

Indiana University
UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL
April 26, 2011
1:30 P.M. - 4:30 P.M. (EDT)

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 075b
IUS: Knobview Hall Room 112

MEMBERS: Ed Berbari, Karl Besel, Elizabeth Boling, Maria Bucur-Deckard, Karen Clark, Janice Cox, Erika Dowell, Nancy Eckerman, Harold Evans, Tony Fargo, Rick French, Chuck Gallmeier, John Hassell, Jennifer Hehman, Diane Henshel, Jorge José, Hitesh Kathuria, Joan Kowolik, Laverne Nishihara, Robert Noel, C. Subah Packer, Jodi Smith, Geoff Sprinkle, Fran Squires, Joey Tartell, Herb Terry, Lesley Walker, L. Jack Windsor

MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT:

MEMBERS ABSENT: Charles Bantz, Barry Barker, Teri Belecky-Adams, M. Todd Bradley, Stephen Burns, Michael Coleman, Nick D'Amico, Stanley Davis, Carrie Donovan, Steve Gerencser, Clifford Goodwin, Richard Gunderman, Karen Hanson, Michael Harris, William Lowe, Steve Mannheimer, Joyce Mac Kinnon, Eugene McGregor, Michael McRobbie, Mary Beth Minick, Lori Montalbano, Sandra Patterson-Randles, Nasser Paydar, Jonathan Plucker, Jamie Prekert, Una Mae Reck, Simon Rhodes, Courtney Robertson, Alan Schmetzer, Ellen Szarleta, Barrett Tenbarga, Audrey Ushenko, Michael Wartell, Michael Wolf

GUESTS: John Applegate, Randy Arnold, Craig Dethloff, Karen Lee

Agenda

1. Agenda Committee Business (10 minutes)
(Co-Secretaries Erika Dowell and L. Jack Windsor)
2. Question/Comment Period* (10 minutes)
(Co-Secretaries Dowell and Windsor)
3. Amendment to the Honorary Degree Policy (20 minutes)
(Professor Herb Terry, Honorary Degrees Committee)
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY11/U9-2011.pdf>

4. Proposals for the Reform of the University Faculty Council. (30 minutes)
(Co-Secretary Dowell) [DISCUSSION]

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY11/U5-2011.pdf>

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/addDocs/AY11/UFCReform.pdf>

5. Sunset of the Family Leave Policy (30 minutes)
(Professor Maria Bucur-Deckard) [DISCUSSION]

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY11/U10-2011.pdf>

[http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/addDocs/AY11/Family Leave Report.pdf](http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/addDocs/AY11/Family_Leave_Report.pdf)

6. Creation of the Rank of Professor of Practice (20 minutes)
(Professor Tom Gieryn, Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs, IU Bloomington) [ACTION
ITEM]

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY11/U8-2011.2.pdf>

7. Discussion of Research Matters (30 minutes)

(Professor Jorge José, Vice President for Research) [DISCUSSION]

Minutes

AGENDA ITEM 1. AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS (10 MINUTES)

DOWELL: Can people, everybody hear? Yes, all right, great. Okay, then the first things we want to do: welcome everybody to our last official UFC meeting of the year, thank you for being here. We first want to do a, just sort of everybody introduce themselves for the record, and let's start with Indianapolis. How about Indianapolis, just go around, tell us who is there.

[Introductions]

DOWELL: I think we will get a word here in just a moment from Craig about whether we have enough people for a quorum. I see him counting. I'll go ahead with just a couple of introductory remarks to say that, sadly President McRobbie can't be with us today. John Applegate is here in his stead. He is up at the State House. As John informed me, this is among the last days where it's possible to have an effect on the budget bills being crafted in the legislature.

APPLEGATE: Exactly.

DOWELL: Want to make an announcement for Bloomington, I can tell you who has been elected to serve as president following me and that is Carolyn Calloway-Thomas from the Department of Communication and Culture in the College of Arts and Sciences here. And I don't know if any other campuses have elections or new leadership to announce just wave your hand or jump in here. Alright, I don't see anybody jumping in so I wanted to say one more thing

about the New Academic Directions Report that was released just – what about a week ago? We discussed it a little bit in the phone conference that the UFC Agenda Committee had last week and it didn't quite make it on the agenda but the report as you may well be aware is public now. It's available if you Google IU Presidential Committees you'll see that report as well as a few others that you can choose from. There's also an online form for individuals to comment on any of those Presidential Committee Reports. At any rate, the New Academic Directions Report is principally of concern to Indianapolis and Bloomington, but a number of representatives from regional campuses commented that it does have implications potentially for campuses beyond Indianapolis and Bloomington. The President has sent letters to at least all of the, I think, deans and directors and faculty governance leaders on Indianapolis and Bloomington campuses. I don't know if he has sent them to people at other campuses, asking for comments on the report by June 30th. He's also announced, of course, that it will be the principle subject of the President's Annual Retreat which happens in August and which Jack and Carolyn will attend among administrators of all stripes. And I know this timing is not ideal, but I think we're not probably going to have any coordinated UFC discussion on this before the fall, but if there is time for individual campuses to forward – and certainly Bloomington will be working on this – but for other individual campuses to forward what they feel their concerns are or what their comments are as far as what's important and especially I think for the regionals it would be important for them to put forward notes about what they feel is the potential fallout from certain recommendations in that report for their campuses. At any rate, so there's comments requested by June 30 and there's also that way to comment individually online as well as there's probably also an email address to do it that way, too. And do we...? I don't know if anybody has further comments on that or...? I know that the timing of the release of the report is not ideal for faculty governance activity. You really have to try to get something together, you know, in May probably after classes are over frankly, but we'll be working to do that in Bloomington and I hope everybody else can have an opportunity to do that or with some small group of people who are still around in May to respond to that report. Any comments on that from folks?

TERRY: I just think reinforcing what you said should be one of the principle comments that we make on this thing. That it raises a whole bunch of really important questions and it can be improved if it is actually subjected to faculty discussion and analysis. It could be made better substantively and there's a better chance of people buying into it and carrying out whatever is finally recommended. But if it is instead a kind of a rush job with very little opportunity in August and September to do anything before implementation proceeds that would be a bad idea. And I would hope that the UFC and the campuses would tell the President that given the release date and the nature of the academic calendar we can have preliminary discussions in the summer about the report and certainly his retreat can talk about some of the

implementation issues in the fall but it's not going to be possible to decide much until the middle of the fall semester at the earliest.

BUCUR-DECKARD: But I think implementation doesn't necessarily mean setting into place a process in which feedback further discussion is not possible. I think it's... what I understood from that message is that we would make an effort to put on the table the big issues for each of the units that responds which then would continue to discuss and not simply execute this. That was my understanding on my reading.

TERRY: We should clarify that understanding and we should make sure that's the President's understanding.

HENSHEL: There isn't an execution written into it –

BUCUR-DECKARD: – No. –

HENSHEL: – very well and so I don't know that they could jump to execution that quickly.

APPLEGATE: Yeah, I was going to say it's not really a very self-executing document so there's...

BUCUR-DECKARD: It's primarily a set of principles.

APPLEGATE: Very good.

HENSHEL: And goals for...

BUCUR-DECKARD: Right.

HENSHEL: It would be great have this, this and this in terms of structure but there's no... I didn't read any way that they could go from here to there by just having a meeting for a week in August.

BUCUR-DECKARD: Or in May, they're leaving.

FARGO: Right.

FARGO: Yeah.

HENSHEL: Right.

TERRY: I know that a couple of the Trustees talked to me after the Trustees Meeting saying that they expected it to result in prompt change.

BUCUR-DECKARD: Actual changes.

HENSHEL: But “prompt,” at a University-level is not prompt at a personal level.

FARGO: Yeah.

BUCUR-DECKARD: No.

TERRY: Prompt at the Trustee level is different than prompt than at faculty level.

DOWELL: Alright, anybody from other campuses besides Bloomington want to say anything about this?

GALLMEIER: Erika?

WINDSOR: We agree, I mean...go ahead.

GALLMEIER: Chuck at Northwest, the best I can do right now is send out the document to the Executive Committee and ask them to review it and give us comments and we’ll send them your way. That’s the best I can do right now.

DOWELL: Yes, I think that is fair. Jack?

WINDSOR: I was going to make a similar comment that we’ll do the best we can and continue to provide feedback even into the fall.

DOWELL: Exactly, I think the fall will be essential and I agree that that the word implement means – you can kind of interpret it in a couple of different ways – so I understand the concerns about clarifying that and I certainly think that what I have heard from the President is that there’s no intention that this will be happening quickly over the summer because it frankly can’t. So I wanted to be sure to mention that. Jack do you have any items of Agenda Committee business to add?

WINDSOR: Just a minor issue, Administrative Electronic Surveillance Policy, feedback was supposed to be provided by April 15th. Did Bloomington supply any additional on the second draft? I looked over it and didn’t see... it was a lot better document this time then it was in first draft.

DOWELL: I will ask Hal Evans here to comment on that. He is the Chair of the Technology Policy Committee. Yes, can you hear Hal if he talks now? [Yes]

EVANS: So we looked over the draft and we had made comments on a previous version and all the comments that we had suggested were implemented so we were all very happy with the new draft and essentially signed off on it.

WINDSOR: Agreed, thanks.

APPLEGATE: I could just add that I think there's going to be some further simplification of it to make it a little more user friendly but not, I think, substantive change.

EVANS: We're happy to look it over, thank you.

DOWELL: Alright great. Item two on the agenda is question/comment period.

AGENDA ITEM 2: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

DOWELL: Are there... I haven't received any questions or comments in advance. Are there any questions or comments now? Alright. As you know we're not very formal here so your questions and comments are welcome later on in the agenda, too, frankly. Alright we'll move on to item three which actually I want to make one more note we do have a couple of agenda items that require the presence of individuals who will only be arriving at particular times, so we're going to have a break probably a short break somewhere in the agenda to just help – well, I think it's nice to have a break when you have a three hour meeting – but also it will help us try to meet these particular time marks when Tom Gieryn can join us and when Jorge José can actually be here. So forgive us for stretching things out, but it's necessary if we're to accommodate the people we have asked to be here. So moving on to item three, which is an amendment to the language of the Honorary Degree Policy.

AGENDA ITEM 3: AMENDMENT TO THE HONORARY DEGREE POLICY

DOWELL: Herb Terry here, from the Honorary Degrees Committee, is going to introduce what's going on here.

TERRY: Thanks, Erika. The chair of the committee, Christine Farris of English here in Bloomington, unfort– can you hear me? – the chair of the committee, Christine Farris, unfortunately can't be here, she asked me to represent what the committee was recommending. I hope we can contribute to staying on schedule because I hope that I can clearly explain the small changes that we're proposing and that it will pass quickly. In Circular U9-2011, the change we are proposing is listed as paragraph 2. It would replace the stricken language of paragraph 2 in the Honorary Degree Policy that deals with the so-called 'Indiana connection.' Let me explain that I've served off and on for five terms on the Honorary Degrees Committee over the years, and in every one of those terms, once or twice, the question of the meaning of current paragraph 2 has come up. Current paragraph 2 says that honorary degree candidates, or honorary degree recipients, generally should have a significant tie to the state of Indiana or Indiana University. Every year, we get some number of candidates whose Indiana connection is hard to discern. This year, we just finished voting on a candidate where the nominator, honestly, said that the candidate was very distinguished but had no Indiana connection. Over the years, the committee has applied Jesuitical reasoning to the word

“significant,” to often approve candidates with little to no significant tie to the state of Indiana who were in other ways, distinguished. What we have proposed is a change that says that the Indiana connection still matters, at the “may have,” but are not required to have that connection. And essentially puts into words the continuum that the committee has applied in the last several years, which is to say to be honest that sometimes we have given honorary degrees to Hoosiers with very distinguished records and sometimes we have given honorary degrees to people with no ties who have even more distinguished records, to be honest. I think this has a number of other advantages I’ve only seen come up occasionally. I’ve seen two or three cases where they came from regional campuses and the ties to adjoining states, Kentucky, Ohio, Illinois, Michigan, were stronger than the Hoosier ties, one way or another. And that makes sense those were approved if they had other reasons for being strong honorary degree candidates. I can tell you that the committee spent almost the entire year rewriting paragraph 2 [laughter] in addition to passing on honorary degree candidates, including the one who had no defined connection to the State of Indiana, that we approved, did the results of the vote, Craig?

DETHLOFF: Yes, that was passed.

TERRY: Mmkay, so you all approved this person, having read the dossier where it says “no contact.” We settled on this, it has the unanimous endorsement of the members of the committee and they do represent the two core campuses and then most of the other regional campuses and I can answer any questions, and that’s my report. Thank you.

DOWELL: Thank you, Herb. Do we have any discussion from the membership here? Questions for Herb? Okay.

WINDSOR: Good job Herb! [Laughter]

TERRY: It only took a year! [Laughter]

DOWELL: Sad to admit, perhaps but you can make almost anything take a year in faculty governance. All right. Craig? No quorum? Very good. Alright, you can expect an electronic ballot to approve this language to come following this meeting. Maybe not today, but maybe tomorrow. Is that accurate to say, Craig? And we hope for your endorsement of it, as well as the endorsement of it by some of your colleagues who are here today, which would make it a legal kind of vote. All right, thanks Herb.

AGENDA ITEM 4: PROPOSALS FOR THE REFORM OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL

DOWELL: Moving on, the two proposals for the reform of the University Faculty Council there before you are things you have seen before, and I wanted to give you an update on where we

are with this, which is not very far, but we have great hope for the future in our optimistic way here at UFC. So these documents that you have before you are unchanged from the documents you've seen before, and as you know they describe very different visions of how UFC might work in the future. At our last Agenda Committee phone meeting, we discussed what our next step should be and we decided that pretty much the only thing left, I think, for us to do is to task another small group to work on this again. And we had some volunteers from the Agenda Committee and I welcome anyone here today or anyone you'd like to suggest or nominate to work on this and then we'll choose from among those volunteers to put together a group of people to set to work on this, hopefully I think over the summer or at least to get started on part of the summer. Right, so we will select a committee from among those volunteers. Do we have anybody who wants to actually volunteer right now or if you'd like to just follow up with an email to me or Jack or Craig that would be fine, too. Alright, I know, it's exciting. Okay, I wanted to say something else about this. As you know, President McRobbie – and we talked about this – is interested in having some kind of small groups possibly made up of just the faculty presidents from each campus to serve as a small group of representative faculty [Laughter] – I'm sorry, a small group serve as a small group – but to serve in a relatively informal way as a sounding board and someone, a group to talk to. And given that our change process hasn't gone too far this year, I had considered just suggesting to the President that he simple invite the faculty presidents of each campus to have such meetings. I floated that to the Agenda Committee when we met on the phone last week. We thought – in general those who were present felt – that it was not, didn't seem objectionable in any way. Although since then I've heard it argued that this could be considered as an invitation to side-step the University Faculty Council entirely. So, I mean I think there are a couple of things we could do, based on this, I could suggest to the President that he simple invite the Agenda Committee of the UFC to meet with him in this way and generally that kind of shakes out to be approximately one person from each campus, or something close to that. So we could do that if we felt that it was a problem to have the presidents of the different faculty groups meeting informally. But I'd be interested in your input on this question. Diane, here in Bloomington?

HENSHEL: Yeah, could you clarify exactly what McRobbie's intent is?

DOWELL: Well, I think his intent is to simply have a group for private discussion where he could float ideas or talk about coming or present challenges in a way that is not a public forum but allows him to get the perspective of a reasonably representative group of faculty. John, would you...?

APPLEGATE: Yeah, I think that's a fair, a very fair description of it, and the meetings that he has with the Agenda Committee I think he finds very useful and so this is a variation on that theme.

HENSHEL: And why would he want...? I guess the question is, I understand smaller than the full university faculty council.

DOWELL: Right.

HENSHEL: I wonder about whether you think that the Agenda Committee would be acceptable then.

APPLEGATE: You know I think this was an idea that was kind of floated in –

DOWELL: Yeah.

APPLEGATE: – a very general sort of way, I don't think he's got an idea that one or the other preferable, I think it was a sort of general conversation because those meetings tend to have been useful.

DOWELL: We also could consider decoupling – often the Agenda Committee meetings, right, they almost always occur immediately before the full UFC meeting, we could also consider I think without changing our documentation, decoupling them, having them at a different time, perhaps, having them in-person in Indianapolis in a way that was suggested by Herb. That kind of follows along with some of the suggestions that we've talked about in our reform discussions. Other comments?

GALLMEIER: Northwest.

DOWELL: Northwest and then East, yes?

GALLMEIER: Aren't all the presidents on the Agenda Committee in the first place or am I wrong?

DOWELL: Yes, no, that's exactly right. They're very similar groups just a few extra bodies on the Agenda Committee. Laverne, then?

NISHIHARA: Yeah, this is Laverne from East. A couple of comments. I'm hoping that the President doesn't assume that the members of this small committee, it might be the Agenda Committee, can be representing their campuses at his meetings, especially if the matters are confidential and we cannot share the matters with our campuses to get their responses so I guess I'm uneasy with the thought that I could represent what the faculty on my campus thinks about things that President McRobbie might be bringing up. That's the first thing. The second thing is I have tended to see a consultative or recommending committee as quite different from a legislative committee. And I even think that different personalities belong on those two different types of committees. So if this is a consultative or recommending sort of committee

with no legislative function, the President might be looking for different people perhaps, and it's difficult to say for sure about these things, because we're not sure what this committee is going to be used for, or what the understanding is for this informal sounding board.

DOWELL: Well, I mean, I don't know that I agree that legislative and consultative requirements require different people but, I mean, I think what I'm saying is that we had talked about the President's interest in having this kind of group to discuss, and I'm simply thinking how can we take our existing group, our Agenda Committee, which I think is probably where we should do this, and just acknowledge that that is another function this group can serve, and that they can talk with the President confidentially about issues, they can also use what they're learning there, with his permission to help set the agenda for the Faculty Council. Jack, you have a comment?

WINDSOR: I mean, we see that the system is broke; I see this as mechanism to enhance communication and transparency. I mean, how effective have we been this year, how many times have we engaged the President because of his time schedule. I'm just concerned about enhancing communication and transparency.

DOWELL: I agree, and I think that this is a way we could do it without having to wait on any kind of constitutional change, and it would be a relatively minor change, just in kind of the venue of where the Agenda Committee is meeting with the President, and perhaps in the frequency and the range of what might be, of what might be discussed at those meetings. Herb, here in Bloomington?

TERRY: I would point out that long ago, the scheduling of the Agenda Committee meetings to coincide with the meetings of the council was done for the convenience of the President. It was done so that the President wouldn't have to go to two different meetings. And I would agree with Laverne, that the function of adopting or changing policies or whatever, of legislating if you want to call it that, has to be open to all of our colleagues—

DOWELL: Sure.

TERRY: —they have to see it. And that the President needs to recognize that the group he talks to can't perform that function.

DOWELL: Right.

TERRY: Or substitute for that function. And that he needs to be here when —

DOWELL: Sure.

TERRY: You know, I'm disturbed. You know, I understand the reasons but I'm disturbed he isn't here for our discussion of Professor of Practice because I kind of anticipate that that will be a controversial discussion and it might come out differently if he were here to participate, than if he's not.

DOWELL: Mmhm, I understand.

TERRY: But hopefully his presence in Indianapolis will have a positive impact on the budget.

APPLEGATE: That's the goal

TERRY: But, that'll happen. I would think that you know, for the coming year, but who in the world is going to object to the President meeting with groups of faculty leaders? I'm certainly not.

DOWELL: Yeah.

TERRY: And it seems to me that at the moment the best course of action is to say, well we have this structure now, it may not be optimal, but we have an Agenda Committee and the Agenda Committee will be perfectly happy to meet with you, we can look at scheduling frequency, format, all of that sort of thing. And that one of the things that the Agenda Committee might discuss with the President next year would be these reform proposals for faculty governance. There's nothing wrong with listening to him in terms of what he would have to suggest for that. So it sounds to me like a good interim approach to that.

DOWELL: Okay.

TERRY: The other thing I think I would express a hope for is that even if it's decided that there are physical meetings or something like that, that when the President's presence is required somewhere else that we be open to having him come in and participate electronically, I mean, this is the President who told us we could do that in tenure and promotion cases no matter where we were in the world. So it seems to me that sometimes his electronic presence may be possible when his physical presence is not and we need to be accommodating of that.

DOWELL: Was that Chuck saying something, or was somebody else?

GALLMEIER: I agree with Herb but I do hope that we have more physical face-to-face meetings of that small group, because I feel like they're very effective.

TERRY: Yeah.

DOWELL: And South Bend? Lesley?

WALKER: I want to also agree with Laverne and Herb and I want to urge us to not overly focus on this specific President, because Presidents come and go and our governance structure shouldn't be –necessarily needs to be – rewritten just because it doesn't please this particular President. I mean I think so, you know, we kind of want to strike a balance and it sounds to me like we're in the process of doing that, but you know, because I think it's understandable that the President may not be able to make three hours of a UFC meeting, but if we have three hours worth of work to do, we should do that work and be as generally representative of the faculty as a whole as possible. So I don't think our entire efforts to reform should be driven by President McRobbie's perceived understanding of the slowness of faculty governance.

DOWELL: Thank you. Southeast, had a hand in, Southeast?

FRENCH: Yeah, can you hear me?

DOWELL: Yes.

FRENCH: Yeah, okay. Yeah, okay, I was curious whether this summer task force that would be working on this issue, can they get together, maybe have an initial meeting, send out a list of questions to the people who are serving at the UFC and get our responses to those, to that list of questions possibly, and we could respond back? And they could use that as input for their summer task force. I'm not going to be on the UFC last year, but I can pass my responses along to the person who will be succeeding me.

DOWELL: Sure, we can ask that that group put out a request and certainly if you wanted to forward something now, that would be just fine and Craig could keep it and pass it on to the group once they're identified.

FRENCH: Okay, that would be fine, thank you.

DOWELL: Great! Okay, Herb, here in Bloomington.

TERRY: You might also consider creating a wiki. I mean we are doing that now.

DOWELL: Yeah.

TERRY: My department is trying to develop a mission statement. It's a way of opening that process, so...

DOWELL: Right. Well, we'll pass on those concerns about wanting to kind of know what's going on with the group, as they work. Herb, again?

TERRY: I have a comment on this whole process. I hope the group thinks very carefully about how much we are a system-wide faculty and how much we are a federation of campuses. I've

been here a long time, I've seen us go from being a very loose federation of campuses to something with more of a common structure in a sense, and I think we're going back a little bit the other way and I think maybe we should. I'm driven, I guess, by some of the consequences of the state thinking of us as all one common thing. When you apply the formulae that the state is applying for funding to our different units, Bloomington and IUPUI or especially the Medical School, don't do especially well at all under those formulas. Kokomo does, but the state, I think, needs to start looking at us differently. Mission differentiation has led to a difference between us, and for all that we try to represent the interests of all of the faculty on University Faculty Council maybe we need to rethink some of the basic boundary points in the federation a little bit, and that might affect the kind of faculty governance structure that we create. I think that's changed, even since Simon and Markus and I were on the task force and so I hope whoever takes this up will consider those very, very fundamental questions as they try and develop an appropriate Faculty Council governance system.

DOWELL: Great, thank you. Maria?

BUCUR-DECKARD: I guess I'm just continuing this thought, maybe in a different direction. By the same token, I think that having the ability to hear these different voices that come with very different concerns is really useful at the local as well as the kind of collective –

TERRY: – I agree. –

BUCUR-DECKARD: – level, so I think, you know, we might want to, I don't know, increase efficiencies in some directions but that might come at a cost, in terms of this unique opportunity that we have to think about what we represent collectively.

TERRY: Yeah, it's both.

DOWELL: Okay, well we'll get that committee together. Remember volunteer if you like, and if not, we have some Agenda Committee volunteers that we will have to rely on. And hopefully you'll hear more from people as the summer progresses.

AGENDA ITEM 5: SUNSET OF THE FAMILY LEAVE POLICY

DOWELL: Alright, item 5 on the Agenda, sunset of the family leave policy. Again this is something that we've talked about in the abstract, we're getting a little bit more specific now. I wanted to make just a few comments before I hand it over to Maria to talk about it and then I don't know if she wants to or I can step you through the draft policy, either way.

BUCUR-DECKARD: Sure, either way.

DOWELL: But what I wanted to say first is that you have a report and you have a draft policy. That draft policy is not something we're voting on today, I wouldn't even call this a first reading. It's not something that we've discussed with administration in any way, shape or form except that we have discussed, in general, a couple of the changes that are suggested there with John, basically.

APPLEGATE: And Neil.

DOWELL: Yeah, and Neil on email. Such that I think this is a policy that is something that at least Maria and I as UFC people think is where we would like to end up, something along these lines, however there is not... We do not have administrative buy in for this, at this point.

TERRY: What do you – what is the draft policy?

BUCUR-DECKARD: It's the white one that says UFC Report on Paid Family Leave Policy. Yeah, that one.

TERRY: So if there's a draft policy it's page, it's the paragraph–

DOWELL: It's Circular U10-2011.

BUCUR-DECKARD: Oh, I'm sorry the policy.

HENSHEL: This is the draft policy, correct?

DOWELL: U10-2011.

TERRY: U10, this is the draft policy. This is not the Trustees' policy. Oh, okay.

DOWELL: No.

BUCUR-DECKARD: No.

HENSHEL: This is the one that we are hoping to put it, possibly, as the framework –

TERRY: – It just doesn't say draft, okay. –

HENSHEL: –for what may go in next year.

TERRY: Got it, okay.

DOWELL: Right, and so it's brought forward here in the spirit of having something that's as specific as we can get at this point for discussion, to make sure that our general talk about different ways we might tweak the policy doesn't stay too amorphous and general, but instead we bring it down to at least something reasonably specific for your information. Maria?

BUCUR-DECKARD: All right, so I mentioned a lot of the things that have gone into the report at our last meeting, and I hope you had a chance to look at the report. I would be happy to take criticisms, suggestions for, you know, addressing whatever problems you might see with the way the report is framed and the information is packaged, or the conclusions themselves. But to summarize things, what this policy has allowed us up to now and we hope it will continue to allow us is as academic appointees who cannot build into our appointments any kind of security with regards to time off, for taking care of others in times of extreme need, unlike our staff. Our staff is able to bank time off, we cannot. We believe that this policy allows us in those moments of urgent need or when you're, you know, getting ready to give birth, to take the time off that is necessary for addressing those issues. The 12-week policy which was instituted in 2008 is one that the amount of leave is one that we hope to preserve for reasons that have to do with the kind of the use of policy and what seems to be a reasonable amount of time for people to take off to deal with these situations. Now the findings as you see them in the report pretty much can be summarized insofar as the policy has gone up in terms of the payment of salaries to cover the leaves of those taking them in the past three years, so since this policy has changed, say significantly if you look at the total amount of money that's being paid out, by the same token the amount has remained tiny in relationship to the total budget of the university and the highest percentage that you see here is 0.27% this year out of the total budget, so it's not a crushing amount and if you also look at the number taking this policy out of the total number that are eligible, the percentage is 0.75% this year, or 44 persons, so these are sort of the, kind of, raw facts. We went to the trouble to do a gender breakdown of this policy because I think it reveals some important consequences should this policy be changed. If you look at page 7, graph number 4, and you see the percentage of total leave taken by women in relationship to the percentage of women out of the total eligible population, you'll see a fairly large disparity between them, which shows that women are over-represented in any year that we've done this graph, to the tune of, at the very least, 12% and in the academic year 2005-06, they were over-represented by 62%, so that's a quite a bit. And what that means, frankly, is that should we change eligibility requirements, should we change the number of weeks that people can take off, or the amount that is being given to, that people can take in terms of income recovery, women will be disproportionately affected by this. Finally, one of the things that we concluded looking at the last three years, and now we are getting to page 8, is that beneficiaries of this policy who make over \$100,000 dollars, we kind of put that as a maybe arbitrary but the difference between faculty and overall personnel that are making sort of more than an average and the rest, that those leaves have accounted for a great deal of the increase in that amount paid out, and disproportionately so, especially in these past three years.

DOWELL: Jack has a question.

BUCUR-DECKARD: Sorry, Jack. Yes?

WINDSOR: What is that amount? One of the problems, I mean, all this is great data, but one thing I've discussed with Erika, I think Trustees want to look at dollar amounts. You made this statement, a lot of that amount increase was due to salaries over \$100,000. How much of the \$800,000 dollars worth was that?

BUCUR-DECKARD: Um, percentage-wise...

HENSHEL: I think he's asking real numbers.

BUCUR-DECKARD: Sure, I mean, I could go to my calculator and tell you in a few seconds what 38% out of \$800,000 dollars is.

WINDSOR: [remark indistinct]

DOWELL: Well, again, I guess you are saying you would like to have that added a little more explicitly in the report.

WINDSOR: Right.

BUCUR-DECKARD: Okay?

PACKER: [remark indistinct]

WINDSOR: For example, if we change it to cap it at \$100,000.

BUCUR-DECKARD: Yes.

WINDSOR: If we apply that to the last year, how much money would that save? It would probably be insignificant, I would think.

BUCUR-DECKARD: Um...

WINDSOR: Those are the kind of numbers I would really like to see.

PACKER: All of this is insignificant. [Laughter]

BUCUR-DECKARD: Thank you. We're talking about \$50,000 dollars difference. All right? Yes? Yes?

WINDSOR: I just find it hard to see how that is significant, kind of like Subah says. Overall the cost of this policy is insignificant, especially when you care package it with the healthcare issues ongoing.

BUCUR-DECKARD: I would prefer not to package it with the ongoing health care issue because I think this is, first of all a separate policy. One that such a small percentage use...

WINDSOR: It's increased in cost.

BUCUR-DECKARD: The what?

WINDSOR: It's increased in cost.

DOWELL: He's just saying –

BUCUR-DECKARD: –Right. –

DOWELL: He's just saying it's increasing in cost at an insignificant pace compared with health costs.

BUCUR-DECKARD: Oh yes, yes. Yes, in comparison, yes I agree. By contrast it is an insignificant growth. Look, we could put more numbers in there that I think the issue is how to drive the point home effectively with the Trustees and with Neil Theobald that this is something that the administration should stand behind in terms of protecting the interest of the university and this is one way to do it. The other way that a group of people have started to do it is to start documenting from both faculty and from administrators what this policy had meant for them in their lives. There's a petition circulating right now, if you want to see there's some really – I cried today when I read some of these on it frankly – at change.org. If you Google the Indiana Paid Family Leave you can see comments from Jeanne Sept, for instance, who was the person who oversaw this policy before it changed but has also seen the change that it's made for her colleagues in Anthropology here since the policy has changed. Caty Pilachowski puts in a very strong – she's the Associate Dean for Graduate Education in the College of Arts and Sciences on the Bloomington campus – and she writes about the impact of a policy like this to attract top notch women in the sciences which we have a very hard time doing, but it's played a very powerful role in her experience with it. And then a bunch of people who write about, you know, having taken the leave what it meant for them. There's a person who was just recruited who said, 'I'm coming because, partly, of this policy.' Somebody else who says, 'I was attracted to go to another job this past year and I stayed because of this policy.' So these are the kinds of things that I think are very powerful. And we couldn't put them in the report because I didn't have that data, but this petition has now some really significant details and qualitative information about the significance of the policy despite its cost if you want to say the cost is high of the policy.

WINDSOR: I think impact is very important. Impact is very important.

DOWELL: Subah, did you have your hand up too, when Jack's done?

PACKER: Yeah, well I think another way of looking at this is what would it cost the university if we don't have the policy. So for example, what happens to people who need to take a family

medical leave and cannot take it or cannot take something that is adequate, what happens to those individuals? Are they then leaving the university permanently? And if so, then what does it cost to replace them? And so I think if the university looks at it from that point of view or if the Board of Trustees looks at it from that point of view, it's going to be very much less expensive to give a family medical leave of absence that's adequate to somebody who really needs it than it is to even advertise and go through the interviewing and so forth and startup funds and whatever else it may take to replace that individual.

BUCUR-DECKARD: I couldn't agree more with you. I have asked various administrators to give me dollar amounts for this and I've not been able to collect that information. But I do have a very strong letter of endorsement from the Executive Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences where about 60% of these leaves have come from, Bob Becker, who says, you know, in no uncertain terms that this is a policy that is worth keeping precisely because of the huge cost of running searches, of trying to deal with, you know, people coming and leaving and so that what you would lose, indeed, by taking away these benefits far outstrips whatever dollars and cents you think you're going to gain by not having the cost in place. But you know a lot of these things are the kind of imponderable quality of life issues that if you just look at the graphs I sent you, you can see the full story which is why this petition is, frankly, so very powerful. If you read those comments you get exactly the picture that you're talking about, you know, that this sets us apart from other places and makes us attractive and you do away with it, people get the word and they might not be as interested in coming to IU or staying here.

DOWELL: Alright, I have a comment here from Herb in Bloomington.

TERRY: Yeah, I signed the petition. I do not believe that any changes from the current policy are in the university's best interest. But we have some Trustees who are convinced that they don't like the current policy. In one sense I kind of like the compromise you've struck where you're proposing to create a ceiling and saying, 'Well, if you make more than this you aren't going to get more than what you would get if you made that as the benefit.' That might attract some of the votes of the Trustees that we'll need in order to prevent a change from occurring. But the thing I would add, and I don't think it'd be persuasive with these Trustees but I would add, is that largely because the endowments of private universities are recovering we're beginning to get raided at Bloomington, maybe IUPUI, maybe the School of Medicine, for top notch faculty by private institutions. Other state universities are still suffering as much as we are, raiding isn't as high, but we are getting raided by those institutions we need to have something to point to to somebody to say here's a reason to stay. We are near the bottom of the Big Ten in salaries again. We are often, from field to field, behind even if the ...our... the best competitive institution is not in the Big Ten. And I too, you know, am looking for something and I know the College has been looking for something that you can point to and say, 'Here's a good reason to

either come to IU or to stay,' and actually it doesn't cost that much. We can't compete on salary. We can't compete on other things, but we can at least turn to somebody with a family or an elderly parent or something and say kind of 'Here's a little bit, it isn't insurance but it really is, you probably won't need it. It's available.' And it costs us so little that, you know, I... for... as a political compromise do the \$100,000 dollars or something, but I don't think that is in our best interest to be honest. The other thing I would recommend, because policy should have a long-term life you don't want to go back to the Trustees again, is that you key this to something. It could be the median –

BUCUR-DECKARD: – It's there. –

TERRY: – it could be the median salary –

DOWELL: – Well, the... it means a different –

TERRY: – of full professors –

BUCUR-DECKARD: – Didn't we talk about that?–

TERRY: – or something that will adjust with inflation increases.

BUCUR-DECKARD: Yeah, you want to talk about the changes?

DOWELL: Mhm, yeah, but I mean Herb's point isn't quite exactly what you're thinking of.

BUCUR-DECKARD: Oh, okay. Right.

TERRY: So that you don't put a dollar figure in there.

BUCUR-DECKARD: Oh, I hear you! I hear you, yeah, yeah.

TERRY: You have to key it to something so it isn't out of date five years from now and the whole debate is reopened.

BUCUR-DECKARD: Yeah.

UNKNOWN MALE SPEAKER: Oh, I see what you mean.

BUCUR-DECKARD: When the cost of living costs three times and a \$100,000 isn't...

TERRY: Yeah, whatever, something that can come out near \$100,000 but is keyed to something. I don't know what.

BUCUR-DECKARD: Yeah.

APPLEGATE: And I should add that the administration is very keen to find some way of responding to the Trustees' concerns and maintaining the policy because all of these points about the value of the policy for retention and so on, I think, are certainly widely shared and hard to argue with. And so the discussions that we've had have been really what are the ways to address the concern, and I think I'd make the concern a little more pointed, which is the extent of the liability from a policy like that and the thing is that is exactly at the core of what Trustees are supposed to be worried about. That is things that are open-ended responsibilities or could go to the solvency or – not ultimate solvency – but the basic fiscal situation of the university. So the fact that they're asking that question is, you know, exactly the kinds of things they should be thinking about. So that's why I'm – well we've been – Neil Theobald and I have been – very eager to find a way that would address that concern and still maintain this as an important part of the benefits of being an Indiana University faculty member.

BUCUR-DECKARD: Well, if I can point everybody's attention then to the very last paragraph of the circular. We are trying to address that and the last sentence says, "If an annual report shows the expense of the policy to exceed 2% of total amount of budgeted base salaries the policy will be re-opened for possible revision by the University Faculty Council." Is this something that is acceptable to the administration?

APPLEGATE: Well, the 2% is – I mean, again it's not really the administration, right? The issue was raised by some members of the Trustees and I don't have an insight into exactly what number and they've, I think, never been presented this, so I can't... I have to... all that disclaimer. But 2% I should say is an enormous number. I know it doesn't translate exactly, but if you had 2% of your work force on leave that would be a pretty astonishing number of people on leave and so, I mean, that's my initial reaction to that number even... I mean 2% sounds small, but 2% of faculty is departments, whole schools are 2% of the university faculty by way of scale.

DOWELL: Well...

HENSHEL: I don't think that's what Maria says. I think she said 2% of the total budget.

DOWELL: Right, well this... this was...

BUCUR-DECKARD: Base salary budget.

HENSHEL: Yeah, that's what I am saying, the base salary budget. So it's not...

BUCUR-DECKARD: That could be far less than those people making \$200,000 dollars or more. That's a lot less than 50% of the faculty.

DOWELL: We have a comment in Indianapolis. Indianapolis?

HASELL: I just recommend you strike it, because it's just – it sets such a level that if I'm a Trustee it raises alarm that we can contemplate going... I'd just get rid of it.

DOWELL: Well, I think what we wanted to... I mean, I think we put that in there as an example of a kind of trigger we could incorporate into the policy. I think, you know, if I were to make introductory comments to this policy I would say this is the one thing that is absolutely not going to stay the same. We might be able to have an agreement about the cap. We did make another change about the frequency with which you can use the leave instead of twice in five years it's once every three, but this whole idea of what kind of a trigger might be acceptable to reopen the policy and to put the brakes on it essentially if it reached some sort of agreed upon level of extreme use then this 2% is definitely kind of a wild number, I think, in a certain sense. Herb?

TERRY: I would have a couple comments. Number one, we found it hard to figure out what the cost of the thing is, so when we say there's a tripwire based on the expense of the policy we're setting up a mess potentially –

BUCUR-DECKARD: – Well, the Trustees keep insisting on calling the income recovery a cost of the policy. –

TERRY: – Right they do. –

BUCUR-DECKARD: – So we have to go with that –

TERRY: – Right –

BUCUR-DECKARD: – to talk the language. –

TERRY: – but my sense would be we better try and figure out how you measure expense.

APPLEGATE: Right, I mean if the idea, I should say, the idea of finding this is something we talked about before – finding a limiting factor like that – and I think this is one way one might go about doing it. I mean, as a metric, that's fine. I mean taking the policy as a formal action that needs to be approved through each campus, so you know that with some specificity it's the opportunity cost that Maria's referring to and that is a cost, because you just have that less effort though obviously we all know that most schools and departments tend to work this out in a more informal way and it's not a very apparent cost.

DOWELL: Right. So I just want to see. Okay, Herb?

TERRY: I would think you could fix the last paragraph by keying – instead of saying expense – it's the replacement income because we can always calculate that. We have somebody who takes this thing and they get replacement income –

DOWELL: Uh-huh.

TERRY: – and we figure out what that is now as a percentage of some base, which we can also calculate, and we double it or something. It's still not going to be very much money. We can give them an example...

BUCUR-DECKARD: You mean replacement income meaning how much it costs to get somebody else?

TERRY: No, the money we give these people for –

DOWELL: – You mean the salaries that can be used for recovery –

TERRY: – when they're on leave.

BUCUR-DECKARD: You mean the income recovery...

TERRY: Income recovery.

BUCUR-DECKARD: "Income recovery," that's the technical term now.

TERRY: Whatever it is. I mean we can give them some figure we can easily calculate. We know there are other costs, we know there are other benefits, but we can make the tripwire something that it is possible to calculate.

BUCUR-DECKARD: Sure, sure, sure. No, that makes sense to me.

TERRY: Okay, we figure out what that would be as a current percentage. We lay on them, 'Look how trivial this is now...'

BUCUR-DECKARD: It is 0.27% of the total budget right now.

TERRY: Okay, so one, you know, we figure out a figure, okay? And we're able to defend it to the Trustees and we say, 'Look, look, here is the current cost figured this way. It's not breaking our backs, let's put in a tripwire and the tripwire is if it goes to this other percentage,' and I would say since this is a faculty-only thing, it should be budgeted based faculty salaries.

BUCUR-DECKARD: It's academic appointees, and not just faculty –

TERRY: Okay.

DOWELL: Right, the library...

BUCUR-DECKARD: – there's people that make \$25,000 dollars at the childcare on campus...

HENSHEL: Oh really?

TERRY: But as currently written, it's all IU based salaries.

DOWELL: Right.

TERRY: And that's a huge figure as John has pointed out. Make the base the salaries of the people who are eligible for this thing.

BUCUR-DECKARD: Right.

TERRY: Okay.

HENSHEL: Okay, "of eligible..."

TERRY: 'Cause if they are setting around figuring out what the consequences –

BUCUR-DECKARD: Sure, sure, sure.

TERRY: – are for the entire employees, they're not thinking about the policy the way it is.

HENSHEL: So, "eligible faculty and staff...?"

BUCUR-DECKARD: or "eligible employees..."

DOWELL: "Academic appointees," yeah.

TERRY: Whatever. And use real figures have real figures based on what we've got now, and you know... We can certainly stand the doubling of this let's make that the tripwire or something I don't know what it would be, but you come back to them and say, 'Now you're protected.' Don't remind them that a tripwire like this is what President Obama has created in his budget plan but, you know, come back and say, 'Here,' you know, and that's far better than a year tripwire which is what we had before –

DOWELL: – Right. –

TERRY: – that's created the current uncertainty.

DOWELL: Alright, I want to have Lesley at South Bend and then Tony here.

WALKER: I think we basically agree with the idea of trying to come up with, you know, some way to key these figures to satisfy the Trustees that the financial obligation won't be excessive and I think that - I'm hoping that – John Applegate is right, that their concern is going to be about cost. So I would urge everybody to reconsider the question of the frequency of the leave and to revert to the original policy. And I make this appeal on behalf of all thirty-something

[laughter] junior, you know, junior faculty members who don't really want you to help do their family planning for them. I think that, I don't know if the Trustees really care to be involved in, you know, family planning for, you know, the young [background noise, indistinct comment] faculty members and can we not go back to the plan that gives more flexibility to women, you know, five years, two times is that really going to matter that much to the Trustees?

DOWELL: Probably not.

BUCUR-DECKARD: More than happy to support that. I only suggested this because I did based on knowing the use of this policy over the last three years. There was one person who used it in the whole system like that.

WALKER: Well, I mean, I guess from the discussions that we've had on our campus over this issue over the last couple of years, it's been, you know, like I said. It just gets the university involved in family planning in a way that I just don't think we want to be. I think we want to give women – women and families – that share of responsibility and, you know, and if you decide to have two babies within two years that's your choice. And, you know, I think we should leave that to women to make those – or families, not just women – but families to make those kinds of choices, and so the more flexibility the better.

DOWELL: Alright.

WALKER: I urge you to consider...

DOWELL: Thanks Leslie. Tony, here?

FARGO: Yeah, I was just wondering what – going back to the discussion of what kind of a benchmark I guess to attach to this policy that would then kick in a review – I'm just wondering since we already have these numbers that maybe what we could do instead is tie this to the percentage of the total budget that family leave costs and say that if it ever exceeds 0.33% of the total university budget then there should be a review, if that occurs for two years in a row or more. Would that make sense?

BUCUR-DECKARD: That makes sense to me!

DOWELL: I mean, I think we'd get some pushback on that one just because the total university budget depends on a lot of things that have nothing to do with salaries and benefits and things like that and if we, you know, if we increase our external support by a great deal or something and that is considered as part of the budget, then why should that inflate the potential benefit for family leave? But I take your – I mean, I think there are a number of things we could potentially use there, but I think we need to make sure they somehow relate to the population of academic appointees more than anything else.

FARGO: The salaries and benefits.

DOWELL: Right and things attached to those people.

FARGO: That makes sense.

DOWELL: You know their salaries and benefits. Okay, Herb?

TERRY: And the logical question. I think we're still expending a lot of effort trying to attract senior women in science. Aren't we?

BUCUR-DECKARD: Yes.

TERRY: Isn't it a university priority?

HENSHEL: Well, we're not getting very far yet.

TERRY: But that is a university priority.

HENSHEL: It is.

TERRY: Do we pay senior women in science more than a \$100,000?

HENSHEL: You're asking the wrong person, I get paid much less. [laughter]

BUCUR-DECKARD: The women in science that have taken this policy in the last three years, no.

TERRY: No, that's not my question.

BUCUR-DECKARD: Well, okay.

TERRY: No, I'm thinking of this is a recruiting devise and the last thing in the world we want to do is turn to some nice well established female scientist and say, 'I'm sorry you don't qualify for the full Family Leave Policy because you make too much money.'

HENSHEL: Well, to be honest most of the time by the time we're having kids is not when we're making that amount of money.

TERRY: But they're headed toward elderly parents and the other aspects under this policy.

HENSHEL: But that's true for everybody.

TERRY: Yeah.

HENSHEL: As opposed to having kids which is....

TERRY: Now I just don't want to adopt something that seems to run in the face of the university's goal of attracting certain groups that are likely to make more than this threshold.

DOWELL: Right, well we did talk about that in our discussions and it's, you know, that's the most visible place to make a change that seems to roll back costs a little bit or control costs.

BUCUR-DECKARD: And –

DOWELL: But that is definitely a side effect is that it's going to have a disproportionate effect on highly paid faculty members and if highly paid correlates to especially valuable and important then it does gyp them a little bit in department as opposed to the current policy.

HENSHEL: But when you look at the numbers that came in from figure 5 and you talk to Maria about further details on this, because it's not quite as clearly stated the people who are above the cut off are mostly men.

BUCUR-DECKARD: By a lot.

HENSHEL: By a lot.

BUCUR-DECKARD: Yeah.

HENSHEL: Even this year –

BUCUR-DECKARD: – From one and a half to three times more men make over \$100,000 of those who've taken it than women.

DOWELL: We have another comment here in Bloomington, Steve?

BURNS: As you were discussing this, did you ever discuss a possible trigger that actually arose from deans so if a certain percentage of deans felt this was detrimental to their operation, you trigger it? Because in many ways –

DOWELL: – Interesting. –

BURNS: – they fund it and they ought to and in many cases probably are supporting it. But it could reassure the Trustees. But I didn't want sort of to throw us off too far.

DOWELL: Well, it's an interesting concept, though. Thanks for bringing it up.

BUCUR-DECKARD: I mean I – that's – yeah, I actually have not thought of that. I could tell you that support among deans was somewhat divided, that we had some strong support from SPEA, from Informatics, the College unequivocally, but we had pushback from HPER – not HPER, I'm sorry – Business –

DOWELL: – SLIS –

BUCUR-DECKARD: – SLIS and Journalism.

HENSHEL: Really?

DOWELL: In Bloomington.

TERRY: In Bloomington.

BUCUR-DECKARD: So, yeah. Would that be a good idea from the point of view of that advocating for the faculty –right? – is what I ask myself.

BURNS: I mean they ought to be advocating for the faculty and their ability to keep and attract talent.

TERRY: Yeah.

BURNS: So that's why I was thinking about it.

BUCUR-DECKARD: Right, and those who don't support it, talk about the high costs of this policy in terms of kind of dollars and cents of paying people who are not at work while they're paying them. And one dean in particular saying, 'I have seen absolutely no evidence of this being important in terms of retention and hire.' Based on what I know and what these comments on the petition tell me, I think that person's out of touch with reality. And so there's other questions that arise there in terms of their ability to lead. [laughter] Sorry.

DOWELL: Let's just bring up – I wanted to bring up one thing. We brought a list of a whole bunch of ways we could possibly change the policy to the Agenda Committee of UFC and the ones that are reflected in this policy are the ones that the Agenda Committee thought were acceptable. And we left out the ones that were considered basically non-starters. But I did want to bring up one more thing, just to take the temperature of the group which is eligible family members. One of the possible changes could be to pare that down to eliminate the spouses part, parents, kind of thing or – I don't think anyone's arguing with immediate family – but as it gets a little more expansive, I just wanted to see... The Agenda Committee felt that that was not something they were at all interested in changing. I would just see if that's a similar sentiment here among us today.

HENSHEL: I think it would be a mistake to take out any of these, okay?

TERRY: I agree.

DOWELL: Thank you. Anybody else feel that they are open to that? Or does everybody pretty much feel that that's not a place that we'd really like to go?

TERRY: You'd have to retitle it. It would cease to be a Family Leave Policy.

FARGO: Partial Family Leave.

TERRY: Partial Family Leave, yeah.

DOWELL: Not partial leave, but partial family.

FARGO: I don't think you want to open that particular [remark indistinct]

TERRY: This is family.

HENSHEL: It also leaves us open to asking too many other questions that we have already chosen not to go to as a university.

DOWELL: Alright. Any of the campuses besides Bloomington want to say anything on this? Or if you pretty much agree that it's not something we want to do, then I'll just take it at that, right? Are there any other wrap-up comments? As we've expressed before this is something that we're probably going to get back to everybody about, probably in – did you see somebody? Oh, I'm sorry, Indianapolis. Jennifer?

HEHMAN: Well, I had a situation years ago where I could've used this leave because I was taking care of my mother as she was progressively dying, and I think there's more and more folks who are having to do that now, at least take time off so they don't go to place their spouse or parent in a facility. So it's not just for the thirty-under crowd.

DOWELL: Sure.

HEHMAN: It's for the over fifty crowd, too. And it is a benefit for some of those folks, and it usually is the daughter or the woman in the family who has to take care of a parent.

BUCUR-DECKARD: Although we have had a significant number of men taking care of their partners and their parents in the last few years, and I'm really grateful that we have that possibility.

HEHMAN: Right, so that was only just for folks trying to get a family started.

DOWELL: Sure. Jack, did you have something?

WINDSOR: Plan of action?

DOWELL: Yeah.

WINDSOR: Yeah, plan of action is to move this?

BUCUR-DECKARD: Plan of action is to get Neil Theobald to meet with us and to see if he will agree to what we have here or the sentiments expressed here and the changes that you've proposed. At which point if he is willing to present this, because it's really in his hands at that point, to the Trustees in June, June 23rd, June 24th.

DOWELL: Right.

UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER: So what if that happens?

DOWELL: So sometime between now and June we would hope to have an online airing of a policy that we have [comment indistinct] that we think can be successful in front of the Trustees, have an online vote to approve it. Hopefully, it will look something like this, but we'll try to keep in touch as we know more. And then it would go to the Trustees at their June meeting as Maria said. And we'll do our best to keep you informed as we go along. But it's a budget year and Neil is – this just hard to grab his attention on right now. And we hope maybe in a few weeks we can get a little smidgeon of his time to talk about this and get some things nailed down.

BUCUR-DECKARD: If I could, could I just clarify one thing? You see this under "Effective Date," I think one of you asked last time if we can get the policy to be extended until the end of the next academic year, at least, as a means to enable the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs and other people who are dealing with these issues to plan ahead, right? So what we have gotten from Neil Theobald is a sort of informal okay to have it in force until February 1, 2012 as a minimum.

WALKER: One thing I was going to ask is if we have anything more formal than that at this point.

BUCUR-DECKARD: We have an email.

WALKER: Just an email, okay. That's kind of... surprising. [remarks indistinct] We're happy to have that.

DOWELL: Well, that's what we have now. Herb?

TERRY: The last comments about taking care of elderly parents and that sort of thing, I think are another reason for going back to the original frequency. Elderly parents have a habit of going into nursing homes –

WALKER: – Right. –

TERRY: – coming back out, going back in again rather than going once every three years.

BUCUR-DECKARD: Plus, people having children, they're having children at older ages when they might have a parent who might have a critical disease. I mean I have a colleague, the one person I know who's taken this, is somebody who's taken care of a dying parent and then had a baby.

HENSHEL: Wow.

TERRY: Yeah.

BUCUR-DECKARD: Yeah, yeah, all within two years.

DOWELL: Alright, we'll move that frequency back to what we have right now. Alright, let's go ahead and work through item six and then after item six, we will have our break before we begin discussion of research matters.

AGENDA ITEM 6: CREATION OF THE RANK OF PROFESSOR OF PRACTICE

DOWELL: Alright, so item six is the action item, "Creation of the Rank of Professor of Practice." You have in front of you the latest version. It includes a couple of, I agree, relatively minor changes based on our discussion of last time. There have been many more substantive kinds of comments on the policy that would have required significant reworking and delay in the policy as well as turning it into something that covered some different situations that I don't think this policy was necessarily designed to address. So the Agenda Committee talked this over and we agreed that we would bring the policy as it stands forward for action today, and if, Tom Gieryn, if you would like to say a few other items of introduction, then we can have some discussion. Craig has already noted that we don't have a quorum today and so we will be having any vote that results from this discussion online following this meeting.

GIERYN: Thank you, Erika. Just to remind you, this is a proposal which would create a new non-tenure-track instructional rank, Professor of Practice. It's designed for a very specific group of people, those who have achieved significant accomplishments and success in a world of practice other than academe. The belief is that such people were they attracted into the university with a rank of this kind would offer a great deal to our students in terms of expertise that they can convey in the classroom, their networks, their contacts, their practical experiences. I mean, we can talk about the details. What I'd like to indicate first of all is that the Faculty Affairs Committee in Indianapolis spent a great deal of time looking over this proposal and I want to thank them for their thoughtful work. It raised a significant number of issues that certainly got my attention and Erika's and were the basis of discussions between the two of us. I will say, however, that many of these issues had come up in the process through

which this proposal came into being. I'll admit straight away that the proposal could have taken a different form. The rank could have been described differently. It might have had graduated ranks of assistant, associate, full. It might have had a different set of goals, really, in terms of what kind of people we're trying to attract. We considered a lot of these possibilities, different routes. There were sets of decisions that this policy is, in fact, what we would like to see passed, that is, the meeting with the deans of the schools on the Bloomington campus including the core schools that link to Indianapolis. They felt, the deans felt, that the rank as described in this policy is the one that would work for them. We took that policy to the Faculty Affairs Committee in Bloomington, and then on to the Bloomington Faculty Council, where again it was scrutinized with many of the same issues that were raised last meeting and by the Faculty Affairs Committee at Indy. And again, the judgment of the Bloomington faculty governance bodies was that this was the way we wanted to present the rank. I say that because certainly we're amenable to amendments that are sympathetic to the goal of the policy as worded. If there are things we can change that would make the proposal better without undermining its overall objective or trying to solve other problems that may exist in policies that are not really part of this policy, if we can limit to improvements that are consistent with the overall thrust of the proposal, we're certainly welcome to talk about those. I think that it would be for our purpose diversionary if we tried to solve problems here with this policy that may exist elsewhere in, say, our non-tenure-track ranks. And there may be problems we should discuss at other times. I say that, I hope we can bring this measure to a vote. Today my final word is that the schools and their deans and the faculty in those schools have been very patient in waiting for this proposal. It's not just the year or so that we've been working on it. It actually is double-digit years since something called the "Professor of Practice," was first proposed. If we miss this opportunity today to allow hiring, we'll miss another recruitment year. We'll be talking about the '12-'13 hiring year, rather than the '11-'12. So without suggesting that this is a matter of life and death, it's certainly is something that the deans are watching and hoping that we prepare – that we pass – this proposal.

DOWELL: Jack?

WINDSOR: Yeah, so if this has been an issue going on for two years, why is the UFC just hearing about it? I mean, I sympathize with IUB concern that we'll get this passed, get it in practice, but why haven't we been informed longer than January of this year to provide a feedback for faculty so we're not at this stage? Why is it so critical we pass it today? And on a procedure issue, if we don't have quorum, we can't make a motion to vote on anything, alright?

HENSEL: We have quorum now, three more people. Craig?

DOWELL: What's that?

HENSHEL: Do we have quorum now? We have more people.

DETHLOFF: No, you don't.

HENSHEL: Okay.

WINDSOR: For a motion you have to have a quorum. To have a motion made to vote electronically, you have to have quorum. You can't make the motion, is that not right, parliamentary procedure?

TERRY: Who's the Parliamentarian?

DOWELL: Well, Craig and I talked certainly earlier, about if there was a motion to table that requires a vote of the majority of those present, it doesn't require a quorum. But that'd be obviously different for actually bringing an item to a vote.

GIERYN: Jack, if I could address the first –

HANSON: – Well I just wanted to ask kind of a question about the procedural question. I understand the issue about it coming after it went through processes, but is there in the worry about whether or not you can get a quorum to have a later vote is there something you would've wanted to bring up though during this period. I mean, substantively, is there some worry that there are things that haven't been discussed about this?

DOWELL: Jack?

WINDSOR: Well, there have been a lot of concerns at the last UFC meeting [remark indistinct] were incorporated and this is a university policy. And I mean, I'm hearing what IUB wants – there's nothing wrong with that – but, you know, how can we hash this to serve the whole university?

DOWELL: Right.

GIERYN: Jack, it's not that we didn't consider the suggestions, what we did is we went – and there were changes made as you can see – one very specific one having to do with the votes of faculty to hire such people. What we did is we considered in a deliberative way the full range of suggestions as well as many that were proposed in the written document. Those that we felt were advancing the proposal in a positive direction, given the desires of the people that framed it, we tried to incorporate. Those that dealt with issues that we really felt couldn't be solved with this particular new rank, we set aside for another day. Issues that were simply designed to take it in a fundamentally different direction, we decided that we didn't want to incorporate it, but we considered it. I don't want to suggest for a minute that we didn't consider all that was said at the last discussion. We didn't feel that they were advancing the proposal in the direction

that the people who intend to use this new rank would benefit from. I guess that's the response.

WINDSOR: Well see, you keep saying, "we." "We," is IUB. You know we intend to use this rank additionally. We [background interference] on this campus. So as a whole university, we'll be using it. So...

DOWELL: Right well, Jack, I mean we did talk about this at the Agenda Committee. I know that Indianapolis is the campus that has the strongest feelings that they would like to sort of stop and start over again.

WINDSOR: Not start over, continue –

DOWELL: Well...

WINDSOR: – plugging the faucet.

DOWELL: Okay, I'll withdraw my "start over" statement, but we did talk about it at the Agenda Committee throughout this time and they were certainly privy to the discussions at the last University Faculty Council meeting. The documents and the responses from the Indianapolis Faculty Council – or Faculty Affairs Committee – were forwarded to me and to you, but asked not to be circulated further, so those didn't go any further really, although I certainly summarize some of the main points once I got it for – for who? – the Agenda Committee? Did it come in before that point? I'm not even sure I remember. Came after that point, right? Okay. At any rate, but at the Agenda Committee we certainly talked about what was brought up and talked about how that would really turn it into, in my opinion and, I think, some of us share that opinion certainly here in Bloomington, a different kind of policy. A ranked policy presents a very different kind of opportunity to one of the highly accomplished individuals that are expected to be attracted by a rank like this. An assistant professor of practice is a lot different than a simply, a holistic sort of rank of a professor of practice. And so, I mean, that is one among the different kind of criticisms or concerns that I think were considered by the Agenda Committee as something that we really couldn't pursue along this timeline. And we got the agreement of the Agenda Committee to move this forward today as an action item, if it fails as an action item, if it's voted down, then we obviously will keep working on the policy at the university level. Tom?

GIERYN: I do think it's important if we are going to vote on this today to find out what the objections are to the proposed changes, because the document was not widely shared. The issue of having assistant, associate and full, we certainly considered that, as you found out in your research, other universities that have professors of practice do it that way. Some don't. The reason why we chose not to go that route is really to solve a problem that you also noted in

the report and that is to create distinction between this new rank and other existing ranks that we use for instructional work, clinical and lecturer. Both of those are gradated and a lecturer moves from regular to senior and then clinicals are associate and associate. If you want to hire somebody into a teaching – largely teaching – role and you would like to give them the opportunity to move through ranks, you can hire them as lecturers or as clinicals. That remains the same. This was designed for a slightly different group. I think we assumed it would be people that were relatively on in their career having accomplished in a field of practice. They wouldn't be attracted to the title of assistant or associate, the point in setting up a professor of practice it was to attract folks with a very distinctive – yes, the effective “p” word that has the cachet – “professor” of practice. We felt that to have the gradations of rank would introduce as you also noted a whole lot of work in terms of setting up exactly what it would take for an assistant professor of practice to go to associate and then on to full. We really didn't want to borrow that amount of trouble by setting up the gradations, 'cause we didn't see that the advantages of it outweighed the additional work it would take.

WINDSOR: And I reckon, Tom, IUB has heard all these rationales as y'all developed the process, the policy. IUPUI has not heard all these rationales, so we're starting in January going through the same process you spent two years on. We don't know the rationales or how the policy ended up here.

DOWELL: Karen?

HANSON: Well, I thought that Tom gave a good account of the rationale, but one of the things that I think is relevant here is that this is coming out of the press from the schools for a particular sort of category that they think would be useful. If indeed that hasn't been something that's been pressing on other campuses then I'm not quite sure why there should be an objection to allowing it in some case where there are these needs. And I must say, even on the Bloomington campus, the appointment would not be that ubiquitous. These are coming from particular settings and they're particularly the professional schools that are largely here. Journalism... [laughter from IUPUI] No, the professional schools that are largely here. Not that the professional schools are largely schools are largely here, the professional schools that are largely here; Music, and then Journalism with the component that's here and the other component that's in Indianapolis, and then SPEA, which of course reports to Indy. But it's not likely to be used in Medicine or Nursing, that's where the clinical ranks could be used. It's likely to be used for the – you know, maybe it will – but the need has come – and if the need was there, Nursing could have brought it – but the need has been expressed repeatedly by the particular schools on this Bloomington campus, so that's one of the reasons it's been in play for a long time at Bloomington. I don't quite see what the rationale is for saying that unless it's

solved, some other problems which may or may not have been the problems which may have been the problems of these schools, that it's a bad policy to allow in these cases.

DOWELL: We do have a couple members of the Faculty Affairs Committee from Bloomington. Randy, would you like to say a couple words?

ARNOLD: Sit here so they can see..?

DOWELL: Yeah, that's good so you're visible.

ARNOLD: Yeah, a lot of these concerns were brought up in our discussions and I think initially when we heard about this we wondered as well how widely it would be used. We didn't really understand how it'd interact and be different than clinical *per se* or the lecturer ranks, but as we looked at the policy more we started to realize that there would be a distinction and our understanding, at least from our discussions in our committee and with Tom, was that this is really going to be used almost in a minimalist way. So my expectation as one of the co-chairs of the Faculty Affairs Committee is that we might hire two or three people a year in Bloomington into this rank. I mean, maybe it would be handful, but it would be very, very few. These would be people of distinction that are in careers where maybe they don't have a terminal degree, so they don't even fit the profile that would apply to people that we would hire as lecturer or clinical faculty or regular tenure-track. So they would take on a completely different aspect than our normal faculty members. So once we understood that that's kind of the intention for this policy and how and why it would be used it made a lot more sense how it was different than clinical, how it was different than lecturer. That it really is designed as a title of sort of the fullest distinction, not one that we would want to start and have people progress through ranks. It's really something where this person's career outside of academia sort of establishes them as a well-known person, an individual with distinction and we want to bring in and bring their expertise to our campus and we thought that that that was something very beneficial and we also recognized that our other academic ranks didn't really fit that kind of description. And this would really be beneficial for those individuals.

WINDSOR: And I think the policy has been enhanced by adding some faculty oversight of that, their portfolio, as they take this position. So I thank Tom for including that.

GIERYN: I think one other issue that has come up and indeed came up last time we discussed this had to do with people moving among the non-tenure-track ranks if we were to create this, and I think from what Randy just said, it seems to be the case that that would be highly unlikely, that people who are drawn in and appointed as lecturers and clinicals have a different career profile than the folks that we see moving into professors of practice. But one of the advantages of this new rank, it seems to me, is that people who might – again because of the cachet of the “professor” word – be appointed as clinicals when that may not be especially appropriate, now

we have another rank, if they meet the qualifications, a rank that may allow us to avoid using “clinical” in a fairly promiscuous way and that that seems to be a more honest set of ranks than we’ve got now. Again, that’s the hope.

WINDSOR: I agree with that. The use of clinical ranks in some schools is inappropriate.

APPLEGATE: Tom, could I ask...? So the idea is that this creates a new opportunity, right? It’s a new rank with a new menu of opportunities for schools and campuses to attract certain kinds of faculty members to do these particular tasks. Then if that’s right, then I guess the question would be what are the ill effects that are driving the concern? That’s I guess what I don’t understand, how is this having an ill effect on other ranks or schools or departments, and that’s what I’m not really understanding here.

DOWELL: Okay, Indianapolis?

ECKERMANN: Well, I think the School of Medicine found out a long time ago. It has volunteer professors of medicine who drop the “volunteer” part, and I think it would be very easy in this case to drop the professor of the practice.

APPLEGATE: You mean the way they sign their names or something?

DOWELL: Can you clarify that? I’m not sure we know what you mean.

ECKERMANN: Well, there is one individual in Indiana who did that in a media sort of way and it didn’t reflect favorably on the School of Medicine.

DOWELL: Jack?

WINDSOR: I mean the impact could simply be that it enhances the percentage of non-tenure-track faculty, but we don’t have a cap on that. I mean, like Provost Hanson just stated, it would be used to limited. How limited?

HENSHEL: You want a cap?

APPLEGATE: Well, there’s still that reporting requirement, right? For every year, aren’t the schools supposed to report that percentage? So if it were getting out of control, presumably you’d have some responsibility on the part of the campus to address that.

GIERYN: And I think the response, Jack, is where really this began, which was what are the benefits that such people would bring to the campus that are not presently being enjoyed? So, yeah, if it were a liability to bring these people in, I could see the problem. The premise of this proposal is that they’re bringing a unique set of talents and expertise and experiences that are

not presently captured by the people even in tenure-track ranks, and that's the benefit of our students. That's certainly where we started.

HANSON: And it's the last part I'd want to underscore. One of the things that's seen as particularly valuable about attracting – again, it's just likely to be a handful of people – is that they often have ties to the external world in a way that line faculty in these schools don't or don't to the same extent and it's helpful for student development and for their connecting often with the world of work or the world of whatever profession they're entering. So, again, we see a detriment to the educational experience for some of the students in some of these limited cases by holding on this for yet another year.

DOWELL: Jack?

WINDSOR: The final thing that I'll say is one of my jobs is to represent concerns that IUPUI has with this policy. However, we do support the policy, okay? And I think I've done my job.

DOWELL: Thanks, Jack. Are there other comments? Yeah, Craig, do you have ruling on what you need to do to actually initiate a vote on this, either here in person or online later?

DETHLOFF: Lack of quorum means that you can't actually have a vote today, and no one can put a motion to vote, but you can't even put a motion to table it either, so you can't take it off.

WINDSOR: That's right.

DETHLOFF: So the Agenda Committee putting it on as an action item means that it is still an action item.

TARTELL: But we can't do anything, we can't act.

DETHLOFF: We can, if we just make a decision to act at another meeting and we can do that virtually online.

DOWELL: Okay.

TARTELL: Ah, without making a motion?

DETHLOFF: Yeah, we have to be able to do something, like adjourn and decide when to reconvene also. I mean that's part of the thing, that means we don't get stuck here. [laughter]

TARTELL: We're in UFC purgatory! [laughter]

BOLING: We're not having another meeting until next fall, correct?

DETHLOFF: Right, unless you decide to schedule one virtually, and say, 'Okay, at this meeting we will bring this.'

HENSHEL: Okay so then that's what you're saying is we can put this to an electronic vote as a virtual meeting.

DETHLOFF: Correct.

DOWELL: Right.

FARGO: Let's do that.

DOWELL: [many voices in background] Okay, just a second. Okay, you're all talking on top of each other and I don't know what anybody said. What'd you say in Indianapolis, Jack?

WINDSOR: This is a good example of why we need reform.

DETHLOFF: Amen.

DOWELL: Yes, I'm with you. And Elizabeth were you saying something that we need to repeat?

BOLING: I was just asking about the duration of the virtual meeting?

DOWELL: Okay, we can have a virtual meeting that is asynchronous to a certain extent, I presume.

DETHLOFF: Yes.

DOWELL: Alright, then. Look for that asynchronous virtual meeting in which we will decide to vote on this and then have a vote coming soon. And thank you for your attention to this matter and your discussion. We're now going to have a short break before we come back for "Discussion of Research Matters." Thank you everyone.

TERRY: When do we come back?

DOWELL: Come back in ten minutes.

TERRY: Okay.

DOWELL: I'm sorry to make it a little bit on the long side, but we can talk amongst ourselves.

BRIEF RECESS

DOWELL: Alright, thank you everybody. I think we're about ready to reconvene for our last item. Vice President for Research, Jorge José, has just joined us. Thank you for fitting us into

your schedule today. He's going to talk and start us out for about twenty minutes, and then we're going to make sure that we stop and interrupt him and allow questions and comments from the membership. And I feel we'll probably run 'til the end of our meeting time today which is 4:30. Alright, thank you.

JOSÉ: Very good. Well, first of all, thank you very much for the invitation. Sorry I haven't been here before. I think I was just invited recently. I was always interested in trying to meet all of you, and I want to tell you a few things that I have been doing. I've been here about not yet nine months, close to nine months, and, in fact, it was interesting I arrived here on August 1st and I think on August 4th I had to make a presentation to the President's Retreat four days after I arrived here. So one of the things that I learned very quickly is what are the principles that a university is based on and those principles actually have been expressed very clearly recently in one of the President's annual addresses and they have to deal with the principles of excellence in Indiana University as a whole. And I take some of those principles as my own principles for my office about what we need to do in the office of research and creative activities. Let me start by actually listing only four, which I think they relate directly to what we want to do. And first of all is the idea of maximizing Indiana University's capacity for research and scholarship, scholarship activities and creative activities, and how do we make a contribution at the state, national, international level and we are recognized as one of the leading universities in the US and in the world. The second, which is very important and I will try to give you some numbers at the end of my twenty minutes, there are very concerning numbers about the funding at Indiana University as measured by the end of March this year, okay? Comparison between the funding at the end of March in 2010 with respect to the funding in Indiana University 2011, okay? And that is related to the idea that we want to increase the external funding and other support for the university for all the scholarship activities that are carried in the university. As you know, it's very hard to do innovative, transformative things without resources and in this case, those resources often have to come from outside, and we have to see how can we be competitive, how can we be a leading institution in terms of getting those resources to be able to create new knowledge based on the projects that we will submit for support for not just the federal agencies, but also philanthropy which actually is very good in the state of Indiana. I'm actually in shock about how much money philanthropy gives to Indiana University and in particular, Eli Lilly had \$250 million dollars in the last four or five years. That's remarkable, okay? Also, of course, as we know, we are very strong in the arts and the humanities in the university [someone speaks from another campus, remark indistinct] Sorry? I'm sorry? And of course, we also want to stimulate the arts and the humanities significantly and one thing that I was actually directly tasked to do is to try to expand the inter-campus collaborations, try to increase the number of projects that actually have faculty from the different campuses in Indiana University. And so these were the four things that I took as the basis for the kinds of things we've been trying to do for the last nine months, and I have to say that all these four are

not independent from each other. They are connected to each other, okay? The how do we get more funding, how do we get more collaborations is also related to how do we administer the money that we get, how do we provide the support, administrative support, to the faculty so that it can actually be able to do their work in the most creative possible way and recognizing that a lot of the money that we get comes with strings attached, okay? There's a study that was done recently by, there's a group in Washington, that has looked at how much time does a faculty member spend, about ten, fifteen years ago, dealing with administrative components of the funding that they get from the federal government and it was about 14% of the time then. It's about 46% of the time now, okay? There's a tremendous amount of administration that we have to do. There's a tremendous amount of compliance that we have to fulfill. And that is a very serious problem for all universities that receive federal funding – how do we manage all the requirements? – and many of them have come to us very recently from the federal government and it has to do with compliance, to the fact that if we don't follow the rules as it's stated the university's at risk of significant financial cost, okay? There are examples that we have today, and I can tell you University of Illinois, Yale, University of Pennsylvania and so on and so forth have had penalties – some going into \$100 million dollars – penalties, because people didn't follow the rules, in particular, when they did research with human subjects. It has to do with the IRB's. Very significant penalties. So we are just scared about doing anything that doesn't follow the rules. After 9/11 we have extra regulations, some of those have to do with export controls. We cannot export things. We cannot take our laptops outside of the country and then bring some information that is perhaps sensitive. And you have examples of faculty members that have gone to jail because they were found to violate one of these rules, okay? I mean you bring your laptop to Iraq or Afghanistan, one of those countries, and it has something that's sensitive, you can be subject to actually criminal investigation and so people have been found to be guilty of having those things like that, okay? So we have to be very careful about how do we manage that. So we have to carry a balance between allowing the faculty members to do their research and often that means to be free to do as much as you want, but at the same time to fulfill these regulations that we've had to obey by because we get money from the federal government. And I don't believe in doing this and I don't believe in doing that, I believe in having a balance, okay? We cannot be completely freewheeling and allow people to do whatever they want, because we'll be in trouble and I have to tell you that Indiana University has been in some trouble before I came here and that's what led to the integration of the office of research and the office of compliance. It has given to a number of reorganizations of the university because we were in trouble. Fortunately, we were not fined significantly for the failures that were not complying with federal regulations, but what that led to was the reorganization of the compliance office and the office of research, okay? So that's the source of why we have been integrating our offices. Now, as I said, one of the things that we want to do is we want to encourage people to be as creative as they can be. We want to

fund them to do the best work that they can do, and to do that often we need to provide them with resources, financial resources. I have to say that, as I said before, one of the strengths of Indiana University are the humanities, the arts and the humanities is one of our strengths, and yesterday I was meeting with some visitors from the University of Minnesota, the University of Iowa, North Carolina and they were quite impressed about how much support there is, internal support from the university, for the arts and humanities compared to their institutions. So we have to be glad about that, okay? One of the components that we have about that support comes from the New Frontiers funding. New Frontiers is something that was funded originally by the Eli Lilly Foundation, \$1 million dollars a year, and it has been in existence of about six years, okay? Now, I have to confess I'm a scientist and I like to be run by data. I like to be run by results and it's very hard for me to say that something worked out very well because someone tells me they worked out very well. I want to see what is the evidence for that. So soon after I came here I actually did a review of the New Frontiers grants that were awarded and the results of what those monies provided and resulted on. And first of all, the first thing I found is that there was not much data out there. Most people that got money didn't write the report they were supposed write at the end of their project, okay? So one of the first things I did is I said, 'Oh, we need to find out what happened.' And so people actually at that point then they replied and they submitted some report about what they had done and as a consequence of that I thought that – and after talking to many people in the arts and the humanities, not just here in Washington, in many places – we decided to change the IFA, the solicitation for the funding of the New Frontiers. And the changes, I think, that have been received well. In fact, I didn't make the changes, I always ask advice from people that are the experts and they are the ones that make the changes. And so what we did is that we reduced the number of solicitations. We made it into only one, but of major changes that we made were the following. First, before when people were not recommended for funding by the committees, they had to wait a whole year to apply again. And so we decided that for the people that were borderline in the funding, where the reviews were close but not quite strong enough to recommend them for funding, we decided to allow for a resubmission within the same year of people that were close, okay? So we funded sixteen proposals, to close to \$600,000 dollars the first round. We have eight resubmissions and we are about to make the final decision the reviewers had to review. It will get down to, I don't know, maybe \$800,000 or so, but I left a certain amount of money so that we could be flexible and nimble to respond to outstanding requests for funding for extraordinary projects. We didn't have that, and so we have had some requests for some projects that people think, you know, 'this is a once in a lifetime,' 'it just came out,' or some opportunity that we can do something with this and they will still have money to support those projects, okay? So that's with respect to the New Frontiers some of the changes that we have made and we'll see what happens. Next year we'll continue with this type of IFA or we'll change it again, okay? Now, a new thing that we started – and the one has to do with the

intercampus collaborations – it was started with a million dollars, a new one million dollars, for what is called the IUCRG, the Indiana University Collaborative Research Grants, and the conditions for that funding and the regulations came from the following facts. I won't be able to give you the numbers now, but if you look at the funding that the whole of Indiana University has had in large grants, large funding, for multimillion dollar grants, we have almost none, okay? We have submitted very few proposals, very few proposals, and we have been not very successful. The only proposal that has been successful in the \$20 - \$25 million dollars is the CTSI, the Clinical and Translational Sciences Institute, and that was funded by the National Institute of Health and of course we have to collaborate with Purdue, with Notre Dame, with Eli Lilly, with Cook. We really have to collaborate with everybody, because the first time we submitted the application it was only Indiana University Medical School and it was almost the last in the rankings by the reviewers. And once we collaborated, we brought everyone from the state, Regenstrief, I mean about fifteen groups have collaborated with this, we were in the top, okay? That's one example of a success story of a large grant being awarded to Indiana University, but we don't have many of those. We have very few of those. So the goal of this IUCRG is to try to form groups and collaborations of people with different disciplines that can actually form the basis for groups that can apply for those large grants, okay? So the conditions were you had to be the PI's, the co-PI's had to be from different disciplines, it had to be new projects, they had to tell where they were going to get the money from, okay? And they had to be innovative. So we actually got 165 proposals which is, as far as I hear, is the first time that so many proposals were submitted which to me indicates that there's a thirst by the faculty members in Indiana University to collaborate and to be more competitive in trying to get money from the external funding agencies. Unfortunately, we only had a million dollars, unfortunately, okay? I tell you unfortunately, because we funded less than 10% of all the proposals submitted. We have many more proposals who are very, very good, but we did not have enough money to support them, okay? So we funded sixteen grants that involve thirty-nine faculty members and six of those projects involve collaboration between Bloomington and IUPUI, the medical school and parts of IUPUI. I must tell you that I was told – and I have to check this – that the last joint proposal between PI and co-PI from Bloomington and IUPUI was funded in 2003, okay? So there is a challenge for us to try to establish collaborations, but I will tell you and I will give you some hope, very interesting hope, about the fact that that is because we haven't recognized some of the strengths of the university. It's not just here, but it's also in Indianapolis and here. So let me actually mention something that I've been trying to do in the last nine months. I've been trying to discover the strengths of the university, of the whole university, okay? And I'm going to give you an example that is actually indicative of something we were missing, I think, before about knowing who we are and that has to do with the area of epigenetics, and you may or may not know what epigenetics is, but it's a very important area of research today in medicine in the NIH. The NIH assigned \$190 million dollars in the road map

funding for that area. I can give you a number of examples. It's really a hot area of research in science today, and I can give you a number of examples that have been uncovered. For example, people thought that your genetic material determined what kind of health, illnesses, you were going to grow up in your life, but that's not true – not completely true, okay? There are other things that happen in the environment. There are other things that can happen when you are born, when you are in gestation, when you are in these things that can transform that completely. So you can have twins, genetically identical, that actually develop totally different types of illnesses. They may actually develop some mental diseases, one and not the other. You can develop some cancer, one and not the other. You know that, I mean, we can have a family history of cancer in the family, but not everybody gets cancer in the same family. So it is not only the genes that determines you're going to get cancer. There are other things that are happening, and those things that are happening can be related to environment, can be related to what you ate in gestation. And I tell you that, because there's just a recent paper, very important paper, that relates about the number of children that become obese because their mothers were undernourished when they were pregnant, because they were told not to eat, not to get too fat and all that. Well, their children, and this is a sixteen year study, their children actually develop obesity, okay? Okay, so what I discovered when I came to IUB, to Indiana University, is the fact that, in fact, we have a large number of researchers here in Bloomington, in Indianapolis and other places that work in this field, but every time I met a chair, for example, the chair of the biology department, and chair of the psychology department, a chair of the medical school and all that, they didn't know about all of the other people that were working on this field before, okay? So, right, we have fifty-six faculty members in Indiana University that list epigenetics in their research area. So we got them all together. Two weeks ago we had a workshop with all of them and they were in complete surprise, many of them, to discover that, you know, that one's doing bioinformatics, that guy was doing something in mental health, that one's doing something in cancer and we're trying to get all that group together now to be able to form a core to be able to apply successfully for large funding in the area of epigenetics. But that's an example, already we have six or seven strengths, that I have discovered in the university that were not highlighted before I came here and that involve people here and involve people there and it's the communication has not been as strong as it should be in terms of forming groups that can actually collaborate and do things. Now, this is for the part of research. To be able to do their research, I also had to reorganize the office completely. The office has been totally reorganized. We have a new assistant vice president for compliance, because I think compliance is very important, a person that only will look at compliance. We are in the process of trying to hire a new person, an associate vice president for coordinating collaborative programs university wide, okay? I'd like to emphasize at no extra cost for the university, we had to reorganize our expenditures in the office to be able to pay for that, okay? So our goal, again, is to provide the best administrative services to

people that do research with animals, do research with humans and that involves people in the humanities and also how we manage grant processing, submissions to the university. In that sense, you know, we are deploying a software that's going to be a leading software of universities at the middle of July, the end of July, that's called Koali-Coeus. I have to say we were in the twelfth century before we actually deployed that, because most universities were totally advanced and from where I came we had a software that allowed us to submit all of these proposals to the new office of grants [remark indistinct]. But now we're going to have state of the art, ahead of the curve, software that is going to be of benefit for the faculty members that can apply for external money, all kinds of external money, not only the federal but all kinds of external money. And so, since my time is up...

DOWELL: We have maybe a minute for wrap up.

JOSÉ: Okay, I have a minute. So one of the things I like to tell my staff is that we have to spend 75% keeping the trains running and keeping the trains running often can be more than 100% of your time. But if we don't spend 25% of the time trying to make innovative, transformative changes to the office, we'll remain behind the rest of the other institutions we are comparing ourselves against. So I try to do that. I often try to spend 25% of my time just thinking about how can we transform the office so that it will become – get best business practices, be innovative and be more successful and that's what we're trying to do. So thank you for your attention.

DOWELL: Alright, thanks. Can I open it up for comments and questions? As you can see we have most other campuses online there. Jack Windsor from Indianapolis, would you like to start?

JOSÉ: Hi, Jack.

WINDSOR: I'd like to thank you again, Jorge, for meeting me a couple weeks ago and as we talked then, communication was very important for faculty involvement. I've been asked since particularly with the grants, you've mentioned about collaboration, did you formally announce those university wide or...?

JOSÉ: Yes.

WINDSOR: Where could we find that information?

JOSÉ: You know, I tell you, you mean the IUCRG? The communication about this?

WINDSOR: Yes.

JOSÉ: Oh yes, of course. I tried to announce it as much as I could. You know, I did this maybe two months after I came here and so I asked people how do I let everybody know and I did this—

WINDSOR: No, who received the award?

JOSÉ: Yes, oh yes, of course, it's online. The abstracts are online, the number of proposals are online, everything is online. We tried to put everything in the new VPR site. Oh yes, yes, we put everything online just so that everyone can see, can look at it. I'm not sure how many people are looking at our new revamped VPR pulpit.

WINDSOR: Yeah, it might be helpful, you know, to shoot each campus an email to let them know it's been updated, because a lot of times now – I'm guilty – I do not go to your site to look. [laughter]

JOSÉ: And you know what? Now they can know exactly who's not been to our site. We can see who has [remark indistinct] we can, we can. No, actually I want to thank about the meeting we had the other day, because I think I want to establish closer collaboration with you. I found out surprisingly that I could send you emails. I can issue it to the whole faculty, because when I wanted to submit emails to the whole faculty, as I mentioned to you, I was told I only have four emails. The allotments was to be four a year, myself to submit to the faculty. Now I know now that I can send it to you, to Erika, and to Jack and they will distribute it to the whole world. So if they whole world doesn't read your emails, that won't be my fault. [laughter] Please.

TERRY: I have a series of questions, I guess. First one is, how many \$20 million grants or above are there out there that are not medicine or engineering?

JOSÉ: Well, we have recently applying – oh, of course! – they are in education.

TERRY: Education.

JOSÉ: The NSF has a grant just for education that are \$20 million dollar grants, which are transformative, educational grants and I noticed that we have not applied for any of those.

TERRY: Oh, okay, thank you. That's a good thing to know.

JOSÉ: Yes.

TERRY: But the bulk of them would be medical?

JOSÉ: Most of – well, it's very simple, I mean, the NIH has \$36 billion dollars to give out, the NSF has \$6 billion to give out, the Department of Education has much less money to give out, so obviously we have to [remark indistinct] the dollars out there.

TERRY: Dean Brater has been making a pitch to the Trustees the last several meetings for a huge investment in additional faculty in the IU School of Medicine to get those grants. In times of limited financial resources if you make that investment there you don't have money to invest elsewhere. To do what you want to do, to increase our number of those \$20 million or more grants, do we have to do what Dean Brater wants?

JOSÉ: No, I give you an example which is a very good example. We just an internal competition for something that's called Science and Technology Centers, okay? Those have \$20, \$25 million dollar grants – have dollars, funding from the National Science Foundation. I found that we have not applied for those at all, okay? So I ran an internal competition and we got seven proposals, big proposals – actually we started with twelve or so – they were reduced to seven. We have three outstanding groups of people that can go after those \$20 million dollar grants.

TERRY: So if I'm not misstating, what you're saying is that we now got that information about the research interests and abilities across the system and by tapping that rather as an alternative in tough economic times to hiring a whole bunch of very expensive medical faculty we might still get more of those grants.

JOSÉ: Yes, yes, I think that, you know, we have to mention something important, okay? We compete with the rest of the world. The medical school competes with the world. Everyone is moving into trying to hire those faculty in medical schools.

TERRY: Yeah?

JOSÉ: I have to tell you about a drop in the medical school ranking last year, because we don't have that type of faculty, okay? You just have to go and look at that and this actually – the chair of the Trustees – saw me immediately and said, 'Do you know this about this?' Okay? So the question is, do we want to be the medical school that we're going to have the best type of medical school we can to provide the services, not just about doing research, because the clinical services, and I have to say we have an outstanding set of groups in the state that are doing precisely things related to health care related things, okay? And we want to be competitive, we really need to do what the investment that we have to make. The investment doesn't have to necessarily come from us. Eli Lilly invested \$60 million dollars last year to try to hire some faculty and if you know how much money does it cost to hire a chair in the medical school, minimum is \$10 million, standard is \$25 million, for a new chair.

HENSHEL: Wow.

JOSÉ: Okay? And we wanted to look hard, we're not [remark indistinct]. We wanted to hire a person in the School of Public Health that is at Yale and she wanted \$50 million dollars investment to be hired.

TERRY: Yeah.

JOSÉ: And the fact is that it is a capitalistic system, right? This is a cost. This is where you have to invest. The problem is, where are we going to get that type of money? I mean this is a real problem.

TERRY: Then let me ask a related question, are we going to join Purdue or something in competing for the thing that New York City wants to start?

JOSÉ: You know, I have to tell you this, we were not even in the game.

TERRY: Okay.

JOSÉ: Okay? Just because I came from New York state, I knew about that, that happened before I came here. It was –

DOWELL: – You might want to give us a little background just to brush up.

JOSÉ: So the background is this. The background is – okay, sorry –

DOWELL: -- It's okay! I know what he's talking about, but I don't –

JOSÉ: Yes, so here's what happening. Many universities are trying to set up branches internationally – okay? – in the middle east, in China or in other countries. Well, some places like New York City have decided that they don't have their return on the investment for educational investments that the City University of New York makes, which is okay, but it's not that good. So what the mayor of the city decided to do is he said, 'Well, I don't need to work with the City University of New York only,' – this is very important to pay attention to – 'I'm going to open up a competition internationally, not just nationally, so that I'm going to give space and I'm going to give funding to outstanding universities to invest here to develop a campus from that university here.' The leading competitor, and not the only one because there are several, to set up a campus there is Stanford University, to set up an engineering school. And Stanford is putting down \$250 million dollars to set up a branch campus of Stanford University in New York City. But there were sixteen – twelve or sixteen – competitors and Purdue University was one of them. Now, we could have competed on that, okay? And we could have competed because the medical schools in New York City, Mount Sinai and Albert Einstein and all that put a proposal together to get that space and that financial support from the city. The city of New York has ten million people there plus about another ten in the surrounding area. It's about – much larger than the state of Indiana in population and their resources are tremendous. But having come from the state of New York, I can tell you certainly New York has larger amount of funding than California and Boston and all that, but has much less of economic impact than those cities or states have and New York wants to change that.

And I know, because I was part of a task force that actually looked into that. So we could have played a role, a competitive role, if we wanted to be in the competition, but you have to have money to compete. You have to put money on the table to do that. Now, unfortunately, we didn't know about that competition here. I mean, when I told people about that here, no one had heard about it, okay? And so we have to be all the time aware of the opportunities that arise out there and try to compete when we are strong – we could be strong in the competition, yes? So – but let me – I have one more thing, this is a real concern, you know, that the universities within the United States, the Harvards, the Stanfords and the Berkeleys start setting up branches in the state, okay? And that's going to be internal competition and if we are not nimble, flexible and try to innovate and be transformative, we're going to have a problem.

TERRY: I am an alum of Stanford and much of what I have learned about that is through their communications with their alums explaining how significant they see it as to their development.

JOSÉ: Yes. Sorry.

DOWELL: Okay, no it's okay. I just wanted to make some opportunity for other kinds of questions. Let's take one from away, from Indianapolis and then we'll come back to Bloomington for a couple hands here. Yes, Ed?

JOSÉ: Can I see who you are? You are Ed, but from where?

BERBARI: Okay, one of the things that we're hearing about is with limited submission grants, perhaps from NSF, that a decision may be made to now consider us, in this case, one university and only submit when there are three, for example, three from the entire IU system and then when we now have been able to submit, you know, from the separate campuses, and I'm wondering if that really fits in with your strategy of maximizing our capabilities for research.

JOSÉ: You know, first, no decision has been made. No definitive decision has been made about the limited submissions. I mean, I don't know where that came from. No final decision has been made. I'll tell what decision I would like to make, okay? I don't care about limited submissions. I care about winning one of those grants, okay? And I looked at the statistics and I looked at how many proposals have been submitted from Indianapolis and from Bloomington and many other places and it's no good, okay? So let me give you an example of what we're trying to do. We need to submit stronger proposals to win. Now the number of proposals is not what determines the results, okay? If I look at IUPUI we have submitted fifteen, but no one were funded. Bloomington may have submitted twenty-five and no one were funded. I don't like about that. Even when they tell me they were close, I don't care about close. I care about getting the money. Let me give you an example – yes! – because the success is the only thing that counts! I mean if you think about what's "close" doesn't appear in any statistics, okay? So

here's an example, you see, IUPUI has never submitted an IGERT (Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship –*Editor's note*) grant.

HENSHEL: Wow.

JOSÉ: Never. There was submission this year! However, you know, we have a group which I think would benefit significantly – we have a competition – we didn't have any proposals from IUPUI, even when you had a chance to submit a proposal for the internal competition. We got three proposals in Bloomington. One is trying to apply for, you know, the letter of intent. And we feel that there are people and there are groups in Indianapolis that can strengthen this proposal, so we are presently working together with people in Indianapolis and people here to see if we can submit a stronger proposal than when we call for a submission of a long proposal, a large proposal, next year. So it's not the limited submission that is the problem. It's not submitting strong proposals that could be funded. In short, at present no decision has been made limiting the submissions. No definitive decision has been made and second, we would like to get a collaboration between, in particular, two larger campuses in the university so that the proposals are stronger.

BERBARI: In understand.

JOSÉ: And now there are elements in Indianapolis that would make our proposal here stronger.

DOWELL: Ed, you want to follow up and then we'll...?

BERBARI: Okay, but I understand the stronger, but I think that the limit to have this internal competition in my mind does preclude quality – a large opportunity – I think it limits an opportunity and I'll give you an example that I think – now not every grant is a \$25 million dollar grant – but a lot of the grants that I think get limited submission requests from NSF are in the area of STEM education. And I think that both campuses could easily submit six grants – you know, three grants from each campus – in those kinds of cases, because we have a significantly different portfolio of STEM activities and to now all of sudden put us in a category where only we're going to submit three, you know –

JOSÉ: – But, but, but, let me ask you, you know this has been a statement that was not based on fact, that the university had definitively decided to limit the number of internal submissions, okay? So now let me add one more –

BERBARI: – I think you should now hear what people are concerned about! And so, I'm concerned about it.

JOSÉ: – But, but, but, you know, we – excuse me – we will make that decision and I just told you that we have made that decision so I don't understand your question.

DOWELL: Well, he's concerned about if the decision is made –

JOSÉ: – Of course, of course, of course –

DOWELL: – in what way –

JOSÉ: – Of course, so what I'm saying –

DOWELL: – will we start processing. He's saying he's concerned –

JOSÉ: – Yeah, of course and I understand that very well and I have to say, you know, when I looked at the success rates of live proposals, IUPUI has been very good at getting educational grants from the Department of Education, they can go to STEM from the NSF, they have been very successful about that. Less than here in Bloomington, and again if you give me ten proposals – okay? – and we have five per campus that I want to succeed when they are being reviewed by the external world I'll be incredibly pleased. I'll be incredibly pleased. Now what NSF has done and now NIH is doing is that they have an explosion in the number of proposals that were being submitted, and they noticed that they invested so much money and effort in reviewing non-competitive proposals that they decided to give that task to the universities and they say, 'You should do an evaluation of those proposals. You should do a serious careful evaluation and only submit this many,' okay? It wasn't us that decided on this limited submission. It was the funding agencies when they had an explosion of proposals, many of which were not competitive, okay?

DOWELL: Okay, let's take a question here, Hal?

EVANS: Yeah, I actually wanted to bring up a slightly different point related to grant administration, and it's been great what you've done with streamlining processes for some of the major problems. I want to point out one area that I think is looming, which is international collaborations. There's a lot of administrative roadblocks to effectively administering those kinds of grants where you have people collaborating internationally and I think it would be worthwhile to start considering that seriously. It's not a big issue right now, however –

JOSÉ: – What I can tell you –

EVANS: – [remarks indistinct] it's gotten bigger.

JOSÉ: – Yeah, we dealt with a problem recently about international collaboration. One of the difficulties sometimes we have is liability, okay? If something goes wrong, and the university's liable for a large amount of money, who's going to pay for that, okay?

EVANS: MmHm.

JOSÉ: So we have had a case recently and of course we would not want to take liability where we have no control of how to protect ourselves against liability. Having said that –

EVANS: – But there's more than just that –

JOSÉ: – Of course, of course –

EVANS: – There's a lot – there are a lot of roadblocks –

JOSÉ: – Of course, but having said that, you know, I will do everything we can do to allow collaborations internationally without risking the university at all. I mean, of course, we will always be happy to have collaborations and, in fact, I have had many myself – international collaborations. Yes, I have! In several different countries, actually.

EVANS: I think it would be a good idea to start looking critically at the way grants and international components are administered internally.

JOSÉ: Could you actually send me an email and tell me what are you concerned about and we will look into that?

EVANS: People, primarily IU employees abroad.

JOSÉ: We just had a serious problem – we just had a serious problem, someone was arrested in [indistinct] I tell you, because we are doing research there. No, but just tell me what the problems are and we'll find a solution.

EVANS: Sure.

JOSÉ: Just tell us what the problems are and we'll find a solution, okay?

DOWELL: Alright, IU East?

KATHURIA: My name is Hitesh and I am an assistant professor of biochemistry at IU East Richmond. I'm a relatively new faculty here and I have a request. Your Office of Research Administration is extremely helpful and I really appreciate what the office does for us when we submit a grant. I'd like to make a point here, last year when the Indiana University collaborative research grant was opened up, I submitted a grant with IUPUI Department of Mechanical Engineering and from Biochemistry here. All I got at the end was 'Your grant could not be funded.' So is there a way to give feedback at least to new faculty that these are the mistakes you're making, what you should do to improve –

JOSÉ: — Of course, of course, yes, I think that —

KATHURIA: — I do realize that our grants are being evaluated by our colleagues who are volunteers and their time is precious, but can there be [remark indistinct] involved?

JOSÉ: Absolutely, absolutely. And we did, in fact. A number of people that were not funded and as I said 165 and only 16 were funded, so you can imagine how many people wanted to know about the results. They were not written, because this was oral meetings. There were notes that were taken by my chief of staff, Faith Hawkins, and if you want to know what the reviewers said, just call her up, just get in touch with her and she'll read — you know it's a complicated thing they use — because it was not written in a way to be distributed. You should definitely look her up. In fact, she has spoken to a number of people because you need to know what they found that was not satisfactory for you to correct it. Absolutely, yes, yes.

DOWELL: Alright.

KATHURIA: And also, is there a way to see the full proposals that were accepted? I mean, is it — are there public documents —

JOSÉ: Of course, yes, they are online.

KATHURIA: —at least from IU East?

JOSÉ: They are online. —

HAWKINS: — Not the full proposals —

JOSÉ: — If you go to our home page —

HAWKINS: — the full — he's asking about full proposals, these are the abstracts.

JOSÉ: — Oh no, not the whole proposals, the abstracts are there. The abstracts are there. The abstracts —

KATHURIA: I was able to see the abstracts, there are fifteen of them there. I could not see the entire grant, because, you know, I'm just using this as a learning opportunity —

JOSÉ: — well, you know it's —

KATHURIA: — to see, okay, this is what got funded.

JOSÉ: Well, of course, it's a confidential information. I can tell you this, okay? I'm a physicist, and when I went to do neuroscience research, I wanted to read a full proposal that was funded. It was impossible, okay? I got the abstract and I talked to a number of program managers in NIH and they said, 'No, we cannot give you that information, because it's propriety.' It's what people propose to do. If you have it up there for other people to read, they may be able to

repeat what you were planning to do, or they will know exactly what protocols they were planning to use. So that's proprietary. We cannot give you that. I mean, because that's the secrets about the research, okay? Unfortunately.

HENSHEL: Just to add to that, you – this is not what I'm asking – but you could potentially when research is, you know, ten years old and it's closed off and there's papers written –

JOSÉ: – Yes. –

HENSHEL: – you know, those successful grants might be –

JOSÉ: – We should be able to do that, of course. –

HENSHEL: – if you get permission from the PI's.

JOSÉ: You need to get permission from the PI's, yes.

HENSHEL: Right, but if you get permission from the PI's on, you know, things that have been funded long ago –

JOSÉ: – Of course. –

HENSHEL: – and are successful that might be helpful to [remark indistinct] professors –

JOSÉ: – Yeah, in fact your advice is very good. The only way I could read a NIH proposal is because I found a friend. I created – I made a friend who was [laughter] otherwise I was not able to...

DOWELL: Alright, Diane you had a question, too?

HENSHEL: Yeah, I would like to bring up the issue of oversight and compliance and administration for research centers and institutes that you didn't really bring up but you did mention that as it is administration right now on research has essentially tripled or thereabouts and people are sort of concerned that the proposed regulations coming from IU are going to do something similar in a very short period of time and that it will be prohibitive to even run the institutes. So could you discuss this?

JOSÉ: Of course, I will. I will. So let me actually give you some information, okay? Between, between – and we aren't doing the regionals – between IUPUI and Bloomington we have close to 235 centers and institutes, okay? And a number of those institutes – you know I just went to IUPUI last week and I actually went to every single link of 112 that we have there – and over 30% of them don't lead to anywhere. They don't have any connection. And so what it turns out, 89 of the 112 are medical school centers and institutes. Now I will give you an example,

because I heard about this last week. And a number of those pertain to people that they were created by one person. I like to give this example, you see, always – why do you create centers and institutes? You don't want to replace departments. Departments do what they do because they specialize in doing what they do. The reason you create centers is because you have a new problem, a new thing, that requires or needs the collaboration of people from different disciplines. That's the reason you create a center or institute in principle. No 'Because I say 240 and it's all heterogeneous.' And so, here's an example that I'd like to give you, because I directed a center for ten years myself in interdisciplinary and complex systems. So there is a problem also in that we have an explosion, a demographic explosion, of blue elephants in the world, okay? And blue elephants are having a tremendous impact in the weather and in energy related problems and all that, and so a group of people say, 'Wow, that's a very important problem, and we know how to attack solving and dealing with describing how blue elephants behave and so on and so forth. So you form a center, you know, you have a director, a sub-director, and all that. You require funding from the university, sometimes you may get funding from the federal agencies because it's real serious problem, important problem. And so you have forty people. You have secretaries. You have, you know, postdocs and so on and so forth. All of a sudden there is a viral epidemic that kills all of the blue elephants. There are no longer any blue elephants around, but the reason why you created the center is to study blue elephants. And so we ask the question, 'Should we continue having a center for blue elephants in the institution? Should we spend money in those centers and institutes when there are no longer any blue elephants out there?' So you give me the question – you give me the answer – I'm sorry – can you give me the answer? Now let me backtrack a little bit, so there are many centers and institutes that have been created and that are created in universities all the time, okay? Sometimes some of those institutes are created because you want to retain the person here. Some unusual centers that it is only the director and there's nobody else, but just the director. Sometimes some of these centers have a laptop or a computer that identifies the centers and the question is, are those adding value to the reputation and to the excellence of a university having those centers where nothing is being done – not much is being done – right? So how could we modify that situation? Now let me start from the beginning, this idea of having a policy or guidelines for centers and institutes is not new. Bloomington has its own policies. I can go and look at the policies that they have at IUPUI and some of them are very strict. I mean, these signature centers and all that, they created about eight or nine of them and only three of them are worth continuing existing, because they do not fulfill the requirements that it was supposed to fulfill. So this thing is supposed to not modify any of the administrative oversight of centers and institutes that exist today. The deans – let me – the deans will continue being the ones that will have the responsibility. And the oversight of centers and institutes will be in the school.

HENSHEL: Uh huh.

JOSÉ: Within the school. When those centers and institutes overlap, different schools or campuses, it could have the same campus, okay? In this campus they are overseen by the now associate vice president research or vice provost for research in this campus. And they oversee those centers and institutes, okay? And we have to look at their performance and how they're doing and so on and so forth. The same happens in the regional campuses and in Indianapolis they report to the chancellor or the deans or the chairs in the medical school, okay? So what we were trying to do is to we're trying to give a uniform way of looking at centers and institutes and centers university wide. And we would hope, and we have one example at least of intercampus centers and institutes, that they will report to my office. Only those will be overseen by my office. All the others will be overseen by the person in charge of those things as of today, okay? Now, the only thing that it is important to do is to find out if those centers and institutes still fulfill their original goal for their creation. Are they performing, are they not performing and who's going to decide that? Not my office. It has to be decided by the experts in the discipline or in the type of center that they have, okay? Someone has to decide, I mean, are you fulfilling what you were supposed to do or not, because it costs money. It costs space in many instances. It costs resources. We are short on resources and we may want to create new centers and institutes, because there is a pink elephant that just came around, okay? And now we have to study pink elephants, which are actually totally different genetically from the blue elephants. And so we really need to create a new center to study those types of elephants. So here is a thing that happened, okay? And I just – I just came – I was asked to do that, okay? The president wanted to do that and I decided to do that and I wanted to communicate with everyone I could. We had all the deans that I could get in touch with, all of the vice presidents, everyone contributed. In fact, what you see as a draft, it was not just developed by us, it was written by many people, okay? Having said that, now I know that I can do – I can send it out to everybody to review and people are making comments and we're going to include some of those comments, okay? That are part of this thing, but the thing is that we want to have the best business practices for running centers and institutes which play an important role in a university, but having 240 is a little bit of a large number, if you go to other institutions that have fifteen or sixteen. I can advise something that may happen, I mean, this is what the dean of the medical school just told me, they have 89 and they will be reduced to 22, okay? And this is what's not only because of our policy, they were trying to that themselves, and what they discovered is where many of these centers and institutes they did not fulfill their original goal when they started. And they will be reduced to – what 22, 23? – out of 89. So the number of centers and institutes at IUPUI is really going to be reduced a lot, because 80% of some centers were from the medical school.

HENSHEL: But there is an effort or a goal not to increase administrative overhead?

JOSÉ: No, no, nothing like that! Nothing like that. How could we do that? We are overstretched, okay? We integrated all of the compliancing and we have very few people to do what we need to do. We need to grow, and now we want to include all of the hospitals for the IRB's and I want to include all of these people and where is the money going to come from? We need new people!

HENSHEL: Right, but I'm talking about from the center director perspectives, because there's concern been expressed about the time costs.

JOSÉ: You know, whatever the deans want to do, wanted to do, or have been doing, they should continue doing what they were doing before.

HENSHEL: Okay.

JOSÉ: Okay? I would not want to tell the deans what to do. I just give them a framework, in which they can assess themselves. That's the responsibility to assess is, do those centers and institutes justify their existence. That's all I'm asking people to do. I'm giving them the framework.

HENSHEL: Sure.

JOSÉ: Okay?

DOWELL: Okay, let's take another question, Steve?

BURNS: So alright, Jorge, one of the things I think that people are concerned about is there are a lot of initiatives and that's good –

JOSÉ: – I had to do that! – [laughing]

BURNS: – but it's sort of – it'd be probably helpful, you're revamping the website and using that as a hub of communication, so as you consider initiatives, sort of a period where you say, 'Hey, we're thinking about...' Before you even get to the point of drafting policy, because that automatically, I think, causes responses. But a fact-finding period, a chance to share people's responses so we know what people are commenting on, we can get up to speed. So in a sense, a deliberative process where you collect the information and respond I think would help in the communication a lot.

JOSÉ: Very well, we'll do that. In particular, as I said, anything that has to do with faculty, that will affect the faculty, of course faculty should play a role in trying to decide these things. That's okay. There are certain things that I've told the administrator – okay? – who should be the assistant vice president for compliance – that has nothing to do with, even if you have ex-faculty, has nothing to do with faculty. That's the most qualified person to do...

BURNS: I will say, though, there are times administrative issues backfire because this university as a whole is so diverse that it may seem like, 'Gee, that's a no-brainer,' and then something else it's like whack-a-munch, you know? You pop it down there, and it pops up over there, so...

JOSÉ: Yeah, you know – yes, along the lines of what you said, I think, I met with Erika and Jack, and we're going to meet at least twice a year or more if we need to just so that we can talk about these things and then we'll bring them up to you, to all of you. I mean, the more the merrier, I think.

DOWELL: Do we have any questions from Indianapolis or one of the campuses? Somebody who hasn't asked a question first, if there's anybody, I see your hand, Hitesh. Anybody else? Okay, one from Hitesh, then.

KATHURIA: I want a question. Is there a possibility – and you can go ahead and laugh on it – but is there a possibility to create a small pool of money only for regional campuses, so that only regional campuses compete for it? One of our professors in our schools, he's very vocal about it. He keeps saying that there is a bias between the research campuses and regional campuses. So is there a kind of way the regional campuses compete only?

JOSÉ: If you look – let me actually say this – if you look at the amount of funding that the regional campuses have gotten – in fact they were one of those sixteen grants, okay? – and if you look at how many New Frontiers grants they have gotten, they have gotten quite a number. And so here I have the following problem, okay? We would like to enhance the excellence of the university and there are excellent projects on some of the regional campuses and when they succeed, they succeed because of the quality of the projects, okay? Now, unless we set up some special fund that only applies to the regional campuses [remark indistinct]. One the things that I've forgot to say – and I wanted to say – is that the funding for the regional campuses, the number of proposals submitted, the number of money received, has dropped and plummeted significantly. It has plummeted and I can give you the numbers because it's significant. Of course, the Bloomington campus also plummeted, I think. So we are very concerned. I can tell you about on the regional campuses – I have this thing here – we dropped 56% –

DOWELL: – From last year, is that what you're saying? –

JOSÉ: – in the number of proposals submitted March to March, okay? And the number of awards has dropped 24% and the expenditures have dropped 6% because that's the money they got before. So I see a significant drop in the interest of faculty on the regional campuses, first of all to submit proposals. We've had a 56% drop in the number of proposals submitted, okay? And then we have a 25% on the awards, on the amount of money submitted. I can tell you that the situation has not been good at Bloomington and Indianapolis either.

BUCUR-DECKARD: Would that be connected to the 46% amount of time that was spent on administrative duties?

JOSÉ: Of course, of course, but I'm looking for a one-year change. And, of course, in previous years this 46% has been around for ten years, I mean we would have an increase –

BUCUR-DECKARD: – going from one year to the next?

JOSÉ: Yes. Yes, please?

DOWELL: Okay, Herb?

TERRY: I just want to bring you in on a conversation and a kind of promise that occurred before you arrived. When, as you pointed out, we got in trouble on this campus under human subjects and ORA's office was organized and that sort of thing, many of the faculty who were suddenly confronted with having to address compliance matters that they might have ignored in the past protested that the things they were being asked to do were counterproductive. And basically the response of the president and the provost to them and to the faculty governance was that we needed to get our house in order first. But that once we got our house in order, we would be proactive as an institution in trying to get federal policies and this sort of that thing that were counterproductive, that were costing us time or money, changed. And I hope that commitment that came out of the process of getting our house back in order is not forgotten.

JOSÉ: We are not yet with our house in order.

TERRY: Okay.

JOSÉ: I think we have a significant number of problems still and what my staff always tells me is we need more money, but where am I going to get more money when we're trying to actually cut the budget because the state wants to cut the budget? Let me actually – this is a national problem.

TERRY: Yes.

JOSÉ: And one of the difficulties we have, I mean, let me say briefly, but it's a big problem. When Vannevar Bush created the National Science Foundation and decided that the government should support research in universities – that's after the Second World War, that's when the whole thing started – the government negotiated with universities for a certain return for the expenditures that you do if you carry out research they want us to do, because most of the research we do, they tell us what to do, it's really not true that we are free to decide on what to do. Well, that calculation that was done in the fifties – forties and fifties – is the same as today. Maybe it was modified slightly in the seventies. And it turns out because of

all the administrative unfunded demands we have from the government, we are spending so much money in fulfilling compliance. If you look at the amount of money the university invests in the research that is done in the university, we don't make money. We spend 25% of those \$438 million dollars that we report as expenditures comes from our own money, because the government is not reimbursing us for all the research that we are doing. So we're not going to get money from the federal government, because they're cutting everything today. So we have actually a guy that's trying to defend us, okay? He's actually a guy that's in the White House, he's a guy that got a Nobel Prize in physics a few years ago, and what we're trying to convince the government is to do what they're doing, what Obama said he was going to do, reduce the number of regulations. The number of regulations has exploded, not just in research for universities, it has exploded in everything, the EPA, the weather, all those. So we are telling the government that if they reduce the amount of administrative costs that we have to incorporate – I mean, to do it because of compliance – that's like giving us money back, okay? So as soon as we succeed in some way with the government we'll reduce the amount of administrative work, but the risk for the university about not fulfilling some of those compliance regulations that they ask us to – the University of Illinois spent about \$100 million dollars and it was put under receivership by the NIH for some time, okay? No one could use their money and all that and we were lucky here, because all of these compliance problems we had with the USDA and so on and so forth didn't cost except we had to reorganize and it cost some money, but we were not fined with penalties from outside. But well, you know, we're all the time just afraid, because the risk is so high. And when the federal government, the FDA, FBI comes here and I tell you I had an experience in Buffalo, we're in real trouble and the amount of money is really serious. The cost. Yes? Of course, we're always trying to reduce administration, who wants to do that?

DOWELL: Do we have any other questions? We're about out of time. I don't see anybody. Alright thank you everyone for an interesting year at the University Faculty Council and thank you very much Vice President José for being here with us.

JOSÉ: Well, thank you for inviting me.

TERRY: You said comments were welcome, I'd like to make one. Remember that this is Erika's last meeting as [remark indistinct, applause] good job.

DOWELL: Thank you, Herb. Thank you, everyone, it's been a pleasure working with you.

MEETING ADJOURNED: 4:27