

Agenda
Indiana University
UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL
IUB Foundation
Bloomington
November 25, 2008
1:30 P.M. - 4:30 P.M. (EST)

Attendance

MEMBERS PRESENT: Simon Atkinson, Carol Baird, Karl Besel, Christian Bjornson, Elizabeth Boling, Grason Bolinger, Donald Coffin, Janice Cox, Erika Dowell, Charles Gallmeier, Steven Gerencser, Kathleen Gilbert, Joyce MacKinnon, Mary Gray, William Orme, Jonathan Plucker, Markus Pomper, John Minor Ross, William Schneider, Herb Terry, David Vollrath, Joe Wert, Karen West, Marianne Wokeck.

MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT: Daniel Sloat (Lucas Fields)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Charles Bantz, Bruce Bergland, Alan Bender, Dane Blue, Terri Bourus, Bruce Burgun, Stephen Burns, James Capshew, Nick Clark, Diane Dallis, Harold Evans, Mary Fisher, Cathy Foos, Greg Garrett, Stuart Green, Karen Hanson, J.B. Hill, Jerry Hinnefeld, Padraic Kenney, David Lindquist, Lesa Lorenzen-Huber, Anna McDaniel, Michael McRobbie, Eduardo Nieto, Michael Nusbaumer, Sandra Patterson-Randles, Nasser Paydar, William Potter, Una Mae Reck, Alan Schmetzer, Michael Wartell, Kim White-Mills, L. Jack Windsor, Michael Wolf.

GUESTS: Jan Holloway (UTS), James Wimbush (Dean), Judy Palmer (Office of VP Public Affairs), Brad Wheeler (VPIT),

1. Approval of Minutes
<http://www.indiana.edu/~pres/speeches/101408.shtml>
2. Presiding Officer's Business (10 minutes)
(Professor Herb Terry)
3. Agenda Committee Business (5 minutes)
(Professors Herb Terry and Simon Atkinson)
4. Question/Comment Period* (10 minutes)
(Professors Herb Terry and Simon Atkinson)
5. Discussion of issues pertaining to the Higher Education Reauthorization Act. (20 minutes)
(John Applegate, Vice President for Policy and Planning)
6. Discussion of Information Technology Strategic Plan 2 (ITSP 2). (20 minutes)
(Brad Wheeler, Vice President for Information Technology)
<http://ovpit.iu.edu/itsp2/resources/ITSP2-Preliminary-Draft-For-Comment.pdf>
7. Discussion on Bookstore Operations. (20 minutes).
(Jill Schunk, C.P. M., Director of Purchasing Operations)
http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/addDocs/AY09/IUS_BN.pdf

8. Formation of the Learning Technologies Steering Committee. (20 minutes)
(Professors Herb Terry and Simon Atkinson) [ACTION ITEM]
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY09/U4-2009.pdf>

9. Discussion of the Proposed Changes in the Office of the Vice President for Research and the Graduate School. (20 minutes)
(Professors Herb Terry and Simon Atkinson)
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/08-09/B14-2009.pdf>

*Faculty who are not members of the Faculty Council and who wish to address questions to 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>.

Minutes

AGENDA ITEM #1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

TERRY: How are you doing everybody? I am obviously not President McRobbie. For those of you listening in a disembodied fashion, this is Herb Terry, and because the President is not able to be with us today, I end up being the presiding officer. The first business is the approval of the minutes from our October 14th meeting. I think this comes to you as an item from the Agenda Committee, so I don't think it requires a second. Can I have all those in favor of approving the minutes, please say 'aye?' [Aye]. Are there any oppositions? Any abstentions? The minutes are approved.

AGENDA ITEM#2: PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS

TERRY: I'm actually going to, it being impossible to disentangle; I'm going to kind of fold together the Presiding Officer's Business and the Agenda Committee Business. The first thing to announce is that we are making a slight change in the agenda for two reasons. One, the issue is not as relevant as it was when we put together the agenda, and two, the one person who could comment on it, John Applegate, will be leaving us at two-thirty. When he gets up and walks out, it's not in a fit over whatever we have just said...

APPLEGATE: It might be though.

TERRY: ...well, it might be, but it's that he has to get to a flight at the airport. So what we are going to do is take item nine and take it up, actually, immediately following the question and comment period. In terms of other business, I have a couple general announcements, and then there are a couple of people on the Council that I want to recognize to say a few things. The one that I want to announce is just that here at Bloomington, and as it turns out at other campuses as well, more attention than ever is focusing on the issue of assessment. As John may comment, the higher education commission has an interest in assessment. The accrediting team from the Higher Learning Commission that came to Bloomington a few months ago will return two years after that visit, and expects us on Bloomington Campus to have assessment data. Kokomo has

signed on to the voluntary system of assessment, VSA program; and in general, a lot of things are going on on the campuses and throughout the system with regard to assessment. At Bloomington, we are going to be forming a group very soon, to study what would be the appropriate assessment mechanism for this campus and its schools and departments and programs. Part of our reason there is to sort of hope that by doing that on our own, we may be able to demonstrate to those who care, that we are moving forward on assessment and hopefully we'll end up with an assessment system that we believe in, and that's workable for this campus and that we can afford. My personal belief is that assessment is likely to vary across campuses, and So what we discussed in the Agenda Committee was that the Agenda Committee will monitor, and may even, if the Bloomington group does not do So may even go out of its way to gather data from all of you about what's going on with assessment at the various campuses, just to inform ourselves. There may be things going on at your campuses that Bloomington should consider. There may be things that we reject, that maybe you should reject too. Who knows? But it will be an active process of talking to all of the campuses as we proceed here in Bloomington. Upcoming soon, I hope, will be some proposed changes to the Code of Student Rights. They aren't extraordinarily significant. As is generally the case with the Code of Student Rights, implementation of the Code is largely left to the discretion of the campuses, but we need to make some changes in the Code, in order to permit campuses that want to do So to exercise some discretion in areas where apparently right now they don't have it. So hopefully that will come to this group very early next year. I think at this point, I'll turn to Simon Atkinson, and he can update us on what's going on with intellectual property.

AGENDA ITEM#3 AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS.

ATKINSON: I know intellectual and property coupled together are not words that you wanted to hear any time soon. The new Intellectual Property Policy that was approved by the Trustees in May and went into effect in the beginning of July, and part of that policy creates a new body called the Intellectual Property Council which is supposed to administer that policy, and has certain specific functions that are defined in the policy such as hearing appeals from creators of intellectual property against the way that the university has handled that property. In the first meeting of that Council, it was brought to our attention by the University Counsel's office that they, and the folks at IURTC believe there are certain technical issues with the language of the policy that need to be corrected. Their belief is that these are purely technical changes that need to be made. So the University Counsel's office, in conjunction with IURTC and John Applegate will be going through the language of the policy and suggesting some specific amendments to address those technical changes. When that's been done, we'll take a look at that in the UFC Agenda Committee, and if those are purely technical changes, then I think it will be okay for the Trustees to go ahead and act on those changes. The Counsel's office considers some of the language to be problematic, and feels that it needs to be addressed fairly quickly. The other issue with the Intellectual Property Policy is that the new revenue distribution scheme allocates 15% of intellectual property revenues to, what's called in the policy, "campus units," and that was deliberately left vague in the policy because it was impossible to define a "campus unit" in a way that would work for all the different campuses. So the policy asks campus faculties to develop campus specific policies to define what a campus unit is and how it should share in that 15% of the revenue. So that's something that the faculty on our campuses need to be working on. At IUPUI, we've put together a joint group between the Vice Chancellor for Research, the

Associate Deans for Research of the different schools and the Research Affairs Committee of our faculty council, to look at that and develop some specific recommendations for how to handle that 15%.

TERRY: Why don't you take that? Joe, we are going to have some comments from you on where the P & T process stands.

WERT: Yeah, thanks. Back in September you, I believe, received a copy or a draft copy, of the recommendations that the Joint Promotion and Tenure Committee were making. We are just about ready to conclude our recommendations. We have a meeting set for December 1st, where hopefully we will finish these up, and the committee will approve them, and then we will send them on to President McRobbie and the UFC leadership. What happens to those from there, I'm not exactly sure, but it will be leaving our hands, hopefully after the first of December. Something that came up, just in our conversations in the last few days, I think warrants some discussion at some point, maybe. If I could just read an e-mail that was sent out to the group from our Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs in the Southeast campus. "According to the handbook, under 'Criteria for Promotion,' the candidate for promotion or tenure, should normally excel in at least one of the above categories, and be satisfactory in the others. This sentence establishes three ratings: excellent, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory. The Southeast campus used 'good,' many years ago, but we were told by Vice President Gros Louis that this was inconsistent with IU policy, and we had to use only the three rating above." But apparently there are campuses in the systems that are using more than three ratings. If that's permissible, then I think maybe we should have some kind of a discussion about this at some point to determine, is it permissible to use more than three categories? You know I assume that if one campus is using them, then it's okay for other campuses to use them as well. This is something that really gets to procedure, so I'm not sure if it's something that our committee can really deal with.

TERRY: I'm sure the Agenda Committee will take up your report and any other recommendations you have or of issues that you haven't dealt with, as soon as you get it out and forward it to the President. Alright, there is one other thing I wanted to say in, I don't know, Presiding Officer's or Agenda Committee Business, probably Presiding Officer's Business. Historically, Bloomington has failed for many years, to get its elections to the Bloomington Faculty Council done, in the time frame provided in our Constitution and Bylaws. This year, we are going to actually make that deadline. The relevance of that for all of you, and I hope maybe for Simon as well, who will be the Senior co-Secretary next year, is that if you also can complete your selections of you councils and other sorts of thing, early enough, it would be possible to get the UFC organized in a basic fashion, before the end of the Spring Semester. I think that will be helpful. Certainly I hope that's what will happen with the BFC, but if the actions of the individual councils are in a timely fashion, then maybe it can be done also with regard to the UFC. Questions and comments?

AGENDA ITEM #4 QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

TERRY: Are there any questions for me? To some extent, John is here representing the President, so if you have some questions that might have gone to the President, then you can pass

them along through John who may comment or decide not to comment. Okay, hearing no questions and comments...oh, I'm sorry Bill.

SCHNEIDER: I just want to clarify the Promotion and Tenure report and what's going to happen with it. Could you say a little bit more about that?

TERRY: Well, my understanding of the report is that it was a group put together at the recommendation of the UFC when the initial document ran into some trouble at the UFC. It was a joint Presidential/UFC created body. The President named some members, and we named others. I take it that the report is a report to the bodies that constituted the committee. So I think we will take it up, and so will the President, when it comes to us from the group.

SCHNEIDER: So one option from here is that we could then propose guidelines or procedures...

TERRY: I think there are things in that report that are fundamentally the province of the faculty.

SCHNEIDER: Yeah, right.

TERRY: So that, we'll see what the report covers and that sort of thing, and those matters that are a subject to faculty jurisdiction under the Constitution, those are the ones certainly, that we will probably bring back to the UFC, but we will act expeditiously so the sooner the committee presents its report to the President and to us, the better.

SCHNEIDER: I'd hate to see it get lost elsewhere...

TERRY: It should not get lost, especially given...

SCHNEIDER: ...by taking it up all the way ...

TERRY: ...especially given the concern that was expressed about it in its first iteration, when it came from Charles Bantz. So we will take a look at it, the Agenda Committee, we will take a look at it as soon as it exists, and we'll see what we want to, maybe, comment upon. There may be things the Agenda Committee feels comfortable saying something about. Probably, however, there will be things that we will bring to this body, or a committee of this body, but I think we could take it up directly through the Agenda Committee once that committee, which we played a part in creating, makes its recommendations. Yes?

GERENCSEK: Could I ask then, ask Joe, if he anticipates it at this point that there are any substantive changes to that draft that we examined in September? Has it stayed pretty much as it was, or do we, do you anticipate there will be significant or substantive alterations to that as it comes out at the committee after December 1st?

WERT: There shouldn't be any more large, substantive changes, a couple of small points here and there, but what we saw in September is, for the most part, what will end up being the final document, I believe.

TERRY: And the document, I assume, as soon as it's run through the President and the UFC will be going to all of you at all of your campuses as well. Are there any other questions or comments, either in this room or remotely? Okay, we need at some point to find out who is out there in the virtual Indiana University community. We will poll the campuses in order to determine who is there so our attendance records will be accurate, and Craig shortly will start the attendance sheet going around. Craig, would you run the poll? Out there? (Poll taken).

TERRY: The announcement that I have to make about Item 9, is that we added Item 9 to the - (Difficulties with technology) Back to Item 9.

AGENDA ITEM #9: DISCUSSION OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN THE OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH AND THE GRADUATE SCHOOL.

TERRY: In his State of the University Address, President McRobbie indicated that he was going to reactivate, staff, populate, whatever word you want to use, the Vice President, the system wide Vice President for Research. He also indicated that he was going to put under that portfolio, the duties of the Vice President for Research Administration, and the duties of the Vice President for Life Sciences. He indicated that, however, he was leaving open the question of whether the University Graduate School would come under the umbrella of the Vice President for Research as was to some extent the case years ago when we had RUGS. Both the Bloomington and the Indianapolis campuses have had the opportunity to discuss this issue, as to whether it would be a good idea... (Difficulties with technology). Let me repeat then, at the State of the University Address, President McRobbie indicated that he was going to populate the Office of the Vice President for Research; folding into that, the Vice President for Research Administration, and the Vice President for Life Sciences. He left open the question of whether he would fold into that portfolio the University Graduate School. IUPUI and Bloomington both had an opportunity to discuss that issue in their faculty councils and committees, and both of us really, believed that the present system was working well, and that it would not be a good idea to have the University Graduate School and the Dean of the Graduate School report to the Office of Research. There were a variety of reasons for this. Some believed that the portfolio of the Vice President for Research was already pretty big and broad, and thought that the office should concentrate on that. Some thought that there were aspects of what the Graduate School did, particularly things that were curriculum related, that didn't fit well under an office of a Vice President devoted to research. And so both of our campuses recommended that this not be done, that the Graduate School retain its current reporting line and not switch to reporting to the Vice President for Research. The reason we can take Item 9 off the agenda is that I am happy to tell you that that has been the President's decision. The President listened to what the campuses, what IUPUI and Bloomington said, and there won't be any change in that. John is more or less in charge of coordinating the process of finding the Vice President for Research, so we've asked him to say something about that before he goes on to discuss, along with Judy Palmer, the implications of the Higher Education Reauthorization Act. So John?

AGENDA ITEM #5: DISCUSSION OF ISSUES PERTAINING TO THE HIGHER EDUCATION REAUTHORIZATION ACT.

APPLEGATE: Okay, not a lot to report. There is simply that Herb and Simon have forwarded the President names for the faculty positions on the committee, so the next step is to put the committee together, and the goal is to have the committee in place, or at least named before Winter break, so that it's in a position to get started immediately after the break. Herb's description of the position and what it encompasses, and what it doesn't encompass, is accurate and so we will be moving forward primarily at the beginning of 2009, to do a very complete search for the position.

TERRY: Any questions on that issue?

SCHNEIDER: Are you using an outside firm?

APPLEGATE: Well, I think that ultimately, that's up to the committee. But, I'm guessing that they will want to use an outside firm, and my office has been putting together, collecting, names of outside firms, looking at other recent searches. There have been a number of recent searches for Research Vice Presidents at some of our sister schools, or peer schools, and sometimes you can get some names from that, and looking into firms that we've used before, and seeing whether they've looked for people other than Deans and Provosts and Chancellors. So we'll have some names for the committee to use.

SCHNEIDER: Is it expected to be an open search, especially the finalist?

APPLEGATE: How do you mean open?

SCHNEIDER: Names of the people known and open meetings on campus and so on.

APPLEGATE: I don't know of any decisions made along those lines. I guess I'd start from the expectation that we'd do it with being, you know, a confidential process, to the point of finalists, and then finalists being public so that they can meet with a wide range of people. I mean that would be my basic expectation. I suppose that could change, but I have heard nothing to suggest it would. And certainly an open search in terms of internal versus external candidates. There is not some preordained direction to this at all.

TERRY: I'd comment briefly on the last point. In some of his meetings with Simon and me, the President has indicated that he really views this as an international search; what you should expect of an Australian president. But in any event, there is an effort to find the best possible person wherever in the world that person may reside, and that's an ambitious task, but I hope it will result in us getting a good Vice President for Research. As I said, John has to leave at about 2:30, so I think we will expeditiously move to Item #5. In the back is Judy Palmer, who is also on this issue. So Judy, given all of our technical problems, would you come up here? Take this seat in case you are asked questions and you want to jump in, and then hopefully the people online can hear us.

APPLEGATE: Well, great, thank you Herb, and I appreciate your accommodating me. I was asked to talk about the Higher Education Opportunity Act, which Congress recently passed, and it is one of these omnibus kinds of statutes that has lots and lots of different provisions connected only because they have some impact on higher education. So it does a wide variety of different things. I will talk through some of the key points in it, but I should say first that Judy Palmer who splits her time between the Office of Planning and Policy and the Office of Government Relations is really taking the lead in this kind of a hub and spoke arrangement precisely because the statute is so broad and touches so many different parts of the operations of the University and the various campuses. So the big topics that the statute deals with are college costs in the sense of reporting them, teacher professional development, that is, K-12 teachers, student assistance, institutional information, copyright protection, lobbying activities and endowment reporting. And I'll just walk through those very briefly.

On college costs, most of this is in the nature of reporting information, so there is a lot of consumer information, if you will, that needs to be reported. If you've taken a look at our fact book, this is an annual publication of the Institutional Research Office. It's on the web, and actually the new one is almost on the web, that is the 08-09 one, I'll put a plug in for it. But if you've ever looked at that, it has a lot of the same information in it, just basic information about the University. There is a somewhat more controversial requirement of a tuition calculator. The best analogy I've heard is that it's sort of like those loan calculations, if you've ever signed a mortgage, it uses different, it comes up with different numbers than you've seen in any other document. And the idea is to normalize them so that you can make a comparison. That's a lovely idea in theory. It's not clear whether that really will work very well. But, that will be another part of it. One of the innovations designed to praise and shame or, what is it, "a tip of the hat and a wag of the finger" in Steven Colbert's thing? It will have lists of the most expensive institutions on various measures and the least expensive ones. There is loan information disclosure; where people get loans, their availability, and then there's a pretty detailed set of requirements for disclosing information about textbooks. It's basically aimed in the right direction; that is, trying to make information available. Judy might comment on this, but to me it has the earmarks of successful lobbying by the higher education organizations, pointing out that universities don't sell textbooks by and large, and they don't set prices for textbooks, so there's only so much that they can do. But, some of the things that we can do are make information available for consumers to make choices, both students as consumers, but also faculty. And so some very detailed requirements there, but not subject to any additional requirements through rules. Did you want to say anything about the textbook provisions?

PALMER: Well I think you've covered that nicely.

APPLEGATE: Okay. Then teacher professional development doesn't really apply to us. Student assistance, a lot of very technical revisions, and I think largely procedural improvements to the numerous student assistance programs that are out of there, that are already in existence, and I guess refunding them as well. One of the new provisions, or new sets of provisions, is a requirement that Universities not only report information, but disclose primarily on a website a large range of information about the University. One of the sort of peculiar ones is that we are supposed to disclose plans to improve the academic program. I have no idea what that means,

and I don't think anyone knows what that means. It sounds like Congress, or some member of Congress had something specifically in mind and we don't really know what it is, but there you have it. Most of it is what you might generally call health and safety information. So we have to report incidents of drug and alcohol abuse, certain incidents; notification of parents or guardians of missing persons within twenty-four hours of when they are determined to be missing, emergency notification. Obviously that's been a big issue everywhere and the IU notify system is in place in response to those concerns, and I think the current legislation is something that we will be able to comply with in our current plans and systems in place. Annual fire safety reports; you can sort of see that this is a list of responses to things that have happened at colleges and universities in the last few years. We have to disclose vaccination policies. There will be policies, the Department of Education will establish policies on the educational records, or disclosure of educational records of disturbed students. And there is disclosure of the results of internal discipline to the victims of violent crimes. We have to disclose transfer policies and we have to disclose diversity and diversity numbers and placement rates. Again, none of this is, well some of these, are things that we probably have not previously disclosed, but a lot of it is, and it's kind of health and safety, or consumer information. So on the one hand, it's designed to make Universities more friendly to students, allow them to make better choices among Universities, more informed choices. There is also a requirement, that I am sure is near and dear to Brad Wheeler's heart, which is we're also supposed to be putting our students in jail, or assisting in that by requiring us to have plans to reduce copyright infringement; a.k.a. movies and music. So we have to have that in place. A previous provision on certification about lobbying activities; that is changed, expanded, or in some way, altered, but that's a preexisting requirement that is now in the legislation, that is lobbying activities by university personnel. And, finally, reporting on the amounts in endowments, and the payouts of endowments, which again is a political issue in recent months. So that's the highlights of this statute. As I said we are working to respond to it, and trying to pull all of the various pieces together to make sure that first of all, we are doing what we are supposed to be doing, secondly, that to the extent that there are rules and guidance that come out of the Department of Education, that we participate in that and make our views known, where it would be helpful, and thirdly, where there are requirements to report things either to the Government or on our website, that we actually do that. So with that, let me just give you, Judy, a chance to add anything you would like to, or just open it up for questions.

PALMER: Well, maybe I'd just add one point about our process. We did have Vice President Applegate ask us to put together a team of experts that deal in each of these areas and Jill who you're going to hear from later, is helping us on some of the purchasing issues related to textbooks and using the ISBN numbers and getting those appropriately recorded, but we do have a team that's working and that's why John refers to it as the hub and spokes, because the real work is being done at the campuses. And I would say that in a number of areas we're awaiting clarification from the U.S Department of Education. Doug Wasitis, our director of the Washington office is very much engaged in this effort with us, and to be quite candid with you, we're not getting much guidance right now, which I know comes as no great surprise to anyone in this room. Transition times are very difficult, so the statute does provide that we'll make a good faith effort to try to comply as best we know how to read the laws that have been adopted here in the new provisions, but some of them we just simply don't have good information about so we will record what we've done for audit purposes or review purposes, but we will be holding

off on some of these until we have more information, which will be some time after the 20th or 21st of January.

APPLEGATE: Great, so we're happy to entertain any questions.

BOLING: May I ask a question please? This is Elizabeth Boling.

APPLEGATE: Sure!

TERRY: Go ahead, Elizabeth.

BOLING: Thank you. I'm from the School of Education, so I'm hoping you might be able to summarize in just one sentence what was said about teacher's professional development.

PALMER: Yes, let me comment on that. Actually I have been in touch with the School of Education and Jill Shedd has been working with me at this point. Actually, we are reporting on one provision already. Each campus is reporting their past rate on the State Licensure and Certification Test, currently, so that one we can check off the list unless the rules or guidance comes out with something different than what we know it to be today. The one thing that has been added is the need to establish annual goals for increasing the number of high need teachers. Now, the first challenge was to find out what "high need teachers," how that is going to be defined; whether it's going to be a regional definition, a state definition, or a national definition. Will it be disciplined based, or will it have other criteria, such as the need for more diversification in terms of race, gender, so forth, in the teaching profession. The law reads that actually, either the secretary or the state educational institution, which we have interpreted at this point to mean the Superintendent of Public Instruction for the state of Indiana, will make the decision. It's an "or," and we don't know how you exercise that "or." Who makes the decision? So this was an issue we were discussing yesterday. Doug Wasitis is going to go back to the Department of Education, and see if there is someone there that can provide some guidance to us.

BOLING: Thank you very much.

TERRY: Any other questions?

ROSS: On the web disclosure issues, are the regional campuses, like Kokomo, for those of you out there, supposed to have certain things, certain ways on the web, to match the rest of the University?

PALMER: The answer to that is, some of this will probably be combined to show the entire University. There may be certain areas that have to be reported, for example, some of the crime statistics or something else that we may need to look at more campus specifically. I'm very glad you raised that question though because I can't quite read your nametag, but...

ROSS: John Ross.

PALMER: ...but I do see Southeast represented, and one of the things that will affect the campuses who've just opened residence halls, will be some of the campus student safety provisions, which apply to campuses that have students living on them. So I've asked Paul Sullivan, and Mark Bruhn, who are leading the University Emergency Preparedness Committee, to take these issues back to that committee, and decide where that can best be addressed because that has representation from all the campuses.

TERRY: Are there other questions?

ATKINSON: How much of this in the statute, and is there new rule making authority also included as part of the act? I assume with the change of administration would have no idea how some of these rules are going to shake out.

PALMER: That's right.

APPLEGATE: Yes!

PALMER: Yes, actually the statute does have a lot of language in it. It's several hundred pages long, but it also has a fairly extensive, what they call, managers report, which is put together by the conferees because this was in conference quite some time. We know that there are two rule making tracks that will be followed. For Title 4, which has the bulk of all the financial aid in it and some of the reporting requirements more related to student and University numbers, not safety and so forth, but that will go through a negotiated rule making procedure, which is, for those who are familiar with it, it's a very formalized structure. We have submitted official comments. We will be making an effort where appropriate, to have representation on those panels that will be created by the Department of Education, to engage in negotiated rule-making. Everything outside of Title 4 will go through the standard administrative rule making procedure at the federal level, so we'll get something, if you will, handed to us, and we'll have a comment period. Hopefully, the national organizations that represent disciplines or interests in all these areas will be able work collaboratively with some of the people in DOE, but it's a real bifurcated rule making process for this piece of legislation.

TERRY: Are there any other questions? Well I assume that the co-Secretaries will work with Judy and John, and we will keep track of what goes on with this. It's quite possible that there will be things here that either require us to reconsider or think about policies, or adopt some, or conceivably, there may be things that are within our discretion that we want to do in different ways, and we'll bring what we think is appropriate back to the UFC, and we will try to identify things that maybe need to be brought to the attention of the individual campuses. But we'll also depend on John and Judy to involve the campuses as well which I am sure they will do.

APPLEGATE: Will do! We are happy to do it, and thank you for having us.

PALMER: Thank you.

TERRY: Thank you. Are you leaving because you're unhappy?

APPLEGATE: No, I'm deliriously happy because I am going away for Thanksgiving.
(laughter)

TERRY: Have a good Thanksgiving John. Okay, I would like to know if anyone has joined from the regional campuses. I do not want to know if anyone has left. Has anyone joined and not checked in on the poll earlier. [Grason Bolinger responds] Okay, anyone else? Does that make a difference, Craig? Okay. We are apparently short of a quorum. Not enough people showed up at the regional campuses. At best, Craig and I can determine through an exchange of notes, there doesn't appear to be a way to adopt or actually act on the item about the forming of a Learning Technology Steering Committee. I think we will proceed to discuss it, assume that the minutes will go out to the members who are not able to be present, and we will have a very truncated discussion of it at the January 27th meeting which is apparently the first time we could approve it. I suggested we do it through some kind of electronic technology, but apparently, our Constitution doesn't allow that, so we will see what we can do with regard to that. In that light, the January 27th meeting is our annual videoconference meeting. Attendance at those has sometimes been less than perfect. I hope that everyone will make an effort to appear at the January 27th meeting, because we will have at least this action, and perhaps some other, including perhaps something on the Code of Student Ethics. So please mark on your calendars the January 27th meeting. We will still take up Item 8 when we get there. I think we are ready to proceed with Vice President Wheeler, and the presentation of the Strategic Plan 2 and a discussion of it. I hope many of you have read it. It is a comprehensive document and on a fast track, and so if we have anything to say about, this is one of our chances.

AGENDA ITEM #6: DISCUSSION OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC PLAN 2 (ITSP 2).

WHEELER: Since we know sound is good from this safe spot, I will speak from here and Herb I think we'll take it as one of the first action items before the strategic plan to come up with a better way to come up with a better way for the UFC meetings to meet. I think there are too many conflicting sound systems and not enough distribution of mics for the size of the group today, so I'm going to work with Craig and let's see if we can do better for the next time we need to do that. It's my pleasure to be with you to talk about the Information Technology Strategic Plan. I suspect a number of you have picked it up and seen it already. So let me only fly through fairly quickly, just a little bit of information about the plan, and then we'll talk about where we're at, and what happens next. Many of you were here in 1998 probably, when the first plan went forward. As you may recall from that time, it had ten general recommendations, and if you go and read those today, they are fairly timeless and they prove about as enduring and good of guidance to day as they were at that time. And then there were sixty-eight very specific action items for implementing the plan. When I came in from...

GRAY: You are coming in and out quite badly.

WHEELER: I am? Then, maybe I'm speaking too far to the side.

TERRY: It may be the case that some regional campus is not pushing their mute button.

WHEELER: I think we're getting background noise from one of the remote sites. So if you're not speaking, if you could press mute, it would probably help the others here. There, I think somebody got it. That got rid of the noise. Hopefully that helps. So there were ten recommendations, sixty-three action items. I was very pleased when I first came in, working part time, for the office, to see, and that was in 2002, how tightly all the budgets and the work were really tied to that strategic plan. It was not a document that went on the shelves. It guided the actions and the decisions. And as you might recall, technology has changed a great deal through the late nineties and into the early 2000's, so the ideas remain constant even though the technology has evolved considerably during that time. I think one other thing that helped the plan to succeed was that it was a comprehensive plan. It didn't choose just one piece to go after while missing some of the other parts that might fall aside but it worked on the whole; whether it's network connectivity, administrative systems, security, across the whole technology gamut for the University. So in May we had a large celebration event marking ten years, the first plan was May of 2008, and on your tables there are some books that have the ten major recommendations and chronicle some of the progress that happened during those ten years. Chancellor Meredith Bepko from Indianapolis spoke eloquently at the event, as did President McRobbie, and a lot of other people who were involved at that time. We're now working on the next strategic plan, and this is a charge given by President McRobbie, as you can see in the charge itself, it is also in the back pages of the book before you. It is a very bold charge. He notes that the progress over the last ten years has been good for the University overall, but it has been uneven among some disciplines, and the charge is to ensure that we can move forward for all campuses and all disciplines in taking advantage of information technology, as it is relevant to the needs of a particular discipline or academic pursuit. So we engaged that work. Professor Frank Acito, who's an Associate Dean at the Kelly School, wanted to be with us today but ended up having a last minute conflict. Frank has worked tirelessly, weekends, weekends, weekends and nights in chairing the overall University Information Technology Committee, and working through many revisions and consolidations of ideas, and working on the plan. When I set out to charge the UITC and the task forces I'll share in a moment, I asked that it be visionary, but realistic, and relevant to the things that we're trying to achieve, and the different missions, in the plural, of the campuses and programs of Indiana University. We organized the work of this plan differently than the first one. If you were to pick up the first document, you would not be surprised to see that it was organized by things that really needed to be done at that time. There was a section on networks, a section on administrative systems, a section on starting the digital library program and accelerating some of the work that was going on there, but it had a very functional orientation. We've got a lot of those things well under way now, trying to incrementally improve them all the time. And this plan was to be a strategic plan in areas we wanted to make a big jump, and so we organized it around people. The role of faculty members, in terms of scholarly excellence, whether that faculty member may be consulting and guiding a student team, maybe working on a private research project alone and solo, or working with a research team at other universities, or teaching on a distributed learning team, maybe at a distance; the role of the faculty member in achieving scholarly success and likewise, student success. Student success means different things for different constituencies. Some of our campuses are largely resident based, with the primary input being 18, 19 year olds and a graduate student population. Some of our campuses have completers. They're coming back, they have a couple of years, their family life took them in a different direction maybe, and job, and now they're coming back to finish their degree. Some of our students aren't on any of our campuses

really much at all. They're principally taking their programs at a distance, and as you know, we have a new evolution of students who are starting out perhaps, in the community college of Indiana through Ivy-Tech and are transferring into IU. So to understand student success that can come in a lot of different forms as well. In the last two task forces were effective community, how we work together, so we don't have communication and video conferencing problems as we're experiencing today (laughter). I joke that IU has never said no to any calendaring system it ever saw. We got all of them, and heaven help you if you try to coordinate a calendaring event with someone who's not working the same calendaring system as you are, you know how much time we spend on things like that, or just the simple things, trying to buy theatre tickets, or finding out where the UFC meeting is going to be sometimes. We need to simplify these things, and how we work together. And the fourth task force is engagement beyond. As you know, we are deeply engaged in helping retool the economy of the state, whether it's through work in the Life Sciences, or outreach with the Indiana Economic Development Corporation, and our work with IURTC, or the new transitional health grant that's being administered out of IUPUI and the School of Medicine with partnerships with Purdue and others. We are deeply involved in the life of this state, and that's what engagement beyond means as well. So this is where we're at. We started. This has been an ambitious plan, from the charter of the President in March to the work to where we're at right now. We are in the university wide comment and review period. We started these at the beginning of this month, and have had many meetings and conversations. I'm going to tell you about that in just a moment, where all we've been with it. But, we've been socializing the plan as much as possible and asking for your feedback, and I'll give you some stats on that very soon. So we haven't fully resolved the title of it, but right now the working title is "Accelerating the Journey," and there are three major sections in the plan.

The first section is the one that you see here title "Sustaining the Foundation," and the key point here is, well let's don't break the things that are working. We've sorted out some things with life cycle funding of equipment and doing enterprise licensing for software packages that everybody can just download, and make use of those things, 24 hour support and such. So some of the things that are working, let's be sure we don't lose sight of those along the way. There are some new items in there about sustainability, and environmental stewardship in our own habits and the habits of those from whom we buy, so that's the foundation piece.

The second piece is human centered. There is no doubt that our lives everyday whether it's the gadgets we're carrying around or it's trying to program out TIVO at home or trying to video conference or link to some new website, our lives are becoming more technologically intense. But we need to make it simpler, we need to make it easier, and that's where looking at things from the role of a professor who may be teaching one moment, researching another moment, and may be on two committees or twelve the next moment, or the role of a student working at home, working in the library, working at Starbucks, doing a part time job trying to finish some homework while perhaps commuting home for a weekend or something, looking at it from a role will make a lot of difference.

And then the third section is one I'll speak to more in a moment. These are grand challenges, and I say grand challenges because they are beyond the capacity of IU to fundamentally solve or do by ourselves. They are not beyond our capacity to lead and work with other Universities and

institutions that face similar problems and would value similar solutions, and we can play a leadership role in some of these.

So just a quick glance, I'll leave the text up here for you to read, but here is a sample from each of the sections. So the first section is "Sustaining the Foundation," one of the things that we know is the life cycle funding approach used for replacing faculty, instructor desktops, has generally served us well. It's allowed us to buy a lot more computers, keep them refreshed, keep them in warranty and supported for far less money than buying them haphazardly as we were doing before. But we also know that has proven incomplete. We have a number of comments from members of the task forces, also from a cyber infrastructure task force in 2005 that makes clear that there is a lot of equipment, used in language labs, or research labs, or other purposes, that is not one chime equipment. It is part of sustaining the scholarly work of the department or learning, but it is not, in any way, covered by life cycle funding yet. So it gets old until the next miracle money comes along and we need an approach to be able to keep that up. The second one you notice there; security and privacy are enormous concerns. While bad things can happen through a variety of means, some of our greatest worries about security breaches have a lot more to do with laptops and USB drives than necessarily the core data center getting hacked. So what we need to do is to be sure we remove the incentives for why people feel they need to put data in places to do their work that is less secure than is appropriate for the university, and we need to make that easy to use, so people can take advantage of those things. So a quick sampling from the second part, "Human Centered Information Technology." I know these are a bit long to look through, but one of the things that came through resoundingly loud and clear is that we have got to have a variety of approaches to help bring up the human skill set of using an evolving base of technologies and data sets. And a class that is going to be offered on Tuesday at 4pm down at the library isn't going to cut it, so we need multiple ways for faculty, staff, and students to acquire skills. Some of that may be very small episodes. Just at that moment you need to know how to do something, and if you could just watch a ninety second tutorial at that moment that would often solve your problem. One thing that we've already implemented that was suggested through the summer is there are a lot of courses that are about one hour courses, that are valuable like graduating to high performance computing or making use of Oncourse for committee and collaborative work and such, but it would be helpful if those were offered to schools and departments at their place, rather than sending people to a training center wherever we would be. So we now have the equivalent of the take-out pizza, or the pizza delivery menu. There are about ten items that your department can order in, so if you want someone to come in and do training on one of these ten, twelve topics, kind of the hot topics of the day, my staff will come to your faculty meeting, or department staff meeting. We've also found that when people learn together, they can reinforce and help each other, rather than when one person goes off and learns something; so making learning available in a variety of different ways. The next one you see there is really big. When we look across the horizon, if you think about the University for the next 10, 15, 20 plus years, there are a lot of different types of data and content that are highly relevant to what we do. Well we understand administrative data like student credit hours, and assessing completion rates and things like that, but we also have all kinds of data regarding scholarly data for scientific purposes or cultural preservation. We have performance data. We have the scholarly life of the institution. The many seminars, lectures, great performances that are given; if many of those perish right now; we don't have a preservation strategy for them. So we need a means of insuring easy access to that stuff for people wanting to make use of what

we're calling Data Utilities for we can name about seven different content types that we need a way to preserve that. Finally, for an example of grand challenges, the number one challenge that you see there is reclaiming the scholarly record. For centuries, I guess almost for millennia, you could argue that Universities and the library have preserved the scholarly record. And, so we know what an article said, we know who wrote it when, we build on a cumulative tradition of research, but at present, I say this with a passion, dear colleagues, we cannot attest that our generation is maintaining the stewardship of that the way those who preceded us did. We have moved from a society of owning our scholarship, to a society of renting access to read our own scholarship; all the while, absorbing 10%, year over year, price escalations among the journals. And there is a much longer story to this than Herb would allow me to sing on for the moment, but we're working very closely with our library and others. This is reaching a point of national crisis. In some ways it's not much different than the textbook issue. But we must find a way to reassert our ability to own and control our own scholarly record, and I believe the means of doing that leaves a lot to be figured out, but I think it is within the decision choice of the scholarly societies who publish their own journals, and who decide what meets peer review standards, then making them an offer that will help the professional societies meet their goals, while we can preserve the record for Higher Ed, and I think there is a way of doing that. So there are several of these laid out. The last section speaks to improving healthcare in the state of Indiana. With the School of Medicine, and the other professional schools, Optometry, Dentistry, the largest school, Nursing, the clinical and science translational initiative we have now with I-Light, our own network in the ground, the School of Informatics, the School of Library and Information Sciences, and our partnership with Clarion Health, we have a lot of the pieces that affect health care, whether its information or clinical delivery or connectivity. So perhaps we could focus those in ways to help improve Hoosier health, the economics of Hoosier health, as well as delivery of Hoosier Health. And so there is a section in the plan around that as well. So here's the short count. I just looked before I came. I think I need to up that ninety-two to about ninety-eight, based on what my Blackberry has shown me while I was sitting in here today. We have done eighty presentations of the plan in the last less than thirty days, so my senior team, we have been out and about. We've been on all campuses. I think the minimum number on any campus was three or four. We've gone to schools, departments, administrative units, about eighteen-hundred in attendance, lots of feedback has come in through the website address I'll put up in just a moment, the e-mail address I'll put up in a moment. A lot of it catching nuances, wordings making it more precise, asking questions perhaps we didn't think about. Sometimes something was clearly in our intent, but it was so in our intent, it wasn't even put in black and white. It was just assumed that it would be better to actually put it in black and white. So with that here is where you can find a hard copy of the plan at the URL above. There is a version of it that is sequentially line numbered all the way through, so if you want to send a comment about line 1382, you can do so or if you want to refer to a particular action item, you can do so. The new plan has 15 general recommendations that I think will prove fairly timeless over a five plus year horizon of implementing this. This is a strategic plan, this is not next year, and 69 action items as it sits today. And with that I'm happy to take your questions. Yes?

UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER: Thank you for the presentation. My question is, at this point, how much conversation or collaboration is happening with CIC or with other peer institutions, particularly with some of the grand challenges.

WHEELER: Yeah, I will. So to repeat the question, which was a fantastic question, and that is “how much collaboration is going on with the other CIC institutions, particularly around the grand challenges.” My precise answer is a hell of a lot, particularly on number one, regarding the evolution of the scholarly publishing. I was just on a call about that very matter today. As you may know, we came together and created Hathi Trust, where we’re putting all of the scanned Google book content. The CIC did that collaboratively, and after long bouts of arm wrestling, we brought in the entire University of California, all campuses, into that with this as well. Michigan and Indiana are in the lead, and in less than two weeks, I will be presenting at an event called the Open Forum, that is looking at these questions about open scholarly publishing, open textbooks, open educational resources, open source software, what are the trends that may help us deal with some of the challenges facing Higher Ed, and the CIC is perhaps poised as well as anybody in the nation to lead on this.

TERRY: Brad, could you reveal the time table for the completion of the report?

WHEELER: I’ll not be having turkey on Thursday because I’ll be editing all day. Frank and I will be working on it all day tomorrow and editing our plan. We’ve asked for feedback by December 1st. Then, the intent is to get the document buttoned down in time for the Trustees meeting which is, I believe, the 13th. No, that’s not right, 11th and 12th. The next Trustees meeting is the 11th and 12th. So we are hoping to conclude all input by the 1st, and then we will wrap up our editing of it. I should say, a lot of the recommendations and the action items are written to describe outcomes, but they are not written in means of saying everybody should have an iPhone, because two years from now, who knows if iPhone will still be the thing, or if everybody should get a 3G network. You know maybe 3G will be passé at that point, so we’ve tried to stay away from any mention whatsoever about very specific technologies. Bill?

WOKECK: This is Marianne from IUPUI.

TERRY: Go ahead Marianne.

WOKECK: Thank you, I had some general comments that came up in conversation on this campus, and I’d like just to report them. One is that it is very unfortunate from quite few of our perspectives that the plan really geared up right in the middle of the summer when many of the faculty were unavailable for active input as the plan was put together, and the other is that their response period falls pretty much towards the end of the semester, when again, faculty are very busy with other things, so the timing is unfortunate in terms of faculty input. The two other major, or general, observations would be that the strategic plan currently does not have its introduction. It is very much a, this is where we want to go, but it does not have a critical, let alone a self-critical, assessment of where are we and what has gone well. Everything seems to have gone exceedingly well, and we know, at least I know, and I’m not the only one who speaks to that, that the example of the transition from Oncourse to Oncourse CL for example, was anything but smooth. So it would be helpful to really have an assessment that makes it clear from where we start and when we start from where we do and where we want to land up. The second general comment is that throughout the document, it always says ‘IT does that,’ ‘IT wants to do that,’ and nowhere does it say whom IT serves. And that, according to what several of us have said, that there has been a very interesting omission, and that it would be very helpful

to see excellence in teaching and research and at least in the context of faculty, to really have that made very clear that the cooperation comes not as IT cooperates with, but as faculty cooperates with IT, in order to set the agenda and try to make good decisions in terms of resources and where to go and at what pace to go, as its currently expressed in the document.

WHEELER: Marianne, I believe if you'll read the document carefully, of the 69 action items, all but just two or three are very purposefully written to say IU should, or IU could, or IU will, for the very point that many of the things that we're looking to achieve now, are not just IT objectives, but they do span the faculty, the libraries...

WOKECK: Yeah, but by way of discussion, and not by way of how that relationship is defined, and that's really, I think, what sparks the discussion at least on our campuses about how that relationship between IT and faculty in this case is defined and there I would encourage you to pay real close attention to how things are and how the objectives and the action items are phrased.

WHEELER: So noted, Bill?

SCHNEIDER: Yeah, I was going to ask a question about budgetary assumptions for this strategic plan. What was their sum and what are you anticipating from now forward?

WHEELER: To repeat the question, Bill asked about what are the assumptions for budgetary planning regarding the IT strategic plan. Well, I think its abundant to all and anyone reading the newspaper there is no pot of money sitting around to do much of anything, but really Bill I think this plan is, more than anything, is a guiding plan for how we spend the money and the things that we're working on and doing now. You've been in budget hearings with me I know where one of the things that we do in UITS is we do a lot of internal pruning, rolling money back, and reallocating for new initiatives. So this summer, when we screwed three-thousand new access points to the walls to upgrade the wireless networks, that was all funded through internal reallocation in terms of cutting things, overtime, rolling up the money and proposal to go out and refresh the wireless network. And, as we've had to do that with increasing security and other things, so I believe the principle means of enacting the plan will be through steering the efforts that we already have to the objectives of the plan, and through internal reallocation. My shop is in our sixth cycle of internal give-backs to roll up money and cut across each of the divisions for that purpose. We welcome any budgetary sources you can identify as well.

SCHNEIDER: Well, as a historian, let me follow up and ask what the budgetary record has been then, in the past ten years. We all assume there has been growth, that the IT budget has increased. Can you put some more precise numbers on that?

WHEELER: The IT budget will have only increased just through -- there have been no new asks or new requests for budget. I have gone to the budget hearings myself since I was acting CIO for the last, and then now Vice President for the last three cycles. We received some increase from student technology fees, which you know go through the student government process, at least on this campus they do. There have been no new asks. One thing we have done is we've been pretty successful in partnering lots of schools and departments on federal grant

wins; things around cyber infrastructure and other pieces, and so lots of that money has come in and helped subsidize the cyber infrastructure as far as high performance computing, big storage systems, things like that. So we're running, you know it depends on the year, but we're somewhere between ten to fifteen million a year, generally in external funding that helps enable a lot of the stuff we commonly enjoy.

SCHNEIDER: And what's the magnitude of your budget total?

WHEELER: It's about a hundred million across all campuses, but remember that includes -- that's the phone system, the phone switches, everything, soup to nuts.

SCHNEIDER: But that's not the campus, the school IT, that's UITS.

WHEELER: That's UITS.

SCHNEIDER: Right.

WHEELER: Yeah.

TERRY: Are there any other questions in this room, or from you Simon...?

ATKINSON: I was just wondering if, in the comments and feedback you've received so far, if there are any common themes, common concerns that have come out of that up to this point.

WHEELER: Yeah, I think there are several. One, I've been pleased, if there's one thing that seems a lot of people who have read the plan, and we've received lots of comments. We've, from support staff, from medical doctors, from performing artists, from other administrators, students; I'm really gratified that the process has achieved what was hoped in putting it out for public comment. The one thing that more people have commented on, I think, than anything else, is the first Grand Challenge. People do recognize that we've lost control of the scholarly record. I mean, as you know, we've got situation where people on some campuses of Indiana University cannot even read the scholarly publications of their colleagues on other campuses of Indiana University because of the way journals are licensed and stuff. And so while no solution is immediately evident, people have embraced that considerably. There has also been a pretty broad view of appreciating where we are able to do things as a university collectively, like the Microsoft Enterprise agreement, where you can just download and get any of that software and you don't have to worry about it, and lots of things that we can do collectively, and if anything concerns me, some of that doesn't go far enough, wishing that other tools that are of interest today were available or some of those agreements go almost to all of IU but we've got some issues, you know, deep in the medical school where maybe you've crossed the line and the agreement doesn't go that far. So people who have hit a boundary, those have been raised very consistently. Other than that, there are lots of people looking at it with eyes related to where they sit, so lots of one off comments from that.

ATKINSON: The other thing I want to say is to echo what Marianne said about the development of the plan and particularly the amount of work that went on over the summer.

This isn't just a problem with the IT Strategic Plan, it's a problem with a lot of plans that the university puts together. Much of the work goes on over the summer because, I think, the feeling is that that's when people have free time to work on these things, but it does tend to leave faculty with 10 month appointments who aren't available during the summer to work on these things to feel somewhat excluded from this process.

TERRY: I'll add briefly to Simon's comment. We've raised this general matter with the president. Not only was IT done this way, but the master planning process for the Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses were also on that kind of an accelerated schedule, and the issue is getting the best work product out. It's getting faculty feedback and in many cases, feedback from others, and the goal of that is to improve the outcome. Our position with the president has been that the best way to get the best outcome is to take the life cycle of faculty, and students for that matter, into account in developing strategies for developing plans or documents of the type we've been talking about. Any other comments or questions? Well Brad, thank you.

ATKINSON: Maybe you can stay up here for the next item, if you don't mind.

WHEELER: Certainly, sure, yeah.

AGENDA ITEM #7 DISCUSSION ON BOOKSTORE OPERATIONS.

TERRY: Okay, our next item is the discussion of bookstore operations. I'm happy to tell you that the Director of Purchasing Operations, Jill Schunk of, I suppose Terry Clapacs' office I assume ultimately, is here to address some issues that may come up. To begin with let me also emphasize something that Judy and Simon and others have said. One of the primary things the bookstore does is to provide textbooks for students and receive faculty recommendations. On the Bloomington campus, at the urging of the Bloomington IUSA, the BFC adopted a resolution at its last meeting, urging our colleagues to get textbook requests in in a timely fashion; in this case by December 1st just because our local bookstore can apparently accommodate that. The reason is the substantial financial impact on the students. The figures here were that had all the textbook orders come in on time, and I'm not sure if it was last semester or last year, students might have saved up to five-hundred thousand dollars. Given the escalating cost of textbooks and all that sort of thing, Bloomington Council decided that that would be a good thing to do. In the course of the discussion of that resolution, I think a number of Bloomington faculty remembered that what we had done was sign a system wide contract with Barnes and Noble, and for example, it was asked whether or not Barnes and Noble knew which books might be used at other campuses of the University, so that students could sell their books on one campus and get the higher price that is paid for textbooks that are known to be used the following semester. At least from what we could determine, that was working locally here in Bloomington, and if a textbook was not being used on the Bloomington campus, what students got offered was a much lower price. We've discussed this in the Agenda Committee and then partly depending on what's raised today, but depending on other things too, I think the Agenda Committee may be urging our committees or an *ad hoc* group, to ask the basic question, 'where do we stand a couple of years into the contract with Barnes and Noble not just from a campus by campus perspective, but are any of the benefits that we assumed would go to us from signing the contract to a single provider for all the bookstores in the system, are those being realized and are there any problems, or anything we could do to improve the functioning of the system for faculty and

for students?’ And I would second what Brad had to say, that there is a lot in this report trying to address, not just making the system work well for faculty and students and staff, but looking at issues of affordability, particularly from a student perspective, and I hope everyone who’s involved will try and pursue that at all levels that we can. As Brad said, the report does reflect a number of things that have been of interest to faculty councils, certainly this Council, and the Bloomington council, and I suspect IUPUI has been concerned for quite some time about regaining the intellectual legacy. I hope we will find a way to be a national leader in that process. With that, we had a report of some comments about Barnes and Noble from IU East so we’ll talk with the person who is most familiarized with that report. Briefly summarize what came up at IU East, and then we’ll let others chime in. Go ahead.

POMPER: Well, I just sent out an email to all our faculty members, and I’ve gotten back a few responses, about a dozen, and the recurring comment was -- I didn’t copy and paste all the responses - - but the recurring comment was that there are not enough books to prepare. So that at the beginning of the semester, the bookstore runs out of textbooks and it takes them a week, ten days or so to order more and then during that time the students are out of books. And there are others that deal with buyback policy. In particular, apparently one psychology book has been customized in some way for IU East, and it’s not quite known in what way, and the bookstore won’t buy it back even though that same textbook will be reused at the campus every semester. Those are two major complaints that were raised.

TERRY: Is there anyone from any other campus that has something specific like that, and then we’ll turn to a general discussion with Jill?

GERENCSEK: I can just confirm that the issue from IU South Bend, the issue of not enough of a given class’ books being on the shelves so that they are available for students for the first day of classes has been an issue on our campus as well.

TERRY: Can you tell if that has gotten worse or better than prior to Barnes and Noble?

GERENCSEK: This came up in a faculty meeting at the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences just this past week and it was, the comments were that, it came up because it had gotten worse.

POMPER: I agree.

TERRY: We had an agreement from IU East.

BESEL: I can concur with the Kokomo campus. We’ve had similar situations, and it has definitely gotten worse over the last two years.

TERRY: Systems were created on each campus for telephonic, and I think in other cases, e-mail contact, with the managers of the bookstores. Do any of you have a sense if that’s working? Is the management responsive when they get these things?

WERT: We have had a bookstore manager come to our IU Southeast Faculty Senate meeting a couple of times and have tried to address some of the concerns that the faculty has, and that

seems to have maybe helped with some of the problems. We've also developed a committee, a bookstore liaison committee, that has faculty, staff, and students on it now working toward fixing some of these problems as well and that seems to be working fairly well.

TERRY: Do any of you know if your other campuses have similar committees? I think we had one in Bloomington that I was on for many years, but it seems not to be functioning.

BJORNSON: We brought in the regional manager from Barnes and Noble and had the same complaint, and they bought enough books to have the entire enrollment in the class from the previous semester, and have them on the shelves for the first day last year, and then they compared their sell through and then, came and talked to us and said that they won't be able to do that for every course this year because there are a couple of courses that they didn't sell nearly as many books, and they had to send back half the books that they bought and so forth, but they were, I thought, quite responsive. So I might suggest to other campuses, you might try and do the same thing and see if you can get the regional manager of Barnes and Noble to come into your faculty senate and talk to them about the issues that you're having. One issue that we brought up that they have not addressed is that our bookstore used to, on the website of the bookstore, post the ISBN numbers of the books, so if a student wanted to buy a book online, instead of going to the bookstore and buying it, they could do that. And Barnes and Noble refuses to do that, and says that it is due to a contract they signed with Bloomington. So they put the blame right up here, so I don't know what that contract actually says, but it might be interesting to hear.

SCHUNK: Well, let me speak to that right away, because I've heard that issue several times, and I know specifically at IU Southeast, that they specifically put that onus right on my office and that is not true. As a matter of fact, ISBN numbers will be posted on the website by fall rush this year.

TERRY: For all campuses?

SCHUNK: For all campuses, that is exactly right. Part of that is because, as Judy and John spoke earlier, part of that has to do with the Higher Education Act, so it's not a matter at this point of what was or what was not negotiated within the contract, it is a matter of it will be required by law of them to do so and they will be compliant with that. Let me first go ahead and start and we can go ahead and take other issues as they come up. Again I am Jill Schunk, and while I've been with the IU Purchasing Department for over twenty years, those of you whom I may have met with, or spoken with in the past, what I have primarily purchased for the last twenty years is technology. So this last year the IU Purchasing Department has gone through quite a bit of transition in our personnel, and over the course of the past seven months, we have actually transitioned through three people handling the Barnes and Noble contract, so let me say first and foremost that I am here for the long haul. I have been here for the long haul, and I will be here for the long haul. I am not handling the Barnes and Noble contract and I have been doing so for about two and a half months, so I am relatively new to the contract, relatively new to the bookstores. I am definitely learning and growing in this arena every day, and let me assure you that what I want to do is make sure that you are successful in what your needs may be with regards to the relationship with the bookstore. I do know, from some of my discussions and

some of the review of some of the previous information that's been discussed, that there was a listserv that was created about a year ago, I think after the last time that Jennifer and Paul attended this particular meeting, a listserv was created so that anyone that had any concerns or complaints could post those concerns or complaints to the listserv, and we would address them and track those. I understand that from what happened initially upon the outset of that listserv was that there was a flurry of activity of about twelve or fifteen e-mails that came in. That is when Jennifer was still handling the contract, and you know, since that initial flurry of activities and some of those initial conversations, the traffic on that listserv had completely died. Now whether that was due to the fact that, you know, there were no new issues or more likely the case, that the listserv had been forgotten about. My assumption is that it is the latter rather than the former, so I want to make a plea and a suggestion that let's reinstate that listserv e-mail address. And I can certainly share that with you right now. It is bookstore-bl-1@indiana.edu. I am on that listserv, so as messages come through, in my responsibility of managing and handling the Barnes and Noble relationship, I will certainly assure you that I will work with Barnes and Noble to track some of those issues. In the meantime, I did follow up with some of these issues, with regards to the latest e-mail that Craig had sent to Paul Sullivan. Some of the concerns that Barnes and Noble had with regards to the amount of books on the shelves had to do with getting the textbook adoptions in in a timely fashion. So if they don't get the textbook adoptions in in a timely fashion, then they don't have time to get the books in and stock them on the shelves. Now, I appreciate the fact that, I understand the President of the IUSA was here last month and you folks approved this adoption or they had supported this resolution to get those timely book adoptions in, and so I appreciate that. I think that will help significantly, and certainly I think we need to continue monitoring that and watching that, and I certainly would encourage your feedback on that as we proceed, to see if that helps. One of the other things that I wanted to speak about today for a few minutes was that the contract with the Barnes and Noble Bookstore, just recently completed going through an internal audit, and the audit results, the audit findings have been discussed with the various parties. They were actually very good. We have been found to be certainly compliant in most of the areas. The finances all look good, and there were a couple of recommendations made by Barnes and Noble, which we are currently following up on. One of those was that we create a contract monitoring, or contract compliance document, so I am currently working with the Chancellors on all of the campuses to create a contract monitoring tool. Those particular things will impact every section of the contract, such as used versus new texts in the bookstores, and buyback, and all of the specific items that were within the contract, we will be creating campus by campus criteria about how those items will be measured. Some of those measurements will be taken at various times throughout the year, quarterly basis, whatever. The university administration, meaning me, my role, will be pushing out to each of the campuses the request for the information that will be feeding back, and then we'll be organizing this into an annual contract compliance document. So we are really working hard, and striving to assure compliance, and again, because I am new to this contract, I really want to assure you that I am here and available for you, and I really want to take your concerns to Barnes and Noble, and see how I can try to help resolve those issues for you. So additional feedback or thoughts?

GRAY: I just had a question. Do we have sense, and I'm not sure how we would get it so, but do we have a sense of how many students are opting out of even using Barnes and Noble? I mean, particularly because they can access Amazon. They have a list of their courses through

Oncourse once they are registered. Do we have any way to measure, and I guess I'm asking this because it sounds like we're putting a lot of energy into making sure we're keeping up our end of the bargain and I'm no longer that clear -- for some professors in the humanities at least, in the social sciences, how much our students are really dependent on Barnes and Noble? For example, I use Boxcar exclusively, Boxcar books in town, so I mean I know a number of us are just trying to opt out entirely from using Barnes and Noble.

SCHUNK: And, you know, I think that's something that, while we may not have our fingers on how many students are really opting out, I think it's something we need to consciously pay attention to, because Barnes and Noble is our contracted supplier, and it really is in our best interest to help them succeed so that they can do better things for our students and work closely with you to do the things that you want to do. So as we're working with our students, and pushing them to other sources, you know that's really not in, necessarily, our best interest. If there are concerns with regards to various issues like, not having enough books on the shelves, you know, those are things that we need to really try and be true partners, with Barnes and Noble with, and say, we have an issue with this, and we need you to come to the table as our true partner and work with us to resolve this. So in answer to your question, I don't think we really have a good way of assessing what students are or are not using Barnes and Noble.

GRAY: Is this listserv, for example, is this something that's available up on the campus bookstore website so that students would be able to submit their suggestions, or is there any way to solicit feedback, I realize their won't be as many people going to that website to offer their input, or they're probably already interested in the bookstore because they're there, but I mean, if we're not asking them and we don't have a way of assessing that I'm not sure how we're going to find out what's working, what's not, from the student end of things. I mean, faculty seem easier to poll.

SCHUNK: Very good point, I do not know if there is a link on the various bookstore sites, with regards to a place to submit their concerns, but I will certainly check on that.

GRAY: Thank you.

TERRY: If I may comment for a moment, this intersects with the Higher Education Act. It's always risky to speculate about the intent of Congress, but it seems pretty clear that this act in its textbook provisions is intended to drive down the cost of textbooks. It's intended to get the best bargains for students, and to put pressure on publishers as well to reduce costs. Now how effective that can be in the current marketplace, that's a big issue. The intent of the Act is to give students earlier notice of the books that will be used in their courses, and ultimately I think we may view whatever Barnes and Noble may do at the moment or whatever we may ask for at the moment as potentially interim until all of the implementing regulations and other sorts of things are adopted under the Act. The Act clearly intends that students shall be able to find out what their textbooks are, and go out and find the best bargain. Part of the impact on us is some vague language in the act that may mean that instead of use waiting for a while to actually adopt our textbooks, we may have to figure out what the textbooks are and adopt them the moment we say we're going to offer a class, and what say we're going to offer a class is uncertain. Congress may have presumed that you put it in the schedule of classes and so it's sort of around

registration time, but alternatively, it could be the case that the moment some department publishes a five year planned graduate offerings or something like that, suddenly we have to come up with textbooks, that's unclear. In response to your observation, I think the issue of deadlines for selecting adoptions is a difficult one. Clearly in order to place orders for textbooks and get them delivered on time, the deadline is going to be somewhere in October or so in a fall semester. Clearly for a textbook buyback, most of us I think would hope that our students wait until the end of the semester, or who knows, maybe after they've taken the final exam before selling their textbooks back. So the bookstore at that point could, and I think probably should, be able to wait until very near the end of the semester to settle on its buyback list. The interaction of the different deadlines by which various parts of the bookstore process go on, is going to complicate efforts to set deadlines. We are going to send out to all of the leaders of the faculty councils the Bloomington resolution. It doesn't do much more than try and encourage faculty to do all they can to comply with the deadlines the bookstores have to establish. I hope that will promote a discussion with the local bookstore managers as to what those deadlines really need to be for purposes of buyback and other sorts of things. Our intent here at Bloomington was certainly, however, to recognize that faculty often had legitimate reasons besides lethargy for submitting their textbook requests. You might be waiting for a new edition to be published so that you could review it before you require students to buy it, and that sort of thing. I'm going to ask if you can send to Craig, the requests that you're making of the campuses for various information, so that we can encourage the faculty councils there as well as the Chancellors and Provost, in the case of Bloomington, to get that information to you. Yeah?

GERENCSEK: I wonder if there's a possibility for Barnes and Noble, which I mean in its commercial ventures has a quite sophisticated website for ordering books, to adapt that in some ways to IU's needs for ordering books for classes. What I have in mind is perhaps a portal which, I don't think students care whether they're ordering from Amazon.com or walking into the bookstore to buy their books. What they're used to doing is ordering books and cd's from Amazon.com or halfpricebooks, whatever it might be. If they can get their books at a moderate price, if they can sell back their books in the way they're used to selling things, by Ebay, by halfpricebooks, and so forth, I'm not familiar with Amazon, I think they would do so if that were available as well. If there was a possibility for Barnes and Noble to be able to work with the physical bookstores on campus so that students could actually be buying their books through a process that supports that contract, but does so in a fashion that students are used to doing already, which is ordering online, there might be a way to not negate, or go around the contract, by going outside, but actually use a fashion that most people, most of our students, are already incorporating. I don't know if that's possible.

DOWELL: Well, it's done on some campuses.

SCHUNK: It should be done on all campuses. It's my understanding, because I also did ask this question of Barnes and Noble just over the last couple of days, it is my understanding that from the point that the students are doing their online registration, that there is a link that goes directly from the registration to "do you want to buy your books now." Yes, please?

DOWELL: I mean that's true, but I think that a lot of this discussion is interesting but it's hard for me to get concerned about anecdotal evidence in this case, because we're in the middle of a

very changing kind of marketplace for the sale of books, and students don't want to go to our place, and especially once legislation mandates the release of ISBN numbers, they're going to be even less likely to go to one place if they can just check the ISBN numbers from the other people in their sorority, or the people online, or buy it from Amazon, or from one of the secondhand dealers online, and you know, the other thing I wanted to bring up was that the other kind of market pressure that is causing not enough books to be on the actual, physical shelves in bookstores is that bookstores want to have just as many books as they can sell, you know? Is the anecdotal evidence just those cases where they guessed wrong, you know? So I just think we're in the middle of a very changing kind of marketplace for books and while we, you know, want to fulfill our contractual obligations with this arrangement with Barnes and Noble, larger forces are working against this being resolved, I think.

SCHUNK: We clearly are in a much more global marketplace than we ever have been before. There is no doubt about it, and students are very savvy and they know how to buy and they know how to go out and compare, and yes, presenting the ISBN numbers on the website is going to present more of a challenge to them, and they know that, but I do think that the links from the registration system on site, right online will help them, you know. And I did confirm with Barnes and Noble that this should be in place on all campuses. I know it is at Northwest. I know it is on a few of the other campuses when we had our monthly bookstore meeting this last week. South Bend was concerned it was not on their site, but I do believe, from my understanding, from Barnes and Noble that it should be, so I don't know whether that has been verified or not, Karen Vargo was going to look and see if she could verify that or not. I do agree that we're in a very global, different kind of marketplace, and it's going to be interesting to see how the future holds.

TERRY: Bradley Wheeler?

WHEELER: Having looked at this quite a bit with CIC and others, and those of you who get the Chronicle of Higher Ed, you may have noted that yesterday and today, there were both headline stories about textbooks and alternatives models and the evolution. My current thinking on the matter, more as a business school guy than necessarily my current role, is I'm not sure the textbook business can be fixed. It's extremely entrenched in the models in which it exists. What may be the path around it is thinking of the content that matters to using courses, and finding alternate models, where those who produce content are awarded for their creative works, and those who consume content can receive it at a price in the distribution mechanism that is to their liking. And there are a lot of alternative models out there that are not just experiments anymore. One I'll just mention in passing is one called Connexions. And if we made it easier for faculty and students through a variety of devices to be able to import that kind of content and make it available, that may ultimately, and some of it being free and some of it there being a toll on it still, but in the conversations I've been in, if you take a hundred dollar textbook at retail, and you parse up where that hundred dollars goes, it's not very pretty in terms of what the students get and the content creators actually get. It seems likely there are models in the future that will again reward the content creators and could cut that considerably. As some of you may also know, Michigan is experimenting without much success right now with a first generation book ATM, where you can literally walk up and put in the number or whatever and it will spit out a book in a few minutes. In a year or two, probably a reliable process. You can already order remotely and

have print on demand for those that would want it. So just by way of comment, I'm not sure fixing the textbook model is where salvation lies.

TERRY: If I could add one additional comment, maybe the answer is not even books. I come from the Department of Telecommunications. We're interested in students having access to audio and visual products from time to time, and I think that's addressed in your technology report. I'm going to exercise sort of a prerogative of the chair. Dan Sloat from the Student Association is here, and I'm going to recognize him. Dan, do you have something to say?

SLOAT: Vice President Wheeler definitely brings up a good point that perhaps maybe we need to be looking at more of a long term approach for the solution. I think it's worth mentioning that at the Bloomington IU Student Association, something we're working on with the bookstore is trying to bring back the Bursar Bill, and I think really trying to identify what is the niche that Barnes and Noble can provide students that maybe these other sources can't. Certainly with Bursar billing, this is something Ebay couldn't offer, it's something Amazon couldn't offer. Giving students an opportunity to maybe wait until some financial aid comes through, some student loans, scholarships, or otherwise, or at the very least, give them a little bit of time to maybe work towards saving up some of that money and pay off their Bursar bill at a later point. So again utilizing the niche they have is certainly worthwhile for a short term solution. Other than that, I know that there are a good amount of students out there who, they really appreciate being able to walk into a physical bookstore, see the book that they're purchasing, thumb through, see that it's in good working condition, and be able to purchase it right there at the checkout and know that they have it with them, not have to worry about when the shipping is going to come in, what time, again working through Ebay, maybe it's not of the highest quality, so ultimately just working with the bookstore to see what kind of, what niche market they have, what offering, for the short term solution, I think, is probably the best approach.

TERRY: I'd like to ask a question based on Dan's comment. Here at Bloomington, one of the problems with Bursar billing is that we have competing bookstores. We have the IU bookstore and we have T.I.S and T.I.S has always wanted to be on Bursar billing if the IU bookstore is on Bursar billing. I don't know what the situation is, maybe you do Joe, in the other communities. Does IUPUI have a nearby commercial bookstore that tries to compete with Barnes and Noble? Simon is nodding his head yes. Any of the other campuses have that situation? Please.

POMPER: To my knowledge, there is no Bursar billing at IU East because, while there is no other bookstore around that would like to have their business, but my understanding is we have to give students the money. We cannot give an economic advantage to our bookstore if there is any opportunity around somewhere else to buy books, even on the internet. So students have to wait until they have their full financial aid in place until they buy their books, which is a big problem.

TERRY: Jill, do you have any comment on the Bursar billing issue?

SCHUNK: I know the Bursar billing issue has been under discussion and is still in discussion, and some of those discussions are being held at Vice President Clapacs' office with Barnes and Noble. And beyond that I'm not really at this moment privy to what some of those latest

discussions are. I do know that currently Bursar billing is not engaged at any campuses. There are interfaces to be built if we do it. There's the whole economic disadvantage kind of question to go through. There's the various competitive sources issues that we need to deal with. So while I know that discussions have been ongoing on this issue, I don't believe there's any resolution yet on whether we will or will not proceed.

TERRY: And the Bursar billing issue extends beyond the issue of textbooks, so there are other things that students, from time to time, would like to have included in Bursar billing and I think the administration, and I'm aware at least, that the Bursar billing issue intersects with the issue of affordability and when students have money and when they don't, and so I think several sources are keeping the issue alive, and I hope we'll do that. Simon?

ATKINSON: Nothing.

TERRY: No? Don, yeah.

COFFIN: I have two things, and one of these things may be unique to IU Northwest, I don't know. I don't understand why we still fill out paper forms and send them to the bookstore to do our textbook ordering. I do not understand why it is impossible apparently to submit textbook orders to the bookstore online. It makes no sense. The second thing I don't understand is this three month lead time crap. I have talked to representatives from the publishers. I have talked to editors and/or publishers; they don't need that. This is something Barnes and Noble does. It is not something that the publishers, at least when I ask questions about this, say that they need. They say they need about two weeks to get the books from their warehouse to the bookstore. Now, why it takes Barnes and Noble two and a half months to get the order from Barnes and Noble, I mean literally, they get the orders in the middle of December and the publishers for the Spring Semester, they get the order about August 1st from the bookstore for the Fall semester.

SCHUNK: I do not know why those lead times were built into the contract. What I do know is that those lead times are in the contract as a contract obligation. I do believe that it is, and I can't say right off the top of my head, but I do believe there are different lead times for whether it is, you know Fall semester or the Summer sessions, but I was not engaged with the discussions surrounding why Barnes and Noble needs the timeline. I do know it is in the contract and I can certainly ask them about it and I can certainly ask them about it, but I do not have an answer for you.

BJORNSON: The Barnes and Noble representative gave a presentation at our campus just a couple months ago. He said that they wanted those early lead times so that they know what books are going to be used the next semester for their buyback. They want that so that they can buy the used books and give the student the used book price instead of the new book price, and so it's all about saving money for the students. He then went on to explain how, when they buy a book for seventy-five dollars, they mark it up twenty-five dollars to sell it as a new book, then they buy it back as a used book at fifty percent, and mark it up twenty-five dollars to sell it as a used book, so they make the same twenty-five dollars whether they're selling a new book or a used book, but it costs them a lot less to buy the used books than the new books, so I think

there's a monetary advantage to Barnes and Noble to do that used book deal in addition to saving the student money.

TERRY: If I may make a comment on something that came up on the Bloomington campus. Not only did the BFC raise the question of whether, in making decisions about whether a book is going to be used again or not, which affects the price they pay. We've suggested we would like to know whether they have considered all the IU campuses in making that decision. The fact of the matter is that Barnes and Noble has these exclusive contracts at a number of other universities, and we presume, in their own internal system, they would prefer to buy a used book from Syracuse or something where they have the contract, and know that it exists, and maybe there are three rates at which they could sell students buyback books from students. They could buy them back at one rate, hopefully higher, if they know it's going to be used the following semester on that campus. Maybe a slightly different rate, but maybe still more of an advantageous rate if it's going to be used somewhere else in the IU system, they will have to ship it, and then maybe at another rate if the thing is going to be used at some other university bookstore at which they have a similar contract. All of that however, will indeed probably result in arguments for pushing the adoption deadlines early, and that's a problem for some faculty in some fields. Any other questions?

ATKINSON: What about Don's other question about why he has to use paper forms for the ordering?

SCHUNK: I do not know, but I'll certainly ask about that.

TERRY: We've gone through an electronic form at Bloomington. IUPUI?

ATKINSON: I don't know, I never order textbooks.

TERRY: Okay, anybody else know?

ATKINSON: Bill, do you know?

SCHNEIDER: My department doesn't use electronic book order forms.

TERRY: Will Jill check?

SCHUNK: Yes, I can certainly ask about that.

TERRY: When does the contract come up for renewal? And when do we start discussing renewal so we can work out provisions we don't like?

SCHUNK: The contract is a ten year contract, and it was, it began in July of '07 so we are in year one, we are beginning year two, so we have quite a while to go. I don't believe it's time to start talking about renewal yet. (laughing).

TERRY: Okay, just asking.

SCHUNK: I think it's time to keep talking about how we can make it better for you.

TERRY: Again, this comes to some extent from my field. Do they have a renewal expectancy? Do we first negotiate with Barnes and Noble come renewal time, or can we get competing applications?

SCHUNK: I do believe that there is a renewal clause within the contract, but typically renewal clauses would be, if mutually agreed upon, and in, you know, as we get closer to that timeline, we would assess that as Vice President Wheeler said, I would anticipate the marketplace will change dramatically over the next ten years. So what the face of a bookstore will look like eight years from now may be very different than what the face of the bookstore looks like now, and I think we're probably a little too far away to talk about what those options might be.

TERRY: Any other comments about the bookstore? Okay, Jill, well thank you very much.

SCHUNK: Thank you.

TERRY: I'm sure we will be in touch. If you have concerns that you think the faculty councils, either on the campuses or here at the UFC should address, please contact Craig and we'll certainly get those out.

SCHUNK: I certainly will, and I do want to suggest, because it does sound like the dialogue at the IU Southeast campus has been a significant impact in the working relationship, and I would certainly encourage you that I am sure that everyone of the Barnes and Noble managers or certainly the regional managers that manage your bookstore would be more than happy to engage in ongoing discussions, and if I can be of any support or assistance in getting the contacts and helping to get something like that established, I would be more than happy to do so because I know Barnes and Noble would be happy to do so. Thank you very much.

AGENDA ITEM #8: FORMATION OF THE LEARNING TECHNOLOGIES STEERING COMMITTEE.

TERRY: Thank you, Jill. Alright, we will move on to what is our final item, but as I noted unless large numbers of people have joined at the regional campuses, anybody joined lately? We lack a quorum to actually act on Item #8. Because of his historical involvement in it, I ask Simon to present this, so please go ahead.

ATKINSON: My historical involvement has been pretty peripheral. I forwarded this issue to the UFC Agenda Committee. So this is a proposal to establish a Learning Technologies Steering Committee, which would be system wide and this proposal I think in part was generated by faculty interests and interests I think from the office of the Vice President for Information Technology to establish this particular committee.

WHEELER: Right, I would just say that Associate Dean Staci Morrone who oversees that area.

ATKINSON: Right, and so Staci Morrone worked with the chairs of the technology committees on the Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses to try and establish a mechanism for her to get input on implementation of learning technologies throughout the system. And I don't think it was purely a coincidence that this initiative really gained momentum when there were some issues with the implementation of the new Oncourse system, particularly on the Indianapolis campus, so this is a proposal to establish a committee which is really a joint committee of faculty with input from the administration to provide input and to some extent, oversight implementation of learning technologies system wide. We have a circular U-4 2009 which describes the purpose of the committee and the composition of the committee. You can see that there are members from Bloomington, Indianapolis, from the regional campuses, and also some student representation on this committee. So if there were a quorum we would ask for approval of this committee. It's not really a UFC standing committee, so I think this is more of an endorsement than a formal approval from the UFC. Are there any questions or comments about this? Markus?

POMPER: What are you asking us to vote on? Just to recommend?

ATKINSON: Just to recommend.

POMPER: Then maybe you should put that on the top that we recommend or endorse it? I mean, we have time until next time, so...

WHEELER: I will note one amendment that I think Herb knows or maybe is getting caught is, there is language in there, may be you caught it. The Bloomington Dean of Faculties' office is being reorganized so that the position referred to there is not going to exist, so it just needs to update to the new structure of Provost Hanson's office.

ATKINSON: Right, that's great. For those of you on the telephone, Vice President Wheeler just pointed out that there is one amendment that needs to be made to this which is in the non-voting members section since Bloomington is about to do away with its Dean of Faculties, or at least the office. There is a need to put in the new title for the person who will be responsible for that.

TERRY: The Vice-Provost for undergraduate affairs.

ATKINSON: Which would be Vice Provost for undergraduate affairs, and so we'll make that change before it comes back in January.

SCHNEIDER: Brad, do you support this?

WHEELER: Absolutely, wholeheartedly!

TERRY: In case the regional campuses did not hear, Vice President Wheeler wholeheartedly supports this request.

ATKINSON: Are there any other comments from the telephone?

TERRY: Okay. Well, please if you have any concerns about this proposal, please e-mail them to Simon or to me or to Craig, so that we can quickly deal with this matter on January 27th. Unless there is any other business from the floor or from the telephone, it appears we are...

ATKINSON: Dennis...

TERRY: Oh, Dennis.

BJORNSON: Actually I do have a question. You mentioned that we are going to bring something to vote at the next meeting, something about the Student Code of Conduct?

TERRY: We may. That may make its way up here.

BJORNSON: I want to ask that every campus gets a chance to look at that document before it comes to a vote at the UFC? There have been times in the past when I've had to vote on something at the UFC and our faculty senate at Southeast has not had a chance to look at it and so...

TERRY: The one thing I will say about the amendments that I know of at the moment, is that all of them would give the campuses is that all of them would give the campuses the ability to do things if they chose to do so, that they are not currently able to do, and I'm not sure that we would vote against allowing the campuses to do things, but yeah, the point is well taken, we'll do what we can. I think the matter was before the UFC last year at one point, and I don't think the item has changed since then. There was some reason we didn't vote on it last year. Okay, well thank you all. This is our last meeting of the UFC until January 27th. I hope you all have something of a Thanksgiving, even Brad over there, and that you have an enjoyable holiday break, and we will see you all, and get your textbooks orders in if they're not already in, and we'll see you January 27th.