

**Minutes**  
**Indiana University**  
**BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL**  
**April 3, 2007**  
**Ballantine Hall 008**  
**3:30 P.M. - 5:30 P.M.**

**Attendance**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** George Alter, Moya Andrews, Eric Arnold, Julie Bobay, Maria Bucur-Deckard, James Capshew, John Carini, Richard Carr, Keith Clay, Angela Courtney, Les Coyne, Luis Davila, Paul Elliott, Robert Eno, Alyce Fly, Dennis Groth, Robert Hatten, Barbara Hawkins, Amy Holtzworth- Munroe, Kevin Hunt, Laura M. Jezewski, Elizabeth Johnson, Owen V. Johnson, David MacKay, Eric MacPhail, Terrence Mason, Murray McGibbon, Michael McRobbie, Theodore Miller, Theresa Ochoa, Lisa Pratt, Sara Pryor, Amy Reynolds, Paul Rohwer, Elyce Rotella, John Scott, Jeanne Sept, Robert Shakespeare, Sarita Soni, Jerrold Stern, Alex Tanford, Herbert Terry, Neil Theobald, Larry Thibos, Maxine Watson, Cara Wellman, William Wheeler, James Wimbush

**MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT:** William Wright for Betsy Henke, Joe De Jean for Grant McFann

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Katy Borner, Aurelian Craiutu, Patrick Harbison, Christina Kuzmych, Andrew Lauck, Robert Terrill, David Waterman

**GUESTS:** Grace Calhoun (Athletics), Roland Cote (Registrar), Mike Carroll (Registrar), Shannon McEnerney (IDS), Julie Knost (Affirmative Action), Kelly Kish (Faculty Council Office)

**Agenda**

1. Memorial Resolutions

Professor Emeritus William H. Medlyn

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY07/circulars/B26-2007.htm>

Professor Emeritus Clinton I. Chase

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY07/circulars/B27-2007.htm>

2. Agenda Committee Business (5 minutes)  
(Professor Theodore Miller)

3. Presiding Officer's Business (5 minutes)  
(Interim Provost Michael A. McRobbie)

4. Question / Comment Period\* (10 minutes)  
(Interim Provost Michael A. McRobbie and Professor Theodore Miller)

5. Annual Report: Diversity and Affirmative Action (15 minutes)  
(Julie Knost, Director, University Affirmative Action and Murray McGibbon, chair, Diversity and Affirmative Action Committee)
6. General Education Report [DISCUSSION] (10 minutes)  
(Professor Theodore Miller, co-chair, General Education Committee)  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY07/circulars/B30-2007.rtf>  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY07/circulars/GECcoursesummary.rtf>
7. Faculty Governance Representation for Non-Tenure Track Faculty [ACTION ITEM] (10 minutes)  
(Professors Kevin Hunt and Theodore Miller, co-chairs, Faculty Affairs Committee)  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY07/circulars/B21-2007.htm>
8. Automatic Enrollment Provision, IU Tax Deferred Annuity Plan [ACTION ITEM] (10 minutes)  
(Professor Elyce Rotella and Librarian Elizabeth Johnson, co-chairs, Fringe Benefits Committee)  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY07/circulars/B28-2007.htm>
9. Resolutions on the Bloomington Academic Calendar [ACTION ITEM] (30 minutes)  
(Professor Theodore Miller, BFC Agenda Committee)  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY07/circulars/B29-2007.htm>  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY07/circulars/B25-2007.rtf>
10. Campus Calendar Principles- Labor Day Holiday [Contingent on the Outcome of Agenda Item #9] [ACTION ITEM] (5 minutes)  
(Professor Theodore Miller, on behalf of the Calendar and Schedule Committee)  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY07/circulars/B23-2007.rtf>
11. Policy and Procedures on Research Misconduct [ACTION ITEM] (20 minutes)  
(Professors George Alter and Randy Arnold, co-chairs, Research Affairs Committee)  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/AY07/circulars/U13-2007.rtf>
12. Standing Committee Reports
13. Old Business
14. New Business

## **AGENDA ITEM #1: MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS**

**MCROBBIE:** Agenda Item #1. Normally Jeanne Sept reads the memorial resolutions on the faculty members who have passed away since the last meeting. She's, I believe, still absent over seas though she returns soon. What I'd like to propose is that the memorial resolutions as per

those URLs be incorporated in the minutes and that we simply stand to observe a moment of silence in honor of those departed colleagues.

Memorial Resolution:

PROFESSOR EMERITUS WILLIAM H. MEDLYN

(May 15, 1925 - September 10, 2006)

William H. Medlyn, professor emeritus in the School of Education at Indiana University, passed away in Bloomington on September 10, 2006. Much of Bill's 40-year professional career was spent in service to Indiana University.

Bill was born in Ishpeming, Michigan on May 15, 1925, and after graduating from high school in 1943, he spent three years in the military. He took courses at Stanford University before being shipped overseas during World War II. He served in Europe with the Company B 66th Infantry Regiment of the 71st Division of Patton's third army, and his unit liberated the notorious death camp at Gunskirchen Lagen and fought in the Rhineland and Central European campaigns. He also served in the signal corps at Eisenhower Headquarters in Germany. His unit held positions along the Enns River in Austria, which was the farthest East of any United States ground forces in Europe. Bill earned the Bronze Star for his actions in ground combat against the armed enemy, and his recollections are on file with the Library of Congress World War II Collection.

Following his military service, Bill earned his BA degree from Northern Michigan College, where he was elected secretary of his graduating class in 1949. He began his career as a school leader in 1949 as superintendent of Stanton Township in Houghton, Michigan, and he was the youngest superintendent in the state. He then decided to pursue additional education and completed his master's degree (1951) and PhD (1955) at the University of Michigan. While working on his graduate degrees, he was the night attendant for the State Hospital in Ypsilanti, so he worked all night and then attended classes during the day. He even assisted doctors during emergencies when no nurses were available!

After receiving his PhD, Bill became superintendent of schools in Novi, Michigan. He also served as an adjunct professor at the University of Michigan and at the California State Polytechnic University, San Luis Obispo, California.

Professor Medlyn came to Indiana University in 1961 as Director of College and University Placement. He provided leadership in the Bureau of Educational Placement in the School of Education from 1961 to 1976. In 1976, Bill became a full-time faculty member in the Department of School Administration (now Educational Leadership and Policy Studies) in the School of Education. He taught the introductory course in school administration and a seminar for students completing their educational specialist degree. Bill taught at IUPUI as well as IUB. He provided invaluable service in advising hundreds of students who were pursuing graduate degrees in educational leadership, and his student advising extended beyond the core campus. He worked with students at IU-South Bend and IU-Northwest who were taking graduate courses

and planning on completing their degrees in Bloomington. He also played a leadership role in working with international graduate students in educational leadership.

In the early 1980s Professor Medlyn was instrumental in launching the Network of Women Administrators to provide assistance to women who were trying to break into the male-dominated field of school administration. Professor Medlyn and another faculty member found financial support for the Network to hold an annual meeting and reception for women interested in pursuing administrative roles. This Network flourished and is still meeting today; among its current members are some of the most influential educational leaders in the state.

Professor Medlyn also served in various leadership roles in the Association of Schools, Colleges, and University Staffing at the state, regional, and national levels. In addition, he was involved in conducting surveys and studies of school districts and was made a Kentucky Colonel for his work with school districts in that state. He also was very active in Phi Delta Kappa and held various offices including president of the Alpha Chapter of PDK. He was named a George E. Reavis associate of the PDK Educational Foundation, and in 2006 Bill was awarded the Centennial Award for Distinguished Service to PDK.

In addition to his professional activities, Bill was always active in civic organizations. He was a charter member of the Rotary Club in Novi, Michigan and subsequently was a member of the Rotary Club in Bloomington. He also did volunteer work for various charities, including the Red Cross.

Professor Medlyn retired from IU in 1989. He and his wife, Ida Giotto Medlyn, remained in Bloomington where they were involved in various community and university activities. They also enjoyed spending time with their three sons and eight grandchildren. Bill's legacy lives on in the students he taught and advised for many years at IU. We are all indebted to Bill for his many contributions to IU and to education in Indiana and beyond.

In recognition of his devotion to the university and to his profession, be it resolved that this resolution be a part of the minutes of the Bloomington Faculty Council and that copies be sent to his wife Ida of Bloomington, his sister Barbara Gauthier of Ishpeming, Michigan, and his three sons, Mark Medlyn of Champaign, Craig Medlyn of Baltimore, and Stephen Medlyn of Evansville.

Martha McCarthy

Chancellor's Professor and Chair

Educational Leadership & Policy Studies

## **Memorial Resolution**

**CLINTON I. CHASE**

**(14 August 1927 – 12 September 2005)**

Clint Chase was born in a small logging town in northern Idaho. His father, Charles I. Chase, came from a pioneering family that in America dates back to 1632. His mother, Agnes J. Eikum Chase, was a first generation American of Norwegian ancestry. When Clint was two years old, his father died, leaving a family of five with considerable obligations and few assets. Clint attended a rural elementary school and then Lewiston High School in Idaho, where he was president of the student body and a letterman in football and track. Upon graduating he enlisted in the Navy, and was stationed at Great Lakes Naval Training Station outside Chicago, the naval station in Bremerton, Washington, and aboard ship off the northwest coast of the United States. He was discharged from the Navy in June, 1946, and entered the University of Idaho.

Clint spent his summer vacations during his undergraduate years working in the forests and lumber mills, managing to cover expenses for his studies. He graduated in 1950 with a bachelor's degree in psychology and as a member of Phi Beta Kappa. He remained at the University of Idaho to complete a master's degree in psychology and educational administration in 1951, and then took a position at Washington State in the Office of Student Personnel as assistant to the dean of students. But Clint had taken a commission in the Air Force during his year of graduate study, and when the Korean War broke out he was called to active duty in 1952. He spent the next three and a half years as a psychologist in the military. He was released from active duty with the rank of captain in 1955.

During his tour of duty in the Air Force Clint encountered what he claimed was his greatest stroke of luck. He met Patricia L. Cronenberger, a fellow member of the Air Force, and in 1959 they were married in Reno, Nevada. They have one son, Steven M. Chase, and two delightful grandsons.

After leaving the Air Force, Clint enrolled at the University of California, Berkeley, where he completed a PhD in Educational Psychology in 1958. During his graduate study he worked part time as a school psychologist. Following brief faculty appointments at Idaho State University and Miami University of Ohio, Clint came to Indiana University in 1962, where he was appointed in the Bureau of Evaluative Studies and Testing and in the Department of Educational Psychology. He served as associate director and director of the Bureau for eighteen years. In his first years in the Bureau data analysis was still being done via punched cards, and formatting was done by manually wiring an 80 x 80 board. Clint brought automated electronic test scoring to IU, and he developed the first electronically scored student rating of faculty programs, known as Multi-Op. Clint also served as chair of the Department of Educational Psychology for four years.

Clint taught statistics and psychometrics courses for more than thirty years. He was a respected and popular instructor; in 1979 he received a University distinguished teaching award. He also taught as a visiting professor at the University of California at Los Angeles and the University of Washington.

Clint was a productive researcher and writer and did valuable service in his professional association. He was the author of five books (one co-authored) and 124 articles. His writing

brought him correspondence from every continent. For eight years he served on the board of the Educational Psychology Division of the American Psychological Association, was an editor for the APA, and holds an APA citation for distinguished service to the profession. He also served as consultant for domestic and foreign education endeavors.

Professional service beyond the university was also a regular activity for Clint. He testified before the Senate Education Committee on several occasions, and also before the House Committee. He was a member of the Blue Ribbon Committee that developed the first ISTEP statewide tests for Indiana public schools. He conducted dozens and dozens of workshops in public schools to help teachers make better examinations and to make better use of examination data. On many research projects sponsored by the State Department of Education he was the Project Director. He also assisted nine medical groups in developing certification examinations for admittance to various specialties.

Clint's wife, Pat, has worked as a remedial reading specialist in the Monroe Country Community Schools, and Clint also worked in the community of Bloomington.

During the years that Monroe County supported a children's home he served on the Board of Directors and as chairman of the board during its last year in operation. He also served two terms on the board of the Monroe County Cancer Society. Clint was awarded the rank of Kentucky Colonel for service performed to the state of Kentucky. He was listed in Who's Who in the Midwest and in Who's Who in America.

Clint was a gentle person, well-liked by colleagues and students alike. He was particularly well-known for his wry sense of humor and his fondness for puns. He enjoyed sailing, and he was an amateur painter, winning numerous ribbons at statewide and regional exhibits. In his retirement he continued to pursue research and writing, contributing several papers to professional journals and presenting papers at profession meetings, all the while spending time with oil painting and taking long walks in the woods at the family's cottage on Lake Monroe.

Be it resolved that this memorial resolution be presented to a meeting of the Bloomington Faculty Council, and that a copy be sent to the wife of Clint Chase, Pat.

Dan Mueller

School of Education

With the assistance of the family of Clinton Chase

**MCROBBIE:** Thank you all very much.

## **AGENDA ITEM #2: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

**MCROBBIE:** We are going to move now to Agenda Item #2, agenda committee business. Ted.

**MILLER:** Thank you very much, Michael. I would like to start with perhaps the most important item. This has to do with the location of our post meeting event. I'm not sure where you think you should go for this event but I just want to tell you that you should just go directly to the Tutor Room. Everything that we are going to do there will be done in the Tutor Room. If you had your sights set on some other location in the Union, cancel that and go to the Tutor Room.

**THIBOS:** At 6pm?

**MILLER:** At 6pm, yes. I'd like to say just a word about the so called Marriage Amendment. As a number of you know, perhaps all of you know, the University Faculty Council did approve a resolution at its last meeting regarding the Marriage Amendment. I would like here just to thank Professor Hatten and also Professor Tanford both of whom were involved in creating an idea about the kind of resolution that we might approve that was quite attractive to me and also to the Agenda Committee of the UFC and I would just like to acknowledge both of your roles in this. I think that was a very useful thing to do. The House Rules Committee in Indianapolis apparently is meeting virtually as we are meeting, to discuss the next phase of consideration of that legislation. Tomorrow morning we should know or later this evening I suppose, we should know something fairly fundamental about where this is going.

Item # 6 on our agenda deals with Gen Ed, you'll note that this is a discussion item. Some of us had hoped that at this final meeting of the year we would have this document coming back to the BFC as an action item as sort of a final approval of the program if you will, as we will discuss when we get to this item. A lot of work has been done but there really was too much to do really to get it all done by this meeting. There is a certain aspect of it that will carry over to the fall. That's just to clarify why this says discussion rather than action.

Then we have two items on the agenda regarding calendar issues, Item 9 and Item 10. I just want to point out to you regarding number 10 you will note that this item is contingent on the outcome of Agenda Item 9. By that I mean, if the council votes to approve something, whatever the form it might be in number 9, we will not have Item 10 on our agenda. That's kind of a backup to be considered if the council votes no on those items related to number 9.

I would also like to remind you that we have a long agenda typical for the final meeting of the year. We have some fairly brief periods of time to do what we need to do with these things. Let's try to keep that in mind as we get into this.

Finally, I would just say that on behalf of the Agenda Committee that we really do appreciate all of the work that you folks have done this year. We come to the end of the year I think feeling fairly good about where we've been and what we've accomplished here. I just say thank you on behalf of the Agenda Committee for helping achieve those ends if you will. Thank you.

## **AGENDA ITEM #3: PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS**

**MCROBBIE:** Agenda Item # 3, I just have a couple things to comment on. I can't remember whether I mention this last time but I don't believe so. I've asked the Agenda Committee for names for a search committee for the position of Provost for the Bloomington campus. They've given me names. I am at the moment negotiating to identify a chair based on recommendations to me. I was hoping to have this done by today, but for various reasons, it's been proved difficult to track certain people down. I was hoping also to have this ready to announce to the Trustees later this week who the search committee would be. It's still not quite tied down yet, but it may be by the end of this week. This committee will be put into place pretty rapidly, and I expect them to move within the next couple of weeks.

Also there are a number of reviews starting to mount up. One them is a review committee for the Dean of the School Music. I think these matters are appropriate to mention publicly. Professor Anya Royce has agreed to chair that committee. I'm now working on finalizing the membership of that committee as well. There are two other committees I think that have come out of their deliberations. One is a committee on the impacts on the Life Science's Initiative on the campus. That one I'm going to leave until we know how much of the Life Science's initiative in fact is going to be funded by the state. Then finally one that frankly I haven't gotten to yet is the Nomenclature Committee to respond to his concerns, but I have names for that and that's just frankly the matter of hours in a day at the moment to get that one done. I hope to get that one done pretty soon. So those are the, I believe, the four committees that I have on my plate to get finalized and their making their way to conclusion. That was all I really wanted to mention.

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

**MCROBBIE:** So we move to Agenda Item #4, the Question and Comment Period. Before we start this, could I just note that I believe it is the appropriate practice here that the questions can only be asked by members of the BFC. Any other faculty members wishing to ask questions should submit those questions in advance to the office, the Faculty Council Office, or to either Ted or me. I believe at any other stage of the meeting if anybody is not a member of the BFC wishes to speak they need to explicitly ask for recognition before they speak. I mean we don't want to treat this like the House of Lords but, I think it's important that we have at least some adherence to our procedures. Having said that are there any questions or comments for Ted or me? No questions or comments.

**TERRY:** I am mindful of our agenda today, but I do have a comment on behalf of the Agenda Committee. It's customary at the closing meeting of the year for the Agenda Committee to bestow certain small, and we hope appropriate gifts upon outgoing presidents of the BFC. This being Ted's last meeting as a BFC president at the end of his second term as president, we are going to do that. His second term makes his very hard to buy for but we've tried to do our best and not duplicate what came before. So Ted would you come up here for a moment please.

These awards are in honor of the last two years when he's been our president but I have here a full page of Ted's service largely to faculty governance. This includes nine terms as an elected member of the BFC, 20 years, not all consecutive but mostly so, on the Educational Policies Committee, 8 years on the MRE, something in reorganization, which has never met but is a good



thing to be on for 8 years, service on the Calendar Committee, so we will see how that goes today, and many other things. As I said we had a hard time figuring out what to do. As far as we know, Ted does not have many serious vices but, we did learn that he had a passion for something. We charged Julie with going out and locating and she succeeded. So that is a butterscotch pie, which we hope you enjoy, you and Joyce enjoy.

**MILLER:** From Gray Brothers, its primo stuff if you are interested. Thank you very, very much.

**TERRY:** There's more, there's more. We have Amy who's a member of the journalism faculty and over there they do lots of good things with news and graphics and things like that. We were told that Ted wanted a plaque, which we interpreted as just something to hang on his wall.

**MILLER:** You know long years of retirement something to look at.

**TERRY:** So with Amy's assistance we have a plaque here that incorporates headlines and some stories from the IDS and elsewhere, famous quotes about Ted from Trustee Shoulders, from the Indiana Daily Student two of these relevant to Ted's accomplishments and a fake parking permit form hell.

Then we have one more, then we'll let you talk at the end, but we have one more. Given where Item 6 stands today perhaps we should give this pending a removal of an incomplete we will see, but we decided that we would exercise authority that we the Agenda Committee do not have, and we would award Ted a certificate. Actually it looks a lot like an IU degree, and if I may for a moment let me read it to you.

“Indiana University Bloomington Faculty Council Agenda Committee to all who may read these letters, greetings, hereby it is certified that the committee in recognition of his service to the BFC has conferred upon Theodore K. Miller the honorary degree of B.S. in Gen Ed, with minors in Admissions Standards Science, my favorite, Flagship Studies, Clinical Philosophy, Parking Administration, Special Meeting Management, One University Affairs, Background Check Arts, and Calendar Informatics, and witness whereof, this certificate is given at Bloomington, Indiana, April 3, 2007 and it's signed by members of the Agenda Committee.”

Seriously Ted, thank you for your service.

**MILLER:** Well it is a very, very fine looking document. It is indeed. Well I guess I can't say having had some experience in these matters; I can't say that I was not expecting something. But I will say that this is a creative group that I've been working with this year on the Agenda Committee. This is really very, very nice, and I appreciate it greatly. I do not have a long speech to make. In fact, I have no speech at all. I just wanted to say that, as many you know, I am going to retire from my faculty position at, what is the exact date, May 31 is my final day. You know I've been a faculty member here in Bloomington for 32 years I think now. I have enjoyed many, many aspects of this tremendously, but I will have to say that working with the Faculty Council, some of you won't be able to appreciate this perhaps, many people outside this room would not be able to appreciate this, but I have enjoyed absolute thoroughly working within the frame here of the Faculty Council. I think it's just a tremendous institution and a force for real good within

Indiana University. Of several things I think I can be proud of, this certainly is one of them that I am very, very proud to have had a role in this. I will continue to follow the activities of this council in my retirement. Thank you again very, very much.

**MCROBBIE:** I intend to make some comments about Ted too, but I'm going to reserve those to the reception, and I'll add to the indignities that we're heaping on him at that point.

#### **AGENDA ITEM #5: ANNUAL REPORT: DIVERSITY AND AFFIRMATIVE ACTION**

**MCROBBIE:** Let's move on to Agenda Item #5. Julie you have up to fifteen minutes, you and Murray to make your report.

**MCGIBBON:** I'll be all of one minute long. We do thank you very much for moving us to beginning of the agenda. I know the last couple of years this committee's report has been at about 4:28 and I was rather hoping the same situation would occur this year. We've had a very busy year. We had 4 major meetings and many smaller ones. What I decided to do because we had 15 members on the committee was to divide the group up into 4 smaller sub-committees, and our work is not yet done. We had a meeting on Friday and two of the chairs of the sub-committees were not there so we're still in process and I'll be submitting a written report to the Agenda Committee before the end of the semester. We've been discussing our major areas of concern this year have been disabled access, gay, lesbian, bi-sexual, and transgender issues, obviously the domestic partner benefits issue, and the ongoing Benton mural saga. Suggestion for next year would be perhaps a smaller committee. 15 members was really hard to get together in one place at the same time, and maybe fewer agenda items. We had 18 items on our list and we've done as best we possibly can but, we're no where near through it yet. For next year's Agenda Committee maybe we could have something more manageable to work with. I'm going to hand you over now to Julie who has created this wonderful document that you have in front of you. Alright Julie, thank you.

**KNOST:** I'd also like to thank you for moving us to the front end of the agenda for the annual report on the status of women and minority faculty on the campus. I've provided a report for you. I also wanted to mention to you that I produce a different type of report that breaks the information down by department. If you e-mail me, I'd be happy to send it to you, it is being put together now. I'm just going to give you some highlights of this year. Let me start by saying that what I'm referring to is a file that we run out of data from October 1, 2006. This is basically a current profile of our faculty on the Bloomington campus. I've also provided in the material some comparisons with CIC institutions, and if I have to say something, I would say that in many of the comments I'm making your going to see the same trends across the CIC.

So let's start by talking about new hires last year. There were 99 total new hires of faculty last year it was 23 more than the prior year. What you see is that there is a great deal of variability on hiring in. If I had to project, I would say probably this is partly related to budget. That is the year before that in 2005 it was 76, but in '04 it was 100. What I see happening is that when we get into a budget crunch at the end of the year some searches are being pulled back or held off to the next year. So there is some variability by annual year. Most of the hiring occurs at the assistant professor level still about 60% and that was true last year. Women on average the last couple

years, we have hired around 30 women a year. Last year we hired 45, which were 45% of the new hires. Representation on the campus continues to increase for women. It's now at 31%. It's been increasing around 1% a year. That distribution however is skewed and that is, as many of you know, if we look at the stem areas, which is science, technology, engineering, math, you are going to see smaller numbers and less progress. Obviously this is related to PhD production and so one of the other things that I look and I hope you look at in your departments is what the graduate student population is and what kind of PhD production pipeline issues we have coming forward in these areas. Both women and minorities are overrepresented in the rank of lecturer, so that while women are 31% of the campus they are 53% of lecturers on campus in the non-tenure track ranks, and the 11% of the lecturers are minority. Now one thing I wanted to say about that is that that's obviously not good, but it's not necessarily bad. An example is this year in fine arts we hired 4 women, of those 2 of them had previously been lecturers. So the assumption should not be made that if you are hired as a lecturer you will never move into tenure track ranks. You are going to find later when I'm talking about some other issues that sometimes we are bringing people in lecture positions for a variety of reasons with the expectation that should they perform well and so forth they are going to move into a tenure track position.

On minority hiring, there were 17 new hires of minorities last year. Remember that for my purposes and for my reporting I include African American, Asian, Latino, and American Indian. The 17 new hires were exactly the same as the prior year. We average 19 a year. However, because of retirements and resignations our overall increase in minority total of the faculty has not been increasing at the rate we would expect it to given our hiring patterns. Currently minority faculty represents 15.3% of the total faculty. Broken down the black faculty is 4.3%, the Asian is 7.1%, Latino is 3.6%, and American Indian is 0.3%.

I want to talk today a lot about resignations and retirements because it's very clear that we have a fair amount of activity going on there that is having an impact across all ranks. Minority faculty account for 15% of the total faculty, but last year they accounted for 23% of the resignations. There were 3 full, 2 associates and 3 assistants', resignations. There were 2 retirements. In the prior 3 years, we had had no retirements of minorities. Women represent 31% of the faculty but, represented 35% of the resignations. In addition, there were 4 female retirements last year. On average, we have around 34, 35, 36, retirements over the last several years. This year we will have, the best I can count, I'm looking off of Dean of Faculties current list, 46. I have no idea what the resignation list looks like. The breakdown on the resignations, there were 14 resignations among full professors last year. That's twice the number as the previous two years and among those were 5 women and 3 minorities. All of them accepted positions at other institutions. Among associate professors, there were 11 resignations, 1 woman, 2 minorities, and all accepted positions at other institutions. If you want to look at some of the institutions, these people went to, I gave department breakdown and where they went. In the report I think it's around page 17 under the resignations.

Assistant professors, there were 22 resignations. 13 were either women or minority. Most took positions at other institutions. There were 2 I think that looked like they were resignations because of concerns about tenure ability. Among the librarians, there were 4 resignations. Two were women and both took positions at other institutions.

One of the things I did this year is I called and looked into every department where there had been a resignation for women and minorities to try to find reasons for the resignations in particular. It was very interesting. Spouse and partner accommodation issues represent a major problem of why we are losing faculty. 6 of the resignation at the assistant professor level were because of spouse or partner concerns. It appeared that one of the things that was happening was that people were taking first jobs after a period of years the spouse or partner was either finding a better job or was now living somewhere else and they were able to consolidate with a better record because someone had put out a book or whatever and were able to have mobility where they could bring both partners together in a better situation. I only checked among the women and minority candidates so I have no idea what the impact is across the board. I suspect if I look at the males that resigned I'm going to see some of that pattern as well. So that's not particularly good news so I'm going to give you some good news.

The promotions, women and minorities are making up a larger percentage of the promotions. One of the areas we in particular want to look is the promotions to full. There were 25 promotions to full last. 8 were women and 4 were minority. Note that I would make, and I don't know anything more about this, except that we have no minorities in the librarian rank and we have had none for 10 years. In spite of having minorities in the associate librarian rank, so I don't know what's going there but it is certainly something that we probably want to look at. In terms of associate promotions, there were 27 promotions; there were 12 women and 7 minorities.

So let me give you some conclusions about what I looked at after looking at these issues over this past year. One is that we have very tough competition on the hiring side. This is not something that I need to be telling you. Let me give you a specific example. We made 3 offers to African American assistant professors in the law school this year. We did not get any of them. They do not seem to have been location per say issues. That is that two of them had previous ties to Bloomington and felt perfectly comfortable coming to Bloomington. They went to sort of comparable institutions, but not necessarily better institutions. But the spousal issue was an issue. And I don't know what else was an issue but, out of those three we got none. We need to be identifying people early, being very aggressive on offers and getting issues on the table early. I realize that again in search processes that may not seem like it's the appropriate time but, we are losing people because other schools are getting all the issues on the table and addressing them very early in the recruitment processes.

The other is a pipeline issue. I don't know how many of you saw the announcement on the front page of the web about the HBCU initiative, which is a wonderful initiative. Indiana University, this is across the university, it will be both Indianapolis and Bloomington primarily, has partnered with 4 may be 5 HBCUs--8 okay. It will be a program where we are identifying, well it is not exclusively minority students because HBCU's also have white students but, they will be partnering and we will be setting up a program in which researchers can come in and work together with people on this campus and on the Indianapolis campus with the hope of developing a faculty pool.

The natural attrition on retirement is going to continue. We know those projections are there. The retention is certainly something we need to continue to look at very seriously. Spousal and partner issues at hiring and retention level are something that we need to address directly and that

I would put back to you as the Faculty Council because things like the family leave that we have now had pending for 4 or 5 years has not been addressed, and I would say other faculty life issues, the full professor may not be a family leave issue, but people have more choices and it looks like people are making choices about where they want to live. They're having more options to a pretty healthy market at this point. I don't know if you have questions off that but I hope it gives you a profile of sort of what's going on. It probably reflects your experience in your departments. Questions?

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** I have a question about promotions. So in terms of when we think about retention of inside of the university. The length of going from associate to full, did you study differences between?

**KNOST:** Women traditionally have taken longer to get promoted to full and it's something that's been addressed. One of the things we regularly do with the Dean of Faculties Office now is we run anyone who's been out from tenure 7 years plus and look at length and ask departments to look specifically at progress and where there is a specific reason for no progress. To address including things like potentially giving additional leave time in order to complete work if research is the issue. So that clearly is one. I think we've made some progress and that's something we need to continue to do. Just across the board, because number of years to promotion is an issue.

**MCROBBIE:** Other questions?

**ALTER:** Julie, you mentioned that some of the resignations have involved spousal issues. Without having written the report, I wonder whether you have information about how successful we've been internally on the other side hiring people who have spousal issues.

**KNOST:** We are putting forth a lot of effort and I can tell you I just came from the CIC meeting and I know that at Michigan State the woman there said that about 52% of their minority hires we're spousal accommodation issues as well. That recruitment they were just figuring it into the budget basically.

**ALTER:** Because our experience recently is that we've made a number of hires that were spousal. Some at our initiative some at other initiatives which I think were quite successful. I think to evaluate how well we're doing on those things; it would be nice to have information on the other side as well. How often we've been able.

**KNOST:** The other thing I could do is maybe give you a little bit more information about how that's happening because there's kind of different situations some are where both people are sort of at the same rank and there are others where that's not the case. There's more flexibility on some side and the budgeting issue quite frankly it seems like we're addressing. We don't ever have enough money but, we're trying to, at least that's in.

**MCROBBIE:** Other questions for Julie. Any other questions?

## **AGENDA ITEM #6: GENERAL EDUCATION REPORT**

**MCROBBIE:** So we move on to Agenda Item #6, which is the Gen Ed. Report; an update and discussion. Ted.

**MILLER:** You have in front of you two documents related to the Gen Ed. One is an annotated version of the General Education program. The second is a list of General Education courses that have been approved by the appropriate group within the General Education Committee. This document represents the end of a really a great deal of work by the Gen Ed Committee. Not that every single course on this list was scrutinized extremely closely but, a fairly large number of them were. There was information solicited from the departments. In a number of instances, there was more information requested. The committee I think did a very, very fine job working through a tremendous amount of material, identifying courses that they felt would fit within the Gen. Ed framework appropriately. Now this work is clearly not finished. The Gen Ed Committee under the policy approved by the BFC earlier this year, and hopefully which will be re-approved next year in its more final form, under that policy the Gen Ed Committee is a standing committee of the campus. It will continue to operate, it will continue to evaluate courses, it will continue to monitor the state of the Gen Ed program, and deal with issues as they arise. The course list is sort of the tangible result of what has happened this year, one tangible result that has happened this year on the Gen Ed front.

The second thing that you'll find in the circular, B32-2007, you will find beginning on page 3, at the bottom of page 3, material about the so called Common Ground. Page 4 has material on the Writing Component. Page 5 has the Math modeling material. Page 6 has the Breadth of Inquiry part. Page 7 has the World Language and Culture going over to page 8. Those pages essentially pages 4-8 are also new parts to this document. We had some material along these lines in the initial version that you dealt with earlier this year. It was sort of cobbled together from various sources but, this material is material that the Gen Ed Committee has worked really, very hard on. This represents the Gen Ed's Committees ideas about what these curriculum areas are all about.

Now as you know, there is another part to this curriculum beyond the Common Ground. This is the so called Shared Goals part, that's on page 9. The main reason why this document is not in front of you today as an action item is that the Gen Ed Committee has not been able to work over these shared goals descriptions. These descriptions are sort of tentative descriptions, preliminary descriptions. The idea was the Gen Ed Committee was going to write the new versions of these Shared Goals components; they did not have time to do that. They were working on the Common Ground descriptions and also on the course list. This Shared Goals part is the remaining part that really needs to be worked on. Hopefully, I'm not really sure how this is going to proceed, but I'm hoping that we can have something happen during the summer time that will move us forward toward getting this stuff organized, so very early next fall the council can take action on this document again.

You'll also find in this document various comments, and these are included simply to give you information about things that have come up within the context of the Gen Ed Committee. There are a couple places where the language that was used originally in this document was interpretable in a couple of different ways, and there is some material here that tries to set out

what the view of those matters is now after the committee has done months of work on this particular matter.

So this is the state of affairs as it exists right now. We are trying to get some sub-committees together to work on this Shared Goals stuff. I haven't really been, well I've been afraid to ask Kelly how that's going because my sense is that the Gen Ed Committee members are pretty much tapped out in terms of what they are able to do this year. I'm really hoping – we really need to get this final little piece kind of done so we are ready to move forward. So that's my report. If there are questions about this I'd be very happy to respond.

**THIBOS:** Just a point of clarification, Ted. This listing of courses does not have a circular number. Does that mean that's confidential, or can it be shared with other faculty members?

**MILLER:** No, no it's not a confidential document at all. I was thinking that is was really an attachment to the circular B30. So that's the way I've been thinking about it, but it certainly is not a confidential document that is something that can shared broadly and probably should be I think.

**MCROBBIE:** Amy.

**HOLTZWORTH-MUNROE:** Related to the list, did you set this up as just an example list or is this actually a current working list.

**MILLER:** This is currently the list. The courses that were submitted to the Gen Ed Committee have been...

**HOLTZWORTH-MUNROE:** Are you sure this is a complete list, for example your Natural Mathematical there is nothing alphabetically after, bam! I mean there seem to be some mistakes on this list. I mean if look if you look at the Natural Mathematical list for example it stops like bam. There are no courses, there's no, this cannot be a complete list because of the state this is in right now.

**MILLER:** The Natural Mathematical folks are they still working through.

**KISH:** No their done. It's still preliminary though. Even after I update it, it's still preliminary.

**HOLTZWORTH-MUNROE:** Apparently there's only one psychology course that would count for anything in Gen Ed on this list.

**MCROBBIE:** There apparently is less for you.

**MILLER:** There apparently are some courses that have been approved that are not yet on this list. So that will be updated.

**KISH:** There will be more added every other week for the next decade I bet.

**MILLER:** And as I say this is a continuing process. I mean the Gen Ed Committee has received a number of course proposals that they really had some basic questions about, and they have sent those back to the departments for a response. So this is an ongoing process.

**MCROBBIE:** Other questions?

**SCOTT:** I just want point out that the lists are not actually alphabetical. If you take a look at them you'll find that they are not in alphabetical order, they are just lumped by departments. Natural Mathematical starts with m then goes to a, e, and s.

**KISH:** The way that it's organized at the moment was to illustrate the courses that are outside the college are listed first.

**FEMALE SPEAKER:** It's by school. So you're still missing, for example, physics on the Natural & Mathematics.

**KISH:** At some point in time, some brilliant person in the marketing office will turn this into something that students can find useful.

**MCROBBIE:** Bill?

**WHEELER:** I think this is fine. I really impressed with the work that work that's been done. So I'd like to move to the council expresses it's appreciation and thanks to this committee for its hard work.

**MCROBBIE:** Can I take that without discussion. I don't think anybody wants to speak against that do they? Can I take that without discussion? I'll take it as moved by Bill, can I have a second cause I think it's worth having that on record. To second that motion.

**REYNOLDS:** Second.

**MCROBBIE:** I'll put it immediately to the vote unless there IS any dissent to that. There being none all in those in favor signify by saying "aye" those against? Carried unanimously without dissent, I think that's a record of everybody's approval on this work. Any other questions? Yes.

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** I guess this is may be best address to the community rather than to you Ted. There are certain courses that appear in several categories and I guess that's how it should be. But then there are other courses that don't appear in several categories although they logically should. Most of the history courses are not in the Social Historical category. I found that rather curious. There is a very small number and it's very interesting. The Social Historical category only has 100 and 200 level courses. The other ones have 100, 200, and 300 level courses. That's the only one that has that kind of limit on it. And most of the history courses are in the World Culture section. I thought that was bizarre. What do you think Ted?



**MILLER:** Kelly has been working very closely with these committees and she knows more about this than anybody.

**KISH:** So the courses, okay let me back up. So the courses were submitted to us by the Associate Deans into specific areas of evaluation. So the committee did not determine where they would be evaluated. Those decisions were made by Associate Deans or in the case of the college CUE, Committee of Undergraduate Education, reviewed each course. Let's assume the courses submitted to the Arts and Humanity subcommittee were then evaluated by the Arts and Humanity subcommittee and then recommended to the larger Gen Ed Committee for their approval. As was already pointed out lets exclude the Natural Mathematical section here because theirs is definitely not updated. All of the Breadth of Inquiry areas, the Writing, Math and Breadth of Inquiry areas should have no upper level courses on these list. That was a decision made to set those aside until the fall where more time could be spent to talk about them.

The World Language and Culture areas are somewhat special and unique and I think the Gen Ed Committee has basically allowed that committee a little bit more latitude because of the nature of the coursework. Again, though the only upper level numbers that should appear are the intensive versions of really first year languages.

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** The world cultures?

**KISH:** The World Culture upper levels, those are basically off the list for the time being. So you are right this is not the most up to date. It looks like you didn't get the most up to date material. All of the 300 and 400 level courses have been put to the side until the fall because the committee was essentially split on what to do with them. So just assume that those are not there. I will send you the correct version over e-mail tomorrow, but there should only be, and I should mention that there should be no overlapping between the breadth areas and the foundation areas. Those courses are all on only one list. There is overlapping between those areas and the World Culture courses.

**MCROBBIE:** I want you to time break now because we are now behind schedule two minutes. Unless there is really a pressing question to try and keep up on schedule with all these matters that we need to address. Can I see if there are any really urgent questions? Otherwise there being none thank you very much Ted. Yes the resolution was passed unanimously.

#### **AGENDA ITEM #7: FACULTY GOVERNANCE REPRESENTATION FOR NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY**

**MCROBBIE:** So let us move on to Agenda Item #7. The Faculty Governance Representation for Non-Tenure Track Faculty, which I think Kevin and Ted are going to speak to. Kevin do you want to start this one or is Ted starting?

**MILLER:** This circular B21 has two parts to it, as it is in front of you. One of them is a proposal to modify the Constitution of the Bloomington Faculty. Then over on the third page, what is the third page, there is some material that focuses on the By-Laws of the Faculty Council. Now, today we are not going to focus on the By-Law changes. We are going to focus on the

Constitution changes that would essentially authorize a new election unit to be formed for purpose of electing representatives of the non-tenure track faculty, particularly those appointed in the lecturer, in the clinical and in the scientist research scholar appointment categories. One from each of those categories, that's the way this proposal now reads, would be elected from that election unit to represent that group of faculty on this Council. If the Council approves this, then of course we are going have to figure out exactly how that election will be conducted. That's the kind of stuff that would normally be in the By-Laws. We do not need to figure out how to do the election today. It's been pointed out to me that some of our election units in fact do manage to conduct elections that are not described in the By-Laws of the BFC. So it might even be possible to elect people from this election unit without a formal decision about how to do it, and we could just do it the way we do it in other special situations.

So right now we're simply focusing on this language on pages 1 and 2 of this circular B21. You'll see that there are a couple of changes in the current constitutional language that have to be, minor changes that have to be done in order to have this all make sense. The main item is at the top of page 2.

**MCROBBIE:** I think this is pretty clear and straight-forward. Is there any discussion on this point?

**MILLER:** I'll just make one other comment. We have several other constitutional changes that the council has approved. Our intention is if this is approved that we would have a ballot made up that would go to the faculty on the campus eligible to vote. There's an item regarding the School of Informatics as an election unit. That's not part of the language in the Constitution right now. We approved that earlier and there's language about the presiding officer of the Bloomington Faculty Council that we approved earlier. That language if you'll recall says that the Provost and the President essentially share presiding officer role for the Bloomington Faculty Council and we basically make a statement I believe which says that we would like to see the President every once and a while come and meet with the Council and preside over the meetings of the Council. Not every one of them. We understand that this at times is tedious. Not every one of them. Anyway so there would be 3 items I believe Kelly, is that right; that would be on this ballot that we would send to the faculty this one to the School of Informatics and the presiding officer ballot.

**MCROBBIE:** Is there any discussion? Moya.

**ANDREWS:** I think this is an excellent idea that all members of the faculty be represented and I'd like to move that we vote on it.

**MCROBBIE:** Thank you. Second for that motion which is I think to approve.

**DAVILA:** I second.

**MCROBBIE:** Any discussion at all on that we have a motion before us to approve this as amended. Any discussion? There being no discussion I'll poll the motion. All those in favor

signify by saying “aye” Against? There being no against this is carried unanimously. Thank you very much.

**AGENDA ITEM #8: AUTOMATIC ENROLLMENT PROVISION, IU TAX DEFERRED ANNUITY PLAN**

**MCROBBIE:** So we now move to Agenda Item #8 which is another action item, which is Automatic Enrollment Provision for the IU Tax Deferred Annuity Plan. Elyce Rotella are you going to speak for us?

**ROTELLA:** I’ll talk for the team. This is actually-- we hope a small and non-controversial item. We mentioned at the last meeting your Fringe Benefits Committee has been merging for a number of years in this direction to have an opt out provision for tax deferred annuity. The truth of the matter is that most people don’t save nearly as much as they need to save for retirement and there’s a lot of research now to suggest that the difference in participation between opt out plans where you’re automatically enrolled but you can always get out of it is much, much higher by orders of magnitudes than opt in plans, which is what we currently have. University human resources is proposing probably in January 2008 to move to an opt in plan, which is described here. We wanted to ask the Faculty Counsel to pass this very limited resolution at the bottom to make it clear that this is being done with the strong support of the faculty.

**MCROBBIE:** Ok, we have another resolution in front of us. Any discussion on this? Yes.

**HOLTZWORTH-MUNROE:** Excuse me, I don’t know how much control we have over this but the only comment I have is specifying where it says participants will be notified periodically of there ability. It would be nice to have that specified as yearly or something so that doesn’t just go directly to finite action.

**ROTELLA:** Right, actually they are planning on doing that. I didn’t want; the details are not worked out yet so I didn’t want to put that in the resolution. I just wanted to give you some information about what’s likely to be in the resolution.

**MCROBBIE:** Yes?

**TANFORD:** I want to add a slight note of caution as a lawyer, a law professor; you are running a danger in an opt out provision. Certainly some incoming faculty at the time that they negotiate their contracts understand how the financial world works and others frankly are on another planet. They are in a position where they are offered generally and fairly informal terms initially a contract of a certain salary. The first time they get a paycheck and find the budget had been deducted into a retirement account that they can’t get at, if this isn’t handled carefully you have the potential even legal problems with breach of contract that you are not paying them as much in a meaningful sense as they thought they were contracted for.

**ROTELLA:** This would not happen for the first paycheck for new hires. It would happen after 60 days. So it wouldn’t happen in their first paycheck.

**TANFORD:** It doesn't change. It still will happen to somebody they will see it. That may be even more dangerous because after a couple of paychecks they stop looking at them carefully.

**ROTELLA:** Possibly. This is now legal. The law has changed to allow this to happen.

**TANFORD:** I'm perfectly aware of that, you don't have to say the reason. I'm just saying that you are running a risk that people handling the negotiation over salaries will not be lawyers and will not be careful about the terms in which they do that and to make it clear in the offer acceptance process that this money may-- that there is this opt out process. As a lawyer, I distrust this a little bit. I yield to the benefits committee that this is a good thing, and I agree with the spirit behind it, just a little note of caution.

**ROTELLA:** But it's hardly a problem there are many, many universities where in fact people don't have it on opt out position. They actually have to contribute.

**MCROBBIE:** Other discussion other comments? Moya.

**ANDREWS:** That's a good point and maybe we could ask the Dean of Faculties office to work on adding some additional language to the formal letter which goes out when the offer is set forward.

**MCROBBIE:** Yeah I think that's exactly the right way to handle it.

**TANFORD:** I do too.

**MCROBBIE:** Yes, Larry?

**THIBOS:** Just a point of observation, in the third paragraph the last sentence it says research shows that many more people save for retirement with accesses to opt in plans. Is that typed wrong?

**ROTELLA:** Oh yes, I'm sorry it is. It should be opt out. Yes, sorry.

**MCROBBIE:** Impressive. Others, yes Herb.

**TERRY:** It's beyond our jurisdiction, were just talking about faculty but at least this wouldn't apply to staff?

**ROTELLA:** This would apply for all employees.

**TERRY:** I would say that presumably we hire intelligent people as faculty who often read there contracts. We hire intelligent staff too, but I don't what systems we have for briefing them on issues of their hiring. I think we need to work beyond the Dean of Faculties office but also we need to make sure but also we need to make sure everybody...

**ROTELLA:** \_\_\_\_\_ staff council.

**MCROBBIE:** Other discussion? I think this is a resolution, but I believe it will need to be formally moved. Can I have a motion that formally moves this resolution as a motion.

**ANDREWS:** So moved.

**MCROBBIE:** One for Moya. A seconder?

**WHEELER:** Second.

**MCROBBIE:** Bill I think got there first. Any further discussion on this? Yes?

**PRATT:** Can I just ask one quick question for clarification. Down near the bottom where the bullet items are 1, 2, 3, 4. Are we approving the Fringe benefits committee recommendation at 5%?

**ROTELLA:** No, no.

**MCROBBIE:** Just the resolution, just the bottom two lines.

**ROTELLA:** The truth of the matter is in this case human resources has been more concerned with it and we've been pushing them to offer this to a larger group of people and at a higher rate.

**MCROBBIE:** Yes.

**O. JOHNSON:** Does this apply just to full time?

**ANDREWS:** No, everyone gets retirement benefits; part-time employees and full-time employees.

**O. JOHNSON:** Would that include student employees?

**ANDREWS:** Not student employees all part and full-time faculty. Isn't that the case?

**ROTELLA:** Will have to check, I'm sorry.

**ANDREWS:** All the retirement benefits are taken out of all employees salaries at the faculty level.

**O. JOHNSON:** It just wasn't stated here.

**MCROBBIE:** It's just anybody eligible for the tax deferred annuity. So it becomes opt out rather than opt in. Any other discussion? I'll then put the motion again all those in favor signify by saying "aye". Against? No against, carried unanimously again. We're on a roll. We're also ahead of schedule by 4 minutes.

## **AGENDA ITEM #9: RESOLUTIONS ON THE BLOOMINGTON ACADEMIC CALENDAR**

**MCROBBIE:** We now move to Agenda Item #9 the discussion about the Academic Calendar. Ted.

**MILLER:** Thank you. You have in front of you circular B29. Agenda item #9 focuses on these two paragraphs called the Resolution on the Bloomington calendar.

[THUNDER] **CARR:** It's not a good idea.

**MCROBBIE:** If we were Romans we'd adjourn and go home.

**MILLER:** You'll note please that this resolution does not commit the council to the adoption of a new calendar. It expresses, what it says is that the Bloomington Faculty Council endorses an academic calendar that has certain features. We know from the discussions in the Calendar Committee that there are problems with the calendar that has such features and these problems appear to revolve around the summer session. So the resolution basically asks the Provost to convene the appropriate campus administrators to discuss the summer session calendar, try to work out something that would fit into the framework that is envisioned here and then return to the BFC in the fall of next year for further consideration of this calendar proposal.

There's also a resolution on Labor Day 2008 printed here. Basically the idea of this is that if the council approves a resolution on the Bloomington Academic Calendar, it is reasonable to believe that that calendar would not take effect until at the earliest the fall of 2009. Possibly not even then, that again is a matter that has to be worked out by the registrar and so forth and so on. But for sure it does not appear that it would be possible to have the new calendar which would have some sort of a Labor Day provision in it. It would not be in effect in the fall of 2008, and in the fall of 2008, as many of you know, Labor Day will coincide with the first day of classes in Bloomington. Therefore this resolution on Labor Day 2008 basically says that we are going to take Labor Day off in 2008.

Now that resolution is kind of tied to this resolution up above. It is not a resolution that necessarily makes sense on a stand alone basis. What we're anticipating is the Council voting on this resolution for the Bloomington Academic Calendar. If the Council approves this then we will act out a resolution for Labor Day 2008. If the council will not act on this resolution for the Bloomington Academic Calendar, if you vote that down, then we have item #10 on our agenda which is an alternate proposal dealing with Labor Day that comes from the Calendar Committee, this year's Calendar Committee. So that's kind of the outline of where we are.

Now you have two other documents in front of you. One is circular B25. These are calendar principles that would be up for consideration in the fall next year. You'll note that principle, #13 the summer session, principle is not described there. That presumably is something that would be formulated by Provost and through some process. With that one put in place this would be the new set of Calendar Principles. We are not voting on these Calendar Principles today. We are

voting on a resolution that might lead us to the point where we could vote on those calendar principles.

Now we also have in front of you a white document that came to us from Rob Shakespeare. And Rob why don't you go ahead and say what you want to say about the origin of this document.

**SHAKESPEARE:** Thanks. It is specifically addressing the top item of B29. In the current wording there's an implied mandate to implement the list of calendar changes pending a successful study to compress or to change the summer sessions. There are many concerns in the performing arts which need to be studied and surfaced so that the consequences of this type of mandate are clearly known and can be seen by all of you. To that affect, I'm proposing an amendment be it friendly or perhaps seconded, which appears on the white document, which adds a few clauses or options. For example the Bloomington Faculty Council rather than endorses, supports the exploration of, and exploration means it could be yes or no. Further down in the second paragraph, I have added if viable, and then finally the final line is again following through that if the implementation timeline and everything else appears viable then we'll move forward and try and work on it.

So I can speak from the Department of Theatre and Drama, we have been working during the past two weeks studying what the ramifications might be. It's far deeper than we thought on the surface. Yes I have indeed looked at other colleges. In fact the associate chair Peter in Illinois talks about really wishing that he hadn't started so early and the consequences of it and I believe that the School of Music also has some very serious concerns that they'd like to study and then present them before we mandate this moving forward.

**MCROBBIE:** Amy.

**HOLTZWORTH-MUNROE:** I have two questions and there both kind of process issues as opposed to what I really think about the calendar. One that I'm hoping maybe Ted you can clarify for me is why the Calendar Committee is recommendations not the only one coming forward? I mean we have a committee do you suppose we've reviewed these things that I'm confused by the process of a different proposal being made of the Agenda Committee. I don't know if you can fill us in on why we're getting a proposal from the committee that's been appointed to deal with this issue and then a different proposal you're actually asking us to consider first from a group who's not appointed to deal with this issue.

The second question I have just a general point is, I'm sure as a new provost you've got lots of other things to do besides this, and I personally would offer the discussion I'm pretty uncomfortable just sort of appointing this off to someone else. Then again I think it's our role to grapple with these things and what requires a \_\_\_\_ here requires a \_\_\_\_ here but it's our decision to have to handle these things not just ask the provost to do this. So if you could address maybe the first issue I'd appreciate that. I'm confused because it's not our normal procedure.

**MILLER:** Well, the proposal to adopt a calendar that is roughly described by these Calendar Principles was proposed to the Bloomington Faculty Council by the Calendar Committee in 2002. The Bloomington Faculty Council discussed that proposal for about well, I'm not sure, the

minutes of the meeting take up about a page and a half. At the end of one of its meetings and the proposal basically was not acted on by the Council the meeting just ended at 5:30. Our parliamentarian-- basically what that means is that the council tabled that proposal. So what the Agenda Committee has done after 4 years or so, has been to resurrect the proposal of the Calendar Committee in 2002 because it really does seem to us that the Calendar Committee during that year was chaired by Kim Walker who was one of Moya's Associate Deans at the time. The Calendar Committee that year did what we think was a very, very thorough evaluation of the calendar issues, made a proposal that was simply not dealt with as a proposal normally would be by the Bloomington Faculty Council. So we're taking that proposal off the table. It's not a normal proposal of the Agenda Committee; it's really a proposal coming from the Calendar Committee. So we've spent a good bit of time talking about this however and we believe that the Bloomington Faculty Council really should deal with this issue. The calendar problems have been with us for a long time. We all know what they are we've talked about them. The Calendar Committee has been really locked in sort of a conflict over these issues and has really been unwilling to endorse the recommendations of the 2002 committee.

My feeling about is that the Bloomington Faculty Council ought to make a decision about the calendar. At this point, I frankly don't care what the decision is, but I think that the Bloomington Faculty Council owes it to the campus to make a decision about these calendar issues that continue. Every year the Calendar Committee gets into it and they talk about the same stuff over and over and over and over and over again. They get into some kind of a situation where they don't feel that they can make a recommendation.

**HOLTZWORTH-MUNROE:** This year's Calendar Committee has made an alternative proposal. Is there someone from that committee to explain why they made that proposal?

**MILLER:** Bill.

**WHEELER:** First, responding to your original question I think it's important to bear in mind that the Calendar Committee is not a council committee, in contrast to the other committees; the Fringe Benefits Committee, the Educational Policies Committee, the Student Academic Appointee Committee so on and so forth. Those are all committees on the council and therefore at least historically have been precedent that motions that come from a council standing committee are made and seconded by virtue of coming from a council committee. On the other hand the Calendar Committee is a committee from the Dean of Faculties office. It's an administrative committee that is not appointed by the council. So it's making a recommendation to the council but it can't actually move something to the council because it's not a council committee. Therefore it falls to the Agenda Committee that does have the constitutional authority to act on these matters. It falls to the Agenda Committee to determine whether something is actually a motion coming from a non-standing committee. I think that perhaps Ted has presented a fine summary of the situations there and that it is appropriate. I'm a member. I have been of Calendar Committee for several years and I think that the procedure that the Agenda Committee is coming to is a productive one.

**MCROBBIE:** Moya?



**ANDREWS:** I think this is an uncomfortable discussion. I too think that Amy's right about the process that we did have a tabled recommendation and it might be helpful, since it is such a complicated issue, if we did have a report in the fall from the Calendar Committee, because they're the people that have really wrestled with the intricacies. And it is a committee that has representatives from all schools and Rob's presented a very good summary and a good alternate amendment, but there are also the sciences and as you mentioned the School of Music. There are so many people that have contributions that we really need to hear about.

The other thing I think we should consider before we do anything that discusses summer sessions is to, Neil probably is someone who could be involved in this, is there is a lot of money involved in terms of summer sessions. We generate a lot of income for this campus from our summer session classes and it's a very delicate balance in terms of upsetting the way in which those classes are offered would really affect revenue. There might be some in depth information that is pertinent that should be discussed before we actually go too far down the road about the calendar as it pertains to the summer session.

It's a house of cards; if you move one card in terms of this calendar all kinds of shocks occur. Since the time is so limited today, I was wondering whether we could vote on the Labor Day issue for 2008, which seems to be something in which there's a lot of unanimity about. I was wondering whether it really does need to be tied to the other more complex resolution or maybe we could ask the chair, we could ask Michael to address this informally, to work with the Calendar Committee, the Deans, or to in some way get information or set up some process so that we could do what the proposal suggests. But do it just in an informal way so that the Agenda Committee for next year would provide us with an agenda item at a committee meeting where there is much more time than there is today. So I would like to suggest that we vote on the one that has immediacy, the one that says in fall 2008 there will be a holiday for Labor Day and that we ask that an informal request be made through Michael; from the BFC to Michael, he understands the problem the intricacies. But let's keep the Calendar Committee in the loop and let's have the Calendar Committee report themselves to this body because there are so many different perspectives that they have been dealing with. The reason they haven't always been unanimous is because the questions are so complicated. I would really, myself personally, would prefer not to vote on this first resolution, but I would suggest we vote on the one that is more pressing. The one about the Labor Day holiday in 2008 but they ask that the calendar question be a priority for a meeting early in the fall.

**MCROBBIE:** Moya, the proposed friendly amendment in terms of your suggestions does that capture the form of it?

**ANDREWS:** Yes, I think the proposed friendly amendment is nicely worded in terms of suggesting that we do this in a reasonable amount of time and not try to rush ahead today.

**MCROBBIE:** There are a couple of people who I've got to call, but just before I do that, does the Agenda Committee, just procedurally would be easier if we didn't have to go through a motion and then the amendments to it. Do they see this as a friendly amendment? Will they be happy to live with this?

**MILLER:** No, the Agenda Committee does not see this as a friendly amendment. Frankly my view of this is that what the proposed friendly amendment does is to encourage us to do what we have been doing for the last 5, 6, 7, 8; I'm not sure how many years we've been doing it, more of the same. The resolution, the original resolution basically says that the council really is interested in a certain kind of calendar and we would like to start moving toward a situation where we can actually vote on that.

Going to the second question that was asked initially, why do we have a Provost and the Administration messing around with the calendar? It's for the very reason that Moya suggested that the opposition to changes in the summer session appear to revolve around the money. None of the faculty understands the money. We just don't understand it. We don't know what the dean's problems are. So we're going to try to get Michael and Deans together to try to figure out if they can figure out a summer session that will accommodate their needs and not make the campus go broke.

**MCROBBIE:** I think there was another question. Yeah, George.

**ALTER:** I'd like to speak against Rob's amendment and to suggest a different approach that I think might serve your interests better. It seems to me as I read this motion what we're saying is the first part is endorsing a set of principles and the second part is setting up a procedure that might come to a fault and generate a new proposal. Rather than trying to make what is already a contingent proposal more contingent which is what I think you're doing, what I'd rather see you do is suggest--propose for us something that could be added to the principles, that would state what the principles, another set of principles that could be considered and should be considered that would meet the needs of music and other departments. In other words rather than just trying to weaken the endorsement, I think what we should be doing is endorsing a set of principles and I'd like to see what the principle is that needs to be added.

**MCROBBIE:** Bob had the call first.

**ENO:** I don't actually see a substantial difference in terms of action in either of the two proposals. I don't really see a substantial difference between them and not doing anything at all further tabling it, and I think that's essentially what we are doing. Although with the record of the discussion as a steering guide toward the provost and the campus administration and so forth I would not want to see us spend too much time debating between the two. I would support Rob's because I think it sends a signal that in fact we recognize that we haven't acted and that endorsement doesn't constitute action but I wouldn't argue if the majority were going the other way, I'd vote whichever the majority so we could move on to what's of more substantive item. I essentially agree with Moya; these are very complex issues. I don't think we were able to bring them to closer again and it's disappointing to me as it is I'm sure to you Ted that we can't actually done this term and risk the possibility of the next council not actually picking it up which is what happened last year. I just think that's where we are right now. If we can't make determinations the next council will have to either do it or decide not to do it and we should move to the one that we think is viable as an actual action we can now take which is the Labor Day one.

**MCROBBIE:** Paul.

**ELLIOTT:** Well I agree with you, Bob. It is a house of cards and we're not just talking about the summer session as far as the School of Music's concerned. They are concerned that the implication of the proposals for the calendar will mean we start a week earlier in August and that they won't be able to get students back. Basically what they would like is to sit down with a concrete proposal for a calendar and put on top of the performing schedule of the School of Music and see whether it can be viable or not. Therefore I would support Rob's friendly amendment which basically moves us in that direction.

**MCROBBIE:** Yeah, yeah Kevin.

**HUNT:** Can I ask Rob and Paul if they can speak to the specifics of how other universities deal with this starting a week earlier? So many other universities in the Big Ten start a week earlier and they manage to cope with it and Rob has contacted some other universities and asked them how they manage with this. The reason I think it's important to think about the specific's when Kim Walker's committee made this recommendation in 2002, one of the things that committee tried to was to balance the interests of all the different units on campus and they considered the impact on music and performing arts and thought that the benefits to the rest of the campus were substantial enough that it was worth coming up with some ad hoc which would be up to music and other units that are deeply affected. Some ad hoc way of dealing with the fact of starting a week early and just adopt the symmetrical calendar. Having said that I would like to know exactly what the repercussions are for other universities that do start a week earlier.

**ELLIOTT:** I'm not sure that I can speak to that. I can say accordingly we'd have a higher proportion of our students who are involved in festivals at this high level that have yearly schedules that will be fixed and that we can't alter.

**HATTEN:** I would add that we have this amazing opera program that does three operas and they have to be finished before Thanksgiving. They have to get started and singers are still out there on operatic internships St. Louis, Houston, wherever and they can't get back in time and I'm sure it's the same way for productions in the theatre department, it is simply an intractable problem because we can't change all those other schedules and what it would mean is it would compromise; of going to two operas instead of three in the fall and I don't think it's something that the Campus Committee would want any more than we do.

**HUNT:** I don't understand that. If we started a week earlier we would have to cancel one of the opera's?

**HATTEN:** No, what you are talking about is not being able to get the seniors back in time to take advantage of that week.

**HUNT:** But they already can't take advantage of it because we start a week later.

**ELLIOTT:** They are back the time we start now.

**MCROBBIE:** Could I comment from the chair that I realize I won't be in this position by the end of summer, but the way I read this is that is the motion from the Agenda Committee, "at the fall 2007 BFC meeting the Provost shall report to the BFC his/her recommendations on the summer session principle and an implementation timeline for the new campus calendar." I mean that recommendation could mean not to do anything or to leave it as is. So it seems to me with that understanding it's not clear that the friendly amendment is needed with that understanding. That it could be on consideration including everything that you have raised. I'm just trying to simplify the proceedings here because we're going to have to start the march towards the vote in a minute. With that understanding it seems that this could cover exactly your concerns Rob.

**SHAKESPEARE:** My concern is that there are some touch bases places and some gateways through which we can really see what the ramifications of this are. My reading of this was not as friendly as what you just stated. If what you're stating is in fact part of the record then indeed...

**MCROBBIE:** I would be happy.

**SHAKESPEARE:** I could live with the original proposal.

**MCROBBIE:** I would be happy to have it part of the record and so by my successor with that understanding. Clearly your concerns and the concerns of music need to be seriously discussed in those meetings and the people from your units be represented in those meetings and have their opinions assessed as well. Yes Maria.

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** For clarification with regard to the Calendar Committee. It seems to me also that the necessary campus administrators could also comprise of members of the Calendar Committee.

**MCROBBIE:** Sure.

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** So Moya's concern and all affects before could be addressed via this definition of the campus administrators.

**MCROBBIE:** Yes, I believe so. I think it could be read broadly. Bill,

**WHEELER:** One quick comment. The semester would start a week earlier but does not mean it would end a week earlier. It is difficult to see what the semester would still end at the same point in time; it's difficult to imagine why there is a real need to cancel an opera because what you would say is you know that the preparations that you envisioned could actually not started until they currently do so. That is that nothing that happen on those during the first week and then it point in fact the schedule for the operas the schedule would be completely unchanged. I think that I agree there is a need to look how the performing arts calendars would synchronize with it but I think you actually the whole in front of you I've seen a couple memos concerning this which also suggest that the focus has been on starting a week early without taking into account that we would still end at the same time so in point in fact that you would actually have one more weekend then you currently have for performances. So you're actually increasing the length of the season not decreasing it.

**MCROBBIE:** I don't want to get particular but I don't want to cut off discussion but there is a resolution from the Agenda Committee in front of us and it hasn't been moved or seconded. We need to start the process of moving so we can continue the discussion but for this to move forward. Do I have someone to move it?

**HUNT:** I move it.

**MCROBBIE:** You're moving it sorry right.

**O. JOHNSON:** Second.

**MCROBBIE:** Second. Alright so we have that motion in front of us. So now it's discussion. We can allow were members can come up.

**HOLTZWORTH-MUNROE:** Is this the resolution we're considering?

**HUNT:** It's the resolution on the academic calendar about the...

**MCROBBIE:** Let's start with the first one. The first resolution not the second one, we'll do them separately. Okay Rob.

**SHAKESPEARE:** My concern remains the one word "endorses".

**HUNT:** But note Robert this doesn't say that we have to start a week earlier. That's to be worked out.

**SHAKESPEARE:** If it endorses a symmetrical semester and it endorses all of these additional days off. I'm sorry I don't know where we're headed.

**HUNT:** It goes toward that yeah.

**SHAKESPEARE:** I have difficulty with the word.

**HUNT:** We may be extremely creative and come up with some way.

**MCROBBIE:** Yes?

**WELLMAN:** I'm not necessarily suggesting that this is a perfect solution, but I don't think it's the case that it absolutely guarantees that you have to start the fall semester early because you could just chop a week off the spring semester instead.

**MCROBBIE:** Moya.

**ANDREWS:** My concern remains that we're doing this in a rush and we're sort of suggesting too much in this resolution. I really am concerned about doing it now. I worry about time too.

**MCROBBIE:** We have five minutes for this discussion if we can stay on schedule. Yes Alex.

**TANFORD:** I think people are sort of mixing the first paragraph with second paragraph of this resolution. If you actually read it instead of being worried about the ramifications and what the provost is going to do with it, the first paragraph says we endorse the following academic principles of the calendar, that semesters should be symmetrical rather than asymmetrical that we should take Labor Day and Martin Luther King Day off as class holidays for a variety of reasons that there should be a fall break and give them a chance to catch there breath and that there should be a summer session that needs to accommodate the instructional needs of the various units and that would include the music school and the theatre. That is the primary thing that we are doing it seems to me that we are endorsing those as principles that make for good education.

Then step two is to give it over to the Provost for the heavy lifting who will presumably will refer to the Calendar Committee which is essentially an administrative, and we'll pull people together and we'll see if indeed a calendar can be created that meets these principles and we'll report back. If we do not endorse the principles then there's no reason for the administration to go through all of the pain and difficulty of trying to relocate the house of cards. So I think as the Agenda Committee envisioned this, this is a three step process. We decide today do we in fact think these principles are important. If you don't think symmetrical semesters are important then vote against it. If you don't think a fall break similar to a spring break is important than you vote against it but if you do think these principles are important then what this says is you vote for it and then we refer to the Provost and in their office gathering all the administrators who are the people who really deal with the problems of really converting it into a realistic detailed proposal and then they come back to us. They can come back to us with a couple of alternatives. They can come back to us with a proposal that says it cannot be done; it specifically says including accommodations of other calendar preferences, and then it comes back to us next year and we reconsider the specifics, but we can't consider all the specific details until we know if it can be done which is answered by the administration, if we tell them we want to move to these principles. I think we're making this more complicated because we think we're having the discussion that will be taking place a year from now.

**MCROBBIE:** Bob?

**ENO:** I think the only thing is that either of these versions has an issue is the verb requests in the second paragraph. I think that's what we're doing is we're requesting a study. In order to move us to a vote, I think this is the best way to do it, if I move Rob's friendly amendment we can vote up and done on the amendment, I think we've heard plenty of discussion. Find out if people feel comfortable bypassing it and going to the other one. I don't think there's any difference between the two, but I'd like to move the amendment see if we can't have a vote on that.

**MCROBBIE:** Okay the amendment's been moved. Second it?

**ELLIOTT:** Yes.

**MCROBBIE:** Ok, in the interest of time I think we understand the issues pretty well unless

anyone is dying to make a comment I'm going to move to the vote. Moya you seem to be dying to make a comment.

**ANDREWS:** Well, I'm afraid with all of these things that it's making possible to do-- I think for the Provost is certainly the person to convene this to. I just worry about I would like to say they consider such things as a symmetrical fall and spring semester and Labor Day, Martin Luther holidays, a fall and spring five week days, a summer session that accommodates, I mean these if we tie them down that they have to include all of these things we may never get a calendar.

**MCROBBIE:** We now have the friendly amendment in front of us. Which I think...

**ANDREWS:** Oh I see that supports as long as it supports or considers—supports the consideration of or the aspiration of...

**MCROBBIE:** Well we have the friendly amendment which supports.

**ANDREWS:** Right I'm sorry, I'm sorry. I think we just don't need to tie them down to tightly because this problem has dragged on because it is almost in symmetrical.

**MCROBBIE:** Well let us try to resolve it by moving. I am going to put this to vote all those in favor of the motion as amended by Rob, the friendly amendment? Rob's Friendly amendment; we're voting on the amendment. We're voting on this amendment to the motion. If this is passed then the motion then the motion becomes as amended then we revote on the motion. So all those in favor of those amendments please signify we may need to count. Keep you hands up so we can count. Please keep them up we have a numerical disparage. Please keep them up, we have 23. Those against? 22. [Some laughter and some confusion over the very close vote] the amendment is carried 23 to 22.

Now we move to voting on the motion as amended. All those in favor please signify by raising your hands again, and all those against. It's carried by some large number to one. So the amended motion is carried. Now we move to the resolution on Labor Day. Can I have someone to move that please?

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** So moved.

**MCROBBIE:** So moved by Maria. Second.

**CARR:** Second.

**MCROBBIE:** I think this is clear. Oh there is some discussion, yes.

**O. JOHNSON:** Just one clarification is it true that classes start as according to current schedule on Labor Day in both 2008 and 2009.

**MCROBBIE:** Roland.

**COTE:** No, just 2008.

**O. JOHNSON:** Just 2008 okay. Thank you.

**MCROBBIE:** Okay we have a motion in front of us I think Bob.

**ENO:** I'd like to suggest an amendment to this one too I'm afraid. We have in the Calendar Principles on B23 a larger proposal that includes the option to have a Saturday make up class and science departments have declared in the past that cutting a week down from five days to four can create a problem in their schedules. I think we ought to give them an opportunity to address that with this supplementary phrase. I'd like to add to the current resolution a proposal; the second sentence in section 6 of the Calendar Principles B23; Classes will not meet on Labor Day however make-up classes may be held on the Saturday immediately following Labor Day at the discretion of the instructor.

**MILLER:** We'll take that as a friendly amendment.

**MCROBBIE:** It's agreeable to that. I don't think. Sorry, Bill.

**WHEELER:** Just a clarification. So even with the friendly amendment we're only voting, it only applies to 2008.

**MCROBBIE:** Right. Is that clear to everybody? I assume there's no other discussion. This is pretty clear.

**HOLTZWORTH-MUNROE:** Just repeat it one more time.

**MCROBBIE:** It's the second motion on the yellow page, circular B29. It has Bob can read that again. Bob would you like to read it again.

**ENO:** At the fall sessions classes will not meet on Labor Day however; make up classes may be held on the Saturday immediately following Labor Day at the discretion of the instructor. Maybe we want to change the punctuation before however to a semi-colon.

**MCROBBIE:** We'll take it as changed. Yes Bill.

**WHEELER:** One point of added information it's been suggested by my colleague that is to say that he says that some years ago when Labor Day was being considered as a holiday that there was concern expressed in the legislature about this. That was why I think he was asking to clarify whether this was about only 2008. I think that...as my colleague indicates there might be external considerations that need to be taken into account. So that's why I consider it important that we're only voting on Labor Day 2008.



**MCROBBIE:** I think that is understood by everybody isn't it I believe. Okay I'd like to put the motion. All those in favor of the motion as amended by Bob Eno? All those in favor please say "aye". Against? One against carried overwhelmingly.

#### **AGENDA ITEM #10: CAMPUS CALENDAR PRINCIPLES-LABOR DAY HOLIDAY**

**MCROBBIE:** Right so that I think means. What does that mean about 10? We don't need 10.

**MILLER:** No we're not going to act on 10.

#### **AGENDA ITEM #11: POLICY AND PROCEDURES ON RESEARCH MISCONDUCT**

**MCROBBIE:** We now jump from 10 to 11. Policies and Procedures on Research Misconduct. George and Randy would you. George are you gonna take us? Are you going to speak to this George?

**ALTER:** Yes. This is a revision that I mentioned at an earlier meeting. It was discussed at the last University Faculty Council meeting. We need to revise our policies and procedures about research misconduct because the National Institutes of Health has issued new guidelines and we need to put our policies and procedures in line with their new guidelines. One of the, perhaps, the biggest change in this is that the previous policies included disputes about authorship under research misconduct and the new guidelines exclude that as an issue. They've tried to narrow down what they are focusing on.

The other way in which this document differs from our current policy and procedures is that up to now we've had two documents one on policy and one on procedures and this puts the two together. So that's the reason why we're revising this. There were several issues raised at the University Faculty Council, which I think we don't have to go into. I can mention that there is one small issue that is still a matter of debate between the lawyers in Bloomington and the lawyers in Indianapolis, which has to do with actions of council, but I don't think it's a significant thing. It does mean that there will probably be a slight change in wording for the final version adopted by the University Faculty Council. Is it okay if we adopt this and then they modify later?

**MILLER:** Yes, yes.

**ALTER:** I don't think it materially affects the policy.

**MCROBBIE:** Okay. This I believe there's a motion to adopt these Policies and Procedures in front of you. I assume everybody's had a chance to read them. Is there any discussion? Yes Herb.

**TERRY:** I just want to make a point that I made at the UFC and it's largely a matter of principle I think and depending on how the aye vote comes out I may abstain or vote no. In my opinion the burden of proof in this document where the committees are deciding these cases on the basis of preponderance of evidence is too low to protect academic freedom. I can imagine proceedings in which unhappy co-authors or lab workers or something could marshal enough evidence to

convince the committee to by a preponderance of evidence somebody had engaged in research misconduct. I would prefer an intermediate standard that is no longer as clear and convincing evidence that's not as high, it's beyond reasonable in criminal cases. It has a place in the law.

That's said. Of course, I've corresponded with George and others, I learn we could do that under NIH but it would mean that we would have to run parallel proceedings concluding that both standards have been met and that seems cumbersome. So some people believe that NIH has done this wrong. I'm likely to try and raise a question about it rather than refusing to endorse it at this time. That said I do hope it passes.

**MCROBBIE:** Alright, Bob yeah.

**ENO:** George, I wasn't listening carefully enough. I thought you said that one of the factors of research misconduct we currently consider was not included in this because the NIH?

**ALTER:** Right. One of the issues that was under the previous policies was when there is a dispute among authors about whose name should be included or excluded and NIH doesn't want that to be done under this policy. We've drafted a policy on authorship which we're in the process of circulating to deal with that issue and in the fall we'll bring that up.

**MCROBBIE:** Other comments? Yes.

**HOLTZWORTH-MUNROE:** Can I ask a quick question? I have not read this completely so I apologize because I think this might have to do with authorship also. I noted in certain fields there are already ethical standards. Has there been any discussion about if there's a discrepancy between those in the other field versus the ones in the University. I haven't had time to compare them but if there was some discrepancy about the faculty provides. The returning fields set out there on ethical standard for research on authorship issues.

**ALTER:** This is a procedure and the main things that it covers are falsification, fabrication and plagiarism. NIH has said that those are the things that they want to be treated as research misconduct and those are the issues that are dealt with here. These other issues about when there's a dispute about whose name should go first and things like that, NIH doesn't want to hear about that. That doesn't mean we shouldn't be doing something about it, but this is a document that NIH is going to audit.

**MCROBBIE:** Other discussion? Other discussion? Oh sorry Ted.

**MILLER:** Just to make sure you understand what's happening here, we are going to act on this today. The other faculty councils around the state are also taking this under consideration in their meetings this month. The UFC has a meeting scheduled on April 24, I believe, its final meeting of the year. There will be some grand resolution of differences of view about this and as George suggested, in a certain part of this document there is a difference of view between Bloomington and Indianapolis. We're going to try and work that out and approve something at that April 24 meeting of the UFC so that if the University is audited by the NIH this summer, we will have something in place. That's the idea of trying to get this done.

**MCROBBIE:** Ok. With no further discussion I'm going to put the motion that we adopt these policies on research misconduct. Actually I don't think anybody's moved it.

**ENO:** So moved.

**MCROBBIE:** Bob's moved it. Second? Second?

**WHEELER:** Second.

**MCROBBIE:** Bill. Okay we have that motion in front of us. Any further discussion? There being none can I call for all those in favor of those this motion to adopt these please say "aye". Against? Herb has recorded his vote of descent. Otherwise it's adopted. Thank you very much.

**AGENDA ITEM #12: STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS-EDUCATIONAL POLICIES COMMITTEE PRIORITY REGISTRATION FOR STUDENT ATHLETES**

**MCROBBIE:** We now move to I believe Agenda Item #12. Is there a report there? Yes Bill.

**WHEELER:** I have before you a report from the Educational Policies Committee concerning Priority Registration for Student-Athletes for the Spring Semester of this year.

**MCROBBIE:** Bill could you speak up just a little.

**WHEELER:** You have before you circular B31-2007 that is a report on Priority Registration for Student-Athletes for Spring Semester 2006-07. Before we turn to this, I'd like to introduce to you a guest today the Associate Director of Athletics for Academic Services, Grace Calhoun. She is here and will be pleased to answer any questions you may have, and Roland Cote the registrar is also here on the other side. Both of their offices are the ones who contributed the data to this report. I refer primarily to the Executive Summary.

In 2004-05, this council adopted what is called a three year interim priority registration arrangement for student-athletes. If you go to the online version of this circular you can click on BFC circular B26-2005 and read that discussion and then study the minutes for those meetings. In particular though it says that this arrangement is meeting its goals of enabling student-athletes to register for courses and sections that they need and do not conflict with practice and competition schedules without any significant adverse impact of non-student-athletes to register for courses for which they have critical needs.

If you look back to the resolution B26-2005 you will see that another important point of that was urging the university to develop enhancements to the registration and academic advising modules of the PeopleSoft/SIS system that could identify critical course needs for all students and therefore obviate the need for a special administration period for student-athletes. We got to say that there has been no progress toward that goal. The three year term of the interim priority registration for student-athletes would expire at the end of next fall's registration period for the spring semester 2007-08. The EPC has reviewed the data and feels that it is achieving its goals of

enabling student-athletes to get schedules that don't compete with practice and competition schedules, and it's not imposing any significant adverse consequences on non student-athletes. So if the data for this spring semester's registration period the next fall, which I presume is already started Roland, if the data continues to indicate that there is no adverse impact upon non-student-athletes then the BFC EPC will recommend to this council next fall the continuation or the extension of this priority registration arrangement.

Let me direct your attention to the next page, the impact on non student-athletes. In particular to the second paragraph where it says a detailed examination of the students who were enrolled in the 138 closed courses in which 1 or more student-athletes were enrolled revealed in only 11 of these 138 courses might have been at worst case that priority registration by student-athletes had an adverse impact and in the worst case interpretation this would have affected four spots for juniors and 12 spots for sophomores. Even in the worst case analysis, these would not have been critical needs for those 16 spots. That is it would not have been the case that not taking the course would have delayed graduation.

You see then on the final page then the list of courses which were closed and which had registrations of at least one student-athlete and then the number of positions that might have been impacted by that student-athlete, by the student-athletes and priority registration and then it will get into those courses. This analysis is based upon a very extensive analysis from the Office of the Registrar you have that as a single sheet, a white sheet, and on the back you see this very complicated table. If you are interested as to how we came to our conclusions on the data we'll be pleased to speak with you in private after this meeting rather than taking time to explain all of it. It was the opinion of the EPC after looking at this that was a contrast to what were the fears of some members of the council in 2004-05 about the potential impact of the priority registration for student-athletes it appears that those fears have been realized that the impact on non student-athletes even at worst has been extremely modest and it appears that the benefits to the student-athletes has been significant. So we feel that the policy is functioning successfully.

**MCROBBIE:** Thank you Bill. Comments? Comments or questions for Bill?

**HOLTZWORTH-MUNROE:** Are you going to continue to monitor in the sense that when we do move to Gen Ed requirements in theory things could change?

**WHEELER:** We anticipate that we would continue to monitor it. The registrar has developed a standard procedure now, which is fairly straight forward, they have their retrievals written. It's a matter of simply applying it and I anticipate that we would essentially gain an annual report. If at any time if this is extended and at any time the data seemed to indicate that there was a problem then I assume the council would address it. Certainly our presumption is that the data would continue to be collected and reported to this council.

**MCROBBIE:** Other questions for Bill? Yes Herb.

**TERRY:** Just one comment. I was on the council when we adopted this thing and I appreciated Athletic Director Greenspan's coming and making sure this to trying to get the rain check system back. I would hope that the EPC next year would continue to look at whether we ought to

continue to push rain check system because the intent of that was to help other students in addition to student-athletes who had for various reasons difficulty getting into courses that they needed for graduation and a way that would ameliorate this for everybody. So I hope the EPC will take a look at that as well as the narrow issue of the impact of the sum.

**WHEELER:** That would certainly be my hope also.

**MCROBBIE:** Any other discussion?

**WHEELER:** Could we ask Grace if she would like to make any comments.

**MCROBBIE:** Yes Grace any comments you would like to make.

**CALHOUN:** I'll just quickly thank Bill publicly for all his hard work and leadership with the EPC on this issue and Roland and say that it is something that really has a very significant impact on student-athletes. We were very pleased to see that it had a very minimal impact on others and I certainly encourage you to continue to consider it. Thank you.

**MCROBBIE:** Any other comments? There are no other standing committee reports I believe unless anything's turned up late. I don't believe there's any old business or new business. So we are adjourned to reconvene informally at the Tutor Room at 6:00.

**MILLER:** Thank you very much folks. Thank you, thank you. (Applause)

Meeting adjourned at 5:25 pm.