

Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
September 6, 2011
IMU Georgian Room
3:30 P.M. - 5:30 P.M.

Attendance

MEMBERS PRESENT: Randy Arnold, Abhijit Basu, Bonnie Brownlee, Joyce Byrer, Carolyn Calloway-Thomas, LaNita Campebl, Shu Cole, Mark Deuze, Tony Fargo, Pnina Fichman, Jeffrey Gershman, Donald Gjerdingen, Matthew Guterl, Karen Hanson, Lesa Hatley Major, Diane Henshel, T. Scott Herring, Robert Jacobs, Bruce Jaffee, Edwin Jimenez, Padraic Kenny, Justin Kingsolver, Susan Kovacich, Rebecca Manring, Jane McLeod, Patricia McManus, Sherri Michaels, Theresa Ochoa, John Paolillo, Mary Popp, Elizabeth Raff, Deanna Reising, Patricia Riesenman, Bret Rothstein, Jim Sherman, Grant Simpson, Marietta Simpson, Andrea Singer, Bryce Smedley, Sarita Soni, Sonya Stephens, Jerrold Stern, William Swanson, John Tafoya, Joey Tartell, Herbert Terry, Pat Thomas, Frances Trix, Jason Turner, Barbara Vance, Maxine Watson, William Wheeler, Tony White, James Wimbush

MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT:

MEMBERS ABSENT: Maria Bucur-Deckard, Kevin Courtney, Gregory Demas, David Estell, , Michael McRobbie, James Perry, Sima Setayeshgar, Geoff Sprinkle, H. Wayne Storey

GUESTS: Greg Buse, Michael Carrou, Amanda Ciccarelli, David Daleke, Craig Dethloff (Faculty Council Office), Elizabeth Johnson, Diana Lambdin, Mike Leonard, David Lewis, Stacey Morrone, Nik Osborne, Barbara Wallace (Faculty Council Office), Brad Wheeler, Kurt Zorn

Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes

April 5, 2011: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/minutes/10-11/04.05.11.pdf>

April 19, 2011: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/minutes/10-11/04.19.11.pdf>

2. Memorial Resolutions for Stephen Harris Cape and Reinhardt Seigbert Grossmann

Stephen Harris Cape: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/11-12/B4-2012.pdf>

Reinhardt Seigbert Grossmann: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/11-12/B5-2012.pdf>

3. Agenda Committee Business (10 minutes)

(Faculty President Carolyn Calloway-Thomas)

Circular B1-2012: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/11-12/B1-2012.pdf>

Circular B2-2012: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/11-12/B2-2012.pdf>

Circular B3-2012: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/11-12/B3-2012.pdf>

4. Presiding Officer's Report (10 minutes)
(Provost Karen Hanson)

5. Question / Comment Period* (10 minutes)

6. MRE Policy Statement (30 minutes)
(Faculty President Carolyn Calloway-Thomas) [ACTION ITEM]
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/policies/MRE.pdf>
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/11-12/B6-2012.pdf>

7. Report on eTexts (40 minutes)
(Professor Brad Wheeler, Vice President for Information Technology) [DISCUSSION]

8. Update on COIA (Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics) (20 minutes)
(Professor Bruce Jaffee) [DISCUSSION]

Minutes

AGENDA ITEM 1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

HANSON: Time to gavel us in for the first meeting of the year. I want to welcome everybody back to BFC business. I hope you had a pleasant and productive summer. And, our first item of business is the approval of the minutes. Perhaps you've refreshed your memory about these over the summer now that it's September again. Does anybody want to make the motion on the minutes for April 5th and April 19th? Or would you like to wait for next time when you will have refreshed your memory of the minutes. Yeah?

TERRY: We just got them.

HANSON: Okay.

TERRY: [remark indistinct]

HANSON: Okay. Do you want to wait on that? We also have two memorial resolutions today, and so I turn to Tom Gieryn.

AGENDA ITEM 2: MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS FOR STEPHEN HARRIS CAPE AND REINHARDT SEIGBERT GROSSMANN

GIERYN: Stephen Harris Cape was born on November 11, 1953, in Springfield, Illinois. He died April 15, 2010, at Bell Trace Health and Living Center in Bloomington, Indiana, following a brief illness. His Catholic grade school and college liberal arts education prepared him well for the professional life he chose as a rare book cataloger. He received a B.A. (cum laude) in English and Music from Illinois Wesleyan University in 1975, an M.A. in English from Indiana University in 1982, and an M.L.S. from Indiana University in 1984. He began work at the Lilly Library as a graduate student in 1976 and was then hired into a staff position in 1978 in the Manuscripts Department. He held other staff positions before being hired as Assistant Librarian, Cataloger of Rare Books and Special Collections in 1986. During those first years at the Lilly Library Steve studied with and was mentored by Josiah Quincy Bennett, the Lilly Library's first rare book cataloger. Steve was promoted to Associate Librarian in 1992.

With thirty-two years of experience at the Lilly Library, Mr. Cape knew the breadth and depth of the collections. He was an expert in the descriptive practices for rare books and special collections materials. He was extremely knowledgeable about early printed books and the processes that produced them. His language expertise included classical and medieval Latin, Old and modern French, Old and Middle English, Spanish, German, and Italian, as well as reading knowledge of Greek and Russian. His publications included articles in *The Book Collector*, *The Private Library*, *Popular Culture in Libraries*, and several exhibition catalogs. He shared his expertise with a generation of students in the IU School of Library and Information Science, supervising internships in rare book and music cataloging.

Mr. Cape was a recognized authority in the area of miniature books. Miniature books, those smaller than three inches, are both a curiosity and a subject of serious scholarship. When the Lilly Library was named the beneficiary of the Ruth Adomeit collection of approximately 14,000 miniature books in 1996, Mr. Cape took on the responsibility for becoming the Lilly Library expert in the genre. In preparing his 2001 Lilly Library exhibition, "400 Years of Miniature Books," Mr. Cape selected approximately 900 items to give exhibition viewers a picture of what the entire collection is like in its variety. He served as the Lilly Library representative to the Miniature Books Society for many years and was the Local Arrangements Chair for the society's Conclave in Indianapolis in 2001.

Music and poetry were particular interests of Mr. Cape. He played classical guitar, collected stringed instruments, and taught sessions on early printed music for classes in the IU Jacobs School of Music. He was also a volunteer for the Bloomington Early Music Festival. In 1979 he was a founding editor, along with Daniel Bourne, of a small magazine, *Artful Dodge*, which is

still being published today. In the early numbers of the magazine he contributed interviews with poets Gwendolyn Brooks, Jorge Luis Borges, James Laughlin, and William Matthews.

Mr. Cape was perhaps happiest when he was at home on his property in Owen County, surrounded by his pets. He was an active supporter of the Nature Conservancy and was passionate about animal rights.

In recognition of his service to Indiana University and his profession, be it resolved that this resolution be a part of the minutes of the Bloomington Faculty Council.

Reinhardt Grossmann, a long-time member of the Department of Philosophy at Indiana University, died on 2 July 2010 at a nursing home in Texas where he had lived since suffering a stroke in 2001.

Grossmann was born in Berlin, Germany on 10 January 1931. Upon completion of his undergraduate studies at the Pädagogische Hochschule, he went to the University of Iowa, originally to study with the psychologist Kurt Levin. But he soon came under the influence of Gustav Bergmann, a logical positivist (at the time) of the Vienna Circle who had come to this country to avoid persecution by the Nazis. Bergmann's specialty was metaphysics, which became Reinhardt's as well – an area in which today he is renowned and deservedly enjoys an international reputation.

Grossmann came to Indiana University in 1962. During his years at Indiana, he was awarded a grant from the National Science Foundation and was a Fulbright exchange teacher in Germany.

Grossmann wrote ten books and numerous articles on ontology, metaphysics, and the theory of knowledge. His books include *The Structure of Mind* (1965), *Reflections on Frege's Philosophy* (1969), *Ontological Reduction* (1973), *Meinong* (1974), *The Categorical Structure of the World* (1983), *Phenomenology and Existentialism: An Introduction* (1984), *The Fourth Way: A Theory of Knowledge* (1990), and *The Existence of the World: An Introduction to Ontology* (1992). He also translated, and wrote an extended and valuable introduction for, Kasimir Twardowski's *On the Content and Object of Presentations* (1977).

Grossmann was well-known at Indiana University for his teaching of undergraduates. Thousands of students took his "Introduction to Philosophy," "Introduction to Phenomenology and Existentialism," and "Elementary Ethics" courses. Faculty members often tell of meeting former students throughout the world who remember "Professor Grossmann" as the one professor in particular whose classes they especially enjoyed.

Grossmann was well known among his colleagues for his eagerness to discuss philosophical problems and to engage in sustained debate on fundamental positions. In fall 1994, the Indiana University Analytic Philosophy Project and the Department of Philosophy held a celebratory conference, "Grossmania," in honor of Grossmann on the occasion of his retirement.

Grossmann served the Department of Philosophy in many ways throughout his long career at Indiana University. He never hesitated to take a stand on key issues, and he was always more than willing to argue against the latest fad in academia when he thought it was wrong. He was also especially admired by his colleagues for his culinary art and famous parties.

A book in his honor, *Studies in the Ontology of Reinhardt Grossmann*, was published by Ontos Verlag in 2010 shortly before his death.

HANSON: I ask you to stand for a moment of silence in memory of our colleagues. [Silence is observed]. Thank you. Now, Agenda Committee Business. Carolyn?

AGENDA ITEM 3: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Thank you. Good afternoon and my warmest welcome to all of you who are assembled here today on September 6, 2011 at the first meeting of the Bloomington Faculty Council for the academic year 2011 through 2012. I hope that all of you had an active, productive, and beautiful summer. Straight away, I want to thank you for the confidence and trust that you have bestowed upon me by electing me as president of this important Council.

Over the years, my service to Indiana University has been consonant with Nelson Mandela's model of citizenship. Said he and Richard Stengel's book *Mandela's Way: Fifteen Lessons on Life, Love, And Courage*, "leadership service is expressed as Ubuntu, the idea that people are empowered by other people, that we become our best selves through unselfish interaction with others." Today, in your presence, I reaffirm this credo. I also reaffirm my deeply held belief that faculty participation in decision-making is a cherished activity of this great university, and it is a principle that I intend to uphold during my tenure as president. Furthermore, I believe that recommendations for merger, re-organization, and elimination of academic units and programs that are proposed by administrators should be fatefully and carefully considered by this Council following as closely as possible 19th century Jerry Bentham's philosophy of upholding the common good, the good that we share in common, which of course should be determined through consultation, civil conversation, and dialogue. This year the Council will confront some compelling issues including; protecting faculty interests while balancing challenges posed by the current financial crisis, responding to reorganization, restructuring and elimination of policy reforms, discussing declining retirement and health benefits, addressing

the many implications of the bold, forward-looking, new directions report; as well as protecting the values of a liberal education in a rapidly changing globalized world.

Some activities on several fronts that relate to our 2011 agenda have happened since the Council last convened. I will briefly mention some of them, specifically the Family Leave Policy, the Burden Task Force, and the UFC Reform Committee. First, as you know, the academic—this past last academic year—the BFC voted to support a continuation of the current academic Family Leave Policy which provides assistance to faculty at critical moments in their lives, from the birth of a child to caring for an ill family member. The item went before the Board of Trustees this past June. The proposed action, presented by Vice President and Financial Officer, Neil Theobald, and Vice President for Planning and Policy, John Applegate, was to, and I quote, “amend the academic leave policy, adopted on June 20, 2008, by extending it for a three year period, ending June 30, 2014, unless the Board of Trustees takes action to renew or revise the policy.” At the June meeting, the Board voted to continue the leave policy for one year—for one year. And to create a task force that will examine its wider implications. The task force is expected to report to the Board of Trustees at the December 2011 meeting. Members of the Board of Trustees, I should have you know, were very concerned about an open-ended commitment to the faculty leave policy at a time of remarkable budget constraints. They want to see what exists out in the world regarding the policy, as well as scrutinize incentives to use it in the future. Vice President Applegate is in the process of forming such a task force with an eye toward broad representation on it. And as soon as the composition of the task force is known, members of the Executive Committee will report back to the Council.

Second, at Vice President—well at President McRobbie’s August Retreat, as well as at the August meeting of Trustees—it was announced that Neil Theobald and John Applegate are chairing a task force on faculty barriers, fascinatingly being dubbed the “Burden Task Force.” Please recall that recommendation three in the New Academic Directions Committee Report states that, and I quote, “IU must reduce barriers and encourage innovative alignments among academic units. Responsibility Centered Management, RCM, the awarding of joint degrees, faculty appointments, the creation of centers and institutes, and tenure and promotion policies, all are cited as possible barriers. The Burden Taskforce is an attempt to address these and other overarching concerns.”

Third, and finally, the UFC Reform Committee, met several times over the summer to grapple with a major problem that exists across all eight campuses, how to make the UFC work more effectively and efficiently. Over the years, as many of you know, there has been a waning interest in conducting and sustaining the business of the UFC. The UFC reform group is focusing on the extent to which matters such as the size of the Council, the number of meetings held per year, the election cycle, and other factors are constraining the robust work of the Council. The

reform group is in the process of pruning and garnishing a document for your consideration and action later.

Of course there are other issues that are on our busy radar screen, including FLAG EAS, Fostering, Learning, Achievement and Graduation Earlier Alert System, which Provost Hanson addressed in the letter to the faculty yesterday. Members of the Council will be meeting with the Associate Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, Kurt Zorn, very soon to discuss the new system. These are some of the pressing issues that should come before the Council later for your consideration. Thank you.

HANSON: Thanks, Carolyn.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: I have been reminded that we received a lovely request from one of the members of our body, Professor Wheeler, and Professor Wheeler noted that we have a mission statement read to freshman students every year at the Freshman Induction Ceremony, and you wondered whether it might be possible for us to have a ceremonial reading of our mission statement. And when he sent the e-mail to Provost Hanson and myself, he wondered whether the reading would be what he called “hokey,” and of course Karen and I said, ‘We are on the side of hokey.’ [laughter] I have taken some license here. But we did say it would be a lovely idea. So, I can see from your expressions that you think it would be a lovely idea. [laughter]. So, for that reason, we decided to inaugurate a ceremonial reading of the mission of the university. So, if you have your documents in front of you, will you stand ceremoniously, and I will read, or shall we read it together? No? Okay. Then I shall read it: “Bloomington is the flagship residential, doctoral-extensive campus of Indiana University. Its mission is to create, disseminate, preserve, and apply knowledge. It does so through its commitment to cutting-edge research, scholarship, arts, and creative activity; to challenging and inspired undergraduate, graduate, professional, and life-long education; to culturally diverse and international educational programs and communities; to first-rate library and museum collections; to economic development in the state and region; and to meaningful experiences outside the classroom. The Bloomington campus is committed to full diversity, academic freedom, and meeting the changing educational and research needs of the state, the nation, and the world.” Here, here.

AGENDA ITEM 4: PRESIDING OFFICER’S REPORT

HANSON: What I actually said in the response to Bill’s email was that Carolyn could make the reading of the phonebook inspirational, but of course the mission statement is itself inspirational, so we had a double force there. I just have a few items I want to touch on, though some of them are rather complicated and we will return to them given how complicated they are. One of them has to do with the New Academic Directions Report and

we'll come back to some issues connected with that, even today, on number six as we talk about the Council's role in this. But let me give you a little bit more of an update on the timeline connected with that report. As you may remember, that went to the president quite late in the Spring term, in April, and then the president brought it to the Trustees in the beginning of May, and sent out a note to the campus that—well, this campus and the IUPUI campus—that he would like comments from whoever wanted to make comments, and he set a deadline of June 30th. Though I think it's obvious you can still comment on it in any way you want to, but that was the point at which they were going to begin collecting and collating comments. It was, as Carolyn mentioned, discussed at the president's retreat, which does involve all campuses. And again, the NAD is really primarily the Bloomington and IUPUI campus business, although there's some of these things like academic policies and administrative policies that would cut across all campuses. The Trustees have indicated they would like reports on the NAD at every single Trustee meeting, so whatever is going on with this—you know, discussions, task forces, those kinds of things—will be reported at every meeting. The work on discussing and vetting the report really is only going to begin this semester.

There was something that happened in the summer I think that may have made people think things were steaming ahead apart from additional discussion, and so it's probably worth mentioning that the president, in response to state budget cuts, set up a task force or a committee, chaired by me, to provide a plan for the closure of the School of Continuing Studies. Not for the end of the activities of the School of Continuing Studies, but for some orderly plan where the functions would be taken up by other units. And I want to underscore that given that the mission statement also mentions lifelong learning, that's something that's not—that on this campus has been also in the purview of Bloomington Continuing Studies. I don't know how familiar everybody is here with the structure of the School of Continuing Studies, compared to the units of Continuing Studies that exist on all the campuses. It's a very complicated structure. Continuing Studies, in various forms, is continuing. But the School of Continuing Studies is in the process of an orderly shutdown, and students are being notified about what they can do if their degrees are in train, how they can—actually, a fair number of students are being notified that they're very close to a degree and they should try and finish up in the near term, but the timeline on that is supposed to be July of next year, that the School itself will cease to exist. Not the Bachelors of General Studies—that will continue to exist. And there will be ways in which the functions are transitioned to various portions of the campuses.

The other thing that is just now getting underway—actually, anybody have any questions about that because that is the one thing that will sort of happen quickly and it happened quickly in part in response to budget cuts. But are there any other issues about that that you want to raise? [Brief pause]

I delivered the report of the committee, by the way, and just to give you the timeline to the President in about the beginning of the second week of July, and HR and the Budget Office are kind of costing out various options there right now, so no decisions have been taken with respect to a lot of things except that enrollment for the BGS in the online School of Continuing Studies degree ceases now and enrollment in the remainder of the courses connected with that will be devolved out by July 2012. The expectation, by the way, on this campus, is that the BGS will become a creature of the College of Arts and Sciences with assistance from the Office of Undergraduate Education. There are special advising issues sometimes and there are ways in which it's appropriate to connect this with our efforts in Adult Education.

The new dean of the College arrived before July 1st, and began to undertake some discussions with the dean of Journalism about the media and communications issues mentioned in the New Academic Directions Committee. I understand there's a working group preparing a proposal for a certificate in looking at some of the issues about places where there might be synergies with respect to instructional responsibilities. There are other kinds of issues there that are still pending, but those discussions are, you know, kind of underway.

The College of Arts and Sciences itself is taking initial responsibility for putting together a task force to work on the recommendation that a School of International Studies be created. And Dean Singell has appointed a committee chaired by a new Associate Dean, but an old member of the Faculty Council, Maria Bucur, to look at the departments that might be involved and the other schools that might be involved and come up with some kind of plan for academic structure. It is tied in with planning for the International Studies building. As of this moment, there still is no funding for that building, but that's part of what one hopes might be achieved in the proposal for a School of International Studies, that there would be something that would be attractive to a donor. The committee that Dean Singell set up includes representation—I've got his memo here—includes representation from various humanities, language, and social science departments, all area studies programs, and representatives from SPEA, HPER, Kelley, Maurer School of Law, Education, and Journalism. Their charge is to articulate a programmatic plan for such a school, and the idea is that this would basically be a school within the College, but with some kind of structure that reaches out to these other professional schools. The professional schools or the thematic schools I would prefer to call something like Informatics. And I don't even know if any of that task force has met yet, but I think more information about it will be coming out primarily from the dean of the College.

Environmental Science is something else on the table right now, and the expectation is that Larry Singell and John Graham, the dean of SPEA, will be working to see whether or not there are avenues that are worth exploring there. There are new degrees in train even now, and

those were in train before. So, whether or not there are reconfigurations that can take place is something that's really just at a really inchoate stage.

One of the things that is probably worth mentioning, as we mentioned SPEA and some of the other core schools, is that some of the things that are being undertaken on the Indianapolis campus may have perturbations here, if only in the raising of anxiety levels. The Indianapolis campus has recently put out a directive to examine what they're calling 'small schools.' There are some other issues there; things that were assigned basically to Bloomington and things that were assigned to IUPUI. Many of the things that look like 'small schools' on the IUPUI campus are actually just portions of schools that are much bigger here. And, in general, I think many of these schools that have smaller portions in Indianapolis have thought long and hard about why they have a certain kind of programmatic emphasis there, what they're doing there, and the issue of whether or not those schools get folded in to a bigger school, for example the School of Liberal Arts or something like that, is very anxiety producing and it's been mentioned in a memo. So it is probably worth acknowledging that—in a memo that came from the IUPUI administrative leadership. But the Deans of those core schools are responding to that now, and I want to underscore that as far as I understand it, you know, nothing is fixed up at IUPUI, but they are beginning these kinds of discussions and a whole variety of things were laid out, some of which were apparently quite alarming to some of the faculty in ways that again impinge on the faculty here who are members of core schools. So, that's the timeline. That's where we are. We are just beginning things and will return to some of the issues about the role the Faculty Council should play in some of these things when we get to number six. But are there any questions about any of that? [Brief pause]

Let me just make another note that I have—well, one thing still connected with NAD, I have requested a meeting with the College Policy Committee, which wrote a long and thoughtful reply to the NAD address to the President, but I think they also wanted to have meetings with me and Chancellor Bantz. I think Chancellor Bantz does not think it's his place to talk to our College Policy Committee, and I consulted with him, I'm not just thinking that. I mean, I asked him if he wanted to come down for that, but I have certainly volunteered to meet with the College Policy Committee. And I want to say for other schools as well, if there's any policy committee group or any group of faculty who want to meet on these kinds of issues, I am in Bryan 100, you know where to find me. I, myself, am going to be calling a number of all-campus meetings. We've, this summer, began to reserve rooms on campus so that throughout this semester, we could have some all-campus meetings on the issues connected with reorganization, restructuring policies. We will obviously have going simultaneously a number of committees and task forces, you know, many of them set up by the schools and some presumably set up by this body, but I wanted to make sure there were some fora for all of the faculty who were all of the faculty who were interested to talk together, as opposed to, you

know, talking out of the units they might already be in. So those will be coming up, we'll announce those as they are a little bit closer on the schedule.

I also requested some space for an all-campus meeting on the future of the libraries and scholarly communication. And there are issues here that are made more pressing by the tight budget we're all facing, but there are also issues that are really more pressing for intellectual reasons that have to do with changes in scholarly communication. And you will all be invited to that soon. Brenda Johnson, the dean of University Libraries, and I will be kind of co-hosting that, and there will be a faculty panel. Anybody here on the faculty panel? I suggested some names to Brenda about people to invite, and maybe they have and maybe they haven't done that yet, but that will be coming up fairly soon. So you'll get an invitation to that as well.

The last thing that I wanted to mention, and this is not exactly on the agenda and so I assume we will come back to this as well, but the Early Alert System memo went out yesterday and I received one very thoughtful and very detailed set of comments on the information that's already there about the Early Alert System. I just want to respond to that a little bit and Kurt Zorn, who was the lead from the Bloomington campus, is here so he might be able to answer questions you might have and if you want we can have more of a discussion about this if this was made an agenda item. But one of the things I want to underscore about the Early Alert System, and again partly here in responding to, as I say, some very detailed and thoughtful comments, is I don't think at the moment we are understanding this as a survey to gather data which will then be used in some way to retain students and help them graduate on time. There may be ways in which in the long run that's something that it's possible to do with what might accrue from the Early Alert System. But this is something that undergraduate education has been talking about for a little while. The early warning system for students to let them know when they're having troubles in a class, even though they may not realize they're having troubles, and what the faculty member thinks those troubles are. It's intended to give feedback to students.

Right now, what is, as I hope you know this from the email I sent you, what's been rolled out right now is something that you can become familiar with. It's not mandatory this term, but it would be useful if you all take a look. There will be one way in which you all have to take a look because there's one part of what this new system takes over that is actually required of faculty already. But the Early Alert System is to alert students that they are having difficulties in a course. You may think students always know that, but I think you may be underestimating how many students don't know they're having trouble in a course or don't know until it is too late. And many students who are having trouble will not necessarily show up in your office saying, 'I'm having trouble.' If they all did—we always say, 'Well, I'm in my office, come in, come in,' and students aren't coming, but in fact you know that if all thirty-five thousand of them came,

you couldn't meet all of them. There are more students who need a bit of feedback that might send them in a number of directions for help, than I think we are currently serving with our system of sort of laissez faire office hours. The Early Alert System will take over the attendance roster that you've always gotten, you have to fill out. And again, you do have to fill that out. You may think you don't have to fill that out, but that is a matter of federal compliance for us. If students are enrolled but not attending and getting federal financial aid, there are grave problems and we have to report to the government when they stop attending class. So if you know a student is not attending class, you are supposed to put the date of last attendance on that, and that will be, you know, that will have a different look this year than it had in the past.

Coupled with that though, on the new Early Alert System is the Student Performance Roster, which will give you a way, with a few checks, noting when students are having trouble. Now you may not, in a large class, be having to do this for absolutely every student, but I think all of you know that occasionally you get students who suddenly don't come or who give in assignments that, you know, are manifestly off the beam, and you may, you know, you may give them an "F" or you may say, 'Where have you been?' or you may not have the option to say 'Where have you been?' because they are still not coming. This is a way to send them a message, and they will get the message electronically. I mean it should ease the feedback but make feedback something that students get in forms that they are more familiar with right now. This is something that I think will be more comfortable for students than saying, 'If you ever have any doubts about whether or not you know what you are doing in this class, come in and see the professor.' That's quite intimidating for some students. It's going to be something that will help you identify for students when they're having a problem early on in a very safe and easy way, and it will suggest they should go see an advisor, they should go to the writing center, they should, you know, improve their math skills. Just check things if you know what you think is the problem, so that you can send that message to the student early enough for the student to try to take some action.

In the discussions that I've had with some of the faculty, and again in a very thoughtful memo, there was a worry about what incentive faculty have to respond to this request that they fill this out. And very disturbingly to me, the memo quoted a tenured faculty member saying, "It's not my responsibility to monitor student progress." I beg to differ. It is our responsibility to monitor student progress. I think we all are concerned that students take responsibility for their own education, but we have a responsibility to see to student learning too, not just the, you know, beautiful delivery of our lectures or the, you know, wonderful interactive mechanisms we may have for courses that they may or may not be succeeding on, but for seeing to it that they learn. And they have a responsibility, too, but that doesn't mean we have no responsibility. Again, I think we may be underestimating the extent to which our undergraduates need that kind of feedback from us. Earlier, more feedback is going to be

better for them. The memo that I got about this from the faculty member also queried whether there were data about whether or not these kinds of interventions work. This is not a— this particular system is not exactly something that we piloted on another campus or something. It is something that we want for this campus to keep track of our students and to give them easier and more available feedback when they're having difficulties. But there are data from around the country that even things like sending a message that 'you've been missing from class too much,' especially if that, in some circumstances, these early warning systems are set up so that if somebody's absent from class a few times, a notification goes to an advisor and the advisor says, 'come in and see me.' We will probably have components of this system of that sort in the near future. There are data that that makes a difference on student retention and success. If you want to speak about other incentives, I actually just think that is a matter of professionalism that you should be concerned that your students are learning and giving them feedback. And I don't actually think we have to make a very difficult or extensive argument that feedback helps people learn. You know they need to be told when they're not doing it right in order to begin to correct it. If you want other incentives, graduation and retention rates will form a part of the funding formula for this campus in the future.

So, we are all in this together. If you want to see another line in your department and faculty hiring to go on, you're going to have to get state appropriations that are built in part on our retention and our graduation rates. This campus does very well on—extraordinarily well—on retention from freshman from first semester to second semester, and second semester to second year, but there are disparities along racial lines, there are some other kinds of disparities and there is a drop off rate at the higher levels. We should all be concerned about that. Our graduation rate is quite good compared to many of our peers, but for a lot of the nation right now, there's a perception that higher ed does not care about the fact that only about 50% of the people going into these great research universities graduate. Ours—again we have a higher graduation rate than that—but even so, the drop off of close to 30% of the people who enter as freshman is something we should be concerned about. I think that the appearance of this Early Warning System may have set off certain warnings for faculty about whether or not this was an extraordinary new burden. I don't actually think it should be. You should be responding in terms of records you're keeping on students already. There's nothing about your teaching that's being interfered with here. In very large classes obviously AI's were keeping grade records can enter a lot of this information, but the appearance of the Early Warning System is something that we're going to be asking faculty to do. It is coming at the same time when there is, you know, a kind of a fatigue about the extent to which things like assessment of student learning are rolling out.

But I again want to say that you do have to understand that these mandates for things like assessment of student learning are required for our accreditation. There are required for

various forms of accountability that we have to the state and as I say to our accreditors. So, I'd urge you to take a fresh and welcoming look at the EAS and see whether or not it couldn't help you provide timely feedback to students in a way that is likely to increase their ability to get help early on if they're struggling with a course. Kurt, do you want to add anything to that?

ZORN: You know the only other thing I would add is this is an effort that is a system-wide effort, so we're seeing on the Bloomington campus what we are seeing what everybody, all your cohorts on the various campuses are seeing, and there was a large demand to get something up and running this Fall on the other campuses because as Provost Hanson mentioned, they have much more concern about retention of students. So, we're part of a bigger picture here and as Provost Hanson's already said, it's available because it's a system-wide approach, so it is available. We wanted you to know it is there. It is optional. There is no expectation that you'll be using it right now because we have just begun the conversations on this campus about the best way to roll it out and the best way to use it.

HANSON: So take a look at it, and then, you know, your comments about what you think works on it, what doesn't work, would help shape this. And that's important too, but I do think you need to approach it with the idea that at the first instance before anything else goes on, this isn't just a recording information about the student to no end or for some other bureaucrat to look at. The information is going back to the student. If you say, 'the student's writing is bad,' or 'the student needs to see an advisor,' you know, you think they're in the wrong level altogether and they actually probably need to get out, whatever sort of checkbox you do should be the beginning of some thought process and action on the part of the student and, you know, that can't be a bad thing. Any other questions or comments about it though? Take a look—Oh, Herb?

AGENDA ITEM 5: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

TERRY: I'm the author of the memo to Karen, and you're free to share that—I hope you will—with anyone that you want including the Executive Committee or Council. I would hope this comes back to the Council soon. I don't have any fundamental objections to trying to enhance retention in graduation. It's the right thing to do, exactly as the provost said. My memo to her is mostly methodological, whether you call this thing a survey or just a questionnaire or something like that, I think it doesn't do a very good job of permitting faculty to identify what they think the performance problem of the student is and tell the student what it is, and it has very limited number of options in terms of what the faculty member can recommend. The main reason for this is it decided, as a conscious design decision, to rely on closed response categories. I've tried to use it. I've tried to use it with a student I desperately think is in jeopardy, and I have tried to do other things; talk to the student, get him to respond to emails, other sorts of things. But I can't get very far through the questionnaire because what I want to

tell him isn't in the closed response categories and it won't let me leave them blank. One answer to this would be open-ended categories. The other answer would be a pretest of this thing, and for a while, and find out if indeed the response categories that are there really fit what faculty want to tell the student and recommend to the student. But I would urge you to do exactly what Karen just said, you have to look at it and try it. You can try it as long as you don't click "submit." And you can find out if it will work for you. Think through what you would have liked to have told recent students that weren't attending or were for other reasons, and you'll see what they are, click on the links that Karen sent out. You'll see what it is. And my objection is not at all to doing it, it's just that from my professional training and in survey methodology and designing questionnaires, I think it has some really serious deficiencies and perhaps, more importantly, it won't even result in gathering the data that will tell us how to fix it.

HANSON: Could I just respond to that? Herb gave a very interesting example and one we had talked about earlier about an international student who really didn't have the language—English language skills to succeed in his class, but I—you said that there would be nothing you could put. I actually do think you could put 'poor performance writing,' 'did not participate in class,' and so on. So long as you put some warning there and send the student off, there is some way in which you can capture that. The other thing is, it doesn't preclude other forms of feedback. I mean it can't have everything or the survey becomes so long, it's probably going to be unwieldy for somebody. Maybe open ended responses are fine, and I want to underscore that other element. It's not just a matter of gathering data so that sometime in the future we do something about retention. I think giving feedback to the students by itself is beneficial.

TERRY: The other concern I have, Karen, is a technical one. I want to make sure that when we respond to the enrollment verification rosters, this system doesn't by default automatically tell every student that they're attending and they're satisfactory and there are no recommendations for improvement. It looks to me like it's set up to do that.

HANSON: Do you want to comment on that, Kurt?

ZORN: I can't comment directly on that particular aspect. Jim Murray is the project leader and he could comment about the specifics on how this system works in the interior way. I do want to make a few comments. Herb, you keep on mentioning a survey and a questionnaire. Basically, these are indicators, nothing more than that at this point. We do have a group of faculty members who are well versed in survey research already engaged, but they're engaged in what we call the "second phase" of the project.

To just give you a short history, we went through and looked as a group. I co-chaired with Rick Ward, who is the Interim dean of the University College at IUPUI, and now I co-chair with Kathy

Johnson who is the new dean of the University College up there. Early on, we had this group, this committee, look at what we call “vended products” that we could take off the shelf and basically we found that none were attractive enough, and were affordable to bring in right off the shelf. And there were features we liked of many of those, and we also figured we could do a better job building it ourselves. The decision was made to build ourselves as late as April of 2011. One of the concerns about us building ourselves and IU alone was that we weren’t going to be able to do it in a timely fashion.

So what you see right now is the result of some very intense and concerted effort on behalf of folks at UITS and SES to put together what is the first phase of this project, which is this Student Performance Roster. Is it perfect? Absolutely not. But it’s something that the regional campuses, who really wanted this, could run with, and they are running with it. And the early returns there are very positive, I have to be honest with you. So keep in mind this roster that we’re seeing is phase one. Phase two will bring in what’s called the “business intelligence component.” There may be a survey, we haven’t decided yet whether we’re going to do a survey. Some of these programs off the shelf have surveys, but there are some concerns about the survey, similar to what you’ve raised, Herb. But this is not a survey. Right now, this is just a flag system and we used flag purposefully. Purdue, up the road, uses a red, yellow, and green traffic light. We’re using flags, right? Red flag—it’s not going to be a red flag, but you know, you get the idea, right? Just to give a moment to a student to say, ‘Hang on for a second, there’s a problem here,’ okay? So in phase two, we’re going to basically try to build in what is the feedback loop that is, very honestly, not there right now. There is not the feedback loop, but our feedback loop will have an advising hub, which will allow us to feed this information to advisors and other people that we are going to identify with regard to who can best intervene on a particular campus. We haven’t started this conversation here in Bloomington. The good news is we don’t have a student retention committee like IUPUI does because they needed one, but we do need a group like that, and I’ve asked Sonya, my boss, and Tom to help put together a group that would represent the Registrar’s Office, faculty, and other interested parties to help us move forward with this, and to basically get this so it looks good for the Bloomington campus. Hope that helps some.

HANSON: We are getting up to time, but that’s just—we can’t underscore that point enough that this is a systemed ‘flag and communicate’ right now. The other thing that was included in the memo, it wasn’t in your voice but somebody else’s voice about, “I don’t see why we do this, it is like a baby monitor. We’re just recording things.” You’re not recording things, you’re communicating things to a student. That’s what will happen from this. And I just find it very hard to think that’s a bad thing.

WHEELER: I would be amiss if I didn't mention the concerns of the faculty of my department who teach large classes. If I were on a regional campus, I might be enthusiastic about this, but I'm not. I have 560 students. And I estimate that using this system, even for the purposes of enrollment verification, it would take me approximately eight hours because of the point that Herb made which is that if you submitted, you are in fact telling the students that they're making satisfactory progress. I have found hidden ways to circumvent that that I have figured out that I think the programmers are unaware of in the way that their thing actually works, but it would take me approximately eight hours or more to use this for enrollment verification purposes.

Again, if I were a regional campus, I think this would be fine. But the current system does not meet the enterprise needs and standards of the university as exhibited by our current grade rosters and especially on OnCourse. Those are very efficient ways that people with large classes can provide feedback. I have sent Kurt an email about this over a year ago, and pointed out that I am very concerned with feedback and that, on one occasion in the Fall of 2009, I actually sent emails to 190 students after one exam saying, you know, 'Based on your performance on the previous exam, here are the questions you missed and missing these questions I think that there's a problem here.' So, you know, I fully support the feedback. I do it myself, but this particular system needs a great deal of improvement before it reaches, you know, the needs of the faculty with large classes.

HANSON: Well, again, there'll be time to work on this [indistinct comment], and there isn't any more time to discuss it right now. I am getting poked by Carolyn. So, we probably need to move on to the other agenda items. But, you know, this is the introduction of the topic. Take a look at the material that was sent to you yesterday, and we'll return to this. The next topic is an action item, the MRE Policy Statement. So, Carolyn?

AGENDA ITEM 6: MRE POLICY STATEMENT

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: You should have in front of you the MRE document which has gone through three amendments since it was formally adopted on December 14, 1982. The last amendment to the document was on April 19, 2011. The purpose of the document is to set forth policy and principles that should govern the most prudent way for school administrators, faculty, and librarians to deal with mergers, eliminations, renaming of departments, and other matters that affect us significantly. The center the holds the document together is its robust and necessary emphasis on the role that faculty governance should play in instances of merger and reorganization because institutional memory is a powerful thing and because the New Directions Report has generated serious concerns among the faculty about who is going to implement the many recommendations contained within the document, when, how, and with what affect members of the BFC Executive Committee thought it wise and sensible to reaffirm

our commitment to the MRE document of principles and policies that was amended this past April. For this reason, we drafted a resolution for your consideration and action. The resolution is meant to be a reaffirmation document of salience and substance, but it is also meant to be a hugely symbolic public announcement of a high principle that we all hold dear: faculty governance. We need to be very mindful because the world is shifting beneath our feet, even as we discuss our business today. As a consequence of living in a world that is shifting, universities nationwide and responding in new and different ways of meeting the myriad of issues that confront us in this fluid, highly globalized and interconnected world. In light of such weighty and far-reaching issues and potential actions, complacency is a luxury that members of the faculty cannot afford, and for this reason we respectfully ask that you consider and pass the resolution that is before you.

HANSON: Any discussion? Have people had a chance to look at the resolution? [Brief pause] Any discussion at all? [Brief pause]

SHERMAN: Karen?

HANSON: Yes?

SHERMAN: It seems to me there must be some fear that the principles wouldn't be upheld because we know that resolutions are [indistinct comment] Faculty Council [indistinct comment]. Is there something that we should know? [laughter]

WATSON: Just related to that, I'm wondering where Continuing Studies falls in this merger, reorganization, and elimination. Because as far as I know, there were no committees and it's going to need [indistinct comment] to consider [indistinct comment]. So, if we have these rules and they are not being referenced anyway...

HANSON: Actually, there was a committee.

WATSON: There was? That would be helpful, you know.

HANSON: Yeah, there was a committee and I'm not—you know, the committee was appointed by the president, but it had representation from the school. I'm not sure you need to be looking at this in conjunction with the new policy that was passed in April. The old MRE Committee isn't really part of that anymore. And I don't know what kind of consultation went on with the faculty governance who—before that committee—before that announcement was made and the committee was formed. Maybe you do?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: You had a question, didn't you, a comment, Randy?

ARNOLD: I was going to respond to Jim's question a little bit, and I think the thinking of the Executive Committee was that because that the revision to the MRE Policy happened so late in the semester, it kind of went off everybody's radar over the summer, and we just wanted to remind everyone of it as we start the Fall semester with knowing that the New Academic Direction Report is out there and discussions are going to start happening, with reference to that we want to keep faculty involvement as strong as possible in that process and this was a way to do that. And that was the thinking.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: It still raises a huge compelling question and that is at what point can one stop something once it has begun. I mean, how do we know what the president is proposing unless he tells us? And then once he has made a decision about a particular issue, then what?

MCLEOD: I have just a very minor comment; the Resolution refers to a policy that was revised on April 14th and then the policy itself says it was revised on the 19th of April. So it's just a little discrepancy, but these are the things that trouble people who revise the Academic Guide.

TERRY: As long we're at that, I just looked at the amendments for the 19th. We didn't vote on it, so we didn't amend it apparently. Minutes are here.

DETHLOFF: No, I think it was a little tweak that we did in your office and mine that happened a few days after the meeting where it was voted on.

TERRY: It was scheduled to be an action on the 19th. And we got, on page 17 of the minutes or 18 of the minutes, to the end of the discussion period, and we did nothing. Well, hold on. Can I move to [indistinct comment] the secondary. Moved and approved. So, why is it back? What's the different between what we approved April 19th—

DETHLOFF: I think it was a minor adjustment, like either the date or a spelling error. I have to go through my records to find it, but it was so miniscule that it did not warrant bringing back to the Council, and I did it in conjunction with Tom's office.

TERRY: And there are no other changes—

DETHLOFF: —No.

TERRY: From what we—

DETHLOFF: —There are no other changes.

TERRY: So, I don't think we have to act on it again...

GIERYN: I don't recall the sub—it was a trivial change. It was a typo of some sort.

DETHLOFF: —Yeah, a title or... But we didn't want to...

GIERYN: But we did vote on this policy last Spring. And the rationale, I think, for the resolution, if I understand it correctly, the New Academic Directions Report does not contain built into it a plan for implementation. It's not obvious as to what would happen next. The provost has begun to elucidate that with the formation of these committees and various people who would be involved, actions taken by the College, and other groups. But the report itself said nothing. So, over the summer and even until within the last couple of weeks, we really had no idea how the report would be implemented, and I think that the resolution is simply an attempt to, sort of, point to this document, and as we move forward, a statement of a set of principles that should guide those next steps of implementation.

HANSON: And, I think it's important to say, that it's absolutely right that there is no implementation plan, and in some cases, things are presented for discussion or consideration or something like that, so that it isn't even just a matter of implementation always, but rather, you know, people need to look at this, and so there are plenty of other places where what the report suggests is kind of an invitation to discussion. Someone's got to call the discussion and structure it and so on, but there are—it's pretty broad strokes in the report.

TERRY: I'd also add, maybe for Jim's benefit, that one of the reasons for replacing our old document was that the old document, in general, didn't work very well, and it especially didn't work very well when a reorganization was—reorganization had an impact on the campus, but was a reorganization of a school that didn't work that well for Informatics when they reorganized, it didn't work that well when HPER was moving into being the School of Public Health. And an intent of this document is to indicate that there's faculty interests when reorg...The original document basically says, reorganization within a school, that should be there business. It's no business of the BFC. We changed that, and I think that's important. So, if you ask whether or not we followed that is always a question with our policies, but at least the idea was to make it match ways in which your organizations have happened recently, that the old document didn't fit very well.

HANSON: And this presents a set of kind of guiding principles, as opposed to very specific committees and tasks for each of those committees, which is also [indistinct comment].

HENSHEL: I have no problem with [indistinct comment], and I went through the same pain of everybody else going through the many times that Tom had to re-craft this, and he did a great job by the way, Tom. I guess what I am disturbed by is the need to actually bring this up again other than as a 'This is what happened at the end. We want to remind people of it now because this is what we are going to be using going forward.' I would rather see that than this resolution because it sets a precedent that I don't like, which is, as Carolyn said, where is it

going to stop? So I would rather withdraw the resolution, and just say, 'Hey guys, this is what we did at the end. Pay attention, it is going to move forward.' And not set a precedent. Sorry.

HANSON: No, I mean [indistinct comment].

GJERDINGEN: As a member of the Executive Committee, one of the things that we wanted to do, we knew this would be a major issue, and we simply wanted to make the—we knew we had new members here—and we just wanted to put it in front of them so they could familiarize themselves. That was the basic gist of it, just so that everybody would know and could use this and to get it from the first day and that was the main reason for it. I don't see, at least that wasn't the intent of a resolution to do anything more than that, to say, 'Please be aware of these. We're going to look at these, and all of us should familiarize ourselves with it at the first meeting because we have new people.' And that was the thinking.

HENSHEL: I think the thinking is excellent. I think the resolution that sets a precedent that maybe we want to think twice about, and maybe just leave this as a 'This has happened at the end. It was by no means fast, but it sure did happen at the very last time, at the very last moment. This is what we use going forward.' But not—I guess I don't like to set a precedent for more procedure upon procedure for the sake of procedure. I think saying, 'This is what happened at the end, it happened at the very last time, this is a whole new group. Not a whole new group, but there is a fair number of new people. Pay attention. This is important.' I think that's really important and I think that's a good idea. I'm wary to set the precedent.

HANSON: Other exceptions or comments? Yes?

KENNEY: I guess I have to agree. I wouldn't—if it comes to the floor—I wouldn't vote against it, it's not something you oppose, but the purpose of reminding us what we did is accomplished really nicely by circular B3, which doesn't say very much on the back side about revision, but then neither really does this resolution. I guess that's a little bit more than you want, but not a great deal more. And so I think that by distributing circular B3, at least if we're reminded that there is something on the back [indistinct comment]. I think the purpose of reminding that something was done with the MRE [indistinct comment] and that's been accomplished.

HANSON: That's alright, I was just looking for B3.

KENNEY: I guess, I mean, it may not be clear what precedent is being referred to, but I think that the idea that any time you pass something we then have to pass something to say that we passed it. [laughter]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [remark indistinct]

KENNEY: Right, and it makes it seem actually less consequential in a way, you know? [indistinct comment] provide our own backup singers. But again, if this comes to the floor, sure, I'm going to vote for it, it's not a bad thing, but [indistinct comment], I mean we passed four other major things, none of which we're resolving again.

HANSON: Is this coming from the Executive Committee...? Tom?

GIERYN: Perhaps the drafting of the resolution has served its purpose in this discussion, and there's no need for a vote. I'm not sure what difference the vote would make at this point, other than the discussion that we've had, and the recognition that the policy on MRE was revised last year, and it built in safeguards. Perhaps the minutes of the meeting and discussion so far serve that purpose.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Yes, because we really did want to call attention to the fact that that MRE document had passed, and we also wanted to call attention to the fact that we need constantly to be reminded of our obligations as members of the faculty. We want to insist upon faculty governance, and so we were moved by the fact that there were new members of the Faculty Council who might not have been as tuned in to this as we would have liked. So, those were some of the motivations, and animating reasons for the document. But, perhaps, as Tom has said, the announcement has been made.

HANSON: Parliamentarian, this has come moved and seconded, I take it, from the Agenda Committee, and there's been a—was it a motion to withdraw?

HENSHEL: I think so. I think I'd rather just say, 'Thank you very much,' and I'd rather not set the precedent. So yes, it is a motion to withdraw.

KENNEY: Yes, I'd like to second that.

HANSON: Vote on that. All in favor of that motion to withdraw, with understanding [indistinct comment]...

HENSHEL: Is this from the Agenda Committee?

DETHLOFF: This is a motion to withdraw. Okay, okay, it looks like the majority has it. If you want to get a voice vote, we can do that.

HANSON: Anybody opposed to withdrawing? Abstentions? Okay, then the motion is withdrawn, but people understand it's the sense of the Council to reassert the new policy. Now we have a report on eTexts from Brad. Very good news on that front. Vice President for Information Technology, Brad Wheeler.

AGENDA ITEM 7: REPORT ON eTEXTS

WHEELER: I think we're good. Sound, are we on? There we go. Sound, are we on there now? Okay. Faculty colleagues, again, thank you for the opportunity to come and speak about eTexts. For those of you who have been with the Bloomington Faculty Council for a while, you will know this is the third time we've had this conversation, but this is the time that I think we have the most to share with you. I'm going to move fairly swiftly with some of the material, and I told Carolyn we have, I believe, adequate time for conversation, discussions, questions. I also have a couple of things to show you that are quite visual in the use of the eTexts, so I appreciate the accommodation on that as well. First off, I think everyone understands, if you've seen the newspapers anywhere, you've talked to your students, you know there are concerns about the cost of textbooks and educational materials. I grabbed just three headlines that have been in the press in the last two weeks. If you notice, the first one "New Site Brazenly Trades Pirated eTextbooks," and as someone who went through the scars of dealing with the music industry and congressional legislation, and all the onus they put on us in that, we would really like to find a way for that not to happen again in this round with eTexts. Seven in ten students are skipping buying books because they're just too expensive. I have five students that we asked to just tell us the summary of what they did in buying books this year. The figures are, for this semester, \$732, \$471, \$480 still missing two books, \$388, and \$502 would have spent \$681, but I am getting by with older editions, even though the professor said he required the newer edition.

The third point there, you see the secondary cost of digital. One of the challenges of things that's going on right now is that the model, much like the music industry, is just sorely broken. And that was the first message I brought to you about two years ago. I said if there's anything going for the opportunities with eTexts, it's that we have a business model that is broken for everyone. It's broken for students. It's broken for authors. It's broken for the publishers, and just about everyone involved. And with technology coming along about this time, it is an opportunity for some change. One thing, though, that is a bit curious, you would expect that the cost of delivering a digital version of a textbook should have savings opportunities over the cost of printing a book, inventorying it, hauling it around, dealing with returns and such, but yet in national surveys, what we're seeing is that a new survey that came out recently, only 8% of the time was an eText cheaper than buying a used book. So something is very wrong here, and it's the economics in the business model that underlie this.

We also see students are very upset in trying to find ways to bring about change. I learned recently that a group—there's a student public interest research group nationally, that has done some very good work, high quality work on the cost of texts and working on what the options would be. A spinout of that is called textbookrebellion.org, and I learned their national bus tour will be visiting us next week. So, heads up on that one.

Part of what you see going on here, though, is students trying to find a way from the ground up to solve the problem that they have. I think, as a university, we have an opportunity to help solve the business model problem by bringing the scale and the leverage of the university to bear in the equation because you can imagine, Justin here has very little negotiating capacity against one of the major publishers when they sit down across the table to determine price.

Going back to the challenge of why do eTexts cost so much, we just grabbed several books here, just for examples. And so when you look at the eText version, the digital version of it, you can see they are in the 70%, 75%, 77% of the national list price. Those are the ranges, and right now many of these have ridiculous restrictions imposed upon them by the publishers, not necessarily by the digital people or the bookstore or anyone else. This is being imposed on them by the publishers. Tied to just a number of devices, no you can't print your book, you only have it for 180 days then it goes "poof!" You have no access to it longer than that, and as you know from our previous conversations on this topic, when we started working on eTexts as part of the IT strategic plan for the university, we said we were pursuing four objectives, and there you see them. Number one, to drive down the costs of this for our students. It's got to be the good stuff that faculty wish to teach with. New tools for teaching and learning. Some pretty clever things happening there, and not just one hit wonders of press releases and pilots that you can't sustain, but a fundamental shift in the economics of eTexts hopefully for this decade.

So, there's two major pieces in that; is we needed to work with the publishers and those who control the flow of content. First off, faculty, if there are sites that have open educational resources, like Connexions, which is CNX.org or other things maybe in your academic discipline. If there is content that is up to date and worthy of using in your class, obviously that is the cheapest thing you can do for your students in pointing them to it. But some of the best content for the foreseeable future is likely to be through publishing firms who do lots of work around it, build exercises, things such as that. So it's both. It's open where we can find it, and reform the commercial model where we can. We think it's got to be digital and print. We can expect devices to get faster, better, cheaper, iPads, Droids, tablets over about every six months you're going to see a march in those. Price points will keep getting better and better. But at least for some reasonable period of time, it's not either or, it's and. Students need to be able to have physical markup, print access when they want to and digital when they want to read on the bus or something like that. The best way that we have seen to change the pricing for the content model, and I'll show you some details on this in a moment, is the use of an eText fee, which I previewed with you the last time I was here. The second thing we need is a software platform because if we don't figure out how to do this, we're going to end up with each publisher wanting to work through a different piece of software, and you can imagine the challenge of being a freshman, having five courses, maybe seven or eight books, and four or

five different pieces of electronic software to do fundamentally the same thing. That's not a direction that we really want to go in either.

So, the content and the platform are the two pieces. We worked with IU Purchasing. We issued a formal request for proposal in February, and it is fair to say that we have been in long negotiations since those RFP responses came in in March. Karen thought that I was just teasing her, that we were actually going to get to a deal, but I am pleased to tell you that during this meeting and just moments ago, we put out a public release. We have signed agreements with content providers and with a software platform. As of this moment, I cannot publicly name all of those content providers, but in time we will be able to name all of those content providers. So, I've had an interesting day. I'll just tell you that, and I think we will see some others coming in the not too distant future. So the deals look—oh, one more thing. This is ready to go for any faculty member that wishes to begin using these models for January classes. We're ready to go. I will show you where that—how to do that in just a moment.

So, first off on the content itself, this is a new option for faculty. That's all it is. It's an option. If you like the book you're using, if you like what you're doing right now, your life doesn't change. This is an option for faculty who wish to move into it. Instead of prices that are often in the 70-80% of national retail for maybe 120 days of access with limitations, all of our agreements, they vary some by publisher, but I will tell you none of them exceed 35%. So, we feel that was a good deal, we were able to work that out with the publishers in a partnership working well with them. Our students are able to print. They can use it on multiple devices. We've worked with them for the digital rights management pieces to fit the needs of the publishers, but not be so obtrusive that we have to worry that students are going to be calling the help desk all the time because they bought a different device in the middle of the semester and it won't work. I think we'll be past most of those kinds of things that the music industry went through. We also, through this model, can take licensed content. If you put together your own readings pack, and we have to license and pay royalties on some of these things in this chapter, or increasingly we're hoping you will make greater use of the materials that are already licensed through the IU Library where our contracts allow us to pump them out into courses. And that can be a big savings rather than making students pay royalty for, you know, a *Business Week* article or a *National Geographic* article. Also, faculty, I was speaking with the other Professor Wheeler just a moment ago. If you have your own materials originally authored yourself that you want to pump through this kind of arrangement, we can do that as well.

The key economic piece here that makes this work is instead of the publishers getting paid only on a brand new physical text book and not getting paid again for all the time it bounces around in the "used" market. So, they prop that new price up very high because they don't make any money. The author doesn't get paid for the coming years. We said we want to change the

deal. If you will drop the price substantially, then each student pays an eText fee, just like students have paid, you know, chemistry lab fees, things like that, for consumable materials, and these are only on required texts. So, if you have an optional text or an optional study guide, that's not in this deal because the publishers are only willing to drop the price substantially if they know they're going to get paid by each student in the course.

We have socialized this with the student groups over the last two years. We've done two years of pilot testing it, and we've learned a lot of feedback from them about this approach. And they've just said, 'Go for it, go for it, go for it, were dying.'

The second thing is the software platform itself, and that is from a company, I am pleased to say, is an Indiana based company, called Courseload. And we chose to go with a company that is independent and not owned by one of the publishers because you can imagine some of the challenges you get in there in being able to—"who controlling whom" in that kind of arrangement. So what I'm going to do, so you get a sense of what that looks like, is I will toggle over, and this is the Courseload software, just to give you a quick look around. You would go into this through OnCourse. So just as your class has a syllabus or a schedule, there is a tool there for Courseload and for the eText. In this particular demo, I have a business text and I have a science text, so we will jump into the science text, and it pops up here. And you have some page guides down at the bottom. You can flip through it and you can change the size to make things larger or smaller, but it also has the ability to annotate text as well. So if I come down, and I want to highlight this section here, notice I can pick a different color or I can even, say, add a note, "lecture was vague, need to get back to that one," and I will mark that as a question that I need to come back to at a later time. Then if I want to, I can look at just the notes that I have added to those texts, and I can choose to say, "Nick is in my study group, and Bob is in my study group," and we can each see each other's notes and annotations; but now, I'm irritated with Karen, she said the bad thing, and I am taking her out of my study group, and she can't see those any longer.

In the pilot study, the students—the feature the students like best was when the faculty made use of this. So faculty, you can go and mark things with different colors, you can code things for exam, you can code things for "ignore this, read this seven times," and you are updating your students' texts with your annotations. If you want to add a link to go out to something else, you can do it right embedded on the text itself. So not to spend too much time on the demo part of it, but you'll also notice that if we want to flip through the book quickly, we can do so and jump to a certain page. And so I'll jump to this page, and it moves there. You will notice some dots if you're able to see those. Those are places I have highlighted, so if I jump to this page, I have some yellow annotations or green annotations on those there. So the students are really liking this approach to be able to work with their texts. Now just for one other quick one,

this is an iPad simulator. I didn't bring a document camera to put an iPad or a Droid or other device there, but you can see if we jump in here, if I was using this on an iPad or a mobile device, it pops in the same way as well, and it knows your annotations. If I annotated on one of those devices and flip to the other one, the annotations would appear there as well. You can work offline. If you're flying on an airplane and you need to be reading your text and even annotating it, then when you land your annotations would update with your study group if you want to.

For this platform, so for example, Bill Wheeler says he has some of his own notes. He can take faculty originated content and pump that through this platform to make it available for students as well. I will also say the MBA program jumped out in working with this and with Courseload this semester. For students who want to work only digitally, they will save \$360 over the course of their first-year reading packet from last year. For students who want all 1300 pages printed for them in a nice bound version plus digital, they'll still save over \$200 in this model.

So that gives you some quick examples of seeing the software and how it works and what we're up to. So rolling it out, here we go, then we will go to questions. It is faculty choice. We do not yet have all of the publishers signed. As I said, this has been a very, very, very long conversation with them, but this is their future. Most of them know, one way or another, something like this is what makes the most sense. It's required texts and it's delivered through OnCourse, as I mentioned to you a moment ago. The one thing you need to know coming out of here today is all information about eTexts at IU are at etexts.iu.edu. So if you go to this website, the research study that was done, it was an NSF funded, IRB approved study over the last two years, we've got the results of that posted. There's a FAQ for the many, many questions that you and your colleagues will have. We'll update that more as we go. For faculty, if you would like to get started in using this, there is a big faculty eText signup button there. You click that, you'll have to login with your university ID. The information regarding how to get started is there. You tell us your section number, things like that. We've got a little bit of manual work flow for this first semester. We will automate more of that in the coming semesters, but this has been a long journey and I appreciate the support of so many faculty and student groups along the way. And I am happy to take your questions. [Brief pause]

(William) WHEELER: Well, thank you very much. This is very exciting. One more question, what about multimedia? Is this only for texts?

WHEELER: Thank you for reminding me of that. We started off on this, calling these digital education resources. It could be a video, a simulation, anything. Unfortunately, in the industry, the word "eText" just stuck as the label. So what we really mean is a digital thingy, okay? Any kind of a digital thingy [laughter] that's what we mean. This also moves—one thing I did not

mention, and this has been written in many of the national accounts. The most difficult situations our students face today is not even the price of a new book, it's when a new book is bundled with a website code that only works for one semester, thus rendering their book worthless almost on the resell market. This has been a bundling strategy some of the publishers have used. What we have convinced them of in this argument is to unbundle. If a professor finds an online tutoring or exercise or something that the publishers have built, and there are really a lot of good stuff out there that the publishers have built, if you want to require that for the students, we said, 'Set a price.' If it's \$15 for students to have online access to that, set a price and that will be a digital resource and bill for it. Don't hide it in an artificially high price to kill other parts of the market. So you will be able to sign up as a required digital thingy for any of those.

HENSHEL: I really appreciate this, I have a problem that I would like you to address in the future—

GIERYN: --Louder.

HENSHEL: Before I would put an eText as a required text in my class, because I try to inhibit cheating by having open text tests, then I'm going to have a problem because once they have access to a computer during that open text test, they now have access to anybody else on the other side of the computer. So, my request is to somehow or another figure out a way that you could lock computers in to one website, one course, one something, so that you can prevent that email exchange or other exchange that would enable them to cheat while you're sitting there in class.

WHEELER: Yeah, point taken. A testing center may be our best approach of getting there. We've got one going in the Indianapolis campus, and then when students are on a university owned device, that we can control that device, we have a lot better chance of doing that than if they all bring their laptop computers in, and they have Lord knows what running on it. Second one is, I take your point. Could the Courseload software possibly have an exam mode that an instructor could kick it into exam mode and maybe do something. We have not yet explored that. One of the advantages, though, of working with the local firm, is that they've listened very, very well to us over the past two years. That's a very good observation.

KINGSOLVER: I have a comment and then a question. First of all, thank you so much for this. I know that students sometimes get frustrated with administration or faculty for whatever reason. Today is definitely not one of those days. So thank you. [laughter] I know in our IUSA campaign, all three tickets had a cost-cutting textbook measure. So this is an issue that's very important. We're actually also trying to fight for a tax-free textbooks law in Indianapolis, but that will come later. I just wanted to thank you first for that.

I guess the bigger question for me is, does your office or someone in the university have a target date for a total conversion to eText or will it probably always be an either/or approach, or an “and” approach rather than either/or?

WHEELER: I do think over the coming years, more of the publishers will make more of their content available in digital format. We don't have access to everything. Again, we don't have every publisher in yet. So I think that that will occur today really with this announcement and in the work of everyone. And I really need to say with the support of the president, with the provost, with the support of our Trustees to press on with this, I think we are helping to reshape the terms of the economic model for the future, and once we demonstrate that that is actually a very good thing for students and for the publishers and authors and such, I think we will see more of it come this way. A key principle, though, is really that faculty pick the best resources for their instructional objectives. We just know that over the next few years, they're going to have more of those to choose from in the digital format.

I should also add, in the two years of the pilot we had unrestricted printing in that with the permission of the publishers for that little piece of it. The behavioral data showed the students did not print that much. It was really still fairly modest once they got used to working in that environment, and the devices will only get better next year and the year after. [Brief pause]

BASU: I have a question about legality here. If there is a husband/wife team taking a course, they can buy one text book...

WHEELER: No, and that is an important question. The—and we discussed this with the students, there are edge cases where two roommates are taking exactly the same set of courses, they've always shared textbooks, and in this model with an eText fee, they will both be charged an eText fee for that. In those conversations with the students, the words came up. There's always going to be edge cases. There's people who pay the transportation fee here and never ride the bus, but they benefit from fewer cars being on the street when they do wish to drive. So, but no, there's not an opt-out. If we had an opt-out, we would lose the leverage that got the price point down in the first place.

BASU: I kind of realized that, that's why my second one for follow up, is that I'll have students in fraternities and sororities they make study groups with their—it's a reality. It may be illegal...

WHEELER: Study groups are not illegal. Copying textbooks is, though. [laughter]

BASU: They make study groups, and the way they study, part of it may be illegal.

WHEELER: The key point—

BASU: —But this is reality.

WHEELER: Yeah. The key point here is the music industry provides the best example. They spent ten years litigating and lobbying and frankly making my life not very good, and finally they went with Steve Jobs, they went with iTunes, and some of the other distribution models, and last year the music industry—and remember, iTunes now, you can buy songs with no DRM restrictions on them. So you can actually move them to other devices. Last year, the music industry sold more music and generated more revenue than any previous year, but that transition to get there is the big one. I will also add, this is the deal, I assure you, this is the best deal that could be had, and to our knowledge IU is the only university out front on this at scale and doing this with the publishers. My personal economics crystal ball is, as this gets established, I think our deals can get better with the publishers over time.

HANSON: Could I just add, too, that we may be out front and the first, but every other university is interested in this. So that is one of the things that makes your prediction, I think, so sound.

TERRY: I'd congratulate you on this. I've been around long enough to know how long this has taken. It's a good thing. I have two questions that are a bit like Basu's. Number one, from the outside, this could be a 21st century version of Bursar billing for texts. And that killed politically when the bookstores and others in this community said, 'You'll have to allow us access to students to compete.' Is that going to happen again? Have we got that cleared?

WHEELER: There are so many questions there—I don't even know where to start. The point being, this is not in competition with anything that we're doing with physical books. This is the content license directly from the source. It's not about competing retail channels. It is directly licensed from the source.

TERRY: My second question would be, does this count, since it is a course fee, much like a lab fee, is it going to be counted against our tuition caps?

WHEELER: No. My understanding is that, and that's a question most appropriate for Neil, but my understanding is if we have a required technology fee, a required, you know, transportation fee, those things do count relative to our tuition in an overall cost. The lab fee for chemistry does not *per se* because it's only tied to a particular course.

HANSON: We only have a short time remaining for this because there's another report that has to be given, but a couple more.

PAOLILLO: So, a common business strategy for a small software company is to develop a product to the point that the company becomes an attractive takeover target for a larger company. If such were to happen with the company that is being used as the intermediary for these licenses, then what would happen to these arrangements that are in place?

WHEELER: No, it's a brilliant question and that was one of our concerns and that's why we have contracted for the licenses from the publishers so we have rights to the content and then we have contracted separately for a software firm to integrate into OnCourse for the delivery and the reader mechanisms and such. If for some reason the current contract and current company became unviable or unattractive to us, we would be able to just re-contract with a different company for delivery of those eTexts. So we purposefully separated those two steps. I should also add, this company Courseload has a startup investment from the state of Indiana, the 21st Century Fund out of the state, and IU Research Technology Corporation has also taken a small investment in it. So we're pleased to see some job generating activity retained in the state.

HANSON: Bill?

(William) WHEELER: Is there any role for the textbook stores, and if not, are we in any legal risk? My recollection is that some years ago, the state legislature passed a law that said the university could not have a monopoly on textbooks, and that's why all textbook orders are split between the IU Bookstore, even though it's no longer IU, and TIS. So my recollection is there's some law that said the university could not have a monopoly on textbooks. Does this pose a problem?

WHEELER: Counsel has been involved with this all the way, so I won't play a lawyer here, but I will say counsel has been involved all the way. And again, we're not talking about a book that is out there that is sold through various retail channels *per se*. We license directly with the content source itself. The thing that's closest here is, this is like the Adobe or the Microsoft deals where we negotiated on behalf of everyone because the university could get a good deal, and then we just recover some of those costs by the people who use them.

HANSON: Thank you very much, Brad, and—

WHEELER: etexts.iu.edu, everyone repeat. [laughter] Thank you all very much.

HANSON: Thanks. The last item on the agenda is the update on COIA, the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics, and Bruce Jaffee is here.

AGENDA ITEM 8: UPDATE ON COIA (Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics)

JAFFEE: This may be a hard act to follow with no technology and no website, although there—I guess there is the original website that relates to this at Penn State. Thanks for the opportunity to make some remarks related to intercollegiate athletics today to provide you with an overview and an update on activities of the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics. The abbreviation is COIA, for which IU has been involved for nearly ten years. I also hope that my comments and any follow up Q&A might serve as a teaser for the upcoming annual

presentation to the BFC by Julia Lamber in a role as the Chair of the Athletics Committee, Kurt Zorn who was here earlier today as the current Faculty Athletic Representative for IU, and Fred Glass, the Athletic Director and Vice President. I'm going to get to COIA in a minute, but I'd like to set the table or the environment for a minute for those of you that maybe don't follow either COIA or what's going on in intercollegiate athletics. Briefly, I would essentially say there were four significant trends or events in the last few years that have affected the landscape of intercollegiate athletics. One is the realignment of conference memberships, which was set up ironically by a Big Ten announcement of less than two years ago that it was exploring expansion. That expansion, of course, made the Big Ten have twelve schools, and the Big 12 have ten. Ultimately, a lot of other realignments nationally, but there have, over the last few years, been a major shift in schools among the major sports related conferences.

Second, and maybe most significant trend the last few years, is a clear separation between resource rich and resource challenged athletic departments. With the simultaneous reduction in state aid to higher education, which has made subsidies to athletic programs very questionable, and the explosion at the same time in conference, school and NCAA media revenue, again, led by the development of the Big Ten Network, by which now actually is marketed not as the Big Ten Network but as BTN, like CBS, and that has generated a significant amount of money for the now twelve Big Ten schools that share it equally.

A third major trend in the last couple of years is well publicized alleged and proven major rule violations, affecting universities with significant athletic programs such as UNC-Chapel Hill, Ohio State, USC, Miami, Tennessee, unfortunately just to mention a few.

And the fourth, I think, significant trend in the last couple of years has been the change in the leadership of the NCAA with the Mark Emmert replacing Myles Brand, clearly with different areas of focus with President Emmert, but still, as Myles Brand was, a former university president understanding sort of the collegiate model and the university structure. I might also want to add that our president, Michael McRobbie, in a modest reorganization of the Big Ten management, has continued as the head of the Council of Big Ten Presidents and Chancellors, called COPC, for a second year. The previous tradition was that the presidency of that group rotated among now the twelve presidents, but that's going to change to be basically two-year terms, and be chosen not based on the alphabet, but rather based on who may be most effective in leading and advising Big Ten athletic matters.

President Emmert has quickly put his mark on the NCAA. He's made major personnel changes up in Indianapolis. He's unfortunately beefed up enforcement and had very strong statements about that. He's involved university presidents last month in directly formulating strategy. So far, in contrast to Myles Brand, he appears that direct links to coaches and coaches groups are

weaker than they were under the previous administration. However, he has continued to listen to and involve appropriate faculty groups, of one of which is COIA.

The connection of IU and the involvement of other Big Ten schools in COIA has been, and continues to be, considerable over roughly its ten year life. Bob Eno, when he was BFC President, was one of the co-founders of COIA in the academic year 2002-2003, when it was formed as an association of faculty senate leaders. We formally joined as a Faculty Council or a Faculty Senate in 2004 as a founding member. The 2011 meeting was held at the Big Ten headquarters in Park Ridge, Illinois last winter and attended by about fifty representatives of various COIA schools. At that conference the speakers included President Emmert and the executive director of the Knight Commission, which has sponsored studies and white papers related to athletic reform in the last twenty years. Three members of COIA's Executive Committee are represented currently from the Big Ten, and for the last two or three years I've served as IU's representative to COIA.

COIA, as I've alluded to already, is a coalition of faculty senate of FBS, Football Bowl Schools, that is, universities that are eligible for the post-season bowls, and there are currently 115 such BCS universities. Fifty-seven of those 115 are current members of COIA. All the Big Ten schools except Purdue and Nebraska are member of COIA, and there's very strong proportional representation in COIA from the Big Ten, the PAC 12, and they can count there, they changed the number from PAC 10 to PAC 12, and the SEC, the Southeastern Conference. So the major conferences do have very large proportional representation on COIA. A key question is what has COIA done and what is it likely to do in the future given it has no role in the formal conference or NCAA governing structure. It has no staff, and it has no resources other than what comes from essentially donations from faculty senates and a host of annual meetings. I'd like to essentially talk very briefly about four things that I think COIA stresses.

First, it maintains that faculty senates and faculty leaders should have a role in the way in which intercollegiate athletics is conducted nationally and on their campuses. That's really maybe the most central thing, that faculty play a role in the ways in which intercollegiate athletics is actually conducted on the campus. I can say in this campus that plugged in to the academic mission of this university, as well as involved in intercollegiate athletics is; Kurt Zorn, the faculty rep, who is also, as you indicated earlier this afternoon, the Associate Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, a faculty member in the former and interim dean in SPEA; James Wimbush, who is on this Council, Chair of the Athletics Committee for six years, and I worked very closely with him when I was a Faculty Athletic Representative, and he's now, of course, the Dean of our Graduate School; Julia Lamber, who I mentioned earlier, who is the Chair of the Athletics Committee, is a member of our Law School faculty, former Dean of Women Affairs, and is for better or worse, one of our liaisons with the IHAC, the Higher Education Commission.

So a key aspect is to have significant faculty involvement in the workings on campus, and I think IU is pretty strong in that regard.

Second, is transparency in terms of finances in intercollegiate athletics, majors in courses taken by student athletes, and any special admit programs. Our sponsored student admission program, which is not limited to athletics, is certainly the best and most transparent of any in the Big Ten, and is a model nationally in terms of transparency, faculty control, and support services for student athletes.

There are a lot of other places where coaches essentially make, or other administrators, make admissions decisions for student athletes. That does not happen at IU. A third critical goal of COIA, or fundamental principle is its establishment of a working relationship with the NCAA to deal with academic misconduct and academic fraud involving student athletes. I would say, in a recent questionnaire that followed up the president's meeting with President Emmert in August, there's a list of what is the most significant potential problem concerning the NCAA, and the issue of academic misconduct, academic fraud, was very high on the list.

And lastly, COIA has gotten—has written and gotten—endorsement from its members, like IU, several white papers that stress best practices, advocate change for the NCAA, and the general areas of emphasis of COIA are on academic integrity, and quality as it relates to student athletes, student athlete welfare, campus governance, and fiscal responsibility in terms of the area of intercollegiate athletics. In the last regard from the meeting last winter at the Big Ten headquarters, COIA passed a general resolution that endorsed the concept of openness, transparency, and consistency among institutions in terms of fiscal responsibility, and we would like, essentially, this Council to endorse that statement and before this meeting started, Craig will have that up on the website for appropriate endorsement or review by the Council of the latest statement that relates to fiscal transparency. So that's a big, sort of a sweeping overview of what's going on in Intercollegiate Athletics nationally at the conference level and on campus, and the role of COIA in affecting that environment.

HANSON: Thanks very much, Bruce. We just have a few minutes for questions, but anyone have any questions for Bruce? Comments? Yes?

TERRY: I have a question. You represented us very ably for a number of years in the sponsored admit program. Does that transfer to Kurt now that he is our FAR, or is somebody else—

JAFFEE: Kurt is—he's talking about now the sponsored—

TERRY: The sponsored admit program—

JAFFEE: —Committee, they're basically currently on campus three, one dealing mainly with the music school, one dealing with athletics, and one dealing with everybody else. I can't speak for the general one or music, but the—it's really the choice, Julia Lamber's choice, but Kurt is heading that committee, and that committee consists solely of faculty members who are on the Athletics Committee.

TERRY: The second question then is for Carolyn. We decided a few years ago that instead of the head of this Council or an officer of it being our representative to COIA that it would be Bruce, but I think it was Bruce as FAR. So my question is, is Kurt now our representative to— from this Council—to COIA?

JAFFEE: I just want to correct that. Basically the issue of the President of the BFC would be our representative, and because of lack of time or interest, that devolved to me, even though I was at that time, not a member of the BFC. I actually think, candidly, having somebody on the BFC is more important than having the Faculty Athletic Representative, although...so this, I think is an Executive Committee.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Yes, that is something we could discuss later, but as the clock is ticking, we don't have time. But I do have a question for you. You mentioned that Purdue University is not a member. Could you comment on why?

JAFFEE: Say that again?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: I thought you said that Purdue University is not a member of COIA.

JAFFEE: That's a tough question for me to explain why anything going on at Purdue. I think, candidly, I think the issue in talking to its Faculty Athletic Representatives, they have two, that it's basically a lack of interest or motivation in faculty governance at Purdue relative to IU. I think, candidly, it's embarrassing that Purdue doesn't do it. Nebraska I think will join COIA, it's moving for an environment where most Big 12 schools are not members of COIA to obviously the Big Ten where there is pressure to do that.

HANSON: Anything else in the last minute? Okay, well thank you very much, Bruce. We're adjourned.

MEETING ADJOURNED: 5:29PM