Indiana University
UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL
February 28, 2012
1:30 P.M. - 3:30 P.M. (EST)

IUB: Franklin Hall Room 106
IUE: Whitewater Hall Room 119
IPFW: Helmke Library Room B37
IUPUI: ICTC Building Room 541
IUK: Main Building Room 111
IUN: John W. Anderson Library/Conference Center 115
IUSB: Northside Hall Room 079
IUS: Knobview Hall Room 112

Attendance

MEMBERS: Rachel Applegate, Simon Atkinson, Ed Berbari, Karl Besel, Stephen Burns, Carolyn Calloway-Thomas, Rosanne Cordell, David Estell, Harold Evans, Tony Fargo, Charles Gallmeier, Steve Gerencser, Don Gjerdingen, Pat Harbison, John Hassell, Moira Marsh, Laverne Nishihara, Yusuf Nur, C. Subah Packer, Mary Popp, Fran Squires, Herb Terry, William Wheeler, L. Jack Windsor

MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT:

MEMBERS ABSENT: Corey Ariss, Jean Abshire, Randy Arnold, Charles Bantz, Zachary Berwick, Hall Bjornstad, M. Todd Bradley, LaNita Campbell, Shu Cole, Stanley Davis, Nancy Eckerman, Clifford Goodwin, Richard Gunderman, Matthew Guterl, Michael Harris, Pamela Ironside, Jorge José, Hitesh Kathuria, Justin Kingsolver, Joan Kowolik, William J. Lowe, Majorie Manifold, Steve Mannheimer, Michael McRobbie, Tim Mickleborough, Geralyn Miller, Mary Beth Minick, Lori Montalbana, Mohamed Razi Nalim, Michael Nusbaumber, Sandra Patterson-Randles, Nasser Paydar, Una Mae Reck, Lauren Robel, Christopher Rutkowski, Jodi Smith, Ellen Szarleta, David Tataw, Lesley Walker, Michael Wartell, Tony White

GUESTS: John Applegate, Craig Dethloff, Benjamin Katz, Jim Kennedy, Steve Keucher

Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes
http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/minutes/AY12/01.31.12.pdf

2. Agenda Committee Business (10 minutes)
(Professors L. Jack Windsor and Carolyn Calloway-Thomas, Co-Secretaries of the University Faculty Council)

3. Presiding Officer's Business (10 minutes)
(Professor Michael McRobbie, President of Indiana University)

4. Question/Comment Period[1] (10 minutes)
(President McRobbie and Professors Windsor and Calloway-Thomas)

5. UFC Reform Status (20 minutes)
(Professor Simon Atkinson) [FIRST READING]
http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY12/U5-2012REV.pdf
http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY12/U6-2012REV.pdf

6. Presentation on Phase 1 of the Student Services Initiative (30 minutes)
(Professor John Applegate, Executive Vice President for University Regional Affairs, Planning and Policy) [DISCUSSION]
http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/addDocs/AY12/SSIPhase1Report.pdf

7. Resolution on Research Misconduct (20 minutes)
(Professor Steve Burns, Chair of the Research Affairs Committee) [FIRST READING]
http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY12/U7-2012.pdf

8. Indiana University Strategy for Global Access to Health (20 minutes)
(Benjamin Katz, IU School of Medicine) [ACTION ITEM]
http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY12/U8-2012.pdf
http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/addDocs/AY12/UAEMHandout.pdf
http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/addDocs/AY12/AUTMStatement.pdf
http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/addDocs/AY12/SPS.pdf

Minutes

AGENDA ITEM 1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

WINDSOR: First item on the agenda, we'll go ahead and skip until enough people show up hopefully.

AGENDA ITEM 2: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Second item on the agenda is the Agenda Committee Business. I'll start out. IUPUI did have a motion regarding the sixty-five step-down administration policy, not supporting the policy. IU

---

[1] Faculty who are not members of the Faculty Council and who wish to address questions to President McRobbie and co-Secretaries Windsor and Calloway-Thomas should submit their questions to the Faculty Council Office at ufcoff@indiana.edu. Meetings are open to the public. Our documents are available at: http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc.

East also did likewise, and that's the only councils I've heard from so far, so do remember to take it up at each campus, and see how the faculty feel. Later on, we'll ask John Applegate any status on the—at the legislature will enact policy that's died in committee. Do you know, John?

J. APPLEGATE: You know, that's a good question, and I don't know. I—um, it—the last I heard was that it was not advancing, but I don't know what the latest is. They go out of session on the 14th, if memory serves, so that would be the final day for it, but I can get back to you.

WINDSOR: Alright. Thanks, John.

J. APPLEGATE: Yeah, sorry about that.

WINDSOR: Other item is the core—ad hoc Committee for Core School Mergers and Reorganizations have been working, and I'll ask—

UNKNOWN MALE SPEAKER: —ask Herb.

TERRY: Either way—

WINDSOR: Go ahead, Herb.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Herb, please go.

TERRY: Okay, we've been exchanging drafts. It's been a very cooperative committee. We started out by looking at the policies at IUPUI, and Bloomington on reorganization, merger, and program elimination because, I think in large part, Bloomington had more recently revised its policy than IUPUI. Almost everybody who read the two documents decided that the Bloomington document was a good starting point, so what we're going to bring very soon to the leaders of the UFC looks, in many ways, like the Bloomington policy with some modifications to reflect that it's a policy dealing with core schools. I think by the end of the week, we should be forwarding our final report to Jack and to Carolyn, and our recommendation, since it ultimately is voted on by representatives of all the campuses of the UFC, is that it be sent out by them to all of the campuses, although I imagine that the discussion at the UFC will ultimately, as the policy does, focus on the core schools, and the interests of IUPUI and Bloomington in this.

But I want to commend the faculty from IUPUI and from Bloomington who are on this group. It's been a very good example of inter-campus cooperation, and I think we're within a few emails of sending a final version to the leaders. Anything to add?

WINDSOR: I would like to echo what you said about thanking everybody on the committee for some good, fast work. Thanks. Another item we talked about at the Agenda Committee was

the generation of an ad hoc committee to look at lecturers policy. Did you have a chance to check with David Malik?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: To who are you directing the question, Jack? Was that directed to me or to Craig?

WINDSOR: That would be IU Northwest.

GALLMEIER: I have not had a chance to do so yet, but I will at the end of [indistinct comment], but I will do so.

GERENCSER: This is Steven at South Bend. I had forwarded to Craig a couple of the documents that had been circling around at IUSB regarding the non-tenure track, the lecturer or senior lecturer policy. We've been kind of moving forward assuming it is—that the policy that we need to adopt, and we're sort of slowly getting our colleges in to alignment with the policy based upon a series of interactions that that non-tenured track committee had last year with Vice President Applegate.

WINDSOR: Right. And we're just checking in to see whether most campuses are in alignment or which ones are not, and what—how to proceed from there.

GALLMEIER: I will be bringing this to the Executive Committee this Friday here at Northwest.

WINDSOR: Okay, thank you. Carolyn?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Oh, I would just like to mention that there was, as you know, a hue and cry over the increase in health care cost last year, and that we have—are in the process of creating an ad hoc Benefits Committee, and I understand that we're probably shy about a few people to serve on that committee, because we really do want to keep that committee in a manageable way, and, as you know, the purpose of that committee will be to serve as the liaison between the UFC and the administration. We really do want to focus as forcefully as we possibly can on getting information out from the administration to the faculty so that people will be informed and know what's going on every step of the way, and we have been encouraged by Dan Rives, who is over in the human resources office to lead us frequently as possible with him, and as soon as we get the additional two individuals to serve on that committee, we will be meeting with Dan and we will try to meet as frequently as possible, and we hope that we can meet once per month minimally.

So that's where we stand right now, and tomorrow the BFC Benefits Committee will be meeting with Dan Rives, and I will also be attending that meeting. And I do want to mention that I have been getting some concerns from some members of committees, in particular Benefits Committee, the BFC Benefits Committee, asking whether it might be possible for us to keep the

standing Benefits Committee as part of the UFC, and I just wanted to put that on the table, and make sure that that item is considered when we talk about the UFC reform policy, and the constitution and bylaws.

WINDSOR: So, back to the small Benefits Committee, we're really waiting for names from the regional campuses to select two out of those names submitted. Is that correct?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: We have six members now, including yourself and myself.

WINDSOR: We're not waiting?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: No, we have someone from IUB—two persons from IUB, one person from IUS, one person from IUSB, one person from—two people from IUPUI. That's where we stand right now.

DETHLOFF: And one person from IU East.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: One from IU East, okay, who's already—I didn't have that person.

NISHIHARA: One thing about that, Laverne from IU East, the only reservation the person expressed was travel time, and I said the assumption is, most of the meetings would be by teleconference or video conference.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: That's correct. Although the constitution and bylaws state—relate that we have at least one face to face meeting of that committee, but yes, that person should have no difficulty in attending.

NISHIHARA: That's fine.

GALLMEIER: Carolyn—Northwest. I think I'll have a name for you, maybe two, before the week ends.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Thank you so much.

GALLMEIER: The concern, again, was the issue of the time, especially the summer, I have at least two people that might sign on. I should know this before the week is over.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Thank you, and I hope everyone is mindful that this is a durational kind of thing, and especially in the summer, that we really will be doing a lot of our work during that period, so we could make that evident to everyone who has considered serving on the committee, that would be very helpful.

WINDSOR: And I envision this committee meeting with Dan, and whatever they learn, carrying it back to the campuses and letting campus Fringe Benefits Committees work on issues as we

move along. So it's just not this Committee, they engage the campuses' Fringe Benefits Committee also.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: May I have a statement from each person indicating whether your campus has an active, functioning Benefits Committee? IUSE, yes or no?

GERENCSER: South Bend has a committee called the Committee on Faculty Welfare which considers wages and benefits.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Okay, IUK?

NUR: I'm not really sure. I'm going to check on that, and report back to you.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Okay, thank you. Some maybe rather than I doing a roll call here, if everyone would send me a note, calloway@indiana.edu, let me know whether you have a committee, a Benefits Committee. Would you do that? Thank you.

BESEL: This is Karl Besel from Kokomo, and our representative should be on there, it is Mary Bourke. And yeah, we do have a committee for—but our representative for this body would be Mary Bourke.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: What's her last name?

BESEL: Bourke, she's with the Nursing School.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Bourke, okay. Alright, thank you. Jack, I think everyone probably—is that the end of that report, Jack?

WINDSOR: Yeah, we'll talk more about the standing committee, whether we want to keep the UFC Benefits Committee as a standing committee, or just generate it as an ad hoc committee when needed. I'm fine with that. We still have the power in the constitution to do that. If we have a major issue that the regional—the campuses want to come together in the UFC, and work on one issue of benefits, that could happen that way. Simon, your thoughts on that?

ATKINSON: Yeah, I agree. I think it could be done either on an ad hoc basis or as a standing committee, so maybe when we come to discussing the reform and policy in general.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Well, I did want to mention, I think all of us probably know that President McRobbie is not present today primarily because the loss of his dear mother, and he will be traveling to Australia to attend the memorial services, and so let us remember him in our prayers because it is an awful thing to lose one's mother. So this explains why he is not here today. So we will not have any presiding officer's business, unless John Applegate has some presiding officer's business?

J. APPLEGATE: You're the presiding officer.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: You know what I mean in, you know, in speaking on behalf of the president, do you have anything?

AGENDA ITEM 3: PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS

J. APPLEGATE: No, as I said, I could mention—well, obviously he's you know very sorry not to be here, but obviously that's quite unavoidable. I was just going to mention a couple of things about legislation, but if you want to do that now or later, it's up to you.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: I would love that right now.

J. APPLEGATE: Sure, well, and it's very short. I mean, not a great deal has changed or at least the trajectory hasn't changed since Jeff Linder gave you a much more complete report. I think for the faculty, the two key things are the credit hour cap, and that has passed both houses, and at the hundred-twenty level, so we're in the process of figuring out how we're going to— partly internally and partly with the Commission for Higher Education—how we're going to work through that. We have a report that's due at the end of the summer, a draft report, and then we'll have the 2012-13 academic year to bring ourselves into compliance or to issue—or have our justifications accepted for various degrees, and then the core trans—the General Education core transfer bill passed in the form that it was when we last talked, so a far improved form. Not exactly what we would have wanted, but a much improved form, and that—there, too, we'll be working with primarily the other institutions, the other major public institutions to figure out how we want to go about defining what the learning outcomes are, and what this ought to look like. I think all of the major institutions are very eager to really take advantage of the big change in the legislation, which was to have this be something organic from the universities, rather than being imposed kind of top down by the state, and so I think it means it's incumbent on us to take that opportunity, so the various universities are meeting. We'll be taking the temperature of the state government on that, and be prepared really as soon as we possibly can to give some—give some guidance and advice to the campuses about how to go about doing this. Once again, the idea is that we will—that IU will have—each campus will have a different core based on its own General Education requirements.

The one thing I'd emphasize in all of this is that there is—it's really important—well, two things I want to emphasize. The first is that both of these are going to involve academic, and hence faculty judgment and involvement. So how a particular degree gets to a hundred and twenty or what the appropriate justifications are and so on, is going to involve a lot of faculty thought and time. So, that I just—kind of forewarned and obviously the General Education committees are going to need to be—on each campus—are going to need to be very involved in developing

those core transfer curricula. So, that's going to be, I think, a major item for faculty in the next—in the next—in the coming year, and actually even in this year.

The other one is that it's really important that we operate in concert with each other, especially within the institution, and ideally with the—with our peer institutions. I'll give you just one example. We can't have a situation where we sort of unknowingly go into having different credit hour expectations for what appears to be the same degree. It may be, at the end of the day, we need to do that based on different content or mission or something like that, but we need not to just go into this unknowingly because we already know that that is the kind of— that's the kind of difference that we're going to be—that we're going to be asked to justify. And as I say, there may be differences, there may well be differences that we want to pursue and justify, but it's very important that we not go into that in a sort of not knowing what we're doing. So, the need to coordinate is going to be more important than I think it's been in the past. So, those are the two sort of takeaways I guess I'd give for that. That we will—faculty will need to be very involved as we get to the actual development of the hour requirements of these core transfer curricula, and that we need to be in touch with each other.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: John, do you know who's going to spearhead this? I mean, there are various institutions involved, but who's actually going to end up—

J. APPLEGATE: —At an organizational level, my office will do that. However, on the substance of it, I expect that to be kind of a project of the Academic Leadership Council or the Executive Committee thereof.

CALLOAY-THOMAS: So you would be responsible for coordinating things among all the institutions, or just among the Indiana University campuses?

J. APPLEGATE: Just IU, but also working with the other campuses to the extent possible to—or the other universities to make sure where we—where we can and should be on the same page, that we are. And sometimes that's going to mean articulating difference rather than sameness, though I think that we all know that sameness is one of the pressures that we see in a lot of different ways, and we need to be able to identify places where there are important and meaningful differences and be able to articulate and argue for those as forcefully as we can.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Are there any questions for John? Comments?

WINDSOR: I still have three more items before we move on.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Okay.

WINDSOR: I assume most campuses are looking at the Student Services Initiative Report, is that correct? Have you heard of it?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Well Jack, I believe Craig sent out—

GERENCSER: This is the first I've heard of it or seen it.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: You mean right now, at this very moment?

GERENCSER: No, I mean [comment indistinct].

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Well, you did receive a copy about two days ago.

GERENCSER: Yes. Two days ago was the first time I've seen it, is what I meant to say.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Oh good, thank you, because I thought we had sent it.

GALLMEIER: Same here at Northwest. A couple of days ago.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Well good, that's when we sent it, a couple of days ago.

WINDSOR: And I think you can send your feedback to John Kennedy, is that right?

J. APPLEGATE: Jim Kennedy.

WINDSOR: Jim. Thank you.

J. APPLEGATE: Whom you'll be meeting in a few minutes under agenda item six.

WINDSOR: Yes, okay. Another thing—everybody remember the issue we had with IRB recently, and as I mentioned last time, limited submissions issue had come up. Simon is chairing our Research Committee here. Can you expand on those two items, what the Research Committee is doing?

ATKINSON: So the—we're continuing to monitor the operation of the Human Subjects Office, and in many respects, things are clearly much better than they were last semester. The main part of the backlog has been dealt with by a lot of extraordinary efforts on behalf of the Human Subjects Office with help from various staff members from other units who are on loan to the office, but what has happened is that, as a consequence of clearing the initial backup, is that the number of proposals being submitted to the office has gone up so people who were holding back their proposals in despair at ever having them get through the Human Subjects Office have now sent them in, and that this is causing a second level of backup. So we're not out of the woods yet. So there are expedited studies that are taking a month for an initial review. This is just anecdotal evidence from the Psychology Department here, so I think this is clearly a situation we keep—that we need to keep watching.

There have clearly been improvements, but we're not out of the woods yet. I think we may be on some kind of, you know, decaying harmonic thing right now, so clearing the initial backlog, and that led to another [indistinct comment] in proposals going through the system, and that's created a lesser backlog. So, I would encourage anyone who has issues with IRB proposals or knows of a colleague who does to contact John Bauman, who's now the head of the Human Subjects Office, and make sure that he knows about these because unless they know at that level, they can't necessarily direct resources that are needed to clear those backlogs.

WINDSOR: And also let the co-Secretaries know so that we can engage the VP for Research if needed.

ATKINSON: The other issue that Jack brought up was an issue that came up at the last meeting of the UFC on the handling of limited submission competitions. We had a discussion of this at our meeting. The—I think the main thing that we all thought was necessary is as much transparency as possible with this—with this process, whether it's handled at the campus level or whether it's handled as an institution-wide issue. And so we encourage the Office of the Vice President for Research and the campus offices that handle these proposals to publish the data on what happens in these limited submission competitions, so how many proposals are received internally for these, which proposals are selected to go out, and ultimately, what the result of the proposals that emerge from the university is. Some of this information is already available on the limited submissions' site. You can go in and look, and have a look at the history of particular competitions, but there isn't an easy way to get that kind of aggregate data. We think this would be helpful in showing as much transparency in the process as possible, along with making sure that everybody is appropriately notified of these competitions.

WINDSOR: Any concerns about balance during the review process?

ATKINSON: We didn't have any concerns about balance in the review process. As far as we can tell, when there are limited competitions that involve more than one campus, there is a balance of reviews that they used across the campuses.

WINDSOR: Good.

ATKINSON: But having the kind of data that I talked about available, I think, will help to ensure that that is the case.

WINDSOR: The last item I have is the Commission on Higher Education is having their annual meeting with faculty here at IUPUI on April 16th. Have most of the regional campuses been contacted? Or has IUB been contacted by representatives?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: No, we have not.

WINDSOR: Okay.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: But we are planning, at some point, IUB—Jack, IUB, at some point

WINDSOR: Pardon me?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS:—IUB at some point, is planning to invite the faculty representative to that committee to come and have a discussion with us.

WINDSOR: Okay.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Okay, but Jack, if you'll send that to me, we might be able to get someone to attend. That invitation?

WINDSOR: I think the regional campuses send a faculty member. I don't know if it's on the Curriculum Committee or the Faculty Council. But last year there was representatives from each campus.

GERENCSER: Steven from South Bend. I believe I received an invitation to such a meeting. I'm kind of trying to find it in my inbox right now. I knew that I could not attend because it conflicts with a teaching day for me, but I'm wondering, did other faculty presidents get that invitation?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: I did not receive an invitation.

GALLMEIER: I don't remember getting an invitation, too. I may have. I get a lot of emails, but I don't remember seeing one.

NISHIHARA: I think that we received one at East. Yes.

TERRY: I'd like to suggest that it's important that we send people to this. I've gone this in the past when I was head of the BFC or the UFC or something. IUPUI stacks—not IUPUI, Ivy Tech works very hard to send large numbers of people to this meeting, and it's one way of them influencing the Commission for Higher Education because staff of the Commission are there, and typically the faculty representative is the nominal head of that gathering. And if it looks like the system is dominated by the perspectives of Ivy Tech, we go unheard, and I would hope campuses would work really hard to send representatives this year who can represent them, and are familiar with the Commission, and what it does, with its reports, and can participate actively.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: I concur with that.

WINDSOR: Karen Lee is going to submit the names from IUPUI. I'll get her to copy the UFC on it so you'll know who to contact for representatives.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Okay. Thank you. IUSB?

GALLMEIER: If we get an invitation at Northwest, I'll either go, or I'll find a representative, so don't forget about us.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Okay. We'll make sure that all of us, as much as possible, have representation because I think Herb's point is a really strong, compelling one. We really do need to be there, present at the table.

UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER: Southeast didn't get an invitation either.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Okay. You're special, Jack.

WINDSOR: I'll send it to Craig, and Craig will send it all to the UFC. That's the last thing I had.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Alright, Simon, and UFC reform. Did you want to say something?

TERRY: Yeah, I want to take advantage of the comment period briefly.

AGENDA ITEM 4: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

WINDSOR: Well, is there any additional questions?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Yes, Herb has—

TERRY: —I just—I wanted to build on the current topic. I was the one at the last BFC meeting that stressed that since 1992, by action of the General Assembly, the Commission for Higher Education has a faculty representative and a student representative. And it's not a faculty member who is appointed to these things. It's designated in the statute as the faculty representative, which I think means that as a the Commission, you know, I agree with John, I don't think we're about to have any mandated state-wide board of regents, but the Commission was originally created as a coordinating body, and it is getting increasingly involved in governance or at least in setting standards rather than advising and coordinating.

I think we should start recognizing that we probably constitute the [indistinct comment] IU— Indiana faculty member is a faculty member upon the campuses of Indiana University, according to our fact book we have about 8,000 some faculty. Purdue has about 4,000 some. Ball State has about 900 some, and I was unable to get confirmation for the other institutions, but we're the largest group, and I think our faculty representative, who is currently an associate Professor of Physics at the University of Southern Indiana, should hear from us on things as the Commission—when the Commission is charged by the General Assembly with implementing or doing something, if we have an opinion of how they should do that, we should talk with them. And I agree with John, where we can, we should coordinate that with the administration, and

try to present a united front. We're the largest group of faculty. Our representative should hear from us.

J. APPLEGATE: I could just add that he's not been shy, and has, on a number of issues, been a very good voice for faculty and academic concerns. His name is Kent Scheller, and, as you say, he's a physicist from Southern Indiana University, and has—he brings a pretty active voice to the Commission.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Good. That's good to know.

GERENCSER: This is Steven from South Bend, and I have a question for Jack. You had mentioned earlier about—something about the campuses views regarding the retirement age sixty-five policy. Is there something specific that you wanted from us? Did you want a sense from our faculties formally? Did you want a vote on something?

WINDSOR: Yes.

GERENCSER: What is it that you wanted exactly?

WINDSOR: Is this something we want to focus on at the UFC level, is this something that all the campuses view that is time to change, modify, you know, just trying to get a consensus, you know?

GERENCSER: [indistinct comment] waiting for the legislature.

WINDSOR: I think it's stalled in the House of Representatives. I don't think it's going to come out. Thanks.

TERRY: I would add that whether it's stalled in the House of Representatives or not, it's a Trustee policy, and so if the—regardless of what the General Assembly does, which would be decisive, is if they say the Trustees can't have it, they can't have it. If it stalls in the General Assembly, and we as a group believe that it isn't appropriate, we can tell the Trustees that.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Are there any more questions or comments? Alright then shall we move to a discussion of the UFC Reform status? First reading, twenty minutes.

AGENDA ITEM 5: UFC REFORM STATUS

ATKINSON: I hope that everybody is familiar after discussion and several meetings with the general architecture of the reform proposals. So what you have before you are the specifics of the changes that are necessary to the documents to affect that reform. This involves changes both to the constitutions and—the constitution of the faculty and the bylaws of the UFC. So perhaps if you look at the U5 circular first, we can look at the changes that are suggested to the

constitution. There are a couple of additional changes that have been inserted to take account of a couple of anomalies in the way that we have been operating, so under Section 1.3, "Certification of the Faculty," there's a small change to change the date for certification of the faculty, and to change the responsible university officer. And the idea of this change is to make it flexible so it will now be an officer designated by the president, so as we all know, university titles and responsibilities change and some offices, like John's, seem to aggregate lots of functions, and other offices transfer their functions to other vice presidents. So rather than naming a particular individual, we can just let the president do it from time to time as things change.

The main meat of the constitutional change that's related to the reform proposal is down in Article 4, concerning the University Faculty Council, and that is to change the ratio of faculty to representatives for the UFC from one hundred to two hundred, which effectively reduces the size of the UFC to something about half of the current size—

GERENCSER: Simon, can you speak up just a little bit?

ATKINSON: Yes.

GERENCSER: You're getting [indistinct comment] a little bit, if you could speak up a little bit.

ATKINSON: I think sometimes when people rustle their papers loudly at other sites, it cuts off the—cuts off the sound from here. So, again, so I'm on Article 4, the main meat of the changes related to the reform proposal is to change the ratio of UFC representatives to faculty, its currently one representative for every hundred faculty, to change that to two hundred, which will reduce the size of the UFC. We're also proposing changing the number of student representatives to two for the entire system to be chosen as the student's choose.

The other changes that are in this document are changing the name of the Agenda Committee to the Executive Committee, so there are a lot of references to the Agenda Committee that have been changed to Executive Committee. And there are also some changes to acknowledge that for a large number of years, we've actually had two co-Secretaries of the UFC, and not a single Secretary of the UFC, so that just acknowledges something that's been going on for— since way before I ever came in.

WINDSOR: Now has IUB transitioned to a one year president?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Yes.

WINDSOR: How is that going to affect this?

ATKINSON: That doesn't affect anything in the constitution.

WINDSOR: Thank you.

ATKINSON: The other document that needs to be changed to reform the UFC is the bylaws of the UFC. So this is U6. The—there are a number of changes here, some of these are trivial changes, changing the name of the Executive Committee. There's a change in Section 3, actually in Section 2, that was in response to comments that were made at the last UFC meeting, which is to indicate that at least meeting each semester should be an in-person meeting. There was some concern raised that this needed to be specified somewhere in the documents. The *ex officio* members of the Council are administrative *ex officio* members are now reduced to two, and they are designated as non-voting members of the Council, so they won't count against the quorum.

The main change is in Section 7, concerning the functions of the—what's now called the Executive Committee, and these are changes that will allow the Executive Committee to act on behalf of the UFC when there's a consensus over a particular proposal, so this is intended to be largely non-controversial matters that come before the—come under the authority of the Council. So the language has been changed a little here, compared to what you saw last time to try and make it clear that the Executive Committee is expected to communicate the, at least a good outline of what it proposes to do prior to taking this action. The rest of the changes are really intended just to clarify the action here.

Then the next major change is concerning the committees, so the proposal was to abolish all the standing committees of the UFC, allow the Executive Committee under the authority of what's currently Section 8.3 in the bylaws to create and appoint ad hoc committees and task forces and to make recommendations of faculty members to serve on administratively appointed committees. And the idea was that this would allow the Executive Committee to appoint any kind of committee that was necessary to deal with any matter that was within the authority of the UFC. And some of these, in effect, ad hoc committees will really end up being standing committees because they will be needed from year to year, like the Benefits Committee—

WINDSOR: —or the Research Committee—

ATKINSON: —or the Research Committee or the probably the Finance and Facilities Committee or Budget Committee, I think would be committees that will be regularly appointed. And to get away from being straightjacketed into a set of committees which mostly have no functioned for a number of years just because they're listed in the bylaws of the UFC. So that was the intent of that proposal. I still—I think it still permits there to be ongoing committees from year to year where that's an area that seems to require such a committee. And I think that is about it. So we have—we have just—I don't know what the pleasure of the Council is, we have discussed

essentially these recommendations with minor changes that were made by the Agenda Committee based on the discussion at the last minute. I think we could consider this to be a second reading, but I'm open to other opinions on that.

WINDSOR: Craig, [indistinct comment]. Do we have a quorum yet?

DETHLOFF: That depends. I can't see everybody there at IUPUI. Is everybody—how many people do you have, and are you all voting members?

WINDSOR: We have eleven voting. Eleven.

DETHLOFF: Three shy.

WINDSOR: Okay. So we can't have a motion to have electronic ballot.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: No, but I would like to raise, again, the issue whether we wish to consider keeping the Benefits Committee because that is a perennial committee. It does have symbolic and substantive value, and there are some individuals who really do want to keep it. So do we want to—?

WINDSOR: I kind of agree—I kind of agree with Simon.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Okay.

WINDSOR: You know, we can generate as an ad hoc committee, and it can continue year to year. You know, it doesn't have to disappear. Whether it's in the constitution or bylaws as a standing committee, or it's an ad hoc committee that continues year to year. Kind of like the Research Committee. IUB and IUPUI came together, Research Committees on those two campuses, and worked together with the VP as the UFC Research Committee. It worked very well, I thought.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Okay, what are the opinions of others?

CORDELL: I have some questions and comments, and perhaps Vice President Applegate can help me here. What percent of IU students are on the regional campuses?

J. APPLEGATE: In terms of head count, it's a third-ish.

CORDELL: That's what I thought. I think that the—(sighs) the situation with the regional campuses has changed significantly since UFC was first formed, and I'm not sure that this document represents that. You know, I mean, do we exclude the people—the faculty from the regional campuses from ever serving as one of the co-Secretaries, when that could be a sort of rotational basis? What—you know, what is the rationale for the five additional members on the

Executive Committee, which were originally outlined as two from Bloomington, two from Indianapolis, and one from the regionals, when, you know, it would seem two, two, and two would be more logical. I'm just trying to understand what the rationale was for writing some of these things in these ways.

ATKINSON: I can certainly explain that. If you look, first of all, at the UFC, what the reform recommendations do is to reduce the proportion of representatives from Bloomington and Indianapolis, and lead to an increased representation at the regional campuses. Because all the regional campus presidents are ex-officio members of both the UFC and the Executive Committee, the regional campuses will actually have an increased fraction of the representatives on both the UFC and its Executive Committee.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Okay, any more concerns?

GERENCSER: Are we sure about that?

ATKINSON: [Indistinct comment] recommendations tend to go along with the change in the importance of the regional campuses that you were just quite correctly pointing out.

GERENCSER: It's at the Executive Committee, actually, that I think that there's more of a concern because of the mandated character of two representatives to be elected at large from Bloomington and IUP—IUPUI each, and only one to represent all of the regional campuses. There, it seems to me, that there—

ATKINSON: There are two campus presidents from IUPUI and Bloomington, and six campus presidents from the regional campuses on the Executive Committee, so the Executive Committee already has the regional campuses very well represented.

TERRY: The Executive Committee is a blend of people who serve because of the offices they hold at the campuses, plus additional elected representatives. When you put all of that together, I think the balance between Bloomington, IUPUI, and the regionals is pretty even. Is that accurate, Simon?

ATKINSON: Yes.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Other questions, concerns?

GERENCSER: Could I ask Simon about the comment that is on Section 4.4 of Officers, where someone had written, I think it was you, we are getting rid of the notion that the UFC members elect the Executive Committee, but isn't that exactly what's outlined in the Bylaws, in also—I believe it's in Section 4, that the Executive Committee is to be elected from the UFC membership?

ATKINSON: Yes, I'm not sure what the source of that comment was. It wasn't me.

DETHLOFF: That comment came from—

ATKINSON: --somewhere along the way.

GERENCSER: Because it does strike from the constitution the language elected by its membership.

DETHLOFF: Right, because one of the things that we want to do when accomplish this reform is to align our actual documents with occurring practice. If you read through the bylaws in the way that the elections are supposed to be held, that dates to 1973, when this Council was formed. They were never used. They are not used today. They are unworkable today, just as they were in 1973. What we're looking to do in the constitution is we get through that round of reforms, the bylaws we can take care of on our own. We can keep playing with those. We just want to get that constitution taken care of before the end of the term, and then we can, you know, think about the bylaws a little bit more. I mean, that could be open to a little bit of play. Yes, because the Constitution has to be voted on by all faculty.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Laverne?

NISHIHARA: Yes, I recall that South Bend a couple of times before this has brought up the question about whether a regional campus president can serve as co-Secretaries of UFC. I think I do understand the explanation about the proper weighting of the number of faculty who are on the Executive Committee and in UFC. I will say, the only reason in the past that I haven't agreed with South Bend about the regional campus presidents having the opportunity to serve as co-Secretary is that I did not see myself how someone with a workload I've become accustomed to can possibly be co-Secretary without some kind of course release from that regional campus. That's the only reason I haven't said more about that. I will add, you know, I think it might be possible in future for whoever is in my position to serve as co-Secretary, but first the person must work something out with the regional campus to allow course release or something addressing the workload. And the only other thing I want to mention is that I think the co-Secretaries have a great deal of say in what goes on the Agenda, you know, in consultation with the chief counsel of the Agenda Committee, and that's why there might be this concern about co-Secretaries. It's because they have so much say in what appears on the agenda, and that's why this is a concern beyond proper representation from all of the campuses.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Laverne, I do wish to speak to that because since I have been on the UFC and particularly in my role as the co-Secretary, we have been very consultative. We have consulted with members of the Agenda Committee, and we always put things on the agenda

that come from that body, from the executive body. We do not willfully make those recommendations without consulting. I'm a very consultative person, so I did want that to go forth.

CORDELL: I think the issue isn't whether you're consultative, but the position is one that has power, quite frankly, and if—and in this current—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: What is it? [Laughter]

CORDELL: Why you may joke about it, but it—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —No, I don't mean to joke—

CORDELL: In this current arrangement it appears that the regional campuses' importance is downplayed, and the regional campus faculty are excluded.

ATKINSON: So I don't see any reason personally to have this language specifying that the co-Secretaries have to come from Bloomington and Indianapolis. I don't think that needs to be in the constitution. As I said, all the other changes are in favor of a greater fraction of representation from the regional campuses, and not in the opposite direction. I'm perfectly comfortable removing the language about the co-Secretaries. But the other changes are—

GERENCSER: Sorry, Laverne. Go ahead.

NISHIHARA: Thank you. I think I would be in favor of what Simon just mentioned, to restore some of the former language which did not specify which campuses the co-Secretaries could be from. It left it open for a regional campus president, let's say, to go up for co-Secretary, if the person could work things out with the regional campus. So I'd be in favor of restoring some of the former language there.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: We're just making suggestions now because we don't have enough people to really vote on things.

GERENCSER: The nice thing about the previous language is it does leave it open. It's something that could be addressed in the bylaws, and I certainly understand that the practice has developed as it has probably mostly for the reasons that Laverne has suggested, you know practical considerations, and yet if feels limiting to put in the constitution, to cement that practice in the way—the way the language currently exists.

ATKINSON: I agree with that.

WINDSOR: Carolyn?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Yes, I think we only have a few more minutes for this item. Yes, who's—

ATKINSON: Subah?

PACKER: Yeah, Subah Packer—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —Okay, thank you—

PACKER: --from IUPUI. I just want to speak to something that Laverne raised, which has been raised in the IFC I think last year, and that is whether or not people serving on Faculty Council in any capacity, particularly people who are chairing committees, and serving on the administration of the Faculty Councils, this is an issue of the exponentially increasing in workload for everybody that seems to be happening in all aspects of our academic life right now, and whether or not the work we do on Faculty Council should count towards things like promotion and tenure, and if that was to be the case, then it would be easier to see how one could request release time to do this kind of work as well, but if it's not valued at that level, I don't see how people can—if we're not being given credit for this work in some way that's formal, then I don't how administrators are ever going to see that we should have release time to do it. So I think it's tying the hands of a lot of us.

WINDSOR: Subah makes a good point. When we were at the CIC meeting at Purdue, we went around the room and each university said what the presidents got. IU presidents got nothing. Some of them got up to $25,000 in release time, etc… Is that your general consensus?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Yes, indeed!

ATKINSON: From the CIC?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Yes, I was just stunned by what members of the bodies on other campuses got. It was extraordinarily a generous package in lots of instances. And I mentioned that to Karen. She chuckled, but nothing came of it.

TERRY: She's going to an institution where they give generous packages so she'll have to deal with that there.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Are there any questions? We really do want to get to all the other items.

WINDSOR: On some of the campuses, even the chairs of the major committees had release time.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: It was eye popping. Eye popping. John—uh, Don?

GJERDINGEN: I just had a quick question for Simon on the Bylaws. On Section 7, it is all very good with the Executive Committee. Now we get down to 7.3.3, but it's a 2, it says "there is unanimous consent of the Executive Committee, including the President to the proposed action." Could you explain what that means because as I read this it means that adding the language "including the President," means if the president is not at the meeting, nothing can be done. Otherwise, if it means unanimous consent that we don't need the language, "including the President." I'm just curious what—what meaning—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: --where are you?

GJERDINGEN: This is in the Bylaws, part 7, and this is 7.3.2. But if we just had unanimous consent, we don't need that "including the President," but—or you could mean, and this is what I'm not sure of, that the president has to be there, and the president has to agree to it, and if the president isn't there, nothing gets done. Now those are two different possibilities, and I just didn't know which one you meant.

ATKINSON: Yeah, I think the sense was that we meant the latter, that the president would need to agree to it. And I guess if the president wasn't there, he could agree to it subsequently—

GJERDINGEN: —Okay—

ATKINSON: —in an email or whatever.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Okay, I believe we're out of time for this item if we're going to get to the other items that we need to discuss. Is there another final compelling point that someone wishes to make or a question before we leave?

GERENCSER: I just want a point of clarification from what Craig had said earlier. Is our idea to focus here primarily on the constitutional changes that need to be done, and the bylaws are showing the language we're moving towards, but those are secondary of significance for us right now, or do we need to be considering them contemporarily?

DETHLOFF: We should be considering them both at the same time, but the constitution is the document that will have to go to all of the faculty of Indiana University for ratification, so that's the thing that we really got to move on right now, and once we get that done, then we can really sort of drill down in to the bylaws and sort out what we want. We can address Rosanne's issues and Laverne's issues, and give it a little bit more air if it needs it.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Okay, thank you. Laverne?

GALLMEIER: Chuck at Northwest. Is this the first reading or the second reading?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: It's really the second reading, isn't it?

WINDSOR: Second reading, but we can't make a motion to vote on it.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Because we don't have a quorum. Laverne, you have the last word on this.

NISHIHARA: I think you answered my question that I can't take this to the faculty at East. It's not quite ready, and a motion has not been made. So I will not do anything just yet, am I right?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: It has no sanction or authority, so you are absolutely correct. Alright, shall we move to a discussion of the Student Services Initiative? John, are you going to read it off? Or Jim, whichever one.

AGENDA ITEM 6: PRESENTATION ON PHASE 1 OF THE STUDENT SERVICES INITIATIVE

J. APPLEGATE: Sure, I'll lead it off and maybe Jim, you want to come and sit here at the [indistinct comment].

KENNEDY: I'm okay, this is great. Thanks.

J. APPLEGATE: Great. The—I first want to introduce, for those of you who don't know him, Jim Kennedy, who is the Associate Vice President for University Student Services and Systems, which is the former SES, right? Yeah. And which was Student Enrollment Services, which is the university organization that addresses—that deals with PeopleSoft, and also financial aid. He is the—I'm the, I guess, executive sponsor of the Student Services Initiative, and I'll say more about that in a minute, but Jim is really the person who is taking the project lead on it. Also, over here, is Steve Keucher. I'm not sure which camera is on, so you can either see him or not, but Steve is also an Associate VP in my office, and is the deputy project lead, I guess would be the way to describe it. So Jim and Steve together have been running this for the past several months, and especially as more detailed implementation kinds of questions come up, you'll see that I'll turn to them.

What I want to focus on, though, to lead off is just the setting for this, and I don't think I need to tell this group that the university faces a very difficult fiscal environment. We've been in that situation for quite some time, and the—I don't see any immediate end to that, and in those circumstances, the president has been very clear that we have to focus, as always, on the core mission of the university which is education and research. With that in mind, and in particular, responding to calls that I think we've all seen in—in many, many forums, in a completely bipartisan way, for greater efficiency in public higher education.

The vice president and CFO, Neil Theobald, a year and half ago, initiated a number of benchmarking projects to look at various administrative functions, again, focusing on the core, making sure that the core mission is protected as much as possible, and looking primarily for

savings in support areas. So the benchmarking activity covered a number of different areas. It covered human resources, let's see, marketing, and there was a fourth one, which I always forget—

KENNEDY: — Physical plant in Bloomington.

J. APPLEGATE: Oh, physical plant in Bloomington, that was it, and student services. The student services one looked at activities not only in the university administration, but across all parts of the university, that is within campuses and within schools. They were—well, IU was, I think, almost too efficient in going about it, at least in the student services area. The people who were hired to do this had a lot of experience with—have a lot of experience with shared service and other ways of performing essentially back office kinds of operations; but, at the same time, they did not have, and I don't believe anyone did, have a lot of experience with student services. We had hoped to be doing this in tandem with the University of Michigan, but here's where our efficiency, and Kathleen McNeely is the hyper-efficient person, and I mean that as a compliment, who got us moving, and we ended up well ahead of the University of Michigan.

So the consultants came back with an estimate, a projection, that in the student services area, and, I should say, student services includes admissions support, financial aid, bursar, advising support and registrar. In all of those areas, they estimated a savings of $21 million based on what other complex enterprises had been able to save in back office costs by the adoption of a shared services system. So, that number is, since it was an estimate from a general pool of enterprises, was obviously not particularly, you know, a particularly precise one. On the other hand, it did suggest that regardless there were savings to be had in our administrative operations, which, under the circumstances, we clearly have an obligation to pursue. So we took that as a starting number. The Trustees endorsed those—the benchmarking activities and the recommendations, and the president assigned the student services piece of that to my office, and I then, of course, dumped it off on Jim. But that was the—that's the context in which this—this developed. There's the mandate to look at this and to make sure that we are being as efficient as possible in our administrative operations is pretty unmistakable, and as I say, I think it responds to a lot of external and internal environmental factors, for lack of a better phrase, and also, obviously, it's very consistent with focusing on the mission in—the core mission in a time of financial exi—or not exigency, that's—that's a word with other implications and that's not the case—tightness.

So, the—in going about this, we had a number of choices to make, and some of them were, indeed, informed by the fact that the $21 million annual savings, which is kind of an eye-popping number, was an estimate. So, with that and other things in mind, we really had a choice between two ways of going about it. One way, kind of the—I don't know, the classic way, but you just adopt top down cuts. You say $21 million is some numerator of some

denominator, and then we're just going to slice and dice. That didn't seem appropriate here either because of the number or really as a sensible way of going about looking at a complicated operation. And actually it's several different operations that have certain similarities to them. The main one really being that it sits on the same basic software system, that is, the student information system, aka PeopleSoft. So, instead what we did was to develop a logical staged process of looking at the business processes that this involves, and these are back office operations, and so they involve a number of discrete processes that either perform the entire need of a particular student or faculty member, or support the work of people who are interacting with students and with faculty.

So, we obviously, as the way I'm characterizing it, chose the latter, and we developed a three stage process, or a three phase process. The first of it is—the first phase, the report of which you have in your materials or were linked to, the first phase took a look at all of these different areas, working with teams made up of the people who are working in those areas to determine first what those business processes are, in other words, what are the processes we do to either perform a function like register somebody's payment or generate a transcript, what are those processes, and then make an initial informed determination about how—what parts of those process—processes need to happen locally, and which ones can be shared among all campuses. They spent a great deal of time on this, and I think it's fair to say, and Jim can speak to this as well, got wonderful support from the people in these offices, and I think the result is a much more detailed and informed look at the way this ought to work.

The first thing that comes out of this or came out of this, as you'll notice from the report, is that the estimate of the savings comes down considerably. Now, there are two reasons—from the $21 million overall to $7.7 million, and I think that's an important indication that what we were doing is looking at this in a very systematic and very real, detailed sort of way. There's another reason for that too, which is that the denominator, so to speak, for the $21 million figure was activities that occurred not only in university and campus administration, but in schools as well, and so that—there's—we have not—the Student Services Initiative has not looked inside campuses. So, the actual denominator we're working with is—is somewhat smaller. And I think it's kind of hard to know exactly what, but it's—it's smaller. But the result of it is a revised estimate of $7.7 million, but Accenture, who's the consultant, felt that there probably, and again, this is an estimate, are a number of—there's probably about $4 million more that can be saved, and that can be saved in a couple of ways.

One is—we've done this in a very, I think, collegial consensus-based way, and one is just taking a harder look, and being a little more rigorous about it would be one way of doing it. Another is that they identified a number of academic policies that are disparate on the campuses, but would be—by unifying them, could be—we could do it in a more automated way. Now,

obviously it's not the job of SSI or, indeed, of the administration to declare what administrative—or academic policies are. And so, the savings there is really going to depend very much on both our further elaboration of what we're already doing, looking at the back office operations, and then where we've identified—we identify areas of differences among academic policies, presenting it to the relevant faculties if it seems like something that is—that might be worth pursuing further. So there's $7.7 million, which I think is a pretty good number, given its source; there's the $4 million, which is a much softer number, and really will depend on important policy choices, and then kind of a generalized relooking at all of these.

The document that you have was circulated to the campuses, all of the individuals who were involved in the process, which would be people in the relevant offices across the campuses, to chancellors and vice chancellors, and so on, shortly after the new year, and we're now in phase two, which is designed to get feedback on the phase one report. Again, part of trying to do this in a thoughtful and well informed way, is to have a large part of this in a part of the overall process involved getting feedback. Now, primarily, since we're talking about back office operations and business practices, we want to make sure that we got it right, as far as this initial report goes. This initial report is not all the details of each process and so on. That will need to be worked out, but as far as it goes, as far as our division or expected division between central and local, we want to make sure that we have that as right as possible before proceeding.

We're also eager to have input from really anybody who wants to—wants to comment further on it, and Jim and Steve, and to a lesser extent I, have been visiting—have visited every campus, and met with numerous groups on various campuses to get that kind of input, and this is—and so we welcome the invitation to meet with you to talk about it, and obviously any input at this point or at some later point is going to be most welcomed.

Phase three—phase two ends formally at the end of this month, which is I guess tomorrow, but obviously our email addresses still work, and our inboxes are still available, and the third phase is going to be a very lengthy activity. I mean, I don't know what the estimate is, but well in excess of a year, and so it's not like some window or draw bridge closes at this point for comments, so please do not take—[interruption in recording]—give it to the machine and get it to give the right results. So that's a very lengthy process, and we'll take, as I say, quite a bit of time. We have some ideas of priorities of time, and how to—how to make—how to proceed with those different areas. So that's really the background for how this process came to be. Those are the basic ideas that have gone into the way we're undertaking this process. And we certainly welcome any questions, comments, thoughts that people have. And I, or Jim, or Steve will do our best to answer them.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Okay, the floor is now open for questions, comments. Yes?

TERRY: I have a simple question, I think, and had Chuck received this thing earlier, he might have asked it, and maybe he's going to, I don't know. Does this imagine that the centralized part of this, which I presume will either be at IUPUI or Bloomington in terms of personnel, will have to be staffed for both the central and eastern time zones, because there will be some people here who will have to deal with some people at IU Northwest when they're on central time, and, you know, since you've saved millions of dollars by you know getting a hundred and some savings, I don't know how many people it's going to take, but it's going to take some working on a different schedule to serve that.

KENNEDY: We currently—it's a good point. We currently do take into account the Northwest campus.

GALLMEIER: Thank you, Herb. I want to say thank you. [laughter]

KENNEDY: We do have some staggered hours right now because to do some of the things we do right now, such as financial aid, we do take into account that difference of the hour. So we've already taken that a little bit in consideration and we'll have to continue as we move forward.

J. APPLEGATE: I mean, a lot of these activities, given their nature, are activities that occur essentially around the clock, too. So, already.

TERRY: Somewhere in there, there will be a need for people from Northwest to reach real human beings here to get things done from time to time.

J. APPLEGATE: And that's the shared and local thing.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Someone had a question?

R. APPLEGATE: Yeah, this is Rachel Applegate from IUPUI. When I read through the report it kept making reference to academic policies that should be standardized, but it didn't really name any of those. Is there a list somewhere of academic policies that they think should be standardized because the administrative part of it, I don't know enough to comment on, but the academic policies is something that faculty might have an idea about whether standardization's a good idea.

J. APPLEGATE: Well, they need—faculty needs to have an idea about whether it's a good idea or not. I mean," should," I think is not—I hope that's not the word that's used, and if it was, then that's mistaken. It really—our goal with that is to make it be as transparent as possible about what are, in effect, the drivers of cost in our back office operations, and I think it would be irresponsible for us not to point that out, but some costs are worth, you know, incurring, and some differences in policy, I think we all would recognize, have grown up simply because

we have functioned very separately in a lot of ways, and so they've just grown up that way, not in order to be different, but just because they have. And maybe some of those, it's not important that they're different. I mean, there is stuff we have in our policies that is university-wide. On the other hand, there's some policies that it's very important be different among different campuses for different missions, different purposes, different circumstances, and the most that I—I can really imagine us doing on this is raising the issue and probably the UFC is the place that you'd raise it and say, well, you know, what's the feeling? Is this a difference that's important to people or not? But I don't—there's not some general view in this and if that's what's conveyed, it's my bad drafting, I will admit. If that's what's conveyed, that's not the idea. The idea is to raise the issue because, again, if there's an opportunity to accomplish our same goals in a less expensive way, then I think we should take it.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Yes, please.

ATKINSON: So to Rachel's point, is there somewhere a list of—

J. APPLEGATE: — Oh, no—

ATKINSON: —of policies where there is a problem?

J.APPLEGATE: No, I mean, what would be—

R. APPLEGATE: Okay, on page five (sic) of your report, it's one of the major bullet things, and it says academic policies should be reviewed to determine harmonization, then elsewhere it will say things like if, you know, five campuses are doing this, then all eight should do that. And so, if it's not more concrete than that thing, then it—it's not meaningful, but if it's going to be meaningful, it needs to be more concrete than simply policies should be reviewed.

J. APPLEGATE: Well, yeah, and I do want to emphasize the way it's written. It says policies should be reviewed. It doesn't say they should be changed, and that's a big distinction. And I—go ahead.

R. APPLEGATE: [indistinct comment] unless that some of the savings are contingent upon harmonization. Because this is a report about saving money.

J. APPLEGATE: Yeah, right, it's in the $4 million dollar figure, the part that I said, you know, is a lot softer. And no, I mean, I think Jim may have just a representative example, but again this—what differences those would make, and so on, are really as we get into phase three and work into—into the details. So, I mean—

KENNEDY: Yeah, I think you're right on, John. As we go through phase three, we're going to be doing detailed business process review of these back office processes, and I think those will

come out saying, 'Well, here's something we're trying to standardize, but when you have these different economic policies…' And that's where I think they would surface to say we need faculty to take a look at these to see. And like John said, if it needs to be different for each campus, then so be it, but if there's something we can take a look at, I think that's where we could raise those concerns.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Let's try to get in as many questions as we possibly can because time is ticking here. Yes?

EVANS: So my main concern here is personal contact with the students in terms of student retention, and I'm wondering how much personal contact will be reduced in this one-stop shop model.

J. APPLEGATE: Right, well, a couple of things. First of all, the idea of a one-stop shop is it would be enabled by having a better back office architecture and infrastructure, but it is not itself the primary goal of this. The one stop shop is really designed to improve student's experience by having them able to deal with a number of different problems at once rather than kind of go pillar to post, but there's a larger issue here, and I'm now violating Carolyn's, 'let's move this along,' but—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —That's okay.

J. APPLEGATE: The—there's a larger issue here, which is that you'll notice that the functions we're talking about are quite different, and the thickness and thinness of the face-to-face contact is going to be really different among them. Bursar, for example, tends to be fairly straightforward kinds of operations. It's collecting money and disbursing money as appropriate. And so, except for the, you know, few students who get all sorts of problems, and it does happen, that can be largely automated.

The other extreme is advising, and there, the back office role is providing tools to help advisors be more effective when they're working with students. So, curriculum mapping, degree audits, early warning systems, all of those things help an advisor to be as effective as possible with students, but it doesn't take away, it enhances that contact. Another good example of sort of thickness there would be admissions. Admissions policies and strategies vary widely across the campuses. Fine. What SSI does, what the automation does, is provides information to support policies and recruiting activities.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Who's hand was up? Steve did I see your hand? Okay, IUSE. Laverne was next, okay, sorry. Laverne were you next?

NISHIHARA: No.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Alright, IUSE.

IUSE FEMALE SPEAKER: I just wanted to point out that there are some serious market differences, I think, across the campuses. The Southeast campus, for anybody who's not familiar, is basically in metropolitan Louisville, and our main competitor is the University of Louisville. Our market edge is the fact that we not only have a lot of faculty-student contact, but also that our student services are really, really personal and responsive, and I certainly am appreciative of the benefits of centralizing a lot of tasks, but if we lose that personal connection with the staff as well as faculty between students, it's going to really hurt our retention and enrollment, and I think we're pretty concerned about not becoming a faceless machine. Thank you.

J. APPLEGATE: And the SSI is—just to respond to that—the SSI is designed to allow campuses to make those choices. In other words, if you have strong support behind it, then—I mean, these people don't report to me. So, if the campus wants to make—seriously, I mean, if the campus wants to make a choice that we're going to have a very large number of people in that student's facing area, what we can do is make them as effective as possible, so they're not fooling around with, you know, easy stuff. What's the schedule, well when is something due? They're working with students on the more complicated things.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: IUPUI. I can't see who's in the background. Yes, your hand is up.

CHUCK FROM IUPUI?: So, a lot of the concerns have to do with the trajectory that everybody feels is in this document, which is increased centralization, and as we go forward, I think if we had sort of a principle, so the more that back office things get centralized can be efficient, but to—to benefit all the campuses, IUB, IUPUI, the regional campuses, there has to be a principle of local decision making authority. There has to be a person on each campus who can make a decision without having to move to some centralized bureaucracy. So, whether that's the bursar, or the registrar, or student services, that's what many of us are worried about, is this movement towards centralized systems means there's one person in the system who has decision making authority, and that will just blow away every campus' ability to meet our own individual missions, and so I would like to sort of articulate that principle as we—as we centralize in the back office, that there still is at every campus somebody who has decision making authority that they can make a decision on the spot.

J. APPLEGATE: Well, Chuck—

CHUCK FROM IUPUI: --Whatever that means, John, or Steve, or Jim.

J. APPLEGATE: Well, I think there are two answers to that. One is that this is one area where shared services is different from straight up centralization, which is the key difference is what

are known as service level agreements in which there is an explicit, up front agreement about what it is that—what services can be expected from the—from the local authorities. And I think that will go a long way to assuring the kind of question, or the kind of responsiveness that you're talking about. The other is it really depends on what kind of decisions we're talking about. If what we're talking about is the decision about, you know, whether somebody gets financial aid or they're—you know, have some emergency situation, should they get financial aid, absolutely. That—I mean within the limits of federal law about what you can give people in financial aid, that's the point, is to have a system that a decision like that can be made, and it's made. In terms of, I don't know, bursar rules for posting checks, I mean that's a central decision that was and still is. So, it—I mean, I just want to give that caveat to it, and, you know, in the interest of, you know, complete candor about it, but the idea is to have a system that's more responsive, that people who are working with students and with faculty can be as effective as possible in doing that.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Okay, other questions? Yes, Bill?

WHEELER: Mine is somewhat methodological in nature. It seems that, you know, this is PeopleSoft SIS functionality that we're concerned with, and that the report is based on analyzing the business processes that, you know, are related to SIS. Now, some of these offices have business processes that are not related to SIS, and yet it seems that the document in vision—is only being concerned with the SIS related things, does not consider the non-SIS related things or, perhaps, campus specific SIS mods. And so, then in the budgetary aspect, it's a reorganization and a downsizing based on the SIS functions, but in that downsizing, there doesn't appear to be any plan to maintain the non-SIS functionality, at least the report doesn't indicate this, and the Educational Policies Committee at the Bloomington campus was told by the Bloomington Registrar that in point and fact that once this goes in to place, the number of things are immediately threatened, such as context grade reports, which the Faculty Council adopted as an anti-grade inflation policy, course grade distribution, which again—[high pitched electronic voice followed by laughter]. I don't know what that was.

J. APPLEGATE: That was my answer! [laughter]

WHEELER: And, you know, early warning systems and other things that are specific to the Bloomington campus that these would immediately be cut in the sense that we would have to immediately have to begin asking for budgetary support for this because the organization was going to be shrunk and centralized—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —May I say—

WHEELER: —without arrangements for doing that.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Before you answer, John, if I may be permitted here, we have two more items on the agenda, so I need to know whether you want us to continue this line of discussion and postpone the other items, what is your pleasure here?

TERRY: We don't have a quorum; we can't act on number eight.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Well, we didn't have an actionable—

TERRY: It's listed as an action item.

WINDSOR: I think what you should do is email John, Jim for other comments, and move on. I would like to—

J. APPLEGATE: —I have a short answer to—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —Yeah, we do want you to have an opportunity—

J. APPLEGATE: — I would like to answer Bill very, very quickly, though. The answer is no. That is not accurate. That's simply not accurate.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Maybe we have time for one more question. Who had a question? Did I see Laverne's hand? Do you have a quick question?

NISHIHARA: I just wanted a brief explanation, as time allows, about how staff have been consulted on it because faculty won't take any hits. It looks like there will be some staff that will be let go, and I'd just like a summary about how staff have been consulted, how they've been involved.

J. APPLEGATE: Sure. Well, that's the whole process of phase one is one that's involved the offices that are involved in this in a very significant way, and these are the offices that—who received the phase one document, and are being asked to comment on it, and the offices that Jim and Steve have been—have been meeting with over the course of the last two months, so I think there has been a lot of consultation. I think that the idea, and I actually was able to meet along with these guys with the—with the Bloomington Professional Council, and what I told them was this, that first of all, this is a long-term project. This is not something—you know, phase three is a long-term project. It's something that will roll out over time. It's far too early to start talking about, you know, cuts, layoffs, this, that, and the other.

I fully understand—I really understand the kind of concern that a project like this raises. And my feeling is that there are kind of two ways to go about it. One way is to just, you know, keep it all kind of under wraps, and present it and this is what we're going to do. I think it is—has certain virtues to that, that way of doing—of approaching it. But I would much rather have the better product, and the more transparent process that comes from talking about it while we go along

with it. That is not the most comfortable way to do it sometimes, and I think that's regrettable, but I think as between doing this as, you know, working behind the scenes and then coming up with a *fait accompli*, and walking through it with the people in these offices, people who may or may not be affected. We don't—there's not grand plan. We don't know how that is going to work out at this point. I think that's the better way to do it.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Okay, so we have time for one more quick question because we did promise Burns that we would have time—

WINDSOR: Let's go ahead and move on. We're running out of time.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Okay. Alright, the last item is an action item, so we won't be able to get to that one so it will have to be postponed, and I believe Steve told me that he needs about fifteen, twenty minutes, fifteen minutes. Pardon?

WINDSOR: Let's go ahead and let the students present. They've taken time out from the clinic to come here. Let's let them go ahead and present. We don't have to vote on it.

BURNS: I can probably go—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Okay, that's fine. Let's thank Jim, John, and Steve for coming. Thank you so much.

J. APPLEGATE: And please do give us your comments and your thought. I very much appreciate it.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: So you suggest that we move to number eight. Is that your—

WINDSOR: Pardon me? Yes.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Okay. So, where is Benjamin?

KATZ: Right here.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Okay, Benjamin. [Indistinct comment]. Thank you for coming.

AGENDA ITEM 8: INDIANA UNIVERSITY STRATEGY FOR GLOBAL ACCESS TO HEALTH

FEMALE STUDENT SPEAKER: I'm Joanna Campodonico. I'm a third year medical student. I work with Benji.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Okay.

CAMPODONICO: Okay? We're here today to ask for support of the University Faculty Council in getting IU to join a host of other universities, the CDC, the NIH, and the Association of

University Technology Mangers in committing to a set of principles to increase the access to medicine—medication for the world's poor. We are the United—the members of the United—of the Universities Allied for Essential Medicines, a student-based organization working to increase access to medication to the world's poor. We have over one hundred and ten chapters in fourteen countries. We believe that every university developed drug, diagnostic, vaccine, and medical device should be licensed with a concrete, effective, and transparent strategy to make affordable versions available in low-income countries for essential medical care.

The World Health Organization estimates that ten million people die every day because they cannot afford existing drugs, and approximately one third of the global population does not have regular access to essential medicine, and that in the poorest parts of Africa and Asia this figure rises well above 50%. Additionally, an estimated one hundred million people are pushed into poverty every day with the high cost of medical care.

Universities, we believe, can play a significant role in increasing access to medicines for people in low and middle income countries. Many of these people have no access only due to the cost of medicine. In 2000, a U.S. Senate Report found that fifteen of twenty-one drugs with the greatest therapeutic impact were developed using federally funded research at academic centers. One hundred and thirty seven FDA approved drugs have been developed at public sector research institutions over the last twenty-one years. This does not include upstream development of drugs from primary research at universities or development of additional drugs in a class after the first drug in a class was developed at a university.

Some examples are like Stavudine at Yale, Abacavir at Minnesota, Fuzeon at Duke, and others such as carboplatin, cisplatin, HPV vaccine, latanoprost, are some of the important drugs for global health that were developed at universities and licensed to pharmaceutical companies. The many HIV antiretroviral I mention because of their importance of their ability—availability for programs like the IU-Kenya Partnership.

Stavudine, as I mentioned before, is an interesting example. It was originally developed at Yale University and licensed to Bristol-Myers Squibb. The price per patient per year in South Africa in the late nineties was well over ten thousand dollars. Doctors Without Borders approached Yale and Bristol-Myers Squibb without making—about making the drug more available to their patients in South Africa. Their request was denied; as Yale stated that this was not possible due to the existing licensing contract. An extensive public backlash against Yale and Bristol-Myers Squibb caused the two parties to re-negotiate their contract. In 2001, the new contract allowed generic production in low and middle income countries, which precipitated a one hundred and twenty-fold decrease in the price over the next few years. And I'll hand it over to Benji.

KATZ: So, therefore, since renegotiating contracts is not always possible and incredibly time consuming, why not create licensing contracts from the beginning with mechanisms in place to increase access to the world's poor. This idea was the impetus for the Universities Allied for Essential Medicines to form, the Association of University Technology Managers to begin to research new mechanisms, and for universities around the world to re-examine licensing. Over the past decade, a number of universities and other institutions have made changes to their licensing policies in order to improve access to medications. Important landmarks include the renegotiation between Bristol-Myers Squibb and Yale, as Joanna mentioned previously. In 2003, the Gates Foundation started its Fair Access Policy to affirm that products the foundation helps fund will be made accessible and affordable to the world's poor.

In 2005, UC Berkeley launched their socially responsible licensing program, this—which was created with the development of the hand helped micro-electric mechanical systems-based diagnostic for the diagnosis of dengue fever. In 2006, the Philadelphia Consensus Statement was launched with one hundred and fifty luminaries and signatories, including nine Nobel Prize winners. In 2008, Emory University developed the Technology Transfer for Global Access Guiding Principles. And in ultimately in 2009, the Association of University Technology Managers released the Statement of Principles and Strategies for the Equitable Dissemination of Medical Technologies with its initial signatories.

This statement was a proposal developed by the Association of University Technology Managers at a number of universities. Whether you're looking research powerhouses, such as Yale and Harvard, Big Ten schools such as Illinois, schools we have partnerships with such as AMPATH Consortium members, Duke and Brown, governmental institutions such as the NIH and CDC, or other state schools such as the University of Vermont and Florida State University, this statement has widespread support, and we think IU should be on this list.

We also provided a copy of the IU Strategy for Global Access to Health. This is a statement written by a committee we formed on—we formed on looking into IU's developing a global access licensing policy. Promoting neglected disease research and promoting additional metrics to measure the societal benefits of university research. This statement was drafted before the Association of University Technology Managers Statement of Principles was released, but the two statements are fundamentally consistent in goals. Endorsement of the Statement of Principles and Strategies for the Equitable Dissemination of Medical Technologies would be a way to act on all of these steps in coordination with other universities. The majority of the committee we formed helped create and endorse the IU Strategy for Global Access to Health. Since that time, the IU School of Medicine Faculty Steering Committee, Dr. Brater, Dean of the IU School of Medicine, the IUPUI Faculty Council, and the IU Bloomington Faculty Council have all endorsed this proposal. We would like the University Faculty Council to officially endorse the

IU Strategy for Global Access to Health. Along with the IU School of Medicine's Faculty Steering Committee's, Dean Brater's, the IUPUI Faculty Council's, and the IU Bloomington Faculty Council's endorsement of this proposal, we would like it for to be presented to the Board of Trustees asking for IU to commit to the Statement of Principles.

WINDSOR: So, we can't really vote on this.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Yes, you have a question?

WHEELER: Yes. When this before the Bloomington Faculty Council, there was an amendment that the Council made to it. My memory is vague as to exactly what that amendment was. Maybe [indistinct comment], but is that—is that—is that amendment reflected in the document before us today?

KATZ: It was—I don't know why it's not, but I can tell you right now what the amendment was. It was to point three in the IU Strategy for Global Access to Health, and it currently states, "Indiana University will advocate for increased federal and private funding for research of neglected diseases." The amendment was to add, at the end of that sentence, "and of new applications of existing drugs," because the IU Bloomington Faculty Council wanted to add as well the importance of research for new uses for pre-existing drugs.

WHEELER: Do you accept that as a friendly amendment? Do you accept that now as a friendly amendment—?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: We cannot act on that today, Bill, but I can—as a recommendation, I think it's a good one.

ATKINSON: I don't see why we can't have a vote that gets the sense of the Council. [Louder]I don't see why we can't have a vote to get a sense of the Council. This is not—we're not adopting legislation here; we're getting the sense of the Council to take to the Trustees, and I don't see why we can't have a vote.

WINDSOR: Well, I like doing things the right way, so I believe in following parliamentary procedure. I would suggest that we charge the Agenda Committee with making a motion at their next meeting, at which time we can vote electronically, [indistinct comment]. We can also do what Simon suggested. Other thoughts?

TERRY: I would like to do both. I think we could pass along, a sort of sense of the people who are here on this issue, and convey that to the people who aren't, if we conduct an electronic vote.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Is that a—is that a—just a recommendation, not a motion? Right?

GERENCSER: I was just about to say the same thing as Herb, but I think we could do both, have a sense of the people who are here, and heard the presentation, and use that to vote a formal vote, as Jack suggested.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: That's a good idea. All those persons in favor of accepting the report, and the recommendations coming from the global access group…

TERRY: Including the Bloomington amendment?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —Including the Bloomington amendment, please signify by raising your hands. Okay. All those opposed, say nay. I guess we should say, 'are you ready for the question,' but that's sort of moot. It doesn't matter. Okay. So what we will do then, we will take this to the general body, and ask the general body to vote on it. Thank you for doing that in a very efficient way. Let's see, we have—we have about—and thank the students for bringing this to our attention. I certainly think this is a worthwhile thing that we should do. Steve, do you want to see what you can say, or hold?

BURNS: I may be able to do it quickly.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Okay, alright.

BURNS: Because at least for the first reading, we've got it out—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —Okay, alright—

AGENDA ITEM 7: RESOLUTION ON RESEARCH MISCONDUCT

BURNS: —of the way if we do it. Okay, so this is a first reading, and the issue before us pertains to the—definition of research misconduct. If you look on the circular here, it starts on the second page; at the bottom is a definition of research misconduct. Item one is pretty standard. It's what we all think of research misconduct. Item two is rather unusual because it says, "on all campuses except IUPUI, research misconduct also includes," and a list of items that are essentially compliance items. The history of this is a bit murky, but apparently someone thought, as this policy was being developed, that compliance was not in good shape at Bloomington specifically, and thought they'd make it research misconduct as well. It doesn't follow federal guidelines. It doesn't follow what most of our peer institutions do, and the appropriate response was to strengthen compliance procedures, which are all now, if they ever were weak, they're not now. They're standard.

The reason we're bringing it forward, as John Bauman pointed this discrepancy out to the Research Affairs Committee, we investigated a bit, and found out we had faculty who got caught in a double jeopardy situation as it were, where they might have an issue of research

compliance. They were informed. They said, "Oh my gosh, you're right. We'll fix it. We'll take extra classes. We'll do all the things necessary to fix, say animal protocol that they deviated from, or something like that." I can be specific, but I'd rather not. And so there was not any real issue of misconduct in any of the senses we mean typically which is plagiarism, falsification, and so we still had to treat it as a misconduct case, which is—didn't make sense. And so, what's before you really is just get rid of that second item, go back to what IUPUI's definition of research misconduct, which is in concordance with most major research institutions, and then there's additional deletions later in the document that almost all directly parallel and follow from this deletion of item two. There's no other intention here, other than changing item two, to delete it. And I can answer more questions if you want, but that's sort of the sum of what the intent is.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Questions? Comments? Bill?

WHEELER: So, I'm on the [indistinct comment]. I can sympathize with deleting 2.a., but I'm not sure I would sympathize with deleting 2.b., and I might even be inclined to extend that to include IUPUI, that is, "material failure to disclose all real or perceived conflicts of interest." You know, I would think that is research misconduct.

BURNS: So conflict of interest is already handled under a complete another set of requirements for all faculty members. We all have to fill out a conflict of interest statement every year, and there's a procedure in place for the university to deal with conflicts of interest that's separate from this one.

WHEELER: And what about in c., the abuse of confidentialities; are there other places in the university where that's protected?

BURNS: Those types of—in other words, the research misconduct typically is reported, and in fact, if you receive federal dollars, you're typically required to report to the government that there's an investigation ongoing in research misconduct. Some of these are very vague and don't rise typically, so many of these happen, for instance, if a student has a dispute with an advisor or something, elevating them to research misconduct, when they're often differences of opinion, they still have mechanisms that they're investigated on academically, but the general feeling is, and the general approach is that they're not really research misconduct which is reserved for plagiarism. You published somebody else's data, put your name on it. Falsification, you've falsified data, um…

DETHLOFF: Fabrication.

BURNS: Fabrication. You made up the data. Thank you.

R. APPLEGATE: This is Rachel. I think, in supporting your thing, many of the things that I think were envisioned in c. could be included in—I mean in c. of number 2., are included in c. of the previous one where it says, "appropriation of another's ideas..."

BURNS: Right.

R. APPLEGATE: I mean, if you edit or have access to other people's ideas, and you appropriated them, then that would fall also—already under c. —

BURNS: Plagiarism.

R. APPLEGATE: —of the previous point.

BURNS: Yeah.

ESTELL: And it's my sense, the same thing, of conflicts of interest, if you have a conflict of interest you didn't disclose, that's one thing. If you acted on that conflict in order to benefit from it by falsifying data, that's when it kicks in to misconduct. I agree, if you just didn't report it, it's not as egregious of a—

BURNS: —Yeah. I mean—

ESTELL: It's when you actually then fake things so you can profit.

BURNS: Louder so everybody can hear.

ESTELL: Yeah, no, it's just saying that my interpretation's our biggest concern with conflicts of interest is people may be inclined to find favorably—in favor of whatever their conflict is, but that's when you get in to the falsification side of things. If they merely have a conflict of interest, but it didn't actually bias their research, then it's—it's a violation, but not at the level of research misconduct, is my reading of it.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Okay, Jim—John, I'm sorry.

J. APPLEGATE: I've got a question about—about 2.a., and these are the deleted section about "protection of researchers, human participants or the public, or for ensuring the welfare of laboratory animals." Are we sure there are faculty policies that cover those—those problems because, I mean, we do see situations in which people are put at risk by failure to follow the proper protocols, and that's obviously a very serious matter, so this is covered somewhere else?

BURNS: So, I'll take the case of a human subject's example. You may not perform research on human subjects without it going through the institutional review board, pre-screening by the

compliance officers of the institutional review board, then evaluation. You're required to report progress yearly, and your research can be stopped instantly if there are major failures of compliance. Animals, exactly the same. There's standing committees to deal with that.

J. APPLEGATE: What if I store chemicals unsafely?

BURNS: The same. Every campus will have a chemical safety officer; probably many of the schools have chemical safety officers.

J. APPLEGATE: Right.

BURNS: —and biosafety Officers. There's a whole structure.

J.APPLEGATE: But what I'm asking is there a correlative faculty policy on the consequences of that, which is what this is mostly about. It's about the consequences of plagiarism and so on, and I'm wondering if there is, in fact, a correlative to that. Because you're right, there are chemical safety and biosafety and rad safety, and all of that.

DETHLOFF: No, because I think that falls outside—wouldn't that be a government matter? They regulate that. But what we're saying, if you're storing chemicals improperly, that is not research misconduct.

J. APPLEGATE: And no, I understand what's doing, but what I'm saying is, I'm just asking the question, shouldn't that be a concern of the university as well, if people are endangering—endangering others?

BURNS: Yes, it is a concern. Obviously, I agree, but I don't think it falls—falls under research misconduct. And, so there are processes, and if they are not appropriate, it's reasonable to ask us to review those safety processes, but I wouldn't treat them as research misconduct, is what I—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: We have about two more minutes.

BURNS: —am saying.

J. APPLEGATE: Okay. Thank you.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Who else has a question or a comment? Herb?

TERRY: A very quick comment. Before this comes back for a real vote, delete 1 under research misconduct because it [indistinct comment].

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Okay—yes? Tony?

FARGO: Yeah, I'm sorry. I have to kind of agree with John, though. I'm—some of what you just described sounded to me like misconduct, and I think if you, for example, if you do a social science research project, and you promise the participants confidentiality, then break it, to me that's misconduct. It's not just oopsy. You know? So—and that sounded to me like part of what A was—was designed to deal with a little bit here. Am I reading it wrong, or…? I guess—I'm trying to figure out what the difference is between misconduct and other things the university deals with elsewhere.

ATKINSON: Steve, my sense of this is that it's very important from the point of view of our relationships with the—with the federal government, and the sanctions that are potentially applicable to the university, that we don't confuse other issues that the federal government doesn't consider as research misconduct in our research and misconduct policy, otherwise we open ourselves up to a lot of difficulty, and some of these other issues are important, and perhaps should be the subject of faculty policy but they should not be part of the research and misconduct policy. It's a very dangerous road to go.

UNKNOWN MALE SPEAKER: Yeah, those are all covered by [indistinct comment], right?

BURNS: Yeah, they are all covered.

ESTELL: That if you violated confidentiality like that, you may be essentially permanently enjoined from ever doing research again; even if you're not technically charged with research misconduct, the Human Subjects Committee could basically say, 'Given your past history, we're not approve…'

BURNS: —Can the government forbid you from receiving federal funding, for instance, for multiple years, and I guess if it arises to altering the data, which is really where—

FARGO: Is this what—that same [indistinct comment] misconduct—

BURNS: —that comes under research misconduct.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: I believe we have reached the mandatory time for adjournment. Thank you so much, and we'll look--

BURNS: We have time to discuss next time--

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —forward to another meeting, where we can vote on some of these items, when I hope we will have a quorum.

MEETING ADJOURNED: 5:30PM