

**Indiana University**  
**UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL**  
**October 25, 2011**  
**12:30 P.M. - 2:30 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: Hawthorne Hall Room 318**  
**IUSB: Northside Hall Room 079**  
**IUS: Knobview Hall Room 112**

**Attendance**

**MEMBERS:** Jean Abshire, Rachel Applegate, Randy Arnold, Simon Atkinson, Charles Bantz, Ed Berbari, Karl Besel, Hall Bjornstad, Steve Burns, Carolyn Calloway-Thomas, LaNita Campbell, Shu Cole, Rosanne Cordell, Stanley Davis, Nancy Eckerman, Tony Fargo, Charles Gallmeier, Steven Gerencser, Don Gjerdingen, Pat Harbison, Hitesh Kathuria, Steve Mannheimer, Michael McRobbie, Geralyn Miller, Laverne Nishihara, Nasser Paydar, Ellen Szarleta, Herb Terry, Lesley Walker, Joe Wert, L. Jack Windsor

**MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT:** Mary Popp (Erika Dowell)

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Corey Ariss, Zachary Berwick, M. Todd Bradley, David Estell, Harold Evans, Clifford Goodwin, Richard Gunderman, Matthew Guterl, Karen Hanson, Michael Harris, John Hassell, Pamela Ironside, Jorge José, Justin Kingsolver, Joan Kowolik, William Lowe, Marjorie Manifold, Tim Mickleborough, Mary Beth Minick, Lori Montalbano, Yusuf Nur, C. Subah Packer, Sandra Patterson-Randles, Una Mae Reck, Christopher Rutkowski, Jodi Smith, Fran Squires, William Wheeler, Tony White, David Tataw, Michael Wartell

**GUESTS:** John Applegate, Shelley Bizila, Craig Dethloff, Marcia Gonzalez, Faith Hawkins, Jennifer Hehman, Marisa Pratt

**Agenda**

1. Approval of Minutes

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/minutes/AY11/02.22.11.pdf>  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/minutes/AY11/03.29.11.pdf>  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/minutes/AY11/04.26.11.pdf>

2. Agenda Committee Business (10 minutes)

(Professors L. Jack Windsor and Carolyn Calloway-Thomas, Co-Secretaries of the University Faculty Council)

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY12/U1-2012.pdf>

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY12/U2-2012.pdf>

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY12/U3-2012.pdf>

3. Presiding Officer's Business (10 minutes)

(Professor Michael McRobbie, President of Indiana University)

4. Question/Comment Period\* (60 minutes)

(President McRobbie and Professors Windsor and Calloway-Thomas)

5. UFC Reform Taskforce Report (30 minutes)

(Professor Simon Atkinson) [FIRST READING]

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY12/U4-2012.pdf>

## Minutes

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

**MCRABBIE:** We are still about even, but that will be about two short of a quorum, but I suggest for the sake of the discussion that we proceed with the agenda mindful that we may reach a quorum, and, if not, we can at least minute this meeting as a discussion among UFC reps as well. So given that, I'm not certain what the status of the minutes of those last minutes are. I am not certain we had quorums for them either, the ones that are listed here under agenda item one. Craig, can you clarify?

**DETHLOFF:** They just have to be approved.

**MCRABBIE:** Right. I shouldn't ask too many questions is that what you are saying? [Laughter]  
Alright—

**WINDSOR:** —agenda in case we do get quorum. Move them down—just move them down in the agenda until we get quorum.

**MCRORBIE:** Alright, well let's see if we can—I don't mind doing that. Let's leave them for the time being. Agenda Committee business, Jack and Carolyn?

**WINDSOR:** My comments or do you want me to—?

**MCRORBIE:** One of you start, whoever wants to start. Maybe you start, you're the senior.

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

**WINDSOR:** Alright, one of the big issues with faculty here recently is IRB issues and the timeliness of approvals. We've been working a lot with Vice President for Research. I met with him yesterday and he agreed to draft a memo outlining bullet points of what he's doing to impact it in the short term as well as long term. Negotiating with the School of Medicine as well as with the CTSI to utilize some of their IRB peoples to enhance this process, to speed it up, to get rid of the backlog. He assures me they're making progress. I also requested that we have regular updates. Are we looking for impact? We want this problem solved. Also he made a comment he would establish one person that would be the go-to person if you have a problem with your IRB and you need it solved ASAP, student needs to start the project because he's trying to graduate, that you have this person to go to, and they would find a solution to get it handled. He also will be taking advantage of a group of individuals that he trained on different campuses to do exempt IRBs. We have some in the School of [indistinct comment] and he's going to use those for non-federal. So he's looking at options, strategies, to get rid of the backlog, to turn this around. We have come to some solutions and that we will be assessing them regularly for impact. We have some colleagues here. I think Faith is in Bloomington. We have two colleagues here. They'd like to make comments on his behalf because I believe he is in Washington.

**MCRORBIE:** Okay.

**GONZALEZ:** Yeah, this is Marcia Gonzalez, I am the Assistant Vice President of Research Compliance, and obviously the turnaround time with the delay and the backlog are not conscionable. This is something we are working on very, very aggressively. I do want to reiterate that the go-to people for the student exempt research is extraordinarily important. We've had a number of outreach meetings with some associate directors and associate deans of the schools to help identify how we can be a better resource for them in their particular areas, and so feel free to contact me or Shelley to get [indistinct comment] so that we can begin to attack—strategically attack all those items. We want to make sure that we are resourceful in terms of specific needs not only of the students, but also the type of research that is done in each of the schools. So if there are any other concerns or items, you can consider Shelley or I as the go-to people for any item, no matter how big or small.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Carolyn Calloway-Thomas. I have a question for Ms. Gonzalez because at the meeting of the Board of Trustees, Jack and I were left with the impression that the office does not have need for additional resources. Can you speak to that, please? I mean are you saying—

**GONZALEZ:** Does not have the need?

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Yes, that's what Vice President José said at the meeting of the Board of Trustees, and I was quite stunned by that.

**GONZALEZ:** Well, at the last—I would say since August, the vice president's office has made a substantial commitment in both personnel and monies to help us get through this process, and so, certainly when you, you know, you take resources from one area it may impact the other. So what we are doing is being resourceful with our own needs, and luckily, with his support, we are getting additional staffing, consulting, and rearranging some priorities to get us to that point. Certainly if additional resources are needed to tackle this extraordinary role, then we will work with the vice president's office, Royce and Faith, and they're in Bloomington, to address those needs. So we do have needs, and the vice president has responded to those requests.

**MCROBBIE:** Other questions? Sorry, is there someone up there? Yeah?

**R. APPLGATE:** I'm new to the UFC so maybe this has already been provided where you have given your metrics, you said that you had metrics for average times?

**GONZALEZ:** Yes.

**CHAFFIN:** So you provided that to the UFC?

**GONZALEZ:** Not to the UFC. I can probably provide [indistinct comment] to you for your particular school and overall as well.

**CHAFFIN:** Okay, I would like that.

**GONZALEZ:** Okay. I can send that to the members of the UFC as well.

**WINDSOR:** One of the other discussions I had with the VP was simply that some people here think it was due to centralization and that they pushed him to go back to decentralize it. And I conveyed to him that he really needs to tell the story, communicate very well and transparent that ya'll are still on this campus, in a renovated building, Lockfield Village I believe, so they are here. People are in Bloomington. So even though, you know, it's been centralized through the system, they're still physically located here, and will be able to troubleshoot. So, I conveyed to him that it is very important to communicate that very clearly. And it's not a centralization

problem, it's simply a backlog, and we talked about what that backlog was due to, and it's basically in the screening because I talked to a lot of reviewers on my IRB, and they're waiting for things to review it's just the initial screening because of new forms, etc... has resulted in a backlog, and I look forward to a resolution to this problem.

**BURNS:** Yes, I want to second this. This is Steve Burns in Bloomington. Resolution of the problem is critical, and one of the things in the last problem period, which was the summer of 2008 that was very useful, was making those metrics of the delay times widely available. We were updated as a faculty on a regular basis. We had information that the queues were shortening. We're actually much longer in to the process here on this period, so I think not just UFC, but a more broad-based communication with faculty would be very useful.

**MCROBBIE:** Marcia, do you see a problem with doing something like that? I mean...

**WINDSOR:** I can address that. I've mentioned I talked to him yesterday. He assures me he's working on a website to get that data available for everyone to visit the website and see it regularly. So people can track it [indistinct comment].

**MCROBBIE:** Marcia, is that on the way, obviously, is it? Marcia?

**GONZALEZ:** Yes, sir.

**MCROBBIE:** Okay.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** But suppose people are not going to visit the website; are there other additional ways that you might be able to inform the body of what's going on?

**GONZALEZ:** Yes, we can—we are also providing them to the schools currently. And he emailed to me, I can certainly provide you that information. We're also going to have a communication plan, in ORA news we can send them out on a regular basis, and certainly through our PI community, we have that on the listserv. So, we can give you both school specific and overall records.

**BIZILA:** But if the Council would like something on a recurring basis, obviously, if you'd like to set that standard, we would be glad to provide that.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** I would love that because I think one of the difficulties is that people really don't know what is going on, and I think you would fill that vacuum by systematically and regularly, routinely letting us know what's going on. What measures you're taking to address the issue, how you're going to address the issue, those sorts of things would be very helpful.

**MCROBBIE:** I think at the next meeting, we should also have the VP for Research here and to do a kind of a report and update, because I think there is a meeting in December, isn't there, if I remember? Yes, Herb?

**TERRY:** I may go on that comment actually. Vice Provost José appeared before the BFC, and I have to say I was shocked when I asked, basically, for benchmarking data, how bad are we compared to comparable institutions and neither the complaining faculty nor Vice President José had any. Ultimately, this problem may be of our own doing, but the delays may also be the results of changing federal regulations, and this sort of thing, and if we don't know how comparable institutions are doing, we may expend resources trying to fix a problem that is not under our control. So I would—on one hand I want the office to take the resources it's got now, and do what it can, reasonably, to address the problems, but at the same time, I'd hope along the way we get some benchmarking data from comparable research intensive institutions with medical schools, have some idea what our targets should be, and then we can go to the feds, as Vice President José said we were going to do, and also argue that we're spending a lot of resources implementing complex regulations that don't have a lot to do with effectively protecting human subjects.

**MCROBBIE:** Other comments?

**GONZALEZ:** I do have comparable AAHRPP data, which is the accrediting body for IRBs, and we also have some Big Ten data through CIC. We can get an updated request for their turnaround times as well. We did ask for one earlier in the year, but that needs to be updated. But that helps us also—

**MCROBBIE:** So such data does exist?

**TERRY:** Okay.

**GONZALEZ:** Yes.

**MCROBBIE:** Okay.

**TERRY:** One other suggestion. I think I have heard from a lot of people that I heard from some years ago when this problem occurred, and there's a sense among some of the social scientists who have contacted me that people who are processing their materials, don't have much of an understanding of especially international social science, and the difficulties of getting approvals and that sort of thing. Well, if the feds require approvals that are hard to get, then we have to turn to those people and say, 'That can't be done.' But on the other hand, I think it may be necessary for the office to look at not just processing capabilities, but areas of expertise. Does

it have the people who understand social scientific research to address these problems, as well as people who understand the biological and medical sciences?

**MCROBBIE:** I think, and I expect that is the case, but Marcia, do you want to comment on that?

**GONZALEZ:** No, I think that's an excellent point, and one of the reasons why among the initiatives we're putting in, are these pilot programs that we are going to [indistinct comment] people in certain departments. Certainly the research that's done in folklore or in [indistinct comment] is not the same that's done in nursing or dentistry and medicine. So it's in our best interest to learn the research environment so it will be more helpful filling out the forms and getting it through the process.

**MCROBBIE:** I think it is the case, Marcia, isn't it, that, of course, IRBs are staffed basically by volunteers from the faculty and some external to the university, and I believe, at least, at one time, it was, it always proved difficult to get enough people with enough diversity of backgrounds to volunteer to accept appointments to IRBs. I don't know what the status is at the moment, whether that's improved, but our colleagues around the table obviously need to do what they can to encourage their colleagues to agree to take on service on an IRB. It's obviously not the most thrilling work necessarily, but it is absolutely essential to the institution, and it relies on a robust group of people willing to commit their time and energy to maintain the standards and integrity of our scientific processes within the university. Can you comment on staffing in terms of members of the IRBs?

**GONZALEZ:** We just went through the reappointment process this past summer, and I believe we're doing fairly well as far as volunteers who are wanting to serve on the IRB. I think they are the, you know, keystone to making sure that our IRB can handle not only the volume but the complexity of the studies that are going through. So yes, most of them are volunteers and are willing to do what they can to pitch in—

**ATKINSON:** But I do want to make a point that the acute issues that we've been facing are not with review by the IRB committees, and that the delays are in studies that are either exempt or expedited, or in actually getting them to the committee, and so, as well as a need for expertise on the committees, there's a need for sufficient expertise in the staff who actually handle the proposals so that they can be routed in the right direction.

**ATKINSON:** Carolyn, the rate limiting staff is screening, right? Carolyn, rate limited, right?

**MCROBBIE:** That's what I understand to be the case from what Jorge's said. Yes, Steve?

**BURNS:** Steve Burns. And I just want to say that from the inside, the reason we hit these rate limiting steps was because of rapid changes in the number and content in forms, people are

highly unfamiliar with them. They were changing quite rapidly, and so, some stability will probably help. And the second thing I want to say is that within the regulations, as far as I know, there aren't a lot of changes in regulations. There are changes in guidances, but the ability of an IRB to be flexible towards specialty areas and to consider the needs of foreign nationals and things are not really limited, and so we need to assure our colleagues that we can accommodate these areas of research.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** On several occasions, and in particular I think Vice President José mentioned what I'm about to say, and someone was quoted in the Herald-Times as saying what I'm about to note here, and that is I understand that some of the difficulty in getting a fast turnaround might rest with the inability of members of the faculty and graduate students to read those applications in a very systematic way. Is that correct? I mean I've heard that on at least two or three different occasions, that part of the difficulty rests with faculty.

**HAWKINS:** If I might speak to that as the person who was quoted in the Herald-Times...

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Okay, thank you! [Laughter]

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Were you quoted correctly, is what I'd like—

**HAWKINS:** Sort of.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Okay.

**HAWKINS:** The point I was trying to make was that as forms and regulations change, it takes everybody time to get up to speed with the new requirements. I was not suggesting that responsibility for the slowdown was because our faculty were ignorant about or slow to learn. It was simply that—it's, we can't just bring people in off the street, sit them down at a desk, and say 'Go to it,' and expect them to do it in a way that will protect the university, our researchers, and the people participating in the research. And so it takes time for anybody to get up to speed. You and I can sit down there, and we would be woefully slow to start out because we have to learn it. And so that was the point I was trying to make is that as Dr. Burns noted, when forms change a lot, it confuses people, it takes us time to understand what's happening, and then respond accordingly.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Because I was going to suggest that a remedy might be for you to let members of the faculty know about these new regulations, teach them how to manage those forms, and those sorts of things.

**HAWKINS:** Yeah. And I mean I would imagine that there is a system through, that we say, 'This change is coming down the pike.' But it's one thing to hear about it, you know, and another thing to actually implement it and look at it, you know, it's the same thing with my tax forms

every year. I hear that there are going to be changes, but it's not until the night of April 14<sup>th</sup> that I realize what that means.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** But I was suggesting scrutiny on the part of your office, you know, some way, some system that you might use to ensure, because this is really a tinderbox of a kind of issue on this campus.

**HAWKINS:** And so, and believe me, we know that.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** It's like a fire bell in the night.

**HAWKINS:** Yes.

**MCROBBIE:** Any other questions?

**WINDSOR:** In light of the time to continue the conversation about the Agenda Committee and changing subjects, open enrollment. Vice President Theobald was here on campus eleven to one today, taking questions from the IFC regarding strategies as we move forward with healthcare. Another thing on the Agenda Committee is simply the UFC reform, which we'll talk about later on in the agenda. Carolyn, anything you would like to add?

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** I would suggest that—I believe Craig told me that Mr. Rives might be here at one o'clock and when he arrives, we want to yield the floor to him, with your permission.

**MCROBBIE:** Who's here?

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Dan Rives, to give him an opportunity to speak to this open enrollment matter.

**WINDSOR:** Sounds good, thank you.

**MCROBBIE:** That's fine, I didn't realize that this was happening, but that's fine. Anything else, Jack or Carolyn?

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** No.

**WINDSOR:** No.

**MCROBBIE:** Okay, alright, well let's move on. Do we have a quorum yet, Craig?

**DETHLOFF:** We're one shy.

**MCROBBIE:** Alright.

**GERENCSEK:** Lesley Walker in South Bend has just shown up. So we now have one person more at South Bend.

**DETHLOFF:** So then we have a quorum.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** So we have a quorum. Good news.

**MCROBBIE:** That's amazing.

**BURNS:** Move to approve the minutes!

**MCROBBIE:** I'm going to exercise chairman's prerogative and move exactly to that. Can I get a motion to approve the minutes, please? And I have it and I think Steve, second? Okay, we've got a motion to approve the minutes. Any discussion, comments, questions on the minutes?

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** This is wonderful!

**MCROBBIE:** There being none, I'll put the motion to approve the minutes. All those in favor? [Aye] Against? [Silence]

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

**MCROBBIE:** Okay, let me move on to Presiding Officer's Business. I want to just tell you a little bit more about the announcement that we made yesterday and give you some background to it. Hopefully the material that's been around has been—is extensive and probably explains the background to yesterday's decision comprehensively. But this was—this particular initiative that was announced yesterday really flowed out of the initiative that the BFC took now about a year ago—over a year ago—to, on the Bloomington campus, move to what's been called, I think, somewhat incorrectly, to what has been called a summer semester. I guess it's more of a [indistinct comment] that it's a summer—that it's been called a summer semester. And there was a, I think, a well-reasoned case for how that summer semester would basically subsume the two previous summer sessions, but provide greater flexibility for course offerings over the summer, and hopefully increase enrollments on this campus and provide better utilization of facilities.

You're probably all well aware, you don't even have to read the newspapers, but you're well aware that we come under constant criticism for our—the underutilization of our facilities at certain times during the year. I know one of the areas that members of some of the faculty councils have considered is Friday classes, but that's another matter. And of course the underutilization of facilities over summer is something that members of our legislature are constantly concerned about. And they raise, not unreasonably, the question, when we make proposals for funding for new classroom buildings, why do you need those, why don't you just

use your summers better? That's sort of, in essence, the nature of the argument. Now, if you combine that with a constant refrain that we've now heard, for a number of years in particular, about the affordability of university educations that we're hearing all over the place, every state is hearing it, every university, I think pretty much, is hearing it. And also, what's also a reasonably constant refrain, too, which is time to degree. And states are mindful of the fact that they're all wrestling with our employment rates, the average is 10% nationally, this state's about just under that. Others are worse, some better. But that graduates have about half the unemployment rates of people without degrees, so a way of improving someone's chance of getting a job is to actually finish their degree as opposed to lengthen that process. If you combine that with the related issue of graduation rates and so on, that has led to the conclusion that in order to try to build our numbers over summer, the one way to do it would be to have a substantial tuition discount over the summer, let me call it summer semester generically, that covers what is now a summer semester on the Bloomington campus, and the summer sessions on all of the regional campuses.

We discussed this with the chancellors, deans, and others, and I discussed it with a number of Trustees individually, and the consensus was pretty overwhelmingly positive to do this. So, consequently, we announced that yesterday a 25% discount for all summer sessions, and it will be for undergraduate, resident students. And a comparable dollar amount will apply to undergraduate, non-resident students, which will be about equivalent of an 8% discount as well. It will obviously provide an incentive for students to enroll over summer, hence improving the chances of completing their degree faster. It will have an impact if they take advantage of it on the total cost of their degree, and then in some cases debt—student debt as well. It will utilize our facilities better over summer, and address some other issues as well. But to give you the numbers, we have about just over 30,000 undergraduate students enrolled as of the last summer semester on all of our campuses. About just over 40,000 if you take graduate students into account. But some of those graduate students are working the whole year round in the professional schools. So this, at the moment, applies just to the undergraduate schools. The—as to how successful this will be, I mean we're not aware of any university of our size and complexity having done this before, but someone may correct me if they know of an example. Because as I said in the news conference yesterday, I would hope that we might see something like a ten percent increase in our numbers for next year, again across all campuses. And then maybe see that compounded over a number of years. If we could over four to five years increase the number of students in the summer session by maybe roughly a half or something like that, I think this will have been a very successful initiative.

It was very warmly received by the Commissioner of Higher Education, Teresa Lubbers, who was with me at the news conference, and the governor though he was unable to attend the news conference provided us with a quote for our news release. And it has been well received

in most other quarters as well. There will be a special meeting of the Trustees this Friday about, I think it's at 12:30 from memory, to consider this recommendation from me to approve this tuition discount over summer. That will be, I think, in the Frangipani Room. That's the background to it.

The specific thing I wanted to bring to you, and maybe this could be for discussion at a later meeting, although it would be fine if we discussed it now, is for the other faculty councils to consider adopting the full summer semester initiative on their campus to replace the summer sessions. It's pretty much a painless decision to take in some ways, although there may be individual complexities I'm not aware of. It's pretty much a painless decision because you can pretty much subsume the two summer session within a summer semester. And it—but it does provide, I think, greater flexibility, and that case, I think was made by the BFC in their supporting documentation for their change. And that would provide, I think, the other campuses with a little more flexibility going forward, given that there will probably be a significant increase in student numbers this coming summer. So that's the background to it. I'm happy to take any questions that anybody has about this initiative. Yes, Jack?

**WINDSOR:** Does this relate any way to the tuition increase recommended by the Trustees?

**MCROBBIE:** No. The tuition increase as recommended by the Trustees, as you'll remember, was—it was 3 ½ % in Bloomington 2 ½ % in the other campuses as per the recommendation of the higher ed commission, and to that, the Trustees added 2% in Bloomington and Indianapolis as a temporary R&R fee, and 1% on the other campuses as a temporary R&R fee as we await, hopefully, the restoration of R&R at some point. And that decision stands, and there were a number of other different increases in a number of the professional schools as well. So this is, as I said, this idea grew out of the initiative of the BFC over a year ago, so this—and this particular initiative has been under discussion among members of the administration and university for some time. And I think the—as I said yesterday, for those of you who saw my quotes from the news conference, I think this is a much more fundamental way of attacking the issues of affordability, time to the completion graduation rates, student debt, and the better utilization of our very expensive facilities—remember, we have seven billion dollars' worth of physical plant across all of our campuses—than some, you know, minor changes to university tuition structure. Yes, Herb?

**TERRY:** Just a couple of comments. I think this was a brilliant initiative. I think initially Bloomington is big enough that what this may do for the first summer is bring a few more seats to classes we already have, and it'll work well, and it will give the students [indistinct comment]. I promoted it in one of my classes ten minutes after I got the press release, and the in-state students were ecstatic, and the out-of-state students wish they'd gotten a better deal, but they understood.

**MCROBBIE:** They are still getting a deal!

**TERRY:** It is still a deal. [indistinct comment]. So that was a very good thing. I would offer an endorsement and a caution about the president's comments about the changes in the summer calendar in Bloomington. The endorsement is we studied that a lot. We think it'll work, but it is about the second most complex thing I've seen us do. Most complex one was General Ed. You start fiddling around with a calendar that goes from a six-week and an eight-week session, that is discrete from each other for the most part, to a summer long semester of different class lengths that can overlap, and we're going to learn a lot this summer, and I would urge our campus to share everything we learn with the other campuses, and I would urge the other campuses to start considering this right away. But, you know, pay attention to what goes on here and you may discover there are complexities to it that we failed to accurately predict, but by and large, I hope it will work.

The other thing I would say is some of the initial reading I did is that it's likely to increase campus—intercampus transfers. That students from Bloomington will go to the regionals in their hometowns, and take a course or two there, and bring it back, you know?

**MCROBBIE:** And vice versa.

**TERRY:** And so I think that's another benefit that hasn't been—. Finally, at the last Trustees meeting, I thought there was a very interesting report on student debt and the cost of going to college. The most interesting thing about it to me was that it split out things we can control, tuition, from things we don't control, what the students pay for room and board, and rent, and all of this sort of thing. And it turns out that a great deal of the increase in student debt is due to things beyond increases in tuition.

**MCROBBIE:** Exactly.

**TERRY:** And I hope that at appropriate times, you know, we acknowledge that we're doing what we can do about tuition, but that the student debt problem is greater than that and we've even, you know, to some extent, attacked that with this summer thing because in Bloomington you can't get anything short of a twelve-month contract for an apartment, and if they can reduce their amount of time a little bit in Bloomington, it reduces those expenses, too. So, I'd urge all of us to acknowledge that tuition is a part of student debt, but the total increase—the increase in the rest of the cost of going to college is greater than the increase in the cost of tuition. And we got the data to support that.

**MCROBBIE:** Thank you, Herb. Who's here?

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Dan is here.

**MCROBBIE:** Yeah, why don't we finish this topic, and then we'll let Dan speak. Questions from any other campuses?

**SZARLETA:** —This is Ellen—

**MCROBBIE:** I can see Steve. Steve, why don't—and then I'll take Ellen, wherever Ellen is I can't see her, but Steve? Steve Mannheimer?

**MANNHEIMER:** Thank you. Steve Mannheimer, IUPUI. Enough about what is good for the students. So what's good for me? It's a joke. [Laughter]. I wonder—it sounds to me, and obviously I haven't thought much about it because it's so new, but it sounds to me like what we're sort of talking about is a kind of a trimester on steroids system. You know, where there's a fall, a spring, and a summer session, are we contemplating, and maybe it's impossible to contemplate because nobody else has quite done it like this before, no other universities, if I understand President McRobbie's comments correctly, that we're sort of opening a can of faculty work consideration worms, so to speak. And I'm not against it, I think it's great. I think it's a very healthy step, but I wonder how this is going to change our collegial culture in terms of our workload. If I decide to teach a single summer class or even two summer classes, am I then sort of excused from teaching in the spring, and then do I wander off campus if I don't want to serve on the P&T Committee that semester? And I know nobody is going to have those answers, but is it something that I'm the only idiot in the room who thinks that this is worth thinking about?

**MCROBBIE:** Oh, absolutely...

**MANNHEIMER:** There are long range impacts that it would [indistinct comment]—

**MCROBBIE:** That is exactly the right kinds of question, Steve, but I mean none of this, in any way, affects the, you know, the present employment agreements that everybody has through their departments. But what it—and, remember, that we have a summer, we effectively have a summer semester now. All this is doing is going to be increasing the number of—I expect—increasing the number of students who will enroll in that summer semester, but that will probably, for a variety of reasons, maybe make the summer semester a little more attractive for some faculty to teach it. So, there will be issues that I think departments will maybe want to start considering now that they probably haven't thought that much about in the past, where it may become much more of a full blown teaching period than it is at the moment. And faculty are teaching two semesters out of the three semesters, I realize this is a bastardizing of the Latin here, but so they may say, 'Well I'll take off the Spring semester, because that's a great time to be in Europe working with, you know, my colleagues over there and my grants, etc...' Now there's lots of complexities and all that, and I think it's going to have to be worked out on a school by school, department by department basis, and maybe a campus by campus

basis as well. But it does open up—I won't say it really opens up because it is open now, but it maybe provides a bit more of an incentive, and a bit more impetus to discuss some of those questions. Someone was trying to get on. I didn't pick up who it was.

**SZARLETA:** This is Ellen from Indiana University-Northwest, and my question was also, so, can you hear me?

**MCRORBIE:** Yes.

**SZARLETA:** Okay. My question was also on the summer session potential change, and I'm interested from the regional campuses since we'll be looking at the issue if the Bloomington faculty can give us a little bit more detail or information about why they think moving from a two session section—two sessions to a semester session—will actually improve the possibilities for enrollment in or for the use of space.

**MCRORBIE:** Can I ask maybe Carolyn and Craig could circulate the Bloomington documents to all members of the UFC so they can see those background documents because it was very thoughtfully considered work? Other questions?

**NISHIHARA:** This is Laverne from East. I'm sorry, we got disconnected for twenty minutes perhaps. Are we at the question and answer period now?

**MCRORBIE:** Ah technology, sn't it wonderful? Laverne, what I did, I probably shouldn't, for the sake of people's patience, go through this again, but what I did basically was just brief people on the summer semester announcement that I made yesterday, the discount of the tuition for the summer semester announcement that I made, and I've just been responding to some questions people have asked me about that. You've probably read about it, and seen the communications, so that's basically what it was.

**NISHIHARA:** Thank you. We apologize.

**MCRORBIE:** No, no, no. Unless you were the one responsible for the... [Laughter]. I think Simon, you were trying to get in. Simon?

**ATKINSON:** Yeah, so I have a technical question about this issue of flexibility in faculty schedules. My understanding has always been that the faculty are on ten-month contracts, the calendar months of those contracts are specified—

**MCRORBIE:** Right.

**ATKINSON:** —and so to release faculty for, let's say, teaching in the spring semester in order to have them teach an equivalent load in the summer is not permitted, is considered ghost employment. Is there any way to address those issues so that—

**MCRORBIE:** —Yeah, I’m not certain...

**ATKINSON:**—so that we have that kind of flexibility?

**MCRORBIE:** Yeah. My understanding, Simon, is yes, in general. Exactly how that would be done, I’m not absolutely certain, but that’s something that obviously we’ll look into as matter of absolute top priority. I believe what I’ve been told, please don’t hold me to this, that it would be just simply a matter of revising the letter of appointments say, that really is what governs these conditions, but that’s obviously something we’ll get clarified. And I’ve heard the same claim about ghost employment, and that’s really relevant to the laws of this state, but we just need to get more advice as to how to do that. I don’t think that—I think the state is supportive enough of this that if there are legal issues in the state that we need to address that we may well have the help in any legislative changes that are needed, but I doubt that that’s what the problem is. So, just to—before I recognize you—anybody else have any [indistinct comment]? Yes, I can’t see who it is, but yeah?

**DAVIS:** Steve Davis at IPFW. Just a point of information, nothing that really deals with this Council, but our media up here ran the full story of this tuition rebate, and then when the—the last line was, “We will not get it because we are under Purdue’s management control.” [indistinct comment due to laughter] raised a couple of questions, a couple of phone calls this morning.

**MCRORBIE:** On that one, I think this really is a matter for the Purdue president and the Purdue administration, and I obviously suggest you raise it with them. But I have reason to believe that they’re very interested in an initiative like this, so hopefully they will do something comparable. Yeah, Herb?

**TERRY:** A slight addition to Michael’s comment. In Bloomington, some of these concerns, could faculty—could this evolve to where faculty substitute a summer for a regular semester, and I think it came up early in our discussion of this proposed calendar change. I think that the general consensus was we would start the calendar change, and if the calendar change basically worked, we would find ways to identify the policies and change them, and fix it. So actually when we—what you’ll get from the leaders of the Council is a lot of discussion of the technicalities of changing the calendar. You won’t actually find that much discussion of how it would change faculty life or the [indistinct comment]. We decided we would let that evolve.

**MCRORBIE:** That is a wise way to approach it. Yes, I can’t see who that is, someone at South Bend?

**GERENCSEK:** This is Steve Gerencser from South Bend. I have two questions, they might be related. One of which is budgetary implications of the reduction in tuition, are those

considered available for us to look at; and secondly, I'm wondering if part of the idea of making up the budget loss could be increase—potential increase in enrollment. So I'm wondering if this is data driven, has there been research that demonstrates that there is, in fact, a market for a ten percent, a twelve percent, a fifteen percent increase in enrollments, or is it hopeful?

**MCROBBIE:** It's not something for which good data exists. It's really an aggregation of views among people as to what will be popular among students, and what will have an impact on affordability and time to completion, given that those are constant things one hears from students and parents right across the board. I—the university will be guaranteeing this, by which I mean if this falls below expectations, the university will guarantee any shortfall on this. So, and, but of course, the converse is not true, by which I mean this is the socialization of losses and the capitalization of gains, by which I mean the campuses will keep whatever surplus beyond what's needed to cover the amounts that will cover the reduction on the campuses here. Other questions for anybody?

**TERRY:** Are we into the question and comment period?

**MCROBBIE:** No, I think we are still on two, because—sorry, three—I'm just, that was the main issue I wanted to raise. I'm just making sure everybody's had a chance to ask any questions or comments. Can I—if there aren't any more from anybody, can I, at this point, since Dan Rives has joined us, unless anybody objects, ask Dan, I think you're going to speak on open enrollment, Dan? Is that your understanding?

**RIVES:** I'm here to answer whatever questions are presented.

**MCROBBIE:** Yeah, questions about open enrollment, yeah.

**RIVES:** Glad to.

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

**MCROBBIE:** Do you just want to—do you want to say anything or should we just take questions?

**RIVES:** Well, um—

**MCROBBIE:** Well, questions for Dan on open enrollment?

**WINDSOR:** Dan, this is Jack. Neil was just giving his presentation question and answer session up here, and the question came up, he made a comment we can't maintain the four plans as they were, but really the Blue Access, \$400 deductible, did change. There was some concerns about that. Can you elaborate on a decision to change the Blue Access plan?

**RIVES:** I want to be careful not to contradict something Neil said, so that puts me at a little disadvantage, but Neil's perspective is we have four viable health care plans. Many other employers, both in Indiana and outside are retrenching, they're pulling back and eliminating, like, PPO plans, and just going high deductible and going with exclusive providers. So we wanted to continue that philosophy of having four different plans. The PPO, what used to be called Blue Access, actually had a—and does have today—a co-payment every time you use the hospital of \$400. And also every time you went outpatient, there was a \$150. So we took those—that concept, and put it as more of a simple, straightforward \$400 deductible plan, so employees could compare and [indistinct comment] understand it better. So, summary, there was a \$400 deductible in the other plan. It was every time you used the hospital. There was an additional deductible of \$150 every time you went outpatient. So it was a restructuring. From Neil's perspective, it's the same, you know, generally same kind of PPO plan, but we hope it's better understood by employees. They can compare the structure of co-pays and deductibles to the premium, and look at the other plans as well. So that's a little bit of the background.

**WINDSOR:** Thank you.

**MCROBBIE:** Other questions for Dan?

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Just to say that, you know, I'm just revisiting Neil Theobald's letter, and I was struck, perhaps I shouldn't have been, but I was, that the majority of the spending says \$187 million will be paid to physician, dentist, hospitals, and other healthcare...

**RIVES:** Providers.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Providers for medical and dental expenses, and so, I mean, for me, this was sort of an argument for why I suppose the costs are going up so rapidly.

**RIVES:** Well, there's two drivers of healthcare costs. And I'm going to oversimplify this, so those of you who study it and write on this, you know, please excuse me. But, you know, one of them is, of course, obviously, you know, how much—what's the consumption of healthcare. And sort of along with that, where it is, you know, a hospital versus inpatient or x-ray versus PET scans, and that new technology is a new expense. So that's one component, and the other component is the charges or the increase in charges by physicians, hospitals, and prescription drug companies, and I think Neil's point there is we are self-funded, so we don't buy insurance, we don't pay Anthem a premium to give them some extra money to guard against something. We are self-funded. So, except for 4% which goes to the administration and adjudication of claims, customer service, adjudication of claims, case management, but the other 96% goes to reimburse hospitals, physicians, prescription drugs, and so that \$186.6 million, that's the university spend, and the employees will actually spend more. So it's really more than that because you got to add the employees' contributions that really go to reimburse hospitals,

physicians, prescription drugs, mental health, the whole continuum, and it's, I mean, as all the newspaper accounts will attest, the cost in the environment—this is a national issue—and the cost is going up many times the rate of inflation, but it's the reimbursement that is going up.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** I guess there's a "balm in Gilead," to use a biblical expression, here because I think people are searching for a way out.

**RIVES:** Yeah, there are some presidential candidates that would like to find a way out, too. You know, this is indeed a national issue. You can't pick up the Wall Street Journal, Financial Times, without a story, and one of the more interesting things in our environment, if I may, is sort of what's happening with Medicare and Medicaid, so as the federal government began to really tighten up on their reimbursements because of their budget constraints, that may indeed push costs to the commercial side. And we're commercial. So a hospital is an overhead machine, if you will, three-hundred and sixty-five by seven, and they've got to keep up that HVAC technology personnel. Twenty four by seven by three sixty-five. And when a big portion of the population, when government programs cap or reduces the reimbursements, that's a balloon that will expand to other places, i.e. ourselves and all the other employers and employees. So it's a large issue.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** So, don't expect anything else from the University...

**RIVES:** Well, we did add \$10.6 million in this current fiscal year, and the projection next year would be to add another 6%, so the university is committing a lot of resources and programs.

**MCROBBIE:** That's a significant amount of money, and it's about, I think it's about, a percent in pay rise, about \$2 million, that puts it in perspective. Yes, I think Steve?

**GERENCSEK:** A discussion has come up on our campus about the possibility of Indiana University being able to offer to adjunct faculty members some sort of high deductibility plan, and anticipating that by 2014 by federal law, you know, people will have to have some sort of health coverage, and we recognize that, you know, it would have to be a different sort of plan that would exist for full time employees, but is this any discussion of that for those people who design such plans?

**RIVES:** Yeah, I think a couple of recent comments, to fill everybody in, the Health Care Reform Act, that was signed a couple of years ago mandates, in many ways, with a penalty, that employers provide healthcare coverage to full-time employees. The definition of a full-time employee starting in 2014 is thirty hours a week. So what that will do will—right now our definition is forty hours a week, or the equivalent, so in 2014 we'll have to change that criteria or pay a penalty, and was it Steve? That actually, that population would go into the normal, regular population because that's the definition of full-time. That is one comment. The other

comment is, you know, many years ago, I've been here about twenty two years, maybe eighteen years ago we had a separate health care plan for part-time employees, and I don't know adjuncts per se, but it included many part-times, and we had a lot of adverse selection, so the only ones who took it were the ones who anticipated using it. So the pool was—of users, not of a combination of nonusers and users, if you will—and it got, premiums got so high, it went away. It was no longer viable. But with high deductible plans, you mentioned something very nicely, we may want to go back to that and see if we could construct something again that may have something that has value, and that the part-time employee, they would buy into, and see if it's viable. The problem there is it has to be viable on an ongoing basis. You don't invest in these things not having a pretty good pool that would have some longevity attached to it.

**GERENCSEK:** Right because one difference now, of course, from twenty-two years ago is it will be mandated. I think it will also be mandated by the law now to carry health insurance, so there'll be a requirement for adjunct faculty, if they do not have it to procure some form of health insurance.

**RIVES:** Yeah, and you know, Steve, every state has to develop exchanges, and as this gets rolled out, Indiana will have at least one insurance exchange that small employers, individual citizens or other individuals can buy coverage into, and depending on how that exchange is crafted and the pool, we'll see how viable that may be for part-time employees, too. Good comments.

**MCRORBIE:** Other questions for Dan? Questions, comments for Dan? Anybody? Alright, thank you, Dan. Let me move on to four. I received one question from Joe Wert, which I assume everybody got. Was that sent around to everybody? Let me just say that the way I want to respond to that is again to note the constrained financial situation in which we work. People hopefully would have had a chance to see my State of the University Address where I described the situation with our state appropriation. It continues to fall, and as I've noted before, we are under intense pressure as far as tuition is concerned, especially in a context where the incomes of citizens in the state have actually fallen a little as well, they're certainly not rising. Our other major sources of income, which is externally funded research, though we had a record year for expenditure last year, having just got back from Washington, and heard both the NIH Director and the NSF Director both speak, I'm not optimistic about any significant increases there, in fact, I think adjusted for inflation, it's going to be effectively decreases for both of those agencies at best. And then philanthropic giving, though that continues to be strong, is still relatively less than 10% of our total budget in the university, and I don't see that ever being able to really make up general shortfalls in the kinds of revenues that we require.

So, under those conditions, I just do not see the Trustees being willing to ever approve a, at least in the foreseeable future, any kind of request for a general across the board significant salary increase, I think they will continue to consider proposals that provide at least a

substantial part of a salary increase to be provided on a merit basis to be decided at the school level, which is what's happened recently, and I expect that's how the Trustees will address salary issues. Again, in the past, and obviously our ability to have salary increases in the future is really going to depend on the state of the economic situation of the state and our situation in the next budget, and whatever the situation is with tuition then. Again, I don't think this is anything that people aren't aware of. There has been—there have been attempts in the past to—including in the last legislature—to cap our tuition. And of course if that were to happen, then all our sources of revenue would be very tightly constrained and our ability to be flexible in tuition matters—particularly in salary matters would be even more tightly constrained. So that's the reality of the situation at the moment. Obviously if the economy improves substantially, that will help with some of these areas. Any other questions? Yes, Herb?

**TERRY:** My question is for Carolyn and Jack. Viewing the February minutes of the UFC, I noticed that we discussed then whether or not we needed a system-wide or at least an IUPUI and Bloomington-wide policy on program reorganizations, merger, and like matters. In the BFC in the last couple of meetings, there have been observations that now that the New Academic Directions Report is out, we may really need some systems better than we have at Bloomington, and I think IUPUI has revised some of theirs, too, for program reorganization, merger, and so forth, on the campuses, but that we don't have a policy for dealing with core schools, and that sort of thing. So I'm asking, do we plan, somehow, to get either IUPUI and Bloomington jointly forming some kind of a core school policy on these matters or do we plan to have the UFC somehow take it up?

**MCROBBIE:** Jack?

**WINDSOR:** Herb, you make a good point. I reckon my impression is probably simply appoint an ad hoc committee like we did for the core school reviews of administrators, and see if we can get it moving in that manner. What do you think about that strategy?

**TERRY:** I think that would be a good strategy. I think it will enable us to be nimble and start considering it. I think the real question is whether this is a, since it's related to the New Academic Directions Report, whether it's something that only needs to be considered by two of the eight campuses, whether this committee should be an IUPUI and Bloomington committee because that's where the core schools exist. And I am kind of wondering how the regionals would feel if we proceeded that way.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Herb, this question is not meant to diminish the significance of your question, but I just wanted to know whether this is an issue that is percolating up from other quarters of the university? Have you heard other discussions about this from other individuals?

**TERRY:** Well, I've heard it from a few faculty in some of the affected schools, but mainly I'm reacting to the conversations we've had in the BFC meetings, and I think we're reminded by the officers and the leaders of the BFC that we need this. And that our own campus policies won't be enough to guide—

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Well, that certainly strikes me upon first hearing your question that— Jack, this is probably something that we could consider, and see how we might—

**TERRY:** And that's all I wanted to do, was raise the question, make sure that the Executive Committee is thinking about it.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** We can discuss it here on our campus and then two of us can get together and have a conversation, and bring it before the UFC if necessary.

**WINDSOR:** Yeah, I think we'll start—we'll get together and talk to Craig and see if we can put an ad hoc committee together to get moving from both campuses.

**APPLEGATE:** In response to the question, but what about whether Dr. Terry was bringing up, you know, an isolated incident, I think that structurally considering that the core schools are in the NAD and not in the campus reorganization policies, it has to be addressed, and if not UFC then what else?

**TERRY:** Yeah.

**WINDSOR:** Quick comment. My people from guests of IRB are anxious to go back and get some of these approved [Laughter] are there additional questions for them before they leave?

**MCROBBIE:** In fact, thanks for that, Jack. I think, unless anybody's dying to ask a question, it would be nice to leave a decent amount of time for Simon's report, and I was going to suggest that at this point we finish agenda item four and we move to five and Shelley and [indistinct comment] and Marcia, and the other people here from the Research Office can all go back to their work.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Unless they prefer to stay here and listen to these marvelous conversations.

**MCROBBIE:** Alright, thank you. Thank you, Marcia. Thank you, Shelley. Thank you, [indistinct comment]. Let's proceed to agenda item five. Yes, Laverne?

**NISHIHARA:** There is just one question from IU-East. We have heard that—about the likelihood of the IU Graduate School being phased out. Would you care to comment about that?

**MCRORBIE:** Well, you read what's in New Academic Directions and the matter that the recommendation is under discussion at the moment, and the provost is heading up those discussions, and no decision of that kind has been taken. But the discussions are ongoing on that matter and I think she's been seeking input from various people and various people have volunteered input.

**NISHIHARA:** Alright, thank you. I just know of concerns about what will replace the functions of the IU Grad School.

**JOHN APPLGATE:** That was assigned to ALC.

**MCRORBIE:** Yeah, that's right. It was assigned to the ALC, the Academic Leadership Council with their basically imprimatur to consider it as well. Alright, thank you. Let's move on to five. Simon?

#### **AGENDA ITEM 5: UFC REFORM TASKFORCE REPORT**

**ATKINSON:** Okay, so this is a report from the working group that's been looking at possible reforms to the structure of university-wide faculty governance. This is a product to the charge from the UFC back in the spring to take a second look at this issue. And so a group of us have been meeting over the summer and into the early parts of the fall semester, and I think most of the members of the taskforce are actually here. We were asked—this taskforce was prompted by a number of problems that have occurred over the years. In Indianapolis, we've been moving extra chairs into the room so maybe we just made this report moot, but one issue has been attendance at UFC meetings and generally participation in university-wide faculty governance. Another issue has been the inability, partly because of quorum issues for the UFC to do business in a timely manner, and there's been a perception that there may have been a lack of engagement of the administration with formal faculty governance mechanisms at the university level through the [indistinct comment].

So the taskforce is making a number of recommendations for structural changes, but also some recommendations for things that fall into the category of good practice; we need to do better at doing these things, otherwise, it doesn't really matter what structural changes we make, unless some of these behaviors change in an appropriate way.

So I'll go through the main recommendations quite briefly, and then hopefully there will be plenty of time for discussion. So, one of the main recommendations is to reduce the size of the UFC, and this is really directed at creating a body which is of a size that's capable of achieving quorum on a regular basis. So the recommendation is to reduce the ratio of faculty to elected members, so instead of there being one member per a hundred faculty, as there is now, to change that to one member per two hundred faculty. And so the effect on that is that the

number of Bloomington representatives will decrease to eight from the current fifteen; Indianapolis would go to six from the current fourteen; and each of the regional campuses would have one representative. Currently, South Bend has two representatives, and all the others have one. So the main effect would be on the representation from Bloomington and Indianapolis. We would retain the eight faculty senate presidents as members of the UFC in addition to those elected representatives. Currently, there are four student representatives on the UFC and this is now probably—actually six student representatives, I’m sorry. We will reduce this number to two, so there will be one representative for graduate students and one representative for undergraduates system-wide.

The—currently, all the chancellors are called “voting members” of the UFC. We’re recommending that they be retained as members, but they lose their voting privileges, since for the most part, they don’t typically vote. I don’t remember Charles voting in a UFC meeting.

**MCROBBIE:** You’ve just lost his vote today! [Laughter].

**ATKINSON:** [indistinct comment] be present at meetings. Again this is intended to help deal with the quorum issues. And a quorum would still be a majority of members as at present, but with the change in the size of the Council the quorum I think would be sixteen instead of whatever it is at present. Craig probably knows the number off the top of his head. We’ve experimented with these video conference meetings, still having more or less the same frequency of the UFC meetings as in past, and I think the consensus on the taskforce was that for a meeting of this size, the current technological capabilities don’t work particularly well. It’s not easy to have a good discussion that involves all the sites. I think we’ve done better today than we have at most meetings. But there’s still an amount of awkwardness to the discussion, and perhaps one on one contact between members from different campuses is lost. So, we recommend reducing the number of meetings of the full UFC to one in the fall and one in the spring, and to have those be in-person meetings to allow for a good discussion.

Hand in hand with reducing the number of meetings, we are recommending that the, what’s currently the Agenda Committee, which we’ve renamed the Executive Committee because of its new functions, the Executive Committee will be able to do business for the UFC between meetings. The Executive Committee would have the same composition as the Agenda Committee, but it will be able to act on almost everything that the UFC can do, pass policies, vote on honorary degrees, etc... But that there will be a remonstrance process to allow for five members of the Council, all of the faculty governance leaders to ask that something be discussed at a full UFC meeting if it seems to be controversial or if there seems to be at the need for more discussion.

The UFC, it may be a surprise to most people, actually has a committee structure. Those committees, with the exception of the Finance and Facilities Committee have not met or been constituted for a number of years. There have been informal groupings of representatives from the—what would be the corresponding committees on the campuses, that have met together to do business. The Research Affairs Committee, members from Bloomington and Indianapolis have been quite active in looking at the IRB issues recently. So we're recommending that we no longer retain these notional standing committees, that in fact don't exist for all practical purposes, and that committees be appointed on an ad hoc basis to deal with particular issues as they arise, and the Executive Committee will be made [indistinct comment]. The one committee that we keep, which isn't really a UFC committee, it's a sort of hybrid committee is the Honorary Degrees Committee.

Then, in the category of best practice, we recommend better communication and advanced planning so setting agendas for meetings of the Council and for the Executive Committee in advance so that business can be communicated to the members informing the faculty as a whole of business that's before the UFC and of actions that the UFC has taken. Making sure that representatives to the UFC are well informed and that can take the form of having a caucus of the UFC representatives on each campus prior to the meeting to get a sense of what the thinking on a particular campus is about issues, and using as many mechanisms as we can to inform the faculty. And finally, the hope is that by having an engaged and active and relatively nimble faculty governance structure, that the administration will see the UFC and this Executive Committee as the go-to bodies when input is necessary from faculty on particular issues that are important system-wide.

**MCROBBIE:** Comments?

**ATKINSON:** Are there any other comments from anybody else on the taskforce?

**WINDSOR:** I'd like to elaborate just a little bit on what I've been doing on this campus is simply meeting with UFC members before the IFC meeting to inform them what is being discussed at the university level so they're more informed and hopefully attendance will go up.

**MCROBBIE:** Comments, questions for Simon? Yes?

**BURNS:** Steve Burns. I'm not familiar with the exact details of the areas where the whole UFC is needed did you think about giving the Executive Committee the power to call an extraordinary session if at some point those items came up that wouldn't coincide well with sort of the end of semester schedule you've got.

**ATKINSON:** Yes, that's a power that I think exists now, so that would not be a change from current practice. So, you know, clearly if the remonstrance process indicated that the UFC

needed to meet or if there were an emergent issue of sufficient magnitude that the full UFC needed to meet, then the Executive Committee could call a meeting.

**MCROBBIE:** Yes, Steve? I think that's Steve. Is it Steve? Yeah?

**MANNHEIMER:** Yes, it is. Thank you, sir. My understanding is that there's a sort of a critical difference between a remonstrance process where, in essence, the Executive Committee would have enacted some legislation and it behooves somebody who was unhappy to challenge that rather than the Executive Committee enacting something, and then needing the stamp of approval at some official later date, although it has, of course—it's in effect, although without the force of law until that point.

**ATKINSON:** And I think we thought this would actually work at two levels, so there would be the kind of post hoc remonstrance process, but there would also be communication of the agenda for the Executive Committee to UFC members ahead of the meeting, the Executive Committee is looking at this as an action item, and so to encourage UFC members to communicate with members of the Executive Committee, if there were concerns. And that, I think, would prompt the Executive Committee not to act on that.

**MANNHEIMER:** Is there a change in the mechanism by which the Executive Committee is constituted? I mean is it constituted by internal election of this body or is constituted by externally—

**ATKINSON:** --it would still be by internal—it would be the faculty governance leaders just as a sort of external mechanism, and then the remaining members will be by internal election as of present. But we thought that the best practice for doing that would be by a sort of caucus. So there would be an Indianapolis caucus that would elect the two Indianapolis representatives. The same in Bloomington, and then the regional campuses would caucus to elect the additional regional campus member.

**MCROBBIE:** Steve at South Bend. Yes?

**GERENCSEK:** Yes, I really appreciate the concern saying that the body as a whole should meet a couple of times a year. One of the things that becomes difficult for those of us who have small representation is, as much as one can try, sometimes both because it's a long ways to go and because of other commitments that can be quite difficult, I wonder if there would be a possibility, if either we could individually on the regional campuses, as part of this document or on our own, have an alternate. So there would be two formal members of the body. The faculty leader, and of whom its body and one more UFC representative, but that maybe an alternate who would be recognized to be able to serve in the place of a member who could not make it to the in-person meetings.

**ATKINSON:** I think that is a really good idea. Craig, do you know, is that permitted under the current rules?

**DETHLOFF:** That is permitted, yeah. There's no change there.

**MCROBBIE:** Yeah, Herb?

**TERRY:** I have deliberately stayed away from this committee because I have dealt with this for many years now, and I think they've done great work. I have a whole bunch of minor things, which I think will end up being reflected in the changes in the Constitution and Bylaws that will have to follow this. So I can forward those along. I would say this: I think you've set a relatively low barrier for additional meetings of the UFC. There are three conditions that lead to—two I should—three. One might be some emerging issue that is of sufficient importance that the Executive Committee looks at and says no matter what we have to have the UFC meeting about that. The second is the remonstrance. The third is the lack of unanimity among the Executive Committee. I presume in this document that there would be instances where you couldn't come to unanimity about something, and you would say, 'We need to have a UFC meeting over that.' Is that correct? Okay.

**ATKINSON:** I think it's been relatively rare for the Agenda Committee not to be able to come to a consensus about most things.

**TERRY:** Yeah, but I think it's important that you're open to that, and it also means, I think, that anything that results in such a meeting will be of some importance, and hopefully will engage some members in coming. Aside from a bunch of little technical things, my other concern is I was wondering if we could add anything somehow to the best practices. I suppose it would fit, to some extent, as a modification of number four, the acknowledgement that faculty governance matters by the administration, but I think part of the problem of getting good people to serve on these bodies is the tendency of—current tendency of our faculty colleagues not to value this service. We—you know, I've tried, over the years, to recruit people, and people will tell me that, you know, in my department, service only counts for 5% of merit formulas and this sort of thing. If we think this is important, I would hope that acknowledgement of effective faculty governance by the administration ultimately leads somehow or another to a recognition in the value system of this university in terms of promotion, tenure, and salary. The effect that high level engagement with this should be rewarded institutionally, and I don't know how we embody that as a best practice but, you know, what we now have is a whole bunch of people often willing to serve at economic cost to themselves, and I'm not so sure that's healthy for faculty governance either, but that's more of an observation than a suggestion.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Herb, what did you have in mind specifically?

**TERRY:** I don't know. I don't know. And we have to work—we will have soon an evolving document on best practices, but I ran into great difficulty in getting people from many schools to serve.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** It is very difficult to get people to serve. [Laughter from IUPUI]

**MCROBBIE:** Sorry Simon, we missed your witticism. What was it?

**ATKINSON:** Sorry, I was saying that faculty governance should come with a move down one band in the health care premiums. [Laughter]

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** You'd certainly will get some takers there, wouldn't you?

**TERRY:** You know, and the other problem is of course, if it's an entirely merit system, how would you evaluate it?

**MCROBBIE:** South Bend? South Bend?

**CORDELL:** Rosanne Cordell. I know that a significant part of this plan depends on good communication, and my concern is that that hasn't been. I'm worried that if we depend upon better communication, that this really has to—there has to be a commitment to it—getting the agenda for this meeting just two working days before the meeting occurred is simply not adequate for us to review all of the documents adequately, have people get back to us if they have any concerns, get questions to the UFC office, et cetera, et cetera... and timeliness and amount of communication has to be improved significantly.

**ATKINSON:** That's exactly why that's included in the report and none of these structural changes will make any different without improvements in some of these areas like communication. So, I'm glad you emphasized that, Rosanne.

**MCROBBIE:** Sorry, Herb, I don't want to curb your enthusiasm, but I want to see if someone wants to get in first. Is there any other questions—yes, Laverne? Laverne?

**NISHIHARA:** Yes, this is Laverne from East. I have a couple of comments and questions. At the top of page five, there is a recommendation that the Executive Committee meet monthly during the school year, and I had a question about whether it's envisioned that this continue in teleconferences or if this means in-person meetings, monthly. And if it's the latter, I'm wondering about covering the costs of travel, if they're in-person.

**ATKINSON:** Laverne, I think we envisioned the Executive Committee meetings being by teleconference. I think for a relatively small group, like the Executive Committee, it works okay. I think the Executive Committee might want to maybe have in-person planning meetings at the

beginning of the fall and spring semester. It would be nice if we could work out a way to cover travel costs for those. But I think for the routine monthly meetings, technology is adequate.

**NISHIHARA:** Thank you for the response. The other question is also on page five, that the Executive Committee determines the agenda for the UFC meetings, and that the UFC agenda should be finalized by the Executive Committee, and distributed a minimum of two weeks prior to the UFC meeting. I wonder if something could be added there, procedure for allowing departures from the agenda, in case something important comes up that has to be on the agenda, or if there's any other reason to depart from an agreed upon agenda. Can there be a procedure included?

**ATKINSON:** I think, you know, normal Robert's Rules would apply to that kind of situation, so it's certainly open to the UFC to alter some agenda with the consent of the members.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Of the body, yeah.

**MCROBBIE:** Yeah, right.

**NISHIHARA:** Alright, if Robert's Rules is governing this, that is fine, as long as the agreed upon agenda is otherwise adhered to.

**MCROBBIE:** Yeah, I mean there's going to be a fair amount of, or some degree of trust and give and take here if somebody who's got an important item they want to make the case it would be the sense of the meeting to let them speak or not and so on, and there are procedures for doing it under the normal rules of meetings. Yes, Herb?

**TERRY:** If we go down this path, I'd like to make sure we have the president's agreement with something. I am not sure what requires that the State—I think it's the Constitution—that the State of the University Address be taken at a meeting of the UFC. I hope if we go down this path, you'd be willing to make the State of the University Address an independent meeting.

**ATKINSON:** But the Constitution I have says that it's at a meeting of the university faculty, not the University Faculty Council.

**TERRY:** Okay.

**MCROBBIE:** Yes, that's right.

**TERRY:** So we will not have the president taking one of our two meetings for the State of the University Address?

**MCROBBIE:** I think there is a provision for September, and I missed it once because of illness, but—

**TERRY:** That's fine.

**MCRROBBIE:** —I think that will continue. Other questions or comments from anybody?

**WINDSOR:** [Indistinct comment] new business—

**MCRROBBIE:** Yes, Steve? Steve in South Bend?

**GERENCSEK:** This is Steven in South Bend. I know on this page five, near the top, discussion of Executive Committee meetings. Point two suggests that the president should be invited to the Executive Committee meetings and should be expected to attend a majority of their meetings each semester. So, that's a little unclear to me. Is that saying that basically the president will be expected and is regularly invited to every meeting or—the language is a little bit unclear to me. And, if I add, with no disrespect intended, that sometimes we have discussions at the Executive Committee, or currently the Agenda Committee, that might have a different timbre in the presence or absence of the president of the university.

**MCRROBBIE:** Well, it's a bit of a strange situation where the presiding officer doesn't actually chair the Executive Committee, that's normally how it works corporately, but an Executive Committee is free to meet by itself if it so wishes to, and they can have a session without the chair. I mean I personally prefer to do it that way. I mean it seems to me to be setting up a bit of a sort of an artificial dichotomy here. And I think that it would seem to me to be a much more collegial and collaborative way of approaching it, for the president to chair the Executive Committee, but the Executive Committee may wish to discuss issues without the president being present, and that would be fine. I personally would prefer to see that worded slightly in that way, which may be a little—which may make your point a little more explicit. But not set up this dichotomy between the president and the Executive Committee.

**ATKINSON:** I think that's fine, I mean the real intent here is to keep the channels of communication open between the faculty and the president as much as possible.

**MCRROBBIE:** If my job is to chair the Executive Committee, then I would take that very seriously and be there and put that in a very, very high in my calendar of priorities. But saying that it is expected to be there for some of the meetings to me reduces its importance. Jack?

**WINDSOR:** [Indistinct comment] was hopefully that you'd utilize the Executive Committee as your advisory faculty committee also.

**MCRROBBIE:** Well, you know that has been my stated public position for some time, that that would be to me the ideal arrangement, yes? Randy, you.

**ARNOLD:** Yeah, it's not stated this way here, but the way the Bloomington Faculty Council Executive Committee works is that we meet for an hour with just the members of the Committee, minus the provost, and the provost joins us for the second hour of the meeting, and that kind of achieves both objectives. If there's a discussion item that maybe would be appropriate, or the conversation would be different in the presence of the provost, the Committee has the opportunity to meet without that person there, and then they get to meet with the person there, and then maybe both—and if it could be worded that way, that might make more efficient use of the president's time as well.

**MCROBBIE:** That is not a bad way of working it, in fact that's—when I was Provost, I was familiar with that way.

**ATKINSON:** I think that that's a good suggestion, and it's maybe not one we want to formalize, but I think some changes in the wording of that particular item so that it doesn't set up too much of a dichotomy is probably a good thing.

**MCROBBIE:** Jack?

**WINDSOR:** So the motion of the ad hoc committee is to move this to UFC for a vote, to send it to all the campuses to obtain feedback so we can move it forward to implement it in Constitution and Bylaws, since it would require amendments to both of those documents. Motion on the floor.

**MCROBBIE:** Oh yes, sorry. Please, yeah?

**CAMPBELL:** Sorry. LaNita Campbell, I am the President of GPSO at IU Bloomington. Can you speak to a little bit of how, since the student representatives is currently six and will be decreased to two, splitting it one and one with graduates and undergraduates, can you speak to how either the graduates and undergrads would be chosen to represent it, because as of right now, very few systems—very few organizations in the IU system have graduate associations. I think there are two that are currently running, and one that is up and running, speaking of Northwest. So, it would seem kind of odd to have only out of three, one step up and take the role or be nominated or...

**ATKINSON:** Well, I guess the position that we took was that we didn't want to dictate to the students how that would be organized, so I hope that university-wide student organizations can think about the mechanisms of how this would work.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** As a matter of fact, that was our conclusion, that that body should determine who is going to be the representative.

**CAMPBELL:** Wonderful. AUSA is going to [indistinct comment].

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** It's the body beyond—what is it called—the body above IUSA? You met after the Board of Trustees—

**CAMPBELL:** All University Student Association.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Yes, that one, yes.

**MCROBBIE:** Yes, Herb?

**TERRY:** If this is going to go out, I would—before it goes out, on page four, top paragraph, roman numeral six, lowercase, I assume the categories A through C are categories one through three. And that should be changed before this goes out.

**WINDSOR:** Yeah, Herb, if you could send your edits, we'll definitely take those into account, as well as the—

**ATKINSON:** Yeah, I changed that in one version, and then sent out the wrong version. Thank you, Herb.

**TERRY:** Let me ask one other question. It might be viewed as editing, but it might also be substantive. Campuses have class days on Saturday. Some of them do. Would anybody object if I suggest brief remonstrance period of seven calendar days, not counting university holidays as the remonstrance period?

**MCROBBIE:** Does anybody have an objection that?

**TERRY:** I'll suggest that as minor things.

**MCROBBIE:** As a way of proceeding, I expect, Craig, we don't have a quorum now because a few people have left. Are you keeping an eye on quorums?

**DETHLOFF:** We still have one.

**MCROBBIE:** We still have a quorum? Okay. So, Simon, is your proposal to—I've forgotten how procedures work. Is your proposal to vote on this as a first reading, or is it really to collect input, you'll do a revised version, then send that out for a second reading? How do you want to proceed or how are you proposing to proceed now?

**ATKINSON:** What we'd like to happen is for the—all the campus faculty councils and senates to discuss this and route any modifications through the Agenda Committee. Then the—some version of the taskforce will work on the actual language of the amendments to the Constitution and Bylaws. And then those will be approved through the normal constitutional mechanism for those, so that the Bylaws can be approved by a two-thirds majority of the UFC.

Constitutional changes have to go to a vote of the entire faculty once they've been approved by the UFC. So, but those steps will require UFC votes anyway.

**MCROBBIE:** Right.

**BURNS:** So we should just move to allow this to be edited and distributed to the individual—

**TERRY:** --campuses.

**MCROBBIE:** I think that's what [indistinct comment]. Okay, we have a motion on the—motion for people is that is for the UFC to agree for this document to be sent out for comment to be routed back through the Executive Committee for a further revision to the document. That is the motion. Any discussion of that motion? Any comments, discussion of the motion? [Silence]. Okay, there being none, I'll put the motion. All those in favor? [Aye]. Against? [Silence]. That's carried. That will now go out. Oh, I guess we didn't add a period for discussion, Simon, but what would the period be for comment?

**ATKINSON:** One month?

**MCROBBIE:** Right. So basically, the end of November. By Thanksgiving.

**ATKINSON:** Yes.

**MCROBBIE:** Alright. I think with that, ladies and gentleman, I believe we are adjourned. Steve, yes?

**ATKINSON:** Can you send me your typos?

**TERRY:** Yes.

**MCROBBIE:** South Bend, Yes?

**GERENCSEK:** Before we adjourn, you know we rushed kind of quickly to the questioning—from the questions from the president to the taskforce, because we were—we want to make sure we gave enough time, but can we take a quick moment to ask a couple of other quick questions. I had a question in particular regarding the constitution of the Fringe Benefits Committee. A question from Laverne, whether she had properly addressed a question she had regarding the tenure—the choices for areas of excellence or not, and did you have a question?

**CORDELL:** And I have a question about the removal of printers for faculty.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Printers?

**MCROBBIE:** Alright, now I know nothing about that.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Could you elaborate please?

**MCROBBIE:** That's a campus issue, isn't it?

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** I don't know.

**GERENCSEK:** We've been told by UITS that UITS will not support individual printers for faculty members in their offices.

**CORDELL:** And that is a non-negotiable item.

**MCROBBIE:** Well, can you take that up with the Vice President for IT? I mean, I think that should be routed to him by you. I know nothing about that. So what was the first question, Steve?

**CORDELL:** I think [indistinct comment] for UFC if a service unit that supports faculty functions makes a decision and that is designated as non-negotiable and it has not been discussed at all.

**MCROBBIE:** Well, I'm just not aware of that as an issue, so I think, you know, maybe it would be possible for you to seek clarification of this with the Vice President for Information Technology, and maybe ask him to report back, and you could share that with the UFC. Yeah, Steve, what was your question?

**GERENCSEK:** So I had a question about the constitution of the Fringe Benefits Committee, in particular where the status of the Family Leave policy is and might be in relation to that, and also, previously Laverne asked the Agenda Committee about the policies concerning the chosen areas of excellence. So I'm wondering while the body is still together, to the extent that it is, if those issues could be addressed.

**MCROBBIE:** John, do you want to comment on Family Leave?

**J. APPLGATE:** Sure, the Committee has been formed under the leadership of Dean Lauren Robel, and that committee is meeting. They had their first meeting—what, Erika?—a couple of weeks ago, and are collecting further information. As a person just kind of sitting in on the meeting, I thought it was a very, very productive, very constructive meeting. Erika, you are on it, I am trying to—if there is anyone else who is on that—

**DOWELL:** But just to clarify, that that's an ad hoc group, not the traditional Fringe Benefits.

**JOHN APPLGATE:** Right, correct. And they owe the Trustees a response at their December meeting.

**MCROBBIE:** Yeah, and what was Laverne's question?

**GERENCSEK:** Well is that because the current Family Policy now sunsets in January, is that correct?

**J. APPEGATE:** No, actually it sunsets at the end of June, but the Trustees wanted to have a report by December.

**WALKER:** And is that report going to be disseminated to faculty?

**J. APPEGATE:** Um, I can't really speak for the Committee, I assume that it will. Clearly, it's a committee that's made up of, I think, primarily faculty members, in getting that right, and faculty members and deans are the main constituents of it. But the—you know, as you know, the Trustees made it very, very clear that they were not satisfied with the current one, and needed to have changes along really two dimensions. One was to make sure that there were some internal limits on it to protect the university against unpredictable costs, and then they were also clear that they wanted some form of shared expense to it on the medical benefits model. So those were—those were awfully clear instructions and that's what the committee is working on.

**WALKER:** Okay, John. I do want to make clear that here on our campus, and particularly with our Faculty Welfare Committee, this is a question that is weighing heavily on a lot of folks and about which we're very concerned, and so we would hope that there will be communication from that committee from, you know, upper administration as plans are being formulated. So, I mean again, I have to say, I can't—except to say that this is an important concern for our campus and for our Campus Welfare Committee.

**JOHN APPEGATE:** Well, and I think that's shared across the university, and I know that the committee takes that very seriously. They're obviously under a pretty tight timeline, not of their own making, and so I'm sure that, you know, knowing the people involved, they will make every effort to get as much input as they can.

**WALKER:** Yeah, well, we really appreciate their efforts on our behalf. And you know, again, just communication is just an, you know, an important quality of the smooth functioning UFC. So that's what we are asking for.

**MCROBBIE:** Right, and Laverne, I think—Laverne?

**NISHIHARA:** Yes, thank you. And I want to thank Steven from South Bend for bringing up this item since East has been disconnected for twenty or thirty minutes, I wasn't sure whether it had come up or not. At any rate, I had brought up several times, the idea of an information/brief discussion item for UFC on a decision, I suppose, that was made last academic year by the Academic Leadership Council formalizing a practice that is all tenure-track faculty

members would be advised when they're coming up for promotion and tenure to declare only one area of excellence for their dossier. And I realize that this is a long-established practice at Bloomington and IUPUI and apparently Northwest, but it was not an established practice at East, and apparently not at South Bend either. What happened at the East campus in late August was that a week before P & T dossiers were due to Academic Affairs, this announcement was made by our executive vice chancellor that people were very strongly advised about an expectation that they declare only one area of excellence. People who had been planning for years, let's say, to declare two areas of excellence and who had met the criteria were then thrown for a loop and had to rethink the arguments for their promotion and tenure dossiers, make quick decisions on their own, sometimes against the advice of their mentors for promotion and tenure, and turn in their dossiers. And so this is back-pedaling, this scrambling was not a good thing.

I did hear from, you know, during Agenda Committee from Lesley during one teleconference that at South Bend an announcement was made by their chief academic officer last January after dossiers had been turned in, that they were all to declare just one area of excellence, and this led to actual department letters being sent back from the campus Promotion and Tenure Committee for the departments to revise. It seems to me that it's a bad idea to change—de facto change a practice having to do with promotion and tenure. And I'm well aware this is not a formal procedure, it is not policy, it is strong advice. But the way the information was disseminated, the way people had to change their strategies or their arguments for promotion and tenure was rather destructive. Potentially it can create problems down the road. Essentially, it seems to be that there is now going to be a standard P & T practice, in fact, that has been instituted without oversight of faculty, and I think maybe the damage has been done. It can be regarded as water under the bridge, but I did want to mention that if there is any practice that touches upon promotion and tenure, it would be wise to have it shared at the very least as an information item with UFC, so that some of this scrambling, some of this re-thinking of cases would not happen again. A simple information item.

**J. APPLGATE:** Well, Laverne and I've obviously talked about this and I've talked about it with others. It was really the advice from Vice Chancellor Richards and I guess Guillaume as well that's referred to was the product of a conversation some time ago with the academic leadership—that the Academic Leadership Council had, and my memory of it is that it was a conversation about best practices and helping people to present the strongest case. If Charles Bantz is still there, I barely see in the back of the room, maybe he will probably remember the conversation as well, and I think what certainly I saw a copy of what Vice Chancellor Richards sent out, and the gist of it or the goal of it, was clearly to provide helpful advice. Now that may or may now have worked and the timing of the campus that I really can't speak to. But I think

that was the goal, and I think that was the gist of the conversation at the Academic Leadership Council. Charles, I don't know if you want to add to that.

**BANTZ:** I'll just add that the concern was that the policy appeared to be quite clear that was being used and that there was apparently confusion on the different campuses and it was an attempt to clarify.

**GERENCSEK:** Could I add that if this actually good advice, it needs to be presented as such. If it's a practice that's formulated in a policy effectively, you know, we spent a long time two years ago working through changes to a regularized policy, specifically going through the UFC. It would be odd if this had become a policy de facto as opposed to a practice. So I think it needs to be clarified what is wise advising to a pre-tenure faculty member going after tenure, and it was, in fact, a policy that holds across campuses at IU.

**J. APPEGATE:** All I—

**CORDELL:** —And during the discussion on PTR issues that took place, one issue that had come up was that on at least one campus, faculty were not allowed to identify an area of excellence for themselves for their dossiers, and it was, at that point, of a discussion felt that it was the right of faculty to identify an area of excellence so that they might gear their dossier to support that area of excellence. At no point in those discussions was it discussed as a problem to have more than one area of excellence.

**J. APPEGATE:** Right. All I can really speak to, and Charles the same way, is to the discussion at the ALC, how that was translated by members at individual campuses, is really, I think you'd want to bring that up with those individuals. The only thing I can say definitively is the—they were really trying to be helpful and help people to present the strongest case, and Rosanne, your point about being able to choose and identify and speak to a particular area of excellence is a great example of that. It is, I would think, as a candidate, it would be very hard not to be able to identify an area and work towards that. I think that's—it makes it difficult for the candidate and I think it makes it difficult for reviewers, but that was the kind of conversation that was had at the ALC.

**MCROBBIE:** Okay!

**NISHIHARA:** This is Laverne again, excuse me. My latest review of the P & T policy of IU states that candidates must demonstrate at least one area of excellence, and that does not imply, I think that candidates may not demonstrate more than one area of excellence. I think my main point is that if there is some kind of strong advice that will the effect of standardizing a practice in P & T, it would be a very, very good idea in the future for it to be shared with a faculty body

and UFC seems to be the natural place to minimize any harm—unintended harm that would be done to candidates for promotion and tenure.

**MCROBBIE:** I think if there's any person who believes that they were in any way disadvantaged by any of these changes, that they should document and make their case as part of the P & T process, and I think that the campus administration's made up of decent and sensible people, and the P & T committees on those campuses are made up of decent and sensitive people and they will take those—take that in to account if anybody believes they were disadvantaged in anyway by these changes. Alright!

**NISHIHARA:** Just one more thing. We were told that the advice was due to the way evaluators of dossiers saw cases in which candidates declared more than one area of excellence. So, if the evaluators who are, in other words, assuming, when they see such cases, or making the judgment that they will scrutinize such cases all the more, this will disadvantage people, if they declare more than one area of excellence. So I think the advice came from the way evaluators see dossiers like that. That is my understanding. Thanks.

**MCROBBIE:** Good. Alright, thank you all very much!

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Thank you.

**WINDSOR:** Thank you.

**MEEITNG ADJOURNED: 2:25PM**