

**Indiana University  
UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL  
September 9, 2014  
1:30 P.M. – 4:30 P.M. (EST)  
Campus Center, Room 409, IUPUI**

**Attendance**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** John Applegate, Janet Badia, Charles Bantz, James Barbre, Susan Cress, Chris Darr, Charles Davis, Alyce Fly, Jan Froehlich, Don Gjerdingen, Lina Adele Goodine, John Hassel, Robert Kravchuk, Wazir Mohamed, Wendy Morrison, Michael McRobbie, Yusuf Nur, Scott Opasik, Bill Orme, Rebecca Spang, Cassidy Sugimoto, Herb Terry, Marianne Wokeck

**MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT:** Charles Gallmeier (Subir Bandyopadhyay)

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** James Barry, Jonathyne Briggs, Erika Dowell, James Kauffmann, Lauren Robel, Ben Robinson, Jim Sherman, Nancy Virtue, Jeff Watt

**GUESTS:** Craig Dethloff (Faculty Council Office IUB), Karen Lee (IUPUI), Tyler White (USG, IUPUI)

**Agenda**

1. Approval of Minutes

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/minutes/AY14/02.25.14.pdf>

2. Executive Committee Business (10 minutes)

(Professor Herb Terry, Past-president of the Bloomington Faculty Council and Marianne Wokeck, Co-Secretary of the University Faculty Council)

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY15/U1-2015.pdf>

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY15/U2-2015.pdf>

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY15/U3-2015.pdf>

3. Presiding Officer's Business (30 minutes)

(Professor Michael McRobbie, President of Indiana University)

4. Question/Comment Period (10 minutes)<sup>1</sup>

(President McRobbie and Professors Terry and Wokeck)

---

<sup>1</sup> Faculty who are not members of the Faculty Council and who wish to address questions to President McRobbie and co-Secretaries Sherman and Wokeck should submit their questions to the Faculty Council Office at [ufcoff@indiana.edu](mailto:ufcoff@indiana.edu). Meetings are open to the public. Our documents are available at: <http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc>

5. Proposed Amendments to the Constitution of the Indiana University Faculty (20 minutes)  
(Professor Herb Terry) [ACTION ITEM]

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY15/U4-2015.pdf>

6. Faculty Governance Reports of the Indiana University Campuses (1 Hour)  
(Various) [DISCUSSION]

7. Post-Tenure Review (30 minutes)  
(Professor Cassidy Sugimoto, President-elect, Bloomington Faculty Council) [DISCUSSION]

8. Old Business/New Business

### Minutes

**MCRORBIE:** Alright. Ladies and gentlemen why don't we – why don't we get started. Welcome, first, to another academic year at Indiana University. I think maybe in terms of starting this meeting, before I move to the approval of the minutes, and [comment indistinct] going around the room and just let everybody introduce themselves given it's a new UFC and I see quite a few new faces – though some old faces, too, around the room. [comment indistinct] And – and do that quickly and then we can start with the agenda proper. So I'm Michael McRobbie, President of Indiana University. John?

**APPLEGATE:** John Applegate, Executive Vice President for University Academic Affairs and a member of the Law's faculty in Bloomington.

**WOKECK:** Marianne Wokeck, co-Secretary of UFC and President of the IUPUI Faculty Council.

**GOODINE:** Linda Adele Goodine, I am from the Herron School of Art, and I'm a voted representative to this Council.

**HASSELL:** John Hassell from the Kelley School of Business in Indianapolis, and this is my first year on this Council.

**GJERDINGEN:** I am Don Gjerdingen. I am at the Law School in Bloomington.

**SPANG:** Rebecca Spang, I'm a historian in Bloomington and I'm the secretary of the Bloomington Faculty Council.

**MOHAMED:** I'm a Wazir Mohamed. I am a professor in Sociology at IU East.

**BARBRE:** James Barbre, professor in Education, Faculty Senate President at IU East.

**OPASIK:** Scott Opasik, IU South Bend, librarian and President for [comment indistinct].

**DARR:** Chris Darr, I'm associate professor in Communication Arts at Kokomo and President of our faculty senate.

**BADIA:** I'm Janet Badia. I'm Director of the Women's Studies program at IPFW and I'm here [comment indistinct]

**FLY:** I'm Alyce Fly in the School of Public Health in Bloomington.

**KRAVCHUK:** I'm Bob Kravchuk. I direct the Master of Public Affairs program in SPEA Bloomington and I am the co-chair of the [comment indistinct] Budgetary Affairs Committee in Bloomington.

**BANTZ:** Charles Bantz, Chancellor at IUPUI, Executive Vice President. Welcome to our wonderful Campus Center.

**BANDYOPADHYAY:** Subir Bandyopadhyay, professor of Marketing from IU Northwest, Vice President, Faculty Organization, sitting in for Charles Gallmeier, he is in [comment indistinct] right now.

**ORME:** Bill Orme, IUPUI Associate Dean, University Library.

**FROEHLICH:** Jan Froehlich, Department of Medicine, IU School of Medicine, an old face.

**MCRORBIE:** [comment indistinct]

**FROEHLICH:** Served a long time.

**DAVIS:** Chuck Davis, IUPUI School of Social Work, Department of Labor Studies.

**WHITE:** Tyler White, I'm the Undergraduate Student Government Treasurer here at IUPUI representing AUSA, sitting in for our Undergraduate Student Government President, Niki DaSilva, so forget my break of decorum if you will.

**LEE:** I am Karen Lee, I'm the Faculty and Staff Council Coordinator here at IUPUI.

**SUGIMOTO:** I am Cassidy Sugimoto. I'm the Indiana University Bloomington president-elect for our Faculty Council, and I'm a faculty member at the School of Informatics and Computing.

**TERRY:** I'm Herb Terry. I am an emeritus professor of it used to be of Telecommunications but I guess now of the Media School. I'm sitting in for Jim Sherman. I was former head of the – co-Secretary of the UFC last year.

**DETHLOFF:** Craig Dethloff, Chief of Staff, Faculty Council Office.

**MCROBBIE:** Good. And the – the people at the back, do you want to introduce yourselves as well, or are you here as the audience – not just, but here as the audience?

**WHITE-MILLS:** I think we're here as the audience. I'm just speaking for myself, Kim White-Mills, Communication Studies here at IUPUI.

**MCROBBIE:** Okay.

**MURPHY:** I'm Miriam Murphy of the Law Library. I'm here in my role as the chair of the Campus Planning Committee.

**MCROBBIE:** Okay.

**DEAN:** Jeff Dean, Professor in the School of Dentistry, and Chancellor's Office Chief of Staff.

**MCROBBIE:** And I think that's – that's it. Would you like to – gentleman who is walking around. Could you introduce yourself, too, and then we're – then we're finished?

**NUR:** Oh, I'm Yusuf Nur, IU Kokomo.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 1: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

**MCROBBIE:** Alright, okay. Good all. Thank you, everybody for introducing yourselves. So let me move to the agenda proper. You should have in front of you a copy of the minutes of the – the last meeting. Could I have a motion to adopt the minutes please?

**UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** So moved.

**MCROBBIE:** And a seconder?

**UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** Second.

**MCROBBIE:** Okay, any discussion, corrections on the minutes from anybody?

**WOKECK:** There is one correction that – right where [indistinct] it is not the School of Philosophy but the School of Philanthropy.

**MCROBBIE:** I saw a version that had Simon Atkinson both present and not present, too, which I thought was an impressive accomplishment. Any other comments or questions from anybody about the minutes? Okay, there being none I'll – I'll put the motion to adopt the minutes, although with that – with that change. All those in favor of adopting minutes please signify by saying "Aye." [Aye] Again, same sign. [Silence] Minutes are adopted. We move to Agenda Item 2 which is the Executive Committee Business, which will be Herb.

## **AGENDA ITEM 2: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

**WOKECK:** I think it's on. Thank you very much. I would like to welcome you as well and thank you for – in some instances make a rather long way to our campus and the campus center, and I would also like to thank Karen Lee who has, on very short notice, provided us with this room because this is a very busy time in the semester and this is a campus that has very rarely any spare room. So thank you very much in particular. They – and I also would like to say that Jim Sherman who is the Co-Secretary of the UFC is not in town, neither Bloomington nor IUPUI, and hence it falls to his colleagues from Bloomington, Herb Terry and Cassidy Sugimoto to help me get through this meeting. So I will call on them as – as the following agenda items will come to pass.

I just very briefly want to say that there were last year three items that had carried actions and they have been appended to the – to the agenda and it would be very helpful if you help us disseminate them on the campuses so that everybody knows the composition of UFC, that is, the – the members are listed, including the staff. We now have – are beginning to have the list of students as well which currently are listed there as “To Be Announced,” so that is very helpful. And you will find as the second item the standing committees and emails amongst the Executive Committee have indicated so far that we do want all of those standing committees staffed because there are issues that will come to pass, and therefore calls have gone out to the various faculty councils to recommend members for those committees so that they can start their work as we are beginning to articulate the agendas for each of those standing committees. So if you please pay attention to it and pass it on, and we will have those hopefully constituted very soon. And the third item is that the – the statement that was very apt, especially in the political situation last year about the assembly's move to – try to get a constitutional amendment that made it very clear what the constitution of marriage should be, namely a man and a woman, and that Indiana University articulated not only its own policy but the rationale for supporting an initiative that was helping to be more tolerant in that – in that respect. I, just as a comment, I expect from what I've heard that it is likely that this issue will reoccur but the question is whether it's going to be as prominent on the agenda of the assembly or not. So there may be follow up on that particular issue, and that is really all the business – a brief summary of the business – that the UFC conducted last year and there is a fairly – an agenda being articulated for this coming year, that is evident from some of the discussion items on this agenda. And we will welcome comments and introductions of issues that you may have on your campuses. We're looking to that and then follow up from that and establishing an agenda for the next meeting and especially for the committees to work on that we can help bring – improve the situation for all of us and our students and the community at the Indiana University. And again, welcome and I think that is the end of the very brief report.

**MCRORBIE:** Thank you, Marianne. Any questions for Marianne from anybody? Any questions?

**TERRY:** I wanted to [comment indistinct]

**MCROBBIE:** I was going to ask you to report next, Herb. Yeah, yeah. Any questions for Marianne from anybody? Okay, then let me ask Herb to add to that all – any new issues he wishes to.

**TERRY:** I feel like Arnold Schwarzenegger in the second *Terminator* – “I’m back.” But let me express Jim’s wishes that he could be here to join this group. He does have to be out of town. This meeting is relatively early in the semester, so is the spring UFC meeting. I hope in the future we may find ways where we also meet later in the semester because of the way in which the University Faculty Council usually does business. I’d add a couple of things to – to Marianne’s report. One thing that is coming our way is the University’s Strategic Plan. I think current plans are that a draft of that will be available next month, and there will be a comment period. Certainly individual campuses may want to comment, but it may be that the UFC in some way wants to take a look at it, too. The president last year assured us that there would be ample time for comment and since I don’t think it’s intended to be finalized until December, there will be. So once it comes out, I hope you’ll take a – a look at it at the campus level, and I can assure the Executive Committee will take a look at it and see how the UFC should approach it, and that’s the only thing I would add to Marianne’s report.

**MCROBBIE:** Any questions for Herb from anybody. I should remind Herb that of course there is quite a few sequels to – to *Terminator 2*, too, so...

**TERRY:** One’s enough.

### **AGENDA ITEM 3: PRESIDING OFFICER’S BUSINESS**

**MCROBBIE:** Any – any other questions? [Silence] Okay. Let me move on to three which is basically a report I give and I’ll just pick up and touch on a couple of matters that have already been raised. Firstly, to – to talk a little about decision of the legislature, I think as everybody knows this is the – a budget session, which means that effectively it’s going to start in November and will go through to April. By statute it has to finish, I think it’s the very last day of April, and it tends to finish at the last moment, and this tends to be a very intense session of the legislature where it takes a lot of my time and takes up a lot of the time of our staff relations people, but also quite a few others in the administration. John’s normally involved, MaryFrances McCourt is, and we have, particularly in recent years, called heavily on a number of faculty with specific expertise in certain areas to help draft specific legislation to – to testify to appropriate subcommittees and committees of the legislature. I don’t see that changing this year. I think if anything it’ll be – it’ll be even more so than we have experienced in previous years. I do think it’s fair to say that our standing with the legislature is – is good as it’s ever been since I – I’ve been here. We – we are well thought of. We are regarded as – as – as being cooperative, that is – that is we have tried to make an effort to work with the legislature to – to improve legislation, to bring to them issues where they can help us by – by making changes to some of the regulatory and compliance burdens that we labor under and which of course cost us money that could go otherwise to valuable academic programs in the – in the institution. People might remember the last session we had some – some changes passed by the legislature that considerably eased the process of being able to build and, in particular, renovate

structures in the university. I've already met with a number of the legislative leaders well in advance of the session to take to them a number of additional changes that I hope they'll consider this session that would further, sort of simplify a lot of administrative processes that we have to engage in with the – with the state, and I got a pretty good reception for that. I think in terms of what – what we can expect as an – as an outcome, people have probably followed – I mean it gets good coverage in the press – the situation with revenue growth in the state. Revenue has been growing roughly as – as predicted and as – as budgeted, not above that, and it was for a little while a little below, and I think the upshot of that is I – I don't think there's going to be a huge amount of new money around, though the hope is that there will be some. We have a series of requests in front of them for some new capital projects. We have a number of special line item requests. The performance measures that you might remember that we were very critical of a few years ago, and which were modified following our criticism, our public criticism of them, have – have been used this year and we've actually come out of them extremely well. Just about any one of the measures you take, IU's been the leader, and that's going to – that's going to result in – unless they decide to change them mid-course – that's going to result in some additional funding coming our way. On the negative side, as I think people know, the governor's office, because of some concern about the rate at which revenue was – was accruing in the state did cut us 2% in the first academic year, and then 2% this academic year. The state budget directive very publically said under questioning from the state budget committee a few weeks ago that – that 2% this semester – sorry, this academic year would be – be restored – or if you like not withheld – if state revenue hit the targets projected for it. I – I have literally just written to – to the governor in which I have said that we are grateful for – for this, but in particular asked that they consider also restoring the previous kind of 2% that was made for the previous – the previous year if the state hits its revenue targets, and I did allude to the fact, of course, that there is a – a surplus in the state of something in the vicinity of \$2 billion dollars, or at least a reserve of \$2 billion dollars in the state. So we'll – we'll see what happens. I also made the point that – that the base for this year's budget should be the previous base as appropriated by the legislature, not the base with the 2% cuts in it, too. And I – I know there's some – there's considerable support for that being the case in the legislature. So that's the – that's the budgetary side of things. Obviously, there's – even though the state provides now – it's somewhere in the range of 25% of our total budget across all campuses – that's still a significant amount of money and – and of course they have been a major source of funding for capital projects in the – in the university, and in particular with our focus on renovation of buildings and the importance R&R. I think again, I think the UFC is familiar with our deferred maintenance bill which is now – which – which we have been able to reduce over recent years – but it is still in the range of \$600 million dollars, so it's a massive deferred maintenance bill, and I was reading a piece the other day that said the dollar you don't invest today is \$4 you're going to have to invest in future years. So we're making strenuous efforts to – to eliminate our deferred – the university's deferred – maintenance bill. I think it'll put us in a pretty unique category if we achieve that, but I've – I've also indicated that's one of the tasks I'd like to try and accomplish by the bicentennial. Certainly, that what we think of as the smaller R&R tasks, and then the larger ones really are the major buildings on this campus and the Bloomington and – and some additional issues on the – on the regional campuses that – that need to be – need to be addressed.

As to other issues, every session of the legislature involves a – a whole range of proposals that come up because individual members can propose pretty much what they like, much of that gets weeded out very quickly, but we – we can expect – every year there are some problematic issues that come up, that’s what we pay our state relations people for is to deal with those issues. We did take, as you know, a very public stance on opposing the proposed constitutional amendment that would ban gay marriage. Of course, it’s already unlawful. By statute it’s banned, but this put – this would enshrine it effectively forever in the constitution, and ultimately the coalition of institutions who arrayed against it prevailed, prevailed in the sense that by changing the – modifying the legislation – it means the clock starts again. But the clock starts again. So that means that it is possible to – to revisit this issue in its modified form at this – at this session. I don’t think there’s a huge appetite for it among many members of the legislature, but I think there are a lot of people who are very passionate about – about this issue, so I expect we’re going to have to wrestle with it again. I want to say, again, how grateful I am to the UFC and a number of the other faculty councils, both at the campus and at the school level for the very strong statements of support that – that you gave and others gave in support of the position that the university took on this – on this issue, and let me say we’ll probably be calling on you again because I think this is not – this is not going to go away but hopefully we might – we might not see it necessarily get to the point it got to last time. It is, on the other hand, it is an election year and so there are people who may want to be seen to be taking a certain position on this given that there – there are elections both at the state and federal level coming up as I’m sure you all know. So that’s the – the budget preview. I could stop. I’ve got three or four issues to go through, I could stop after each issue, I could just wait to the end – to just ask me any questions you like at the end. Anybody dying to ask anything now, because otherwise I will just continue through and then just open it up at the end?

Let me then mention I think an issue that Herb touched on, pretty much just to validate what Herb said. The – the university’s strategic plan, which as I’ve indicated before, and this goes back to my State of the University speech last year is – is – is going to be in many ways an aggregation of the various major points, major issues, major topics out of the – the various plans for campuses and other units within the university is under – is under development with a view to taking it to the Trustees, and then I will formally release it in draft form in my State of the University speech on the 14<sup>th</sup> of October. It will be in draft form, I will release it in the sense of asking for comprehensive comment on it from across the university, so it’ll be made available in – in a web-based fashion that will enable comment to be provided, and obviously it’ll be provided to all the – all the faculty councils for input, and so on. There is – there is considerable desire on the part of the Trustees to try to get this finalized by December, and certainly that would be my goal to try and get it finalized by December, but if it turns out that we need more time than we will – we will take more time, but I’m hoping that – that in the – in the spirit of trying to move these matters along – and there’s been a lot of time spent on strategic planning already and it can rapidly become an area in which one can get – get bogged down, and since we have all got many things we want to do, and there are many things in the plans we want to get done, I’m hoping it might be possible to get it done by the December meeting of the Trustees. I – I will digress there for – oh, sorry, one other thing I wanted to

comment, and I have said this before, I think people know it, that we're really using the Principles of Excellence which this body endorsed a number of years ago, and was endorsed ultimately by the Trustees as the – as the kind of framework for – for the plan as well. So there is much in it that – that will be familiar, number one. Number two, there's much in it that's already been announced, so the development, I mean at the – at the facilities level the development of the Wishard site, for example, is going to be a major thing. The digitalization project that I announced last year will be a major theme in IT, so there's a lot – a lot of things in it. This really aggregates together a whole lot of already preannounced issues that are under way, but tries to give them a coherent framework as well.

I did want to digress and just say that I think, again, as people know we had – we've had some turnover on the Board of Trustees. After three appointments, nine years in the Trustees the – the chair, Tom Reilly, and the previous chair, Bill Cast, both retired from the Board and they have been replaced by Andy Mohr, who has been a very generous donor to the university over many years, and by Mike Mirro, a physician from Fort Wayne. And – and – and Randy Tobias has been elected the Chair of the Board. Randy has – has got enormous experience in the – the management of higher education. He was on the Duke board for, I believe it was for twelve or thirteen years, and he was Chair of the Duke board for – for three years, and of course he's had a long and – and illustrious career in business. He was Deputy Secretary of State for a period, and so on as well, so I'm very pleased to have – to have Randy be agreeable to take on the chair, the role of chair. And MaryEllen Bishop who had become the chair on Tom Reilly's retirement becomes the Vice Chair again, and there's been a number of other changes in terms of the committee chairs and so on as well. So I think the Board is going to focus in – probably in certain different priorities. Every time there are new members on a board the issues that most concern them change a little, but I don't think there'll be any diminution of their focus on issues of fiscal responsibility, efficiency, affordability and excellence in quality within the institution.

I do want to say something about the IPFW situation. I don't have a huge amount to say. We have consistently taken the position that – that this really is a matter for – for Purdue to decide what they want to do here. Probably people are mindful of a report that was released now, I think, about three weeks ago – three or four weeks ago, that has a whole series of recommendations and a fairly exhaustive analysis of issues concerning IPFW that actually recommends that it become an IU campus. That – that again is not something that could even be considered unless Purdue is – is agreeable to at least having discussions. I have, as of this morning, spoken to President Daniels, and he is agreeable to having those discussions. I don't think – I think it'll – it – it's going to be a long time even getting that moving. He will need to identify somebody to get the discussions up. These will be discussions held at the level of the administrations of both institutions and there will – and discussions will be about a number of issues raised in – in the report, but as I said this is a – this is Purdue's campus. Purdue is responsible for it administratively and – and we will simply take our lead from – from them. But – but I do want – I do want to stress that no behind the scenes deal has been – has been done here. This – we – we – we will hope to publically announce, I mean just very briefly, that we will begin these discussions at some point in the near future. So that's IPFW.

I – let me say a little, too, about the Student Welfare Initiative, and – and I’m going to ask John to – to maybe add to this as well. You’re – you’re probably familiar with – I’m sure you are all very familiar with – the enormous amount of attention that issues of student welfare and student life have been getting nationally, in particular focused on the issue of sexual violence on campuses. This is a – I – obviously a highly charged issue at the moment, and I expect that – I expect that – that it will continue to get a large amount of attention nationally for – for a long time to come. In – this – this is obviously an area of enormous importance to us, and one we take immensely seriously, and I have asked – I asked John and his office to take responsibility for it working with all the – all the campuses and probably many of you have seen the – our – our statement on this matter, and – and this was presented to the Trustees in August, and there was a series of major announcements and there were websites that have picked up on this and so on as well. There is – there’s a considerable role that is already being developed in this for – for faculty. We – we have, I think, across the various schools and the universities, in particular in the Health Sciences, but other areas as well, considerable expertise in this area and we hope to really muster that expertise in support of the policies and procedures we’re trying to put into place to deal with – to deal with this issue. But, John, do you want to – would you like to add something to that –

**APPLEGATE:** Sure.

**MCROBBIE:** – at this point, yeah?

**APPLEGATE:** The – well, as you say there’s actually a lot in place already. All of the campuses have been concerned with this issue for quite some time and over the past year, I was saying to the Regional Faculty Caucus this morning that I think three of the four Trustees’ meetings this year have had significant presentations on – on this issue, and that’s a long standing concern of theirs. There’re really four parts to the – or subjects – for the Student Welfare Initiative, which is what we are calling it. First, and of course first, is prevention and response. Prevention, I think, most people would agree is very much a matter of changing culture and that’s very explicitly the root that the typically deans of students’ offices on – on all of the campuses have been focusing on. Response is more the – the law enforcement side of it, but equally important is supporting victims of these crimes and making sure that they – they not only are but feel supported in what is a very difficult time and a very difficult environment providing the resources for people to be able to prevent – prevent these kinds of incidents. One of the big issues or the big resources is bystander intervention, providing indeed scripts and skits at orientation about ways to intervene in situations that look like they are – they are dangerous. So prevention and response is the first part, and I’m just scratching the surface there. A second is compliance. The federal interest in this is not – not just saying things. The Office of Civil Rights in the US Department of Education under Title IX has been very aggressive in pursuing this issue including very significant penalties for violations of Title IX and Title IX regulations, which are themselves getting larger all the time. So compliance is another important part of what we need to do. A third is communication. The principal website – it’s now live – it’s called [stopsexualviolence.iu.edu](http://stopsexualviolence.iu.edu), and I really commend it to you. The – for one thing that our creative services people did this very quickly, and I think very, very well, and it’s got all kinds of

resources for all parts of the community, students, faculty, and staff. It also, I think, expresses our commitment to addressing this issue in a very forceful way. And you've also, I hope, seen posters around the place. They're a model that we actually - had been developed at South Bend and is - was really a very effective one, and that's been made available and I think is being distributed on all campuses. And then the fourth part is - is research. Too often we know that we kind of ignore our own talent and we're really determined not to do that in this case, and so we asked the chancellors or the vice chancellors from all the campuses to nominate faculty for a research workshop on this issue with the idea of bringing our best thinking to - to these issues, and I hope that Sarita Soni, at - who's the Vice Provost for Research at Bloomington, just retired and - and she has agreed - eagerly, actually - to take this on in her retirement for which I'm very grateful. So that - those are the four big pieces as Michael said. The faculty role is in the research. There are undoubtedly changes we're going to need to make to university policies in accordance with the federal guidelines and requirements under Title IX and there will be more of that over the course of the year, I think. The - I just can't tell you how prescriptive the Department of Education is in getting into this issue. And finally, again, the - one of the big questions everybody has is what should I do if I hear about one of - an incident like this? The website, [stopsexualviolence.iu.edu](http://stopsexualviolence.iu.edu), is - has wonderful resources on that, pointing you to people on each campus and to some handbooks that the Office of General Counsel has put together with working with deans of students to give faculty and - and others the resources, where to go. The important thing, of course, is supporting victims of these crimes and making sure they get the kind of professional support, whether it's law enforcement, or counseling they need as quickly as possible, and all of those resources are there.

**MCROBBIE:** Thanks, John, and I will just finish up with one final comment which is, by the way, of foreshadowing a matter that'll be raised later in the agenda. The - the issue of - of - of post-tenure review which is - which is coming up for discussion, I want to stress that this is, I think, basically on the - on the agenda because it was, I think as people know, raised at Ball State by the - by the faculty there. It has not been something that has been raised - or at least initiated - by the university administration or the Board of Trustees. I know that story is floating around. It's false. This has been a new - this has been basically initiated because of what's happened at Ball State. I do think that given that and - and given this is a topic elsewhere in the country - that it is worthwhile. The faculty being seen to be engaging with this issue and trying to feel like get ahead of - of this issue in - in what is a very skeptical age, as far as external constituencies are concerned, but this should be completely faculty driven and a matter for the faculty to decide about how - how this should be proceeded with and - and dealt with, as we'll also will come to that later. That's - that's all I've got to say. Happy to take questions now, which I guess is the next point anyway, but happy to take questions on any of the matters I talked about or anything else and John, in particular, on the Student Welfare Initiative. Yeah?

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

**GOODINE:** I want to go back to the legislation and the budget.

**MCROBBIE:** Yeah?

**GOODINE:** Could you just give us maybe one example of the most important capital budget item? Maybe an important line item?

**MCROBBIE:** The – there – there are requests in it for renovation of buildings at – in the Wishard site there, and there is a request in it for – for this campus, for the renovation of – sorry, for the addition to the science and engineering [comment indistinct] building, for phase two of that. That's one of the five major projects. On the Bloomington campus, there's a kind of omnibus group of renovations for a series of the buildings in the Old Crescent, which is a long standing issue there. With respect to – to – to line items, there's a number of things. There – issues to do with regional student success, statewide economic engagement and – and some additional support for the clinical translational sciences, and in particular, the CTSI initiative. These are all line items that are developed in – in – in discussions with – with key people in the legislature in terms of what they think is realistic or not realistic to get – to get funded by them. The – and I'm pretty certain this is all – this is, I mean, this is all public I mean. I do – I – I'm presenting to the Higher Ed Commission on Thursday and will be presenting on all of this in terms of our budget – budget request. I should have mentioned that before, too, by the way, that – that the first step in this whole process is the presentation to the Indiana Commission for Higher Education which starts actually tomorrow. There'll be a visit there – this meeting's in Bloomington. They'll be visiting the campus. They get taken on various tours. They meet with students. In fact, I think, some of our – some of the students of the Bloomington campus concerned with the Student Welfare Initiative will be meeting with them, something which they have got now considerable interest. Then I – then I host a dinner for them, next day I do two separate presentations to them, and I think John's – and John does a presentation to them at lunch. Other questions? Yes, Herb?

**TERRY:** I – I'd like to make just – excuse me – I'd like to make just three comments, one building on that. In circular U2-2015, you'll note that we are, the Executive Committee, has decided to repopulate the Government and External Relations Committee, formerly the Vigilance Committee or something like that. I – I hope that committee will work with – with Government Relations on this sort of thing and be of assistance going forward. We'll get that constituted soon. I'd also say that at least as a member of the Executive Committee, I – I think I can assure you that the Executive Committee would be anxious to work with the administration to help disseminate and – and educate campuses and IU faculty about the Student Welfare Initiative, and the expectations that we'll have of faculty. We had a presentation at the Bloomington Faculty Council, sort of a repetition of a presentation at the Board of Trustees. As John has indicated, it's a rapidly changing environment. I spent the weekend reading an awful lot of this stuff and a lot of it is contradictory over time. So it – it will change rapidly and it does have consequences for every campus and, you know, I think we're anxious to work to distribute that. And finally, since I've been involved in it for so many years, I want again to thank the president for the position that the university took last year on the constitutional amendment and add one thing to his comments on that. Yeah, it's a legislative matter. It is certainly a legislative matter in this case, but in many ways it looks like the final decision here in many

ways will come from the Supreme Court of the United States on constitutional questions. It would not surprise me if higher education or some other related groups get actively involved, participating in friend of the court briefs, and that sort of thing, should this go to the Supreme Court and – and personally, our General Counsel, Jackie, was very effective with our General Assembly and – and others. I would hope that if the opportunity arises for us to join in a relevant friend of the court brief before the Supreme Court that we would seriously consider it.

**MCROBBIE:** It is only our practice, Herb.

**TERRY:** Good.

**MCROBBIE:** That's exactly what we normally do.

**TERRY:** So, you know, it has this – remember that it has this legislative dimension, it also has this constitutional law dimension, and I'm glad to know that we will take a hard look at participating if it gets there. That's the only additional comments I would make.

**MCROBBIE:** Are there other – yes, Bob?

**KRAVCHUK:** Michael, with respect to student welfare [comment indistinct].

**MCROBBIE:** Sorry, could you repeat that, Bob?

**KRAVCHUK:** Okay. With respect to student welfare most of the – the comments that I've heard respecting faculty involvement have either been what to do in the event that some incident was reported with [comment indistinct] or in the area of research. And I wonder if – if you would envision a role for the faculty in reminding the students that – or imploring them if necessary, exhorting – it is – it is not okay, you know, to intimidate, and it is not okay to abuse your relationship with someone else. It – it is not okay to engage in what are essentially illegal practices. There are [comment indistinct] on campus, and I think if they were to hear from the grown-ups that this – this isn't okay and that we're – we're mindful of – of their safety, mindful of their conduct in this regard, that that might assist in – in creating the kind of culture of prevention that we really want to get at –

**MCROBBIE:** Yeah.

**KRAVCHUK:** What I've heard so far has been mostly in the area of reaction, and I'm wondering if we can take some pro-action.

**APPLEGATE:** Well, I –

**MCROBBIE:** I mean, I completely agree with that by the way, Bob, yeah.

**APPLEGATE:** Yeah sure, and the more that that message is – is heard the better. In fact, one of the more difficult issues we have here is that students don't come to college with a – in a – with a blank slate on these issues. Their attitudes and behaviors are often ones that they've learned all too well when – when we first see them. So the more that that's repeated the better. But I – I do want to make sure that everyone understands how much the orientation process for new students focuses on this issue in lots of different ways and very intensely, and very directly, and – very directly. And both with students and their parents, and I really commend the – the office of the orientation programs on, again, all of the campuses for taking this on but, yeah, it is about culture change and what's acceptable and what's not, so couldn't agree more.

**KRAVCHUK:** Just a follow up on [comment indistinct] – it's important to stay on message [comment indistinct] they hear a lot of things during orientation; how to find the bookstore, it's not okay to cheat, this is – this is [comment indistinct] and, you know, that's the first few weeks of their experience at IU. I'm just wondering if there isn't going to be some opportunity for the faculty, or maybe we should simply make opportunities with our students. To just say, you know, we're very concerned about this. This is a big issue. This will ruin your life, and this will ruin the lives of your victims. You don't want to do this.

**APPLEGATE:** Right.

**KRAVCHUK:** This is a bad thing.

**APPLEGATE:** Right. And there are – and, again, there are ongoing programs with various groups on – student groups on campus, but yeah, exactly and I have a feeling that it's the multiplicity of messages from multiple sources that will, you know, have an effect in the long run, shorter run, I hope, but –

**KRAVCHUK:** Will there be a particular message we might be able to deliver? Or will this depend [comment indistinct] sort of the Department of Education's regulations as we move on. I want to be sure if I'm going to say something to students, that I'm not –

**APPLEGATE:** Well, you know, I – I think the sort of passionate belief that you are expressing right now is probably the most effective thing. I mean it sort of sounds odd but, you know, what you believe in your heart about this and communicating that strikes me as the most effective message that we can send rather than – I mean, I think there – there's a place for, you know, posters that cover things and have resources, and there is a place for that, but there is also a place for, you know, people speaking – speaking their hearts on it. And just as there's a place for RA's having, you know, informal sessions with students in dorms, I think it's those different kinds of things. So I – I'd hate to regiment it.

**MCRORBIE:** But I – I would, you know, really – to some extent off the top of my head, Bob – I would – John might want to comment on this but but if – if there is sort of – if this body and the other faculty councils wanted to adopt some kind of position on this, I mean, I think endorsing the Student Welfare Initiative would – would be, I think, particularly helpful. But then, in

particular, disseminating that to all faculty saying – this is – this is how the university is – is addressing this issue. We endorse it and – and we strongly encourage all faculty to – to use all appropriate opportunities to stress the importance of – of these issues or something like that. I think that would – I think that would send a very strong signal, an extremely strong signal.

**APPLEGATE:** Yeah, absolutely.

**MCROBBIE:** And maybe – maybe, it’s probably premature to do it now, but maybe that might be an issue that we should look at to put on the agenda at the – precisely on the agenda at the next meeting. Or the Executive Committee may pick it up in-between the meetings and – and maybe – maybe try and get something like that done before the end of the semester. Other questions from anybody? Any questions for Herb or Marianne as well? [Silence] Okay, there being none let’s move to agenda item 5, the Proposed Amendments to the Constitution of the UFC. Herb?

#### **AGENDA ITEM 5: PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE INDIANA UNIVERSITY FACULTY**

**WOKECK:** I would like –

**MCROBBIE:** Oh sorry, Mary?

**WOKECK:** – to ask Herb to present it –

**MCROBBIE:** Yeah, sorry.

**WOKECK:** – thank you.

**TERRY:** Well, thank you. I’m looking for it. Here it is. Okay. Let me first of all acknowledge in many ways I am probably one of the right people to present this because this actually began with the Executive Committee of the UFC last year receiving a request from representatives of the regional campuses to consider how we might better incorporate someone from the regional campuses in the leadership, the co-secretaries, of – of the UFC. Last year’s Executive Committee, in fact, endorsed the idea of doing that, leaving it to a subcommittee largely of regional campus folks, but I ended up getting involved in it, to produce a formal proposal to amend the constitution to accomplish that objective that the UFC Executive Committee approved last year. What you have before you is U4-2015, is the result of that. This document, or this idea, was discussed by this year’s Executive Committee about a week ago and we endorsed it. I am grateful to you folks for coming to this meeting today because amendments to the constitution must pass a meeting of the UFC. It’s not something that can be forwarded to the faculty just as a result of Executive Committee action. So this meeting is essential in order to get this out expeditiously. As you can see there are really two amendments in here. One would add to the co-secretaries, the current co-secretaries of the UFC, a third co-secretary that would come from the ranks of the regional campuses. Currently, more or less by tradition,

although it's in the constitution in a way, we have two co-secretaries, and they tend to come from IUPUI and IUB. They don't have to. You could elect somebody else, but they have tended in recent years to do that. What this would do is formalize the idea that the UFC would have three, to begin with, co-secretaries – one from IUB, one from IUPUI, and one from the ranks of the regionals. It doesn't specify exactly how each of those three people would be selected for a good reason. It is laborious to get amendments to the constitution passed. They have to be approved by various subsets of the entire Indiana University faculty. It's not as difficult to change the bylaws. This council adopts the bylaws. So what we have decided to do is put the idea that there would be three co-leaders of the UFC in the constitution and stipulate that the bylaws will determine how each of those three people is selected. What I imagine we would do if this passes, is we would ask IUB to specify, or to propose bylaws for how the Bloomington representative would be selected. We would ask IUPUI and the Medical School to do the same, and we would turn at this point to the Regional Faculty Caucus because it sort of represents regional campuses to propose ways for doing the third. That would be subject to your review. The bylaw changes would come back to the UFC so if somebody proposed something that you really thought was a bad way to do it, you'd have an opportunity to say so. But I rather hope that – that we would, you know, readily approve whatever it is that they propose. This has the advantage that if our mechanism for changing, for selecting these people needs to change, it's easier to do than if it were a part of the constitution. That may well happen at Bloomington. I mean right now we might say the president of the Bloomington Faculty Council will be the co-secretary of the UFC. But as I will report, when I report later on what's going on at the various campuses, we are reexamining the faculty component of shared governance at Bloomington. We might not have a Bloomington Faculty Council. We might call it a senate or something. If we put that in the constitution we'd have to go back and change the constitution. If we put it in the bylaws we can deal with it later. The reasons why we think this is a good idea is just that – that in many ways the university is sort of composed now of three primary components. Two of them are core campuses, IUPUI and IUB, and one is the regionals, which increasingly under John are brought together and kind of cooperate. The regionals have now something they didn't have a few years ago, the Regional Faculty Caucus and therefore a way of kind of representing themselves, and – and I think I can say pretty confidently that the recent co-secretaries of the UFC have tried really hard to reach out to the regional campuses and to include their perspectives in our meetings with the president and elsewhere, but that would be made a lot easier if we actually had a representative from the regionals in our ranks. So I know I support this. I'm pretty sure Jack Windsor, the most recent co-secretary from IUPUI does. Marianne can speak for herself. The Executive Committee did, and we hope you will send this out for the approval of the faculty. The procedures for that are in the handout. You're required to convene a meeting on your campus at which the faculty can attend and become informed on this before the vote of the faculty and it must be passed by a majority of everybody who votes and by a majority of the campuses. So there's a little bit of double – two different ways in which the votes must be counted, but that's not impossible. So there will be plenty of opportunity for discussion of this by the faculty on your campuses before they vote, so [comment indistinct] get that discussion going.

The second amendment comes primarily, I think, from Jack Windsor and I. It's to change the title of the people who head this Council from the faculty. They're currently called co-secretaries, and I'll be honest with you, I did get much involved in the constitutional amendment issue last year, and to people I spoke to and legislatures I wrote to, and that sort of thing, I kind of had to say, well, I am the co-secretary of the University Faculty Council, think "co-president," or "co-leader," because what we do as co-secretaries is not very secretarial in many ways. So the second amendment proposes a change in title to co-chairs, and that title would change if the second amendment passes anyway – everywhere in the current constitution and policies and this sort of thing. If both of these things pass, then we'd have three co-chairs. And I – I think that would just help better identify what the leaders, the elected – or selected leaders – they would be elected, I assume, by the campuses – of the Council kind of do. We didn't want to call them president, although some of you have presidents of your campus faculty councils, because here the president of the university is our presiding officer and that could be confusing, so we settled on recommending "chair" and "co-chairs" as – as the best title and superior to "secretary." So that's what we propose, and as I noted it's been discussed by last year's Executive Committee and this year's Executive Committee with no significant dissent, I think, within either of those years. I'd ask Marianne if she has anything to add, and then I've asked if Chris Darr, who represents the Regional Faculty Caucus, would like to add anything, too.

**WOKECK:** I do not have anything substantive to add to this. This is a – I think – a good proposal. I hope we discuss it and then move forward.

**MCROBBIE:** Discussion?

**TERRY:** Thank you.

**MCROBBIE:** Let me – it's – it's an action item. I guess that – that we should – we should see if there's a motion to adopt this and then we can have the discussion on the motion. That's probably the way to proceed. Is – is there a motion to adopt this constitutional amendment?

**DAVIS:** So moved.

**MCROBBIE:** Second?

**BANTZ:** Second.

**MCROBBIE:** Okay, so we have a motion to adopt this in front of us. Can we have discussion on that motion please? Yes?

**DARR:** Thanks [comment indistinct] for Herb for working on this. [comment indistinct] about the rationale behind it. I also want to just mention – Chuck could not be here but he claims it was his idea – so we will give credit where it's due, and I think that it's, you know, as we've seen the Regional Faculty Caucus develop as it has, I think it – it's a good thing for all the regionals

because we have found that we have really good, really common interests that are somewhat different from what the other two campuses have because our student populations are somewhat different, and things of that nature, and I just think that it would be a – a very important to bring those interests, even more prominently to the floor in this group by having the third co-chair that comes from that area.

**MCROBBIE:** Other – other discussion? Questions or comments from anybody? Other discussion? [Silence] Seems to be a great general consensus on this matter. Any – any other comments or discussions? An important – important step, so I want to make sure everybody has a chance to comment on it who wishes to. Nothing? Well, in that case, I will put the motion. All in favor of adopting effectively this constitutional amendment or series of these constitutional amendments please signify by saying “Aye.” [Aye] Against same sign. [Silence] So that is carried overwhelmingly.

**TERRY:** And we will send it out with Craig’s office. We’ll send a reminder of the procedures that – that you have to go through on the individual campuses as well.

**MCROBBIE:** Okay.

**TERRY:** Thank you!

#### **AGENDA ITEM 6: FACULTY GOVERNANCE REPORTS OF THE INDIANA UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES**

**MCROBBIE:** Alright, let me – we move to agenda item 6, the various faculty governance reports from the various campuses. How should we start this? In order of the –

**TERRY:** Alphabetically?

**MCROBBIE:** Alphabetically? That’s a way to be certain that it is – is that – that would be probably you Ed?

**APPLEGATE:** Jay, from East.

**MCROBBIE:** Jay, right? You want to start?

**BARBRE:** As – as far as information we brought?

**MCROBBIE:** Well the – the agenda item is faculty governance reports and I think the idea is that the – the president or equivalent on each campus would say something about any issues on his or her campus, with respect to his or her – her faculty organization.

**BARBRE:** As far as East goes, one thing we are presently looking at is the composition of our Faculty Senate, including how to move to a representative form of it as opposed to one that is all inclusive at this point. And really that’s – that’s all I have.

**MCROBBIE:** Okay.

**TERRY:** Can you expand on that? What you mean by the difference between representative and – ?

**BARBRE:** Well, there's been discussion and the FAC is currently reviewing this to see whether we want to move to a representative constitution just by virtue of the – the number of faculty that we have, trying to make the process more efficient. We haven't really landed on whether we're going to do that or not. It's still – still in the discussion phases.

**SPANG:** So right now, every member of your faculty [comment indistinct]

**BARBRE:** That's correct, yes.

**MCROBBIE:** Okay, I think and – I think Chris you're next.

**DARR:** Okay, yeah. It kind of follows hand in hand with the constitutional amendment, and the idea that there are different needs and different populations of students at the regionals than at the others. One of our primary issues is some of these unforeseen problems or – or issues that come up with initiatives such as graduate in four and the degree maps. And it was mentioned before at the RFC we talked about, just a little bit but, for instance, we feel like at our campus, and I'm sure the other regionals as well, one of our strengths is the smaller student population and smaller faculty. We have – we have a closer relationship with students in many ways, right? We have smaller class size, et cetera. We also have in our degrees, we have fewer students. So I'm in Communication Arts, we have about sixty majors, we have four faculty. We have a lot of flexibility, so if we want to, you know, we have found that time to time we'll – we'll, you know, adjust our schedule of offerings things to help a few kids get out sooner, right? So a couple of kids need a certain class that's only offered every two years, we'll go ahead and offer it so they can get it. With the degree maps we're afraid that this might be restricting some of that flexibility somewhat, because we've had this happen this semester and it's new and it's just kind of getting started here, and we realize that but, for instance, if a – if a stu – if we offer a class that's required for our majors every other fall – right? – and a student – and in the past we might say, well, this student needs it to graduate this spring, so let's offer it early so they can take it. That sounds pretty simple, right? You just offer the class an extra time. But that could impact whether or not the class makes when it comes around because the kids that are in the major have already taken it. So then what do we do? Alright, is it just that simple? Can we find a substitute you might ask? Well, with the small campus, again, and not as many course offerings it could be hard to find a substitute class that has similar learning outcomes. So there are some challenges with that, that we are going to continue to work through, and although overall I think we are, you know, looking forward to the positive that the degree maps and these other initiatives can have – positive effects they can have on our students, we're concerned about some of the nuts and bolts of – of making it work.

**MCROBBIE:** Okay. Janet, I realize that – that I did not do a very good job of ordering this alphabetically. You should have been first.

**BADIA:** Yeah, I'm usually first. It's not – not very often [comment indistinct] Well, obviously we're in a unique position because we're Purdue-managed, and so our issues are probably a good bit different from the other regional campuses. The big preoccupation on our campus right now, both at senate and just generally, is we – we do have a new strategic plan, a strategic plan 2020, which was unveiled this summer and we have a task force called the – it's the University Strategic Alignment Process Task Force, and the idea is that that task force – task force – I'm having a hard time saying that today – is going to align, or – or evaluate the alignment of all of our programs on campus with the strategic plan 2020. All of that sounds good and well. I think that some of the concern among the faculty is there seems to be an expectation that from that process will emerge several signature programs that will align with the strategic plan and that will most likely receive additional resources, potentially, at the cost of other programs. Among the IU faculty, in particular, we're concerned that the programs that will be identified as signature programs will be largely Purdue programs and we want to make sure that our IU programs do not get sort of left behind in this process, and so that's the issue we've been talking a lot about on campus.

**MCROBBIE:** Thanks. I – I'm – I'm mindful that a number of people are representing other people here today, and so I might as well sort of throw alphabetization to the winds. Who's representing South Bend again?

**OPASIK:** I am.

**MCROBBIE:** Would you like to report?

**OPASIK:** Yes. Our biggest issue is our budget, and we had to dip into reserves last year, and so far this fall semester we did not meet our projected enrollment. And so this affects us in a number of ways – ability to address salary – salary compression which is a problem on our campus, also to hire new faculty next year. So that is a concern of ours. I think our – our second biggest concern is building a working relationship with our new admin – top administrators. Last year we – our new chancellor started. This year, our new executive vice chancellor of academic affairs, and with shared governance it's important that these – that we build a good relationship. I'm not suggesting that there's any problems here, just that with the short time we certainly can't say that this building of relationships is a finished product.

**MCROBBIE:** Somebody from Southeast – I didn't – ?

**TERRY:** I – I was asked by Jay Barry to –

**MCROBBIE:** You're so incredibly versatile.

**TERRY:** Yes, well, I – I am regarded by Barry as an honorary IU Southeast faculty member in part because my wife is a Southeast faculty member, but I do not speak for her and I, in fact, do not speak for myself. I speak for Jay and – and you have at your table a statement that – that he sent asking it to be read. I'm not going to be read but, you know, Jay's a philosopher and so as far as he's concerned the major issue at Southeast is matters of principles, and the boldfaced portion in there is that he wanted to express IU Southeast's hope that or expression for support of the first principle of the university, that the further decisions are made from the core academic operations of the university, the more likely they are to lead to unforeseen consequences to its essential academic mission. The context of that principle is – is in the handout that you have in front of you. With some trepidation, you know, I would add that they, too, are adapting to a new chancellor. It may be a matter of adapting to the chancellor or training the chancellor – I am not sure which – but they have a new one. And unlike Kokomo, it – it's a totally – he's a totally new person to the IU system, so I'm sure that they will be working closely with Chancellor Wallace in terms of the issues that confront that campus.

**MCROBBIE:** Thanks, Herb. Any – you're representing Northwest?

**BANDYOPADHYAY:** Yeah.

**MCROBBIE:** Could you – would you like to come up?

**BANDYOPADHYAY:** [comment indistinct] I think two main concerns for us, one would be enrollment, which is kind of related to the budget, because we are in a situation where we are hemmed in by two proto-campus from at least northwest and they say that the only area that you can go to the north is into the lake. So that apparent number that we got, I think we are down 4% in headcount, and 1% in credit hour. So we are kind of out there, so we are looking at that how best we can bridge that shortfall in the budget. The next one is, of course, the advising, which is kind of front and center at the campus. There is an advising task force. So they are looking into it very closely. That task force went to a conference – advising conference – in Portland recently, came back started making recommendation. Another related thing with that is IU FACET Leadership Institute. At our campus, the team that is there I happen to be a part of that. We have selected advising to be our topic, so we'll be doing research on that area. So our hope is that we'll have some sort of solution, some sort of ways to improve our advising even better. Right now we are pretty good. A recent reports shows for the graduating seniors, I think the satisfaction level is at 78%, around, which is a pretty good number, but we'd like to move even farther, higher on that, so advising another main area.

**MCROBBIE:** Yeah, there's – there's no doubt that I think at least three campuses have had fairly significant enrollment declines, and less on credit hours but – but certainly the numbers, and I – I think that – that – that in general – generally across the university we're going to have to start wrestling with the fact that I think we've reached a high water mark for enrollment and demographically there's going to be sort of a trough coming and we're probably going to see for at least a number of years declining enrollment and we're going to have to start looking at

how do we address and deal with that, especially on those campuses that are most severely affected. Okay, Herb, on behalf of Bloomington?

**TERRY:** On Bloomington. First of all, we – we – the agenda of the BFC can often be affected by the desires of the members, so all I can talk about are things that we anticipate coming before the BFC this – this year. Other things may happen at the will of the membership or because of as yet unforeseen events. Like all the campuses, I think we have recently gone through a strategic planning process. Ours was pretty exhaustive and extensive. This year will be one where the campus tries to implement that plan and certainly the BFC will be taking up issues related to that – that implementation. There will be some instances, I assume, where policies or practices adopted by or endorsed by the BFC will need change and we will take that up. One of the areas in which that's going to take place is the strategic plan recommended a review by the BFC of the faculty component of shared governance at IUB. I was asked by the Executive Committee to chair a sub-committee of our Faculty Affairs Committee that will undertake that review. We'll begin Thursday. The one thing I would say is that I don't think it's fruitful to limit the review to just the faculty component of shared governance. Shared governance is a system. And so we need to look at the administrative component and other components and how the faculty intersects with these other components and so forth to – to really make enhancements. And I would second with John, the idea that – in fact it's occurred to me recently – we deal with things we now confront involve cultural change. We have to change culture around sex and violence on campus. We have to change culture on alcohol. We have to change culture on governance and service. At Bloomington we often characterize research and creative activities as “offering opportunities,” teaching is a “load,” and service is a “burden.” I – I think we need to do better than that on several fronts, and so while we will look at structure and all of this sort of thing, we'll try and figure out how to modify the culture of the campus in such a way that shared governance works better. Some other things in the strategic plan that we will take up, one relates to the policies on life, and that sort of thing, of our non-tenure-track colleagues. There's been almost no growth in the tenure-track faculty at Bloomington in the last several years, there has been dramatic growth in NTT faculty. It's time to take a look at their lives, the policies we have that – that govern those lives and govern those activities. That may end up involving the UFC in the sense that some of those NTT policies are adopted by the UFC, so it's possible that our review may lead to some discussion back here.

The other thing that we're going to take up that I think's related to the strategic plan is our policies – which are not UFC policies, they're campus policies – on program mergers, reorganizations, and so forth. We did have two new schools created in the College of Arts and Sciences last year. One of the things we really discovered was that our policies didn't quite cover the creation of schools within schools. I don't know that any further reorganizations are immediately planned, but any organization looks at its organization from time to time and they may arise, and so I think we'll take a look at the – at the campus policies on program reorganizations, mergers, and elimination. That may actually lead to something that I think we have to look at in Bloomington and that's the core school phenomena.

Some of the schools at Bloomington and IUPUI have, I mean, are core schools. Some are not. And I think we discovered last year when we tried to bring the definitions of the ranks of clinical faculty on Bloomington into line with the UFC policies that IUPUI and Bloomington and Kelley and some others all had some different notions of what that meant. So I think we may need to take a look at Bloomington and work with IUPUI on reducing difficulties that arise from policies that may not well match the idea of – of core schools. We will be taking a look at our post-tenure review policy. We have one. It is called the policy of Faculty Misconduct, but we will take a look at it and see if it can be improved, if it needs any change. We – there is some interest in our campus on intercollegiate athletics and the rights and treatment of student athletes. That's actually a very interesting issue because intercollegiate athletics does not report to the campus, it reports to the president, but it's located on Bloomington campus. We were – Bloomington was a founder of an organization known as the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA). COIA is very concerned about forthcoming possible reorganizations of Division I of the NCAA, and what role faculty and presidents will continue to have in protecting the interests of student athletes. In the event of that we may get involved in that. We have a general interest in taking a look at our efforts on diversity, both among the faculty and among the student body, and trying to figure out how we can do better there. The Student Wellness Initiative has – has elicited some comment and some concern on the Bloomington campus, and I'm sure that will – will continue. We had a presentation the other day at our last meeting by John Whelan, the new head of Human Relations [sic], HR, of the university. I actually talked to John afterwards. I urged him – I urged him and subsequently urged the UFC Executive Committee to reconstitute Human Relations subcommittee of this body since most of our university human relations policies are system-wide rather than campus-wide, so I – I hope we may take some look at some of these things on the Bloomington campus, but urge this campus to look at them, as well as the UFC to look at them. And then, finally, I don't know which of the regional campuses are already doing this, but we adopted a resolution last year at – two years ago – both two years ago and last year at the BFC to move to online student course evaluations. That's getting implemented. It's run into some problems, technical problems, in some ways. Other than that I think [comment indistinct] anticipated, so it's not flowing as rapidly as we would think. There may still be some remaining issues about online course evaluations that the BFC may take up. And I think that's our list of activities so far.

**MCROBBIE:** Okay thanks, Herb. Marianne?

**WOKECK:** The – the – the list for IUPUI is a little shorter than that for Bloomington in part because of the way we have begun to operate is that Karen keeps a very good list of the standing committees and what their charge was last year, how much they reported, and got done, and what needs to be added to it, or what needs to be taken up. There are, I think, two issues, that I want to – and so they will be addressed in the appropriate committees at issues ranging from leftover issues related to the common calendar as well as to questions of civility and they're – they're addressed at the – at the standing committees. There is one issue that I think may be taken up by a task force. We are currently trying to figure out how best to address that. And that is the issue of how we can better align the different types of faculty that are contributing to the life and governance of our campus, but who are by restrictions of rank

or history or – or other ways restricted from serving, and that goes in part hand in hand with the NTT issue that Herb brought up, and it is something that we really do not know in some instances how our different kinds of faculties are distributed across the various units on campus. So there is a learning curve for all of us to establish that, and then see what it takes to create pipelines for faculty governance that is really in the spirit of what faculty governance is, namely in part to help plan and implement for the [comment indistinct] the university and campus over a long period of time, and how we can best get everybody involved, but also really assure that those who do serve, and serve with the kinds of background and the kinds of knowledge that helps the campus and the faculty governance structures as a whole. That is going to be a task force that will probably work for the whole year, and we are looking forward to stop making certain decisions ad hoc and for temporary measures because that really is not helpful. We do need to have better ways in which we can pull people who are resourceful and have expertise and experience, and maybe not the right degree or not the rank to – to help us improve us in what we are doing.

The other issue that is more an administrative one, but that has implications for all of the faculty is how do we do faculty annual reports and reviews in a fashion that is helpful for faculty, that has the right kind of connection to promotion and tenure, and not in effect avoids having to do post-tenure review in instances. And so, again, it's a mixture of looking at what kinds of administrators – administrative procedures are in place. How are they being administered? Are they effective? If not, how can they be changed? Should they be left to individual units? Should they be addressed campus-wide? So there is, again, a wide range of issues that are connected to it and that's sort of just a short way of describing how we are looking into it and what we are trying to help both administration to get better data from what we are doing, but also help faculty not to get bogged down in reporting procedures that are onerous and that really do not help anybody other than just prepare another report, another dossier and so, therefore, that's one of the items that we are looking into quite [comment indistinct].

**MCROBBIE:** Marianne, thank you. Okay, with those reports let's move to agenda item 7, which is the issue of post-tenure review. Cassidy are you going to lead this off?

#### **AGENDA ITEM 7: POST-TENURE REVIEW**

**SUGIMOTO:** Thank you. This is meant to be just a brief introduction to this topic. This probably won't take the thirty minutes that are allotted there on the agenda. First, a bit of history. In 1999, this body approved what was called the Indiana University Guiding Principles for Faculty Review, and in that document it said each campus must have procedures for three things: one was annual merit reviews, the second were procedures governing reappointment, tenure, and promotion, and the third were procedures governing review, remediation, and sanction, which were put all together for any violation of professional standards. Now, this did not include sexual harassment or research misconduct. There are other policies that guide this, but this was essentially a call to all the campuses that we needed post-tenure reviews. Now, it's not surprising that in 1999, almost all the campuses followed suit with such policies, but they were

very different. That might be expected due to mission differentiation. And you can see the tone and the style of these documents just by the title. So IU Kokomo is one of the only that called it a Post-Tenure Review Policy. IUPUI's is Review and Enhancement, which is, you know, far softer in nature, and Bloomington's is a Faculty Misconduct Policy. So you can see which one sounds the most menacing here, and speaks to different nature, that this is a remediation plan, a support, a mentoring plan, or a sanction, a punitive plan. That was fifteen years ago, and I think given just that the fact that these were established fifteen years ago, it may be time to stop and review these policies to see how they are working, if they're working effectively and appropriately at each of the campuses. As President McRobbie said, this is not a mandate coming from the BoT, or from the administration, but there are external pressures on our faculty in terms of accountability, and I think it behooves us as a faculty to be proactive, to say, do we have mechanisms in place for the review of faculty who are tenured, and are those working appropriately and effectively? And I think if we can say as a faculty, yes, that they are and no changes are needed that's one outcome from this type of review. So what we're proposing here is not that we change or create new policies, but rather that we take a reflective stance, look at the policies that exist, and be able to confidently say to external and internal stakeholders that these policies are working, or that they need changes or updates to our current system and our current context. Marianne also spoke to some of the inconsistencies between policies on each campus. So, for example, Bloomington has three policies. One is a Merit Review Policy, one states that only associate and assistant professors need to be reviewed, and the other is our Faculty Misconduct Policy. There's no relationship stated among these policies so that if one is – does poorly in an annual review after years, that triggers the faculty misconduct review rather a dean must say, yes it is time to start this faculty misconduct review. So one of the things we're doing on the Bloomington campus is looking at creating relationships between these types of documents. Other campuses may consider periodic assessments to be a better approach, but all in all what we're asking here is that the UFC think about post-tenure review whether the document we have, that guiding principles for faculty review, is sufficient, if it general enough to allow for differentiation on the campuses, and whether each of the campuses' policies falls into that general framework. So I'm welcome to take any questions, but at this point it's really opening the discussion on this issue.

**MCROBBIE:** Questions or discussion? Cassidy put it very well. Charles, do you –?

**BANTZ:** I would just have one question. Have you taken a look at the – any of the literature that is available since these policies were pretty much of the 90's? With the exception, as I remember of Hawaii, which may have even been in the 80's, and they had actually done a study that was really serious about how it worked. I'm curious; it has been a long time. Is there literature?

**SUGIMOTO:** There – there is literature on this, and we have one group – subcommittee – working on this and the first thing is information gathering, right? I mean, many universities set up policies within the last decade and I think it's time to look have – have there been studies on these? How effective are these? How many universities have kept the initial policies that they

created in the 90's? Do those still work in 2014? So I think that's a great point, that there is literature out there that exists.

**BARBRE:** At the last teleconference, it was mentioned that the different policies had been reviewed and there had been some analysis that had been done. I never received an email. The RFC members have asked about that. Will that be disseminated?

**SUGIMOTO:** Yes. So I've gotten from Craig all of the PDFs of each of the review policies and I think it might be useful to have those in addition to the analyses. So I'll send those out.

**MCROBBIE:** Other questions or comments? Yeah?

**ORME:** I'm not familiar with policies on the various campuses, obviously. But you mentioned in your statement that there is somewhat variation of intent, seemingly even in the titles of the various policies. Would there still be room for that type of variation in order to discover whether a policy's working or it's effective you have to ask working toward its intended end –

**SUGIMOTO:** Mmhmm.

**ORME:** – and to what effect? So...

**SUGIMOTO:** Yes, I absolutely agree. I think one of the things that we'll need to look at is whether they're providing for all three of the stipulations of that guiding principle; review, remediation, and sanction. And I think some do better on one or two of the three rather than all three. So the question would be not, do we have to have something that's a sanction-based policy, but do we have policies or a policy that deals with all three of those aspects?

**MCROBBIE:** Other questions or comments from anybody? Obviously, this is an ongoing matter, but it's just for discussion at the moment, of course. Anything else? Okay. Well, there being no further discussion on this item. Any old business from any member? Yes, Herb?

#### **AGENDA ITEM 8: OLD BUSINESS/NEW BUSINESS**

**TERRY:** Something was mentioned briefly. I'd like to ask you a question that flows over from last year. Last year we adopted the common calendar, and we said that we would be welcome to hearing any problems or concerns that anybody had with it. We had one big one at Bloomington. We got it solved pretty quickly, involved lots of people, but it had to do with dates that seemed to flow from the calendar for eight-week class sessions, and when midterm grades were due. Have any of you encountered any difficulties? If – if you don't want to express them here, you'll send them to the Executive Committee but my – my gut feeling so far is that the first semester of it has worked reasonably well, but we promised the Council if it didn't, you know, we'd be open to – ?

**MCROBBIE:** John, do you know?

**APPLEGATE:** I just commented, of course, that it isn't coincidental that it worked well because these two years – the one we're in and the next one – didn't require a whole lot of change except our friends at Northwest. But it – so, that should've worked pretty well. But as I was saying this morning to the Regional Faculty Caucus, we really do need a UFC calendar committee because we need to – we need to start, sort of, ratifying or however you want to put it, the – the out years. We've got two very solid years worked out, and the rest of them kind of flow from that, but the – but typically one has five or even more years either in – in a final or projected form. One of the issues that – that does remain is the summer calendar and that's – from the beginning, has been difficult and there are a number of – of challenges with it. Many of them can be dealt with simply by having, you know, the same envelope approach that we have taken to the – to the rest of year, that is, just have beginning and end dates and anything in between, including starting and ending in between, can be worked out. But there is the way it intersects with commencement on some campuses and that's – that goes from being sort of awkward to being actual conflicts, and so that's going to have to be worked out. But as I say, I think having a UFC calendar committee would be a great way of – of moving that forward.

**MCROBBIE:** Okay. Any other – any other old business?

**WATT:** I had one comment on the calendar. At IUPUI, the withdraw date for students at the pre-course mark in the semester, is that part of the common calendar? Is it the balancing around here – this semester it's in the fourteenth week out of fifteen weeks. Last year it was in the thirteenth week and – and I believe on our administrative [comment indistinct] it says the pre-course mark of the semester, which is now the fourteenth [comment indistinct] fifteenth, is not to – [comment indistinct]

**MCROBBIE:** Unless anybody knows – unless anybody knows the answer to your question we'll have to take it on notice. But does anybody know the answer?

**APPLEGATE:** I – I believe that this is one of those dates that is kind of arbitrary and, therefore, it is in the common calendar and it is – we just kind of split the differences among the campuses. I think this is – it's that date that – that I've just described.

**WATT:** Okay.

**MCROBBIE:** Okay. Yes, Herb?

**TERRY:** I have one other comment of things that have come up. Our strategic plan, among other things, at Bloomington raises some doubts about whether the current faculty annual report works well, produces the data, some of the things that have already been mentioned. To a substantial degree, the university-wide FAR is Bloomington's gift to you, and – and so what I want to kind of assure you is that clearly we're going to take a look at it, but what I will do as I go back is to try and make sure that – that while we look at it we also look at it from a university-wide perspective. I – I think, you know, it's better in many ways than the old, manual,

typed ones, but on the other hand, especially as John has noted, it is incredibly difficult to pull data out of. I've heard from many regional campuses that it doesn't work terribly well for them. It's well designed for reporting research, not so well designed for reporting that sort of thing. So I want to assure you that – that I will go back and feed into the system the idea that we need to work with John's office and others to make sure that we end up with not undoing things to fix a Bloomington problem that – that creates a problem for the other campuses.

**MCROBBIE:** Thanks, Herb. Any – any other questions or comments from anybody? [Silence] Any new business? [Silence] Any old? [Silence] Any UFC member want to raise any new business? [Silence]. There being none, we are adjourned. Thank you very much!

**MEETING ADJOURNED: 3:10PM**