

**Minutes**  
**Indiana University**  
**UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL**

**IUB Education 1002**  
**IUE Whitewater Hall 119**  
**IUK Main Building 111**  
**IUN Hawthorn Hall 338**  
**IUPUI Education/Social Work 2101**  
**IUS Hillside Hall 102**  
**IUSB Northside Hall 075B**

**January 22, 2008**  
**1:30 P.M. - 4:30 P.M. (EST)**

**Attendance**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Simon Atkinson, James Baldwin, Charles Bantz, Karl Besel, Christian Bjornson, Jacqueline Blackwell, Julie Bobay, George Bodmer, James Capshew, John Carini, Donald Coffin, Rosanne Cordell, Angela Courtney, Mary Fisher, David Frantz, Trevor N. Fulk, Steven Gerencser, Dennis Groth, Marilyn Kintzele, Lloyd Kolbe, Bryan McCormick, Anna M. McDaniel, Ann McNally, Michael McRobbie, Bart Ng, Kwadwo Okrah, Nasser Paydar, Ruth Person, Markus Pomper, William Potter, Lisa Pratt, Paul Rowher, William Schneider, Martin Spechler, Herb Terry, Rosalie Vermette, David Vollrath, Joe Wert, Karen West, Kim White-Mills, L. Jack Windsor, Marianne Wokeck

**MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT:**

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Bruce Bergland, Janice Cox, Patricia Foster, Laura Ginger, Floella Gonya, Karen Hanson, M. Gail Hickey, Kevin Hunt, Matt Jarson, David Lindquist, Terrence Mason, Michael Nusbaumer, Sandra Patterson-Randles, Una Mae Reck, Deanna Reising, Richard Shockley, Alex Tanford, Michael Wartell

**GUESTS:** John Applegate, James Boyd (Herald-Times), David Malik (EVP), Sharon Turner (Ace Fellow), Brad Wheeler (VPIT & CIO), Alexis Rose, Craig Dethloff (Faculty Council Office)

**Agenda**

1. Approval of Minutes  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/AY08/minutes/10.23.07.htm>  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/AY08/minutes/11.27.07.htm>
2. Presiding Officer's Business (10 minutes)  
(President Michael McRobbie)
3. Agenda Committee Business (10 minutes)

(Professors Bart Ng and Lisa Pratt)

4. Question/Comment Period\* (10 minutes)  
(President McRobbie and Professors Ng and Pratt)

5. Discussion of Intellectual Property Policy (35 minutes) [DISCUSSION]

6. Resolution on Recent Changes in Promotion and Tenure Review for Faculty on the Regional Campuses  
(35 minutes) [FIRST READING]  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/AY08/circulars/U5-2008.pdf>

7. Core Schools Review (35 minutes) [DISCUSSION]

8. Credit Transfer Resolution (35 minutes)  
(Professor John Carini and Professor Kathy Marrs, co-Chairs of the Educational Policies Committee)  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/AY08/circulars/U6-2008.pdf>

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

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

**MCROBBIE:** Okay, let's move to the agenda, ladies and gentlemen. The first item on the agenda is the approval of minutes from the, I think it's the last two meetings. Can I have a motion to approve both sets of minutes please? Motion?

**MCCORMICK:** So moved.

**MCROBBIE:** A seconder?

**ROHWER:** Second.

**MCROBBIE:** Okay we've got a motion and a second up here. Any discussion? I'll put the motion, all those in favor please signify by saying yes, aye. (Aye) No? Motion's carried.

## **AGENDA ITEM #2 PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS**

**MCROBBIE:** Let me, I'll just move on to some comments I've got briefly. A couple of updates on some matters, one of which, actually two of which, will be addressed today. Firstly, I think the last time I met with you I mentioned that I'd established a Master Planning Committee and that one of the key jobs of that committee is to engage a new master planner for the University. That committee by the way includes Lisa and Bart as members and also Andrea Ciccarelli from the faculty in Bloomington and Rick Ward at IUPUI and about another twelve people. We, a request for services was put out to master planning companies all over the country, and from that

group a final short list of seven was identified. We met, as Lisa and Bart know only too well, we met all of Friday and a good chunk of Saturday interviewing those seven companies and have reduced the seven to two and some further investigation of those companies, and further interviews will be held later this week, and then a recommendation will come from that committee to me, and I in turn will take a recommendation to the Trustees at the next meeting or at least that's what we hope to do. So that one is moving fairly rapidly to conclusion. And as I said, I think with a lot of building planned and I think Bart and Lisa with both simply confirm this; there are some pretty significant planning issues on both campuses and this engagement of the new master planner who will hopefully bring a new, fresh eye to certain planning issues that we have is, I think, coming at a very timely time. There should have been, I believe there have been two committees established by Chancellor Bantz and by Provost Hanson in Bloomington and IUPUI. And those two campuses should be very broad campuses to involve a considerable cross section of the key stakeholders on both campuses to feed in campus specific information. In particular to update all the data that was collected when we started this exercise when I was VP for Research about, jeez, about four years ago now. And that's one of the jobs they're going to do. And they will also act on the campus level as the key bodies who will interact with the master planners while the master plan is being put together this year. As I said previously, this is really in two parts. After IUPUI and Bloomington, after their master plan is complete, the master planner will then move to updating the master plans for all the regional campuses. I think the feeling is that a lot of the work that was done there some years ago needs some updating but probably doesn't require a comprehensive overhaul given the smaller size of those campuses. But that will be Phase 2 of this exercise. That will take place next year. So that's an update on where we are in that process. Secondly, the Intellectual Property Policy: that is an item on the agenda, agenda item five. I just wanted to comment that I think what, where I expect that will go, is that a final version of that will be formally transmitted from you to me, but based on the drafts that we've already seen, the financial implications of that need to be investigated in more detail. I've already established a small group consisting of Neal Theobald and Dottie Frapwell, Bill Stephan and John Applegate to review the financial implications. I'm hoping that that will be done in the next week or so, too, and then bring that back to me. I must commend people for, I think, the good spirit in which this policy, the most recent versions of this policy have been developed. I know this has taken a long, long time. Thankfully we have a reasonably serviceable policy in place at the moment, so it's not as if this is necessarily causing us major dislocation. But it will be nice to see if we can have this matter resolved pretty quickly. Third, the Family Leave Policy: this, I must apologize that this seemed to have fallen a little between the cracks in that it wasn't quite certain what the next steps for dealing with this were. I have asked that the matter be taken over directly by my office and asked John to take carriage of this in my office. And I'm now in the process of getting it reviewed by deans, chancellors and others with a view to making some final determinations about it very quickly. And this, again, I think is a policy that's probably taken longer than we would have liked to have it dealt with and addressed. And that one I expect we hopefully should get sorted out reasonably soon. Certainly this semester, and my goal is earlier than that if we can do it. Fourthly, you will remember, some of you will remember that there was a review of core and system schools that was done by Emeritus Dean Chuck Bonser in 2006/07 that resulted in, again this comes up for discussion later, that resulted in a report that went to President Herbert which is now known generally as the Bonser Report. I, that was President Herbert accepted most of those recommendations and they were endorsed by the Trustees in the June meeting of the Trustees last year. What was, I think,

left unaddressed was the question of the operational processes in those schools. What worked well, what didn't work, where were the weaknesses in the administrative structures of core schools, and so on. Some of those issues I think had been flagged in the Bonser Report. Some I don't believe had been. So, in follow up to that what I have established is a what I call a Core Schools Operations Review Committee to be co-chaired by Chancellor Bantz and Provost Hanson will have as its members the eight deans, I believe it's eight deans, of the core schools and then eight other members who I expect will be faculty members chosen from each of those schools as well and I will ask, I've asked them to basically review the operation, how schools operate with a view to trying to adopt where possible best practices from across the schools and to achieve a greater level of consistency and also to identify impediments to the more efficient operation of core schools. I'll ask for that report by the end of this semester as well. I have asked that the deans ensure that there are mechanisms in their schools for obtaining faculty input and input from others in the schools who may have views and comments and to do this in a fairly robust manner to ensure we get all the comments and inputs that we want. The two key principles here are I think that a dean in order to run a school needs to have the appropriate authority to do so. But at the same time, a component of a school on a campus needs to be responsive to the particular missions and needs of that campus as well. So there's always going to be a tension to a greater or less degree here that it's essential that a dean be able to negotiate in a thoughtful way in conjunction with both the Chancellor and the Provost and with his or her faculty and other colleagues. And finally, after some period of time, Vice President O'Meara completed the development of the International Strategic Plan that received quite a lot of input from a variety of sources and in particular went to the President's Council on International Programs which is the key body that has faculty representation from all of the regional campuses as well. That was presented by him to the trustees in the last meeting, in the December meeting and I believe there is just some final cleaning up and that if it's not already, it should be on the website of his office imminently if it isn't already and it may be. I just didn't get a chance to check. But that was announced I think widely at the time when he presented it to the trustees. And some of you, I think, may have been familiar with some of the details of that. So those are just the five matters I wanted to report on and if there are any questions maybe we could defer those to under four but let me jump into Agenda Item number three which is business from the Agenda Committee and ask Bart and Lisa to comment accordingly.

### **AGENDA ITEM #3 AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

**NG:** Sure, thank you. Thank you Mr. President. I just wanted to remind everybody that since we are on a teleconference, please mute your, use the mute button to cut off the sound when your group is not speaking, and that would be very helpful. And the second thing I would ask you to do is please designate somebody on each of the sites to keep a list of the people who are attending and send that to me so that we know who is in fact in the meeting. And when you speak, I want you to make sure that you identify yourself before you speak and so that will be very helpful, too and when you speak make sure that you speak loudly to activate the camera because we only hear from the site where there is voice apparently. I want to bring up the first item. This has to do with the date for the next meeting of the UFC. We had a meeting scheduled for February 26 but however, the president because of some urgent business will not be able to attend and both Lisa and I agree that the president needs to attend to the business that he has on the date. So we will have to change the date of the next UFC meeting. What we're proposing is

that we will move the meeting to March the fourth and we will also change the time just to say, this is again exploratory at this point, but what we are proposing is that we hope we can change the meeting to be held on March the fourth and we're trying to hold the meeting between twelve, it will be a shortened meeting between twelve and two o'clock. I would be grateful if all of you could drop me a note to see whether you would be available so that I have a sense to see whether that time would work for most of you just so that for all the people who are attending today if you could drop me a note to let me know whether March the 4<sup>th</sup> between 12 and 2 o'clock that's an alternate time and date for the next UFC meeting. I think that would be very, very helpful.

**BALDWIN:** Where will you hold the meeting?

**NG:** The location is the same. It will be in Indianapolis, however the site, the room may be changed. We're investigating that possibility. Okay, I really appreciate your cooperation because the president has business that he really needs to attend to and both Lisa and I agree that he must attend to that business on that day. I want to report the Agenda Committee had a very, I would say, a lengthy discussion on item number six about the promotion and tenure review procedure that has most of its impact on the regional campuses. You will hear more about this later but at the same time I want to let you know that we will be making a motion to postpone the resolution on the agenda to the next meeting. However, we will in fact have a thorough discussion on the issue all the same. I think with that I think that's all the business I have to report from the Agenda Committee unless, Lisa, you have something to add?

**PRATT:** No, I think that covers it.

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

**MCROBBIE:** Okay, agenda item four, questions/comment period. Yeah, Marty?

**SPECHLER:** This is Martin Spechler, I'm a professor at IUPUI, made the trip down to Bloomington because that was the announced site of the meeting when I arranged my schedule. Michael, I want to ask you about perhaps terminology, but more importantly procedure with respect to core schools, one of the things you talked about. Now, traditionally, we've talked about system schools and core schools. Maybe the terminology is changing and maybe it should be changed, but I understood core school to be schools that exist on the two large campuses: Bloomington and Indianapolis. For example, the School of Education and perhaps the School of Journalism. But you talk about eight or ten schools which must include schools like the, like SPEA, which exist of course on quite a few campuses, I don't know how many, six or seven. I guess School of Nursing, likewise. And if that's true, if we're going to retain the notion on the one hand, core schools, just two campuses, system schools, more than two campuses. Then, are you referring to a review of both? And if you are, if you are, I want to call your attention to the strong interest that the smaller campuses have in that review and I may have missed it but by just involving the deans of those schools most of whom are housed either in Indianapolis or in Bloomington, we somehow avoid, I could be wrong in your, in understanding what you want, but it does seem to me that we should have the chancellors or some representative from the smaller campuses, each of which has one or more system schools on those campuses. They, those campuses have become much more independent than they were in the past. But their

interest of being connected for various reasons to the mother ship surely have not disappeared. So could you comment on that?

**MCROBBIE:** Yeah, Marty, the thing is that your definition is exactly right as to what core schools are and I believe that in the case of some of those schools you've defined as being system schools, they're in the process of converting into core schools. So, SPEA, I believe the part of SPEA that exists, I think it's at South Bend, is in the process of, if I remember rightly, is in the process of becoming an entity in its own right and SPEA will be just based on the two campuses Bloomington and Indianapolis. The same I believe is true of Nursing, based on the discussion I just had with the dean recently and I think the same is true, I believe, of all the other schools. So it really is just core schools. I, what I regret of course, is unfortunately I missed one, someone will have to refresh my memory I was writing them down: It's Education, SPEA, SLIS, Informatics, Nursing, Journalism, and Business.

**BALDWIN:** Social Work?

**MCROBBIE:** Social Work, yes, I think is the other one. Thank you, Social Work.

**UNKNOWN MALE SPEAKER:** \_\_\_\_\_.Music?

**MCROBBIE:** No, Music isn't because it's, the program at IUPUI as I understand it, is going to be incorporated into Liberal Arts as a program on its own.

**SCHNEIDER:** That's news to me.

**MCROBBIE:** Well, is the Chancellor there? Charles?

**BANTZ:** Sorry, you can't see me. They haven't decided where, but in the report the decision was that music would be separating the IUPUI program from the Jacobs School of \_\_\_\_\_, that's correct.

**CORDELL:** I believe that the Social Work is the one continuing system school.

**MCROBBIE:** That's right because of their accreditation, that's right. So the goal, Marty is to focus just on the core schools as defined.

**SPECHLER:** So system school will remain a concept but only for the one school?

**MCROBBIE:** Well, it's true of Medicine too, I mean, Medicine effectively is a system school.

**SPECHLER:** I see, and I trust that these decisions to split off is not only the decision of the regional campus, but also taken into account the dean and indeed your judgment about whether that would be good for the university as a whole.

**MCROBBIE:** Well these decisions were taken prior to my assuming the presidency by President Herbert, and by and large, I endorse them. But they were taken by him, I think it's an

unwise business to as a principle anyway to get back into changing decisions immediately when a new president takes over. I mean, one has to have some kind of continuity of decisions but I happen to have by and large endorsed them and they're also endorsed by the Trustees.

**SPECHLER:** That's fine. Sure. I have one other point from the Agenda Committee.

**MCROBBIE:** Sure.

**SPECHLER:** And that is that as someone now in his seventh term on this council, I've been dissatisfied with the idea of having meetings by electronic means. And let me tell you why. I think that although it's supposed to increase the attendance, I don't think it really does. And some of our regional campuses are effectively as we've just seen, more or less cut off from their participation. I think attendance is down and I wish you would check that. Although the intention was to increase attendance by increasing the convenience, and I appreciate that, but also I think there is a more intangible efficiency of this procedure that it reduces the solidarity and personal acquaintance that we have among faculty of different campuses. And since we're supposed to function on committees and indeed for the interest of the entire University I think losing solidarity at this level is a loss that we shouldn't approve. So I would like us to go back to the idea of meetings in Indianapolis, meetings in Bloomington, and one meeting on a smaller campus in rotation. I thought that was the best procedure all around for the functions of this council.

**NG:** Marty, I want to remind you, I think your question is based on the premise that something has changed. But actually, nothing has changed. We continue to hold meetings in person at Indianapolis and in Bloomington and in the smaller campuses. What has changed in fact is that this particular meeting never existed until two years ago. There was never a meeting in January. I hope that being a member of long standing, of the UFC I hope you remember you never had to go anywhere or drive anywhere in January. And I think it was between me and Ted Miller we decided a meeting in January is a good thing to have, but at the same time, because of weather is so unpredictable, we decided to make only the January meeting to be a teleconference. All the other meetings as far as I know, are remaining exactly the same. So the format has not changed at all. We only added one teleconference meeting.

**MCROBBIE:** Other questions or comments? I think we've got time for one, otherwise I want to try to keep us on schedule. There being no other questions or comments, let's move on to Agenda Item 5, the discussion of Intellectual Property Policy. Bart or Lisa? Are you going to kick this off?

## **AGENDA ITEM #5 DISCUSSION OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY POLICY**

**NG:** Sure, sure. We want to actually use this time to basically report to you what is being done and what has been accomplished on the so called IPP, the Intellectual Property Policy. Some of you recall, I think many of you will recall that we have been working on this policy for the past three or four years. And the last iteration was actually passed by the UFC back in, oh I would say, sometime last year, 2007, and we forwarded that policy to the President's Office thinking that our job was done. However, what happened, we found out, during the summer that the

policy that we passed was viewed as not implementable for various reasons because it was very hard to read and so forth and so on. And so the University council's office working together with John Applegate who is the president's liaison to the faculty started working on what we now call a draft which is now known to be the "consensus draft" to try to clean up the language and to make the policy to shape it up in such a way that we can actually make it useful, readable to a, a mere mortal shall I say. And when we started that work there was some discussion as to how we, let's assume that they have come up with a draft, what are we going to do with it because we were very concerned given how much time we spent on the policy in the previous years, we were very, both Lisa and I, were extremely concerned that we would have to go through the entire approval process once again. That is not good for anybody. So we decided, in consultation with the Agenda Committee, we decided to have two faculty members, that is, Simon Atkinson from the Indianapolis campus and Dennis Gannon from Bloomington, to work with John and work with Dottie Frapwell to develop a draft which we now call the "consensus draft" with the intention of preserving all the spirit and the substance of the version of IPP that we passed. And after they had done that, we then took that consensus draft and asked two faculty members from Indianapolis, two from Bloomington, and one each from the regional campuses to actually act as independent readers to make sure that the consensus draft really reflects the policy we passed in substance as well as in spirit. And that was done over the Christmas holidays, the break. And the report that we got back was that there were two points that were mentioned by almost all the readers; the first one being that the idea of academic freedom was not emphasized enough and the second point is the role of the IPP council was not clearly spelled out and to some, that may actually diminish the role of the council. So in response to those comments we then went back and asked John Applegate to take those comments into consideration and then do a further tweaking of the consensus draft and John has done that during this past week and he has in turn sent that document back to the group of independent readers who have raised those issues. And our hope, we both, you know we looked at the document during the Agenda Committee meeting and we agreed that what John has done as far as we can tell that indeed satisfied, would take care of those concerns. So what we are proposing here is that unless John hears back from the independent readers that there is any concern by, say, Friday, the close of business Friday of this week, we are planning on sending this document on to the President and he will then you know take the policy and proceed to do what he has to do with it. So this is the status of that policy and I would be very happy and maybe Lisa has something to add, can add something as well? We just wanted to let you know about the process, and what has been done with it, and how we want to proceed to move ahead you know from here on out.

**PRATT:** I will only add that we're very grateful to the independent readers who really dug in deeply and made important comments and suggestions and then to thank John Applegate for reading those comments, those comments I might add were compiled in a marvelous way by Craig Dethloff in the office so that anyone who wanted to see the complete set of comments tied to individual lines in the document could do that easily and in an electronic form and then John Applegate took all of that input and responded not only quickly but he responded in a thoughtful, very thoughtful way to one more round of revisions and one of those revisions resulting in a bit of reorganization that I think significantly again streamlined and clarified the document. So it is my sense at this point that we're very close to having our work done and, again, we are setting a deadline of end of business Friday afternoon of this week to not move it forward.

**MCROBBIE:** Okay.

**NG:** Mr. President perhaps you want to actually comment on what you will be looking at , what part of the document you will be looking at after you received the document.

**MCROBBIE:** Well I indicated in my opening comments, Bart, that it's principally the financial implications of the change of the model and how that affects things like the budget for IUITC and so on. We need to get some idea of what those implications are.

**NG:** Will you be actually involving a couple of people who drafted this originally to look at those implications as well? Would they be sort of, what I'm saying here is that suppose that your office after finishing the study, would that be an opportunity for comment that's what I'm looking for.

**MCROBBIE:** Oh sure, absolutely. It will go in two or three different ways. I mean, you know, one way is everything looks fine, let's move this forward. It could be it comes back with some concerns about something in which case I think the best way to handle that is to try and iterate and make any, try to negotiate any final matters that may come up. I mean I don't want to flag anything yet because I don't have anything in front of me. And I think doing it the way you suggest would be probably exactly the right way to do it. I know Simon, I know Dennis, I mean if they would be the kinds of people you would involve or some of the people who actually drafted the policy I think that's just fine.

**PRATT:** I think we would welcome continuing involvement and I think we now have a very good core group of people who have already invested a lot of time and effort in thinking about this and could respond quickly.

**MCROBBIE:** Right, right I think that's a good point. Remember, I've got a vested interest in this too. I initiated the process of generating the new one about four years ago.

**NG:** And actually, I just want to also say that what the president will be looking at, correct me if I'm wrong, is really the table that has to do with the distribution schedule for revenues.

**MCROBBIE:** That whole section, section three.

**NG:** That whole section. And as I understand it that when that section was drafted, all the figures were really based on looking at what other places are doing but without really, you know, looking at it from the situation that exists within the university and what is best for us. And I think that is the reason why the president wants to take a more careful look rather than accepting the figures that seems to be, you know, what is happening in Michigan and various places. We want to make sure that what is done will support IUITC you know on our campus.

**MCROBBIE:** And I see that frankly, Bart, as being about the only place that some further work may need to take place.

**SCHNEIDER:** Is there a chance then that distribution table would be changed?

**MCROBBIE:** I just don't want to flag anything until I see the analysis. Let's just leave it until I get the analysis and we see where that comes out.

**NG:** Bill, do you have any comments? You being one of the independent readers. And I want to publicly thank you for doing the job.

**SCHNEIDER:** No, I made my comments.

**MCROBBIE:** Thank you, Bill.

**PRATT:** I saw Brian here.

**ATKINSON:** This is Simon Atkinson, can you hear me?

**NG:** Yes, Simon, please!

**ATKINSON:** I just wanted to clarify one last point. When the policy was originally drafted, we did take into account information from IUITC as to how much money they thought they needed to be competitive with other Big Ten tech transfer offices, but I agree with the president that those numbers probably need to be revisited because they're at this point four years old. So, everything's probably changed.

**MCROBBIE:** Right.

**NG:** Thank you, Simon for that clarification. I don't mean to imply that those are just picked out from thin air. But I know that there is a little bit of that aspect of the historic, so like you say, it will be good to look at those numbers afresh again. Thank you.

**PRATT:** I don't know if Brian or Dennis have any further comments since they're in the room?

**MCROBBIE:** Is Dennis here?

**PRATT:** Dennis is right behind you. Oh, Dennis! I thought it was Dennis Gannon, but it's Dennis Groth.

**NG:** The other Dennis was the one who worked with Simon. So I also want to thank Dennis Groth and Brian McCormick for being one of the, two of the readers as well. So it was a very efficient process I may add.

**MCROBBIE:** So, okay anything else on agenda item five? Again, I think this is moving hopefully to resolution reasonably quickly, and I thank everybody who's been involved in this long and somewhat arduous process.

**AGENDA ITEM #6 RESOLUTION ON RECENT CHANGES IN PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW FOR FACULTY ON THE REGIONAL CAMPUSES.**

**MCROBBIE:** Agenda Item 6. Let me begin this by taking up the point that Bart mentioned in his comments. I would like to suggest that the way to move here would be, and I believe Bart and Lisa may wish to do this, we move a motion to postpone this motion to the next meeting and the reason for that is that this is not an issue in which I have been involved in any way. I've heard one, I think, relatively brief discussion on it at a previous UFC meeting. I had assumed this was a matter that would be resolved. Clearly it hasn't been. I'm prepared to commit to further discussing this matter with Chancellor Bantz and Dr. Malik to try to better understand what the issues are here. I heard some compelling concerns raised in the Agenda Committee meeting earlier today and I've seen a petition that has come to me raising a series of issues that I confess I do not know whether there are responses to those issues or what the background to them is. I don't feel fully informed about these issues. At the same time I'm also mindful that this is an issue that clearly concerns a majority, a substantial majority of the faculty on all the regional campuses. And as such, I think it's important that the matter be revisited. So I'm committed, I'm prepared to commit to doing so with Chancellor Bantz and I have already spoken and the goal is really to, for me to, or you, his thinking or Dr. Malik's thinking behind this to review the concerns that have been expressed by the regional campuses that I've seen both in writing and also verbally this morning. And then to hopefully bring back some new ideas on this matter at the next meeting. As I said, I can't say much more than that simply because I'm not fully familiar with all the issues here and I don't want to get drawn into hypotheticals and counterfactuals about this. But I think that probably a resolution like this is maybe not helpful at this stage and a better way to try to deal with it is to see if we can work out a way forward that basically satisfies everybody in this matter, if that's possible.

**NG:** Mr. President, I move that we postpone this Resolution on Recent Changes in Promotion and Tenure Review until next meeting and spend a lot of time to discuss with Chancellor Bantz and David Malik the issues that gave rise to these concerns.

**PRATT:** I second the motion.

**MCROBBIE:** Okay, there's been a motion moved and seconded to postpone this motion. Now I call for discussion on the motion to postpone can just be on the motion to postpone and not on the substance. Any discussion on the motion to postpone?

**CORDELL:** Roseanne Cordell from South Bend. Although we feel strongly about the resolution, I think that postponing to give the president time to discuss this with Vice President Bantz and David Malik is reasonable and I have no concern about postponing for one month.

**MCROBBIE:** Any other comments on the motion to postpone? Hearing no other comments I'm prepared to put the motion to postpone. All those in favor please signify by saying, aye. Sorry, Bart?

**NG:** You may want to poll...

**MCROBBIE:** Oh, I'll poll! I will poll. Thanks, Bart. I'll poll the various campuses first. Any comments I can see, I can see South Bend at the moment. I saw IUPUI just before. Any comments or anybody at East?

**FRANTZ:** No.

**MCROBBIE:** Kokomo?

**KINTZELE:** No comments.

**MCROBBIE:** Northwest?

**BODMER:** No.

**MCROBBIE:** Southeast?

**WERT:** No comment.

**MCROBBIE:** No, I don't believe there's any other...In that case I will put the issue to postpone this resolution. All those in favor please signify by saying 'aye.' Again...

**NG:** You may want to poll each one of them too.

**MCROBBIE:** Bart's suggesting that I poll again, each of the sites remotely, just to make sure there's for the 'ayes'. But, why don't I see if there's any, 'no's'.

**SPECHLER:** Is there a point of order? Does the first reading need any postponement at all?

**MCROBBIE:** Yes, because what was determined was that that would then make the next, the motion at the next meeting the first reading.

**NG:** And also, we want a discussion not focused on the resolution but on the substantive issue that gave rise to the resolution

**PRATT:** Also, first and second readings as it turns out are not specified in Robert's Rules of Order. They're simply our tradition.

**MCROBBIE:** Ok, let me call for any 'no's'. Anybody opposed this motion, please. And I'll just check the campuses. East?

**FRANTZ:** We have no objections.

**MCROBBIE:** Kokomo?

**KINTZELE:** No objections.

**MCROBBIE:** IUPUI?

**SCHNEIDER:** No objections.

**MCROBBIE:** Southeast?

**WERT:** We have no objections.

**MCROBBIE:** South Bend?

**CORDELL:** No objections.

**MCROBBIE:** I believe that's passed unanimously. Or without dissent.

**NG:** Without dissent.

**MCROBBIE:** Sorry, without dissent. Not unanimously, without dissent. Thank you very much. But now I would like to move into a discussion of this item. It's going to be a little hard to know who to give the call to on this, but maybe on behalf of the Agenda Committee, Bart or Lisa would you like to maybe start with any comments?

**NG:** Well, I think the best thing is just to confirm that there is a great deal of interest and a great deal of concern about the proposed changes in the procedure. And having said that, I think the best thing perhaps is to ask either Chancellor Bantz or Dr. Malik to actually give a background of what really brought this proposal about. I think that would be helpful and then the faculty on the various campuses can respond. And I think, would that be okay?

**MCROBBIE:** That's fine.

**NG:** And also, I just want to remind everybody. Those who are not speaking, would you please mute your microphone? Because we can hear a lot of noise at this end and that will make the discussion a little bit clearer. So with that said, I think that we'll, either Chancellor Bantz or David Malik want to start off the discussion?

**BANTZ:** This is Charles Bantz. And I'll just start it and ask David to pick it up because he's been involved in this. As most of you know, just about two years ago I assumed this position and had the responsibility...

**MCROBBIE:** Excuse me, Charles, sorry just to interrupt, if it's possible to get you on screen, whoever's controlling the camera up there...

**SCHNEIDER:** Why don't you move up here?

**NG:** Why don't you move up there? Both David and Charles can move up to the first row perhaps?

**BANTZ:** Is the sound good?

**NG:** Yeah, if you can actually focus the camera, too, closer to you.

**BANTZ:** Well, I have Jim Baldwin doing work on the focus...

**MALIK:** Left is right and right is left.

**NG:** Can you zoom?

**BANTZ:** As I was starting to say, as the University was reorganized, I gained responsibility for promotion and tenure review for all of the campuses outside of Bloomington. And in the process [end of tape...some comments lost] To develop that process more systematically because we did not obviously have any systematic process at that time. What I noticed in my first year which, I started February first right at the height of the season of promotion and tenure, was that there was enormous variation in the materials that were sent forward and I'll give you the most extreme example. It was not clear as I gathered the information from the different campuses that votes were recorded in the process in a way that was clearly identifiable. And I say that in literally some people would list positive negative and neutral in that order, others were in different orders, some weren't in fact clearly identified. So we spent some time going back and forth and that raised just a practical question of how we were handling the process to assure that candidates were treated fairly. And that is a fundamental principle that I've held in my roles as provost previously and obviously when I was involved in promotion and tenure in a college committee as well as a chair is we wanted to make sure we had consistent, accurate information. So I asked David to look at this as he took responsibility in the next cycle in handling the materials, bringing them together, and making sure that we treated each candidate fairly and thoroughly as we brought it then to the president and the board. Because the position that I take as it were not in the business in this level of doing the analysis of the substance of a person's work. That is obviously left to disciplines. But what it is important is to make sure that every candidate is treated appropriately, fairly, thoroughly in the process. And that was the principles that I framed, and then I asked David to begin to look if there were ways which we could assure that that would happen. And I'll let David discuss because he's been spending time on this, many of you know David Malik because he's also the director of FACET, as well as a half time in his role in my office. So David I'll let you speak and I'll slide over so that you're the focus rather than me.

**MALIK:** Yes, to repeat, it follows from evaluating lots of different cases and looking for where we had conflicted cases. And many, perhaps you can call them shortcomings, in the documentation began to arise in practices. For example, people who were not in attendance at meetings voting, cases of multiple voting that people would be on successive committees and voting more than once on the same person. A mixing of administrative and faculty reviews where there are ambiguities about what a committee would say. There was an ambiguity about the reports that committees would generate. And in trying to identify best practices we started looking elsewhere into the literature to try and see what issues were the most important ones to look at. We also knew that historically IU had some requirements from the past that weren't being consistently used and it wasn't clear what the motivations for those policies, or maybe lack of policies, were but we wanted to just examine it and see what people were doing. As a result

of this, we spent the past year at the Academic Leadership Council, the group of vice chancellors for academic affairs, trying to get a perspective on different issues that might relate to good and bad practices on the different campuses and that's how the original document emerged. And since the EVP was created for IUPUI and the regional campuses, that was the domain that we restricted our policy reviews and practice reviews to. I think now that terrain has changed somewhat I don't know if it affects anything that we are doing. And at this point we have visited campuses and collected faculty input. We're beginning to go over those. One campus remains to be visited and we're trying to ensure that the difficulties, variations in mission on each of those campuses is taken into appropriate consideration as we work on generating what might be the final report. At some stage, we expect to go to University Counsel and look at issues, one of the things we were trying to do was eliminate in advance what becomes litigious foci on different campuses and we were wanting to avoid those possibilities. We also were looking into the idea of confidentiality and what we might have to reveal. For example, if someone's on a committee are there circumstances where they would actually have to reveal their vote? Well, it turns out, legally there are. And we wanted to know what the implications will be for those problems and hence the involvement of University Counsel. And then ultimately, generate a final report to the president for consideration and to the EVP. So that's more or less where we are.

**MCROBBIE:** Do we have comments? I think some of the people on regional campuses have got concerns. Would they like to express those?

**CORDELL:** Joe may not be back, this is Roseanne from South Bend so I will take the first position in expressing some of our concerns. This document seems to go well beyond just process here and it touches on a number of issues, and some of them, the regional campuses, cannot abide by even if we wished. We don't have enough full-ranked faculty to populate all of the PTR committees in order to have only full-ranked faculty vote on cases of that kind. And if South Bend doesn't, I'm pretty sure that the other regional campuses don't have enough either. The issue of the six letters got into a discussion of how faculty would prepare for the entire many, multi-year process before they went up for promotion. So that clearly went into standards. There are just too many issues here that we felt should have been brought to the UFC Faculty Affairs Committee and allowed them to look at them and involve discussions with campus PTR committees rather than developing a document outside of that process.

**MCROBBIE:** David or Charles, given this is really a discussion, do you want to respond?

**BANTZ:** I think that the question of the number of letters of some of you, I certainly didn't know that history, that President Ehrlich actually enunciated that a number of years ago and then there was feedback from at least one campus about the difficulty of that. And what we observed was the variation in the numbers. Whether that is something stepping into governance is a question that I think is worth having at that discussion and the president and I and Bart wrote and Lisa, I think we should talk about that; how we handle the substance of those reviews. My concern when David brought this to me is the incredible variation we were having about this and also the way in which they're selected. I certainly have been involved in numerous conversations over my career about how you select reviewers and the disclosure of relationship of reviewers and so forth. And so that's a very important area. I think some additional discussion, and that's what David was hearing. For those of you on the larger campuses the

concern about having individuals of higher rank was predicated on the smaller campuses being concerned about the availability of faculty and their units. We know even on large campuses sometimes it's necessary to fill the committee with individuals from outside your unit if you have a small enough department. So it's, that's a good discussion to have about how important is that value of having higher ranked do the review versus how you structure the process.

**MCROBBIE:** Other comments? Marty?

**SPECHLER:** Well when I first looked at this paper, I saw the words "recent changes." But it turns out in reading the resolution, which I think makes a lot of sense that we're really talking about proposals here. Proposals which as I understand from my friend David Malik are not yet adopted. They're not final. They're still open for discussion. I think that's the way it should be. That we need some discussion, some variation. Indeed as Chancellor Bantz rightly said, some amount of unanimity or uniformity may be essential to fairness, but that should be uniformity probably within the campus since we've always recognized that procedures and especially standards for tenure will be campus specific. So I don't think that necessarily we need to have the same standards, the same number of letters, the same waiting and so forth on say, South Bend, as on Southeast. I think it can depend on the level of development of the campus, its size and its particular student population. All those things could lead to differences among the smaller campuses. So I'd like to see whether everyone can agree that these changes are indeed just proposals and need to be followed by consultation on each and every campus concerned.

**MCROBBIE:** Thank you, Marty. Was there someone else here? Yeah, Marcus.

**POMPER:** I'm glad to hear that the report has now been downgraded from a requirement to a proposal or a report. Because when I first got it last June from our vice chancellor it said, \_\_\_\_\_ as IU East adopt or change our promotion and tenure policy to accommodate that policy. So I'm glad to hear that we're now talking about best practices and report rather than requirements. So what I've seen is that David pointed out several interesting things about the P&T documents that come forward in the multiple voting for example, things that could have opened us up for litigation for a lawsuit. And I think we as UFC should look at that at some point and change the university-wide P&T policy so that things like that can't occur. Other things that occur in the report I think infringe on governance issues and we should be careful when considering those things.

**MCROBBIE:** Herb Terry from Bloomington.

**TERRY:** I just have a couple of comments. One, I think this has now been pushed off until March 4<sup>th</sup>, for our next discussion because we abolished the February meeting. Is that right? That leaves plenty of time I would think for the smaller campuses to use their own deliberative mechanisms. And I hope that they will take advantage of that window to conduct a discussion and be able to send representatives to the next UFC meeting and represent what the campuses have to say. The second thing is quite a minor point, but it's something I'd like to know about before I discuss this thing again. When Tom Ehrlich proposed to increase the number of letters, people in relatively small fields like mine, Communications, suddenly discover that we can use up all of the really relevant reviewers if we conducted a thorough third year review and then

turned around and did a tenure review. So I don't know if the smaller campuses conduct third year reviews or not. I'd like to know that. And I'd also say that you, know, based on my experience, those are good things to do too, in the sense that they give faculty formal feedback as to how they're progressing. And maybe you would want to think if you're developing guidelines of recommending or requiring, that would be an interesting debate: third year reviews as well as formal final reviews at the end of the probationary period.

**MCROBBIE:** Thanks, Herb. Comments on other campuses?

**SCHNEIDER:** Could I comment? This is Bill Schneider at IUPUI. It would seem to me that we would be well served if between now and March, that the Agenda Committee, Bart and Charles, could have a discussion about whether or not the more appropriate place within these discussions would be the UFC Faculty Affairs Committee. It's, for a lot of reasons, not only is it in my opinion, really a faculty responsibility to do these things, but the mechanism of UFC is ideal for this, because it's got the built-in faculty input on all the campuses as a mechanism to review it. We did something analogous to this about 10 years when we changed, when we had changes, in faculty boards of review. Faculty boards of review are arguably maybe even more sensitive to local campus issues as well as to some general principles that have to apply fairly in all places. And we did it through the UFC mechanism with the UFC Faculty Affairs Committee, and we came up with a policy that allowed for some variations on each campus but still abided by UFC member principles. I would strongly urge you to consider that rather than trying to rush out and get some input from the regional campuses between now and March, to take a real thorough look at it and do it within the structure of the UFC which by definition has the faculty input that I think is crucial for this.

**MCROBBIE:** Other comments? Other comments? I might go around the campuses just to get...

**COFFIN:** This is Don Coffin from IU Northwest, currently sitting in Indianapolis.

**MCROBBIE:** Oh, I'm sorry Don, go ahead.

**COFFIN:** I'm actually very sympathetic to what Bill just said about getting this to the Faculty Affairs Committee. The thing I will note is that the faculty from the regional campuses have been raising this issue since last summer, and it seems to me that there has been a disinclination from the two big campuses and, frankly, from the administration, to look at this as an issue. If we can get this into the formal faculty governance structure and get it dealt with in that way, I'm all in favor of that, but this is not something that suddenly occurred this month, folks. This is an issue that people have been trying to put on the table since last fall, and let's not forget that.

**MCROBBIE:** I'd like to hear from other campuses. We might go around. East? Any comments from anybody at East?

**FRANTZ:** No, I think most of ours have been raised and surfaced.

**MCROBBIE:** Kokomo?

**KINTZELE:** I think the idea of going to the Faculty Affairs Committee would be a good process.

**MCROBBIE:** Okay, Northwest? Anybody? George, are you still there?

**BODMER:** This is George Bodmer from Northwest. I just want to iterate that, you know, we have been, we sort of got this, I think sort of accidentally in the summer and fall. Here was a policy that was being developed without faculty input, and as Don said, we have raised this at every meeting and have had difficulty getting this out for discussion. So you know I'm just emphasizing the need for faculty input on this policy, of which many aspects should be part of our faculty governance.

**MCROBBIE:** Southeast, anybody at Southeast want to comment?

**WERT:** Yeah, I think we'd be happy with having the Faculty Affairs Committee look at this.

**MCROBBIE:** Okay and Southbend? Maybe Southbend's already spoken. Any comments from anyone else at Southbend?

**GERENCSEK:** Yes, I'll just hope that some of the issues that others have brought up are an issue about the size of the regional campus faculty such as being able to staff PTR committees with persons in rank. Others, however, are reflective of deliberative decisions by our faculty. So, for instance, we have had non-tenured faculty members on PTR committees, as a process of providing legitimacy to those in the untenured rank and providing communication about the PTR process. So these are not accidental only, but also, because of deliberative decisions by our faculties. So having input from our regional campuses about those decisions we made seems significant and important as they be conveyed to the UFC, but also to our own executive committees and PTR processes on our campus.

**MCROBBIE:** Other comments? Other comments from anybody? Any other comments? So as I said, I'm committed to take this issue... well, obviously there's a lot of interest in taking this to the Faculty Affairs Committee. I'll discuss that with Bart and Lisa and the Agenda Committee, discuss it with Charles and David, and see if we can find a way forward here that satisfies a lot of the concerns, and then bring back wherever we are at the next meeting.

**GERENCSEK:** Excuse me, may I make one more point?

**MCROBBIE:** Yes.

**GERENCSEK:** Yes, it seems to me that we have, not surprisingly, both substantive issues and procedural issues. And it seems to me that there might be ways to break down the ways in which this policy is developed, communicated, and discussed and decided upon, and a way to separate that, in some ways, from some of the substantive issues. The substantive issues might themselves disappear a bit if the procedural issues are made clear about whose responsible for what decision making at what point.

**MCROBBIE:** Thank you. Any other comments? Any other comments, any campuses? I could do another round, but I think probably I've done that. Any comments, anybody here at Bloomington? At IUPUI any comments? Alright good, well thank you very much. Let's move on to Agenda Item 7.

#### **AGENDA ITEM #7 CORE SCHOOLS REVIEW**

**MCROBBIE:** I probably said in my introductory comments as much as I need to say. I could reiterate it, but basically, as I said, I've established a core schools, actually it's called an operations review committee that Chancellor Bantz and Provost Hanson are co-chairing with the deans of the relevant core schools, and faculty members from those core schools on that committee to collectively review the operations of core schools to look at opportunities to make them more effective and efficient, to meet the needs both of the deans as deans and also, the needs of the campuses through the chancellors and their constituencies, and at the same time, to look at impediments to them functioning in a more efficient way, to look at the balance of local autonomy with the need for the management of the school as a whole. That should be meeting within I think probably the next couple of weeks. I've asked John Applegate to staff it and I've asked for a report back by the end of the semester. As I've said, many of the actions may well be things that can be handled at the school level, some at the campus level, some may require my involvement, some may require UFC involvement or the relevant faculty councils. I don't know at this stage, but I wanted to put these issues on the table for this committee to deliberate about. I've responded to Martin's question earlier, but are there any other comments or questions at all from anybody?

**SCHNEIDER:** I do have a question about the UFC involvement, whether there's something explicit or just informational? One of the problems with the Bonser Report to begin with was that it kind of appeared in real and came to the UFC after the fact, and UFC made comments. And so can you explain a little more what kinds of either explicit or possible ways you might see the UFC involved?

**MCROBBIE:** Well, these may simply be matters that can be resolved at the school level, Bill. I just don't know until the committee starts meeting as to whether there will be any matters that actually will require involvement or action by the UFC. I've given them a pretty open charge, so to try to smoke out the issues that may be contentious here where changes are needed, but whether any of those impact the brief of UFC, I just don't know at this point. So this is a little different to the previous exercise. I think of this as being principally about management issues within schools, but management issues that effect the good running of those schools, as I said, in particular, as schools, but also as organizations that do have components that report up through campuses, and must be respectful of and responsive to the missions of the campus and the needs of the relevant campus officials, too.

**SPECHLER:** Martin Spechler again. At the original discussion two or three years ago, with former Dean Bonser, a lot of the issues about system schools, and now core schools, were raised. It struck me that the big problem that was not really addressed was the contradiction between the budgetary authority, which is campus specific, with some flexibility for the president, and on the other hand, the idea of a core campus school or core school, which is a little different idea. In

other words, a school exists on two campuses but, on the other hand, the budgets are separate, and budgets are really important, not just to us economists. And here's why I think it's important. Many of the core schools or the departments in the core schools are highly specialized and rather small in order to take care of all the new developments in their disciplines, so it seems to me very important, increasingly important, that each of these core schools takes advantage of the full range of the faculty on both campuses. To be more specific, there have to be procedures for allowing the Dean to draw on all of the faculty for the courses that are needed on either or both campuses in order to give incentives for faculty who are say, housed in Bloomington to teach in Indianapolis, or vice versa. This would allow us to be more efficient, which not only to us economists, is always very important because it frees up money to do more, to search for excellence. And it does seem to me, Michael, that if this committee doesn't address this issue of the contradiction between budgetary division and faculty unity, we're not going to be efficient and not going to exploit all the advantages of our size at Indiana University.

**MCROBBIE:** I'm sympathetic to that Marty, with the proviso that there are certain rules about co-mingling budgets that are imposed on us by the state and other organizations that we have to be mindful of, but you know certainly, I've tried to make the point since I've been in this position, that using the united strength of both campuses in this context of core schools is essential in doing it in an effective way. And clearly it probably functions better in some schools than others, so part of this exercise will be to find out how best practices actually work, and how practices in places that maybe don't use those can be adjusted accordingly.

**NG:** I want to just make a comment about the UFC's role in this discussion. You know, when the Bonser Report was first put forth, the UFC was very, very concerned about the lack of faculty input in the drafting of that report. In fact, at the UFC last spring, I hope that you will remember, actually compiled almost fifty pages of faculty comments that we collected on that report, and at the same time, because we couldn't really get our concerns addressed, at least in any systematic way; I'm sure the President was aware of it. We also acknowledge the difficulty at that time about the President's wanting to put that report in front of the trustees. We commended the President, the UFC actually passed a resolution where we commended the President for raising the issue, and recognizing that he was in a difficult position, wanting to move ahead with the process, but reminded the President at that time that any further discussion of issues relating to the core school and the system school, the administration should seek maximum input from the faculty. So I think that in our discussion, in Lisa's and my discussion with the President, we made that point to the President that this is really essential as we move ahead in this process. I think the President recognizes this and in fact, as I understand, in his broad announcement, will try to address the level of faculty involvement in this process. And so yes, the UFC has a very strong role in this, and our actions are really based on the resolution we passed last April. And I also want to comment on one point, that Marty has raised, about the, as the President said, it's very difficult to co-mingle budgets, but I think that I look at the challenge in a slightly different way. It's not that the Dean, in a very kind of top down way, has complete control of the budget and moves people around between Bloomington and Indianapolis. I actually, I would argue against this simply because that kind of centralization would add to the complexity of the organization. It would take away flexibility that we all hope, in this process that we try to seek – is the ability for each campus under the umbrella, the broad umbrella of a core school, to act in the interest of each campus, in a sense to be most responsive to the

constituents, and at the same time, still recognizing there is an overarching interest of any academic school that it should have, if they are to leverage all the strength there is in that school. So, I do not believe the fact that the Dean has complete control over the budget of the school at all campuses will actually lead to what you, I hope is what you want, Marty. Just a comment.

**MCROBBIE:** I didn't necessarily interpret Marty that way, but I don't disagree with what you're saying, either, Bart.

**NG:** Okay.

**MCROBBIE:** Any comments? Any comments, questions at all on this matter?

**ATKINSON:** This is Simon Atkinson in Indianapolis. Can you comment on how the faculty membership of this committee is being selected?

**MCROBBIE:** What I've asked the deans to do is to choose a member of their school, if they're on campus, one campus to choose a member from the other campus and I said preferably not an administrator. I didn't say definitely not an administrator in case there's a situation where they simply can't get anybody else who isn't an administrator. But I've said that the expectation is that they will choose a faculty member. So the committee will consist of a number of deans of the core schools and then it will consist of the equivalent number of faculty members as well who as I said, the expectation is that they're not administrators. And then I'm also going to ask the deans to put mechanisms in place, and I didn't want to be too prescriptive about how they did this because I think it's going to vary from school to school, but put mechanisms in place to allow full faculty input into these deliberations. For example, Bart has suggested that this be done through some sort of formal sub-committee. I think that's a good idea, and that may work well for some schools but again, I didn't want to be too prescriptive. I don't mind giving that as an example of how to do it, but there may be other ways people want to do it. So I think it's very important that there be substantive faculty input. As Bart said, there's already been faculty input of a kind that's probably relevant here that should form part of the initial working papers for the committee once it meets, when it has its first meeting. Any other comments, from anybody? I might do a quick round of the campuses... Oh sorry! Is there someone there? Charles, yeah.

**BANTZ:** I would just add that Karen and John and I have already had our first phone meeting. We've taken the charge the president gave us and we've developed it into a format where we're going to ask each of the schools to indicate how they view the status of each of those questions. If you haven't seen the memo, the president posed a series of questions about some of the kind of issues we've already heard discussed and that way we'll come into the first meetings with an understanding of where each of the schools is operationally currently. In addition to that, the Indianapolis Faculty Council budget and planning committees had asked that part of the budget hearings on this campus this year include this topic. And so we're going to frame some of those questions up and so there'll be an opportunity for faculty input through the governance process in those hearings. And that'll be yet another mode as well as the modes that the president just referred to. I also expect that Karen and I will discuss how we can gather input once we begin to share the report and we're going to want to get, obviously, significant input from the faculty that are the ones affected as the charge points out. That's one of the questions for example is

governance and we want to make sure that the faculty feel that they have adequate access to governance in this model.

**MCROBBIE:** Yeah, there's also the issue of although the governance can be lopsided where people in a small part in a school have to do four times as much work to be able to participate in governance because of representational issues. There's no shortage of issues here that need to be aired.

**BANTZ:** Yeah.

**MCROBBIE:** Let me do a quick run around the other campuses. East, any comments?

**FRANTZ:** No, nothing to add at this point.

**MCROBBIE:** Kokomo?

**KINTZELE:** No comments.

**MCROBBIE:** Northwest?

**BODMER:** No.

**MCROBBIE:** Southwest? Southeast! Sorry, I was creating a new campus. (laughter).

**WERT:** No comment. We're fine.

**MCROBBIE:** South Bend?

**CORDELL:** No comment.

**MCROBBIE:** Any other comments at all from anybody? Because we can move on to the next agenda item if not. Okay, well thank you very much, Sorry, we'll move on...

**SCHNEIDER:** I'm here at IUPUI, can you hear me?

**MCROBBIE:** Yes Bill.

**SCHNEIDER:** Well the suggestion would be rather than having the dean appoint the faculty member from the school if it's possible to have the faculty governance entity of that school select the faculty member and that would give both the reality and certainly the appearance of having more faculty input on the committee.

**MCROBBIE:** Let me suggest, what I'll do in the spirit of compromise, Bill, is I'll ask the dean to consult with the faculty governance apparatus in that school. You know, I don't want get into the business of now that I've propagated and put out a memo I don't want to have to start

changing it now. But it's reasonable that they should at least consult and use that as a way of helping to identify that person. I'll try to remember that.

**PRATT:** Thank you Bill. That was a point that Bart and I had also made in a private conversation with the president.

**MCROBBIE:** You hadn't actually made that point, but that's an interesting way to put it. Let me move to, unless there's any other comments...Let me move to agenda item 8. Is John? Where's John? Are you going to take this one?

**CARINI:** Yeah.

**MCROBBIE:** Right.

### **AGENDA ITEM #8 CREDIT TRANSFER RESOLUTION**

**CARINI:** So I believe I'm the only representative from the Educational Policies Committee present? I guess Kathy Marrs is in Indianapolis, the co-Chair, is teaching right now, so, if that's so, I'll just take it from here. So what you have in front of, some of you have seen this and some of you have not. It's, I guess, what you have seen was the report from the Academic Leadership Council and the proposal that the faculty take this issue up, and this is our response. And what we have done is put it in the form of a resolution that I hope summarizes the points that seem most compelling to us as faculty members to proceed with a policy like this and to start to define a little bit better what we mean by the different schools and Associate's Colleges, the Baccalaureate Colleges and the doctorate-rated universities in the second clause of the resolution and that was one thing that had gone off in a previous UFC meeting, to try to use the Carnegie classifications to characterize these different types of higher education institutions. So what we've really tried to aim for is a policy that is, that establishes some uniformity with respect to accepting transfers from the two-year Associate's Colleges. Both with respect to not distinguishing between different associates colleges on one hand and also trying to be uniform across the university, across the different schools and campuses as well. So I think, you know, we've tried to state our goals as clearly as possible in the resolution. And then in the implementation guidelines, we've tried to take into account, you know, tried to be very clear that we want this to be a uniform policy but there will be, or there should be room for reasonable exceptions and we tried to spell out what the nature of those exceptions should be and how they should be considered on each campus. For example, in the fifth implementation guideline, you know, we give some examples of programs that seem to us, would clearly call for some exceptions and then describe more generally some other situations that might call for exceptions. Now, it's very possible that we haven't thought up every possible reasonable situation so we're open to try to change the language there especially if there are specific examples that people can point to that we should be taking into account. In the eighth guideline, you know, we try to make it clear that the exceptions should really be granted at the campus level by the chief academic officer because we think that's the appropriate level that should be knowing and agreeing to any exceptions to a policy. Or in the case of university wide programs in guideline nine, it should really be the president or the president's designated academic officer who considers exceptions there. So, now in guideline two, we try to protect the interest of any students who have already

transferred into the University or have begun work in programs articulated associate's degree programs already so that their plans are not derailed by anything that we do here. We want to protect their interests, but on the other hand we really want this to be the policy and that's the reason that guideline one is to try to put it in place as soon as possible and then in guideline seven have it applied to all future agreements including those that are being negotiated right now. So I'd be happy to accept any comments.

**MCROBBIE:** Questions or comments for John, from anybody? Yes?

**TERRY:** I have a question and I think it's just as to the intent. Number one, I think your policy, if I'm right, is basically the last sentence in the resolution, "other than in exceptional cases, no more than 64 semester credit hours earned from an Associate's College will be applied to an Indiana University baccalaureate degree." You're going to print that in the University policy and that will be it. My other question goes to meaning of implementation guideline eight. Are you saying that the chief academic officer of each campus will be the officer deciding if the exceptions that you spell out earlier apply or not or are you giving the chief academic officer at campuses the ability to create additional ad hoc exceptions?

**CARINI:** Well, I think we expect the exceptions to go through the normal \_\_ processes within their departments in the schools and then if they decide that an exception is needed, they should bring it to the chief academic officer. So if we're not clear about that, I guess we could rephrase that.

**TERRY:** I think you could make it clearer as to whether the role of the academic officer, the only one that seems to me to be debatable would be five. The academic officer trying to figure out if there's some other Associate's program that fits that, but otherwise if you want to say that we're creating a mechanism where other exceptions bothers you, may be created by the chief academic officer, you should say that clearly. I don't know.

**CARINI:** That was not our intention.

**TERRY:** If that was not your intention, then I would sort of organize this, it's wordsmithing, but I would re-organize it to make it very clear that the chief academic officer is to implement it with the exceptions you have spelt out here and not create additional ones. I might in fact again clearly state the policy and then as subcategories say, 'Here are the exceptions to this policy,' and if it's a close call about whether one of these exceptions apply, then the final judgment is in the chief academic officer of the campus, or in certain circumstances, the president.

**CARINI:** Well, that's really guideline nine. I guess the point is that whatever body/bodies that are negotiating the agreements should ultimately bring those to the chief academic officer. So maybe it should just be lumped into five. It should be added to the end of five.

**MCROBBIE:** What is this? Is this a resolution you're hoping will be approved at this meeting, is that the idea?

**CARINI:** Well, I assume that this would be a first reading. So since not everybody may have seen this...

**MCROBBIE:** And a first reading can include sort of your ability to make sort of drafting changes to bring it back the next time and to indicate what they are.

**CARINI:** Right.

**MCROBBIE:** So we can treat this as an opportunity for comment on this, okay, alright?

**TERRY:** I'd like to just send you my suggestions.

**MCROBBIE:** Okay.

**CARINI:** We'd appreciate it.

**MCROBBIE:** Any other comments? Any other comments for John here? Yes, Marty?

**SPECHLER:** I agree as usual with Herb Terry. If I understand him right, he's making a point that exceptions could be granted only according to this criterion in five, and not according to broad discretion. And if so... [end of tape...some comments lost] ...the chief academic officer cannot dream up other reasons they exist if, you know, attendance is a problem, enrollment is a problem on the campus, there may be some interest in loosening up, but we don't want that. We want him or her to act according to this principle.

**PRATT:** Bart, we might need to do a round robin of the other campuses since a number of councils have already taken action on this.

**NG:** Yep.

**MCROBBIE:** Okay. Let me go round the campuses again unless there's any comment in this room, anyone who's dying to make some remark. East, any comments?

**FRANTZ:** Yeah, actually we like the wording of the current proposal and we'd hope that there is some flexibility in the proposal.

**MCROBBIE:** Okay. Kokomo?

**KINTZELE:** We have taken this to the Senate yet, the Educational Policies Committee has looked at it, and they are in favor of the motion.

**MCROBBIE:** Okay. Northwest? George?

**BODMER:** Yes, we have, you know, our Academic Affairs Committee has considered it and, you know, and presented it to the \_\_\_\_ organization on Friday and sees no real objections to it.

**MCROBBIE:** Okay. Let's see, Bill. IUPUI again, any comments there?

**SCHNEIDER:** No comments, I guess.

**NG:** Except to say that IUPUI is, the IFC has actually voted on this proposal and approved it.

**SPECHLER:** And eight was there in that position?

**NG:** In that position, correct. But I do not believe there will be any objection for this kind of, you know, re-ordering.

**MCROBBIE:** Will it then have to go back there, Bart?

**NG:** I don't believe so, we can deal with that. It's not the main issue.

**MCROBBIE:** Okay. Southeast?

**WERT:** This was passed unanimously by our faculty senate last Thursday.

**MCROBBIE:** And South Bend?

**CORDELL:** The original wording of this document was reviewed by our Academic Affairs and Admissions and Advising Committees and they approved it. The changes that have been made in this wording seem to be in the spirit of the comments that they made. So I think we're in agreement with it.

**PRATT:** Bloomington would bring this forward for a first reading at the next meeting, is that right?

**CARINI:** Right, in February.

**PRATT:** It should pass pretty quickly, I think.

**MCROBBIE:** So it sounds like with any luck, unless there's any problems here or Kokomo, we might be able to bring this to a conclusion at the next meeting which would be good.

**NG:** Correct.

**MCROBBIE:** Any final comments on this issue? With there being no final comments, that's the end of that discussion and I think that's the end of the agenda and we are adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 3:02