

Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
October 2, 2018
Presidents Hall
2:30 pm – 4:30 pm

Members Present: Kyle Adams, Heather Akou, Hussein Banai, Alan Bender, Simon Brassell, Fritz Breithaupt, Paul Brunner, Daniel Bullock, Todd Burkhardt, Selene Carter, Barbara Cherry, Judah Cohen, Rachel Cohen, David Daleke, Kenneth Dau-Schmidt, Lori Dekydspotter, Erika Dowell, J Duncan, Jane Dutton, Ann Elsner, Alyce Fly, Phil Ford, Lynn Gilman, Krista Glazewski, Dennis Groth, Kenneth Guerra, Diane Henshel, Maggie Hopkins, Colin Johnson, Padraic Kenney, Peter Kloosterman, Robert Kravchuck, Ivan Kreilkamp, Moira Marsh, Meg Meiman, Thomas Nelson Laird, Eliza Pavalko, Eric Rasmusen, Angie Raymond, Lauren Robel, Leslie Rutkowski, Susan Seizer, Jim Sherman, Katie Siek, Marietta Simpson, Paul Sokol, Bruce Solomon, Geoffrey Sprinkle, Alex Tanford, Aaron Travers, Jonathan Trinidad, Richard Van Kooten, John Walbridge, Jacob Warner, Nick Williams, Alex Wisniewski

Members Absent: AJ Asomani-Adem, Carey Beam, Joseph D’Ambrosi, Frank Diaz, Linda Gales, Carol Hostetter, Pamela Jackson, Thomas Schoenenmann, Patrick Shih, William Winecoff

1. **Approval of [Minutes of September 18, 2018](#)**
2. **[Memorial Resolution for Robert Howard Shaffer](#)**
3. **[Memorial Resolution for Peter E. Bondanella](#)**
4. **Executive Committee Business** (10 minutes)
Moira Marsh, Faculty President
5. **Presiding Officer’s Report** (10 minutes)
Lauren Robel, Provost
6. **Question/Comment Period**
Faculty who are not members of the Council may address questions to Provost Robel or President Marsh by emailing bfcoff@indiana.edu.
7. **Discussion of faculty voting rights** (30 minutes)
[Discussion Item]
Nick Williams, Co-chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee
8. **Discussion of The Faculty’s Long-Range Plan for Indiana University (Bloomington)** (30 minutes)
[Discussion Item]
Alex Tanford, Past President and Chair of the Long Range Planning Committee

[B13-2018: The Faculty's Long-Range Plan for Indiana University \(Bloomington\)](#)

9. **Brief reports from BFC Committees** (30 minutes)
[Discussion Item]

Transcript

AGENDA ITEM ONE: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

ROBEL: As we wait in quiet hope for the coming of fall, could I hear a motion to approve the minutes, please? Thank you so much, Peter. Thank you, Bob. All in favor? Opposed? Thank you. Eliza.

PAVALKO: Thank you. We have two memorial resolutions today. The first is for Robert Howard Shaffer, 101, passed away peacefully on April 21st, 2017.

AGENDA ITEM TWO: MEMORIAL RESOLUTION FOR ROBERT HOWARD SHAFFER

Robert Howard Shaffer, 101, passed away peacefully surrounded by family on April 21, 2017 in New Smyrna Beach, Florida.

A native of Indiana, Bob was born September 13, 1915 in Delphi, Indiana, to John W. and Bessie Hall Shaffer. He graduated in 1936 from DePauw University, Greencastle, IN, where he received his BA in history. He was a member of DePauw's Athletic Hall of Fame as a quarterback and defensive back on the 1933 football team, which was undefeated, untied, and un-scored-upon. He earned his MA degree in guidance from Teacher's College, Columbia University, and his PhD degree in higher education from New York University in 1945. He was awarded LLD degrees from DePauw in 1976 and from Indiana University in 1985.

Bob loved Indiana University. He served this campus as a respected and wise administrator, a treasured teacher and mentor, and an engaged member of the community, attending numerous campus events. IU basketball was always one of his favorites, and he was known to talk with alumni regularly about the team's status in the Big Ten. He first came to IU in 1941 to join the School of Business faculty, after serving as a professional staff member of the Boy Scouts of America for five years in New York City. Bob left IU briefly to serve in the U.S. Army from 1943-1945. He returned to IU and accepted a joint faculty appointment in the School of Education and School of Business. Beginning in 1946 he served as Assistant Dean of Students until 1955, when he assumed the positions of Dean of Students and Director of the Division of Student Personnel until 1968, after which he joined the Higher Education faculty.

In 1959 and 1961 Bob served as a consultant under Indiana University's educational contract with the United States Agency for International Development in Thailand. In 1967 he was special consultant to Kabul University, Kabul, Afghanistan, where he worked with an IU team to help improve facilities,

programs, and the administration of higher education. He was chair of the Department of Higher Education from 1973 to 1979, and then chair of the Department of College Student Personnel Administration from 1979 until his retirement in 1981.

He was instrumental in establishing the Higher Education and Student Affairs (HESA) program, formerly known as the College Student Personnel (CSP) program, as one of the most prestigious programs in the country. During his time at Indiana University Bob guided the campus through the turbulent times of war and campus protests. Focused on creating a campus environment that would bring the community together, recognize individual student struggles, and advance a campus climate that valued freedom of speech and diversity of opinion, he was instrumental in the creation of counseling, veterans' affairs, and international services offices on IU's campus.

His legacy is found throughout IU, and the higher education and student affairs profession. In a 1986 article in *The Journal of Counseling and Development*, Professors George D. Kuh and Michael D. Coomes noted, "Everybody who knows Bob admires and respects him. For over five decades – as a counselor, dean of students, faculty member, professional association leader, and international consultant – Bob has pursued a simple but important goal: To encourage the personal and professional development of those with whom he has contact. Throughout the world there are thousands of former students, staff members, and professional associates – all of whom he considers friends – who have been touched by Bob's enthusiasm and commitment to human development." Bob's contributions to higher education extended far beyond his formal roles at IU. Bob was a national leader in higher education and student affairs, and contributed significantly to the literature surrounding student affairs work in higher education.

His professional activities included leadership positions in several national organizations in the field of student affairs, from which he received numerous honors and awards. Bob served as the first president of the American Personnel and Guidance Association (1951-1953); appointed associate editor of *The Personnel and Guidance Journal* (1948); secretary of the American College Personnel Association (ACPA) (1948); regional vice president of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) (1964-1966: Region V); and editor of *The NASPA Journal* (1969-1972). In 1969, Bob was honored by both the American Personnel and Guidance Association with a special meritorious service award, and by the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators for distinguished service to higher education. In recognition of his seminal contributions to the field, Bob was awarded the inaugural Outstanding Contribution to Higher Education Award from NASPA (1969); the NASPA Scott Goodnight Award for Outstanding Performance as a Dean (1973); the ACPA Annuit Coeptis Award (1988); the ACPA Esther Lloyd-Jones Professional Service Award (1979); and the NASPA John L. Blackburn Distinguished Pillar of the Profession (2017).

While the profession has lost a pioneer in the field, Bob's contributions and caring approach to working with students will not be forgotten. Students, faculty and staff throughout the country are honored annually with awards in Bob's name. The IU Class of 1967 created the Robert H. Shaffer Chair in the College of Arts and Sciences. The Association of Fraternity and Sorority Advisors honors an individual annually with the Robert H. Shaffer Award which since 1980 is given to a professional who has demonstrated a long-term commitment to fostering change, building relationship, and mentoring professional in fraternity/sorority life. Tenured graduate faculty are recognized annually through the Robert H. Shaffer Award for Academic Excellence as a Graduate Faculty Member which

was established in 1986 to honor faculty who have a distinguished record of scholarly achievement, have made significant contributions to the professional associations, and inspired graduate students in the field. The IU HESA program honors a doctoral graduate with the Robert H. Shaffer Alumni Award which is typically presented annually to someone who exemplifies outstanding service to the student affairs profession. Each year at IU undergraduate students are selected to be part of the Shaffer Internship program where they work in the Division of Student Affairs to create conditions on campus that promote student engagement. Into his 100th year, Bob would Skype with the undergraduate interns to learn about the work they were doing on campus. He never stopped engaging with students, faculty, staff, and alumni on campus.

Bob is survived by his loving wife of twenty-seven years, Dr. Joye Coy Shaffer; his son and daughter-in-law, Jim and Lynn Shaffer, of Cape Elizabeth, ME; a daughter-in-law, Margaret Vegeler, of Fort Wayne, IN; stepsons John Coy of East Amherst, NY, and William Coy of Nashville, TN; stepdaughters Connie Coy Weeks of Orlando, FL and Teri Coy McLean of Gainesville, FL; their spouses; two grandchildren, Derek Shaffer and Ryan Shaffer; four great grandchildren; eight step grandchildren; and two step great grandchildren. His first wife, Marjorie Fitch Shaffer, to whom he was married for forty-seven years, and a son, Bruce W. Shaffer, who died in the Viet Nam war, preceded him in death.

Bob will be missed, but never forgotten. Indiana University is grateful for his many contributions that continue to touch the lives of undergraduate and graduate students. This resolution will be presented to the Bloomington Faculty Council and become part of the official minutes and its archive to document the remarkable life of Robert Howard Shaffer and his contributions to Indiana University and higher education in the U.S. and internationally. Copies of the resolution will be sent to his widow, Dr. Joye Coy Shaffer, and his son and daughter-in-law Jim and Lynn Shaffer. In addition, copies will be sent to the national offices of NASPA: Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education, ACPA: College Student Educators International, American Counseling Association (ACA) and Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors (AFA).

Danielle M. DeSawal, Clinical Associate Professor and Higher Education and Student Affairs Master's Program Coordinator, IUB

George D. Kuh, Chancellor's Professor of Higher Education Emeritus, IUB

Richard N. McKaig, Retired, Vice Provost for Student Affairs and Dean of Students, IUB

Lori Reesor, Vice Provost for Student Affairs and Dean of Students, IUB

AGENDA ITEM THREE: MEMORIAL RESOLUTION FOR PETER E. BONDANELLA

Our second resolution is for Peter E Bondanella.

Peter Bondanella, Distinguished Professor Emeritus of Italian Studies, Comparative Literature, and Film Studies at Indiana University, passed away near his home in Utah on May 28, after a tough struggle with pancreatic cancer. Everyone who ever met Peter can only imagine the strength and intensity with which he fought the disease, physically and intellectually, while still working on his

scholarship, traveling to conferences throughout the US and Italy, visiting with Italian directors in his beloved Rome, mentoring his students, and collaborating with colleagues until the very end.

Peter Bondanella earned a BA in French and Political Science at Davidson College (1966), a Masters in Political Science at Stanford University (1967), and a PhD in Comparative Literature at the University of Oregon (1970). After teaching for a few years at Wayne State University, he joined the faculty of Indiana University in 1972, where he had a remarkable career as a scholar and teacher of Renaissance studies, Italian cinema and culture, and literary theory, until he retired in 2007. Although he published widely on Italian and European literature, he is best known internationally as a scholarly pioneer in Italian cinema. He began teaching regular courses on Italian cinema in English in the 1970's, when the discipline was not taught in foreign language and culture departments, and was, only partially and sporadically, taught in Film Studies programs and units, but not as a specific academic discipline. Before the publication of Bondanella's 1983 widely acclaimed history of Italian Cinema (*Italian Cinema: From Neorealism to the Present*. New York: Frederick Ungar, 1983), which was awarded the 1984

President's Prize from the American Association for Italian Studies, the English speaking academic world generally knew only a few major Italian filmmakers.

Among his many other publications on cinema, we must mention his books on Fellini (*The Cinema of Federico Fellini*, Princeton UP: 1992; *The Films of Federico Fellini*, Cambridge UP: 2002) and Rossellini (*The Films of Roberto Rossellini*, Cambridge UP: 2003), as well as the revised and updated edition of his history of the Italian Cinema (latest edition, New York: Continuum: 2009). Ever since his years in graduate school, he showed a remarkable intellectual curiosity about literary theory and culture and, in addition numerous journal articles (on Rousseau, Proust, Svevo, Kafka), Peter authored books such as *The Eternal City: Roman Images in the Modern World* (U of North Carolina Press: 1987, which was nominated for the Pulitzer Prize for non-fiction), and *Umberto Eco and the Open Text: Semiotics, Fiction, Popular Culture* (Cambridge UP: 1997). While the first book was an early model of cultural studies for Italian culture, the latter was one of the first books to revisit Eco's entire production to date, without focusing solely on one of the many activities of the late Italian thinker.

Before these accomplishments in Italian film and contemporary literature, Bondanella began his career as a refined scholar and translator of Renaissance authors. After publishing monographs on Machiavelli (*Machiavelli and the Art of Renaissance History*, Wayne State UP: 1974) and Guicciardini (Boston: Twayne, 1976), he co-translated Boccaccio's *Decameron* (New York: Norton, 1977) and Machiavelli's *The Prince* (Oxford UP: 1984) together with his colleague and noted translator Mark Musa.

He has also co-translated many authors with his spouse, Julia Conaway Bondanella. Among these translation and editions, we might mention Giorgio Vasari's *The Life of the Artists* (Oxford UP, 1991), Machiavelli's *Discourses on Livy* (Oxford UP, 1997), and Benvenuto Cellini's *My Life* (Oxford UP, 2002).

Peter Bondanella was a lifetime member of the American Association of Teachers of Italian and the American Association for Italian Studies, and served in leadership roles in a variety of academic organizations during his illustrious career. Additionally, he received numerous awards including the National Endowment for the Humanities Younger Humanist Fellowship (1972-73), Senior Fellow of the American Council of Learned Societies (1988), Mellon Visiting Professor and Mellon Lecturer at Tulane

University (Spring 2001), Fellow at the National Humanities Research Centre at the Australian National University, Canberra (September 2001), Mellon Foundation Emeritus Fellowship, and most importantly selection to the European Academy of Sciences and Arts (2009). Moreover, he educated and mentored three generations of scholars in Italian, Comparative Literature, and Film Studies. Many of his former students are well-known professors at major academic institutions in North America and Europe, and through their publications and teaching, they keep his scholarly and pedagogical inheritance alive.

Peter leaves behind his spouse, Julia Conaway Bondanella, a scholar of Italian Renaissance literature, and Professor Emerita of Italian Studies at Indiana University.

Colleen Ryan
Professor, French and Italian Studies, IUB

Andrea Ciccarelli
Professor, French and Italian Studies; Dean, Hutton Honors College

ROBEL: Yeah, those were two giants in their fields. When Bob Shaffer passed away, I heard from people all across the country who remembered his contributions and, really, in forging the field of student affairs.

And Peter Bondanella, we all get to celebrate every year with the wonderful Italian film festival that happens every year through FRIT, so please stand.

Thank you.

Turn now to our president, Moira Marsh, for executive committee business.

AGENDA ITEM FOUR: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE BUSINESS

MARSH: Good afternoon. I have several things to report out. First of all, I've received information about a celebratory conference called Title Six At 60: A Bicentennial Symposium On International Education To Mark The 60th Anniversary Of Title Six.

If you're interested, go to internationalcrossroads.indiana.edu and you can register there for that conference. The dates are—that's a key thing—October 25th through 27th for that.

Second, of the Executive Committee has arranged or is in the process of arranging three town halls to discuss and provide information about the upcoming vote to ratify the amendments of the Constitution.

So most people here are very familiar with those, but our colleagues are not necessarily so familiar. The dates of those town halls are Wednesday, November Seventh from 3:00 to 4:00 pm in the IMU Georgian room. And then two on Thursday, November Eighth: one at 3:00 pm to 4:00 pm in the Dogwood room and another, again, November Eight, 5 to 6:30 in the Dogwood Room.

And there will be a lot more information coming out from the Constitution of Rules Committee and the EC closer to the time so that we are all talking about the same information, hopefully.

The Educational Policies Committee has been discussing the Diversity Task Force Report, which recommended that the general education shared goal of diversity in the US should require students to fulfil coursework that meets a selection of specific learning outcomes from three distinct co-categories.

If you can't guess by now, I'm actually reading this, this is from the chairs of the Educational Policies Committee, so they know more about it than I do. The EPC is eager to receive suggestions and comments on possible approaches to implementing this enhanced diversity requirement from all campus constituencies.

And so they have thrown open their next EPC meeting which is scheduled for Friday October 19th, at 9 AM. The location to be determined depending on, I think, demand. And it would take the form of an open meeting to provide an opportunity for student, staff, and faculty perspectives on the recommendations to be heard.

And this will allow the EPC to provide a more informed view of the campus consensus for initiating an enhanced diversity requirement. And that will be conveyed to this body during the discussion of the task force report, which is tentatively scheduled for the next BFC meeting after—okay, so the next BFC meeting is actually going to be the State of the University Address from the President, but the following meeting is, hours again, October 23rd, and that will be on the enhanced diversity report will be on the agenda for that meeting most likely.

So, there will be an announcement coming out soon from the educational policy committee on that. And there'll also be at that time, information that gives access to a web form that faculty, students, and constituents can use to input written comments to the educational policy committee.

And then finally, earlier today the UFC executive committee met for its monthly teleconference and I have a couple of updates from that. First of all, as this body did last year, the IUPUI and the regional campus councils have considered the possibility of adding a third lecturer rank. There's broad support for this change on all the campuses, but there is vigorous debate, should we say, about what to call it.

You might remember that debate we had, so it's not just us. So any change in faculty ranks requires action by the University Faculty Council and by the Trustees. And so the UFCAC will shortly appoint a task force that charge with crafting recommendations to go to the UFC for action in time for its spring meeting which be late April.

And that task force will include an equal number of tenure track and non-tenure track faculty from all campuses. And the other thing the UFC committee is working on is we've been reviewing changes to the various university conflict of interest policies. There are at least seven of them, two of which are actually UFC policies, so that's why we were involved in reviewing these changes.

And in the course of that discussion it has come to our attention that possibly there may have been changes introduced to particularly the Financial Conflicts of Interest in Research Policy, ACA 74 which was discussed by Research Affairs Committees here and at IUPUI. But it seems that we inadvertently forgot to vote on them.

So we're going to report at what I call the tiny task force to fix that. But that'll be going to the UFC most likely and most likely later this semester. And that's all from me.

AGENDA ITEM FIVE: PRESIDING OFFICER'S REPORT

ROBEL: Great, thank you. And just a quick reminder from me that it's first Thursdays this week.

With any luck, it'll be a little bit cooler. It'll be stunningly good. Remember it's free. It's 5:00 to 7:00, and then from there you can go on to any number of events that are happening all around it, around the Arts Plaza. But this is a wonderful First Thursdays, it's about how the arts and humanities can work with people concerned about environmental activism to really explicate and describe and talk about the environment.

And so it's a wonderful blend of the arts, and humanities, and science, plus all the great music you've come to expect. And with that, I will close my comments. The trustees are meeting this week at IUPUI. I'll have quite a bit more to say after that meeting is over.

AGENDA ITEM SIX: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

ROBEL: All right, I received no questions in advance of the meeting. I'm not sure if there are questions from the floor at this point? Okay, great. Ann?

ELSNER: This is a very minor point. My unit, Optometry, has some promotions coming up. And some of the people being considered have an instructor track.

And we were told at first, yes, that we should review them. And then we were told, no, we didn't need to review them because we're not sending them off to campus yet with the others. So I just wanted to make sure that-

ROBEL: You're doing the right thing?

ELSNER: Yeah.

ROBEL: Eliza, would you like to respond? Thank you.

PAVALKO: Yes, I would. So the process for, I assume these are lecturers, you said the instructor track lecturers?

ELSNER: There seem to be quite a mixture of people all going for promotions. So if you could just hit the main ones and tell us yes or no.

PAVALKO: Right, and certainly, the process would be the same within the school. So throughout lecture, clinical faculty, and lectures go through a promotion review process and that's always within the school. But our current practice for lecturers is that if it's a positive vote in the school, it doesn't come to the campus for further review.

It's just, that's the final decision. And that should continue. So certainly within the school, there should be continued practices you've always done. So the piece that was passed last spring as part of the package, all of those are advisory to UFC because the appointments policy, the policies that guide those, are university policies, and so we need to wait for them to go through and see if they approve.

If for some reason they don't approve the third rank, which are the other pieces that we approved, we have proposed the change for the Bloomington policy and so we'd still do that. And that would send those promotion decisions to the campus level for review. But I think it makes sense to let UFC do their work, and then we certainly would be sure to give schools and the faculty being considered ample notice before we go to change the process where everybody is reviewed at the campus level. So you find continuous we've been doing for now and we promise we'd give ample notice before that process changes.

AGENDA ITEM SEVEN: DISCUSSION OF FACULTY VOTING RIGHTS

ROBEL: Thank you. All right, I move now to our discussion of faculty voting rights.

And Nick Williams, I think, is leading this discussion, Nick?

WILLIAMS: This issue might be seen as a continuation of the work that's already been done on constitutional amendments. Those constitutional amendments, some of them anyway, took up the issue of NTT participation in campus governance, and, in particular, on this body.

And that seemed like a natural place to start since it involved an issue that this body had direct authority over, and could pass policy and immediately effect some change. So then the logical next step seemed to be to think about non-tenured track faculty's participation in school and departmental governance.

And I'll admit that when I first started thinking about this issue, I thought we were limited to thinking in terms of a non-binding resolution. Because I had the understanding, largely drawn from this campus's policy, that this body, the BFC, didn't really have a great deal of authority in dictating to the schools.

Because as the first sentence says here, voting rights should be determined by the school, which may assign the decision to the departmental level. But I've been instructed, I've been told that there might be more potential to work on policy than I thought this allowed. So I bring to you the general issue of non-tenured track faculty participation in departmental and school governance.

Largely to get your sense of what the state of thinking of this body is. So this is a discussion item today rather than a first reading of a policy or anything like that. But to guide discussion a little bit, I thought I'd mention some issues that could be touched on.

The matter of NTT participation, and election of unit heads and departmental chairs, their participation in committees, membership on committees. Their participation in discussion and voting on curricular issues, on departmental hires, on routine administrative issues, and on promotion of NTT faculty. So I really don't have anything more than that prepared, but throw out this issue to you to see what the state of opinion is on this body about the potential of creating policy about NTT faculty participating in this variety of ways.

ROBEL: Could you talk, Nick, a little bit about that jurisdictional issue you alluded to at the beginning?

WILLIAMS: It's really the case that I personally don't entirely understand how the faculty affairs committee might create policy on this. And I know that there were folks on the executive committee who thought that that was possible.

So I'm quite willing to-

ROBEL: Defer to the EC to talk about that? Alex, would that be you?

TANFORD: I think there-

ROBEL: There's a constitutional jurisdictional allocation between the schools and the BFC, so how did you think that through?

TANFORD: A couple of different ways, one is there's no question but that this body has legislative authority over the conditions of work and employment, the terms and conditions under which the faculty on this campus operate. To suddenly remove from that general mandate, but we cannot address voting rights, is to essentially take the largest chunk of areas in which we have general responsibility and remove them.

A couple of examples sort of to tell you what I mean. One is that Indiana cannot decide that it's going to raise the voting age to 30, because they are tired of young people voting. But they can certainly decide a lot of the procedural issues. How far in advance do they have to register? What kind of ID do they have to show? Florida can decide to disenfranchise all of its felons, even though most other states don't.

So it strikes me that the most principled distinction between our jurisdiction and school jurisdiction, same one as the distinction between UFC jurisdiction and our jurisdiction, is that we have the right to set the basic terms and conditions under which faculty on this campus operate. The details of that, for example, the six issues that Nick has put up there, strikes me that that's the area in which the units sort of set their own procedures.

But on the fundamental issue of voting rights, I don't see how we can say that we don't have general authority. We pass policies all the time that affects the units.

ROBEL: Well I would guess the thing that would get in the way would be the Constitution's division of authority of the faculty between the campus, which has legislative authority regarding the campus' structure of faculty governance consistent with university policies, and the school faculties which have legislative authority pertaining to the school regarding the school's structure of faculty governance, consistent with university faculty standards. So, what do you do with that second provision?

TANFORD: If university faculty standards say you get voting rights in your department, then they have to be consistent with that university standard.

ROBEL: But university and campus are not the same thing. Wouldn't this be a UFC matter and not a campus matter constitutionally? I mean I don't want to cut off discussion. We can certainly have it. But I would think that would have to be worked out with UFC.

TANFORD: I think any of these federalism discussions...Clearly, there has to be lots of communication at all levels. But if the UFC is silent, then what we do is consistent with UFC policy.

ROBEL: Although it's not consistent with our own constitution, if our constitutional provision is specific about schools having decisional authority over the governance structure in their schools.

A specific provision ought to trumpet a silence at the university level, I would think. But again, I don't want to cut off discussion, I just want to note the issue before-

TANFORD: I'm just saying, we have accepted, for a long time, it has sort of been general wisdom that the scope of legislative jurisdiction of the unit is very broad and the scope of this unit is very narrow. And I'm saying that as we all know the US Supreme Court decides every Constitution dispute via a five to four vote. I'm not saying that my view might prevail. But there are perfectly good arguments that we can set the basic terms and conditions of faculty employment. Leaving it up to the units then to work out the procedural details because we do that all the time.

ROBEL: Okay well note the disagreement and we'll move on to the discussion. Thanks. Yep?

PAVALKO: I have a question for Alex. So I'm trying to think through...I know certainly a number of departments within the college, and, I think, other schools as well come up with their own definitions of voting rights based on people who have multiple appointments.

And somebody has to have 50% appointment or 25% appointment, and I know those vary. So how would this, I'm trying to think how decisions we might make here might affect the department's ability then to make those decisions about who they consider their faculty and voting faculty?

TANFORD: I don't, it seems to me we have... If we don't have a clear definition of faculty and voting faculty, then that needs to be addressed, and it's a separate question. But I think we do and I don't think there is any, I mean we have general guidelines, some of the UFC level and some of the BFC

level on people who hold visiting status and various kinds of statuses other than full-time tenure-track faculty.

So I, again, the policy I absolutely agree would have to have lot of flexibility built into it, that allows the units to adapt it to their own internal structure. But I would say we can draw the line at a unit claiming our NTT faculty may not vote on anything.

It strikes me that that then implicates basic questions of faculty progress.

ROBEL: Okay, Colin?

JOHNSON: I'm just wondering, since this is sort of an open discussion of this, and the jurisdictional question is on the table if another way to test this is to see how the institution would react to precisely a kind of hypothetical that you were putting out there.

If an individual department, for example, established governance guidelines that said everybody gets to vote except Bob, right? Would there be a mechanism, just as a sort of edge example? Would there be a mechanism at the level of the campus to address what is in that case clearly, I would think, a violation of some kind of basic bedrock notion of sort of enfranchisement as meaningful participation in governance.

Other than going into your office and going, I hate these people Eliza help me.

PAVALKO: That's usually where it starts, right? But no, we'll walk it back.

JOHNSON: If they hate me, tell me.

PAVALKO: I mean certainly if there's both a school level and, I assume, really it would be at the school level where I think if a department had a policy on voting that said, you know, we don't allow this person or that, there has to be a valid policy. But typically that would be the school level committee that would I think review that.

ROBEL: Yep, let's see. Eric and then...

RASMUSEN: Yeah this kind of thing came up in my department a couple years ago.

We had a dispute because my chairman said the departmental policy was that he could choose the three person hiring committee, and only they would vote on hiring assistant professors. And I thought there should be department wide faculty vote. And you may remember, Eliza, that I appealed to you and I was told that, but that's an internal thing so that the campus couldn't do anything for us.

I should say that I also complained to the school people that Kelly and the Dean the next year required departments to come up with written constitutions that required faculty votes. But that is a story anyway for what is worth of this kind of a problem.

ROBEL: All right, let's see... Next, and then we'll come back to you.

DUNCAN: So this body is constituted for the purpose of faculty governance and I'd like to assume that everyone is here because they believe that's a useful, and productive thing. I would assume then that our plan in any discussion about these matters is how we could make faculty governance as extensive, and as productive as possible.

And that happens only when all members of the faculty are included in governance, which in many departments in schools right now is not the case for non-tenure track faculty. Certainly, the issues that are here, I mean look at that last one. Assume that you were not allowed to vote on promotion in your category, how would you feel about participation in that department?

So, I hope that the discussion here engenders some suggestions for how we could improve working conditions because that needs to happen.

KLOOSTERMAN: All over the map and thus we don't have anything that would be 80% of the people do this, any leading as to which way we want to go on these sorts of things?

WILLIAMS: I'd be lying if I'd said that I'd surveyed a broad variety of departments but that's my sense. And of the departments that I know in the college, in particular, I don't think there is a lot of NTT participation on this issues.

ROBEL: Do you all know your own policies in your own schools?

Could I ask you to find out? I know what the policy is in the law school, which includes voting rights on most things, but not on tenure-track appointment. Not on tenure-track promotion and tenure. So I'm wondering and I'm pretty clear that the college is all over the map internally.

But I don't know what everybody else does. And I asked Eliza before this meeting, and she didn't know either. So might it be a good idea to get some sense?

SOLOMON: Yeah just for clarification you said find out what your schools do but as a member of the college, I mean I pretty much know what my department does, I think.

Shouldn't we be taking that into account?

ROBEL: I think the College is probably all over the map. That's my sense. I think that there may be more or less variations school to school. I'm not saying that they're all uniform, I think there's probably less variation. Yep, have a question again?

Yep Barb.

CHERRY: There we got that. Two points. One is, well as far as being able to have some flexibility, for example, when I was in the Telecommunications Department before there was a Media School, because the departments had the power to determine, we expressly included NTT faculty that have certain voting rights that they didn't typically have in other departments.

So always keep in mind that if you can't reach agreement at a macro level. Leaving flexibility to allow some differences at a lower level is also a way of helping to enfranchise at a lower level when you can't get it green in the total level. But my main question is this, since it appears that we have a difference in interpretation going on between the Provost and our past President here about even what the constitution means, it seems to me the first thing to wrestle down is what does the BFC actually have jurisdiction to do or not. Because that will then set forth what tasks make sense for us to embark on. And whether or not, if for example we don't have jurisdiction to do it right now, what would it take to enable jurisdiction?

So, it seems to me, we still need to understand the procedural hurdles. And it's not clear to me how does that happen? How do we wrestle down kind of more of that definitive interpretation of what authority is or is not.

ROBEL: That's a great question and the discussion today would be useful no matter what because where Nick came from in the beginning was if not a policy then we could pass a resolution and it would have some force with the departments and schools, the College perhaps. But it's a really great question. What you do with the disagreement about constitutional interpretation. I'm happy to think a little more about it in this context. I'm sure Alex will as well. Yep, Padraic?

KENNEY: There's a question about the second point there. Is committee memberships meant to refer to the question of service then? And, not voting so to question whether NTT, faculty have access to all committees?

WILLIAMS: I think both service and voting on those committees.

ROBEL: Who else?

DUNCAN: So certainly I would be interested in the constitutional issues also but if nothing else we can at least pass recommendations as the Provost noted.

For things like committee membership and service, this becomes increasingly relevant as we consider further appointments in some of these categories. A lot of the proposals for example for a third rank in my appointment category include strong requirements for service. Which I think is appropriate but only if that service is accessible which it often isn't especially at the school and department level.

Certainly even in a school and department that are very very favorable to my appointment category, I found it difficult for a long time to enter in to those committees and at the campus level, very difficult. We would like to see more service by people who are motivated to do it. We don't want to have to strong arm people into committee membership. One of the ways for you to get more time to conduct that research you really have the meaning to get to instead of being bothered by your department chair constantly to you serve on the same committee is to let some of the other people in your department to serve on it. And some of those people might be non-tenure track members.

ROBEL: Who's next? Eric and then John.

RASMUSEN: Well, I think the problem is ordinarily we do strong arm people into being on committees, so a question is, could we force NTTs to serve on committees also or is their contracts say that they can't be required to do that?

I don't know.

WALBRIDGE: I was going to address that. There's a couple of sides to the committee membership issue. I'm in a small department with I think a little over a quarter of our faculty are lecturers, and we need them on committees because warm bodies are in short supply. I think I've got quarter of our faculty are on leave this year.

The other issue that then arises is questions of official responsibilities, evaluation of how service ranks. And, in fact, given that significant number of lectures actually have terminal degrees. I'm director of graduate study, my department you know we have graduates students who want these people on their PhD committees.

So there is a, I think, all but very large departments, there is a genuine need for participation by non-tenure track faculty on committees and then fact in graduate education.

ROBEL: Thank you. Let's see, I think, it's Colin and then Alan.

JOHNSON: I was just going to say, Alex, I was thinking earlier about the reference to the Supreme Court and issues of federalism.

It does seem to me that one of the challenges we have on some level, because we think in that paradigm, is we actually don't have a court to adjudicate grievances around these questions, not like I'm suggesting we create one, but one, because-

ROBEL: That's working out real well.

JOHNSON: Yeah, that's working out super well. And then let's confirm people, that'll be great.

Anyway, but it does seem to me that one area, for example, where we might have jurisdiction would be to specify how grievances with respect to governance policies. Like who has jurisdiction to actually mediate or address them.

So it's not clear. I think the assumption would be that the higher level unit structure if, for example, in the College of Arts and Science, somebody in a particular department had a grievance with respect to the manner in which those things were being executed, and implemented in a department, logic would dictate that they would go to the dean, or they would go to the next level up, or maybe Eliza because your purview is much larger.

But I do think it would be within our rights to say, we are going to be quite explicit about how these issues are actually adjudicated when what marks them as actionable is an individual grievance that can be brought to somebody's attention. And I think that could actually articulated in fairly general

terms without getting into the issue of specifying what those rights are to allow for the addressing of individual cases where people feel like they're being poorly served by that.

ROBEL: Alan?

BENDER: Yes, I'm thinking about possible resolutions or best practices. And it seems to me that one suggestion would be for each department to have policies in the first place about who may vote on what. I mean, so we're talking about NTT faculty but there are some departments where it's not clear even if tenure-track faculty members get to vote on curricular issues.

Or some sorts of departmental hires, like for NTT faculty, it seems like that's done without tenure-track faculty for the most part knowing that it's even happening. And same with curricular issues in some departments. The Department of Biology, where I'm from, we're right now creating a simple policy about who in the department not only gets the vote on what sort of policies but who gets to create them and how that process works. So that's just another thing to throw in, it's not just voting but it's how you create policies. But then we should be talking not just about NTT faculty but also about TT.

And so maybe one recommendation would be that each department should have some policies in the first place about who gets to vote on what.

ROBEL: Is that the faculty constitution that each part of the campus is supposed to have, Eliza?

PAVALKO: I think most departments do have by-laws of some kind, I have to confess, I haven't gone through and checked to make sure every single...And ideally, they're posted on a website so that we can link to them. But I know certainly within the College, if you go in you can find every department has their policies, and I think most do. Now there are some departments in schools where it's more of the school level that has them.

School Of Public health, for example, has largely school-level policies, and so it certainly varies across schools as well. But really, I have yet to find a department or school that didn't have some kind of bylaws for guiding. And if we found that, we certainly would strongly encourage them to do that quickly.

ROBEL: I think your point is well taken, because I will say that I have been surprised in the past, few years since I have been in this position at the variety of cultural assumptions that are made across the campus with respect to things that seem at the core of faculty governance.

Hiring members of the faculty, for instance, Eric's example was a good example. Who gets to vote on that? How does that process move forward? Curricular decisions. There is just a variety of practice. And frankly, I think we would do well to have a good sense of that variety because I think there are some places where things that I think of as core to faculty.

Things that that belong to the faculty like curricular issues and decisions about hiring maybe are a little bit abided in the processes. And that could be for lots of reasons. It could be because there are

schools or departments within the College that have come to other decisions and done that explicitly in conversation with faculty.

But I do think it needs to be explicitly in conversation with faculty.

Yep, okay. There and there again.

DUNCAN: So there's a clear desire for more information about what the school and departmental policies are. Do we have a good mechanism to reach out and get that data?

Does a committee need to be charged with that? Do we need to pass a motion to make that happen or can we just reach out and get that information?

ROBEL: We can do that, we're happy to. Eliza, do you-

PAVALKO: Yep, certainly all of that information, you can go to our website, through policies, and it has links to school and departmental policies. And so those should be there, and they are for most of the school, and really for-

DUNCAN: What we've seen before, sometimes at these presentations, are some nice summaries. Understanding that not everybody has the time to crawl every department and school on campus. Of the following departments allow the following types of voting by the following types of faculty.

And as Alan says, it might even be good to know what the rights are for tenure track faculty, while we're at it.

RASMUSEN: I've maybe looked at this more than anybody else in the room because of my own department having this big dispute. And the site is very good, I think every department in the College of Arts and Sciences has a written constitution.

They're all over the map, you wouldn't be able to have a simple chart unless you choose out the five or six or ten things out of the 50 that you want to have as parameters. The Kelly School, no department at all of the six had a written constitution before two years ago.

And then after this mess, I joined the Council, actually with Alan's suggestion in mind, pushing for that. But it turned out to be an empty door, our administration pushed the faculty to have written constitutions for the departments. I don't know if Informatics does at all or really, does anybody, except for the College departments, have any departmental written by-laws?

ROBEL: Departmental, yeah.

Right.

PAVALKO: And many of them are school level, in fact, except for the College, in most cases, they're school level where they've got the policies. And all the departments then go by those same policies.

NELSON LAIRD: So I think another thing that comes up out of these issues is just the functioning of some current policies that I think are important.

And I think the 60/40 rule is top among them, where does that apply, does the 60-40 rule apply to departments? Because if it does, don't we have departments that don't have anything tenure track faculty members? In which case they can't make decisions, apparently—at least constitutionally sanctioned ones.

So, I mean, it'd be good to have a survey and an understanding of how that policy is working and works variably or is not working in certain instances. And that might be something that needs to be taken up as a part of this.

ROBEL: All right, another question or two and then we can move on to the next topic. Yep, Diane, then John.

HENSHEL: Just to validate some of the comments, in SPEA we do not get to vote for departmental hires. We get to provide recommendations, and that's it, but it's up to the deans to decide.

ROBEL: Do you recommend, do you make recommendations and then the deans try to hire the people, is that the way it works?

TANFORD: Sort of.

ROBEL: Well, we had a meeting in this room last week, was it, to congratulate newly promoted and tenured faculty members. And I said at that point that if you've been newly tenured, you should ask the question what are you doing with your tenure?

If you are unhappy with the governance of your schools, I would really suggest that those of you who have tenure and, frankly, those of you with long-term contracts might take a little bit of time to spend some time in your schools seeing if your colleagues agree with you. And seeing if you can't make those local changes since they are clearly contemplated by the constitution, and no one is going to disagree with that, right, we're on the same page on that one.

TANFORD: As long as they are consistent with and not contradictory to university and campus policies.

ROBEL: University faculty policy, the same as this body's, right, okay, so I think-John was next? And then Bob. John, did you have your hand up?

No? Okay, great. Well, Bob, do you want to follow up?

KRAVCHUK: I just wanted to add that, in principle, I agree entirely with what you said, Lauren. But there's a prior problem, and that is that schools need to be very careful in who they select as their deans.

ROBEL: Yeah. Agree, totally agree with that, all right.

DOWELL: Given the wide variety of bad policy that people seem to indicate exists, maybe we should, instead of doing a survey of everything, suggest that folks who think they have a good policy alert the Faculty Affairs Committee of it.

And that could inform their consideration of the issue.

ROBEL: A great and positive suggestion. All right, you know that Faculty Affairs is considering this. If you have further thoughts, I would strongly suggest that you talk to Nick and talk to Faculty Affairs and we'll see where you end up next time.

AGENDA ITEM EIGHT: DISCUSSION OF THE FACULTY'S LONG-RANGE PLAN FOR INDIANA UNIVERSITY (BLOOMINGTON)

ROBEL: In the meantime, I'll see if I can convince my esteemed colleague in law or he can convince me offline, how about that? We'll move now to discussion of the faculty's long-range plan for, well, Indiana University Bloomington. Alex?

TANFORD: I'm bringing this to discussion as the putative chair of the Long Range Planning Committee, something that I have been for exactly one meeting.

This is to bring to the floor for discussion the document prepared last year by the wonderful Long Range Planning Committee under the direction of Rebecca Spang. Two of the members integrally responsible for the report, Heather Akou and Colin Johnson, are here. And I would turn over the discussion of what this document is and why it's being brought and where we go from here to them.

AKOU: All right.

TANFORD: Heather, do you need the clicker for visuals?

AKOU: If there are visuals, I didn't prepare any, do you have some?

TANFORD: I didn't prepare any.

AKOU: Okay. Let's see...

ROBEL: The document is so beautifully written that it paints its own picture.

AKOU: Wonderful, yes, and I do thank Rebecca for writing the document.

[00:53:23]

But there are a couple of important things to know about it. One is that it's certainly not just Rebecca's vision for long-range planning for the campus, this document came out of the committee

as a whole. We had many thoughtful discussions throughout the year, we met as often as every two to three weeks.

And I think this document really captures a lot of the essence of our conversation, so it is very much a group effort. And all of the committee members are named at the end of the document if you want to take a look at that. So another thing I want to say is that this document is not a proposal in the sense of other things that I've seen forwarded to the BFC for consideration, this is very much a working document.

It's not a proposal per se, it's definitely not *the* proposal, it's very much open for continued conversation. So, thinking in those terms, so the Long Range Planning Committee met many times last year. We held a couple of sort of town hall meetings. They weren't well attended, but we did invite all the elected members of the BFC to come and talk with us about their concerns, their visions, what they wanted to see included in this document.

And we also, after those, we individually reached out to members of the BFC. We weren't able to reach out to everyone, but I think each person on the committee sent emails to at least two or three representatives and held individual meetings and pursued the same questions. So we gave them a draft of our document, we asked for their feedback, and we really listened to their concerns and questions and, in many cases, really wonderful ideas.

So, the BFC in general has many committees, I've served on CREM in the past, I'm on the Mediation Committee this year, and again on the Long Range Planning Committee. But most of those committees carry out pretty well-defined short-term projects, I mean, well-defined-ish. Some are more nebulous than others, but many are meant to be carried out over a year or two-long span.

The Long Range Planning Committee, on the other hand, is a place where faculty across campus can work towards some kind of shared vision. What will Indiana University be like in 20 or 30 years, and how do we as a faculty body want to prepare for it? We expect our deans, the Provost, or the President to think about the future, but what do we think as faculty?

True shared governance means that we should be participating in the long-term decision making just as much as short-term decision making. This is kind of a conclusion that we came to as a committee. We decided that we would focus on the 20 to 30 year long distance planning. And that the work that other communities do short term is wonderful and very needed, but they're also needs to be a body that's really thinking ahead for the long term.

So, that being said, the long range planning committee needs two things to be effective. First of all, to have any claim that we represent the faculty as a whole, we really need to hear from more representatives, so we welcome continued conversation. IU is a really complicated campus, but we also have many talented and thoughtful colleagues, so we need to hear your concerns, we need to hear your good ideas and we're really happy to continue incorporating them into this document especially as we know this patterns across many conversations.

Two, as it makes sense to consider, starting to implement some of these Long Range plans, the Long Range Planning committee will need to work with other committees on the BFC. So for example, the document that we develop last year has something that we call the three, four, five plan.

As more and more students enter IU with transfer and AP credits, maybe we should encourage them to raise their aspirations instead of trying to rush through and have them finished in three years. Maybe we should encourage them to stay for four years or five years and graduate with both a bachelor's degree and a master's degree.

Maybe instead of trying to reconfigure general education, we should drill up a new call at the junior or senior level for students who wants to enter the world of doing research and earning a graduate degree. So I'm a newbie to the BFC, last year I attended as representative from the college policy committee.

This is my first year as an elected representative. So I don't want to step on any toes or make presumptions about what did or didn't happen in the past. But I do know that there is an interest in getting more people involved in the work of the BFC, and, I think, that the Long Range Planning committee is one place where we can listen to many people both on and off the BFC, and we really welcome input as we try to develop some kind of shared faculty vision.

So open now for comments.

ROBEL: Yeah, open it up for comments or thoughts. Yeah, Barb?

CHERRY: Yes, when I was reading the document on, I guess, page three, under ambitions and recommendations in the first bullet point as you were just talking about the potential for a multi-year or three, four, five year program.

The only thing that flagged for me was the concern that we have to be vigilant about how the state legislature looks at this. And, again, I think you know deeper background than I do. But my understanding is that there's been a number of pressures brought to bear about trying to encourage people to graduate in four years and so there's year-end financial pressure.

And this may lead into the concern of Ivy Tech and everything else. But we need to look at the big political picture about how difficult or hard or what kind of ground work we would need to lay to better enable a more extended time frame to do it.

I'm not opposed to it, in fact, I've witnessed a number of cases where the rigid four years, what if students want change a major or something? It makes it very difficult, but I just think we need to flag or be aware of the bigger political context in which if we were going to make some strategic plans, we have to deal with the political strategy.

ROBEL: I can give a little color commentary if you'd like. We have very few students who use their advanced placement or ACP credits to graduate in three years. I mean, I would say it's a trivial number. The state's performance funding is built around four years. But I don't take this document to

be saying that we really are trying to encourage students to spend more time, necessarily, getting an undergraduate degree, because for lots of reasons, it's costly to the students, and other things.

But more to encourage students to think about diversifying from their current strategy from taking multiple majors necessarily, which is what they do, to a strategy that might include giving them AN additional credential in a five-year period which is possible. We try to encourage that. David Johnson is here with a particular kind of program built around financial aid that allows students to keep their financial aid into their first year of graduate study if they finished undergraduate in three using those ACP credits.

But I don't think that was a particularly successful strategy without an underlying academic strategy of the type discussed here. So that might be helpful.

Let's see, Dianne?

HENSHEL: So one of the things the Long Range Planning could consider in reviewing this document and thinking about where to move forward, is that we've already seen the impact of politics on our student body in that we now have a significantly reduced international presence on campus, and that's affecting both undergraduate and graduate.

And it has been significant and it will affect our budget into the future. In addition, there's going to be a reduction in overall student body, at least that's the prediction, coming in, it's less than 10 years, and some people are saying 5 but other people are saying it could be as high as a 15% hit or more.

So one of the other things that needs to be considered is, what do we do about a reduced student body which is going to affect our budget? How do we handle either attracting worse students or changing our structure in some way or changing our programs?

TANFORD: Lauren, Katy has also...

SIK: Okay, so you mentioned you wanted to get feedback from the faculty. I was wondering if there is a short slide deck, so something I'm asking for is in our faculty meetings, if I can get five minutes and present it. I also sent out short bits for my notes and the faculty respond to me.

So if I can get a five minutes out of faculty meeting, and if we all could get five minutes, we can go through it and then send feedback in.

AKOU: That's a great idea. I'd be happy to prepare a few slides. We debated, how are we going to best capture this?

We could send out a survey, but that has its limitations, we could hold some focus groups, reach out to individuals, but that sounds like a great strategy for reaching out to a lot of people.

ROBEL: Now Peter.

KLOOSTERMAN: Yeah, the second bullet under, I guess it's ambitions and recommendations there.

I was not really sure what that was going, what that's about, I mean it talks about common foundation of seminar basic learning and one year of shared courses. Can you give me some sense as to what...Yeah, I'm not familiar with the programs it talks about here. Give me a sense as to what that paragraph really says.

JOHNSON: Yeah I can, so because of the scope of this thing, and I think this is a really important thing to bear in mind. When Heather says that we're thinking 20 years out, we're thinking about things that are not just policy shifts or curricula shifts, we're thinking about things that may actually end up being or could be cultural shifts at this institution rather than trailing behind the shifting landscape of higher education, these might actually serve to kind of lead it in what we think are actually kind of positive directions.

So, it's like at that scale that we're thinking. And I think with respect to this particular point, a couple of things were at issue or came out of our discussion. One was that we were as a committee, and in our conversations with other people and in sort of different ways, I think there is a concern amongst lots of people or at least we detected one, and certainly felt one, that they are trends towards the sort of virtualization of residential education and massification of sort of the educational experience at every level in the form of online education.

Various kinds of forces that abstract form of instruction and learning that we still think has great value and needs to be preserved. And that is the face-to-face small interaction with faculty in some form. And I think this is something we wrestle with in various forms in a much shorter time scale when we talk about things like general education and there are genuine differences of opinions and different ideas about what general education is that range from the kind of distribution model that is a dividend of innovations at Harvard in late 19th and early 20th century—thank you, Charles Elliot. And then other kind of core based systems that are more representative of modes of thoughts that came out of places like Chicago, Columbia, and other liberal arts schools. That where, there was a kind of core base model of instruction, right? Where everybody took the same classes and read the same thing, not because—although in that case, it was partly the privileging of certain literatures as being the Arnoldian best that's been thought and written, but there is also reason for that, right? The idea was that you build a community by having people have common points of reference so they actually have something to talk about in common.

That's a conflict in the understanding of education that has been unfolding for a century and remains unresolved and our concern, in the longer term, is that when we have discussions about these things, people have very principled ideas about these things based on their own experiences, and their principles as pedagogues, and as scholars.

But we always hit this wall of a kind of short term pragmatism. If we wanted to create a class that everybody would take, how would we possibly staff it? And then we stopped talking about it. So on a five year time frame it's hard to figure out with all the kind of churning of exigency, how we would do that.

When you move into a 20 year time frame it's much, at least in our estimation, it's much easier to start to think about how you'd prepare to make something like that possible. Because you still value

it, so that's one part of it. The other part of it is precisely the issue that Heather raised which is we have had a tendency to think of undergraduate education as being a sort of normative four year experience. And then we have been facing kind of the reality of shifts in the landscape of higher education, where we're looking at essential that kind of, for example, a lot of those common experiences bleeding out of the bottom of it because we have been in conjunction with other people, we have been very happy to create ways for students not to have to do things on our campuses, right, for various reason. All of which were well intentioned but they collectively have had a whole bunch of consequences that I don't think anybody fully anticipated, like the fact that a sizable percentage of our undergraduates will be entering with sophomore standing.

And we have at times, I think, again, with the best of intentions, done things that in retrospect you look at and you're like why are doing this? There was a period, very briefly, and I think we corrected very nicely where I felt like I use big PR campaign was come to Indiana, we're fast and cheap, sort of like with tuition reduction programs and we're fast and cheap is not I think what we want to be. I think we want to be more thoughtful about what that looks like or could be. And our discussion especially around the issue of graduate education rather than chasing after that stuff, that's falling out of the bottom, our idea was rather than Indiana kind of clawing its way to be competitive with other states, and other communities, in terms of having a certain number of college graduates we, not to sound maliced about this, but we were like why not take to great leap forward and just say rather than we going to be competitive in term of number of BA holding citizens we have in the state why not just figure out the way to set higher degrees as kind of norm, as an available goal for people, but that require massive institution shift over time.

I don't know if that answers the question.

ROBEL: I can tell you that this all resonates a lot with a set of discussions I was in at the AAU Provost Conference a week or so ago. Both parts of this discussion, partly triggered by Georgia Tech's current strategic plan which is very much, let me see if I can use the agricultural economics terms that the Yale provost used: an extensive vision, you know, to include many more people with a lifelong engagement with higher ed and an intensive vision of residential education. And I heard a very thoughtful attempt to reconcile those two as not being in sharp conflict with each other by the Yale Provost. So I think you are certainly grappling with many of the same sets of issues that people in my position are grappling with around the country, at least at residential research intensive campuses like ours.

Yeah, and Fritz.

KLOOSTERMAN: Yeah this has been very helpful, it's not at all what I got out of the paragraph when I first read it.

ROBEL: Okay, Fritz?

BREITHAUPT: Thank you, first of all thank you to the committee, I find it also very valuable, I mean so thank you Heather, Colin, and everyone else.

I also want to second Katie Siek's proposal to have some document, PowerPoint, that we can actually bring to the faculty to share this. Because indeed these are wonderful. As a minimum, they make a great conversation to talk about what's happening everywhere.

I mean, the question of the campus will play a role in it, of course. Virtual kind of things. Online things. Sustainability and climate change. Two things that are very dear to my heart, too.

I have one specific questions or comment, which concerns again the three, four, five reference here. And the potential of this build an MA programs. There are a lot of initiatives on campus work, different programs at least in the College considering and creating these kind of things, and indeed I think that would be one wonderful if we would have a campus conversation about it to coordinate these things.

There may even be some joint MAs that could be attached not to the same program, I mean some programs use it as an idea to say hey, the students can stay a year longer in brackets in our program. But that would be a wonderful kind of thing to give people more opportunity at that point to move around and kind of say, hey, I have my BA here, can I combine it with an MA in a related field that somehow attaches to it?

So I think that's really something about if there's a lot of feedback on that. I can see that as a very specific proposal that we can talk about, and not just talk about, do something about.

Yeah. Thank you.

JOHNSTON: Yeah, and if I could just respond to that because I think this is exactly the sort of the ethos behind the document, right?

There are a lot of initiatives that are going on all over campus. I think there has been discussion about the need to kind of expand, make available, sort of master's level education. But I think it's precisely, there's certain things that I think if we did it in a bigger way, not in the sense of just scale, but in the sense of being contemplative about the process by which those curricular structures are put in place, I think we would be in a much better place 15 or 20 years from now than we are likely to be if we use kind of market-based logic in order to intensify curricular reform where we say very unit needs to think individually about how it can compete and increasingly cut throat educational environment.

And I think there's a way to move past that to something that feels much more profound and meaningful in terms of curricular. So that's partly why we're putting this out there. I mean, one of the ethical issues about this, I'm from a department where we intentionally decided not to offer a master's degree program because we had ethical questions in our own mind about the value of that relative to the potential cost, right?

I mean, if you're independently wealthy and can afford to think about what we think about at the mastery level for a year, yay. And I think we need to think about those kinds of questions as well, and think about how do we make this a new resource for students who are already here, rather than how can we get people to come to IU for two years, right?

I mean, those are the kinds of the nexus of concerns that we were really working through.

ROBEL: The other thing, if I could just pile one, because I think you're headed in exactly the right direction. The campus has been trying, the last couple of years, to seek multidisciplinary masters initiatives.

We got one approved in cybersecurity, there's another one that I've been pushing on for two years in curatorship. The idea being to take pieces from around the campus, because often you may not in a humanistic discipline want to encourage students, what you describe about having made a conscious decision, not to encourage students to pursue a master's in your discipline, that doesn't mean that there might not be a piece of what you do that would be profoundly important to a different way of thinking. And I have found that these kinds of degrees are so hard to get people to the table around and get all the way to approval.

And so I can't thank you enough for taking this on. Yeah, I saw Alex.

WISNIEWSKI: Yeah, so I just wanted to say from an in-state student standpoint, the three, four, five model is super interesting. I came in with ample AP and dual credits. I'm a triple major in the Kelly School and I have a minor in Spanish.

So I had a little bit of free time.

But I think from a traditional student standpoint, as you were mentioning, the four-year thought of a university is what is market-based, is what is just common. I probably could've graduated in three years or gotten a master in four or five.

I didn't think of that, I thought undergraduate education takes four years. And I think-Exactly, and I think that's just literally spot on to a student standpoint.

And then I also want to say, I think this document provides a really critical point to student voice in the long-term decision-making of the university.

Student voice, we learn with the diversity requirements that we didn't know that students were on the committee that wrote those requirements. There's turnover, there's transition that happens, things get restated. And I think once this document gets truly solidified and the vision gets created, that will kind of ensure that the voice of the students gets heard and at least the macro level things.

So I really appreciate that, thank you.

ROBEL: Other comments? Let's see, Barb and then Jon.

CHERRY: Yes, I just want to pile onto the pile on. Just a little bit about the multidisciplinary masters. I think also to keep in mind how do we allow more interdisciplinary course work at the PhD stage?

From my own personal experience, I got my PhD at Northwestern, fellow big ten competitor. But they had enough flexibility, I was able to distribute my course work among three schools. Communications, engineering, and Kellogg, and I was also permitted to have a faculty member from each school on my dissertation committee.

And that allowed a breath of different kinds of inquiry that when I've talked to friends who have been to other schools, they haven't been able to replicate that. And that can be a real selling point. And the only reason I flagged that too, is that I noticed on the last page, long-range planning, it's in a parenthetical.

You're referring to a plea for moving from zero some thinking which may rightly or wrongly, you see it's encouraged by RCN budgeting. If we're going to talk about long-range planning, I still think that something, I know I'm talking really big picture, but there's something this university has to think about, because the RCM budgeting does impose a certain mindset on how these programs are designed and why you are restricted in what you can take.

The RCM budgeting, if that had happened at Northwestern, I never would have been able to design the coursework that I could do. And as we become increasingly more interdisciplinary, and we say we want to support interdisciplinary, then part of the bigger picture is elevating to awareness how issues like this can actually affect the ability to get there.

TRINIDAD: So this is somewhat related to something else, and I'm not really sure where it fits, but long-range planning seems as good as any. I think there needs to be more discussion about how the university relates to the State Legislature. Because a lot of times we talk about x, y, or z and it seems like we're being very reactive to the constraints that they're putting on us.

And of course, they rank above us and that's possibly why we take that attitude. And there's, of course, been this 20, 30-year decrease in state funding for higher education everywhere. But it would be good to know, for example, what state universities or states have been able to buck that trend more than others.

And how they have done that, and what can we be doing as a faculty to influence what goes on at the state level.

ROBEL: We have. I mean, actually, if I look around The Big Ten, we have been the most successful school in the big ten to work with our state legislatures around funding.

I would encourage you, this body has several times in the past brought The Government Relations people in to speak, and I would encourage you to issue that invitation again. I know there's a long-running disagreement about whether you should listen to presentations or have other kinds of discussions. But I think the Governmental Relations people are really, at this university, pretty outstanding.

And we're about to move into the biennium, and we've got a new person on board in Governmental Relations. It might be an interesting invitation to issue.

WISNIEWSKI: Who's the new person on the Government Relations staff?

ROBEL: It's Trevor Fowdy.

WISNIEWSKI: Thank you.

ROBEL: Yep. Patrick, did you have your hand up?

KENNEY: Yep.

ROBEL: If you're on this side, just yell it out

KENNEY: Just a quick question about feedback. So faculty will read this and can give feedback through the BFC. But is there another mechanism? How would you like to get feedback? Is there a long-range planning committee email, for example?

JOHNSON: Send it all to Alex. I'm just kidding.

TANFORD: I think that's an excellent, I'll of course defer it to Elizabeth, as to whether or not we can have some kind of portal on the long-range planning committee page or the website or some place that allows people to send comments directly to us.

PEAR: I will work with long range planning on putting together some sort of portal - even though I hate that word - and we will have it in time for your secretary's report.

ROBEL: Okay. Let's see. David and then Susan?

DALEKE: I hate to go back to piling onto a pile-on.

But going back to the graduate education space, I think there's something that we should also be aware of, and that is there's changing demands for training at the graduate level that are not traditionally, they don't traditionally fall into the categories of master's and PhD. I'm hearing more and more conversation about this.

And I think that if we were to think down the road, we have to be more responsive not only in creating those opportunities, but then also in leveraging them to the benefit of our students. And we also know from other data that we've heard that here before, that there are more credits and credentials the students are gaining while they're also gaining credentials from us at the same time.

I think that's an opportunity that we might be missing. And then, lastly, another thought about the difficulty of combining into disciplinary programs to create something unique. They work when there is a problem that needs to be solved. It's not just getting another degree or another credential in your field, as you mentioned, but it's really in serving a need and then an idea that will coalesce several ideas around it.

So just providing an extra year or two of an opportunity for a student to gain that extra master's degree may not gain the traction that you want. But if you have something that everyone is going to flock to, then it's going to succeed. So cybersecurity has worked in that regard, I think just totally because it's extremely popular topic.

So as we think down the road, can we find those topics, those periods of training that are really necessary beyond a baccalaureate that might be able to create an interdisciplinary node that we can flock to?

JOHNSON: Yeah, if I could just respond to that, because this was actually touched in the discussion.

I agree with sort of the need to be sensitive to those things. But again, I also think for us, in the 20 to 30 or 15, 20 year time frame, the same logic that you're pointing to about, well, not all credentials for these degrees or whatever, I think on a sort of broader ethical level when we were wrestling with like, what can we give to the state? What can we give to our students? What can we make available?

Indiana, as a state does not rank particularly highly nationally in terms of educational attainment of its citizenry compared to other states, right? We do a great job, and we make all sorts of resources available to the people of this state and they work very hard.

But that is a place where, if you look at the metrics competitively, I don't think it's necessarily a point of state pride that we're wherever we are. And I think that our goal was, rather than being the people who are chasing after the middle, right? Which is sort of tends to be one disposition that, I think the way we described it is that we actually wanted to think on the horizon of creating the most qualified pool of graduates from one of the less likely pools of candidates.

That there are a lot of things that count against our fellow Hoosiers in terms of accessibility issues where higher education is concerned, the scale of their aspirations for themselves. Being a first generation college student, which many of our students are, automatically deprives a lot, makes it harder for people to even understand what graduate education is, right, and what it means.

And that we want to create a culture on this campus where our students are not running behind other people who are already sort of implicated in that. So that may mean that I get a little itchy about the credential utility thing, and I understand the importance of it. But we really have tried to fight against some of that thinking on the 30 year plan.

ROBEL: Susan?

SEIZER: Is it on? Yeah. I want to add another thing, I appreciate the spirit of this document so much. So, add it to everyone else's voice. To return to that second bullet point under aims, and, is this a proposal, and forgive me if I missed you saying this, is this a proposal to have a faculty seminar in next year, 19-20, to have, that it be sponsored by the Office of the Bicentennial? Are you making a proposal for this new one-year core program?

AKOU: Right, so that was one thing we had discussed, and this, it's certainly the most short-term practical thing that's in this document.

And it was something that Rebecca floated by us last year that there might be an opportunity to get Bicentennial fund to bring speakers to campus who are thinking about, what are the trends in higher education for the next 20 to 30 years. And so if that funding is, again, I think this might be one thing that's fallen through the cracks just slightly. But if that kind of funding is available, it's something that we definitely would like to pursue.

SEIZER: Yes, because it's been very difficult to get a consensus on what a new core course for one year be for all students, right? So that's a longer term goal than, I mean I love the idea, but I just wondered if that was like something that you had already pursued with the Office of the Bicentennial.

AKOU: Yeah, Rebecca engaged with Kelly Kish a bit on that funding but as far as developing a core, we talked briefly about, okay, well, if the focus of this advance court is to get students engaged in what is research, what does it mean to do original research, what are research methods?

And then we started getting to the tails of, okay, exactly what methods and who should teach them? The conversation really broke down, so I realize that that's quite a monumental task to really create a pragmatic core that can be taught on campus is a lot of work.

KENNEY: I want to pass along an email message I received from a colleague who said that a reading of this document would suggest that we're not a research university. That if you search through the document and find the word research, I think the comment was four times, and several times that's in relation to undergraduates doing research.

And so I just put that out there, and ask if the committee could comment on.

JOHNSON: We'll both do it.

AKOU: Yeah, I mean, the first point on the document is that we have been, are and must continue to be a residential and research intensive university.

But I mean point taken and definitely we know that this does not have a tremendous amount of information about the research mission of the campus. And that is something that we do want to talk more about this year, so we kind of mapped some concerns and some opportunities but we know that research is a piece that we wanted developed further.

JOHNSON: If I can just add to that, I would say, one of our experiences working on this committee last year, and this goes to a point that Heather was making about the nature of the LRPC itself Which is different people in administrative positions sort of do and must think about kind of planning, long term, short term, medium term planning.

That's part of their kind of responsibility in those positions as the steward resources and ways that actually add up to something over a period of time. But we really did because the mandate of the LRPC is so vague, we just kind of said we're going to have this conversation last year.

And start talking to our colleagues and thinking in these terms. Because there's nothing prohibiting us from doing something during so in the title of the committee suggest that we have some sort of mandate to do that. And one of the things that struck us is that we really do have space as a faculty and the LRPC is a place to start, not to be waiting around for people in administrative positions to come in and sort of have big ideas for us.

And then to try to sell us on them on us, right? A lot of these big ideas that come from initial discussions actually are fed through administrative channels, and then presented back to the faculty in a way that I think often raises questions about how organic they are, even when they are organically grown from the faculty.

But we do have a mechanism to actually leap over the timeframe that most administrative minds work in in the sort of five to ten year. To say we're thinking big stuff like 20, 30 years, and we're going to get that on the record. So when you set that as your own mandate then there's a lot of stuff to think about.

And this was one set of ideas that emerged from that discussion. I think LRPC, we would actually love an explicit mandate from the BFC to start planning on this scale with specific respect to research. Because when we do that, we actually have then something, we've laid a foundation, to be able to say to people when we disagree with them, about their vision of things.

Listen, we have our own ideas, and you can take those into account too. And they come from the faculty.

ROBEL: David, are you?

DAVID JOHNSON: Yes, I just wanted to make a quick comment. I know you're running out of time on this portion of your agenda, but I wanted to support what Lauren had mentioned earlier.

We put in place a pathway scholarship program for students. If they finished their undergrad in three years and wanted to begin a graduate program, they could use their undergrad scholarship in their fourth year, their beginning year of graduate school. And to put this in perspective, we had eight students last year who took advantage of that but then to support the point of the collaborative graduate programs, we have 46 students who were in either Kelley or Optometry or any other programs that were doing early admission program, and they have used their scholarships. So those programs are very attractive to students rather than just finding their own way to graduate school. And the long range planning, I appreciate this and Diane's points and others about the change of demographics, that's something we are always looking at in the administration.

So, thank you.

AGENDA ITEM NINE: BRIEF REPORTS FROM BFC COMMITTEES

ROBEL: I had wondered what had happened to that. This is the point where we're supposed to turn to reports from committees. And so I'm wondering who's leading that. I assume this is not the last time we get to comment on, or think about long range planning.

But you know who to talk to at this point and please do. And who is leading the-

TANFORD: If I can say one thing, anybody who is inspired by this presentation and neglected to volunteer for the long range planning committee. But really would like, for example, to pursue a similar discussion on research to sort of follow up on some of these things and think long term like this, you are welcome, just email me and we will include you.

ROBEL: Yeah, thank you so much, a terrific start I think. All right, who is giving the brief reports on that? It doesn't seem to be on my agenda.

MARSH: We did leave that open deliberately but, if I remember right, the three that were on the line were CARC and FAC and DAAC.

So, is that right?

Yes? Okay, so who wants to go first? DAAC looks exciting.

CARTER: I'd be happy to go first.

MARSH: Yes.

CARTER: So, a very perhaps overzealous agenda for the year, we have a wonderful committee. And I'm excited we have three students on our committee.

First on our agenda is meeting with the researcher who is requesting that IU reflect, remember, and apologize to the Japanese internment during World War II and the ban on Japanese-American students. So that will be something we'll be working with immediately.

Next on our agenda is changing the name of our committee. Updating that to reflect our goals. We're very committed to the diversity course happening, so we're working with Dennis and we have students on our committee who were part of initiating that course. So we'd really like to see some progress in their final year at IU.

We are going to be looking at, I don't love this title, Champion of Diversity Award. So, similar to the Trustees Teaching Award, we'd like to establish a teaching award for teachers, for faculty who embrace and foster equity and diversity on campus. We're examining diversity statements, and diversity history statements for all hiring and promotion, and in the DMAI reports. And we're also having conversations and looking at specifically language and culture around diversity on campus.

So moving away from problematizing, I hate that word just like portal. But problematizing diversity and instead celebrating it in really looking at ways that we use terms like they and them in our language. And finally, we're going to be spending time looking at equity statistics and reporting of equity statistics so that we can more fully take action on the dis-equity.

Thank you.

ROBEL: That's terrific. Who is up next? Are there questions for the committee before we go on? Yep?

BENDER: Could you say a little bit about what sort of equity statistics you're seeking?

CARTER: Well, we're aware of a report that was made to the BFC and that report hasn't been made.

So we're specifically looking at just statics and salary, and also in enrollment around gender, race, and socio-economic background.

ROBEL: Other comments or questions? Yeah?

HENSHEL: So this is the same thing I was going to say before. There's a new resource that came out from the Census Bureau called the Opportunity Atlas, and Indiana does not fare well.

So you might want to consider looking at that. It's just came out yesterday.

CARTER: Thank you.

HENSHEL: Yeah.

R. COHEN: Just a really basics with my first here, you're from the university and academic action committee?

CARTER: It's called diversity and affirmative action.

R. COHEN: Okay, sorry, we didn't get the full name, so I wasn't sure what committee you were from.

CARTER: Okay, thanks. DAAC—that's why we want to change the name.

ROBEL: And I have to say I don't know what CARC is either. So whoever is in charge of it start by just telling us what it is.

MARSH: There will be a test at the end of the meeting.

DOWELL: I am in charge of CARC.

I've been involved with faculty governance for at least ten years, and I don't remember calling it CARC before. But you re-join and things have new names, so that's Constitution and Rules Committee. CARC sounds, maybe sexier I'm not sure. CARC is mostly looking at how we present these proposed amendments to the constitution to the faculty.

We have a meeting on Thursday, where we will start talking a little bit about what contextual, supplemental, FAQ style information we might need to provide to help people understand the proposals under consideration. And then we also have a revision of the bylaws that we will take up after the constitution activity is over.

ROBEL: Questions for Erica? All right, let's—Alan.

BENDER: What bylaws do you have in mind, or what are they about that you're thinking about revising?

DOWELL: The bylaws revisions? Gosh, we've been thinking about the Constitution so much. Bylaws revisions. It ranges from cleaning up mistakes.

The bylaws also describe in some detail some committees believe other standing committees out completely. So we're thinking of adding in something that describes over standing committees.

The part that talks about archiving the business of the BFC is dramatically kind of out of date, and will be supplanted very soon by a more comprehensive university level, campus level archival policy.

Those are the things that I can recall off the top of my head that are sort of bigger. We're also doing some clean-up of some specific language. When we talk about unit, right, are we talking about an academic unit, or an election unit? Exciting stuff like that, but things that will help hopefully for our future selves to interpret what we mean better.

Elizabeth you have anything else that comes to mind? Okay.

ROBEL: And Faculty Affairs?

WILLIAMS: You've already heard that Faculty Affairs Committee is interested in thinking about non-tenure track faculty's participation and in school and departmental governance. We're also planning to review the policy regarding professors of practice. And we're also planning to review the policy concerning academic specialists.

And I had something to say about academic specialists in particular. It came to my attention that the discussion of the BFC had last year about NTT voting hurt the feelings of some academic specialists. Remember that we briefly touched on the issue of whether academic specialists should be embraced within those amendments, and I just wanted to apologize for my role in those hurt feelings, and to confess that I was working from a deep ignorance about the category of academic specialists.

So I wanted to mention that I would correct that ignorance and hope to redeem myself on that point.

ROBEL: Right, questions? Thank you. Questions for the committee?

RUKOWSKI: Just one question of clarification as we're starting to talk about our voting rights and responsibilities. Is it possible to get a list of all of the categories that we'll be considering?

WILLIAMS: Do you mean beyond the three non-tenure track?

RUKOWSKI: Yeah, I don't know what those are.

WILLIAMS: They are lecturers, research scientists, and research scholars which I'm regarding as a single category. And professors of practice in clinical, clinical professors. And then, there's this other, the reason that academic specialists is kind of a special category is because it's not clear whether it's a faculty category or a staff category, and there are almost 100 academic specialists on campus.

So there are smaller than the group of lectures and the group of clinicals. But I think that was five categories.

RUKOWSKI: Is there a resource that describes what each of those positions are and what their goals are?

WILLIAMS: There are policies that describe that, and maybe Eliza has some.

PAVALKO: Also if you go to our website, there's a section on faculty resources, and then promotion, they're sectioned for non-tenured track faculty. And I'll add so academic specialists are academic appointees. But then the debate last year in terms of whether they would they be considered for BFC purposes as faculty.

But they are definitely academic appointees.

ROBEL: As some meaning in terms of the kinds of notice they get if there's non-reappointment. It's consistent with all the others. I would strongly encourage this body if you have not been there yet to find and it's really easy to do, The IU policies website which has all the policies about faculty ranks, faculty appointments, ect, etc, etc.

Great. Alex?

TANFORD: If I can follow up on that a little bit, I'm sure everyone has been around for a while knows but new comers must remember that there is a university faculty council that has representatives from this body and from IUPUI and from the regional campuses.

And it is responsible for university wide policies dealing with faculty. There are lots of them, some of them going back to 1949 that have never been looked at. There is now a committee being formed at the university level and I am on it. And Eliza doesn't know, but she will be on it as well.

We talked this morning about that committee continuing a task originally undertaken administratively by the Office of Policy Administration. To systematically review and look at policies at the university level affecting faculty. And see which ones need to be looked at and updated. So I really concur with Lauren, go to the university as opposed to the campus.

Faculty Council website their policies or their policy website and-

ROBEL: IU policies, that's all it is.

TANFORD: And look through them and bring to my attention, bring to the attention of this body, University level policies governing faculty that you think are outdated that don't fit the way your unit

works. Don't fit your research plans, things like that. Let us know about them. Because we are charged with looking at them and updating.

ROBEL: I do think it is the case and Elizabeth probably knows better than most that the university has indeed looked at these policies over, since 1949 because there was a big exercise.

PEAR: There was an exercise in the Office of Policy Administration actually before I started there. For those of you that don't know my job prior to this was working with then Jenny Kincaid in the Office of Policy Administration, and, shortly before I started, they went through the process of dismantling the Academic Handbook, at the time and transferring that into the policy's database that you see now. My understanding is when that happened they just pulled the policies straight, they didn't make any changes. So if it wasn't looked at since 1949, it wasn't updated in that process.

ROBEL: Yeah, the only thing that I will say about that is that when they went through that process, and noted all of the, you know, this is when it was adopted by whatever group adopted it, this is when the trustees approved it, they did make a pretty long list of policies that needed to be addressed and have been sort of systematically working on that over the years.

So, it is a good thing they is doing this.

TANFORD: The list is about seven single spaced pages long.

ROBEL: Yep.

TANFORD: I have it sitting on my desk. I mean, the answer is the university policies cover a whole lot of things that really are not within the purvey of the faculty.

Government affairs, how purchasing works, all sorts of things like that. But those policies that fall within the legislative jurisdiction of the faculty, now are getting some special attention from us. I certainly did not mean, I mean, we are building on the incredible work that Jenny Kincaid and this group started.

But this is an opportunity for us to look at the policies affecting faculty and think about whether they need to be updated.

MARSH: I know you're all dying to dive into the policy website. Another way that you can find it is from our Bloomington Faculty Council website, bfc.indiana.edu.

If you click on policies, there will be links there to the Bloomington policies and the university policies, and not to mention our own bylaws and constitution. So any time a question comes up, do we in fact have a policy that requires cakes and ale at exams? That's the place you can go to help try to look for it.

And if you still can't find it, which is possible, entirely is it fair to say it can send people, too? It can send people to the BFC office to help in tracking down a particular policy.

ROBEL: Okay, let's see, John and then Alan.

WALBRIDGE: I've been involved with the NTT process from the late Ice Age, but one of the issues that we looked at as part of the original mandate before the committee, before the committee, before the committee was research scientist.

We looked at that, decided that, A, we didn't have any scientists on the committee and B, it was quite a different issue. But I recommended then and I recommend now that a task force be appointed to look into the situation of research scientists. How they're evaluated, how they're paid. What they do. What issues there might be outstanding.

Just to throw out an example that I got from an interview we did before we gave up, Was that somebody in one of the science departments who was evaluated on research, but his job was maintaining some large machine that everybody used.

And he sort of muttered about salary evaluations, but it was all a black hole for us, and somebody I suspect needs to look at it.

BENDER: So is the Faculty Affairs Committee going to consider a proposal that we sent to it about modifying the online course questionnaire? I think it's a low priority, but I'm wondering if it's somewhere down the line.

WILLIAMS: There's a sub-committee that's joint between educational policy and FAC that is putting together a report on the student course questionnaire. And I'm waiting on that report but once we get that report, I think we're going to take up that report, but there is a committee that's talking about that issue.

ROBEL: Does it have any students on it?

WILLIAMS: It does.

ROBEL: Good, great, I knew you were thinking it, so I thought I'd just go ahead and ask it. All right, any other questions for the faculty affairs committee. Yep, John.

J. COHEN—I just want to point out in response to the question about research scientists, that that's also on the agenda of the Research Affairs Committee.

So perhaps we can also have a conversation about that.

ROBEL: Terrific, that's great. I really appreciate the reports from the committees. I think it's very helpful for the whole council to know what work is happening in the committees. And I hope that we hear from some of the other committees soon.

I believe I'm not at the next meeting, is that correct?

MARSH: Next meeting is the presidents.

ROBEL: All right, we'll all be at that in one way or another. All right, any other comments for the good of the order or can we adjourn in our usual way?

HERRERA: Loren, I have question. So in previous years, we have the minutes from the standing committees. I don't know if we could have also like to get some minutes from.

PEAR: We do make those available on each page on the website for the specific committee.

I'm a little bit behind on posting at the moment but I have trained my wonderful GA on how to do this. So we should be caught up in the next week or so. Not all committees provide minutes, so I would strongly encourage any committees to make the list public and available.

ROBEL: Anything else? All right, thank you all so much.

Meeting adjourned 4:23 p.m.