

Indiana University
UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL
October 27, 2015
1:30 P.M. - 4:00 P.M. (EST)
Campus Center, Room 409, IUPUI

Agenda

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Applegate, Jonathyne Briggs, Ange Cooksey, Donna Dahlgren, Alyce Fly, Jan Froehlich, Charles Gallmeier, Joan Kowolik, Solomon Isiorho, Neovi Karakatsanis, James Kauffman, Robert Kravchuk, Robert McDonald, Michael McRobbie, Diana Mishler, Scott Opasik, John Paolillo, Gregory Steel, Cassidy Sugimoto, Hannah Van, L. Jack Windsor, Marianne Wokeck

MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT: Daron Olson (Ron Itnyre)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Janet Badia, Niki DaSilva, David Fisher, Linda Goodine, Wendy Morrison, Bill Orme, Nazareth Pantaloni, Nasser Paydar, Lauren Robel, Ben Robinson, Rebecca Spang, Jeff Watt

GUESTS: Craig Dethloff (Faculty Council Office), Joan Hagen (OVPCFO), Jenny Kincaid (CFO), Karen Lee (IUPUI Academic Affairs)

1. Approval of Minutes

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/minutes/AY15/02.24.15.pdf>

2. Memorial Resolution for Byrum Carter

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY16/U4-2016.pdf>

3. Executive Committee Business (10 minutes)

(Professors Chuck Gallmeier, Cassidy Sugimoto and Marianne Wokeck, Co-Chairs of the University Faculty Council)

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY16/U1-2016.pdf>

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY16/U2-2016.pdf>

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY16/U3-2016.pdf>

4. Presiding Officer's Business (30 minutes)

(Professor Michael McRobbie, President of Indiana University)

5. Question/Comment Period (10 minutes)*

(President McRobbie and Professors Gallmeier, Sugimoto and Wokeck)

6. Review of Executive Committee Action on the Student Code of Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct and the Code of Academic Ethics (30 minutes)

(Profs. Gallmeier, Sugimoto and Wokeck, Co-Chairs of the University Faculty Council)
[DISCUSSION]

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/addDocs/AY16/StudentCodeSummary.pdf>

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/addDocs/AY16/AcademicCodeSummary.pdf>

7. Faculty 10/12-month Method of Payment Option (30 minutes)

(Joan Hagen, Associate Vice President and University Controller) [DISCUSSION]

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/addDocs/AY16/Faculty1012Summary.pdf>

8. New Business/Old Business

Minutes

AGENDA ITEM 1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MCRORBIE: Alright, ladies and gentlemen, I want to—why don't we get moving. We don't have any amplification, can people hear okay though? Over there? Okay. Okay. Alright. The first agenda item is the approval of the minutes from our last meeting. Can I have a motion to approve the minutes please?

OPASIK: So moved.

MCRORBIE: A second? Second?

SUGIMOTO: Second.

MCRORBIE: Thank you. Any discussion on the minutes? Any corrections, comments from anybody on the minutes? There being none, I'll put the motion to approve the minutes. All those in favor of adopting them as is, please signify by saying "aye." [ayes] Against, same sign? [silence] The minutes are adopted.

AGENDA ITEM 2: MEMORIAL RESOLUTION FOR BYRUM CARTER

We—we have next a memorial resolution for the late Byrum Carter. He was, as I'm sure people know, an IU vice president and chancellor of the Bloomington campus from '69 to '75, was a political scientist by background and gave, I think, great service to the university. He wrote a book on the—the British prime ministerial system that was a *New York Times* bestseller. And I—normally I guess we—we—well, not normally, but quite often we have—there's somebody who wants to read the resolution for the record, but I don't—I notice there's no one down to do that. Unless anybody is intending to do that, I think I'll just put the motion to adopt that resolution concerning the late Byrum Carter. Is it—is anybody intending to—to take that on? No? Okay. [audio cuts out] ...memorial resolution for Byrum Carter?

SUGIMOTO: So moved.

MCROBBIE: And another second?

WOKECK: Second.

MCROBBIE: Thanks. Any discussion, any comments anybody wants to make? There being none, I'll put the motion. All those in favor? [ayes] Against? [silence] That memorial resolution is approved and I believe the standard procedure is that a letter will go, I think from me, to his relatives conveying the resolution to them as we normally do. Thank you very much.

Executive Committee business—who's going to lead off?

AGENDA ITEM 3: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE BUSINESS

WOKECK: I'm—I'm last in the alphabet, but I'll start, so. I—I would like to start out with actually a very minor point that is connected to the memorial resolution. I suggest that for the future we adopt what the IUPUI Faculty Council does. That we recognize it, but that we do not read it, because we are electronically well-versed these days, and I think it is readily available to everybody so that it can be as part—can first appear as a circular and then will be in the minutes so that we can do it that way. So I suggest that just as a way procedurally, not as a formal motion, it's simply a way of, I think, allowing us to give the credit and recognize the people but without the more old-fashioned way of reading it aloud, especially if it's a very long one.

I—I want to make, I think, three observations and—for discussion or rather for consideration of further discussion. And that is I think everybody is aware that the Bicentennial Campaign has kicked off and that the—on our campus at IUPUI with a new administration—there is new vigor in aligning the strategic plan for the campus with a strategic plan for IU as a system. And as part of that, one of the issues that has come up in our discussion on Executive Committee as well as within is a question of what does it mean to be a community of academics and what does it mean to us as faculty and what does it mean to us—to our students. And I think it is something that we—we are a special community, we are different, and we—I think it behooves us to try to find ways to not only articulate it and agree upon it amongst ourselves but also allow us to carry that recognition out to those who are highly suspicious of what faculty do and how they spend their time and whether they're earning their money, to put it bluntly. And as part of that I—the IFC Faculty Council is also considering the—a restatement of what it means—of what academic freedom means in our—both in our research, in our engagement with each other, and with those forces that come to us that sometimes and quite often have very opposing views that can escalate. We currently have on our campus a discussion about—that is rather forceful about the treatment of each other on the side of Palestinians and Israelis, and I think

we need to—this is just one example—I think we need to find ways and remind ourselves of civil discourse in all of those issues that come to us, whether it is by students, whether it is in the classroom, or whether it is through publications from outside, that we have voices that address the issues but that are not personal, that keep the discussion in not just orderly fashion but really inclusive in the sense that every voice is being heard rather than subdued. So those are two issues that I simply want to report what we are particularly concerned with on this campus, and other than that you will not be surprised that it's past midterm and everybody is very busy and trying to get the semester over with well. Thank you.

MCROBBIE: Thank you, Marianne. Cassidy or Chuck? Chuck?

GALLMEIER: Well, good afternoon. I don't really have any real prepared comments, but what I want to do is thank everyone here who is responsible in whatever way to make this kind of historic event happen. I am the first UFC Co-Chair for representing the Regional Faculty Caucus. I'm proud to be here. I'm looking forward to it as a learning experience. This has never happened before. [comment indistinct] and once again I want to thank everyone who had anything to do with making this occur. Thank you very much.

MCROBBIE: Thanks, Chuck.

SUGIMOTO: Hi, I'm Cassidy Sugimoto. I'm the president of the Bloomington Faculty Council, and I'll just give a brief report of what we've been doing. So we started off with a retreat, because what we felt was lacking in shared governance was intentional governance, that we were passive and reactive rather than being an active body. And so we started with a retreat in August where we met and we focused on the agenda setting for each of our standing committees—well, six of our most active standing committees. And I think that they are off to a really vigorous start, and we have a lot of very critical issues that they're considering—a redrafting of the post-tenure review policy, looking at work-life balance for non-tenure-track faculty on our campus, and other issues like that. We've have several meetings so far, and we've been having a “bylaws moment” at each of these meetings. We are actively trying to refresh and realign our bylaws and our governance documents to ensure more effective governance. The Executive Committee is also very occupied with addressing 52 recommendations for shared governance that was passed in our last spring meeting. And so that's a pretty onerous task to go through each of those 52 and see what we can do to improve shared governance on our campus. And I'm happy to share those recommendations with any of you if you'd like. They were the culmination of a year's worth of investigation into other governance structures at other institutions and a recommendation not only of best practices but how to enact those practices. They include having stronger relationships with other governance bodies, such as school policy committees, better relationships with administrators, using our governance structures as communication vehicles, and other issues like that. Finally,

I'll just say briefly that as the president of Bloomington Faculty Council, I had the opportunity to go to the UIUC a few weeks ago for a meeting of the campus leaders of all of the CIC institutions. And as one can imagine, people were angry. There were very, very angry faculty from Iowa and from Madison and from Purdue, and people were considering the different kinds of relationships that we have with our Board of Trustees or Board of Governors or Board of Regents. And the culmination of that meeting was a resolution in support of and advocating for the faculty at the University of Iowa. And that was signed and delivered on behalf of our Executive Committee and given to the press, and you may have seen some of this in *Inside Higher Ed* and other things. And I think it represents a nice movement for governance bodies not only to come together as this one does across campuses but also across institutions in order to make a greater and a stronger faculty voice around the things that we care about. So those are, essentially, the kinds of things that we're doing at Bloomington, and I look forward to talking more about how we can enact with a single voice at this institution. Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM 4: PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS

MCROBBIE: Thanks, Cassidy. Any—no, sorry, we'll come to the questions to you—after my comments and to the three of you as well. Let me—let me—I just want—want to just raise a couple of matters or mention a couple of matters. Firstly, Marianne mentioned it, but a few weeks ago at the showgrounds here in Indianapolis we announced the public phase of the Bicentennial Campaign for—for the whole of Indiana University, all campuses. The first time that—that we've ever done that and it was a wonderful event. I know Marianne was there, I think you were there, Chuck? I don't—no, you weren't, sorry. There were a lot of people. [laughter] And we had about 750 people attend, and it was—it was a great evening. There were a couple of surprise gifts announced, and then following that—the following week, there were some more announced, and I expect there will be more on the—in the weeks ahead as well. The goal was announced, although I think everybody knew what it was, because we talked about it before, but the goal was formally announced of \$2.5 billion dollars to raise by the 31st of December 2019. And we also announced that basically about almost exactly half of it had—had been raised. A number of priorities were discussed at the—or announced at the launch, and a number of matching programs were—were also announced for things like chairs, student scholarships, and so on. We—we also announced in particular a—a matching program for a campaign directed to staff and to faculty in the—in the university, and the goal is to—to raise a total of \$25 million to endow a variety of different projects. This one is actually completely open as to what people want to give gifts for, and that those endowments will be matched one-for-one by the university as well. I—in that context, I should mention that every vice president, every dean, every chancellor has committed or is already giving to the—to the campaign as well. I sent, I believe, a letter that hopefully you all got just mentioning this particular program and encouraging people to contribute to—towards it. And I hope you all consider it and maybe

encourage your colleagues to consider contributing towards the—to the campaign as well. It is the—the—obviously the most ambitious campaign by far that we've ever attempted at Indiana University. But I'm personally delighted with doing it across all the campuses involving every—

[audio cuts out]

—is actually one of the larger campaigns by any public university at the moment, ranks probably—certainly in the top ten, close to the middle of the top ten public university campaigns. So it gives a sense of the—the ambition of—of this particular campaign. I think it's fair to say that the launch and the various things that were announced there have generated a lot—a lot of excitement, a lot of interest out there, and on that note alone, I had a number of people tell me that they were inspired enough that they would be making gifts to the institution that had not been something they had already been considering. So again that's—that is something for which there's a very good webpage, there's a lot of detail out there if you're interested in knowing—in knowing more about it. And of course, at the end of the day, it ultimately will benefit all of you through more student—undergraduate scholarships, graduate fellowships, endowed chairs and professorships in a couple of areas that are being focused on, the study abroad scholarships specifically aimed at minority and low-income students or students of low-income backgrounds, and then more broadly in the health sciences focused on trying to improve the quality of public health indicators in the state of Indiana, which, I think as people know, are in the bottom 10% of the country and really pretty unimpressive. It's something that I think we are in a position to have an impact on, and the campaign in turn can have an impact on that. So that's the first thing.

And then the second thing is every year my wife and I hold a dinner called the Academic Excellence Dinner for all academy members and people who've won Nobel Prizes, and we did for a period have someone who had a Noble Prize at those dinners, and Pulitzers, and so on. And every year, based on recommendations I get from deans and others, I make a number of awards, and this year I gave the President's Medal to Fedwa Malti-Douglas, who is recently retired faculty member in the Department of English and Gender Studies and also was in the Maurer School of Law and a number of other areas on the Bloomington campus but who had also, about a month before that, won the National Medal of the Humanities, I think as most people know, the most prestigious award for the humanities in this country, and becoming only the third person in the university's history to—or third person associated with the university in our history to get the National Medal of the Humanities. I also gave it to David Wilkes, who was until very recently the Executive Associate Dean of the School of Medicine and who'd done a wonderful job overseeing research in the—in the school under both Dean Brater and now Dean Hess. Sadly, after I had taken the decision to give this medal to him but before the award, he took up the position as dean at the University of Virginia, as people probably know. But David

came back for the—for the award, too, and I was delighted to be able to recognize him and, of course, delighted for David that he's got such a fine position at such a good university. And then, finally, of course, Jerry Bepko, the longstanding chancellor of this campus, of the IUPUI campus, vice president of the university, interim president for a period, dean of the School of Law, and just about every other position in the university you can think of. Jerry has been an extraordinary servant of the university. Still teaching, still active, still serves on the Commission for Higher Education, very—in a very helpful and positive way to higher education in the state. With the approval of the Trustees, I awarded him the University Medal, which is our highest award. I think this is only the thirteenth, from memory, that we've—we've ever given of the University Medals and I think Jerry was, of course, richly deserving of this award. So it was—it was wonderful to be able to recognize these three people who each in their own way have given so much to the university over the years and brought such distinction to the university over the years as well. And with that, maybe I could, in the interest of moving business along, ask if there are any questions for myself or any of the three co-chairs, and we can just do it all together. Any questions or comments anybody wants to make on any matter? Questions? Comments? Yes?

AGENDA ITEM 5: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

WINDSOR: [comment indistinct] ask a question. I've been approached a lot by School of Medicine faculty members about the direction they're taking, the changes in the reporting line. Can you help us—what should we be telling these people? I mean...

MCROBBIE: Well, the—the—the reporting line—the School of Medicine reports directly to me now, and many other things are staying as they were, but—but obviously there are some components of that that—that—that will change. But a lot of that is being worked out at the moment between—between the vice president, Dean Hess, and the chancellor of this—of this campus. Certainly I—I want to ensure that whatever changes are made are done in a way that doesn't cause any—any problems for—for—for either institution but recognizes the fact that the School of Medicine really has a state-wide footprint and is a multi-billion dollar organization when you take into account its IU Health component as well and is really on a sort of different trajectory in many ways and especially with the pending construction of the new hospital and the moving of the center of gravity of the School of Medicine up to—to the hospital there. I mean, it just does—and it will be changing the alignment of the—of the School further.

WINDSOR: More faculty are being concerned more about P & T issues than anything else.

MCROBBIE: Yeah. Yeah, and that's—that—that's got to be worked out. I'm convinced it can be worked out in a way that people will be—will be happy with. But—but—but I think that—that—

that it is going to be a matter that's going to take a bit of thought as to how to do it in the best way.

WINDSOR: Thank you.

MCRABBIE: Okay. With that, let's move to Agenda Item 6, the review of the Executive Committee's action on the Student Code of Rights, Responsibilities, Conduct, et cetera. Who wants to take the lead on that?

SUGIMOTO: Marianne.

MCRABBIE: Alright.

AGENDA ITEM 6: REVIEW OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ACTION ON THE STUDENT CODE OF RIGHTS, RESPONSIBILITIES, AND CONDUCT AND THE CODE OF ACADEMIC ETHICS

WOKECK: Okay, yeah. You had in your packet two circulars, both of which address changes that are not changes in substance but that are alignments from legal responsibilities that the university carries with the way we have articulated our codes of conduct, both for faculty—that is academic—and for students. And if you go through the marked up copies of both of them, you will see that the changes are wording changes and not substantive changes. We discussed those in University Faculty Council Executive Committee, but our rules make it—well—make—make it necessary that we bring it to the full Council and that we have a vote on it, because this—these are policies that govern both our students and our own conduct, and therefore it needs to be properly vetted and properly dealt with, so that we can post them with confidence and not only that but then abide by them with similar confidence and no confusion, which is, I think, what Cassidy brought up in another context—that as we are aligning documents, both of university administration and the various campuses, we are running into discrepancies that sometimes are of policy, sometimes are of wording, and we need to have, I think—and discuss maybe later—a concerted effort, how we can do that and bring those in alignment. But these two that were distributed are the ones at hand now, and we—unless I hear that anybody wants to go through each of the changes, which we can do, but I assume that you are like good students and have done your homework and read them in advance and therefore we can discuss them more generally if anybody has any questions. And we have Jenny here to help us out and also John if there are particular questions that have the legal implications as opposed to the policy implications that they simply qualify.

MCRABBIE: I'm not sure. Jen, are you going to—

APPLEGATE: Well, I just might add one thing, that the changes all flow directly from the Sexual Misconduct Policy that we discussed and voted on last academic year, so that's—those changes

were sort of the master set of changes, and so these are just conforming ones, conforming to the Student Code to them and the Code of Academic Ethics. And I don't know, if Jenny—Jenny did you want to—?

MCROBBIE: Jenny, do you want to—?

KINCAID: I would say, too, just we have a really nice new website for the Student Code of Conduct. If you haven't had a chance, check it out. It makes it much more easier to find and read everything. So we had nice effort by IU Communications on that. So I think that helps in just sort of the ease of finding things.

WOKECK: Jenny, would you help me understand how when you have a website like that, one of the things that tends to go awry when that happens is the links that we bookmarked to the previous one, and is there—is there a protocol to update that? Because that, to me, has been one of the not-so-easy things.

KINCAID: Sure, no, and there is a redirect in place, so if anyone was linked to the old site, it will automatically go to the new website. You don't have to change, really. I mean, it's good to update it as we go forward. It's studentcode.iu.edu, but if anyone has the old link, that—there shouldn't be any disruption.

MCROBBIE: Now, just help me procedurally here. This is down for discussion. That's—this is effectively the first discussion, this is not—

WOKECK: No. We—we have discussed it. This is—we—we can vote on it as far as I—we actually need to vote on it, because we already had the discussion.

MCROBBIE: Okay, so this is for action, then.

WOKECK: Jack?

WINDSOR: The UFC-EC approved on behalf—

WOKECK: Yes, they did. We need to—

WINDSOR: —of the full Council, so the full Council does not need to vote on this.

WOKECK: But we need the affirmation, Jack.

WINDSOR: Okay.

WOKECK: Yeah.

MCROBBIE: So you want to vote—you want to have the Council vote to endorse this?

WOKECK: Yes.

MCRORBIE: Okay. Okay. And I guess since it's coming from the Executive Committee, we really don't need a mover and a second, we'll just take it as a motion.

WOKECK: That's correct.

MCRORBIE: Okay. Any further discussion? Any discussion, questions, or comments on this? Discussion? Alright, there being none, I'll put the motion to adopt those changes as per the document that has been distributed to you as already approved by Executive Committee. All those in favor? [ayes] Against? [silence] That is adopted as carried. Thank you. Thanks to everybody who worked on this as well. Joan, you're going to talk about the—this issue about ten- and twelve-month payment periods.

HAGEN: That's right.

MCRORBIE: Joan is the Associate VP and University Controller in the Office of the VP for Finance.

AGENDA ITEM 7: FACULTY 10/12-MONTH METHOD OF PAYMENT OPTION

HAGEN: Good afternoon and thank you very much for inviting me here to have this discussion. What I'd like to do today is describe the groundwork that's been done to evaluate the system impact of implementing the ten over twelve payout functionality and then also talk a little bit about the tool which we can offer actually very soon which we've begun development on in response to the interest in the ten over twelve pay option. And then, mostly importantly, I'll be interested in your feedback after going through these things. So my part in this, my job includes responsibility for the payroll side of the university's HR and payroll system. And, in managing systems, we take very seriously our responsibility to support the mission—we are a support unit so we are supporting the mission of the university—and to do so in a way that keeps administrative costs down and protects the university from risk. And those priorities are weighed in every single system functionality decision we make, not just this one. My responsibility is to communicate costs and risks to decision-makers. So at any point in time there are hundreds of competing priorities for new functionality, and staff in many, many different areas and offices across the university are keeping the system working every day, so that over 50,000 faculty and staff, representing \$1.4 billion in salaries and wages are paid accurately and on time. We're keeping things running, implementing new functionality all the time, and watching administrative costs all the time. Just to give you an idea of scope, there are currently 444 open issues in the system scheduled out for the next 72 weeks. So this is not a static system. IU is a very complex environment in which to operate. So, many of the system changes are actually mandatory and they're put in place in response to changes in tax and

other regulatory changes. So tax is very important in the payroll system, and then recently we've had the Affordable Care Act, which required some major changes to the system to comply with.

Some of the initiatives currently scheduled are designed to create operational and processing efficiencies, driving administrative costs down—again, very important—and then some system enhancements to functionality necessarily require allocation of additional resources to implement and support, driving administrative cost up. The ten over twelve pay option would be one of the latter, while—with ongoing costs well beyond just the initial implementation. It's not something we can just turn on, it would take 12 to 14 months to build just the baseline, initial functionality and requirements and to configure our—our current processes to—for the set up. Estimates for the initial baseline implementation phase are for about 6,500 hours of work at a direct cost of \$400,000, and additional costs to mitigate and monitor for risks along with ongoing support costs have not been estimated.

There are some major compliance issues that we're keeping our eye on which would require special attention. Contracting grants, grant payments according to research administration could not be made on the 12-month calendar at IU, so there would be major ongoing work to mitigate the consequences to and of faculty going on and off grants. That would be a major piece of work.

In the meantime and for a much lower cost, say in the range of \$20,000 to \$40,000, and doable within a few months, we're working on the budgeting tool that I described in the written update. Basically the tool connects to the user's actual pay records and will simulate receiving his or her net over twelve months, calculate the required savings in the two months not paid, and then will connect directly to self-service direct deposit where the—the savings can be set up and directed into an account. In addition there are—there's other functionality where different scenarios can be modeled, such as what if I change my deductions or my tax withholding? What would the result be on my net? So it's—it's actually a full paycheck modeling tool that we're creating. So this provides quite a bit of flexibility, I think more than a straight twelve pay requirement. It can be changed multiple times during the year. Puts more—puts the employee basically in control of the outcomes. Savings would be owned by the employee rather than the university hanging on—holding that money until the last two months of the fiscal year. So I would really be interested in feedback on any or all of this.

MCROBBIE: Questions? Marianne, yeah?

WOKECK: Joan, I would—I have a number of questions.

HAGEN: Okay.

WOKECK: This—this question of that option has come up when I first came to this university, and it comes up every time we have new colleagues, because that is the rule for all the other institutions that I know and most certainly the institution that I came from. It also is what IPS does internally in the state, and I understand that Purdue offers the same option. What is—what we know from especially faculty who are not the highest paid ones but the lower paid ones that having the regiment of the university hold back that money is much more helpful than we—calculating it ourselves. And so the question I really have to you is, why do we compare so differently to other peers that we know of? It just seems very odd that the—that we can't do that at what—you've clearly indicated, there's time involved, there's cost involved, but the other universities do that. How do they do it? Do they do it better than we can?

HAGEN: So that's a good question and we've looked at that carefully.

WOKECK: Yeah.

HAGEN: When we look at the Big Ten and CIC, so thirteen peer institutions, I believe six offer the ten over twelve pay—or nine or ten over twelve, but they make the twelve pay mandatory. They don't offer a choice. So I think that might not be attractive to faculty. Three of the institutions offer a choice. I believe one of them is Michigan State, which is actually—I've heard they're—they're going away from the option. They're going back to nine or ten over twelve, and that was primarily over concerns about contract and grant pay, because that's a—a—a sensitive exposure.

WOKECK: Yes, and that's why the opt-in is the one that is the most common that the colleagues I talked to reported.

HAGEN: Right. So that would be most desirable. To—to give the option. The—the system we use is PeopleSoft and that's a common system—

WOKECK: Right.

HAGEN: —and many PeopleSoft users do offer ten over twelve pay. So PeopleSoft is not the problem. We can do this.

WOKECK: Mmhmm.

HAGEN: We are—as I've described—we are not—we're still evaluating the risks and the costs.

WOKECK: I think that—that gives me an answer to my colleagues, because I've gotten a lot of email because of that.

HAGEN: Sure.

WOKECK: And this is not the first time that the question has been brought to us, so it seems—it looks as if we've been stalling on this for many years. And that's why I'm glad that you gave better background as to what needs to happen and why, because this has been a—a vexing problem. So...

HAGEN: Sure.

GALLMEIER: You—you said PeopleSoft is not the problem.

HAGEN: Correct.

GALLMEIER: Because when I was hired and—because every place I've taught, too, before here, you always got twelve months. It was a ten-month contract, but you always got paid twelve months and then you taught in the summer for, you know, they pay you for a course. But when I arrived here, they said the problem was PeopleSoft. They could not make that transition or something. So that's not true.

HAGEN: No, PeopleSoft can handle this—

MCROBBIE: Yeah, It's just a bit of software.

WOKECK: Yeah, but that's not the answer we got.

HAGEN: —and likely if we had implemented the twelve pay option when we implemented the system, PeopleSoft, back in 2005, it would have been an easier—relatively easier—thing to do. At that time there was quite a bit of sensitivity over the costs. Implementing a new system is very, very costly, and I wasn't involved in looking at this decision. I don't know, but I would say probably it was decided to—to take that out of the mix to keep the costs down.

GALLMEIER: I know this option will make at least some of my junior faculty happy because they can't always count on the grants in the summer after a couple years, and this would enable them to have money all twelve months without, of course, having to teach if they choose not to.

HAGEN: Yes, I understand that.

MCROBBIE: Yes? Yes, Bob?

KRAVCHUK: Currently with interest rates being so low—

MCROBBIE: Sorry, Bob, could you speak up just a bit?

KRAVCHUK: Oh yes, currently with interest rates being so low, there isn't such a great advantage to the university in terms of cash flow, which would certainly work to the advantage

of the U and actually to the disadvantage of the faculty member, because they're having money held, money they could be using and earning interest on themselves. I—I for one, if I had the option, would opt for ten months. I like getting my money sooner than later. However, I'm wondering if there wouldn't be any estimate of what the cash flow advantage to the university might be that would help to offset some of the costs of development?

HAGEN: Well, that's an interesting question. We've not quantified that. It's something we could easily model. Again, interest rates right now are low, so the answer would probably not be an offset. But it—it's worth looking at.

WOKECK: Just a comment, that the large proportion of faculty who would most benefit from that opt-in are not in a position to reinvest money, so that is really pretty much a moot point. It's a good point in terms of estimating costs to the university—I fully understand that—but I think in terms of budgeting—household budgeting—that the faculty have to do, that is not the major concern. And we have—being in the School of Liberal Arts, we've had this argument with our colleagues in Econ versus the colleagues in English for many, many years.

KRAVCHUK: I can imagine.

WOKECK: I know. I'm just stating the obvious, but I do want to draw attention to why we really would like to see that as an option, because it makes—if we have—or, as we have faculty who are not worrying over where their mortgage payment or their car payment comes from in the summer months, there's more flexibility for those who do scheduling of classes in really scheduling where the programs are—need them, rather than trying to figure out how we can fit the faculty who need the money which, you know, we—we have both these obligations of looking out for our colleague but also have a responsibility to the programs, and that sometimes gets very difficult.

KRAVCHUK: [comment indistinct] it's the advantage to the convenience, I agree with you.

WOKECK: Yeah. So that's—that's all I wanted to add.

MCROBBIE: Other questions? Comments? Comments to Joan? Okay. Thanks very much, Joan.

HAGEN: You're very welcome.

MCROBBIE: Alright, well, we—we move to new business and old business. John, I think there's an item—at least—that you were going to raise or—that TJ was going to raise?

APPLEGATE: Right, the fac—yeah, Faculty Collaborations project of AC&U, and TJ Rivard, who is professor at IU East and also the head of the University Transfer Office.

AGENDA ITEM 8: NEW BUSINESS/OLD BUSINESS

RIVARD: Good afternoon, everyone. This is more of an advertisement than anything else. On February 26th, we are going to have a—a—our first conference on faculty collaboratives, and what the faculty collaboratives is, is an attempt to network faculty across the state and across institutions surrounding faculty development and innovation in the leadership and leadership for the purpose of student success. This is a—this is a conference that's sponsored by AAC&U. I serve as the hub director and what that means is that there's a network of faculty and Indiana is a hub of this network of faculty within Indiana and it's also connected to hubs of other states—of four other states. And the goal is to create an interactive and dynamic conversation among faculty centered on—on—on innovation and on faculty teaching. So—so one of the things that the conference will do is create—is—is—where we've asked for proposals from each of the institutions on a best practice that they can share at the conference. That best practice will be shared on the website or at the hub so that other faculty can then interact and—and begin a discussion about those—those best practices and so that they then can begin to practice those on their campuses. The—the hub itself will go—we hope, anyway—will go a little deeper than that in that it will offer opportunities for faculty to publish. It will also offer opportunities for both an informal and a more formal discussion of faculty high-impact practices. So—so the kickoff is in our—is in February for—for—at least for the—the—the launch of the hub itself will probably come in the next month, but the kickoff for the primary interaction among faculty will be at that February conference. So I guess my purpose here today is really to ask you if I could send out an email with a—with a—an invitation to the conference and that you could get this out to your faculty as much as possible. We've picked a number of avenues to try to get this—the word out about this, and it's a pretty exciting opportunity, especially when I hear things in this group about what faculty do and how they spend their time and what faculty care about, and I can't imagine anything better than about teaching best practices within teaching. So, that's really all. Does anybody have any questions? Oh, by the way, there are six faculty fellows that the hub chose from the Indiana institutions, and one of them is in this room right now, who are working on projects right now that will—that will also feed into this hub. So...

DAHLGREN: Are any of the—is it going to be simply focused on teaching? What about service initiatives or retention initiatives as it relates to...?

RIVARD: Well, this is—they focus essentially on teaching, yes.

MCROBBIE: Questions for TJ?

WOKECK: TJ, can you explain a little bit more in the development that faculty increasingly are being divided amongst or by the focus of what they do, namely research and teaching, and is this an initiative that mostly tries to gather faculty whose excellence is in teaching or is it—is it open—what—what's the background a little bit more?

RIVARD: It's really open to all faculty. In fact, one of the areas that we're trying to encourage and actually try to figure out how they can participate is adjunct faculty and lecturers, tenure-track faculty, tenured faculty. There's one project that's—that is attempting to reinvigorate faculty who feel like they are—they have burned out. So there's—so it's a very wide-ranging kind of pursuit. As you might guess, it—because it's sponsored by AAC&U, it's also—it's also looking at the four proficiencies within AAC&U, which includes the degree qualifications profile and tuning and other things. But yes, I mean, it's really an opportunity for all faculty to explore teaching at a variety of levels.

WOKECK: Follow up question, is FACET involved in this?

RIVARD: Yes, yes. I—the FACET director is part of the steering committee.

WOKECK: Okay.

RIVARD: And there are representatives on the steering committee from all public institutions with the exception of one that chose not to be a part of it.

MCROBBIE: Other questions? Any other questions for TJ? Any questions? No? Alright, good. Thank you, TJ. Before we get through agenda item 8, is there any other new business or old business? Any member? Any other new business or old business?

WOKECK: Just a reminder that one of the concerns that has been brought to my attention that we need to be more and better mindful of reporting out what happens here to our—not only to our faculty councils but from there also to the committees of the faculty council. That it is hard in the information overflow to really keep those communication lines open, and so this is just a reminder that we all have that as one of our tasks and that we take that seriously.

MCROBBIE: Alright. There being no other business, we are adjourned.

MEETING ADJOURNED: 2:18PM