<u>Minutes</u>
Indiana University
UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL
October 23, 2007
IU East Whitewater Hall Community Room
1:30 P.M. - 4:30 P.M. (EST)

<u>Attendance</u>

MEMBERS PRESENT: James Baldwin, Christian Bjornson, Julie Bobay, John Carini, Angela Courtney, Janice Cox, David Frantz, Trevor N. Fulk, Steven Gerencser, Dennis Groth, Lloyd Kolbe, David Lindquist, Anna M. McDaniel, Bart Ng, Nasser Paydar, Markus Pomper, William Potter, Lisa Pratt, Paul Rohwer, William Schneider, Martin Spechler, Herb Terry, Rosalie Vermette, David Vollrath, Joe Wert, Karen West, Kim White-Mills, L. Jack Windsor, Marianne Wokeck

MEMBERS ABSENT: Simon Atkinson, Charles Bantz, Bruce Bergland, Karl Besel, Jacqueline Blackwell, George Bodmer, Donald Coffin, Rosanne Cordell, Mary Fisher, Patricia Foster, Laura Ginger, Floella Gonya, Karen Hanson, M. Gail Hickey, Kevin Hunt, Marilyn Kintzele, Terrence Mason, Bryan McCormick, Ann McNally, Michael McRobbie, Michael Nusbaumer, Sandra Patterson-Randles, Ruth Person, Una Mae Reck, Deanna Reising, Richard Shockley, Alex Tanford, Michael Wartell, W. T. Wright

GUESTS: John Applegate (Office of President), Craig Brater (VP for Life Sciences), Daniel Callison (School of Continuing Studies), Anastasia Morrone (Teaching and Learning Information Technologies), F.C. Richardson (Chancellor Emeritus, IU Southeast), Robert Sandy (Assistant Executive Vice President), Craig Dethloff (Faculty Council), Robin Murphey (Faculty Council)

<u>Agenda</u>

1. Presiding Officer's Business (10 minutes)
(Professor Bart Ng)

2. Agenda Committee Business (10 minutes)
(Professors Bart Ng and Lisa Pratt)

3. Question/Comment Period* (10 minutes)
(Professors Bart Ng and Lisa Pratt)

4. Life Sciences Initiative Presentation (45 minutes) [DISCUSSION]
(Professor Craig Brater, Vice President for Life Sciences, Dean of the IU School of Medicine)

5. Break (5 minutes)

6. Preliminary Discussion on Credit Transfer from Two-Year Institutions.(10 minutes)
(Professor Robert Sandy, Assistant Executive Vice President)

7. Oncourse Issues (45 minutes) [DISCUSSION]
(Professor Anastasia Morrone, Associate Dean for Teaching and Learning Information Technologies)
"Concerns about bookstore," by Professor Rosanne Cordell.
"Letter to President McRobbie," by Professor Marianne Wokeck.
Response to IU South Bend and IUPUI School of Liberal Arts Concerns about Oncourse CL.
http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/AY08/circulars/IUSB_IUPUI_OncourseIssuesResponse.pdf

8. EXECUTIVE SESSION: Chancellor's Review Report (50 minutes) [DISCUSSION]
(Dr. F. C. Richardson, Chancellor Emeritus, IU Southeast)
http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/AY08/circulars/IUSB_Statement.pdf

9. New Business

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

AGENDA ITEM #1: PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS

Ng: First of all I want to welcome everybody to the beautiful campus of IU East, for the second of this year's UFC meetings. I just want to let you know about the agenda, and we would like to make a couple small modifications. One is actually for the greater common good; Lisa made a very wise suggestion that we should not have 3 hour long meetings, sitting down without break. So we will actually somewhere in the middle, after about an hour and a half, we will have a 10 minute break so that everybody can stretch their legs and do whatever is necessary to make themselves comfortable. And finally we also want to add an item # 8: new business. We have a couple of new business items that we want to bring up for your consideration. With those modifications I suggest that we adopt the agenda for the day and unless I hear an objection we will do so.

Also, first of all, I would like to invite Interim Chancellor of IU East, Nasser Paydar, to say a few words of encouragement and welcome. Nasser, the floor is yours.

Paydar: Well, I encourage you and welcome you. Good afternoon, on behalf of the faculty of IU East, I welcome all of you to the beautiful campus here in Richmond. It's a wonderful campus with great faculty. We have about 90 faculty to 2500 students. We did have a bit of a challenge last year with a number of issues. I want to assure you that we are over all of those, the budget is in order and in fact we are searching for 16 faculty in this coming year and the student numbers are increasing and the quality is also going up, and the faculty are doing a superb job here at IU East. So welcome again to Richmond and IU East.

Ng: Okay, thank you Nasser. If anybody can actually lift this, any campus, to the next level, it would be you Nasser. Thank you very much for the hospitality.

I would now like to turn to John Applegate who is attending this meeting on behalf of the president. The president will not be with us at this meeting and the next meeting but John will be

with us and will be attending the meeting on behalf of the President. There are a few things that I think John wants to report on.

Applegate: Really the only thing I wanted to mention was just to convey President McRobbie's apologies. The reason he is missing this meeting is he is attending a meeting of the AAU, the Association of American Universities, in California, I believe. That's an organization which is a fairly important one and one that it's important for Indiana University to have a real presence at. So he felt that this was an opportunity to get that started that he really could not pass up. Then in November it will be because he will be in China. And as you know from having listened to his inaugural several times I'm sure, that international programs is something that he believes is very important for all of our campuses, for all of IU, and that China is really the center piece of that international outreach. So China as the first visit abroad is both practically important and symbolically important. So again, he is very sorry that those things got scheduled or were scheduled by others really, or because of the needs of others on top of these two meetings. So that's really all I wanted to add.

Now, do we want to talk to about the other point; the bookstore point at this point?

Ng: Yeah, please.

Applegate: Oh, ok. This is actually in item 6. There's a document; concerns about the bookstore. Lisa and I have been working for a number of weeks to make sure that there is some good process for accumulating concerns about the new operations of the bookstore. Obviously the university administration is concerned about that to make sure that Barnes and Noble and with the Motor Pool, Enterprise are living up to their agreements with us. But there are other broader issues obviously of legitimate concern for the faculty. So Lisa and I have been working on how that ought to happen. We recently took a new direction, but the person who is directly overseeing both of these contracts in their first year is Paul Sullivan, who you may know is Terry Clapacs' deputy. So it's been monitored at really the very highest levels of that operation. He and I, with Lisa's help, will be sorting out some kind of process for making sure that concerns with the operation of the bookstore are collected centrally so that we can see how that's going.

I also just also want to add a note from Terry Clapacs in particular, which is that to the extent that you have issues obviously trying to deal with them quickly and locally, with the manager of the local bookstore is going to be your best bet. The idea is to see if there are systematic issues that arise or larger policy kinds of issues that arise. But I think it's going to be much more effective with individual issues that arise, if you try to fix those locally. And I think Paul will be otherwise a fairly slow way of getting smaller issues done. But he and I and Lisa will work together to figure out the best way to get this information collected.

Ng: Okay, are there any follow up questions for John?

AGENDA ITEM #2: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Ng: Okay, I would just like to report on one item as Agenda Committee business. This has to do with the Family Leave Policy. I just want to give you a progress report and update. As you know this year we have to bring forth to the Trustees a Family Leave Policy to replace the interim policy that the Trustees have approved that is good until June 30 of this year. We have, I may have mentioned it to some of you, that is we decided it's very important that when we develop this policy that we do not just simply develop it on our own, but try to include the input from the Trustees or rather keep the Trustees informed of what we are doing at every step so that they will not be surprised and we can in fact get their input as the policy is being developed. So at this stage we are following through with that plan. There is already a draft policy that is developed and I think we are in the process, the committee that consists of the Indianapolis and the Bloomington Faculty Council plus a few other people, we are in the process of actually getting a handle on the cost of such a policy because this is always a contentious issue. A great concern on the part of the Trustees and rightly so, so this time we're trying to do a much better job in terms of really coming up with the estimate on the cost of that policy so that we'll be prepared to answer any questions, any challenge and concerns they have with some facts.

So our hope is to have this policy come in front of you by January because we need to have the process—it will take a little while to go through the various faculty councils, and so what we want, and given the reduced number of meetings that the Trustees are having this year, they have cut it down from nine to something like five or six meetings. So we have to kind of be very mindful of their working schedule that will put the policy in front of them in time for them to act given the July 1st deadline. So, Lisa do you have anything to add to that?

Pratt: No, I think for those of you that are sort of wondering what does the policy look like; it looks very much like the one the Trustees declined to act on last time. But with some of the details more flushed out, it still includes the language of partners as well as spouse, which I think will come as a relief to many of you. It's still includes 12 weeks as we decided we'll start there again and hope that we can hold on to that. Again, the critical thing is this financial analysis and we made a call at the Bloomington Faculty Council meeting; if you have colleagues on your campus who have particular expertise in thinking about these kinds of benefits and who uses them, how often, if you know someone who could serve in consultation to that committee, please let us know because we've had a couple of volunteers. They could come from Econ., they could come from business, I don't know, they could come from almost anywhere, but if you know them, please get their names to us.

Schneider: Did the Trustees specify their reasons for not accepting the last policy?

Ng: The answer to your question was no because I don't recall that there was any very explicit objection to it. To some of them, it seemed to be quite personal. I still remember one of the Trustees basically saying, "Well, I work for a company that doesn't have this kind of policy, I don't see why you should". But that trustee is no longer on the board. Marty?

Spechler: Well as someone who participated in that discussion and was skeptical that the Trustees would accept it, let me make a couple of comments especially for those members of the council who weren't a part of that discussion.

The proposal of about five years ago was to enhance the conditions for taking family leave; the amount of time, the compensation in lieu of salary and so forth. Those were the main things. In other words, it was an enhancement. We had, we have a Family Leave Policy, this was to be enhanced in this way. So it was obvious to everybody that this might very well increase its cost. But there was no analysis at that time of that and it's also pretty obvious that when you enhance the attractiveness of Family Leave, some people who had disregarded it before would want to take up that possibility in the future and there was no way to estimate that and I believed then that we were in severe financial trouble at the time, that the Trustees would not want to take on an uncertain commitment.

Now let me make a suggestion. I think though we're no longer in financial stringency, the other conditions certainly do still apply, I assume, from what Lisa said that it's not only going to be more inclusive about the type of people, maybe the type of incidents, but also more attractive financially. And the only way I see to do that and my colleague Bob Sandy is a noted labor columnist, Lisa, just look to your left and get this guy to do something, would be to, the very thing we do with new programs, which he's an expert and that is to look at other experience around the country. That's the only way to see, and it's the way that we got the benefit for unmarried partners by showing that elsewhere this was a rather negligible increase in cost. And then the Trustees were, because of other reasons, good reasons they went ahead and accepted. So I think what we have to show here is not only that we know what the costs are, but that those costs are controllable. And I think that that would be the way to get this thing done. Our department has some excellent labor economists, and our best is sitting right by you.

Ng: Thank you Marty. Bob?

Sandy: Ann Royalty works on pension and …

Spechler: That's right.

Sandy: … and health benefits take up, so we have someone exactly in that area. Thanks for the compliments anyway.

Ng: In fact, I mean, I was just going to make an announcement in IFC meeting comparable to what Lisa had said at the BFC and thank you for those names. I think that's useful. I think that's exactly right. I think this is the path that we're going to go down. And hopefully when the Trustees see that at every step that we're doing it, they will have a little bit more confidence when the policy comes out.

Schneider: If this was for a new proposal I would agree with that but this is something that's been in place for more than five years, Marty. Why can't we just take a look at our own experience and see what the cost is. It hasn't been very much.

Spechler: No.

Ng: No.

Spechler: No.

Terry: You're wrong.

Spechler: You're wrong, Bill. The interim policy is the old policy. It's not the enhanced policy that was turned down. It's the enhanced policy for which we do not know the costs.

Schneider: So we can go back to the interim policy as a permanent policy?

Ng: Well, we could.

Schneider: All it would do is go from 60% to 75%, wasn't that the change in the new policy?

Ng: No, there's also the frequency. So there's a couple…

Schneider: …okay, so we changed it a bit, in fact, because it didn't cost much. That's why we did it, because in fact, the experience of many years was that it didn't cost very much so the new policy developed because in fact experience had shown that it…

Spechler: That's not the relevant experience, Bill. Not the relevant experience.

Ng: Alright.

Spechler: It's an entirely different to the topic for the Agenda Committee.

Ng: Okay fine. So are there any other questions on this particular piece of business?

Terry: Just one comment. I hope we can all still document for the Trustees the benefits of this to the University. And those may be harder to quantify as we actually construct an analysis, but we need to demonstrate in either our experience or others' this helps with retention, it helps with recruitment, improves employee morale, anything that we can point out to them as to why this is a good thing to do for the institution.

Ng: Thank you. Yes John?

Carini: There is a draft that's actually—that someone can look at now?

Ng: The reason why I do not want to circulate it is I literally got this a couple days ago and frankly the person who is very much involved with this is out of town. And she is going to work with the committee to actually, there will be some discussion before I distribute. I think that will be better so that they're fully aware. It's not entirely clear that everybody on the committee has yet agreed to the draft. So that's the reason that we're holding off on that. Okay, any other questions?

AGENDA ITEM #3: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

Ng: If not, I will open the floor to questions, this is the question and answer period.

Spechler: Thanks Bart. I'd like to raise an entirely new subject. People who've been on the council as I have for seven terms know that almost every piece of business that comes to the University Faculty Council has originated elsewhere. What we do is generalize experience from this or that campus or this or that administrator. But, I can't really remember over some nearly twenty years that we've actually initiated and taken up a new issue. And I'd like to point out that I think there's an important one that we've neglected. And that has to do with academic ethics. Academic ethics. A recent article in the Journal of Academic Ethics, which I'm sure everyone reads, pointed out that in a survey of 100 leading universities, not only do academics generally not ask questions about their profession and institution but universities are significantly behind other institutions in setting up structures and processes to deal with ethical issues. We have concerns about the ethics of students, but hardly any concern about our own ethics and it is the hallmark of a real profession that it does look and regulate the ethics of those who practice that profession.

One or two things strike me as relevant to Indiana University. First, there's the question of big science, especially commercially funded science which is so clearly an emphasis of President McRobbie. How is science such as supported by pharmaceutical companies, who've been very generous to us, reconciled with the norms of academic freedom and intellectual property rights? That's a big issue. Here's another one, a little closer to home for a lot of us. Countless pages from books and journals are being illegally copied or distributed or uploaded to course websites even by regulations, I'm told, of our very own librarians although it appears to be not only unethical but also illegal. And then there's the question of the proper definition of academic freedom. I've heard people, very distinguished people on this council, say that it's perfectly okay to promote your own ideas in the classroom. Well that's ok as long as other intellectually responsible ideas are also presented in a scientific and critical way. We've never discussed this. We've never discussed what academic freedom means at Indiana University and yet, people refer to it. People cite academic freedom in defense of this or that practice, but we've never talked about what is academic freedom in areas like mine and like many that are controversial philosophically, ethically, politically. So, I would like to invite the Agenda Committee to consider whether we should, for the first time, consider the ethics of the professors of Indiana University and how we regulate our own life in the academy.

Ng: Any comments?

Baldwin: Didn't we just have a long two year discussion of the conflict of interest and conflict of commitment. Those documents are acceptable, right?

Bobay: Oh yes.

Ng: It is in fact…

Baldwin: So we did something at least in part, small part.

Ng: Small part

Baldwin: Didn't feel like a small part at the time.

Spechler: Just to start a data point here. In the new Office of Research Administration there is a sub-office whose acronym is REEP, which is research, education, ethics and policy. So ethics is there and their Vice President Peskowitz currently has a committee and panel to look at the appropriate structure of that office within research administration. So that is going to be one piece of what you're talking about. So that's in place and obviously that is building on the ethics side on a whole structure of research ethics issues that are dealt with in a great detail and a great deal of time on human subjects research, animal welfare and so on. Just to let you know.

Ng: Marty, I just want to say, what do you see as an outcome? I mean, in some sense I don't disagree with anything you said, the question then is what kind of concrete action can this council take?

Spechler: I'd like to see a short, but fairly comprehensive code of academic ethics for Indiana University which would include such things as plagiarism, improper use of copyrighted or patented material without authorization, without compensation, for example. And, rather importantly, what is the proper role of the professor in the classroom in presenting one side of rather controversial issues. I personally believe that it is possible to present several respectable sides of important issues, maybe not particularly hiding one's own view, but at least being critical and open to alternative points of view. I think, personally, that that is the responsibility of a professor. We are not politicians in the classroom, we are professors in the classroom.

Schneider: So you don't have evidence of cases that warrant this at this time at Indiana University.

Spechler: That's right, because I'm not a vigilante, Bill. I don't…

Schneider: I mean, you've talked to a lot of people here from IU. It's not prompted by that?

Spechler: No, it is prompted by that, but I can't name names in public.

Schneider: Okay.

Spechler: But I'd be glad to fill you in in private that this is an issue and it's not only an issue at Indiana University. And of course, part of my concern is to head off this kind of thing. There are always controversial issues and there will be in the future.

Ng: Thank you. Yes Jim?

Baldwin: Is there a definition of academic freedom in the handbook anywhere? It's supposedly the cornerstone of tenure and promotion? Is there a definition of academic freedom?

Ng: You got me, I cannot answer that question.

Terry: I think we tend to rely on the, whatever it is, 1948 statement, which I believe the Trustees at some point endorsed.

Schneider: So there isn't an official document defining academic freedom at the moment?

Ng: Well, the question here is do we have to reinvent the wheel? Does the AAUP have any policy that we can…?

Schneider: It is the basis of our whole tenure system.

Spechler: So let's see, uh, 1948, Herb wasn't born yet, I was five years old. So let's drag that out and see whether that is still applicable sixty years later.

Bobay: It has been ratified since 1948**.**

Schneider: It was actually 1940, but it's been ratified several times since.

Ng: Alright, the Agenda Committee will have a discussion on that and hopefully we can respond to your suggestion. Yes Markus?

Pomper: How does that relate to the code of academic ethics that's already here on page 46?

Spechler: You know, I haven't read that recently, but if you'll pass it down, I'll be glad to answer the question.

Ng: Ok, let's move along. The next item on the agenda is Dean Craig Brater has joined. I'm very happy to have Dean Brater join us today. He's going to talk to us about Life Sciences Initiative. Many of you have raised this as an item that you're interested in learning more about and so Dean Brater, you have the floor.

AGENDA ITEM #4: LIFE SCIENCES INITIATIVE PRESENTATION

Brater: Okay, thanks. I have to stand up; I think better when I'm standing up. Thanks for the opportunity to be here. I have to give a little personal anecdote that when I come to this corner of the state I get a little bit nostalgic because if you go that direction about fifteen miles is where all of my mother's family is from. They were all farmers over off of Highway 1, just a couple of exits down the road. I didn't grow up in Indiana. I grew up in Tennessee, but I used to spend a lot of my summers up here following my grandfather around like a little puppy dog, driving the tractor, stacking the hay in the hay mat and all that kind of stuff. And I don't know if this holds with this group but certainly with, at the medical school, I've stated the following and I've never been challenged so I think it's true, that I'm the only faculty member in the school of medicine who has literally shown livestock in the Indiana State Fair. So I don't know if any of you all can claim that so we can compare trophies. Come see my office, I've got a couple of livestock trophies there.

Vermette: Any blue ribbons?

Brater: No, this was grand champion _____ and the other is something _____. But anyhow, I spent a lot of time in this part of the country. I thought what I'd do is tell you a little bit about what we were proposing to the legislature last year, do a little dissection about where it ended up and why, and what we learned from that in terms of moving forward. Firstly, when we put this together, we felt it was important to be responsive to what we saw as a state need/perseveration on linking anything we were talking about to economic impact. So set in a different faction, we didn't find any appetite at the state legislature for discussion about the wonders of research and the findings of what derived there and from improving humanity. That kind of discussion usually resulted in glazed looks… [End of tape 1, Side A… some comments may be lost. Tape 1, side B begins]

… does see life sciences as an opportunity, what can we learn from other parts of the country? And if you look at other parts of the country that are real hotbeds for biotech and have successful life sciences economy: bay area, San Diego, Research Triumph Park, etc., you can actually create a map, and you put little x's on the map in those places and you can take another map, using NIH research dollars as a surrogate for life sciences research activity, you can take the top fifteen or twenty NIH supported institutions and put those on another map of the US, and then if you put those on top of one another they superimpose.

So the message is, that if you want to have a successfully life sciences economy, it has to be coupled with robust life sciences research activity. And the reason of course is these laboratories are the birthplace of all sorts of ideas, and a certain number of those ideas actually have intellectual property potential, a certain number of those have market potential, and a certain number of those turn into successful companies who create jobs and wealth, etc. etc… So we converted that logic to saying that if Indiana is going to be on this map in terms of success as a life sciences biotech economy, then the research intensive institutions in the state need to be up in this upper echelon in terms of research activity and research funding. Then it's a question of where are we now, and where do we need to go? And that is about a doubling of the current research activity. And then you can basically say, 'Okay what's the expectation in terms of research dollars of the faculty member we generate, etc. etc…' and you can essentially construct a business plan. And when you go through that calculus, that's where that number of wanting to recruit 500 additional faculty comes from. So one of the important points that we made when we would be talking to people is that we didn't just fetch these numbers out of the air, this derived from an analysis again looking around the country and saying what can we learn from the success of other places in the country. And in fact, the number wasn't 500, the number was 486, but we took the liberty of rounding it up. And I have to tell you that it seemed to me, at least when I was talking to people, they seemed to appreciate that this wasn't just some kind of wild hallucination in terms of coming up with a number like this.

So then we said, 'Okay, if we want to recruit 500 new faculty, what's really the time frame for which that would be accomplished?' And that number we kind of did pick out of the air; 10 years. And then we said, 'Okay, we want a mix of both junior and more established faculty members and if you just figure a reasonable mixture of those then what kind of dollars would it take to recruit them?' And we looked internally at the recruitment packages that had been metered to recruit both junior faculty and more senior faculty and we used those as the numbers. So on average, mainly at IU for the last few years to recruit a more senior faculty member

usually measured by somebody who's got NIH or NSF grant that they bring with them, the average dowry that that person has been required to recruit a person like that is 1.3 million dollars. The average dowry for a junior person is about half of that, not exactly but close enough, a little more. So then—and then of course you have the base salary that you have to factor into that. So those essentially went into the calculations of what it would take to not only recruit but then maintain an additional 500 faculty. Parenthetically you can go through the same exercise to figure out how much lab exposure. And that becomes another part of the issue.

We also then said that there's no way that the state would fund this 100%, so we've got to have skin in the game, and we arrived at that we would basically match what the state did. Now where the hell that would come from, that's all fundraising. Fundraising is the solution to everything. And so basically what that turned out to be that in the first biennium we were asking for a $40 million dollar increase on the base budget, each year. So, $40 million the first year, another 40 the second year. So by the end of that there would actually be an $80 million increase in the base budget. So we're talking about real money. So that's the package that we were recruiting from. And then we also went through an exercise of saying if you help us do that, and we recruited all these people, what would the state see at the end of the day based on our current level of activity of our faculty, level of productivity of our faculty, and based on what our faculty currently do? If you added 500 additional more, the state would see an additional, an incremental 2.4 billion dollars worth of research money flowing into the state. It would see $100 million a year of royalty and licensing revenue flowing into the university. It would see the birthing of about 100 new companies over this ten year period of time. It would see the generation of 14,000 new jobs that would be well paying jobs. And it would see about 750 million new tax dollars flowing into the state colleges. So it would be a good return on investment and it would mean that the net investment by the state, so this whole thing would take an investment, if you took it out the whole ten years, and they did exactly what we asked, the net, the total investment by the state would be right at about a billion dollars. But again if you subtract out all of the incremental and taxes, all that kind of stuff, it's about $250 million dollars and then that's not to mention what happens from all of the ramifications of all the increased jobs and increased companies etc. etc… So, it's a pretty good deal.

Now, so then we got—this was the package we were putting in front of people and it resulted in countless rubber chicken dinners. I have to describe the highlight of the, my highlight, of the legislative season, which is the day that I had the privilege of driving through Paoli not once, not twice, but three times in the same day. I got to leave my house at about five in the morning to drive through Paoli to get down to French Lick to have breakfast in a diner with an elected representative down there. I got about 10 years of passive smoking in that one hour. And then I got to drive and then I got to cut through Paoli to go down to New Albany and eat lunch with a couple of elected officials, had a couple of greasy hamburgers. And then I got to drive back up through Paoli to have dinner with another elected official in Bedford, and finally got home about nine or ten that night. It's worse than being a surgeon. So that was one of my highlights. But people were listening, and people didn't fall asleep and people seemed supportive. And in fact, going into the budget session, we had—we didn't have anything, we didn't have $40 million in the budget but we had on the table an increase in our base budget of $20 million. So, were we happy with that? Well it's hard to be disappointed in that. We would have liked to have seen

more but we saw that okay, people are listening, that's a good start and that would get us on our way to proving that we are worthy of these kind of investments that we're seeking.

At that point, that basically was going into the weekend, the budget basically got put together late on a Saturday night and going into late Friday we had that. It was basically the budget that was on the table. And then through that weekend two things happened. One, there was a budget projection that came out that showed estimated revenues coming in lower than had been anticipated, and then the other was the property tax tsunami which caused great hysteria at the statehouse. So everything got thrown out the window as they tried to grapple with that. To make a very long story short, at the end of the day, the state budget director who was a strong advocate of what we were proposing managed to get them to insert $15million in cash into the state budget. So no increase in base funding, but in the second year of the biennium we would have $15 million to invest in the life sciences. And that was in turn to be distributed through the Indiana Economic Development Corporation. So they could put all sorts of whatever they want in terms of conditions on it and we are right now in dialogue with them trying to figure out how we can pull down the money and how we can use it. It's for recruiting new people and it's to recruit people who are at the more senior level. So if you think about that, $1million at the average recruitment package historically has been 1.3; we're talking about 10 faculty, and with nothing in terms of sustaining and support to keep it going. So we've been trying to create—at the public level we've been trying to turn this sow's ear into a little bit of a silk purse. My tongue is bloody because I have to bite it every time I have to do that, because I have to save it to be able to be part of the disappointment.

When we talk to people we still get positive reinforcement. So the notion is that may be we got them softened up and receptive for making a run the next round. So we are already in discussions, we, I'm using it a bit euphemistically, because it's really the government relations people that are out trying to talk to the folks and do a bit of a postmortem on this to try and figure out what the best strategy is going forward; one of which would be, if we're barking up the wrong tree then we might as well forget it. We're not getting that kind of feedback. The feedback that we are getting is more that in the corners of the state there is great sensitivity towards needing more doctors and other health professionals out of the smaller and mid-sized cities of Indiana. Richmond is a great example. Richmond, Connersville, Muncie, all these places and that we would probably do better if we crafted a life sciences strategy that was not totally focused on research. That we also craft it in a fashion that we're addressing the health manpower needs in the corners of the state. That's where our regional campuses and regional centers for medical education can really be helpful because if you put all of those on a map, we can penetrate every corner of the state.

So we're really trying to work very closely with all of the different campuses and centers for medical education to try to practice strategy, some of which may be things like—this may be a surprise to NASA, but it's been talked about a little bit behind closed doors, is should we even consider things like formal medical school rotations and opportunities in Richmond, in New Albany? If you look at the map, those are some of the areas that aren't covered and they really scream and yell about health manpower deficiencies; not in the future but today.

So these are some of the kinds of things that are being talked about and I think it would be very easy to weave all of this into the kind of message that we delivered last time. Again, focusing it on needs of the state as whole but broadening that from economic impact needs, job creation and that kind of thing, to also including some of those, health care I mentioned. So that's basically where we are right now and I thank you for the opportunity to share a little bit of that with you. Quite a learning experience for me I would have to say. I'm not sure I want to relearn it but I'm a pathological optimist. So I think that we do have some opportunity going forward; I've kind of gotten over my grief and loss reaction to what happened in the last session of the legislature and now I'm just kind of angry and ready to prove them wrong. But thanks for the opportunity to tell you about it. So, questions?

Ng: Jack.

Windsor: Yeah, Craig, the $15 million, is that going only to IU? Is that sub-divided to Purdue or how is that parted?

Brater: Say that again?

Windsor: The $15 million, is that only for IU or is that sub-divided to Purdue?

Brater: They actually allocated a total of twenty; fifteen for IU and five Purdue. So there was a moral agreement.

Ng: Julie.

Bobay: In a broad sense, when we say life sciences and you said we were going to ask for five hundred new faculty in the life sciences, can you talk a little bit about the differences, if there is any, between what we think of life sciences and what we think of as medical sciences? Is there a difference? When you say life sciences do you mean something other than medical sciences?

Brater: Yeah, we mean it a lot more broadly. So, you know, a lot of the molecular genetics work going on in Bloomington is a good example; life sciences that, you know, while there may be many steps in between, you get to those things that have held impact. So, yeah, we purposely defined it quite broadly. I have to say we've never got to this stage and we still haven't, where we would say, 'Okay, let's—' say we hit the bonanza and they give us all this money that we're asking, and we are going to be able to recruit five hundred new faculty. Well, how's that going to be parsed? Where are those going to be? We haven't really come to—we haven't made those internal decisions yet and in large part because we assume that that would be something in which Michael would want to have a substantial role and of course, you know, he's just now getting settled. So that's kind of still up in the air. It's a problem that we hope to have. Now, of course if we do get that, then everybody will redefine themselves as a life science. So it will be very interesting.

Ng: Rosalie.

Vermette: I was just wondering, the state, it seems like they are very insular in their focus. How does that position Indiana with respect to the other states that are dumping, like Michigan for example, lots and lots of money into the life sciences initiatives and biotechnology and stuff? I mean, didn't they respond to that argument at all? That Indiana is just going backwards again?

Brater: Well, we kept giving them—every time we'd see a state come out with some appropriation of life sciences you can bet that we floated that by people and said, you know, 'Here's a challenge, don't you want to rise to this?' And so we got them all that information, but I will have to say that a lot of that stuff that's floating around out there, when you drill down into it, it's often recasting of stuff that's already occurring or, like in Michigan, there's also a lot of hoopla and then they got into financial trouble and in fact, just this last weekend, I was in a meeting with some people from Michigan and I said, "What is the status of that?" and they just laughed. It's just, it's all melted away because they don't, the state budget is in such a shambles. In fact they don't even have a budget in Michigan right now because the legislature and the government can't come to an agreement. But what one of the things that is heartening is that, in fact I was just at a meeting this morning over in Indiana some forum that was put on by Biocrossroads, and there were a series of these kind of things that keep going on all the time and one of the things you see is that if you bring in people from the outside who will look objectively at what is going on in Indiana, they keep telling us that, and important elected officials, they keep saying that there is a stronger foundation here and there is more going on in Indiana than in the vast majority of other states. So indeed, and we get this question, so we go ahead and talk to our legislature or legislator or governor and say, 'Well, every state in the union has a life sciences initiative and some have more than one. So why are we going to be successful in competition with all of those?' And we've been able to get a lot of external validation that we do have a leg up. Part of the reason is that if you just inventory all of the things going on in the state, we're far above most. So, you know, we've got Eli Lilly, we've got Roche Diagnostics, we've got Cook, we've got all these orthopedic companies up in Warsaw, we've got Dow and Agrosciences. And you can actually, Biocrossroads has actually created a little map of Indiana that has all the little life sciences companies and activities and stuff going on. And it's really pretty remarkable. So there's a lot more going on than most people are aware of, and importantly, we're not having to make that point ourselves because we're getting enough external validation that that's.

Ng: Bill.

Schneider: Craig, you're in the middle now aren't you of expanding the medical education for training M.D.'s right? Is that with, does that figure into this? Is there additional funding for that? Could you say a little bit about that?

Brater: Yeah, we, what Bill's referring to is we've worked, we in medicine, the Association of American Medical Colleges, which is a club of 126 medical schools in the country, keeps a pretty close watch on manpower. So they get people who are doing these man power analyses periodically. And we went through a period of time when everybody was projecting a surplus of physicians and then a period of time when all these analysts, some would say, 'Nah, it looks like we're, I think, we're heading for a deficit,' others would say, 'Nah, it's still a surplus.' So disagreements. But now it's gone the other way, and now everybody who looks at this is projecting a shortage of physicians in a magnitude of about 30%. So as a doctor, my advice to

you is don't get sick. It's going to be pretty ugly out there. Now one of the things we did was say, 'Well is that true of Indiana?' So we've done our own manpower analysis and we worked with state, all the usual suspects in terms of state medical association, state department of health, etc… And did a very robust analysis looking at things like____ projections and aging of the population etc. We found essentially some result for the state of Indiana. Then we coupled that with how many physicians that are practicing in the state come through our doors and then therefore, what would we need to do to meet this need. And the answer was that we needed to increase our class side by about 80 people. From the undergraduate perspective, that's trivial, but think about it we now take 280 students a year and that's the second largest medical school in the country. So we would be increasing right around 30%. And we actually started that this year by taking 14 additional students. We couldn't take all of these as a whole because we just wouldn't be able to handle it. What we decided to do prospectively was to try to use our centers for medical education to do this because one of the biggest needs of the state is not just numbers of doctors, but it's distribution of doctors. So physicians practicing in smaller communities and also people who want to practice primary care. And when we train them all in a place like Indianapolis, you know, we are so tertiary and quaternary oriented that it's hard to talk primary care and people. We have trouble walking the walk. It's easy to talk the talk. So we can better do that in the centers for medical education so we crafted this plan over ___ have a expand their educational opportunities at around the state in a more primary care, shall we say friendly environment. Right now, we don't have any funding to do that. We're just kind of figuring out an approach and saying 'Well we'll figure it out.' And that's another reason why we only increased by 14 instead of a larger number than that. And we know we're going to have to find some kind of fundings for __. So that's an example of what we would do coupled with this, what was formally a purely research focus. If you think about it we should also be looking at that in terms of what are the nursing needs and what are the dentistry needs and what are the other health professional needs. Because the same things are occurring in those areas as it comes in and out. That's a long winded answer to the question.

Ng: Marty.

Spechler: Craig, on that subject: you're probably aware that these centers of medical education are considered rather inefficient ways of training physicians the first two years, and Professor Erlich wanted to curtail them, but was blocked from doing so. And you make a good case that these centers, I guess there are seven or eight of them around the state, somehow provide physicians to underserved areas and then primary care. Fine. Is there any study to show that young people who are trained, let's say in Bloomington or Evansville, have a greater likelihood of wanting to practice in those areas than those who begin in Indianapolis? Now that being my question about med…If so, if so then the extra money may be well spent. And in fact might be extended to Centerville, Crawfordsville, or wherever you want to go. But if not, then that leads me to my second point and that is of course, you're disappointed, and we are terribly disappointed at the response particularly because this 15, 30, 40 million dollars, not the 80, was premised on the idea that some of it will be spent in Fort Wayne elsewhere and so on. And President Herbert told us that that was politically necessary and you've essentially said the same thing. Now, my point about this is that there's a real danger of dissipation. Not only of the entire budget because of necessary medical education and don't dispute that, but rather that research has to be concentrated in order to be effective. I think you've said this and everyone

I've talked to who's an expert in this field as I'm not, tells me that you need a, you know, specific concentration of researchers in whatever subfield you're talking about, and that the $15 million actually is only going to buy you a handful of senior researchers together with the post docs which today's life sciences researcher really cannot do without. Not to speak of expensive lab space. So you know, you are a pathological optimist, I'm glad you're pathological in this respect because the objective facts do not point in an optimistic direction. So here's my, we've talked life sciences, and as you talked to Julie, that's a very broad idea, but it would appear that given Indiana's reluctance to invest at the scale that you've put forward that we're going to have to specialize. That we're going to have to pick out those parts of life sciences, and there are many, where we really have a chance to make a breakthrough and to provide these things. We can't be across the board, just as Indiana University cannot be great across the board, whatever we say in public, whatever the hype is, we cannot be great across the board. And clearly, we can't be great in life sciences across the board. So my second question then is, have you considered what areas we should start where we have the best chance of exploiting all of these advantages including the great advantage of the Eli Lilly Company?

Brater: Good points and questions. Firstly, we've actually done the calculus and it is more expensive to train a medical student at one of these centers than it is in Indianapolis. Which makes sense. I mean it's just an efficiency question. But we do have the data, and these aren't controlled trials by any stretch of the imagination, but our data show that if you look at the physicians practicing in different areas of the state, where we have a center for medical education, that area is enriched with people who spent their time there as a medical student. So it does, and to be perfectly honest, that's a surprise to me, because this is their first two years and after their first two years, then they have two more clinical years, and then they have their residency, and I'm thinking, is this really going to have much effect? I mean, it's a great theory, but again if you look at the data and where our graduates end up practicing, it suggests that these centers are having an effect of luring students back to those areas to practice. That would then support a hypothesis that if we actually now start giving them 3rd and 4th year opportunities they'll even do a better job with that, and that's part of the plan. And parenthetically, those 3rd and 4th year opportunities are not as expensive.

Spechler: Yeah.

Brater: And also parenthetically since these, all of these centers have capacity. By that I mean, we can add 8 students to Terre Haute and we don't need to add any faculty because those faculty have capacity. So it's really then a question of is there any part of any physical space needs and those are usually (end of side B tape 1 – some comments lost) We can do this in a very cost efficient way in terms of adding these students, and so it does go beyond the purely political calculus. We do have some data to support that these things do help lure physicians to practice back in those areas. And I can tell you the perception of people who live in these communities is certainly that, data notwithstanding, you'd never be able to convince them otherwise. There's no question that to have a, to do modern biological sciences research, you've got to have a critical intellectual mass and about the only centers in terms of just talking about the medical education centers that would be able to pull that off, they're partnered with host institutions that contribute to that critical intellectual mass. That's going to be Bloomington, that's going to West Lafayette, it's going to be South Bend. And not because we can, the medical school could coalesce enough

research oriented faculty at those centers by ourselves, but we can leverage off of the host institutions, the host campuses. Said in another fashion, I don't see how you could, unless you have a lot of money, how you could ever get sufficient numbers of research oriented people in Evansville, Terre Haute, Muncie, etc… to pull it off. If you tried it, it would be high risk. So those sites should have in our view a different focus. So Terre Haute ought to have a focus, and people there are very enthusiastic about it. They have a wonderful rural health, family medicine residence. Well, why don't we leverage off that, and create a medical student program focused on rural health. Including a whole different admissions process to make sure we that we take in people who have a demographics that we know predict that they're going to end up practicing in a small community. Evansville, great opportunity for a primary care focus. Muncie, great opportunity for primary care focus. Fort Wayne, a whole different question there. It's a little, you know IPFW may be wanting to build a bigger research enterprise, so that we partner with them there. There the question's still out, but we shouldn't be trying to set up little niduses of research. That's just simply going to fail because of lack of critical mass just because it sounds like a good thing to do or we think it's going to have political cachet. That's just being intellectually dishonest; we shouldn't do that. Similarly, for the research intensive campuses. Yeah, we do have focus. In fact if you go back and look at the life sciences strategic plan, it defines I think, it's five areas that are our current strengths. And so let's build on those strengths. Because no, we can't be all things to all people let's take the areas in which we're strong and we already have a leg up and let's amplify those. It turns out that three of those, the ones that are more disease focused: cancer, neurosciences, and diabetes, happen to be the three areas of focus of Eli Lilly. Now that wasn't on purpose, but you know historically what's happened is Lilly recruits people and we recruit people and often, there are, you know, it's recruiting two professionals instead of one. One's going to work at Lilly, one's going to work with us. And just over time you just end up having areas of strength that happen to be consonant. So that's a real plus.

Ng: Jim.

Baldwin: Just one question sort of a recruiting business. How much has the life sciences been incorporated into President McRobbie's vision that he outlined on Thursday last, I'm speaking strictly of the Wells Professorships to lure big stars? You said it cost a million and some to get a senior researcher in the field. How much would it cost to get a Nobel prize winner in physiology, how much would it cost to get a number of national heads of sciences? Wouldn't that gobble up a lot of the money? Final question is: Nobel Prizes generally come at the end of someone's career, do those people move very often? So it's an empty promise?

Brater: Well, I think maybe the Nobel Prize part might be, but certainly you can get Institute of Medicine people or National Academy of Sciences people but it takes a good dowry. I have to say I don't know what that might be for somebody say in the biology department in Bloomington, but I can tell you in the world in which I live, we're now looking a couple years from now, we'll be recruiting a new cancer center director. Well the market for a high level, if they're not NAS, they're certainly people with, that think that they're a strong candidate for being in the Academy, they want a dowry today of 20-25 million dollars. Now they don't get paid a whole lot of money, but that's basically because they want to recruit a hoard of people.

Baldwin: And bring the research staff with them.

Brater: Yeah, so you can chew up a lot of dough in a short period of time.

Ng: Okay, are there any other questions?

Brater: I'm still on. Fundraising, philanthropy!

Vermette: It's a huge one at that and you're very good at that.

Ng: Well again, I want to thank you…Oh yes? Steve?

Gerencser: As I've listened to your presentation, I'm wondering if all of your dreams came true, if all of this funding were appropriated over the course of a decade, if all of these researchers were hired, does that suck off the available oxygen for any other sort of initiatives in any other areas of academic excellence and inquiry with the possibility of being taken up by Indiana University?

Brater: I don't think so at all. I think that when you start having success in any area I think it breeds success at home. You know, again, I've used the philanthropic, philanthropy a little bit in jest, but the reality is you know anything that calls attention to the institution and is a certified area of excellence that we can trumpet is going to help any other area, because you find, you know, that captures people's attention and good things start to happen. So I'm a firm believer in you know, when the tide comes in, all the ships go up. And in fact, I would go so far as to say, you know I have a pretty, I see the world through a pretty narrow prism you know I'm kind of a uni-dimensional person, just ask my wife. But that having been said, I mean, I think that we would be terribly remiss if we were singularly focused and that we took an approach that did not try to leverage success in life sciences or any other area over to the other activities of the university. I mean, we're a broad university. We need to continue that perspective and scope.

Ng: Are there any other questions? Is there anybody on the phone who wants to ask a question? Well, hearing none, I just want to thank Craig for coming, and we appreciate your time, so thank you very much.

Brater: Thank you for the opportunity.

Ng: And have a pleasant drive back.

Brater: Thanks!

Ng: Ok, well, we have now used up an hour and forty-five minutes. Let's take a break, and we'll continue. About five minutes? Five minutes.

AGENDA ITEM #5: 5-MINUTE BREAK

AGENDA ITEM #6: PRELIMINARY DISCUSSION ON CREDIT TRANSFER FROM TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

Ng: Well, welcome back. I hope you all feel better now. We shall now continue with our agenda. The next item is the preliminary discussion on the credit transfer from two-year institutions and Robert Sandy is going to give us a brief discussion, give us a little bit of background and so by the way this item is being looked at by the respective Education Policy committees on the various campuses and especially in Indianapolis and Bloomington. In fact as we speak, the Indianapolis, what we call the Academic Affairs Committee is actually talking about this issue. And this will be, all the people on the various campuses should also look at it too.

Pomper: Bart, who would be sending that out?

Ng: I'm sorry?

Pomper: Who would be sending that out? Because I haven't got anything…

Ng: I can actually send that out to you. But I thought it was good for us to have a very brief kind of collective idea about this before, you know, you work. Go ahead, Bob.

Sandy: Because there were ten minutes I should have had five minutes of one page of remarks and five minutes of questions. In September the academic leadership council, a body made up of the vice chancellors for academic affairs from every IU campus endorsed capping at 64 the community college credit hours that can be applied to IU baccalaureate degrees. These chief academic officers at the campuses normally favor campus autonomy. Their vote was unprecedented. Why did they endorse a limit that would bind their own campuses? Their vote, well, the problem that the ALC recognized was highlighted by articles in the Star and Chronicle about the school of continuing studies applying 90 credits from out of state community colleges to its bachelor of science in general studies. Last May, Dean Callison met with the ALC to discuss capping. He had one request. That his school not be singled out, but rather that IU adopt a common rule on capping community college credit hours. The ALC found that capping was widespread at our peer institutions. I'll forward the details of that. The laissez-faire policy now in place at IU had little consequence when there was no state-wide community college. Laissez-faire has allowed transfer agreements as high as 75 and 90 credit hours. 100 and 200 level courses at Ivy-Tech are being transferred as upper division courses to IU. Individual IU schools and entire campuses have capped community college credit hours at different levels. Our present situation invites confusion by students and the public. The rapid increase in the number of Ivy Tech students pursuing associate of liberal arts degrees makes UFC action imperative. In Indianapolis this fall, Ivy Tech enrolled 1800 students into its new associative liberal arts program. Absent guidance from IU, these students will be tempted to take as many courses listed in the course transfer library as possible. The ALC's concern is that we will drift into a 90 credit hours at the community college, 30 credit hours at the university model. There's a natural preference for uniformity on transfer rules on the part of Ivy Tech, on the higher education commission and the general assembly. Neither Ivy Tech, nor the commission, nor the general assembly is seeking a 90/30 model. But if we continue to set up agreements with high numbers then they'll come to think of those numbers as the norm. The ALC has considered the

political consequences of capping. J.T. Forbes, the Vice President for Public Affairs and Government Relations is convinced that the general assembly will see capping as a positive move because it would signal to community college students that they should transfer as soon as they earn an associate's degree and because capping maintains academic quality. What is this academic quality argument? Is the academic training of students with 90 credit hours from a community college different than students with the same number of credit hours from a four-year institution? The students from four-year institutions have to declare a major. They have faculty advisors. And they have access to advanced courses that are related to their major as well as within their major. An IU baccalaureate degree that is made up of 30 credit hours in the major and 90 credit hours of lower division courses chosen because they happen to be in the course transfer library undercuts the value of all IU baccalaureate degrees. That is why the vice chancellors voted for a cap that restricts their own actions. Any questions?

Ng: Well Bob, thank you very much for the background. Anybody have any questions? The floor is open for questions. Marty.

Spechler: Well Bob, I very much agree. I think that those agreements that were made behind our back were scandalous and rightly excited a lot of derision. Now, a 60 credit cap makes sense, but let's think about how you make progress in fields like our own, economics. Like most of the natural sciences; physics, chemistry, biology, many of the foreign languages, and so on, it requires at least two years, at least two years, one year devoted to the elementary matters or mathematics and at least one year devoted at the intermediate level before we would say that this person is worthy of a degree. So I do believe that the sixty hours would require at least 2 years residency at Indiana University. And residency has values above and beyond the courses that you take. It has to do with the advising, with the atmosphere, with the fellow students you meet, with extra-curricular activities and all, and so forth. So it does seem to me that we might extend that and cap it at 60, but also consider whether we should have a common residency requirement at one of the four year campuses of Indiana University in order to capture all of those advantages of actually being on the scene.

Ng: I think actually we already have residency requirements, so that part, this particular policy is not intended to address that. We already have…

Spechler: You mean with the 90/30 thing, students had to spend two years on campus in order to get those 30 hours?

Ng: : No there's no 90/30, I mean…

Spechler: There was.

Ng: No, we're not talking about the past we're talking about what we're going to, this policy will apply from here on out. I'm not so sure about what you're referring to as 90/30.

Spechler: In the past, you say we have a residency requirement. Nonetheless, that residency requirement, as you admit, was not effective in preventing the 90/30.

Ng: I didn't say that. I did not say that at all.

Spechler: Well, how did they get the degree based on one year's worth of credits?

Ng: Well I think people got to understand, this policy really intends, it says it only applies to two-year colleges or community colleges. Now, I mean, it has always been possible that for somebody from a four-year college to transfer to Indiana University and in fact if they do so with more than 60 hours if they come from a four-year college, if MIT comes here and they want a degree from Indiana University they will have to satisfy some residency requirements. And that is already on the books. There's not an issue there.

Spechler: And you say that that has been observed in fact in the…

Ng: Oh yes. Absolutely, absolutely. Each school, in fact, my school certainly enforces it rigorously.

Spechler: Uniform across the university?

Baldwin: Well, it's not the same number.

Ng: Not the same number, but put it this way, it is not an order of magnitude difference how many hours in the major have to be taken in residence. I mean, there's no such thing as a single number I can quote you because I don't think that exists, but the spirit is satisfied.

Sandy: Martin, I'd like to address that question also. The ALC considered using residency requirements to address the concerns about credit hours from a community college and typically the residency requirements are set at the school and are set around 36 credit hours. The number does vary from school to school, but if IU set a 60 credit hour residency requirement on all transfer students including those from four-year institutions, we'd be completely out of line with other universities. So the capping of the number of credit hours from a community college that can be applied to a four year degree, a baccalaureate degree, is common, but a two year residency requirement, I don't know of any place that does that.

Spechler: Bob, we've made the distinction and rightly so on the grounds that you've mentioned between two-year institutions where there is weaker advising or no advising, where it's mostly a commuter operation, where there's no major and so on and so forth in your presentation, so I wouldn't argue that a student who comes from MIT or Purdue even, banish the thought, would have to spend two years in an IU institution. But what about a student who comes from one of these two-year institutions? Shouldn't he or she spend two years at an IU campus?

Sandy: The 64 credit hour…

Ng: De facto…

Sandy: …limit on the, that effectively would force them to spend two years, at least sixty credit hours more at an IU campus.

21

Spechler: Okay 60, I understand that argument. One more comment.

Sandy: Okay.

Spechler: We have at Indiana University a lot of correspondence courses. They count as IU courses. Would these have to be 60 credits taken in residency? Or could they also be distance education or some of the online education courses.

Sandy: The 90/30 continuing studies arrangement with community colleges in California, Arizona and Texas, the 30 was all distance. There's no residency. There's residency, the way that registrars define it, is not physical presence. So in theory you can take distance courses and satisfy the last 60 credit hour but there are very few upper level courses being offered on a distance basis. It's not cost effective. So effectively, the capping like I'm proposing, or well not me personally, but the ALC is proposing, will force students to be on campus.

Ng: Okay. Very quickly, Julie and then Fulk and then Kolbe.

Bobay: I just have a quick question about procedure and the purpose of this discussion. Is this, and this might be to Bart and Lisa, is the reason that this is on the agenda to introduce the topic, and then I guess, within ten minutes we're not going to be able to discuss the substance of this at this meeting and so my question is, where is the substance of this issue going to be discussed and when and at what point will we really get to discuss the substance?

Ng: The substance of the discussion you know will be discussed as I say at the EPC committees on each campus. Okay, and as I mentioned to you, some campuses are ahead of others simply because of the timing. So eventually, this will be a policy voted on by the UFC.

Schneider: So we're going to see about concurring with their policy, or making changes or…?

Ng: That's right. That's correct. Like for, I'll give you an example, there was some discussion about whether it should be 64 hours or 50% of the credit, you know, towards the degree. So, you know, each campus had a slightly different take on it, so we will try to work on that. But I thought it was good for everybody to have a kind of common conception where we need to go from here. Yeah, Trevor?

Fulk: My only question is, based on my understanding of this, this is an upper level cap. So a school on paper then would be free to choose a lower number of acceptable credits for a specific degree program for only two year institutions should they choose. For example, if a particular school, like for example School of Engineering Technology at IUPUI were to say that we are only willing to accept X number of credits toward a degree in electrical engineering, would that still meet the requirements of the policy which is to say it's an upper cap rather than a new decision you must take this up or is that under discussion?

Sandy: You're correct. For example, right now, arts and sciences, the College of Arts and Sciences in Bloomington, wants to stick to its current 50% rule which could be less than 64 depending on the major. So this is a max. And there's fine details of some exceptions and…

Fulk: Sure.

Sandy: …more that I don't want to get into, but one procedural issue; we're inventing a sort of cross campus academic policy and I first went to your two presidents and said, 'How about you do this?' And they said, 'How about the administration act first and show that we really actually want this and that the UFC won't be spinning its wheels coming up with a policy and then be ignored.' And I said, 'Alright, we'll act first.' So you got a resolution and you can modify it. The transmittal letter said that we're very flexible on different ways of doing it.

Schneider: So this has no problems with the Trustees or to the presidents from them?

Ng: That's correct.

Sandy: This is an academic matter. That's why it has to go to the UFC. Think of these academic vice chancellors as being worried and upset and saying , 'Please look at this.'

Ng: Professor Kolbe.

Kolbe: Professor Sandy, you suggested that J.T. Forbes anticipated the __ nature of these ____. Has there been any discussion especially with higher tech anticipating what kind of response they will have whether they consequently might request from the legislature more ___.

Sandy: I, part of my job is dealing with my counterpart at Ivy tech, Marnie Kennan, and I've talked to her in general, about, not this resolution but about caps and what numbers she can live with. And she has never pushed for big numbers. What they want is that the students can just march in, in platoons to well established rules, but they're not saying march in with 90. So right now, I don't anticipate…what they hate is any public criticism of the quality of programs at Ivy Tech. So we have to always be careful and be utterly factual and say something like, 'Well you don't declare a major.' So as long as we're, we don't denigrate Ivy Tech in any public forum or any way, I think they can live with a well established and understood rule.

Ng: Okay and one last question, Jim?

Baldwin: We know that about community colleges, where my concern comes; is Vincennes no longer a community college?

Sandy: That's one of those footnote things. For the purposes of bachelor's degrees offered by Vincennes and I think there's six of them now, any student transferring within that bachelor's degree program would be treated as having come from a four-year school. Because they have all the descriptors I gave before about advising, major, advanced courses, and anyone coming from the rest of Ivy Tech…

Baldwin: Vincennes

Sandy: Sorry, misspoke. Thank you, Vincennes, would be treated as coming from a community college.

Baldwin: So this isn't an Ivy Tech policy, this is a community college policy in general. It would apply to out of state colleges like those in California too.

Ng: Okay, are there any other questions?

Callison: Bart, this is Danny Callison.

Ng: Yes Danny?

Callison: As Dean of the School of Continuing Studies this of course is an issue that affects our program and actually because of the 90/30 program that was a part of the school it's one of the sparks that brought about the discussion. I just want to state that we have discussed this resolution. I have with each of the directors of general studies on each of the campuses around IU along with the faculty representatives in our School of Continuing Studies faculty council and that we find it to be quite a workable resolution that we can work within those guidelines and happy to do so. I want to express appreciation to Bob Sandy and his assistants for doing the work that they have this summer to gain background information and we did a similar exercise and the information that we found substantiated of course what Bob's people found. I hope that there's continued discussion on this. I'm glad to learn that individual campuses are also discussing it and I hope that you will keep me attuned so that when a full discussion with the University Faculty Council takes place I can be a part of that. We're very anxious to see this concluded so that we can carry on with other business including (end of Side A – some comments lost)

Ng: Thank you Danny. I appreciate your comments. And Bob thank you very much, I think that was very helpful.

Sandy: Thanks for inviting me.

Ng: Yeah. Thank you very much.

Spechler: Good job.

AGENDA ITEM #7: ONCOURSE ISSUES

Ng: So we can now move onto our next item of business. As you recall at our last UFC meeting there was a lot of concerns raised about the Oncourse, the state of Oncourse its ability to handle the demand placed on it. So there was a very strong feeling that we should have somebody from IT. (loud electronic noise in room)

Spechler: The revenge of IT.

Ng: The revenge of IT, that's right! There we go. Stacy is that planned?

Morrone: I didn't do that!

Ng: Anyway, I think there was, in fact as I recall President McRobbie invited when Marianne Wokeck raised the issue, that President McRobbie invited, you know, her and us to actually…

Wokeck: It was Mary Fisher who had raised the issue.

Ng: …that's right, to send in written comments and what you have in front of you is in fact a letter written by Marianne Wokeck to the President with a reply from Stacy Morrone who's with us today. Now I think that, and of course you can read the two letters, I think that Stacy's response answered many of the details of the difficulties that many of you have experienced especially at the beginning of the semester. At the same time I think it's very important that we as a body talk about issues at a more general level; mainly about how the policies are made in IT, you know, what is the mechanism that they use to make such policies and what is the role of faculty in such decisions. We haven't had this discussion as I recall, at this level, with this spin on it, for quite a while so I think it is very important for us to actually think about the issue in a more, in a higher plane rather than say, you know, addressing specific difficulties that we have or have not experienced because I think much of that was really, was already commented on by Stacy. So with that, perhaps Stacy you can, you know, give us a general introduction, some introductory remarks and then the floor will be open for questions and comments.

Morrone: I appreciate the opportunity to be here, and Brad Wheeler, Vice President of IT, sends his greetings. One of the things that Bart and I talked about before the meeting is that there may be many faculty who still don't know about what is called the Oncourse Priorities Committee. And I chair that committee, but that is a committee made up of faculty from across Indiana University two of whom, members of that particular committee, David Vollrath from South Bend, and Chris Bjornson from IU Southeast, serve on this committee. This is a committee that essentially sets the priorities for Oncourse. So, I think there are faculty who think that UITS sets the priorities for Oncourse, but in fact it is the faculty who make these decisions about what will be in each subsequent release of the application. And that's as it should be because this application is for our faculty, for our students. And so this priorities committee I think is running pretty efficiently, what we do is, and Chris drives up from Southeast three times a year, we bring the committee together for a face to face meeting. We spend the bulk of the day. Every faculty member, every student, every staff member who clicks "Contact Us" and submits a suggestion, we see all of it in summary form on that day. So there are faculty who have said, 'You know, it feels like it goes into a black hole and I don't know what happens when I send in a suggestion,' and I think that Chris and David I think can probably assure you that in fact, every suggestion is summarized and synthesized by the Functional Requirements Committee. The Functional Requirements Committee provides the support to the Oncourse Priorities Committee. The Functional Requirements Committee is made up of teaching center people largely and a few other UITS staff. These are the folks who sit with faculty every day in the teaching centers, and know the issues that many faculty are facing. So they take a first crack at summarizing what are a lot of suggestions and put together a report which is then submitted to the Oncourse Priorities Committee and they have some preliminary recommendations. Ultimately, it's our faculty who

decide what goes into Oncourse in each subsequent release. Now that said, we can't do everything for every release. So what we do is we have a certain number of development hours and estimates on sort of the things we think are the most pressing issues and the faculty on the priorities committee then spend the day talking about these various priorities, raise new ones that may not have been on the list, think back to old ones that we're still waiting on. Chris has long since every meeting asked for multiple gradebooks. One of these days he's going to get a multiple gradebooks. So he advocates for that. So this process works pretty well and I think that it's generally regarded as a successful process and it's one that puts directly in the hands of our faculty the ability to vote on what goes in and what doesn't go in in each subsequent release. Things that don't make it into one release are carried over as items for the next one. So it's much like original Oncourse in the sense that suggestions that you made for original Oncourse eventually made their way into the application. The same process works here. The advantage that we have now, that we didn't have before with original Oncourse is that we are part of the supply open source community. And what that means is that the things that our faculty want don't necessarily have to be developed by Indiana University so there are things, there are developers all across the world, who are developing code for us and we can pick and choose what we want. We can put things into the application that make sense for Indiana University we can develop our own flavor of things that we need. So it's an opportunity to really gain some incredible ability to innovate with this application. And over time, this will become an even more powerful application. So that said, my background is actually, I'm the Associate Dean for Learning Technologies, a fairly recent appointment for me, about a year. Before that I was the teaching center director at the IUPUI campus and I'm an educational psychologist and my tenure is on the Indianapolis campus in the School of Education. So, I'm a faculty member in my heart. I think like one, I act like one. I learned a lot of new vocabulary words at the beginning of this semester. Not from our faculty from, you know -- technical people laugh and think 'What kinds of words?' I learned a lot of technical jargon as we had to sort through a pretty disastrous start up of the semester. It was pretty disastrous. Essentially the application wasn't available. We've talked about that I think at length in various places and even regular faculty now have a general sense of what happened. We believe we have those problems solved. And we have just done a complete, and it went flawlessly, an upgrade to the hardware that Oncourse is sitting on which will essentially safeguard us from that happening again. And so some of those things have happened since the beginning of the semester that we are very cautious and very careful about and meanwhile we have the priorities committee who's setting the priorities for what will be in the late December and January release which is shared in this document. So that's kind of an over arching way in which faculty are a key partner with UITS in this process, and I don't know if Chris or if I've missed anything David or Chris, but that's essentially how the process works. They may have something they want to share from their perspectives.

Ng: Okay, do you want to say something David and then Chris?

Bjornson: I'll just say that I think this is a very effective committee. I'm very happy with the way the committee works, and I'd like to see this as a model for other committees so that the faculty actually have a lot of input on what happens.

Pratt: How'd you get on this committee?

Bjornson: I was actually asked to serve by our director from ILT, our Teaching and Learning Center.

Bobay: Your director from what?

Bjornson: Our Teaching and Leaning Center.

Bobay: Oh. Thank you.

Unknown Male Speaker: How long are you there?

Bjornson: It was a two-year appointment and I just re-upped for another two-year appointment.

Morrone: The people who serve on this committee right now were recommended by the teaching centers by deans, tech deans, people like that who, we needed faculty who would be advocates for technology in general but advocates for Oncourse CL, in particular. So that's how we found Chris.

Ng: David? Do you have a comment?

Vollrath: I think all I would add is this, maybe the main perspective that I get from the committee that I didn't have before just coming out of the classroom is that the hard work of that committee is matching reality and dreams. I mean, we all as instructors have wish lists or maybe if we're technological laggards rather than leaders other people are trying to sell us on all the cool bells and whistles. This committee tries to figure out, given finite resources which of these way cool things gets incorporated first and which have to wait until later. So that's a bunch of the work kind of that we do in committee.

Ng: I have one comment before I open the floor. Stacy I think it would be very helpful when you recruit people to this committee, you talk to the tech dean and the tech dean knows this and that, but if my memory serves me, I do not believe I have ever been asked as, you know, as a faculty council person to suggest people. As you will, as you can see, many of the so called problems are first reported to the various faculty councils. So in some sense I think it is quite important to have people who are very not necessarily believers so to speak in the technology, you know, to be on that committee. And so, because we have a discussion in the Agenda Committee that this is really the, looking for people to serve on that committee it has to be much more broad based. And I would, this is something that I will, certainly explicitly both I and Lisa will, suggest to you. So anyway with that, Marty?

Spechler: I'm an unbeliever. I am very skeptical about this.

Ng: Unbeliever-nonbeliever?

Spechler: Non-believer.

Ng: Oh, non-believer.

Spechler: Non-believer in how this thing has been done over the years. I remember a meeting of the executive council of the IUPUI faculty council in which it was explained to me, over to us, over more than an hour how these things were done and I think basically resource allocation in this committee in the past, not under you, was done on the basis of what benefits have support and let's put those in, rather than a concern about the cost of the whole enterprise. Now that resulted for example in taking away my telephone and those of my colleagues so that students cannot call me on the telephone using university facilities. I had to buy my own, which of course I'm glad to do, I'm well paid and all this. I wouldn't be without a telephone. But they took away our telephone! Right now, they can call, they can do email, which I'm glad they have, but they've taken away my telephone. They keep giving me a new computer, I don't even understand the computer I had in the past. One of the results of Michael McRobbie's long tenure in IT where he sold IT as, you know, "IU is Red Hot" was almost unlimited budget for IT as compared to other things that we need for instruction like decent furniture, like chalk in the classroom to mention two very mundane things not to think of thesis salaries so that we can recruit better teachers at Indiana University. I'm sure you're concerned about that. So I think what's really wrong, and Bart says let's talk broadly, what's really wrong with the IT procedure at Indiana University is that we're not considering IT or Oncourse which I like, but I like the old Oncourse. I didn't need the new Oncourse. I just wanted the old Oncourse to work properly, but by the way, my son who's a student at IU now regularly is told, 'You don't have to come to class. We have an Oncourse class for you.' Professors just taking off. You know, we pay the usual tuition, and now it's supposed to be some kind of distance learning. Never signed up for that. But you know they just take time off and say, 'Well get together with the other students on Oncourse.' That's, as someone who pays his tuition, unacceptable. Unacceptable. But it's one of the effects of this. I have the feeling that these committees, and clearly there's some very fine people working on the committee, nothing personal, are always considering, 'Well what would be neat to have?' but not what we're giving up to have those neat things. And what we're giving up? Good teaching, good teachers, my telephone, and my old computer that I barely understood.

Ng: Marty, thank you. I know about your telephone problem. Yes Jim?

Baldwin: Just out of curiosity, the committee you have, the advisory committee, and this relates to what Martin just said, does this committee do anything else except recommend bells and whistles for Oncourse or does it actually look at the budget for the whole system, for Oncourse?

Morrone: It's a priority setting committee.

Baldwin: But it doesn't look at the total, I was wondering if your billable hours were enough. The committee's never been sent out, investigated whether the hours you've allocated for work on the system was actually what was needed to do make the system work. I mean a mega-look.

Morrone: We…

Baldwin: So you don't use the committee for that purpose?

Morrone: No. UITS is very good at activity based costing. And we make all of that data available. Oncourse is a relatively good deal. It costs about $10 a user, which is not really all that bad. And so it's a fairly efficient process.

Wokeck: I mean, that's my next question, compared to what?

Morrone: Right. You know the reason why this strategic decision was made three years ago by, actually Brad Wheeler was in my position at that point as associate dean, is because if you go with the commercial application like Blackboard, WebCT, you essentially are at their mercy. The prices go up dramatically every year. You have no say in what goes into the application and you live with what you get. And so the cost might be one thing one year. It will go up at the will of the commercial vendor. And so this decision, we've been used to having control with original Oncourse, that's our homegrown application, it grew up at IU, and so we've been used to the ability to say, 'I want that.' Chris wants to be able to say, 'I want multiple gradebooks, and I'm going to get them eventually.' And he wants to be able to say that. And if we had a Blackboard or a WebCT or some other commercial application, we would live with what we have. So it was an issue of what makes sense for Indiana University and control our own destiny and to be able to innovate as we see fit was part of the strategic decision.

Ng: Herb?

Terry: You've acknowledged that it was a disastrous rollout. How did that happen? I mean, that seems to be the focus of this. Old Oncourse was pulled back, the new thing was in place and it didn't work.

Morrone: Well, actually they've both been running concurrently for three years, so the rollout was really actually not the rollout but those faculty and there were certainly campuses that had very low adoption rates. Those campuses took it on the nose in this case. Bloomington was already at about 85% adoption of Oncourse CL. That campus had an easier time simply because they already knew the application and were able to adapt. So what I'm talking about were those two days on August 27 and 28 when basically you couldn't get into Oncourse. It was essentially, it was on its knees in terms of ability to perform. That was a lot of issues that we've articulated in a number of places with data connection, pooling software, and those kinds of matters. We also just, quite frankly the low testing just did not suggest that we would have these problems. And the enterprise software division and the associate vice president for that particular division, Barry Walsh, did load testing and asked the Oncourse team to do load testing to the extent that they thought that everything would be fine. Obviously it didn't go that way, and the load testing didn't reveal the complex ways in which faculty used the application. So that's what I'm talking about. Those two days, slow performance even before then, but those two days really when Bloomington started is when everything, essentially performance, was unacceptable for about 36 hours. You couldn't use it for all intents and purposes. I think UITS responded pretty fast, about 36 hours, most of us didn't sleep during that time and we were able to make a lot of changes pretty rapidly meanwhile the application was down a lot of the time.

Terry: What's in your $10 per user calculation?

Morrone: It's got a lot of things in it. It's got the development team, it's got the computers that it runs on, the infrastructure, so there's large servers that are running Oncourse. It factors in teaching center consultants who helped to develop the functional requirements for the application and so forth, so it's a number of things all of which those of us who touch Oncourse in any way report what portion of our time our hardware is…

Terry: So it doesn't account for faculty time, what the school has to spend…

Morrone: It does not account for…

Terry: …what the students spend and all of this.

Morrone: No it's a UITS budget allocation, yes.

Terry: Okay.

Ng: Marianne?

Wokeck: I was the one that summarized the comments that my colleagues in the liberal arts had sent. So this is not in a sense my matter it's simply my summary and I want to make that very clear. I also want to raise three points. One is the question that has already been brought up, and that is the timing of the decision for the timing to force the going from Oncourse original to Oncourse CL. And those of you who have a short memory, I'm a historian, so I'm paid and trained to have a long memory, we remember that because of the concerns it was already once pushed back, that forced migration, and ___ had responded to that and that allowed people to have both systems available. And the one aspect, that at least for the school of liberal arts I really want to make very strongly, I have heard now from quite a few UITS vested people who say that people who are not willing, not prepared to move because they don't know how to use the computer. The vast majority of people were Oncourse original savvy and many of them were, including myself, Oncourse CL savvy. And yet we could not handle it. And it wasn't because we were not prepared or dumb. So I think that is really one of the things that courtesy does require to acknowledge that most of the people were willing and able to make that move. However, there was no backup. There was no way that anybody could have an alternative strategy. And I think that goes back to who made the decision and why was that decision made. And that leads to the third point: that there's a cost. And what has happened in the School of Liberal Arts is that you talk about the first two days that were really bad, well it was still bad last week. There is no mechanism that Oncourse CL even lists which of the problems have been fixed. Now what it doesn't do is that most of my colleagues who have encountered problems with the message system, with the forum, with the gradebook, you name it. It's midterm. We have long abandoned Oncourse CL because it does not work. At the cost of retention, at the cost of incredible anger by the students. And any of you who have taught, who teach repeatedly and who would teach many people know that that is something you cannot make up in a semester. No matter what you try, how you try it, this is going to be the experience that you carry through the tests, through the midterms, and through the finals and through the grading. And I as academic affairs dean, am not looking forward to the last part of the semester when those complaints are going to be cumulative. The reputation, the damage to the reputation by our

students, through our students, to the community for this forced migration has been extraordinarily large. I cannot put a dollar sign on it. But it was, it seemed at least from our perspective and some of, one of your tech people tried to explain to me that Oncourse was no longer, the software was no longer, reliantly workable and that's why the migration was necessary at this point. It would have been nice to have that explanation. It would have made certain things a little easier to take but that's the kind of larger thinking that I think we need to employ when we do have a system that is ours. Whom are we asking that it works properly for those that have very little expertise and those who are at the forefront? We carry a great gap, not just amongst faculty, Spellman with whom I talked was surprised that we have students who do still have non-broadband telephone lines as their connection to the computer. We teach in a world that is not a perfect UITS world. And we need to take that into consideration. We would like to be asked about these questions. Rather than have people assume. That's why I think the policy and procedural aspects of this, that's where we can learn from. This semester has been shot, one of the very amusing to me things that I was asked, 'Well we have not received any complaints about the forum, we've not received any complaints about the gradebook anymore.' They're done with it. People are not using it, hence there are no complaints. So that's the kind of difficulty in language that we encounter when we have people with technical expertise talk to people who manage a classroom and I think the two need to talk together with each other rather than past each other. And that I think is where we're working on what we're trying to grasp.

Ng: I have couple of thoughts. The first one is that as I was thinking over the committee that you have, and the faculty's involved, I think they're a perfectly fine committee. But I believe that in some sense they are asked the wrong question. The faculty was asked the wrong question in the sense that, 'Well, given Oncourse, what do you want?' The question should be really, 'Well what do you want? What will make you, help you, in teaching? How can IT serve the faculty to make them more effective teachers and students more effective learners?' I think that is, you know, underlying the various questions that you hear. I think that is very, very important. The other point that I think, you know, I'm thinking about Julie who raised a very important question at the Agenda Committee that we as a body, I think it's very important for us to try to act in such a way that will effect change in the system in a fundamental way. We're not here to really to hear complaints and vent the complaints and, you know, well hopefully everybody will have said their piece and go away. So I would encourage, and this is a message to the members here, that I would encourage that we perhaps in a little bit further down the road, and maybe sooner than later is to formulate a resolution. A sense of resolution from this body that asking, with due respect, that the people who are in charge of IT for this university to listen to the faculty for their other needs. And asking them to develop a mechanism which will get us involved from day one in making decisions, in making choices and not necessarily go on the assumption that 'Well, this is the latest in instructional technology now it must be good.' And I think that is where the disconnect came and it has, unfortunately this took place a few years ago. Even the concept of open source, so called open source code, I agree is a very good idea, but I am not so sure that you know the various choices that the IT has made in the intervening years are all good choices because we are all to some extent accept the premise that you know, IT is good. The latest is the best. And I think this is where we get into trouble. So are there any other comments about that? Julie?

Bobay: It's not really about Isabelle, the commitment priorities committee. It's just an observation that at least in my mind input from the faculty is defined in many ways and creating a group, bringing together a selected group of faculty to apprise you, is not necessarily synonymous with hearing from the faculty. That faculty committees, appointed, nominated and endorsed by faculty governance groups like this really are a different thing than a selected group of faculty that an administrator calls together and it does seem to me that both can work great and both have their important roles, but picking a group of faculty who are, that one of the criteria for them to be on the group is that they be advocates for the product or what, you know, the open source product, if you call it a product does seem to me worthy of some thought. That having priorities set by a group of faculty who were chosen because they are big Oncourse users and can be advocates for the product does give you one set of input and not another that might come from a group who are not big advocates.

Morrone: May I clarify?

Ng: Sure.

Morrone: And I did say it that way. Many of the Oncourse priorities committee members didn't use Oncourse CL at all. So they were essentially faculty who taught with technology… (end of tape--comments lost)

Morrone: …until the end, and with good reason, and in fact our readiness survey told them to wait because they were waiting on some functionality that wasn't there yet. So for some of our faculty, Julie Freeman's one of them, she was on of the later adopters of CL simply because she needed some functionality that was not yet there until one of the later releases, so that's, Bart if I may…

Ng: Sure.

Morrone: The idea behind what you're talking about is exactly where we're going with a new learning technologies steering committee that comes out of, it's a joint proposal with Hasan Akay's faculty council technology committee. This was meant to be a faculty council and UITS committee to solve the problem that you're talking about, whereas this particular committee is a joint committee where it would have faculty council representatives on the committee and it would have faculty, so it would have faculty council representatives and it would have faculty from various schools across Indiana University. Now this committee is intended to be larger and have a greater scope than Oncourse CL, because priorities committee can keep themselves busy just with Oncourse, but it was meant to address that issue of why this decision, why did we go this direction, so this committee that I think Hasan will be talking with you about, that we have been working on the language which will come to the executive committee is in fact intended to be exactly what you're suggesting.

Ng: Just a little bit of background. What Stacy's referring to is the learning, is the technology committee of the Indianapolis faculty council. As you already mentioned, there's a lot of discontent on our campus about this, and our technology committee is trying to actually, you

know, come up with a proposal, a mechanism, to deal with what I have actually just said. But that does stop it from any other campus, okay in other words we can broaden this into a literally a UFC committee, even though the idea may start off on one campus this is why this body should take ownership of it eventually. I hope we will. And so…

Pratt: Yeah, because I don't think makes any sense for you or I to be tackling this from the Bloomington side or any of the other campuses, we need to make this a UFC…

Ng: That's correct. Yeah, sure.

Morrone: …with nominations coming forward.

Ng: Because that is still not completely developed, that's the reason why.

Morrone: And that's what we're working on right now.

Wokeck: But I do think that Julie's comment about, any decisions about teaching and learning have to come from a very broad perspective. I mean, just to give you one set of numbers, in the School of Liberal Arts we have 200 resident faculty that is full time of all ranks, but we have 250 part time faculty. Now on Bloomington campus that would include the grad students who have more ___ but the numbers are pretty roughly equal. And the concerns aren't for the ones, not the ones who have all the connections in place, we need to be thinking very broadly when we make any of those decisions and that just simply has not happened. And I think that Julie is quite correct, when even the questions haven't been asked because, as Bart said, we have had the course that went the wrong way. It is teaching and learning that should drive IT and not the other way around.

Morrone: And I completely agree.

Wokeck: That's, I think really, yeah if this comes across as adversarial, there are many of the complaints, some of them are so that there was a lot of new vocabulary, that I did not want to continue with, so I cleaned out some of the acronyms out of some of this stuff but what did come through and I do want to say that indeed that support people, like you, like John Gosney and others, people appreciated what you're trying to do, but could not get across the countless hours that were spent on the phone, on the computer, when we're blocked out that were empty hours. And that hasn't stopped. That hasn't stopped yet. And that is the part that is the frustrating one, and that is I think where had we done it the other way around, we could have had different things in place.

Ng: Thank you Marianne.

(Electronic Feedback)

Bjornson: I would just like to point out too that the faculty import to this is not through the committee, the Oncourse priorities committee. The faculty import is through the "Contact Us." All faculty members can contact can click "Contact Us" and then the functional requirements

committee takes a look at all of those, summarizes them and gives them to us and then we set the priorities of what we think needs to be done.

Wokeck: And that's where some of the breakdown is because if your screen freezes up, you can't use "Contact Us." And any of you who've been in the position of preparing class when things freeze up you prepare your class. You do not necessarily go back 2 hours later and say, 'Oh yeah, I really remember when it froze up and this is what I wanted to say.' And there are, unlike when you go IT in general, there are no incident numbers so even if you get the general report dealing with it, there's no way that you know that that particular problem is being dealt with. Is it just your computer that is acting up, is it everybody, is it the software? That's I think where a lot of work can be done to make this system more suitable.

Ng: Lisa wanted to make a comment.

Pratt: I think, John, it's really important that you carry back to President McRobbie, the sense of frustration among the faculty. It is very widespread that many of us, I'm another one. I uploaded all my course materials, I checked, they were there. The next day they weren't there. And it was extraordinarily frustrating. If we attempted to calculate the faculty hours that were put into and continue to be put into trying to figure out what's wrong with us, why can't I make this work, re-reading instructions. It's simply too steep a learning curve for people who are already burdened with loads of other responsibilities and somehow we because the president is engaged with technology, is enthusiastic about it, I think we need to help him understand that the application of that technology is sometimes extraordinarily expensive not only in terms of human hours, but in anger and frustration. And then, it comes back and gets the faculty again because it shows up on your teaching evaluations.

Wokeck: Yeah, exactly.

Pratt: And they think that you somehow personally failed the student in the application of the technology.

Wokeck: Yeah.

Pratt: And I think you said it exactly right. We cannot undo the damage that's already been done. That has to be part of addressing the cost of embracing new technology.

Wokeck: And that's why I think, Stacy, when the new version comes out, don't make it between the two semesters where we have the same anxiety going into spring. I really want spring to go smoothly.

Morrone: Me too, Mary.

Wokeck: So whatever you can do, don't, it's not that timing if it's not right if it's not done

Morrone: Actually, I delayed a number of things on purpose for that very reason. Because even though the assignment still needs to be rewritten, I'm not willing to do it in December and

put it out there. So, it's just too risky for our faculty, so I'm not going to. So I delayed it, priorities committee backed me up on that. So I am being very cautious about this.

Ng: Thank you, David?

Frantz: Yeah, I hope that one thing we don't lose sight of is actually finding someone to get some input from the students. Because the frustration that is felt in the faculty is probably magnified ten times over on the students' part. And it has to do with everything having to do with particularly what does a student do when they need help. And it's just, because I have enough problem, when I have a problem finding somebody particularly because when most of the problems come up it's not between 9 and 5. And you know, so it's, I think it's just important because it does have an issue of retention, how people view the institution and I don't want to make the issue larger than it is, but I think we just can't afford to lose sight of the student experience.

Ng: Trevor we have a student here, so we must hear from Trevor.

Fulk: Thank you, Bart. You're right in two respects for sure. There is frustration from the students when Oncourse, like it does to the faculty, either stops working which in some cases yes, is a computer problem at the client end in some cases it's not and a lot of our students can't tell the difference. Sorry, it's true, ok? Some of our students are as technologically adept as our IT students like myself. I don't have any problem finding help because I know where to get it, but some of us are like Dr. Spechler, who avoid computers unless necessary to an extent and we have some that simply don't know where to get the help or in some cases like we brought up earlier are using plain old telephone systems if you will and dial up to get in and quite frankly, Oncourse, in the latest of CL like OneStart is a very graphics intensive piece of software. And that's the way it is. Graphics take up bandwidth. So for those students who are not like I am, on high speed internet connection at home and don't have the ability to do that readily they're restricted obviously to either bringing a laptop, if they own one, to campus where they have access to that type of data network connection or go into one of the computer labs. For example, at IUPUI, we have one 24 hour computer lab. Believe me, if I walk in there at 10:30 at night, I guarantee you half the spaces in that lab are filled and a lot of them are with students who don't necessarily live on campus but simply have to come to campus because that's the only place they can get the amount of data bandwidth on the network connection to actually be able to access their Oncourse assignments. Going along with that, the faculty adoption of Oncourse CL, I've been, had the privilege of working, of being a student here for seven years. Three years ago, as we all know, Oncourse CL came out with basically version one. And we asked faculty to adopt it then, a few did. And the students expressed some frustration to our student governments over the simple fact that we had two versions of this thing. And nobody seemed to know which one was the version they were going to use for which class. And like you know from the faculty side of it, dealing with the administrator side, or the administrator user side as an instructor, the capabilities of the two different pieces of software were not equivalent when it first came out and in a sense in some ways they still weren't even when we dropped the old version of Oncourse to improve development time for Oncourse CL. I think the students' perspective in modern society, the vast majority of our incoming freshman students particularly, and those to a certain extent that are transfer students are those students like myself who grew up in a technology based

environment. Ok, this is not something that we're unaccustomed to. Ok, we understand that software applications do not always work. Welcome to Windows, I think we've all heard the line at least once that Microsoft Works, doesn't. 'Kay, The point is that many of our students are very familiar with technology and we expect that, as a student, from our university. So, Dr. McRobbie's emphasis in a sense on, 'Yes, let's employ this technology because students are demanding it.' I think he's right, but it does need to be tempered with the recognition that one, not all of our students are prepared for that, not all of our faculty are prepared for that, and quite frankly, the software may or may not as it's being developed be prepared for these specific uses of the faculty and/or the student that are asking for its use. So I think, in correlation with the Oncourse priorities committee, learning steering committee, I would hope that we would ask that there be student participation on those committees particularly in those areas where like with Oncourse they are very student and user oriented entities. Quite frankly, the students are the largest users.

Ng: Thank you.

Morrone: There are two students on the committee.

Ng: Alright, one very…

Spechler: Before I get the reputation of being an utter Luddite, let me say that I haven't had any trouble with Oncourse CL and let me tell you why. I use it in a very limited way. I ask the question first, does this new technology which I'm skeptical of, contribute to learning? Sometimes. And second, does it work? Sometimes. And if it passes those two tests, I use it. And I don't believe that the students are, you know I ask the students do you think you need this? And that's part of the decision. But, you know, a lot of the problem was, seems to me, people trying things that weren't working yet.

Ng: Okay, we must bring this discussion to a close because we're running rapidly out of time, but I thank you Stacy for coming. I'm sure you will hear from us again, perhaps in maybe a more, in a very constructive way about how IT should redefine its relationship with the teaching and learning enterprise of the university, and we will you know, of course invite you and Fred to come back when it's the appropriate time. Okay, now we have to go into executive session even though this is not noted on the agenda because if F.C. Richardson, chancellor emeritus, F.C. Richardson is going to brief us on the, on the review of chancellor May Reck of IU South Bend so this will be an executive session and only members of the UFC should stay and thank you for all the rest who participated. Okay…

AGENDA ITEM #8: EXECUTIVE SESSION: CHANCELLOR'S REVIEW REPORT
[Executive Session remarks not recorded.]

AGENDA ITEM #9: NEW BUSINESS

(first part of item comments lost)

Applegate: …for enrollment and retention issues and it's really a resource position, it's not you know additional ongoing responsibilities, it's really simply a recognition that Roger has a lot of

experience in these areas. He was obviously key in, a key part in the Pell promise and 21st Century Scholars and the Covenant programs on Bloomington, in Bloomington, those affordability issues are very important ones for all of us and I think the president simply wants to have that resource more directly available. Another issue that I know Roger has been working on with others is rankings issues. So, it's really just a project by project kind of role.

Ng: Thank you very much. That's very helpful that I can bring back that news to the people who ask me those questions, and Steve…?

Gerencser: Since this is not time sensitive, I think it would be reasonable to put off to the next meeting because it might engender a long enough discussion that we wouldn't want to rush it right now and then Roseanne could actually spend more time thinking about it as well.

Ng: Okay, could you briefly just tell us what ….

Gerencser: Sure, Roseanne received some inquiries regarding the increase in chancellors' salaries at the various campuses and those expressing consternation not so much about the dollar amounts themselves but relative to the if we shall say, rather meager salary increases at a time of economic and financial depredation at various of the campuses. And so we thought it would be something worth discussing at UFC as well as potentially coming up with resolution that would speak to sensitivity to those matters when the president considers the increase of regional campus chancellor salaries.

Ng: Well, with that, I think we are through with our agenda and I thank you very much. Do I hear a motion to adjourn? Ok, well thank you for travelling all the way to IU East we appreciate it and thank you for, wonderful to see all of you. Thank you.

Meeting adjourned: 4:36pm