

**Minutes**  
**Indiana University**  
**UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL**  
**DeVault Alumni Center**  
**Kelley Dining Room**  
**Bloomington Campus**  
**February 10, 1998**

**Members Present:** Myles Brand; Robert Arno; Ellen Brantlinger; Patrick Brantlinger; Ann Bristow; William Burgan; Richard Carr; Lewis Ciminillo; Karen Cobb; Michael Downs; Paul Eisenberg; John Findling; Bernd Fischer; Michael Foos; Richard French; Paul Galanti; Laura Ginger; Richard Heinz; Loren Henry; Steven Hollander; Sara Hook; Paul Joray; Jan Keffer; Thomas Mawhinney; Theodore Miller; Julieann Nilson; Lloyd Orr; Victor Riemenschneider; Linda Rooda; Carl Rothe; William Schneider; Dennis Senchuk; Marion Wagner; David Zaret.

**Alternatives Present:** Kathleen Wartel for Richard Fredland; Randi L. Stocker for Delores Hoyt.

**Members Absent without Alternatives:** Gerald Bepko; David Fulton; Kenneth Gros Louis; Erita Hill; Kenneth Perrin; Hilda Richards; F. C. Richardson; George Walker; Michael Wartell; Thomas Broadie; Michael Cochran; Donald Cunningham; Stuart Hart; Richard Vaden; Walter Wagor.

**Visitors Present:** Robin L. Penslar; Professor Thomas Duffy; Mike Wright; Sara McNabb.

## UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING

### AGENDA ITEM #1: PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS

BRAND: I don't have any particular business in the Presiding Officer's Business. Let us move to Agenda Committee Business.

### AGENDA ITEM #2: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS

SCHNEIDER: There are a couple of items I would like to bring to the attention and report from the Agenda Committee. First of all, since this is the first meeting of the UFC this semester I want to welcome back members who have been away or on sabbatical. One of whom I noticed at least is here, Richard Carr, welcome back. You'll see how much we've done but how much remains to be done. We thank you for coming back. I don't believe I've missed anybody else. By the way I think I speak for everyone in noting the surrounding we are in at the meeting, I believe it's the first time we've met here at Bloomington to note the, how nice the surroundings are and I believe we'll be meeting here next month as well. Indeed, probably until the foundation is remodeled, at least.

BRAND: May I mention that the entire renovation building was undertaken by private donations. (Laughter)

SCHNEIDER: OK. As I said the next meeting will be here in Bloomington, the April meeting, however will be in South Bend, it's our practice to meet once a year to meet at one of the regional campuses. It has been our practice in the past to make available to UFC members, the University plane, if it is available for the flight up to South Bend and if anyone thinks they might be of interest, we have to first find out about availability on that particular day and then an itinerary, but if that is something that would interest you would you please either contact me or contact let Ellen know at the UFC Office on that matter. Finally, a little bit more substantive is something that has been distributed to you and you should see a copy of and it has to do with the proposed policy on Family Leave that was passed by the UFC last April, the Family-Related Partial Leaves Policy was, after discussion and revisions and so on for a number of years, was passed last April. It has been discussed at one trustee meeting, questions were raised. I've mentioned this at a previous meeting and a small subcommittee, consisting of the two co-secretaries and two other faculty members, has discussed with the Trustees some responses to the questions that were raised and what you have before you is probably the best summary of some changes in what was actually passed by UFC that seemed to be what would be necessary in order for the Trustees to, we hope, act favorably on it. The Trustees we hope will take this up at their meeting at the end of the month and so this is really to inform you of the status of this policy and you can see in boldface those things that have either been added to or modified from the proposal that we passed here. Most of these are clarification or responses to questions that, you can see clearly one question had to do with stretching over two semesters, another one had to do with trying to minimize disruption through instruction, at the bottom you will see there is a question about the relationship of this to the federal policy and the need to make sure that there wasn't essentially two leaves for the same thing. The one I would point out, however, that may be a little more substantive is the application of the policy and the policy to whom it is applied. When the policy passed in April the language was to household members and in response to a very clear

signal from the Trustees that language has been changed to be family member rather than household member, this is number one the way the federal policy is described and it also in meeting with the wishes of most of the Trustees that we talked to anyway left as described as family, so this would be the way that's the most likely language I think that the Trustees would be amiable to, so this is for your information.

KEFFER: (can't hear his question)

BRAND: I think they'll probably use the legal definition as opposed to a more cultured definition.

KEFFER: (I still can't hear her questions)

BRAND: Right. Please Paul.

EISENBERG: Actually, I'm sorry to bring this up because you wanted us to make just a brief information report, but I think this is the first time we've seen this version. (049) and perhaps others here we struck by the fact that one is allowed fifteen weeks in one case or supposing a catastrophe in the family occurs on that last day of semester one, one allowed apparently a much shorter period for the same catastrophe (052)

SCHNEIDER: (053) was right in another place. In practice it would mean one would simply make a judicial decision to muddle through for a day or a week for one semester and then take time in the next semester or if it was important enough to take it in the one semester and that would be it. That may be something that we could talk further about modifying and not make it quite so strict, in other words, leave some possibility in extraordinary situations for the ability to bridge between two semesters.

DOWNS: We did discuss the rewording of that in the agenda committee which would of simply stated that every reasonable effort would be made to confine the leave to one semester but then under certain circumstances the leave might stretch into a second semester.

SCHNEIDER: What I think we might do is simply eliminate the last phrase which ever is shorter and then add that clarifying sentence but I understand your point and it was raised very recently so we haven't had a chance, we can certainly take that in our (063)

ARNOVE: Tell us the figure of six through five (can't hear the rest of his question)

Orr: It was in the original proposal and it's not completely from thin air and I think it had to do with I think ah.

SCHNEIDER: I think it had something to do with the replacement cost, as I recall the conversation.

BRAND: As well the pregnancy, I think it's also based on the equivalent I think that's the original origin of it what's allowed by law for pregnancy leave. So it is actually a harder number than you might think.

SCHNEIDER: Any other comments. Any thing else.

MILLER: No.

### **AGENDA ITEM #3: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD**

(none)

### **AGENDA ITEM #4: PROPOSED UNIVERSITY POLICY FOR RESPONDING TO ALLEGATIONS OF RESEARCH MISCONDUCT**

BRAND: We will have discussion and also a vote today, Robin from RUGS.

PENSLAR: Thank you. I'm Robin Penslar and I work with the Vice President from Research on the Bloomington Campus. The policy that I hope you both had a chance to look at is a UFC Policy, which is essentially a compliance document with federal regulations that require that institutions who receive federal funding have in place processes for handling allegation of research misconduct when they arise. Whether than adopting a single set of procedures for all campuses the structure that was created by the, campuses worked together, the Vice President formed, was to create an umbrella policy that set up this structure required by the Federal Regulation as guidelines for procedures and then allow (084) to adopt their own set of procedures that fit their campus' cultures. It also provides that (085) that a campus does not adopt (085) of procedures that the Bloomington procedures (086) and so if Bloomington has adopted through the (086) Indianapolis has adopted a set of procedures, both which meet the federal requirements, that the requirements would sponsor. The policy also deals with several other issues which are not addressed by the regulations, such as what to do in the case that there is more than one respondent that is the person accused of research misconduct whose home campus isn't different. It also sets out a statute of limitations period of six years. And there are several other issues addressed. (Can't hear) (090) And that essentially is it, (095)

RIEMENSCHNEIDER: Is it the intent then that if each campus establishes it's own committee for review then you would let the campus do their initial review first and then it would come to the all campus vice president? Or how, our people were concerned that in initial review occur on the campus first before it gets put off campus.

PENSLAR: That's right, in fact review occurs on the campus at which the (can't hear 101)

BRAND: Other comments or questions.

KEFFER: I'm on the IUPUI (102) Research and have been for about seven years and we're doing three right now, two (104) and I was chairing an investigation for one that's over a year to investigate and it stayed right on the campus so it's campus specific investigation to answer your question. And our procedures work very well. Just glancing at this and glancing (108) it seems to follow and is a necessary thing to have done. I know our committee would share the document we have.

PENSLAR: George Walker's office through myself primarily but anyone else who works with me on our campus or on the Indianapolis campus would be happy to share materials and help the campuses in developing their procedures or in reviewing (113) you in Indianapolis or our procedures you're welcome to (114)

FINDLING: Who put this document together (115)?

PENSLAR: No, it was a faculty committee that Dr. Walker convened that had members of faculty from the Bloomington Campus and the Indianapolis Campus.

MILLER: I would like to propose what I think is a minor friendly amendment to this on the first page in the section titled Authority, it really strikes me that this document grants authority in principal at least to two different people. Although I understand that in today's world this is a reference to one person but I think it would be reasonable to strike the Dean of the University Graduate School.

PENSLAR: I think that would be fine.

BRAND: I take that to be a friendly amendment and not an issue. Any other comments?

RIEMENSCHNEIDER: (I can't hear him) (125)

BRAND: Would strike in the section Authority on the first page it would strike the phrase "and Dean of the University Graduate School". Any other questions or comments. Please.

GALANTI: Refresh me, I thought that the IUPUI faculty council raised a question about the word immediately in the campus procedures section which would be on page five of the blue document, and I hope the suggestion was made that promptly would be more appropriate than immediately because immediately might run into problems if somebody comes up in the end of a semester.

PENSLAR: (135) which comes directly from the Federal Regulations require an immediate inquiry. What the term immediate means in the federal minds, I can't tell you.

GALANTI: We can assume it means as quickly as practical.

(Can't hear)139)

Absolutely.

BRAND: Any questions or comments?

PENSLAR: (140) can't hear what's being said.

SCHNEIDER: There was one other issue raised under Campus, page two under definitions the second item Allegations it says, any written or oral statement or other indication of possible indication of any scientific misconduct, it was suggested that instead of scientific it should be research misconduct and it turns out that was a typo that word should read research misconduct so for the record maybe we should state that as well.

BRAND: You're not going to let all the Humanities vote you off the book?

SCHNEIDER: That's right, it was raised by someone in the Arts School as a matter of fact.

BRAND: Fair enough. Any other questions or issues. Are we ready for a vote? Will someone call the question? Someone please call the question?

EISENBERG: I call the question.

Unanimous vote: Approval

## **AGENDA #5: FACULTY GOVERNANCE OF ATHLETICS**

BRAND: Let me indicate what the charge to the committee was for a moment. The committee was to look at the issue surrounding 1960's and 63 policy revise it as appropriate and also to consider issues that were relevant to the fact that the IUPUI Campus has gone Division I. That committee report will go directly to the Trustees as a recommendation of the Faculty Committee, in addition, input from the Agenda Committee of the UFC in works of your discussion as well as the advise you receive from the two faculty councils in particular the major campuses, the larger campuses but also the smaller campuses will be communicated directly from this group to the Trustees.

WARFEL: The study began working last March on the project and it took us a little bit longer than expected going through several drafts of the document that we finally turned over to the BFC/UFCF and Myles. This study group did have representations from Bloomington, Indianapolis and the smaller campuses, not all of the smaller campuses but one of the smaller campuses as well. We began our work by trying to gather all the information we needed from within the institution and from without the institution. Our goal in putting together the policy that you have before us was to formulate a policy for University wide governance under which the campuses could operate and under which the University teams at IU Bloomington could operate. There was attention between maintaining faculty authority over the programs, in particular faculty authority over the academic aspects of the athletic programs and yet accommodating the very real needs of those who administer the university and administer the academic programs. The policy is very straight forward beginning with missions and goals that attempts to put athletics into the academic context principles of authority, which among other things, elucidate the fact that the teams at Bloomington are the University teams and they are administered by the University Athletics Director and those at the other campuses are considered to be campus teams. This section also underscores the fact that the President has tremendous responsibility and authority in the area of intercollegiate athletics which was consistent with the NCAA expectations but that in general many of those authorities will be delegated. The campus athletics committees have existed on each of the campuses and the language here again is general language over (200) language under which individual campuses can formulate their detailed operations. One of the new things in the document is the creation of the Athletics Coordinating Council. There was a poll between the need for campus autonomy and the need for university identity similar to that, that we face in other arenas. One of the things that will provide consistency and unity to the Intercollegiate Athletics Programs is the fact that the University Athletics Director while he or she has operational responsibility for the university teams in Bloomington will also have some oversight responsibility for the Intercollegiate Athletics

Programs in general. Similar to the way in which the Vice President for Academic Affairs has oversight responsibility for academics in the University as a whole. Another thing that will help provide consistency especially among the two Division I programs of Indiana University is the formation of a small Athletics Coordinating Council that will also serve as a forum for conflicts that may arise in the future. With that brief presentation, it's my understanding that today this is a discussion item on the agenda only so I guess we can discuss this.

BRAND: Any one have questions?

ARNOVE: The Bloomington Faculty Council discussed this matter last Tuesday, perhaps the (226) page six or seven B concerning (228) (can't hear) of hiring and firing of coaches and what the term consult in a timely manner means, whether that means twenty minutes before a coach is presented to the press or what? I mean, this is of great concern to us.

WARFEL: Well currently, the experience that you are eluding to was one of the triggers for the whole undertaking and I think that it is the belief of the committee that there is an understanding on both sides, perhaps we should be asking Myles to address this question rather than me, but consult in a timely manner means consult in a timely manner.

BRAND: This proposal should solve the issue in so far that it leaves open the option that the Athletic Committee will have a personnel subcommittee that could be involved very early on in the process.

ARNOVE: How much authority does the subcommittee have with regard to (242) hiring and firing, (243)

BRAND: It has consultative authority as do all faculty committees, the final decision rests first with the administrative officer and then with approval of the trustees. That's standard practice with all our hiring and firings for all people, faculty and administrators at the university. There is no faculty committee that hires directly. It recommends and advises and consults. Any other questions, there was some questions about the make-up of the coordinating council that had come up at the Agenda Committee that you may want to address.

RIEMENSCHNEIDER: The (254) of the Athletic Committee recommended that the regional campus (256) beyond the court date (256) Many of the regional campuses have (256) NCAA Division I but they are in one of the other leagues and therefore do have concerns about coordination in this area and whether there would be need for a separate council under that for that division or whether it should be part of the larger council. I think...

WARFEL: I think that could be worked out either way, that it's not critical. In writing the language that was written here the council itself has balanced membership between the two Division I campuses it also indicates that at least annually the other campuses will be drawn into a general discussion. I think that there's enough flexibility in this language to allow it to develop as need be. Again, this council is not one that, the council is one that meets and services a forum for resolution of conflicts but is not necessarily one that votes on policy decisions so that actual voting rights really aren't a concern.

BRAND: The Athletics Coordinating Council of Roman Numeral I (282 can't hear) Any other comments?

MILLER: Kathy, I wonder if you could say a little bit more, this is on page five under functions of Campus Athletics Committees, I'm particularly interested in number four in the list of functions. There is a particular list of things there that according to the document are related to academic matters and the final phrase of number four mentions the scope of athletics conference and association rules. Now is it the case that with regard to these matters, academic eligibility policy, recruiting strategy, missed class time, that there are conference and association rules about those things within which the university operates. Is that the implication of this language?

WARFEL: Well yes and no. There are a number, again this is umbrella language here, some of the campuses are in NCAA and some of them are in other associations. The NCAA for example does not have any requirement that there be an athletics advisory board at all, on the other hand the Big Ten Conference has some expectation of faculty governance of athletics, so the language here is trying to capture the idea that at each campus you of course have to be in compliance with your association rules and your conference rules if you are a member of the conference. The things that are listed in particular are examples of things that come up when you are discussing intercollegiate athletics and they have a fairly obvious connection to the students academic experience at the institution such as the missed class time policy and so forth.

MILLER: The thing that really struck me as I reading through this was really the contrast between number four and number five. And the language there regarding the functions of the athletics committee is quite parallel in terms of what the athletics committee does in regard to these two sets of activities, and somehow it just seemed to me that the faculty should somehow have more authority, let's say, with regard to number four. It isn't clear, for example, in regard to number four who actually does have the authority to make these general athletics policies related to academic matters. I means who ultimately decides what the policy will be? Is it the Athletic Director, by implication I guess it's the Athletic Director?

WARFEL: I think as a practical matter be development of these policies as done by the Athletics Director or staff in coordination with the committee advice. Again, in intercollegiate athletics, the ultimate authority is presidential authority, though I doubt that the President would want to spend a lot of time writing them as class policy for each campus.

MILLER: It just is sort of at a very intuitive level it struck me that faculty should have a greater authority in this area than with regard to ticket pricing, I don't think we have any natural claim to authority in those areas.

BRAND: Well, let's look at some of these for example, recruiting strategies, it turns out the NCAA rule book, which is about two feet thick, is very specific about what's permitted and what's not all the way from the color of paper you can use on brochures and type size. So there is very little flexibility on some of those and I'm confident that the Athletic Department would not want to put itself at a disadvantage compared to it's competition by not using everything available to it. Missed class time to the best of my knowledge is more of a institutional policy and I would expect that there would be deference, strong deference to the athletic committee faculty on the Athletic Committee to deal with that. I think the policy would be set by the Athletic Department, therefore, the Athletic Director, but I would think that would be an area in which the Athletic Committee has some flexibility's compared to the one I just named and would exercise that flexibility to best of its judgment and I would expect both practice in good sense would dictate that the Athletic Department and Director would follow that. If it doesn't work, then there are appeal processes through the President and Trustees. Any other questions.

SCHNEIDER: As a practical matter, are you suggesting a different word than participates, I mean is meant to be a simple way to accommodate what you are suggesting?

Beginning of Tape 1 Side B

MILLER: (382) or does or should have any authority over these matters it should pertain somehow to the academic, you know to parts of this that impinge on the academic part of the student's activity. It isn't clear to me, I mean it could be that one of my problems that this list is kind of a mixture of things that don't separate out nicely between things that the faculty should be more concerned about and things that maybe they shouldn't be and maybe a little reorganization of lists could help us in terms of this item.

FINDLING: (388) can't hear this questions.

BRAND: There might be some. It's also the case that faculty throughout the university are going to set cirrocumuli requirements, degree requirements, they are the ones that pass on degree, on earning a degree, so all the student athletics must meet all those other requirements that are set in other places. These are rules that go beyond academic rules, no doubt, but rules that go beyond what's expected for all our students as those policies established by the faculty. So these are rules that are specific to athletics, so if there's a missed class policy for the entire university, which I believe there isn't as far as I know, but there is one for athletics that would be over and above what is minimally required by policy set by the faculty. I'm not sure that helps, but it puts it in context and so since you are dealing with student athletics that's why the athletic department and not the faculty alone are involved. Does that help?

MILLER: I'm just expressing a reaction that I had to this.

SCHNEIDER: The idea that the council also discussed this perhaps not quite with as much detail or gut reaction as the Bloomington Council but there is general agreement that we wanted to see specifically how it would relate to what we are already doing and it's currently being considered by our Athletics Committee. But one question was raised to me I want to see if we can clarify it is, Language on the bottom of page three, incidentally for the record is page two done or is there something missing from the report?

WARFEL: It's done.

SCHNEIDER: OK so it is blank. At the bottom of page three it says that the University Athletics Program based at Bloomington Campus shall be governed by the President and University Athletics Director and the Bloomington Campus Athletics Committee. Could you clarify what the University Athletics Program is, is that defined elsewhere, did I miss something?

WARFEL: The University Athletics Program are the Hoosiers, the teams that are based on Bloomington Campus that are considered the University teams.

SCHNEIDER: But this is a new name for them that's necessary in the document? I think that might be clarified, maybe we could put a (412) expression or something. Unless it's elsewhere, is it explained elsewhere in the document?

WARFEL: We felt that this language did explain it but if it needs to be even more straight forward, there would be no problem with that.

SCHNEIDER: OK.

BRAND: I'll take comments or questions.

MILLER: I have just one question, you mentioned the personnel sub, there's a mention of a personnel subcommittee of the Athletics Committee. It doesn't really indicate where that committee is going to come from. Is it the intent of the committee that this subcommittee would somehow be selected or developed by the Campus Athletics Committee in some way?

WARFEL: The intent of the study group in claiming the idea of a personnel subcommittee came from the reality of hiring and dismissing high profile coaches with a lot of visibility. What was envisioned here would be that the campus athletics committee would identify very small number from among them, possibly the chair the faculty (429) one additional person, a very small number that could work but could be called upon quickly and could over a very short time frame, two weeks works. So that it wouldn't be matter of arranging a special meeting of a large committee.

BRAND: Other questions or comments?

WARFEL: But it was also intended that the details of who should be on that on any given campus would be worked out the way the membership of any given campus can be worked out. That is, it will be determined by the Campus Faculty Council and consultation with the Chancellors.

MILLER: I'm sorry now. So this personnel subcommittee will be formulated not by the Campus Athletics Committee itself.

WARFEL: Yes it would.

MILLER: It would.

WARFEL: Yes, well.

MILLER: I've heard you say two things, one is that the campus athletic committee itself would determine who the members of the personnel subcommittee would be that's option A, option B would be that there would be some processing of negotiation between the faculty council, the President and whoever and in the same way that the athletics committee itself is structured that there would be parallel process that would structure the personnel subcommittee.

WARFEL: When this policy, with some amended version of it, become policy when each of the campuses would have to work out some details with their CEO Bloomington with the President, the other campuses with their Chancellors. There would have to be details about the membership and how the membership is going to be selected within some of these umbrella guidelines. And there would have to be some understanding of what the personal subcommittee was going to be and how it was going to be chosen, but the thinking of the study group was that the members of the personnel subcommittee would be members of the campus athletics committee a small subgroup.

BRAND: There are, of course, already in place at least I'm thinking about the Bloomington case, there are understanding in places about how the campus athletics committee is developed.

MILLER: I think one key question is, will the personnel subcommittee consist solely of faculty members? It's my inclination that the answer is yes, but I'm not going to preempt the athletics committee if they think otherwise.

BRAND: So you would not be uncomfortable if this, in a more overt sense I mean just for example the inclusion of a phrase at the end of the sentence on page six feels, you know, through a personnel subcommittee selected by the campus athletics committee.

MILLER: As long as there is some agreement about what the principals of selection are, the individuals yes, I am perfectly comfortable with that but I would want to be involved in what the principals are. For example, would the chair of the athletics committee always serve on the personnel subcommittee, I would think the answer to that would be yes, so with those broad general principals that's fine.

FINDLING: I would like to return to the comment of my colleague (466) can't hear his question (laughter)

WARFEL: (470) representative of (470)

FRENCH: I think there was a, or some thought, regarding representation of the regional campuses on this council and basically whether there should be, they should be involved in the process of the coordinating council or basically whether, basically, they would essentially delegated (476) to each of the individual campuses to basically not be terribly active in the Division I decisions that would be involved in the NCAA, in other words there were the NCAA Division I Athletic programs that were selected an issue.

On this but we still wanted to have at least an annual meeting of all the different athletics programs and representative from the different campuses from their athletic committees. They would still have significant (482) in basically the administration of their own individual campus activities.

BRAND: So, I'm not sure I understand the question, is it a yes or a no. (Laughter)

WARFEL: I think what I heard him say that yes it's just time to have a representative from a smaller campus representation on the council but they might be really bored. (Laughter)

BRAND: That's fine. I think nothing is harmed by putting one on. I think something is gained.

WARFEL: I think that's fine. In one interaction of the document all of the campuses were represented and we decided that was a tremendous waste of everybody's time. I think it would be fine to go ahead and say that there will be some representation, but then you would have to work out how you decide the best thing to do. And since our study group has disbanded.

GINGER: When this issue was raised in Bloomington, what Gerald said was that (496) the thought was it was that if conflicts would arise between the divisional (497) programs and then if another campus decides(498) their representative would be added but his thought was that the intent had been that this coordinating, the conflicts would be between the divisional schools and that's why only those two campuses would have one or apparently selected so maybe we should suggest well maybe you should put language in there saying (502) the two (502) programs and then you would have to amend that later but maybe wasn't what the rest of (503)

WARFEL: Let me say, we assure to insure operational consistency with Division I athletics programs whether there are two of them or eight of them in the future.

GINGER: (506) (I can't understand what she is saying)

WARFEL: That's correct. The smaller campuses feel very strongly about the (508)

WAGNER: You might of answered this last week, I just had a question, I can't (510) the Bloomington teams are considered university teams because in a way (511) they represent all of us, all the campuses. My question is why is the Athletic University Program only concerned with Bloomington Campus Athletics and (513) from other campuses? We're part of the university.

WARFEL: We did discuss at one time whether or not there should be some language put in about adding non- Bloomington representation to the Bloomington Athletics Committee and we simply came down on the side that being cumbersome and not necessary and that we would entrust the university programs to the Bloomington Faculty knowing that they would see to it. We did discuss that and decided against it.

JORAY: I think the purpose of the council as presently constituted as primarily to resolve conflicts at the Division I level of NCAA and two, we probably ought to say that, because that suggestion would resolve conflict regarding athletics in other areas that would involve the regional campuses, (528) smaller campuses. I'm also wondering if it would make sense, I don't know how you would do this some (529) or something, have a coordinating council that would be made up of representatives from the smaller campuses because of potential conflicts of Division II or Division III or those kinds of things. Bobby wouldn't have to meet as often because I think that probably wouldn't happen too often but sort of a similar kind of coordinating kind of group.

BRAND: I would think that (534) correct me if I'm wrong, with one of the functions of the coordinating council is just to exchange information about their practices and (536) any direct operational (537) it might be useful through a representative to go to the smaller campuses to (538) If that's true and if that was part of the intent then we need to coordinate (540) it might be useful to have (541) on board. Is that fair?

WARFEL: I think that's fine. I think that this study (543)

SCHNEIDER: (544)The annual meeting of all the athletics committees? Of all the Campuses?

WARFEL: I think what I'm hearing is that coming to one annual meeting may not be the same experience as we (546)

BRAND: Any other comments or questions.

RIEMENSCHNEIDER: We had one place where our present faculty constitution might be in conflict with it I take from the Agenda Committee Meeting (549) Trustees.

BRAND: I take it that we will discuss this bill at the next meeting as well and if there are any other further comments then when you report to the Trustees you'll include those as well.

SCHNEIDER: Yeah, these will be discussed at the individual campuses, at least Bloomington and Indianapolis between now and last meeting if the regional campuses subsequently have additional suggestions that they will want to convey, please convey them, and we will either have a report or a final summation of comments may be the best way, that's what we are shooting for, for next March, that's the likely outcome.

BRAND: OK, let us go to then on to the next issue on our agenda.

#### **AGENDA #6: REPORT ON DISTRIBUTED EDUCATION AND INDIANA UNIVERSITY**

BRAND: This is a discussion item and I ask Tom Duffy who's co-author of the report along with (563) to make this presentation and get us started on this, Tom.

TOM DUFFY: I am going to use some overhead so we can efficiently summarize. I am happy to be here, what I want to do is basically address the questions that were the basis of the charge of the committee. The Distributed Education Committee, that is visible I presume, the Committee basically was formed last February, it was disbanded in December so basically there is no committee to report back to though we still talked about it all. With the final report having been delivered the charge, the kind of questions that President Brand gave to us were basically those up there, should IU be a player in the distributed education environment if we are to be what direction should be proceed in, in essence what areas do we want to get into and how, and what structural changes are necessary for us to be successful. Basically, what I want to do is briefly summarize those issues. The committee began we produced over the course of the nine or ten months of the committee existed we developed three white papers, these are all available on the web site for distributed education which is accessible at the bottom of the IU Home Page, and I presume that's been publicized pretty widely, if not there's a lot of valuable information there worth looking at. The three white papers is the School of Continuing Studies did a summary of; where is IU in distributed education right now or in distance education?, how many courses are we offering?, what are the delivery mediums?, who are the audiences for them?. So there is a compendium of across the university system what's going on. Doug Pearson did an examination there was a specific issue that we were dealing with, it had to do with delivery technology and looking at the telecommunications kind of cable industries as mechanisms for delivery and then (595) did basically a scoping of the higher education environment, how is the higher education environment changing?, what are the implications for us and what are the implications into distance education? OK There was also a subcommittee on pricing that was formed and Judy Palmer headed up to look at issues at how do we price distance education? We established a Future Look Lecture Series where we brought in people who were leaders in addressing distributed education issues to give public lectures and to meet with the committee extensively to get their point of view of what the options were, where the field was going. As I said, we had the IU web site which is still existing and that's been turned over to the School of Continuing Studies, so Jeremy Dunning will in fact be maintaining that is in the process of putting the final report from the committee up there. That's in the process, and finally, we let a Coopers and Lybrand, there was some sense that we needed some outside people to come in and have a look and give us an outside perspective. There was also a sense that we needed somebody to do some number crunching to look at what our options were when we started considering where we might go. And Coopers and Lybrand developed three business plans basically for three initiatives in distance education's, OK? And finally, we have this long range procedure (615) The results of looking at what is going on in higher education and implications for distance education basically

resulted in the three “D’s” as we want to call them; Demographics; Digitalization. Demographics, we are talking about the fact that the demographics are changing rapidly, OK? And they are establishing the need for distance education. The number of over 25’s are projected to increase from eight million to about twenty million over the next decade. Basically, this resides heavily with industry and the information age, the glove of information, the rapid changing of understanding that we are engaged in. Meaning that people are needing to update their skills. We’re simply a skill updating and continuing education lifelong learning is taking on new meaning and a return to academia to university to training of some sort becomes necessary. So there’s a large visioning population out there. Deregulation is the threat. Basically, the need for the educational, for educational courses to the information age kind of environment is opening up the market to industry to private university’s and to a variety of others. We’ve all heard the University of Phoenix with their enrollment of 60,000-65,000 students, it is an accredited university, reasonably well recognized. Though we may question the quality of that university, it is in fact operating in the system. But look (638) has begun a business college and they’re talking about partnering with Ohio University to offer an MBA and a variety of other industries, Microsoft obviously is getting into the business. So the deregulation is opening up the market widely. Finally, digitalization is a vehicle for addressing the need, OK? And digitalization basically is the web environment the distance education environment where our territory, and remember we used to have our territories within the IU system and we couldn’t market in each other areas, that concept has basically disappeared and the digitalization is going to impact it even more. Anybody can move into our territory and we found that out with Wesleyan and other universities coming in. This means it’s not just the University of Phoenix and not just Microsoft who are offering courses, but Dartmouth is offering courses, Ohio University is offering courses, Stanford is offering courses, Pennsylvania is offering courses and they can all move into our market. These three kinds of issues the demographics, deregulation, and digitalization’s basically argue that the face of higher education is in fact changing and that distance education, delivery systems, web-base sort of support, is becoming an essential component of what is happening in higher education. There is another part of it however as one looks at what’s happening at universities what we are seeing is a breakdown between the distinction between distance education and on campus education. The web-based delivery system we have faculty on our campus all over or putting their course materials up on the web for students to access. Much in the same way you would be doing if the students weren’t present on campus. We are using more and more and there is greater and greater demands for conferencing systems for students to interact. And basically, the separation between on-campus and off-campuses is beginning to break down and the projections are that it will continue to break down. That’s why we changed the name of the committee and we emphasize in the committee report distributed learning rather than distance learning, distance learning carries the correspondence kind of notion with it, it assumes people are just at a distance. Distributed means they can be on campus or off but we are using the technology to support the learning process. So that’s one of the important outcomes. The result from that is, yes it looks like IU should be involved in the distributed education market there’s real opportunities because of the demographic growth there’s real threats because of the deregulation in the digitalization means people can move into the territory. The question becomes where and how can we begin our initiative, if we consider IU basically we could begin anywhere, anybody could hold up there hand and say we can move into distributed education and so what’s the logic of getting started? Basically, the committee identified three categories of criteria to start thinking about where should we begin an initiative. The first criteria is we should be consistent with the mission of IU and in that case we turn to the strategic directions charter and look at the goals of the charter and use that as a basis and I’ll come back to those issues, but those four listed up there are basically the four kind of items in the charter that served as the guide for identifying and rationalizing areas. It also has to inform our

migration path, as we say in the report, IU doesn't need "a" strategic plan for distance plan but it needs multiple strategic plans. We need to learn this is uncharted territory and it's uncharted territory for everybody. It is a different ball game from traditional correspondence distance education. It is a different kind of market place. So our argument is that we need several initiatives and those initiatives need to inform us and we need not view them as fixed but we need to view them as learning curves and expect them to change, and we talked about a migration path in the report and there needs to be a migration path to better understand how to answer the distance education arena. The learning issue that we identified as critical are partnering strategies. It's becoming clear one doesn't go into this area alone, you don't do it all on your own. There's varieties of partnering and levels of partnering, you can partner with publishers where we become the producers of materials the publishers become distributors. So in essence, we don't necessarily deliver the stuff we produce. We can partner with corporations or professional associations, so that we're in partnership offering courses offering support for their employees or the members of their organization in a variety of ways of partnering in that fashion. We need to worry about interdisciplinarian strategies, in essence as we are moving into the information age and the complexities of the work place in the real world says that in fact it's not just single strand sort of focuses but we need to be multidisciplinary, much in the same sense that SPEA developed in response to a change environment. The expectation is that that's going to occur more and more. So we need to figure out how to work together. There are also obviously, key issues of how the core campuses and the regional campuses all work together. Right? A tough problem, it's a problem that invades all aspects of doing our business in the university. We need to look at different strategies at how do we cooperate, how do we capitalize on strengths on the different units within the system and we need to learn how to do that in the distributed education environment. Finally, we need to consider, is the best strategy to look at targeted programs, filling a niche environment, or is it a broad based program that we need like an associate of arts degree approach. So the migration path has many components that we need to worry about and learn about. Finally, the third component of decision making has to do with the readiness of the units in market. Is the technology available in there, is there administrative readiness within the unit, are the faculty ready to go forward, does this unit really want to move into that area, and that has to play some role in the decision making. With those notions in mind we identify four or seven potential initiatives and they're organized in terms of the strategic directions charter, basically the consistency of our mission. In terms of serving the state, the new public university, the identified two possible strategies that we could take, and by the way the recommendation is that obviously we don't pursue all seven of these but these are seven possible paths from which to choose

beginning tape two - side A started counter at 0

some folks have argued strongly for it and it's become an option, so doing the AA degree basically increasing the school continuing studies kind of efforts in converting that into a web-based environment to increase penetration. Also, business partnering, we talk about corporate Indiana, can be partner with the corporations in the state of Indiana to in fact make it a more hospitable environment for corporations to move into by provide an educated populous. The third and fourth areas have to do with enhancing prestige and visibility within the strategic directions charter we talk about capitalizing on our reputation, basically working in terms of our brand. If we are going to move into distance education in an international sense, then we need to look at our brand image and say what areas can we move into where we are going to be known, where we can develop rapidly a reputation and be successful. So there's a commodifying our distinction as one strategy for example working with the School of Music which has a strong international reputation as an example and moving out into an international market and that could happen in terms of the degree, completion program it could happen in terms of a life-long learning environment, a recreational kind of environment. The fourth area has to do with emerging markets and the information age the knowledge management the huge demand for that, partly we see in the Business School, Information Sciences, but we see within my own department Instructional Systems Technology we see it in (015) with Information Sciences and we see it with the new Media Program being developed at IUPUI. A huge demand for folks that can manage knowledge, understand how to create knowledge environments and how to maintain them. One of the proposals is that we look at creating a new program in knowledge management and take leadership in that area, because in fact there's little out there to support that environment. The fifth area is one close to my heart which has to do with enhancing the quality of teaching. Basically, there's a strong statement that interactively among students is important, conferencing systems, having students talking to each other working on problems is important to the learning process. And it is in fact what will distinguish the distance education movements we are talking about from traditional correspondence courses. This applies whether we are at a distance however or whether we are on campus the distributed notion. And what we need to do is augmenting our pedagogy to increase that inter-activity to enhance learning and in fact to the extent we do this on the campuses we're readying units for moving into a distance education environment because in fact they're dealing with the technologies and the kind of working with students that they could well be doing at a distance. Finally the last two areas have to do with life-long learning, providing life-long learning opportunities again the strategist directions charter listing. Continuing professional education is an area we recommend exploring, nursing School of Education there are lots of options there. And there is in fact readiness amongst several of the professional schools for moving in that direction. And finally alumni learning, if we want to get into the life-long learning market one strategy for beginning to move into that area is to look at our own alumni. Again, we have brand name there, we can attract them and we can develop our strategies for the life-long learning market in that environment. What the suggestion is what we want to really do with that market is look at areas where in fact we can capitalize on distinction as well, areas where we have particular expertise and can provide useful learning environments, in archeology, in language, folklore, music, areas where we have this particular distinction. So those are the seven areas to be recommended to be considered, debated, that have come out of the recommendations of the report. Three of those areas were a focus of Coopers and Lybrand's effort and those three areas, Degree Completion, Knowledge Management and Interdisciplinary Health Care, ie. The Continuing Professional Education. Coopers and Lybrand took those three areas and they spent several months developing cost models. They've both done interviews of folks within Indiana University looking at the literature outside of it and using their own cost analysis data. We do have available plans, business plans that have real numbers there estimates

a terribly hard thing to estimate so anybody wants to criticize that can but it's a best guess and it's a starting point to move from. So that's the kind of directions of where we want to go now what are the infrastructure issues and the recommendations in the report regarding that? First of all, the notion and it seemed clear to us that moving into the distance education environment requires close coordination and cooperation amongst the units, not only the eight campuses, but amongst units within the system and we need to worry about not duplicating efforts and we need to worry about pooling resources and making sure the resources are working in the right way. In that sense the argument of the committee was that there needed to be a leadership position created, and I think in that report we say it's in the sense of having created the vice president for information technology position, somebody who can have a high level leadership position across the university system to worry about helping to coordinate, helping to encourage and support efforts in distributed education. So and the nice part of the report is we can say and we need to leave a lot of the decisions up to that person when they come on board. We went on to talk about the kind of issues that need to be of particular concern. One has to do with faculty support, this is a new teaching environment we want high quality courses, if we don't have high quality we're not going to be successful and we're not going to be happy it's just not something we want to get into. So we need to worry about how do we do affective instruction at a distance and we need to worry about supporting faculty and developing those teaching skills, so we had two sets of recommendation one is strong effort of supporting faculty in terms of training strategies providing workshops, guidance, a variety of support structure that has to do with both the pedagogy and with the use of the technology. The second part of that statement is that there was a recommendation to create an applied research center that would explore new strategies that would be involved in evaluating courses and understanding how we can do our stuff better, so there's both a direct service support and a building of our knowledge base of how to do this stuff were strong recommendations within the report. And finally, obviously, the issues of tenure and promotion become terribly important within this environment and we have increasingly taking teaching into account in the tenure process we need to worry about that because there is no question that moving into new styles of teaching and new uses of technology is in fact time consuming so the recommendation is that the tenure promotion kind of policy needs to be considered in light of these efforts. I think that's a reasonable summary of where we are.

BRAND: A trivial question and then on to more serious ones, was any thought given in addition to interdisciplinary health as a target to the legal profession unlike members of our profession, lawyers must undergo a thorough certification that are (077) there may not be as many lawyers as health care workers but they pay a lot more for those courses. And I was (078)

DUFFY: There are lots of opportunities in that direction. And that really is an important consideration. The professional schools, I think, in general are very ready. Nursing, Allied Health, has been very proactive in moving forward in distance ed. That is the reason they were singled out by Coopers and Lybrand. Within the committee report, we're really saying we need to look at professional education, because the overall implication of what you're saying. It is an area that overall is important to us. And we need to know how to do it. We need to start somewhere, so we need to choose amongst those that are. And if we're going to use criteria, then we need to ask questions about the readiness of the unit. Are they ready to go or not?

ZARET: Also, how much competition there is, frankly, for legal education. It's a pretty crowded field right now. There's a lot of competition. We may be able to enter, especially since we're the only medical school in the state. We may be able to enter into the health care professions a little more quickly.

DUFFY: My impression is currently with all this (090). Just a comment on that. That's one of my real reservations about professional, because it seems like it is easy to move in all the professional areas, but it is also the area where there has been the most effort to create these distant learning environments. And I think it's been particularly true in the medical profession. I've done some work with the medical schools, in going out and looking at the web and the kind of training that's available. And I'm now inundated with stuff they're sending me announcing new programs and that that are available. So those are important considerations.

ZARET: Yeah, the other point that I want to make very quickly, is that it's a central premise in the report that there are not the absolute odds between distance education and traditional pedagogy does not quite seem to square with the sense that we need revisit tenure and promotion requirements. It seems to me that, to a sense, there is a lot of distributive education going on now, and that our policies permit variable weights by campus and initial units to research and teaching. I'm not sure how helpful it would be or how necessary it would be to revisit that one. Or the issue of (101), for precisely the same reason. That if we're doing a lot of this then there is an incentive to (103), perhaps to encourage people to get the tuition. Could you tell me on page 23, where you talk about the RC budgetary stuff. What is (105)?

Laughter.

BRAND: Toward the end of the second to last paragraph. Dissipation of resources and vociferousness. ...

DUFFY: My memory of it is, the important part of it is, the scattering about. That's what it means.

ROTHE: ... campus school of medicine... am assigned to however. And also the chair of your policy technology committee have four points that I'd like to make. First of all, this is a good report. I've been through it about 3 or 4 times now, since that first early draft back in the summer. Got this so-called final draft in December. And every time I read through it, I find it more helpful and more informative. It clearly seems to me that distributive education is here, obviously. And also on this campus, and on the campuses of Indiana University. It is not new. You do not have to try to do things. You have to expand and encourage current things. The implication there is to disturbing. But one of the most disturbing parts I find here is why was not this report on the web? You're willing to talk about using the web for information transfer. And here's a prime example of not doing either of those. It is not the staff that did not get this on the web. Somebody goofed, and didn't think it was important enough. Now, (125), but saying well it's because the faculty and these councils don't count. Now Indianapolis, we got a copy early enough that our foreman was able to get copies in the mail three days ahead of time, and we were able to get a copy. Here, we don't even have a copy ahead of time. So my first point is that we should use the web and use it effectively. Because it is the tool that we are going to be using. Whoever is handling that web site, someplace in this chain of command has buffed. AS the report talks about, there are (131), this distributive education, not face-to-face education, is not the way to train at the KT and graduate level. You cannot train a (134) if you cannot see them face to face. You are not going to train a physician, you're not going to train an attorney. It is very useful, however, for an information transfer for facts, rules, and techniques, and renewals. There are many issues. The University of Phoenix? This is a university? 80% of the courses are in business. This implies training professionals. (139) 80000 students worth \$2.2 billion on the stock market. It almost sounds like if you have an idea how to run a match, you will (140). But it's not. We need to look at the various niches where we can do something about it. And

particularly one of the things that bothers me in terms of niches - the committee talks about. Take a top slice from the country fundings. The implications that all schools will have a slice of the budget taken to fund the program to fund the new administrator and staff. I would think that the deans would have (147) all over the place. We have enough problems with funding. And those schools that have the most likely possibilities should be able to do it themselves. Take it from that. And those schools that have programs that are not as in need of (150) distributive education maybe should not. So when I said (152) which programs are selective and what programs to support and particularly which schools to tax. It is distressing to hear the committee recommend hiring yet another administrator and support staff. It seems to me that IU is so complex that it is going to be very difficult for anybody to really get ahold of what's going on and to get going. And it seems to me that it's well worthwhile to encourage the schools to develop the distributive education programs. They're (157), you say, are doing it now. It's not new. They need support. They need encouragement. And I really seriously doubt that top-down management will encourage the innovation, will encourage the dedication of faculty, to forego the opportunities of getting prestige, money, and the like, in doing research. (161) the usual teaching programs to get these skills to do this. And if this is something that is going to be done by outsiders, then maybe we should just set up separate corporations and do the job. And not be part of the institution. I don't think that's all of the idea. But it seems to me that we have the (---). Report does a good job, I read it for the 3rd and 4th time. The faculty (166) more and more. And this is good. Because they can do it. I won't argue that half of us are not (168). But the other half is still about 2000 faculty members. That's a lot of people. The final point - (170) and the new administrator is going to do away with implication. As a physiologist who knows something about biology, redundancy is not (172). Redundancy helps us survive. Redundancy may go to work. A little bit of competition is not bad at all. So my summary is three Cs, like the 3 Ps up there. Communication, Cooperation, and Coordination. I would suggest that we meet on these campuses much better at cooperation. This needs to be encouraged. This cooperation needs to be supported. And it needs to be expected. And we certainly need good communication. What is it then? What will we find out? Why do I have to spend hours and hours and hours learning new software? Learning to migrate with email? And it seems to me that coordination by distributive education and so on should be minimized. Ways to encourage the faculty and the existing staff to take this very powerful tool and will be part of the future (186).

DUFFY: In terms of the physician and the funding, and those issues. But I guess let me. Just to go in reverse order. And I like your three Cs, by the way, and I think I'll include them from now on. We'll move up to D and then A. We'll do work on that. But the Zar, and it's not meant to be a Zar, and I tried to say when I was making my remarks here that the goal is that somebody is going to support the kind of bottom-up efforts and support people that want to get involved in the initiative. And I think that's a wide-spread sentiment that that physician needs to not be somebody that dictates but rather somebody who is supportive of the process. So I think there's total agreement with what you're saying. But in fact, the schools are operating independently now. The school of continuing studies is trying to provide a coordination role, but in fact there are huge amounts of duplication of efforts. Everybody is moving through the same learning curve at a very slow rate, without being able to learn very well from each other. Knowing some of what I know is going on in nursing, they're operating on a shoestring and not quite sure how to proceed. The School of Education: 16 of the 30 courses that are being offered over the web this semester come out of the School of Education. And I'm involved in that. I'm not in a leader role in that, but I'm close to it. There's a real struggle to try to figure out how to do things. So the notion of having a leader to kind of provide that support and pull things together, I think, is

important. And that's kind of the sentiment. So I don't think we're in disagreement on that. But I'm not sure.

ZARET: Don't you think it's too big for a person to do all this?

ROTHER: Well, presumably there's going to be somebody working with that person.

ZARET: But it seems to me that with good communication, the schools can do it amongst themselves. (208).

ROTHER: Potentially. I mean, we're probably at a difference of agreement whether we can do that. And also the need to coordinate across the 8 campuses. I mean, the levels of coordination re just really tough. And sharing.

ROTHER: We've been at this for years, as you correctly pointed out. And we have not gotten the coordination and communication that you rightly point to. We don't need someone to direct, manage, or control model. You're right about that. But we do need someone who has the authority and the responsibility to bring people together. Someone who's job it is to make sure that there's cross talk. It would be ideal if it worked by itself. In this university, like every other university, unless you ask someone to really take on that task. People are usually so busy and so hard working, they tend to not put on the extra effort for communication and cooperation that you correctly cite.

DUFFY: I appreciate your comments. And as I say, if you read this through the second, third, and fourth times, you'll realize this is clear. The first time through, it sure doesn't seem like it.

ROTHER: Two quick comments to what you said. The talking about other places that are involved in distance education is a hard one to manage. We can point to the university of Phoenix, and poo-poo them. And there are a lot there are a lot worse than that. The University of Phoenix is actually one of the good examples of that whole group. Good within that class. They are in fact, filling a role. And there's a lot of argument that in fact higher education, the university system, is not being responsive to the needs of the culture. These unites are. And so as much as we may not like it, we need to pay attention to what's happening in the world in regards to these kinds of units. They'll get better The important thing is - they're filling a need that it appears we're not filling. So we need to attend to that. The other half of the whole thing is we can put them on the side. That's one point to make with them. But the other half of it is all of our peer universities are also moving into this market. It's a large market. It is the demographics, save this is going to be something important. The digitalization says that those other sister universities, the peer universities are going to be coming into this market. Stanford is going to be offering the courses. We don't need to talk about University of Phoenix.

DUFFY: What about leadership in American Universities today? Stanford and the University of Michigan - two fine institutions, are beginning to take the leadership in this. So we see some of our strongest universities nationally being engaged.

ROTHER: May I suggest, one of the things that are missing here are the various demographic groups of these services. It seems to be that if you go after (236) other than the more traditional groups it's going to save a lot of anxiety on people part and (236) children to Indiana University. It's a huge market, a huge market.

TOM DUFFY: And I agree, and I thought the report at least the one Blaze and I did the initial one we did, and we tried to summarize that at the beginning of the final report the argument is residential universities are not going to disappear, they offer an awful lot that is important for the eighteen year old, there's no question about the socialization that happens on campus. It is primarily this older population coming back it is primarily the continuing education that we need to be responsive, so I don't think there's any disagreement with that, I hoped we had made that point. But it wasn't obviously wasn't clear enough yet.

BRAND: (245) enthusiasm (can't hear his comment)

ROTHER: David has raised a point about, we need to revisit the issue of tenure and promotion and the faculty and I'd like Tom to talk in greater length about how actually distributed education is likely to impact, who is defining this effect (251) and what the actual functions of faculty members are because the experience from other countries and institutions (252) learning (253) distance education is that you have a segmentation or fragmentation called a faculty role and as the report points out you have people involved in design of others in production, others in teaching, others in delivery others in (256) others in assessment, this happens elsewhere and it's likely that it's happening here. Then a very important implication for tenure promotion is the discussion at various points of this proposal that have capital intents of teaching and learning made out to take the place of labor intents. That turns out to be substituting machines for faculty, you know to cost this out and you allude to it, there are parts we talked about whether to go capital, (262) to me that means in some cases that means machines are going to be substituted for faculty so that has to be discussed as well. Now there's another issue, about these technologies the ways of distributing material but the content and the quality of the material is something that I've raised with you before is particular when you are talking about marketing certain program in China, Malaysia, or even thinking program here for other populations in the state in terms of what's the language of instruction, how culturally sensitive are those materials, so tremendous amount of intelligence energy has to go into the development of these materials. Now once you've got to the point that Carl made about populations generally one of the fastest growing populations in the United States or around the world is the people over the age of sixty. These people may not want to sit in front of a console computer, they may want to be on campus. So when we talk about distributive education particularly when we talk about serving the seniors in this state we ought to look at how we can bring these people to residential situations. Finally this is a point that was raised a number of times with Tom and with (277) in terms of imagery, rhetoric, the metaphors that are used in this report and it seems that's essentially a financially driven or market driven report than an educationally inspired report, we find all kinds of terminology like collotification, distinction brand names, niche market, that's (281) and very few new terms related to education of learning, I saw inter-activity and things like that and just the plea for beginning to find a vocabulary that's more suited to a teaching and learning type of institution.

BRAND: Thank you (284) but that's our whole spool of impressions I don't know how many you may want to address if any. (Laughter)

ARNOVE: (285) later on. (Laughter)

BRAND: Obviously, you've had these discussions before, are there any comments you want to make.

TOM DUFFY: Oh, I guess in terms of tenure and promotion or the roles of faculty is, the overall statement is the goal is to create quality and the assumption that we can't create quality in a distance learning environment when people are at a distance or where they're distributed I think is just I mean crazy. Of course we can do good job of it, we need to worry about it just like we have to worry about the quality of our residential campuses or residential courses. When I talk to faculty who are using collaborative tools and this faculty teaching at a distance as well as faculty teaching in their classroom and using the distributive tools for conferencing. Every one of them has commented on the quality of the interaction they are seeing in their students. We're now working also at collaborative writing tools for use on the web, Brian Smith on campus here is just developed a tool that he is starting to make available where students can annotate papers that are put up there and you do collaborative writing note because all of this is visible the teacher is mentor, can feed back on that in ways that weren't possible in the past. Huge impact on the quality of writing, Brian's comment in terms of the students producing these papers, are the best papers, and (303) that they've ever seen, so the technology offers, I mean it's neither evil nor good, it's a tool and it's the way in which we use it that's incredibility and I've seen lots of potential for it. Whether we break up roles in the way you are talking about or not it's something that's gonna happen down the line, hopefully it doesn't mean however roles start to develop and it may not that they change at all, hopefully that's not a quality issue. There's no reason that it be a quality issue.

BRAND: I want to give as many people to discuss it as possible, Sara.

SARA: I think that the niche markets seems to be chosen very carefully, I know law was mentioned and at first it was seemed like an excellent market because attorneys in Indiana have to get thirty-six hours of continuing legal education credit every three years however, the bar associations are already doing a fairly good job of that, it's fairly inexpensive and also there's a foundation as far as group dues go toward to support that kind of thing and it's not only in person training but also (318) I think we need to be very careful in choosing what niches we want to fill and whether or not they are already filled. Another comment is about the University of Phoenix I've been interested for several years in pursuing a certified plan financial planner designation and there was a national foundation that handles all this and it was all done by self study and then you took the exam and provided you passed all these and met the other requirements then you would use this CFP distinction and I've been following this and contemplating this an now I notice that's being now subdued under the University of Phoenix and I found that interesting and I wonder if I should of applied now or wait until (can't hear)

TOM DUFFY: (can't understand what he said)

ROODA: I'm from the Northwest campus, maybe you could elude me about those three paragraphs that begin on page 14 (332) read somewhat like the combination of my (334) you know when I see words there's a lot of verbiage here do we now understand (335) but I have to say (336) words like rethink regional campuses role suggest even greater (339) for full time positions there's words here that really concern me and maybe you could give me some background on your thinking.

TOM DUFFY: And I obviously realize that regional campuses in general are concerned about that and I guess a couple of things, one is I would argue that it seems rather clear with the way higher education is moving with distributed education the regional campuses are under the greatest threat regardless of what IU does. Stanford is moving in, Michigan is moving in, Wesleyan is in and expanding and pushing and the threat comes most strongly against the

regional campuses, not Bloomington, in terms of doing that. So in terms of rethinking or thinking, drop the rethinking, but thinking about the regional, they do I think require particular attention to say how do we survive and blossom in this environment and there's particular attention to paid there I truly think that's particular attention to be paid there. I truly think that's the important kind of consideration. The arguments that are in the final report were two fold one is that the regional campuses should be looking for linkages within their community for development methods, much like the Chrysler Corporation one of the (358) has the relationship with, those sort of things, where they are self serving market and can capitalize on it. The other part is, there is a learning agent aspect of the whole thing, in terms of really supporting students in their learning process, I think face to face when we are dealing with the undergraduate regional stuff is an important compliment of the learning process. As I look at distance ed programs large numbers of them, open university at the UK and I did a sabbatical there years ago and we're just revisiting them, have students coming back to campus, have tutors available, Ohio University in Athens that I worked with have students coming available. I think there's an important role in terms of our role in the state, if the regionals play in providing that kind of support structure for students in face to face environment.

ROODA: (can't hear her questions)Laughter

BRAND: (373) rhetoric aside, which is concerns me too about the regional campuses, rhetoric aside there are new and opening opportunities for the regional campuses in their geographic communities to deliver both offsite and onsite distributed education and if anything the regional campuses may have greater opportunities on the larger campuses though they have to act on them so I want suggest in all earnest and seriousness that there's good news in that for the regional campuses though they do have to act on them.

ROODA: So you can understand the perspective as if have TV monitors and test doctors.

BRAND: Yes, I see the rhetoric.

TOM DUFFY: An honest statement, how many people saw draft copies of the final report? Large numbers I presume and there was rhetoric that disturbed people and I imagine it sticks on peoples minds. In fact, part of that was written because nobody wanted to attend to the issues of the regional campuses, it kept getting raised and nobody had anything to say about it. So there were dramatic statements put to really draw out conversation saying they're an important consideration, we need to think about what the issues are involved there.

ORR: I don't think there's any question about whether distributed education can deliver quality, there's no question whether you can. The question is whether you will or not and what we see is competition within the university (398) and competition from all the universities who are in a more traditional mode creating quality issues(400) to some degree with getting pressure pull you down and (401) pulls you up. As Bob has pointed out the metaphors and marketing and competitive pressures and so forth absolutely rung through this and so one would expect these same kind of pressures to create greater difficulties, greater difficulties in the (405) learning environment than they do in the traditional learning environment. If in fact you are going to produce quality then contrast most of what you see out there at the present from your own (409) you're going to have to differentiate your product, and when you do that others that are taking it up are likely to take it down at least (411) if you are really intent on putting on a quality(413)

BRAND: can't hear him

KEFFER: I'm going to speak as a faculty person who has been teaching on (417) and was then charged to developing my ethics in a legal graduate class as a web supported class. Web supported this semester will be web based in the summer. I sometimes get the feeling that eventually there will be no need for people like me, that we can have Robert (424) from Georgetown do an international bio-ethics course and that will be all that will be necessary, that's one thing. The other thinking that I have is that as I put my materials in the course on the web and I feel that I will nothing left in my brain to offer the students that it will all be out there for easy domain. Somewhat a feeling of intellectual raping, but not really so I don't know exactly how I'm evolving with this and maybe as a person right in the middle of the mud of it right now, that I'm feeling a little uncomfortable right now because I don't know where I'm going to be in five years or who will be able to take my course and use my material, and whether or not I'm really getting anybody out there or whether we should just turn it to Robert Beech and Tom Beechum and Triss (440) and let it happen.

BRAND: Well, you know in a case of text books the intellectual property is still owned by the faculty member though all that information that you put in a text book is now out there with luck you'll get some royalties back. Legally, it should work the same way with the internet web and other electronic media but I would suggest to you more than the technological problems we're having, we're having problems with intellectual property and understanding what code we follow and how it's put into an acceptable form so there are appropriate rewards for creating that intellectual property and your right to be nervous because I don't think all that's been settled yet, I it is still in great flux though I would hope in five years when it does get settled you'll feel as comfortable doing that as you feel writing a text book but with good reason that's not the case now.

KEFFER: It is a disquieting feeling?

BRAND: Yes.

TOM DUFFY: I'm going through the same deal.

SENUCHUK: I would think that one of the important components of quality of the future would be the caliber of the students. I don't see this report, (463) missing something, talk about selectivity of admissions for example and that concerns me.

TOM DUFFY: We have university requirements, I'm not sure why they would change.

SENUCHUK: Your thinking of people as going through some sort of standard admission procedure ...

TOM DUFFY: We offer a masters degree at the School of Education, Language Education, and they go through regular admission requirements.

SENUCHUK: Well, I guess when I see this that tends to look like a mass communication enterprise it concerns me that, there's not been a suggestion that it be filtered through (478)

TOM DUFFY: Oh, yeah, no the whole need for a whole student information initiative systems within the university now is going to, has to be worrying (481) distance education marketing communicating to the students but it's an innovative system that addresses their students

whether they are at a distance or on campus and I can't imagine why the standards would be different unless we are doing certificate programs and it's a different kind of audience, you know the Business School does their executive education and some different sort of standards.,

SCHNEIDER: Just to show you we're ready, I was told our (486) 5% of our admissions applications were submitted electronically. So the technology is there as well as the (400)

Finding: I think Dennis's concern is that there's perhaps a little bit more (492) but there this sense of urgency that we have to do something and do it quickly and do it in a very broad spread way because otherwise Phoenix will take all the potential students away from us and Indiana maybe this is where it's coming from, you know we've got to expand our market develop our market as broadly as possible.

TOM DUFFY: Miscommunication if I said that, I didn't mean to say that, I mean we need to look at different migration paths.

MAWHINNEY: I am finding myself amusing in a philosophical sense over Professor Keffer's remarks. They were taken to be remarks related to the legal contingencies involved with the spreading of our knowledge through the areas of digitized media. But Bea Skinner, perhaps this century's greatest psychologist and somebody who I find myself going back to and thinking about his using, suggest that the matter of personal dignity or worth might be confronted by all of us as we put, as you so happily put it, the contents of our brain out in the computer and what is left? In his book Beyond Freedom and Dignity he suggests that in order to go beyond these prescientific concepts we're going to have reformulate the way we teach and arrange the environment such that learning occurs in just about every domain. So the thought that he would tell us today I think I believe in accordance with this whole initiative is that we as professing professors are just one mode of teaching and learning, we can sit back and be specialist at arranging such that learning occurs but to do that we will have to get over this idea that our worth is somehow lessened when we ourselves hand our knowledge over and step to the background and I think we are confronting that, that's what I took from your remark, not the legal aspects of it necessarily.

KEFFER: Part of it, but certainly not all of it.

MAWHINNEY: OK, that's what I got.

BRAND: Give me thirty seconds to add on to that, and I was (538) your remarks in a similar vein and I was actually thinking of Myles(539) of the textbook, somebody that writes a textbook and puts it out there could have the same feeling that you had they'd put their knowledge out there, but it's not really knowledge it's information your putting out there, the knowledge comes through the student interaction. And so it's a new mode, the uncomfortableness is not that you've raped yourself and put all your knowledge out there, you've put out a lot of information and that's how we've done a whole lot of the teaching, the question becomes now how do we interact with students and how do we engage with that interaction cause I think it's critical and I think we need to learn how to do.

KEFFER: That's the key.

BRAND: Any other comments.

WARFEL: I wanted to follow up on Linda Rooda's point but in regard to the core campuses we seem to have a different vision on page eleven

Tape 2 side B

WARFEL: talk more about how that would be?

TOM DUFFY: In real language? (Laughter)

TOM DUFFY: Let me just say a few words here and see if we attack it. Really Bloomington is the kind of residential traditional campus, it has the ivy covered walls, it is the eighteen year old residential area. If you (004), if one wanted to talk about places not ready for the distributed learning environment (006) would probably be up near the top of the list, they in fact view themselves in the traditional learning mode, which is fine and good and there is whole huge audience to deal with, IUPUI is dealing with that over 25 market, they see and (009) talks about the importance of their role in that environment, the regionals are doing it as well. I don't what the issue is there it's seems should I say (010)?

WARFEL: No I don't want to say (010).

TOM DUFFY: OK.

BRAND: Any other questions, comments? I'm gonna ask Bill to address the issue of what we do with this report next in particular which committee it's assigned to or committees it's assigned to. But if you permit me I'd like to make two comments, one a comment the other a question. While we are undertaking this enterprise be assured every other Indiana public university is doing something similar and at this weeks commission for higher education meeting the commission will put forward a draft policy for regulations governing distance education in the state. There are some very interesting features, on the one hand through a preamble they point out that we should be open to distance education the state is going to join the western governor's university for example and invite in the distance educators providers from all around the country and maybe even further. On the other hand they want to regulate the Indiana campuses and universities on how we handle it and how we can deliver it and the hurdles we have to go through. So that will be an interesting discussion on distance education. They are adopting a command and control model in the state that's simultaneously inviting in lots of competition, I am wondering what's on their minds. (Laughter) The second I would very much appreciate your advise on one aspect of the report, this report has been discussed with a number of other groups, sometimes by Tom and sometimes by others, and once suggestion has emerged for the person or the office that's to coordinate these activities and in particular that person as the report suggests would be an associate vice president who would be stationed as it were whose offices would be at IUPUI for some of the same reasons that Tom just gave. That person would have three main activities in his/her portfolio one would be the person to whom the School of Continuing Studies reports, secondly would be the coordination and communication efforts that I think were addressed earlier as a facilitator but not as a control because each campus indeed each academic unit is going to have to develop distributed education activities on their own to be successful but it must be coordinated and we must find ways to learn from each other, and third to oversee the initiation of some of the particular initiatives that Tom discussed for example the three that were named and business plans formulated for from Coopers and Lybrand. So that would be the range of the clarity and responsibility for the person, the results are suggested in other meetings but because this individual will be deeply involved in the academic activity of the university that he/she should report to the vice-president for academic affairs who presently is Kenneth Gros Louis but particularly in order to make sure that we don't duplicate technology unnecessarily or worse,

create incompatible technologies that should be an opportunity for the person to work with UITS and in particular the person should have a joint reporting line also to the vice president there to Michael McGrabby and that way, I should say, plug into advisory committees that exist at UITS. That's a recommendation or suggestion that is emerged in some other groups and if anyone has any views or thoughts on that I would appreciate hearing them now. No. OK.

TOM DUFFY: They're much easier on you. (laughter)

BRAND: Please, Carl.

ROTHER: I'm reassured.

BRAND: OK, thank you.

ROODA: I'm not. (Laughter)

BRAND: OK Linda, what's on your mind?

ROODA: It's just, I don't want to speak (054) but we don't have any campus representative here so (054) assume it's just a region thing (055)

BRAND: That will become essentially be monitored for which (056)

ROODA: Just the sensation of (056) hire as many full time people because eventually this (057) thing will come out and you will tune it in and you will sit there nicely in the corner as (056) then (059) this is a vision and this just isn't mine, right (059)

?: Right.

ROODA: This isn't just my vision on our campus.

BRAND: That may happen at Phoenix University, I couldn't imagine it happening at IU to tell you the truth and we have to offer options to students both adult continuing students, lifelong learners who are returning as well as a number of traditional students to get a quality education with the use of technology and if we opt out of it all that's left is the Phoenix University's of the world and I think therefore we are doing a disservice to our students by not provide this option for them at a high quality under our university standard academic procedures. So, will it ever replace everyone in this room? Not in our lifetimes, I wouldn't worry about that. Please Paul.

EISENBERG: Thank you, (068 can't hear him) There seems to be some kind of concern to advertise the (071) of quality in this arena. (072) direct competition (073) ladder of quality (073)

BRAND: I think you all knew why Indiana University can compete with these other institutions both in state and out of state as if we have the very highest quality (074) otherwise we have a change.

EISENBERG: I agree, but I also think we also need (075) market the fact that (075) that's of some importance.

BRAND: Yes, quality education, lifetime opportunities.

EISENBERG: (can't hear him)

BRAND: Absolutely, and as we consult with people our constituents, our potential students of what's important about Indiana University, quality is always the first one, there's no question about that. If we ever give that up we should just fold up our tent and go home. Because that is what we are all about and we have to make people understand that yes you can probably get a degree in three years counting life experience elsewhere but that's not Indiana University. We have to be very clear about that Paul, there's no question about that.

EISENBERG: But what do we mean by quality (082) contrast to Phoenix?

BRAND: I think defining that (083)

?: Not necessarily (083)

? (083)

? What do we mean by quality as (084)

BRAND: It's faculty (084)

?: Whatever (085)

BRAND: Oh, I think the answer is the faculty involved in the intellectual power behind whatever method whether writing on a blackboard or showing on a screen.

TOM DUFFY: The University of Phoenix hand a faculty member a cirrocumuli which they are to follow. I actually met somebody that teaches there last month, they get paid \$1800 to teach the course, they follow that script exactly, they get exactly \$1800, so it's a bizarre sort of thing, it is in fact working the quality can continue(laughter) does that say enough that in fact that's not the way we are going to be dealing with it? The issue of interactivity I think is important, the issue of quality I think is absolutely fundamental if you go up to the web site for the distance ed you can look at the policy recommendations for the School of Education with regards to distance ed, the emphasis on quality is pervasive in there and in fact there's a argument that during a program of studies there should be some face to face component because of the importance of that aspect, so there's a lot to worry about.

BRISTOW: (096) just an observation, I'm sure you've heard before. There's always problems with a (097) and the likelihood of a strong candidate feeling uncomfortable with such a role and some with the observation that it would come to that (099) the academic role, a solution to that problem is that person reporting directly and only on the information technology side (101)

BRAND: OK, Mike.

DOWNS: I just wanted to say I'm for a regional campus and I don't feel anywhere near the apprehension but the reason for that is because I've been involved in distance education now for three years and more and if the commitment is to quality you don't have to worry about there being less work or (105) faculty, you're going to have to worry about needing more faculty to do it. The key is that if the commitment is to quality, it will require full time faculty who are willing

to work harder than they have worked before. It will ultimately justify an even greater investment on part of the university of hiring and retaining well qualified professionals who are willing to do that work. I found that, I'm not comfortable with it, but I think it's worth doing if you do it well, you're going to be working harder than you do in a regular course that you teach. The only payoff as I see it in my experience is that you are dealing with students that are extremely well motivate with a good work ethic and it's the more satisfying teaching experience I've had in more than thirty years at Indiana University. It's not for everybody and it may not even be for me every semester but I find it to be very gratifying and I'm eager to see the university try to do what's going to be difficult (115) to do it but to do it very well because it's going to require that a lot of people decide to make an extra effort, I think it will.

ROODA: I agree. But that's not what the report (117)

DOWNS: But (118) work with what's on the ground right now. Doesn't seem to me that these developments are that scary.

BRAND: Last comment and then I'll ask you to address (119) please.

RIEMENSCHNEIDER: I found that parts of the document I felt were insulting to the regional campuses but I think the document said some things that needed to be said concerning (122)reaching out of the university to students in ways that may have been (122) We have students who drive good distances and are juggling impossible careers, family, and trying to get an education at the same time, I think we need to help them in every way we can. As far as feeling threatened by the advances of Phoenix University or outside universities I think any university stands on its reputation and our student population has been growing and I think it's growing because of the reputation of our faculty and I think as long as we maintain that reputation we maintain that quality. I don't think we have to worry about competition in the same sense that someone has a piece of goods that they are selling (131) I did object to the School of Continuing Studies calling students consumers, calling students consumers, we consume (133) in the education process, the knowledge is there. We can join together in a partnership with the students to help them gain some of that knowledge but the amount of knowledge there doesn't, isn't any less whether somebody partakes of it or not, it's a partnership and so I think as long as we understand that and keep working towards that end that I don't see any problems with the competition. I think we have to do what we can do to help the students in helping those that have difficulties and there are many ways that we can help them. Many technologies opening up many new (140)I think there are a lot of things that we do well and we need to keep doing well.

BRAND: Thank you. Bill (142) the policy in terms of the next steps for this report.

SCHNEIDER: Two things, first a small (143) in response to something raised by Carl, as far as the documents accessible on the web somewhere between Tom Duffy and the committee and Jeremy Dunning and Continuing Studies it will be on the web I'm told very soon that will be of practical use to people. Tom if you want to add anything to that you can but that's something we'd had hoped to have ready by now but it's not and we'll work on that. Secondly, in response to the President's request for discussion and response for the report rather than this being the final word the Agenda Committee is referring this to two UFC Committees, the Educational Policies Committee and Technology Policies Committees and based on their further discussion if you have items or things you felt unsaid or if you think of after the meeting you can forward it to

one or the other of those committees and if those committees want to come back with any formal recommendations to this body or directly to the president we'll do it that way.

BRAND: Good, thank you. Let's go on to the next agenda item which is a report of the Faculty Affairs Committee Status Report by Professors Brantlinger and Hook.

### **AGENDA #7 FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE: STATUS REPORT**

PAT BRANTLINGER: (158) as far as the Status Report and Progress Report. Our status is up (159) (laughter) progress on three issues and I want to talk about one of them and we'll ask (162) his comments and (162) we'll talk about another one. On the issue of post-tenure review, the Bloomington Faculty Affairs Committee is now considering policies specific to that campus and I'll be turning over the text (166) to the Bloomington faculty council agenda committee (167) and during that discussion we decided a couple of things. One is we're calling this policy Merit Review Policy not just tenure-review because (169). More importantly, in our discussions it's come up a couple of times that (171) policy is aimed at advancing already existing reviews if in fact the units on the Bloomington campus, and I say this is true throughout the system, if the units on the Bloomington campus were in compliance with already existing salary policy we might not need most of the items that are in Merit Review Policy (175). I don't know the exact date Ellen can help us there perhaps but sometime in the mid 80's I think we passed a salary policy that was also passed by UFC and the (178) approved by the Trustees and that policy calls for there to be in all units I believe all units with ten or more faculty (180) an elected salary committee that performs a merit review each year (181). In smaller units there's supposed to be according to the salary policy they already have there's supposed to be a democratically chosen system for salary merit review purposes, democratically chosen the implication is the faculty of the unit votes on what the policy will be. It could be six or fewer but I'm going to have to get Ellen to help me drudge up the policy. But in any event, the policy we're considering incorporates some of what already is in place in existing reviews, also incorporates some of the IUPUI policy, but it's substantially different. And we assume that the same kind of conservation is going on all the campuses involved in merit review policies as we are calling this one. The second item that we are considering both in (194) committee and which we are distinguishing separating very carefully from the American Annual Review issue, is ways to strengthen disciplinary procedures, to strengthen and clarify. Ann Bristow and in her conjunction with (198) is drawn out the most recently a proposal for a faculty review for professional misconduct that Ann may want to say something about. I think the key aspect of that proposal is that to replace a new committee to speak from the grievance and faculty board reviews that would be the assigned duty of a judicature disciplinary procedure on types of issues related to misconduct or incompetence, extreme kinds that don't fit under the merit review policy, so Ann I don't know if I should stop at this point, do you want to say anything about it.

BRISTOW: I don't really think it's right to talk about much, the only thing I might add is the way I view it personally in a sense building on the IUPUI (208) not a new start but looking at (209) pieces of documents and see where we might go from there.

PAT BRANTLINGER: I would like to centralize and clarify some of the definitions we've already got in place along with proposing at least the creation of this new committee. I see (211) Ann has already mentioned and as a proposal that will come before the UFC because I think the language in the proposal is such that it will necessarily go to the academic review board at some point if it's approved. On to the third issue and it has to do with non-tenure tract faculty and Sara and Bill (216) the UFC Faculty Affairs Committee helped me by conference call a week ago last

Friday and we have mostly through (218) efforts we have fit the first (219) suggested proposals that we made last fall to the UFC. We fit those into the language and definitions for the clinical ranks and policy that's already in place and more or less just redrafting the proposal to have some of the suggestions that were made during our most recent meeting. Do you want to say something about that Bill?

BURGAN: Yes, I would just say that I do think we've been making good progress on this. Our aim is to present to the UFC at the March meeting a proposal that would be parallel to the proposal on clinical ranks that has passed, I believe in the spring of 96. With that in mind we have tried to (228) this forth coming proposal in (229) that were parallel (229) and this would apply to full time non-tenure tract faculty. We had made purpose I think on the matter of (231) we think it's desirable to have a (232) a single (232).

?: can't hear comment (233) (laughter)

BURGAN: Through the system for non-tenure tract faculty and we may have to find another way of describing or another term to describe one category of non-tenure tract faculty who are currently prolecturers, that is people who were hired who are (238) and with the expectation that they will become tenure tract as soon as they receive the degree. We think it's desirable to segregate that group in the terms used to describe from most non-tenure tract faculty. There are some issues that are unresolved and I think as (242) conversation on our recent telephone conference that we may of gotten as far as you can without having firm numbers and I'm very happy to say that this past Friday we received from the Dean of Faculties in Bloomington a set of data on FTEE4 non-tenure tract faculty across the whole system, across all the campuses, and that not only shows (247) over time but that discriminates between that is gives you numbers for full time and part time. With that in hand I think we can proceed to deal with what is probably the most problematic aspects of the case (251) question of salary how that should be judged and determined and a questionable limitation of numbers question (253) Those issues have got to be fixed there is a very clear statement of our capping respective clinical ranks. But that in particular is a question that we did not feel you could even begin to bring into sharp focus without data and we've got the data now and it's going to be UFC committee's next move to try to agree on the document (259) council and then after that meeting in March this will go back to all the campuses for final discussion and hopefully we will vote and (261)

BRAND: Sara, do you want to add anything?

SARA HOOK: I'll add a few things about the faculty review and the enhancement policy. As you recall in November we sent a letter to accompany the policy to all the regional campuses asking for feedback and we asked a rather general question in which was, could there be some overarching guidelines and themes that we all would share on a university wide basis. And then from there each campus would more or less develop its own policies and procedures, I've had a lot of feedback on that I should add too that I've gone to several meetings presenting again the policy I've had lots of e-mails and lots of good feedback. More to the place where I think I'm going to reconvene the small subcommittee at the IUPUI campus of the Faculty Affairs Committee that drafted the original document and take what's become quite a lot of feedback and input and see if we can come up with a second draft. I think that this will be a somewhat vifracated draft there'll be the beginning sections which the university looked at and we've done a lot of work on the Bloomington campus will fit nicely with some overall feeds and goals and

guiding principles and then from there we'll take a look at the particular procedures at the IUPUI campus. There are some rather large issues to discuss but I think that work can continue now.

BRAND: Thank you. Any questions, comments you'd like to make at this time. OK, (283) we need now to move into executive session and consider honorary degrees.

**AGENDA #8 EXECUTIVE SESSION: DISCUSSION OF HONORARY DEGREES**

Adjournment at 4:00PM in Executive Session