

Agenda
Indiana University
UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL
Indiana Memorial Union Frangipani Room
Bloomington
September 23, 2008
1:30 P.M. - 4:30 P.M. (EST)

Attendance

MEMBERS PRESENT: Simon Atkinson, Carol Baird, Karl Besel, Christian Bjornson, Jacqueline Blackwell, Donald Coffin, Janice Cox, Diane Dallis, Erika Dowell, Cathy Foos, Charles Gallmeier, Steven Gerencser, Mary Gray, Jerry Hinnefeld, Joyce MacKinnon, Michael McRobbie, Bill Orme, Jonathan Plucker, Marcus Pomper, John Minor Ross, Herb Terry, Joe Wert, Karen West, Kim White-Mills, L. Jack Windsor, Marianne Wokeck

MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT:

MEMBERS ABSENT: Charles Bantz, Alan Bender, Bruce Bergland, Dana Blue, Elizabeth Boling, Terri Bourus, Bruce Burgun, Stephen Burns, James Capshew, Nick Clark, Harold Evans, Lucas Fields, Mary Fisher, Greg Garrett, Kathleen Gilbert, Stuart Green, Karen Hanson, J.B. Hill, David Lindquist, Lesa Lorenzen-Huber, Padraic Kenney, Anna McDaniel, Eduardo Nieto, Michael Nusbaumer, Sandra Patterson-Randles, Nasser Paydar, William Potter, Una Mae Reck, William Schneider, Alan Schmetzer, Michael Wartell, L. Jack Windsor, Michael Wolf.

GUESTS: Karen Adams (President's Office), Geoff Conrad (OVPR, IUB), Julie Knost (Office of Affirmative Action), Kelly Kish (President's Office), Lloyd Kolbe (HPER), Craig Dethloff (Faculty Council Office), Patricia Pierson (Faculty Council Office)

1. Approval of Minutes

http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/minutes/AY08/UFCMinutes_04.22.2008.pdf

2. Presiding Officer's Business (10 minutes)
(President Michael McRobbie)

3. Agenda Committee Business (20 minutes)

(Professor Herb Terry and Professor Simon Atkinson)

Circular U1-2009: <http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY09/U1-2009.pdf>

Circular U2-2009: <http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY09/U2-2009.pdf>

Circular U3-2009: <http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY09/U3-2009.pdf>

4. Question/Comment Period* (20 minutes)

(President McRobbie and Professors Terry and Atkinson)

5. Promotion & Tenure Review in Faculty Ranks by the Joint Faculty/Administration Working Group (30 minutes).

(Professor Alfred Guillaume, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, IUSB and Professor Joe Wert, IUS)

http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/addDocs/AY09/PT_draft.pdf

6. Report on New Frontiers. (30 minutes)

(Geoff Conrad, Director of the Mathers Museum of World Cultures)

http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/addDocs/AY09/NF_Averages.pdf

http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/addDocs/AY09/NF_Summary.pdf

http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/addDocs/AY09/NF_Quickfacts.pdf

*Faculty who are not members of the Faculty Council and who wish to address questions to President McRobbie, Professor Terry, and Professor Atkinson should submit their questions to the Faculty Council Office at ufcoff@indiana.edu. Meetings are open to the public. Our documents are available at: <http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc>.

AGENDA ITEM #1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MCROBBIE: Alright, ladies and gentlemen, why don't we get moving, get started. What I'm going to do first is go around the other campuses who are connected by teleconference I believe, and to who we've got there. Maybe they could say who's there or who's coordinating things at the other end. Firstly, IUPUI? Anybody there? IUPUI?

BLACKWELL: Jacqui Blackwell.

WHITE-MILLS: Kim White-Mills.

BAIRD: Carol Baird.

MCROBBIE: Okay, that's it for IUPUI? Okay, IU South Bend? Anybody from IU South Bend here?

GERENCSEK: We're here.

MCROBBIE: Not here, I'm sorry, but on the phone? IU Southeast?

WERT: Joe Wert.

MCROBBIE: So Joe you're there? Okay.

BJORNSON: Chris Bjornson.

MCROBBIE: Okay, anybody else?

BJORNSON: Chris Bjornson.

MCROBBIE: Okay, thanks. IU East?

FOOS: We're here.

MCROBBIE: You're here. Anyone dialing in from the campus, on the line? Okay, and IU Kokomo? Anyone from Kokomo on the teleconference? Okay. Anybody else on the teleconference who...shouldn't be there? (laughter) No one else? Alright.

UNKNOWN MALE SPEAKER: They can listen, they just can't talk.

MCROBBIE: That's right, that's right. They might be beamed straight to ESPN or something. Okay, so let me start firstly by welcoming you all to the first meeting of this academic year of the UFC, and I know there's a number of new members, actually quite a lot of new members, although I certainly recognize some of the faces of our new members and old members, as well. So welcome, certainly to all the new members of the UFC for this year. We tend to start with a motion that approves the minutes, of course not all of you were here for our last meeting so feel free to weigh in on this motion if you wish. Are there any comments on the motion which - can I ask for someone to put the motion? Yeah, and a second for that? Any discussion on the minutes? Yes...

GERENCSEK: I have a question actually. Is (inaudible) to the matter we just accomplished which was to see that those persons attending by teleconference are included as members present. I know at least a couple of times last year because the teleconferencing didn't always hook up at the beginning of the meeting many of those who got in five minutes, ten minutes late were not included as members present. So I wonder if there's a way to accomplish that, I know whether it's for the last meeting or make sure that we're doing it for ongoing meetings as well.

MCROBBIE: Okay, maybe we could let Craig and the co-Secretaries discuss some way to record that. I think we've got the names of everybody who was on the teleconference, too for this meeting. So any other discussion, any other comments on the minutes of the last meeting? There being none, let me put the motion, all those in favor signify by saying 'aye.' (Aye). Against? It's carried I think unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM #2: PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS

MCROBBIE: Alright, I've got a series of things I'm going to report on to you. I want to start firstly by commenting on the situation at IU Northwest. I think as we all know the campus was badly affected by flooding starting not this weekend just finished, but the previous weekend. I believe it started happening late on Saturday. Interestingly from what I understand and from what people up there understand. It wasn't caused by flooding from the river overflowing its banks or the levees breaking or anything like that. It appears to be caused by storm water backing up through the storm water system and that causing the flooding. It flooded the lowest part of the campus and the carpark at the, I think, the north end of the campus and then gradually moved south and made its way into a number of buildings. The situation is very serious on the campus. I met with

Chancellor Bergland at the Chancellor's meeting actually early Thursday morning and he briefed us on the situation. And some of it had not been, to be frank, particularly clear from some of the written briefings that were coming through. Based on his briefing at that meeting, I decided to fly up Friday afternoon which I did. I took Vice President Clapacs with me, a number of his senior staff, Paul Sullivan and Hank Hewetson, head of facilities and engineering, and also Vice President Sample and we flew up and spend the afternoon on the campus and we were given a pretty extensive tour of all the flooding there. I think it's fair to say and I believe that the Chancellor has announced this, correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe it's fair to say that Tamarack Hall is probably going to be abandoned. It was very, it is very, badly affected by the floods and the whole lower crawlspace area and I guess the orchestra areas are just completely full of water I think from memory a couple feet of water there as well. And that is in a building that was already in pretty poor shape and was interestingly on our priority list for funding from the legislature for replacement at some point. Something is going to have to be done, obviously, about that building. It was, I think, instructive that the relatively new life sciences building, one of the sciences buildings there was built and it was bogged up somewhat probably, I don't know, two or three feet, and it appears to be completely unaffected as far as I know by any of the flooding there. A number of other buildings there, probably four or five, were affected to greater or lesser degree. Most, it looks like, can probably be got back in action pretty quickly. One or two may take a little more work and there are some other ongoing issues there. As of the last report I got this morning, the flood water is receding but slowly. When I was there after we toured the campus I convened a meeting of all the relevant people on the campus and the people I'd brought with me and took a series of steps to try to provide additional help and assistance to the campus and one thing I've asked to have done is a hydrological study to actually find out a) what caused this, and secondly what can be done to rectify it in the future. And that I've asked to be done pretty expeditiously as well. But the key point I wanted to make when I was there was that the gents on the campus should understand that they should ask for anything they need to help them get the campus open again. I think the expectation as I understand it is that the campus will - there's a good chance it will open next Monday. It could even have maybe be opened by the end of this week but I think people wanted a little longer to get everything up and running. Assuming that there isn't any more rain, and I gather there's none forecast. Our deepest sympathy goes out to our colleagues at IU Northwest. I know that coming on top of a number of grievous losses they've had, their Robert Berkley who was tragically killed in a car accident and I gather a number of other senior staff members who died of natural causes have obviously affected a relatively small campus pretty severely and the flooding coming on top of that is an extremely unfortunate situation. Our deepest sympathy to all of you. I have, as I said, instructed all the relevant offices here to provide all the assistance and help that they can and I've told that to the Chancellor and others up there to let us know what needs, what they need, in order for us to try to address the problems there. So I wanted to bring that to the attention of the UFC, so that you understand the gravity of the situation here. Clearly the number one priority is to recommence the academic functioning of the campus as soon as possible. I sent out a note to all members of the campus over the weekend as well that it was our goal to try to achieve that as quickly as possible. Clearly, in a situation where the campus actually had a significant increase in enrollment and

credit hours, this is a blow and I'm hoping that we will be able, the campus will be able, to address things rapidly so that it doesn't see too much attrition to those excellent enrollment numbers that they had seen this year. Let me stop at that point because this might be one where people might have questions and I'll try to go through the rest of my report reasonably quickly. Does anybody have any questions at all or any comments? The colleagues from Northwest who are here, would they like to make any comments at all?

COFFIN: I just want to thank you on behalf of the faculty again for coming up. It meant a lot to us and we feel good that we know we can count on you, and so I appreciate that.

MCROBBIE: And don't hesitate to let us, you know, know directly if there are any issues that need attention that we can help with in anyway. I brought it to the attention of the governor and to the higher education commission and so on so people understand and they understand that this is not going to be business as usual in terms of trying to address these issues on the campus. Any questions or comments from anybody? Okay, let me go on.

Secondly I just wanted to comment also on the budget submission that we hope one of the things gets done over the summer of a budget year be the House will commence operations probably they will start organizing in December once the election is over and then the budget commission starts with a vengeance in January goes through to the 30th of April. This, as you'll understand, is one of the most important events that happens every two years for the University and as I'm sure you'll also understand, it is going to be something to which I will be giving a lot of attention and devoting a lot of my time over that period for roughly from now because it's starting to rev up right through to the end of April. To put it in perspective, we have requested, and some of this comes very much under guidelines that we're given by the state budget agency, but we've requested about \$40 million dollars as an increase in our operating request, operating budget, to the state. We've asked for, and this is formula driven, we've asked for \$58 million for R&R. It's particularly important to preserve that because that's what we use for the vast range of small and medium sized repairs, renovations all around all the campuses. We've asked for nearly \$300 million dollars for new capital projects which included a replacement for Tamarack Hall at IU Northwest and that clearly is, the recent problems at IU Northwest with the flooding, I think are going to obviously elevate the importance of that being addressed very substantially and then as I think some of you may have seen, we were able to form a, we called it the Innovation Alliance with Purdue and have asked for jointly, which is I think relatively unprecedented, we've asked the legislature for \$35 million dollars to support a pretty broad based initiative in the life sciences. And I took that to our Trustees and President Cordova of Purdue took it to her Trustees and both sets of Trustees passed it unanimously. And this is a note of unanimity that has been taken note of by the powers that be in this state and also by the, obviously, members of the legislature as well. So that is a very substantial request, one of the biggest we've ever put to the legislature and as I said, in order to assure we get at least some of that, I'm going to need to be devoting a lot of my time, as will most of the senior members of the

administration on all campuses and at the university level. Another point that I wanted to make thirdly was the number of records that have been broken over the last three or four months, too. And I think anybody who is a member of the University, faculty members in particular should feel very pleased and very proud of some of these records. We have seen across all campuses with one exception, and that was a very modest exception, record numbers of students certainly by recent measures. And as I said, it's very unfortunate that after a very good increase, Northwest has suffered the difficulties it has. But also, we have people measuring, we have people compiling the SAT's who have seen a significant increase in SAT's around the universities, the campuses as well. We have broken the 100,000 figure for the first time in the University's history in terms of the number of students we have and we broke, on the Bloomington campus, the 40,000 figure for the first time and the 30,000 figure in Indianapolis for the first time, and at the same time the overall quality has I think increased. There was small dip in student numbers in Kokomo, but then I believe there was an increase, a small increase in credit hours which indicates probably that the composition of the campus is moving a little from a reliance on part-time to more full-time students, more traditional students, because they're taking more credit hours. So that, those are excellent figures and it's clear that a lot more Indiana students are staying in the state as well. We announced over the summer, a couple of months ago, that the university achieved a record amount of externally funded research, \$525.3 million dollars, the largest figure ever in the history of the university. And I think every faculty member at the table sure has been involved in some way, in research projects over the years and should feel personally very pleased and very proud of that wonderful achievement. And it's particularly meritorious I think in face of federal funding becoming so much more competitive. Our success rate on average for federal grants has gone from one in three to one in five and in spite of that, we increased the amount of federal funding which was about half the total by 25%. So it's a remarkable accomplishment and the faculty members are really, and students I'm well aware of the role that graduate students play and of course the role that many, many staff members play too, are all to be congratulated on that wonderful achievement. Private sector support, private sector support we also announced a new record just over \$400 million, \$408.6 million dollars in the last financial year in private sector support. That was another new record that I think indicates that the alums and other supporters of the University are being particularly generous. Over the last couple of Trustee meetings a significant number of new construction projects have been approved and we now have across the University either in planning or under construction or expected to be under construction soon over 50 major projects which I believe is probably a record for the number of projects at any one point. And hopefully after the next budget session we might be able to get a few more moving as well. The number of international students, which I think is an important gauge of our international engagement, is up as is I believe though these figures aren't finalized yet, the number of IU students overall who spent periods of time in study abroad activities which is certainly a priority of mine. That's a series of records all of which had been announced over the summer since we last met, but all of which I'd like to think every faculty member in the room would take great pride in and be delighted to hear about. I could pause here for a minute to see if there are any comments. There are quite a few things to report on, but if there's any questions or comments?

HINNEFELD: Excuse me, sir.

MCROBBIE: Yeah?

HINNEFELD: Could you comment on those budget submissions? Other than the new initiative are those sums similar relative to previous submissions? Are there any notable increases or decreases in those budget categories?

MCROBBIE: The operating request is roughly for, is roughly driven by, criteria that they give us. And it doesn't, for example, include inflation. And whether we get an inflation adjustment will be a matter that gets negotiated out during the session. So that's to some extent formula driven. R&R is formula driven. The capital projects, that's maybe the largest capital request we've ever put. And one has to realistically understand that we're not going to get all of that. At best we've achieved around 100 million dollars in the past. There are some exceptional projects this time that may affect that, but there's also, realistically I think people know this, there is a resistance to capital projects and supporters too. So that is as well a large figure. And it includes a project on every regional campus too, so it's a very broad ranging proposal. And the Innovation Alliance, we have tended nearly every budget session to have some special request supporting the development of some area of research that we feel there is a good opportunity to get support from the legislature for. We got some last year for the Life Sciences Initiative. This is a development in refinement and enhancement of that as well. We've done some proposals that involve technology in the past as well. So that's - it is, I think, large by historical terms. And it is to some, I think again, it doesn't surprise people to hear that how successful we are will be determined to some extent by the economic situation as people foresee it or see it around the end of the first quarter of the next calendar year. I wanted to announce that, as I announced to the Trustees on I think it was Thursday that I have established a President's Diversity Fund that is focused on two key things really. Both the recruitment of a more diverse student / faculty / staff base in the university and the retention of the minority faculty, faculty from other areas like that, that we have at the moment. This will be a million dollar fund. It's open to all campuses. There, I believe if you go to the website, the Office of the Vice President for Diversity and so on, Equity and Multicultural Affairs, I've given him a very long name. If you go to that website, Ed Marshall's website, it will be Ed Marshall's website, you should find the form for proposals. Proposals have to go in through the Chancellor or the Provost who will comment on them and approve them and so on. And then they go to a committee that Vice President Marshall will chair and then he'll make recommendations to me. And he and I will make the final decisions. This is an attempt to do something a little new. It's an attempt to try to unleash a certain amount of creativity from all the faculty members and staff and maybe some of the students on the campuses to look at, to try to find new approaches to expanding, increasing and enhancing diversity. There has been significant commitment of funding in this area but the results have been mixed: good in some areas, not so good in others. This is an attempt really to try to identify new ideas, creative ideas for maybe parts of the University that haven't had the opportunity to come up with proposals and to have their proposals funded and put in place. So that is, that should be

functioning pretty much straightaway. I don't know, is Karen here? Is that up on the website yet? I'm not certain, but it's meant to be, but it will be up on the website very soon if it's not already.

Also, over summer, it's been very busy, I approved a basically, based on a report that I received from a committee on sustainability on the Bloomington campus, I approved an interim, well it was an interim proposal for the implementation of components of that proposal which will include the funding of a full-time diversity, I'm sorry, a full-time sustainability officer on the campus. And that's the details of that were all made public a few weeks ago. And the committee that prepared the report will continue in place as an advisory committee to the diversity, I'm sorry, I'm mixing the two up, the sustainability officer and to other people as well who are supporting that initiative. I, this is something that I think each campus is going to have their own views about, as to the relative importance of these issues on their campus because they may already be addressing them in various ways. I'm commending this to the Chancellors to look at, and I know some of them are already doing some things to address this and we'll leave it to them to decide, at this stage anyway to them, to decide how they want to proceed with any initiatives or actions they want to take in the sustainability area. There is, you'll remember there was a report on the structure of the Core Schools at IU that I initiated last year. I have received the report back, the report's been seen by the co-Secretaries, and I have basically approved that report and it will be the approval of that should be making its way to the relevant people in the next couple of days. I expect there may be an interesting discussion of some of that at some point and that's for a future meeting possibly. Searches; the IU East search is nearing completion. Unfortunately, we didn't get it done before Chancellor Person went to Flint, Michigan, Michigan at Flint, but Cathy's continuing to take on the role of chairing the committee for which I'm most grateful down to final interviews and so on. I'm expecting that I'll get recommendations from the committee in the next, I would say two or three weeks, something like that.

FOOS: We've had two campus visits we have two more coming up this week and next.

MCROBBIE: Right and also with the retirement of Chancellor Bergland coming up and also the resignation of Chancellor Person, obviously I want to commence searches next academic year for both of the replacements as well. Now, I've forgotten when our last meeting was, but just for the sake of the record I wanted to remind you that as I think this may be before, it was, that after we last met I believe the Intellectual Property Policy was passed by the Trustees and the Family Leave Policy, that was at the main meeting of the trustees, and the Family Leave Policy was also passed by the Trustees at the June meeting. It was basically the one that had previously been discussed at some length with faculty governance though an exception has been made for clinical faculty in the medical school. But the rest was as previously discussed. So the UFC should be, I think, reasonably pleased that those two important policies have both now been placed as passed by the Trustees. I believe the Family Leave Policy is, will be reviewed after a year, so the Trustees are at the moment very concerned about these kinds of expenses and want to keep a close eye on them which is their responsibility so it'll be looked at again

in a year. And that is, that's the key things I wanted to comment on. Now, let me just ask an omnibus, any questions on any of that or comments from anybody? Yeah?

HINNEFELD: The diversity fund, is that a redistribution of existing funds?

MCROBBIE: No, that's a new fund.

HINNEFELD: That's a new fund.

MCROBBIE: That's a new fund, yeah, right. And as I said, it comes out of my office and it's open to all campuses. And we will then assist future funding based on how successful this is as an initiative. Other? Any other questions? Okay. There being none, let us move on to Agenda Item #3, Agenda Committee Business. I think Herb, you have the cord here.

TERRY: I do.

AGENDA ITEM #3: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS

TERRY: I do. First of all, there's been a number of 'dings' here suggesting that some people may have joined us since the last time we polled the rooms. We had a request earlier to try to improve the accuracy of our records of people who are attending at a distance. If you have joined a group that was already polled or if you have come, I think this is possible, new to the conversation, would you please speak up? And let's just open this rather than go around the campuses. Anybody joined the group since this was last polled, and if so would you give us your name and campus.

WINDSOR: Yeah, this is Jack Windsor, IUPUI.

COX: Jan Cox, IUPUI.

TERRY: Is that all? Okay, I'll ask perhaps at the end of the session we may poll again just to see if anyone has joined during the course of the meeting. Well, first of all, you have in your packets at your tables the three traditional handouts of the UFC. You should regard two of these as interim handouts or temporary. The first is a list of University Faculty Council members, there may be some changes in that as the year progresses. It's pretty sound. That if there are changes, it'll be posted on our website, so the most accurate list of the faculty council members and their contact information will always be on the website. U2-2009 is a list of committees. It has been the custom of the UFC in recent years only to create UFC committees when they are needed. At the moment, the only two committees we have is the Agenda Committee, which needs to meet to set the agenda of these meetings, and the Honorary Degrees Committee. I can tell you that we will be creating the committee, whatever its UFC title is, that deals with fringe benefits because as President McRobbie has mentioned, the Trustees have made it very clear that they are interested in fringe benefits matters and I would like to see the faculty council become informed about those matters and be an active participant in whatever debate

goes on about that. And we will form other committees as we go along if the business requires. The third circular is one that indirectly President McRobbie commented upon. It's the usual summary of what we did last year, and it looked rather barren when we listed the one thing that we adopted last year, so we decided to add the fact that the Trustees approved the other two items because the faculty council and its leaders were involved in the discussion of those items during the year, although they had already passed out of our jurisdiction and gone forward to the Trustees. So that's that. Let's see, the Agenda Committee met this morning and a couple things emerged from that. First, as usual, we are interested in getting the best possible heads up that we can get on items that may emerge from your campuses and reach the UFC this year. Clearly, the members of your campus as they are on the Agenda Committee can help us with that, but please if you see something emerging in your campus or if you see something that you think the UFC should turn its attention to, write to us at the end of the table here is Craig Dethloff who is the Chief of Staff of the UFC, his contact information is on the website. If you contact Craig, he'll send it out to the Agenda Committee and we will consider it for action for the year.

It is fairly traditional that the first agenda of the UFC may be brief. Ours has turned out to be briefer than we maybe originally planned. As President McRobbie mentioned, he is about to release his actions on the Core Schools report. We thought that might be done in time for this meeting, instead we'll roll it over into the next one if when we see what he's done there's something that the UFC should discuss. Item 6 on today's agenda is also off the table today. As many of you are aware from news reports, the Indiana Commission for Higher Education has released final drafts of several documents or reports that they have putting out their view of some reforms that they think would be appropriate for Indiana higher education. We had hoped to discuss those here, but the President has appointed John Applegate of the school of law here at IUB as his Vice President of Planning and Policy. And among John's portfolio is relations with the higher education commission so we wanted to discuss ICHE at a time when John could be here and he isn't available for our meeting today. We expect to roll that over to the next UFC meeting. In terms of things that we do anticipate coming before the UFC this year, let me alert you to something that on its surface appears to involve only IU Bloomington, but ultimately will involve the UFC in many ways. As you know, the Bloomington campus no longer has a Chancellor. We have a Provost. And that's not entirely the same office as the Chancellor because the President, by action of the Trustees, became the Chief Executive Officer of the Bloomington campus. I don't think we have a policy of a system that mentions Provost. But we have lots of policies that place various obligations and responsibilities upon Chancellors and we don't have one at the moment. So we are beginning on the Bloomington campus, the process of identifying all of the instances in the Academic Handbook, we'll start there, that—where policies rely upon Chancellors - and we will over this year at Bloomington, try to resolve the question of where we put in Provost and where we might put in President as Chief Executive Officer of the campus. As Bloomington finishes those up, we are likely to bring them to the UFC because they are University policies even though the effect is only upon the Bloomington campus. So you may be asked to act on that. This, however, the changing administrative structure of the University is not just entirely a Bloomington issue. Nobody has ever

comprehensively gone through our policies to identify how many other administrative offices we once had and included in some policy or another and no longer have. And so, at least as those occur this year, we are going to perhaps bring them to you as we sort of see a resolution to them. Just for an example, we recently had to name the chair of the committee here at Bloomington that reviews conflict of interest / disclosure statements. The policy that requires that says that the consultation, actually a joint appointment is supposed to be made of that chair with the Vice President for Research. Well, we don't have a Vice President for Research anymore. So we're going to *ad hoc* our way through those to some extent. We decided that consultation would be with Vice President Pescovitz. But as those occur, we may just bring those to you and say, 'Here. Here's something we might as well bring up to date.' I intend at Bloomington, to try and propose that we create a system where we keep our policies up to date, where the Agenda Committee and the Chief of Staff are sort of tasked with looking out for changes in the administrative structure of the University. Most of those may be routine. We probably will create some process for sending blanket changes out to people to object to and anything that we think is controversial we'll bring to the appropriate campuses. I would urge you at your individual campuses to look at campus policies that you may have and see if there are things that, along the same line that you might want to address. We've been in touch with the President as was mentioned about upcoming searches and for those that might come up that our system searches were beginning discussion of how we would bring members to that. And, I think that's it. The President has foreshadowed that we may have the Core Schools and the ICHE discussion at our next meeting. And I think that's my report. Simon, do you have anything to add?

ATKINSON: No.

AGENDA ITEM #4. QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

MCROBBIE: Okay, Agenda Item #5, the - Oh, sorry there's a Q&A period, Agenda Item #4. Yes?

GERENCSEK: Is there a link to those ICHE proposals available on the UFC page or could you make one available or could you make it known where we could find those in preparation for that meeting?

TERRY: Craig?

DETHLOFF: There's one on the BFC page.

TERRY: But we'll put it up on the UFC page as well. So go to the BFC for now, but we'll get it there in a few days.

GERENCSEK: Thank you.

MCROBBIE: Other questions or comments?

UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER: I have something on item number 5.

MCROBBIE: I'm sorry, we're just about to move to that. I realized that we hadn't done number four.

UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER: Oh, okay, thank you.

AGENDA ITEM #5. PROMOTION & TENURE REVIEW IN FACULTY RANKS BY THE JOINT FACULTY/ADMINISTRATION WORKING GROUP

MCROBBIE: Any other questions or comments? Okay, let's move on to Agenda Item #5, the P & T reviews. This, I believe, is sort of an update on the state of the deliberations of that particular committee. I know that Alfred Guillaume is down, but Alfred's not here, I think, unless he's on the phone. And Joe Wert, and Joe is on the phone. Is one of you, are either of you going to report on this and comment on the draft that's here? Alfred or Joe are you going to start this?

WERT: Yes, I can.

MCROBBIE: Is that Joe?

WERT: Yes, this is Joe. Can you hear me?

MCROBBIE: Yes, go ahead.

WERT: I think everyone has a copy of the working document in front of them. This is, of course, a working document, a draft, and there's still quite a bit of work to do on this. Although, I think we've gotten for the most part past most of the really prickly issues here and I don't see any problem with getting a document together of our recommendations by our December deadline. I should add that we've been trying to work as transparently as we can on this, and we've had a website created where faculty members on any campus could join the site and find the document and there's a forum link on there where they can actually leave comments about the document. And I know on my campus, I've been asking my faculty to take a look at the document and make comments to me, if not to the website, or to the Oncourse site and I think that other faculty members have been doing the same thing. One of the things that we need to work out yet is what we want to do about lecturers and clinical faculty. That remains kind of an open question at this point and I think we're going to talk about that at our next meeting in October. I don't know what else I need to say about, you know, you've got the document in front of you. Does anyone have any questions?

MCROBBIE: Any questions for Joe?

COFFIN: Yeah, an issue that came up on our campus at Northwest recently had to do not so much with the formation of the campus-level committee, but of the unit level committee and there was some concern about whether there were policies or whether there should be policies that govern whether people with full-time administrative appointments could serve on such committees. And that was an issue that I thought I

would just mention. We did manage to resolve the issue we were dealing with, but just as an ongoing thing, the question of whether someone with a full time academic administrative position should be on or should be allowed to be on a unit's promotion and tenure committee. Seemed to me at any rate to be something that probably needed some consideration beyond our campus.

GALLMEIER: Could I add to that? We couldn't find anything in writing that told us one way or the other.

COFFIN: Yeah, there was nothing in the Handbook that anybody on our campus could find that addressed that issue.

MCROBBIE: Joe, if you haven't already considered it, that's obviously an issue that's probably reasonably important to consider. If you haven't done that, you may want to take that one on and see if you want to make a recommendation about that.

WERT: Yeah, we've talked about administrative people who may serve on multiple committees, but we hadn't talked about that one. So I will put that on our list of things to discuss. That's a good point.

MCROBBIE: Okay. Other comments?

GERENCSEK: May I ask, how binding is point eleven relative to the rest of the points above it? And I have in mind for instance at the department level or division level or college level committees if each of the principles such as one third of the review committee must be full professors or all must be tenured members of the faculty. Are those to be binding on all levels of committee decision whether it be department, division, or college as well as campus?

MCROBBIE: Yeah, that probably needs to be clarified Joe. That's a good point. Can you, if you don't have an immediate response, can you take that one on as well?

WERT: Yes, my immediate response is I think we wanted to make things as fluid as possible for the (inaudible) level committees. And we didn't want to put (inaudible) on that (inaudible) level committee. [phone breaking up]. But I will clarify point number eleven.

MCROBBIE: Okay, other comments? Yes?

WOKECK: Brief comment on number four under dossier preparation. Instead of asking that the guidelines should be given to the candidate to be placed in the dossier, it may be easier to have a line in the checklist that that has occurred well before and it's checked off rather than adding more paper to the dossier.

MCROBBIE: Joe, did you hear that Joe?

WERT: It was kind of jumbled.

MCROBBIE: Could you say it again or...?

WOKECK: Yeah, instead of having under number four, under dossier preparation...

WERT: Okay.

WOKECK: ...instead of having the guidelines in the dossier, and that the candidate has been given those guidelines, it may be easier to have one line in the checklist for the dossier that this has occurred and be checked off and thereby avoiding more paper in the dossier.

WERT: Okay.

MCROBBIE: Other comments? Yes, Mary?

GRAY: I had a question if there'd been discussion on the back on the discussion of the dossier preparation. The guidelines of having at least four external letters, if there had been a discussion of setting a maximum?

MCROBBIE: I think the spirit of this was to allow, was to try to come up with a sort of a baseline for all campuses and then allow all campuses to expand on those as they wished. So if one campus wanted to argue for twenty, they were in their rights to do so. That probably wouldn't be hugely popular, but (laughter) the spirit was to allow campuses the flexibility to expand on these, yeah.

WERT: That's true.

MCROBBIE: Other? Yeah?

GERENCSEK: In the introductory section of the dossier preparation, the language in discussion of the four external letters is strangely conditional. It says, "four external letters *may* get sufficient evidence...." Can you speak to why, "may" or are we setting that as a baseline of four letters? Should that be a "should" or "there must be four letters," or is this still conditional?

MCROBBIE: Were you directing that question to Joe or me?

GERENCSEK: Yes, Joe.

MCROBBIE: (laughter) Speak to the heavens! Yes, Joe?

WERT: There was a "may" in there, and if I understand your question correctly, the word "may" is meant not that you may need more than four letters but that the decision

isn't going to be based solely on those four letters that we'll also be looking at the dossier and things like that as well.

MCROBBIE: Other questions? On the teleconference? Anybody have questions for Joe? Comments? (inaudible)

PLUCKER: Joe, I have a question. If I heard you right in the beginning, the task force now is going to look at the clinical ranks? Is that correct, and how they mix with all this?

WERT: Yeah, at the next meeting we're going to be looking at whether we want to do something different with lecturers and clinical faculty.

PLUCKER: Okay, some of the work that we've done on the Bloomington campus, we were surprised to find out that there were about five or six times as many research faculty as there are other classes of adjunct and clinical ranked faculty. So I would encourage you to include that in your discussion, too, because those are extremely related issues.

WERT: Okay, yeah we will.

PLUCKER: Thanks.

MCROBBIE: Other comments or questions from anybody? Okay.

WERT: I have a question for you President McRobbie.

MCROBBIE: Yes?

WERT: This is from the committee that there's been some concern among some members of the committee and we'd kind of like you maybe to speak to that. That these recommendations, assuming that they are eventually accepted on down the road, would they apply to all campuses equally?

MCROBBIE: Well I mean I think the point about them, as I remember the process, is that these are recommendations that would then go to all campuses and that all the campus faculty councils would then consider them. I would hope that if agreement could be reached that they will consider them and hopefully adopt them if they are, you know, broadly supported throughout the University. But I don't approve those when they come back to me. I may refer them on to the campus level faculty councils and then they make their decisions. I think that was pretty clear as I remember it from my letter setting all of this up. So there's quite a bit of work to be done once you finish your way in this Joe on this and now I think it will not be a productive situation if you then have the broad spirit of your recommendations being widely changed. It just gets us back to where we started. So obviously, we will probably need to have a fairly frank conversation about that in this group and in others so that people understand what's trying to be achieved here and will try to work within that spirit assuming that there aren't any major objections to it.

WERT: Okay. Thank you.

COFFIN: I just want to add a comment to that from my point of view. This is Don Coffin from IU Northwest. It seems to me that if this is actually going to work, this sort of thing is going to have to wind up in the Handbook someplace...

MCROBBIE: Right.

COFFIN: ...so that people will actually have a policy statement to which they can refer and by which they will be bound. So at some point, there's going to have to be some agreement on what this is.

MCROBBIE: Right.

COFFIN: It's not going to be able to be a campus by campus pick and choose. There is going to have to be a baseline. That doesn't necessarily mean all of these things will wind up in that baseline, but there needs to be...

MCROBBIE: The question is how that would be done (inaudible) Because P&T criteria are, have been determined in the past historically campus by campus. So...

COFFIN: Except that there are university-wide guidelines...

MCROBBIE: Right.

COFFIN: ...for promotion and tenure.

MCROBBIE: But they're guidelines.

COFFIN: Yeah.

MCROBBIE: Right, right. And that's probably exactly right. I mean, that goes a long way towards...

COFFIN: Well, if you look at the language that's here, fairly clearly these are guidelines. They're not requirements. But I am a little uncomfortable with the notion that somehow, you know, IU Northwest could opt out of all of this.

MCROBBIE: I agree. I'm uncomfortable with that notion in general for all campuses. I agree. Yes, Steve – sorry, Simon?

ATKINSON: I'm wondering about the issue of lecturers and clinical ranks in particular, whether that is within the intended scope of this task force. I think there would be a lot of concern in the School of Medicine about consideration of the clinical ranks when there isn't any direct representation of the School on the task force. I think the Dean in

particular, and probably the faculty, clinical faculty, might be concerned if this becomes part of the scope of this task force.

MCROBBIE: Well, I think this matter was probably solved on some of those issues when we started, but I - as a preference, Joe, as maybe guidance to you - and I prefer that you, that your committee or the committee that you and Alfred are heading, would come up with recommendations if you like for the core academic faculty of the University rather than have to sort of battle out expanding into these ranks straightaway and that that can maybe be sort of a follow-up task in some way. You know I'd hate to see this whole exercise sort of jeopardized because of that. I have some sympathy with what Simon said. So, if it looks like we need to do this in a couple of pieces or expand upon it, that would be preferable than jeopardizing the whole exercise or at least denying the whole exercise.

WERT: Okay.

MCROBBIE: Herb?

TERRY: I was actually going to raise the same question Simon did, but in a broader context. Here in Bloomington, we're trying to get a handle on the life of our non-tenure track colleagues and our goal ultimately is to make their life better. And I think, yes, I might as well at some point be helpful and useful to our campus. On that, they're not medical school, clinical folks and one of the things we discovered for example in Family Leave, is that 'clinical' to the medical school is a different issue than 'clinical' in many other places. So I would second the President's recommendations. Certainly, however, if your group has thoughts about what might be the issues to address in guidelines for clinical promotion tracks and that sort of thing, it would be very useful to know what you've learned. But at this point I think it would be, it could jeopardize the whole thing if you try to write one policy that includes all the clinical faculty in all the different ways that they work at all of our different campuses and schools.

MCROBBIE: Right, right. Other comments or questions for Joe and Alfred *in absentia*? Anything else? Okay, thanks very much everybody and Godspeed to you two, Joe and Alfred, to get this done by December.

WERT: Thank you very much.

MCROBBIE: Okay, item #6 I think is postponed to a future meeting. Hopefully, next one when I know that John Applegate will be pretty certainly available to comment. Now it gives me great pleasure to move to Agenda Item #7 and to ask Jeff Conrad to talk to us about the New Frontiers program. The reason it gives me great pleasure is that this is an initiative that I actually started when I was Vice President for Research and I appointed Jeff to be the person who oversaw it, as well. So it was very pleasing to see that it has obviously done very well but we're looking forward to hearing about how things have progressed, Jeff.

AGENDA ITEM#6 REPORT ON NEW FRONTIERS

CONRAD: Thanks, I think I'll move up to a more central location. Would that be a little better? You have several documents pertaining to the program in your packet here but one of the things that you didn't get was the address of the Office on the Vice Provost for Research website which gives the basic information about the program. So, I thought I would just say a few words to begin about what the program does. As President McRobbie indicated, he did indeed start this program. It was an initiative of his that the money was received from the Lilly Endowment in the fall of 2004 and I was hired then to oversee it. It's a million dollars a year for five years, which in the arts and humanities is huge. IU is a member of the American Council of Learning Societies Consortium on Humanities and Humanistic Social Sciences. There's 31 universities in the U.S. and Canada. I attend the biannual meetings as IU's representatives. I am the lowest ranking person who attends. Everybody else who attends is at least a Dean. There's a lot of Chancellors. There's even a few university presidents. But I'm the only one who overseas giving away a million dollars a year. And when I tell people that we have this program, their jaws drop. They go, 'We don't have anything like that.' It's an extraordinary program. We're in the - just starting the fifth and final year of the original grant. I hope not the final year of the program, because it's very important. It's really invigorated the arts and humanities at this university. It's very important to the faculty who have benefitted from it. Three of them are members of this Council, but I don't think any of them are actually here. Two of them also serve on the, two, two members of this Council serve on the review committee. There's four sub-programs within New Frontiers. The first one is called New Frontiers proper. It provides up to \$50,000 in support for projects in research and creative activity in the arts and humanities. On the documents when you see NF, that's New Frontiers, New Frontiers proper. NP is New Perspectives. That provides up to \$20,000 for conferences, workshops, symposia, master classes, anything that gets a group of people talking about something, you know it's a very important aspect. The third is called Visiting Visionary Scholars. That is to bring distinguished artists and humanists to campus for a period of time that would be greater than the visits typically sponsored by say, the Institute for Advanced Study. The visits ideally are of at least a month. That's proven to be a little tougher. I think most faculty members can get away for a couple of days, where if you're on sabbatical for semester or a year, but faculty members who can get away for a month are rather few and far between. I think the greatest single beneficiary of this program has been the modern dance program at the school of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation because they bring in artists. The last program is called Exploration Traveling Fellowships. It's travel grants of up to \$2500. You know, I can get \$300 from my department, so \$2500 for travel is pretty good. And that is ideally to help faculty members get started with a new line of research work/ creative activity. It's not to go to meetings and report on work that's already well advanced. And in the early years of the program, we got a lot of the second type and turned them down. Now the word's pretty well out that no, you have to be trying to start something new and the success rate on most current applications is fairly high. Original allocations for the, for sub-programs were \$400,000 a year for the New Frontiers proper and \$200,000 a year for each of the others. For the first three New Frontiers, New Perspectives, and Visiting Visionary Scholars, there's one deadline a

year. It's coming up on October 17th, so there are probably faculty on younger campuses who are visiting working on proposals. The travel grants, the Exploration Travel Fellowships will accept applications at any time; six times a year in the middle of the even numbered months. If you go now to the piece of paper that's headed New Frontiers four-year averages 2005-2008, that gives a breakdown of average, of yearly spending and totaling average spending, across the four sub-programs and all the programs and broken down into Bloomington, Indianapolis, and the regional campuses. The first thing you'll see is that whereas there was initially \$400,000 dollars allocated for the New Frontiers Program proper, we've been spending \$600,000 a year. It's way over subscribed, and I'll come back to that. New Perspectives, we spent a little bit more than it's allocated, but basically that allocation is pretty much on target. Visiting Visionary Scholars, which is VV and looks like W, is undersubscribed. It's the most undersubscribed of the program. We spend less than \$100,000 out of the \$200,000 allocation. And so we're reallocating with the permission of the Lilly Endowment money internally. And Exploration and Traveling fellowships, I was surprised, I thought everybody would want to travel, but basically we spent about half of what the initial allocation was. But I think that's a very important program even though it's undersubscribed. I do think we should keep it. It's particularly important on the smaller campuses where there's not a lot of research money internally available and very little travel money and the chance to travel to do something means a great deal to a lot of faculty members. So that's what we've spent. If you go to the New Frontiers four year summary of applications and awards success rates, what you will see is that we have made over the first four years of the program 319 awards of which 181 are in travel grants. Actually, we've already done the first round of the travel grants this year for new awards. August is a slow month. So we're up to 323 total awards. We've had 194 applications for the travel grants and made 181 awards at the other end, we've had 252 applications for the big New Frontiers grants and have made 72 awards. The success rate which is at the very bottom line there, over four years for New Frontiers is 29% and it's pretty much the consensus among the members of the review committee, and I agree, that we could easily fund with that money twice the number of New Frontiers proposals as we do fund and without a major dropoff in quality. That we'd be funding roughly 60% of the proposals. And then there'd be some drop off in quality for the last 40%, but we would, if we have the money, we'd be happy to fund twice the number we do. In New Perspectives, we fund pretty much all of what we consider to be the really high quality proposals. That program has enough money to pretty much cover everybody. Visiting Visionary Scholars, we fund 75% of the proposals, but we've never gotten more than 4 in a year and last year I believe we had only 2, yeah, that's correct. And then in the Exploration Traveling Fellowships, we pretty much now fund most proposals. The word is out after four years as to what this program is for in the first year or two, first year and a half as I said some people were, this is just travel to conference money and for others it was just travel money regardless of what field they were in and they thought they'd try it out, so we had to say, 'no, no, your project has to be in arts and humanities. Sorry, the campus just can't let you travel on this money unless you're doing something in the arts and humanities, because it is the nature of the project and not the department or affiliation of the people participating that determines whether it's eligible.' If you go now to the New Frontiers 2005 and 2006 survey all through '07, 2007, some quick facts. Last fall, and these data are as of

November 28, 2007, I did a survey of the award winners from the first two years, 2005 and 2006. And those are the projects that had been out there long enough so that we could reasonably expect they might be beginning to show some results. I will come back in the fall for an update, because what became clear was there were a lot of projects still in progress and although they were showing results, the full extent of their final outcome wasn't available yet. I'll also be surveying the people from the third year. We had the, there were a total of 157 awards in the first two years to 142 PIs, 174 faculty members who had been involved in one or more projects. Of the PI's I was pretty gratified. I got out of 142, all but 5 returned my questionnaire. Which I somewhat attribute to my ability to nag people, but also I think is a real statement of how important this program is to the people who are participating in it. One thing that really struck me and I haven't, I would love to do a survey or a study and pick some cohort, of those 142 PIs over the first three years, there are only 3 who have left IU. And I would like to think that in some way shape or form this program had something to do with the fact that people are staying here. I know there were about, I think there were 85 grants, some with multiple collaborators and some duplicated figures, and so if you add the third year people, we're up to considerably over 250 awards that I know of only one other PI who has left, four people. And I would think if you look at any group of say, 250 IU faculty members over a span of three years I'm willing to bet that more than 3 would have left. But again, I haven't actually done it. You can read the numbers of books and monographs published and articles and exhibits and performances. It's very, very impressive. The numbers are very impressive. The numbers of people have been spurred. There are a lot of faculty in the arts and humanities who don't think in terms of grants to fund their research and this really spurred them on. They got a lot of proposals out there that were derived from these and as of last November, pretty much they brought in one dollar for every dollar we had given out at the time. I think in the middle of right now, just trying to update the grant, I sent an email message to 51 PIs who had indicated at the, as of last November that they either had a grant proposal that was out under consideration or they were planning to submit one within the coming year. And I so far have answers from 17 of the 51 so exactly a third. Three of them report a total of four additional grants, totaling over \$250,000 dollars. Two have proposals that are out there under consideration right now including one to the NEH for almost half a million dollars, \$495,000. And, let's see, one, two, three, four who've had definite plans to submit. So, you know, the impact's continued.

MCROBBIE: Jeff, can I just interrupt here and ask a question? When you look at the proposal, the funding generated by New Frontier awards, it's about just somewhere over \$2 million, which is very impressive. But that's out of \$4 million granted, roughly. But then of that \$4 million, what amount do you think roughly would be from those proposals that could generate grants, I mean, if somebody is, I don't know, developing, is, you know, writing a book of poetry they're probably not somebody who's going after grants for that...

CONRAD: No...

MCROBBIE: So what, that of the \$4 million, 50% or...

CONRAD: No, this is just the first \$2 million. This is just (inaudible)

MCROBBIE: Oh, I see. Okay, so that was \$2 million on \$2 million, roughly.

CONRAD: I'm assuming we're on \$2 million, yes.

MCROBBIE: And that \$2 million itself is not all grant generating, or so to speak?

CONRAD: No, no...

MCROBBIE: Do you have a rough stab at that?

CONRAD: I would...what percentage of faculty members go on...?

MCROBBIE: What percentage of those grants are the kinds of things that can lead to faculty putting in proposals to the NEH, NEA or whatever?

CONRAD: Well, I think a fair number, although it's somewhat skewed by the travel grants, supposed to be.

MCROBBIE: Sure.

CONRAD: I would say of the, if you look at what I think of as the big three, New Frontiers, New Perspectives, and Visiting Visionaries, maybe half, something like that. A number of projects are...

MCROBBIE: That's a two for one return, which is you know very impressive.

CONRAD: Very impressive. And as I say that, you know, there's evidence that that first \$2 million hasn't stopped, but I think to me, in some ways even more impressive since this is the arts and humanities and numbers are -- They really matter to me because I really consider myself a humanistic social scientist rather than an artist or a humanist. But to people in the arts and humanities maybe words mean more, so I collected at the time I did this just things that people said about the program either in the questionnaires themselves or in the cover email they sent when they returned it. So I'm just going to read you a couple of these because I find these very impressive. A lot of people are essentially saying this changed my career, this changed my life. "We have been directly encouraged by the NEH program officers to apply for additional funding from them and will be doing so before the deadline in summer 2008." Then in bold, I'll point out it came back with an exclamation point at the end, "NONE OF THIS WOULD HAVE HAPPENED WITHOUT THE NEW FRONTIERS FUNDING!" In regard to response to the conference, "It's been amazing. With the NP award, I organized and chaired a multi- and inter-disciplinary conference on animals called Kindred Spirits. It put IU on the map in animal studies. Since then more things have happened than I can list here. Perhaps more importantly though is the visibility it gave IU in the area of animal studies.

Conference participants kept saying, 'I had no idea this was going on at IU.' The New Frontiers award has primed the pump in every way. It helped me believe in my new project in a stage when it was still a reach for me moving in new directions." "This New Frontiers award was the first major grant that I have written. It has now encouraged me to look into other sources for future projects. This experience was invaluable not only in the specific research, but in achieving and understanding a confidence in grant writing." And finally, "The Exploration fellowship was wonderful. It gave me powerful images, stirred my imagination, and opened up a much more complex and tragic view of my project." That's five quotations, I have five pages of them. It's really an extremely gratifying response. But just an indication of just how important this program is to faculty members in particular in the arts and humanities where people tend to be sort of overwhelmed by the amount of money and attention that's going into the life sciences nowadays which is all to the good, but if you're an artist or a humanist, you kind of think, 'Well, my breakthroughs aren't going to get turned into business. I'd like to think they'd get turned to an increased quality of life and a better ability to lead an examined and useful life, but that is more intangible.' But this level of support, which I too, I don't know of any other place that has this, it's just such an important statement to people in the arts and humanities that IU values you and values the contributions of a liberal arts education. Which some of the people, Terri Bourus who was on this wrote wonderful things. I wish Terry were here when she was faculty member at IU Kokomo, two big grants and then when she went to IUPUI she took one with her but she's one of the poster children for the program; just done wonderful things. So, I'm hoping to, you know, work in pulling things together to make a brief for renewing this funding in one way or another. I would recommend some changes in the program and some internal reallocations of money that are more in line with what we've actually been spending and I, myself, would scrap Visiting Visionary Scholars as a separate sub-program. I would make those kind of proposals, of which we get very few, eligible under the regular New Frontiers model and replace Visiting Visionary Scholars with something else, but I really love this program. I mean it's so gratifying to oversee it and see what it does for people. I just can't say enough good things about it. And I disqualified myself from receiving any grants. Well, I'm the primary source, I'm the primary contact if you want to get on it. I want you to believe you're getting the best advice that I can give you and that I don't that I'm not giving bum advice because I have a proposal in the pot. I'd like to think I wouldn't do that anyway but it's better if nobody has to just take my word for it. I'm not involved in this competition in terms of being a recipient so if you come to me, I'll do my best for you. So, that's pretty much what I have to say. I'd be happy to answer any questions. Yes?

GERENCSEK: What is the status of this program going forward?

CONRAD: We are in the final year of the original funding and hoping very much to renew it.

ATKINSON: Maybe that's a question for the president.

CONRAD: Yeah.

MCROBBIE: Yeah, as the father of this, I'm obviously going to be very sympathetic to some mechanism for continuing it, but we've got to find a way to do that. So it's interesting, Jeff, hearing that. I remember when I put this together, talking to a lot of people before devising the four categories. I was told over and over again how important the traveling fellowships...and it turns out to be, as soon as you say, picked up a bit, but it's still surprisingly undersubscribed.

CONRAD: I am surprised, but I think it's worth keeping, because it makes a great deal of difference. I would just allocate a smaller amount of money to it. I mean, I think \$100,000 a year would pretty much cover it.

MCROBBIE: Yes, Mary?

GRAY: However it's renewed, is there a hope that there won't be a gap in terms of keeping this continuous so that essentially campuses know to look for this? Are you concerned at all about having a break happen after this fifth year? Can we expect the funding will be decided on to keep it moving?

MCROBBIE: That would be the hope if we can find the funding for it, yeah.

CONRAD: Yeah, I think it, I would very much like to see it there be no break, me personally. Even though, I'd have a lot less work. Because there's a lot of projects out there and people are, I do spend a lot of time dealing with requests for extensions of deadlines or reallocations of funds and you know I am a researcher myself but my field is archaeology and so I deal with complex logistics but I also work in an underdeveloped Latin American country so I know there's what you set out to do and then there's what you actually can do and they're not often the same. So I'm very sympathetic to people who need a little more time who need to move their....

MCROBBIE: Other comments?

BESEL: Is this for the social sciences as well?

CONRAD: Only the humanistic social sciences. The humanistic social sciences are eligible. And this is a problem that we go back and forth with on where you draw the line between the humanities and the social sciences. It's not a clear line, so we use the NEH statement. There's NEH's definition of the humanities, there's a statement that the policy committee of the college of arts and sciences on this campus came up with about the role of humanities in 2006 and that is a good guideline. I actually like, despite the fact that the first sentence is ungrammatical, the statement about what are the humanities on the Indiana Humanities Council website. I think it's fairly good except for a misplaced modifier. I was brought up parsing sentences so...

MCROBBIE: Such a showoff. Yes, any other comments and questions?

GALLMEIER: Would anthropology fit?

CONRAD: Yes. That's my favorite. And I'm identified here as the Director of the Mathers Museum which is also true, but I oversee this program in my capacity as the Associate Vice Provost for Research here. I don't make the decisions. There's a review committee that consists of twenty faculty members from around the system. It's divided into two sub committees so that each subcommittee sees half of the proposals and we get a fair number of proposals from the people on the committee so we just steer them to the other side but they're an extraordinarily good committee: Bill Schneider, IUPUI, is one of the co-chairs, Anya Royce on this campus is one of the co-chairs and eighteen other people. There's about a 20-30% turnover every year mostly because of sabbaticals, sometimes because of retirements. This year tragically Robin Hass Birky has been one of the members and I have to replace her and she's going to be difficult to replace.

MCROBBIE: Other comments? Geoff, let me thank you too, for all you've done with this program for four years. You know, obviously having worked with you closely for a while before this on other things I know what an outstanding job you have done in a highly competitive environment, too which is to say a one in three success rate is obviously brings its share of angst with it as well and you have had to deal with that too and done it in a very diplomatic and very dignified way and I think the University owes you quite a debt of gratitude for all you've done to make this one of their flagship programs, frankly.

CONRAD: Well thank you very much. And as I say, I love doing it. It's one of the most gratifying things I've done in my 25 plus years at IU.

MCROBBIE: Anything else then, no other questions? I think we're really done apart from any final comments before we're adjourned.

TERRY: Yeah, I just have two. Number 1, we're adjourning early, that's fine. There's no reason to have the agenda expand to fill the time available. And it did happen because we dropped a couple of other anticipated items, but related to that in a way the Agenda Committee is beginning a review of the functioning of the University Faculty Council, how we might make serving on it a more rewarding experience for people. We're going to begin by gathering some information from universities that are sort of like us and see if they do some things that we could learn from. I have no exact timetable for how we'll proceed but we decided during the Agenda Committee meeting this morning to begin that process and we will be contacting perhaps you, others who have served on the Council in the past and trying to get some ideas. And finally as I said, has anyone joined this group remotely since we last polled? No.

MCROBBIE: We, I think then, unless there's any final comments ladies and gentlemen, we are adjourned. Thank you very much.

Meeting adjourned: 2:58PM

