford, I think, to have memberships there if they want to, but student are in a different category, and we want to make it as open and as accessible as we can. So, it's going to be a tough time as what courses are all about.

REBECCA PORTER: Thank you very much.

J. TERRY CLAPACS: Thank you.

REBECCA PORTER: You've been very helpful in giving us information that we didn't have previously.

JIM SHERMAN: Thank you for coming, and I will, I hope that we will pursue it another time as more general question with Miles about the role of faculty and students in land use and development, and you can consider this a practice trial because I think you're aware this probably won't be the first time you're going to be asked questions about this from faculty and students and,

J. TERRY CLAPACS: I hope not.

JIM SHERMAN: of the university and students.

LYNN COYNE: Sure, glad to do it.

JIM SHERMAN: Thanks for -076- <laughter>

LYNN COYNE: Glad to do it. Thank you.

REBECCA PORTER: There is a sign up sheet that has circulated around for members. Anybody not sign in? We're now at the point in the agenda where we're going to be moving into executive session, or we're ready to move into executive session. Are there any objections to moving into executive session? Hearing none, we will wait for the room to clear.