Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
November 2, 2010
IMU Georgian Room
3:30 P.M. - 5:30 P.M.

Attendance

MEMBERS: Randy Arnold, Robert Arnove, Elizabeth Boling, Geoffrey Brown, Maria Bucur-Deckard, Joyce Byrer, Carolyn Calloway-Thomas, Nick D'Amico, Gregory Demas, Erika Dowell, Tony Fargo, Thomas Gieryn, Don Gjerdingen, Karen Hanson, Diane Henshel, Brian Horne, Neil Kelty, Padraic Kenney, Patrice Madura, Rebecca Manring, Jane McLeod, Sherri Michaels, Robert Noel, Mary Popp, John Raglin, Diane Reilly, Patricia Riesenman, Eric Sandweiss, Debora Shaw, Sarita Soni, Geoff Sprinkle, Sonya Stephens, Herbert Terry, Maxine Watson, Tony White, James Wimbush

MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT: Jennifer Chaffin (Grant Simpson)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Jack Bielasiak, Arthur Bradley, Andrea Ciccarelli, Michael Coleman, Angela Courtney, Mark Deuze, Frank Di Silvestro, Janice Duchene, David Estell, Lucas Fields, Lessie Jo Frazier, Laura Ginger, Matthew Guterl, Edwin Jimenez, Susan Kovacich, Eugene McGregor, Michael Ogden, Elizabeth Raff, Ranu Samantrai, Sima Setayeshgar, Richard Shockley, H. Wayne Storey, Adam Szczepaniak, Joey Tartell, Neil Theobald, Sue Whiston

GUESTS: Yvette Alex-Assensoh (OWA), Robert Allen (student), Grace Calhoun (Athletics), Amanda Ciccarelli (Provost's Office), Roland Coté (Registrar), Julie Cromer (Athletics), David Daleke (UGS), Craig Dethloff (Faculty Council Office), Fred Glass (Athletic Director), Pete Goldsmith (Dean of Students), Bruce Jaffee (FAR), Jocelyn Karlan (Faculty Council Office), Julia Lamber (Athletics Committee), Nik Osborne (OVPIT), Carl Short (EITS), Brad Wheeler (VPIT)

Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes
October 19, 2010: http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/minutes/10-11/10.19.10.pdf
2. Memorial Resolutions for John P. Brogneaux and Verna L. Pungitore
John P. Brogneaux: http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/10-11/B18-2011.pdf
Verna L. Pungitore: http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/10-11/B19-2011.pdf
3. Agenda Committee Business (10 minutes)
(President pro Tempore Erika Dowell)

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

5. Question / Comment Period* (10 minutes)

6. EPC Proposal on Academic Programs in Residential Programs and Services (RPS) (15 minutes)
(Professor Padraic Kenney, Chair of the Educational Policies Committee) [ACTION ITEM]
http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/10-11/B17-2011rev.pdf

7. Discussion of the National Research Council Doctoral Program Rankings (25 minutes)
(Professor David Daleke, Associate Dean of the University Graduate School)
[DISCUSSION]
http://www.indiana.edu/~grdschl/nrc-assessment-of-research-doctorate-programs.php

8. Annual Report of the Athletics Committee (25 minutes)
(Professor Julia Lamber, Chair of the Athletics Committee; Professor Emeritus Bruce Jaffee, Faculty Athletics Representative; Vice President Fred Glass, Director of Athletics)
[DISCUSSION]
http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/10-11/auxiliary/bfcrecruit.pdf
http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/10-11/auxiliary/ACR0910.pdf

9. Report on Digital Education Resources and eTexts (25 minutes)
(Professor Brad Wheeler, Vice President for Information Technology) [DISCUSSION]

Minutes

[The recordings of this meeting of the Bloomington Faculty Council on both cassettes and compact discs were incomplete due to technical malfunction. The conversation begins in Agenda Item 7: Discussion of the National Research Council Doctoral Program Rankings on page 7 below.]

HANSON:

MCLEOD:

HANSON:

WHITE:

HANSON:

GIERYN:

HANSON:

DOWELL:

HANSON:

TERRY:

HANSON:

GRAY:

HANSON:

TERRY:

DOWELL:

DALEKE:

DOWELL: Thanks

ARNOVE:

HANSON:

TERRY:

HANSON:

TERRY:

HANSON:

TERRY:

HANSON: It is –

TERRY:

HANSON:

KENNEY:

HANSON:

DOWELL:

KENNEY:

TERRY:

KENNEY:

HANSON:

KELTY:

KENNEY:

KELTY:

KENNEY:

KELTY:

KENNEY:

KELTY:

KENNEY:

ARNOVE:

KELTY:

HANSON:

GRAY:

KENNEY:

GRAY:

KENNEY: Right.

GRAY:

BUCUR-DECKARD:

GRAY:

KENNEY:

GRAY:

HANSON: Tony?

FARGO:

KENNEY:

HANSON: Herb?

TERRY:

KENNEY:

TERRY: Does it know?

KENNEY:

TERRY:

GIERYN:

TERRY:

GIERYN:

TERRY:

HENSHEL:

KENNEY:

HANSON:

HENSHEL:

HANSON:

HENSHEL:

KENNEY:

HENSHEL:

DOWELL:

KENNEY:

HENSHEL:

KENNEY:

HENSHEL:

KENNEY:

HENSHEL:

KENNEY:

HENSHEL:

KENNEY:

HENSHEL: Okay

KENNEY:

HENSHEL:

HANSON: Tom?

GIERYN:

HENSHEL:

HANSON:

HENSHEL:

GIERYN:

HENSHEL: Oh that's interesting

HANSON:

SIMPSON:

KENNEY:

GIERYN:

HANSON:

TERRY:

BUCUR-DECKARD:

TERRY:

KENNEY:

GIERYN:

HANSON:

DALEKE: …hide the fields or the columns that you're not interested in, sort by the variables that you are interested in studying whether it's one of the rankings or one of the twenty variables which are all listed in the spreadsheet, and then do your analysis. I recommend using the NRC demos and tutorials on their website to help guide you through the process and then lastly if you're really interested in the methodology refer to the methodology guide which is also available on the NRC website to understand how they came about with the numbers that they did.

So a few of the results that the NRC has published out of this – a little bit of their analysis and these are the trends that they were able to describe since 1995: the number of students enrolled in engineering and physical sciences has gone up, those in social sciences and humanities has gone down. On the average there has been a growth overall in female students in all of the programs, the smallest growth in humanities because, well, they had the largest percentage or fraction of female students compared to other fields, but there was a large growth in engineering up to 22% overall. The PhDs awarded to underrepresented students also increased for all fields and the numbers you can see there are up to say 14% for social sciences. And one of the interesting aspects of the survey that came out is that larger programs tended to do better than smaller programs even when you've normalized for the number of faculty or number of students. There's a little bit of a weight effect there. Once you have an aggregate there then things tend to move a little bit faster. I think that's what that means. Some other

general findings is that doctoral education was dominated primarily by public institutions. 72% of the programs ranked in the studies were from public institutions like ours and of the 37 universities that produced the most PhD's, only 12 were from private institutions. Some results that were not so good – and I think illustrate a continued struggle – is that the faculty were not as diverse as the student population was and that's, I know, an effort that even on this campus we have struggled with for many years. In addition, in general, it's hard to say to make sweeping statements about time to degree for students, but over 50% of students completed their degrees in six years or less in the sciences. In the social sciences that was 37% in six years or less. So I think that nothing too surprising came out of the time to degree analysis and there were other studies by other groups recently that also were finding very similar things. Again this is a topic that's of great interest to us in the Graduate School that is to try to address the question of making sure students have reasonably short time to degrees. Students were surveyed also in this report but the data and the information has not been released. This is all that they have released so far is that most of the students seemed satisfied with the program, but I won't even say much about this because we haven't seen any of the data. I just copied that directly out of the NRC report. I'm hoping that sometime soon we'll be able to see the student data as well, if they can release in some format to us that we can actually do an analysis on what the students opinions were as well. So finally I wanted to come back to this difference between the R and the S rankings because I think it can be very confusing. One of the things to keep in mind is that the R rankings are not reputational, people may think that because it's "R" it's for "Reputational" even though they began as Reputational rankings they were based on some small amount of data, but they were regressed against those program variable and so it's really the rankings were built on the variables. Some of the things I've already mentioned here is that the faculty – even though the larger programs tended to do better on the R rankings – the faculty in their opinion didn't think that larger programs were necessarily better in terms of determining quality than the smaller programs. So there was a bit of a disconnect with the reality there. It may also be that faculty just in choosing their priorities chose other things that were higher. And then lastly the data were expressed as ranges of rankings and this can also be somewhat confusing. This actually began as an effort to attempt to capture not a single point for a ranking for a particular program, but actually to give some range to indicate the variability of the data. It started off as an attempt to do a 50 percentile range but then someone pointed out – rightfully so—that all that told you was you had a 50% chance your program was within that range but it meant also that your program had a 50% chance of falling outside that range so in order to accommodate that statistical problem they increased the range to 90% so all of the ranking are expressed as 95^{th} and 5^{th} percentile rankings and that gave everyone at least the confidence – 90% confidence – your program was somewhere in that range. It's a little bit unsatisfying for people who want hard numbers, but that seemed to be the best that they could do. And lastly there's some other questions that may come up about the assessment, I don't have answers to these except for the top one, the NRC is going to correct data if it finds that an error was made by the NRC in the data that was given to them. If there was a problem with the data that

was generated from an institution they will still post it on their website but they are not going to go in and change the data. So I guess as a point of information, if you know that your program has some issues with the data, that there were some errors that have been detected, please send them to me as soon as possible so that I can get them to the NRC so that the NRC can at least post those on their website. And in the rare case that we find where the NRC has made the error they will make a correction to the data. The NRC promised that about eight months after the data was released, they would have a symposium where they would invite people to present their analyses of the data, I haven't heard any word about that yet. I anticipate that that may come at some point. When it does we'll send out an announcement so that everyone knows. And then lastly, the survey was supposed to have created a template upon which further surveys could be built, so in other words the data could be updated regularly. If I were to assess the interest in the participants in doing that I would say it's really low right now, both in confidence that the data would mean anything and then also in the value of putting the effort towards doing it again. But that may happen, we'll keep you up to date on that one. So lastly the last slide shows you where you can collect more information about the survey on the Graduate School website. We have a website that is devoted to the NRC there are lots of very good links that are there so the top one is the link to the UGS website. The direct link to the data is the second one that's the www.nap.edu/rdp that'll take you right to the page where you can download all the data to your computer and analyze it to your heart's content. There were a couple of other outside groups that have taken the data and rendered it in a very nice way for display and analysis that includes a Chronicle of Education and phds.org. The Chronicle of Education left that site open for about two or three weeks for free, now they want you to pay for it. So you might want to go there, it's actually probably the better of the ones that I've seen so far but you have to pay for a year's subscription to it if you are interested. Phds.org has data from a lot of other data collection surveys that they've been actively participating with and they are accumulating quite a bit of data in one spot. That might be the best place to point students to. I have no financial connection with phds.org. And again that's my contact and Sherry's contact for the institutional coordinators.

HANSON: [remarks indistinct]

ARNOVE: I'm trying to put the NRC study within a broader framework of this worldwide scramble in terms of becoming a "world class university." And just coming back from China and Hong Kong this is very much on the mind of people. So the question arises, for example, how do you really measure research impact? Do you actually find out that if we do research on health in Kenya, for example, that that research actually improves the morbidity, I mean the – you know – the life chances of individuals? And then when you actually come down to the institutional level and you talk about the different weighted rankings of faculty then obviously you're going to get different patterns across departments and across institutions. So if we look at Indiana University, what sort of jumped out of the data telling you about these differences in the weights by departments or programs? And actually the broader question of can we really say that a

university is contributing to the general wellbeing of the state or society based on these kind of data?

DALEKE: I can say that the last question is the easiest to answer. I would not do that.

ARNOVE: Mmmhmm.

DALEKE: I think that these data are useful only for the limited purpose in which they were generated. I don't think we can use these data to make any argument about our value to the state, or to the nation, or to society. In regard to the second question, there were some programs that did tend to stand out. One of the things I'd like to do is to show you our preliminary analysis – which I did not attach to the agenda, but I will give to Craig so that you all have access to it – in which we combined the R and the S rankings to try to get some idea of how you then order programs – within their field of course – to determine how our programs did. The best program – or the programs that performed the best within their fields – was Folklore and Ethnomusicology. And if you don't mind I'll go ahead and open that one up. It also gives me the opportunity to show you some of the other analyses that we've done. And again this will come in a separate document. [slight laughter after screen changes to picture of children. –Editor's note.] I did not do that on purpose. So, let me jump down a few pages in this report. What we tried to do was to take the range of rankings for both the R and the S rankings and group them together and then try to order in some way the program performance for Bloomington. And you can see the top ones here are Folklore and Musicology, EEB in Biology, Public Policy, Psychology, Public Affairs, Mathematics, and Sociology. By this analysis, the red bar is the R rankings and the grey bar is the S rankings so keep in mind they're regression based and survey based rankings and you can see that just by glancing down this list – and this is just a partial list of all of our programs – that there were some good correlations and some poor correlations and some huge ranges in a few of the programs which makes it very, very difficult to say, for example, in Germanic Studies they did really well in the S rankings what does it mean to have such a broad R ranking? And I'm not sure I can answer that very simply. We have to go back and look at the data, look at each individual field to be able to get a better answer for that.

HENSHEL: Did you as a committee or did the NRC ever discuss the implications of having this bias introduced by the size of the programs? Because automatically if they've been around for any length of time they're generating faculty who are putting in those biases and their biases are based on where they went to school. It's like an automatically self-perpetuating bias.

DALEKE: That was recognized, I mean, it's an unavoidable part of the survey.

HENSHEL: Except how do you take that out?

DALEKE: I'm not sure that the NRC –

HENSHEL: – was willing to?

DALEKE: – was willing to do that or to overcomplicate the survey even further to try to manage to do that. There was no explicit attempt to try to eliminate that variable. I'm only going to try to explain the NRC to a certain extent.

HANSON: Actually, we need some guidance from the Council. The Agenda Committee has allotted 25 minutes to this and to the next two presentations, and obviously we're not going to make this. This is obviously very important, so are the other things. Do you want to continue this discussion? Yes? What do you want to do? I mean otherwise you might have to bounce something.

TERRY: I'd like to have David return and make more sense of this.

DALEKE: Well, I'll tell you what I'll do. This, what you're looking at here, is the preliminary report that I will send to you. I'm not sure I can make more sense of I,t but I am happy to return. But once you've had the chance to look at a little bit more of our analysis then you may have some more specific questions. Another point is that the advisory group is going to meet at least one more time in an attempt to generate a final report. This is our preliminary report, but I think there's a lot of good things in the preliminary report that you might find useful.

ARNOVE: It would be useful to know when you come back if you think that these variables and what you have gathered really gives you a good sense of the quality of the doctoral program and what the serious limitations are.

DALEKE: I would also encourage you, if you have time, to go to the NRC site that is on your hand out there, download the data and start to look at the data. I mean, there is some instructions about how you work through the spreadsheet and do start to look at the data and see how it is constructed because that will be very helpful in answering any questions you might have.

HANSON: Thanks very much David. Now comes that necessary tech break, but just for a few minutes until they reset this and then I think we will have to ask both the Athletics Committee and the Vice President for Information Technology to have a slightly shortened presentation. Okay, thank you. Quick break!

[Recording of some of the proceeding were lost in on recording]

HANSON: …professor emeritus Bruce Jaffee and Vice President Fred Glass are all here to give the Athletics Committee report.

AGENDA ITEM 8: ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ATHLETICS COMMITTEE

LAMBER: Thank you. In addition to the three of us, I'd also like to introduce Grace Calhoun –who's back there – who's come to the Faculty Council before, who's in charge of academics and Julie Cromer will come back in a minute! – who Fred will probably mention in a minute. So we have our written report and the report is for last academic year, which I am happy to provide you. But right now, of course, I'm only worried about this academic year, and the most important thing on my agenda is that Bruce is retiring at the end of the year which really is terrible. We've already convinced him to stay several times. So importantly we have a search committee – you should have gotten an email from President McRobbie announcing the search and announcing that the deadline for that search is November 15th. So I hope you will think about who would be good and nominate people and take another look at President McRobbie's email. The other thing I wanted to mention about this year's committee is that we have more new members on this year's committee than we have continuing members. So as you know you elected three faculty members for this coming academic year to the Athletics Committee. We have two new alums and the students are all new, so again the challenge this year is the makeup of the committee. So Bruce is going to talk and then Fred will talk.

JAFFEE: Thank you Julia, I'll just spend a few minutes and leave the remaining time to Fred to talk about sort of the state of the department. But let me talk first about a couple of key things of interest at the Big Ten level, a quick comment about what is happening at the NCAA level, and then maybe give you some data on the student athletes that began their studies and their athletic work this fall. At the Big Ten level I just want to mention two things, one that really effects student athletes is a change in a rule that the Big Ten has had for decades related to intra-conference transfers like someone, a student athlete, transferring from Purdue to IU. In the past the rule has been that if such a student transfers from Purdue to IU, he or she would not be allowed to have any athletic aid. That was viewed as disadvantaging relatively low income student athletes. Starting next August the rule will be changed so the receiving school will be allowed to provide athletic-related financial aid but the transferring student athlete will have to sit out the first year at the new campus. So it will be an issue that says you can get money, but you will not be able to compete for the first year. Second thing I want to mention, at the Big Ten level is the Big Ten of course has eleven schools. We're going to twelve next year with the inclusion of Nebraska and I guess I want to report that that inclusion is going very well in multiple dimensions both athletic and academic. As Karen probably can report, Nebraska is being brought into the CIC and the Big Ten will remain the only conference in the country for which all schools – all twelve schools – are members of the AAU. And the integration from a financial point of view from Nebraska is such that they're moving in pretty gradually and won't get a full share of the Big Ten revenue distribution for approximately five years. In terms of the NCAA level, I am on the legislative council for the NCAA there is sort of an issue there in that that's sort of the congress and rule making body for the NCAA and there is

disproportionate small representation by faculty on that body. In fact, it is among – nationally among the 31 conferences – I'm the only faculty person on the body. In fact there aren't many athletic directors on that group either, so on campus, financial and academic role on the legislative council is, at least not directly, represented. Let me quickly mention a few comments related to the incoming group of student athletes this fall. We brought in 185 student athletes this fall the final number will be higher than that because beginning or so called novice rowers were recruited last month and probably be continued to recruit. So the total will end up being over 200. 117 of those have an athletic scholarship and one critical or interesting aspect of that from a scholarship point of view is 71% of those getting athletic scholarships are out-of-state, 29% are in-state that's almost the exact opposite proportions for the campus as whole and that's a significant financial burden for the Athletics Department that is responsible for raising all the scholarship money and that's of course significant with 71% paying out-of-state tuition. At various times in front of this body I have talked about sponsorship of student athletes. The number of sponsored student athletes decreased by two for this fall and in the past I've focused on the characteristics of that group. I'd like to point out a couple of things for all student athletes, just for a minute. The average GPA of the incoming student athletes was 3.4. For the campus as a whole, it's approximately 3.7. Average SAT score for all incoming student athletes – sponsored or otherwise – is 1070. Campus as a whole it's a number that's approximately 1200. Let me finally just talk about GPAs by sport. Of all the incoming student athletes in water polo, the average high school GPA in water polo 3.976 from high school, women's tennis 3.93, women's soccer 3.9. Now I guess that's not surprising that women are smarter than men [laughter] but I do want to indicate – and unfortunately were only dealing with one new person in that sport – but I'm happy to report that in one sport there was one male so that the average incoming class in that men's sport was a perfect 4.0 [laughter] beating out the women. But men's tennis 3.88, and I think what's most impressive is baseball, which is academically challenged nationally though not so much at IU, the average incoming baseball student athlete – of which there were 20 – the average high school GPA for that group 3.6. You know there's a lot of publicity for the relatively low GPAs and academic high school performance of student athletes, but the numbers I quickly read off there are pretty good numbers on both SAT scores and GPAs among all our student athletes and there's some absolutely exceptional even team GPAs when we talk about some of our sports. So you know there's some really strong student athletes out there. I'll turn it over to Fred to add to the news.

GLASS: Excellent! Good afternoon everyone, I was advised that I will be done at 5:15 so I'm going to take my hour long presentation I made to the Trustees that I cut down to 25 minutes for today to less than 10 minutes to try to allow for some questions so I want to be sure I answer anything you all have. What I think I will do Craig, is I will give you a copy of the PowerPoint I presented to the Trustees so that if folks want to, you know, look at that and follow up with questions they're welcome to since I am just going to have time to just skim over the highlights as it were. This is like last year really trying to share with you what I shared with the Trustees earlier this year. My presentation to

them focused around the four priorities we've established for the department. I announced what those were before I even became the Athletic Director. The good news is their still the same and they are in order: 1) we're going to play by the rules, 2) we're going to achieve academically, 3) we're going to excel athletically, and 4) we're going to be better integrated with our university and our community and that's what we focus on. Those are our touchstones. My experience in other lives is that if you don't have a dogged focus on what your priorities are then everybody else's priorities become your priorities because of who is sending the email and who is outside the door and what fire needs to be put out. And so we work really hard to try to stay focused on these and we think by doing that athletics is back on track. We're trying to make sure they're not hollow – you know nice phraseology – and make sure that they have some "oomph" behind those. We think we're doing variety of things to make that true. We've added personnel – in terms of following the rules – we've added personnel to make sure our compliance office is well staffed. It is now the second largest in the conference. We've professionalized the work environment. We had three compliance people to a single office. You really can't have the kind of conversations and do the kind of follow-up work you need to do in that kind of environment. We've made adjustments so that we have better space. We had an outside audit by a national firm that can understand better what the NCAA is looking for and what the hot topics are of the day and they made recommendations to us, all of which we have embraced and perhaps most importantly we hired Julie Cromer from the NCAA who's been a real star nationally to head up our compliance function. We're really thrilled that Julie has joined us.

Number two, academic achievement. Again it's one of those things that you can say well, what are we doing to do that. Perhaps most significantly we've raised the money to build a new Academic Center. We've gone from less than 2500 square feet to over 26,000 square feet and – I didn't major in math here – but I can tell you that is over 10 times as big and it has all the bells and whistles and all that sort of thing. It's proximately located to where the student athletes operate underneath the grandstand at the stadium and I am particularly pleased that two-thirds of the time that the Academic Center is open will not be utilized by athletics. It will be utilized by the campus. Starting this spring we've turned that space which is, you know, authorized, certified classroom space over to the campus to be distributed with the usual inventory for, you know, whatever classes need that. And I understand there is a need for the inventory. I think that is not only going to be helpful, hopefully to fill needs on campus but it will help breakdown some walls by having kids come on to our campus and our facilities that might not have otherwise come there. I got thankfully a long list of evidence that we think we're making progress on academic achievement. You know, I think maybe I talked last time about a Rhodes Scholar from our field hockey program. Last year we had more student athletes who were academic All Big Ten selections than any other school on a pro rata basis. I say that because Ohio State had two more than I did, but they have twelve more sports. So I'm going to take that as winning on a pro rata basis. Bruce went through a lot of that, but 57% of our student athletes have a GPA of 3.0 or higher. The average team GPA is 3.13. Men's basketball has received a lot of attention.

When Tom Crean got here the team GPA was 2.1 it's now 3.16. The APR for the men's basketball team went up 164 points the first year Tom was here and while it hasn't been announced publicly yet the men's basketball team had a perfect APR of 1000 for the last reporting period. So I think there's great progress being made in that very important area.

Number three, athletic excellence. I think we've made progress in that. More student athletes have been named Big Ten Athletes of the Year than any other school, pro rata basis or not. In real terms we've had three individual national champions in the last year, we just crowned a Big Ten champion in soccer. On Sunday with the assistance of the Athletic Committee we hired a new men's soccer coach. Forty-nine All-Americans representing nine sports and thankfully the list goes on and on and will be a resident in what I provide Craig, if anybody is interested in more information about that. We've made progress. There's a lot of components to athletic excellence. I think number one is our coaches, Herman Wells said "that you build a great university through attracting great faculty." I've taken a page out of *Being Lucky* and said we build a great Athletic Department from our faculty, which are coaches. We have to have facilities. We have to have marketing. We have to have a variety of support, but we're going to be famous for bringing in fabulous coaches and retaining them, and that's what we set about to do. I'll spare you some of the details on the marketing piece. I do want to talk about integration with our university. I think that is critically important not only because it feels good to come before you and say that and polish my apple a little bit, but it's really selfish because there's so many resources at the university that I want to glob on to to bring into the Athletic Department to help us be successful in our mission and we've done that in a variety of ways. We have a new fabulous partnership with the IU Auditorium, I think, to bring better customer service to our guests. We are creating a sustainability initiative with the help of the Sustainability Office with the goal of being the greenest Athletic Department in the Big Ten. We have worked with the Business School on identifying ways to make our games more attractive. We've worked with the J School to get better at new media. We've worked with Brad's shop to be more efficient with how we utilize our information technology function. We've tried to reach out to faculty and staff, we've reinstituted faculty and staff discounts for both football and men's basketball. I've tried to be involved. I'm chairing the United Way – co-chairing the United Way Campaign for the university with Mary Frances McCourt – trying to set an example with athletics. We had an embarrassing participation rate of 9% last year. This year, with a month to go in the campaign, we're already at 75% which is a record for any unit of the university in United Way participation. So we're trying to be a good corporate citizen and be integrated with the balance of our university. We've started a thing called the Excellence Academy. I could go on and on about that, but suffice it to say that it's a mechanism to try to instill in our student athletes some gaps that we think that this generation comes with. Whether it's helicopter parents or being over-programmed, the kids don't come as able to be accountable and responsible and leaders as they did. I don't know if that's just nostalgia on the coaches' part, but I think it's a real issue that we're trying to address through collaborations with the School of

Education, the Provost's Office, HPER, and other partners on campus. As part of the Excellence Academy as well, we've started a program called, "The Spirit of Indiana: 24 Sports, One Team," which I candidly think will be transformative for the Indiana University Athletic Department. We set out those traits that we want to see in our student athletes and expect every coach and every administrator and every person in our department to help us instill those in the kids. I'd like to talk a lot more about that, but it does look like I'm closing out. We finished in the black, one of only 14 schools according to the NCAA and Sports Illustrated. Among the 140 that offer D1 football, we're one of only 14 that finished in the black. We have a variety of fiscal challenges not the least of which is paying our tuition bill. As you all know, but some people don't understand, the money doesn't just fall from the heavens or the campus doesn't pay our bills, we have to raise the money to pay for our kids' school and that bill has gone up 38% in the last six years because while the university I think has done a great job of making IU education accessible and affordable – especially to in-state kids, especially to kids that merit special merit based aid – sometimes that skims over us, because we have a lot of out-of-state kids and we have some kids that don't qualify for merit aid and our cost of scholarship looks like a hockey stick. So we have to run harder just to stay in place to pay our annual tuition bill and that's one of our challenges. We have a variety of other ones but we are addressing those by containing costs, I've cut my senior staff by a third, that saved half a million dollars we were able to utilize to hire compliance officers, academic staff, strength conditioning coaches, so forth and so on. We're working to raise the money we need to do – and I'll skip through all this stuff. Our ten year financial plan we do demonstrate, despite those challenges, we will be in the black over the next ten years. I think that in some ways is job one as a steward of the department. Beyond Spirit of Indiana we have other values that we talk about. They'll be in what Craig has, if you're interested, and I think I almost made it. [laughter] So I'll be happy to answer any questions that anybody might have. Thank you. Yes ma'am!

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: First of all that was very impressive, a very impressive report, and I'm pleased to hear that the student athletes are doing remarkably well, that is good news. Under major activities, this is my question –

GLASS: Yes ma'am.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: – under major activities 2009-2010, you indicate in number three that the committee conducted student exit interviews. Could you give us a sense of what the student athletes are reporting about their experience at Indiana University and what are they telling us that we should be mindful of?

GLASS: Yes ma'am, that's an excellent question. The NCAA requires us to have a routine exit interview of seniors leaving the program, and usually that has been a sampling. Most schools it's a sampling. One of the things that we've instilled since I've been there is we interview every single kid that leaves as a senior and the folks that oversee those programs have to show me those exit interviews or document due diligence where the

kid just refused to provide it. I think that's very important because I think sometimes in a sampling you can really miss pieces. We have two components to it, one is objective that's, you know, fill-in-the-dots, and one is written out answers which often times are the most instructive. But the fill-in-the-dot ones enable me that if there's ever an issue in compliance I can send it over to Julie. If people say, you know, 'I think we are practicing more than the NCAA says we should,' I can send that to Julie. If there's academic issues, where people say, 'Well, I don't think I had the access to tutors that I should get,' 'I don't think,' you know, 'that the training table was really a training table,' then Grace – Grace is part of our operation – follows up on that. And then the more subjective piece we can follow up on a person by person basis. With 24 sports and 650 student athletes, it's hard to, you know, generalize what their comments are but we do follow-up on those and sometimes they involve conversations with coaches or even a part of a coaching change as frankly was the case with our men's soccer program recently. Does that help?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Yes, I had wanted some specifics, but that's fine.

GLASS: We try to draw it out by organizing the questionnaire to get at things like academics, compliance, administrative support, facilities, training table, you know that sort of thing and then follow-up on those.

HANSON: Thank you, I'll leave this to the Agenda Committee [Laughter].

DOWELL: Oh boy, I'm sorry Brad, but –

HANSON: But one of the things that Brad has suggested is that there is a timeliness to the presentation he wants to give that worries me a little. I know that people would like to continue this discussion. I know there are some very specific questions.

DOWELL: But I think we need to let Brad at least have a time to introduce his topic to us and so I think we have to cut off questions for athletics and maybe the committee can come back sometime if we feel we want to talk some more? I'm really sorry we've just…

BUCUR-DECKARD: And with the presentation online there will be other kinds of, you know, comments that….

DOWELL: Anyway thank you so much for being here. I'm sorry that things have gone so wrong today.

GLASS: One thing I meant to mention to Erika is. I just wanted to offer, I think Athletics has opted out of this in years past, but I would be happy to offer to be part of the Budgetary Affairs Committee process. I think we were defined out of that but we're happy to be in that and answer any questions. And so you know, I'll just raise my hand if that is something that would be useful in the future.

HANSON: Thanks, thank you Fred.

GLASS: Thank you.

HANSON: Again we do apologize for the hastiness of this, but thanks. So, Brad?

AGENDA ITEM 9: REPORT ON DIGITAL EDUCATION RESOURCES AND ETEXTS

WHEELER: Thank you, and in anticipation of the situation, I brought the full and the short version which I preloaded the short version once I got here. So I will try to be as swift as I can in walking through this. So I think it is a matter of great interest to many of us in understanding what's happening with digital education resources and eText and Fred, I think we can make your bills go down in buying textbooks for our student athletes. There's no doubt there are concerns among students, among parents, among faculty, among stakeholders across the state and the nation about the cost of textbooks for students. These are what we estimate and post officially here on the Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses. I've met with a number of student groups already and got a varying set of responses, of 'Yeah, that's about right,' 'No, I spend a lot more than that,' and some say, 'I don't spend quite that much.' So I take that as the numbers maybe are not too far off. You can imagine for students who are attending the community college of Indiana, Ivy Tech, the percentage of costs for textbooks is much higher for them relative to students attending IU. With *Empowering People* – I think most of you know about the IT strat[egic] plan that we did a couple of years ago – we have a section in there about trying to look at what was going to happen with textbooks and be involved. So we did a study in 2009 and looked at 20 large courses. What is the student experience in the cost of textbooks? So some students buy new books, we know what the price of those are. Some buy used, who shop online. Then the question is, what is the real net cost of a book to a student? So if they go to sell back, only about a third of the students typically succeed in sell back, because first year, second year, third year, is often a very different sell back experience for the students. Often about two-thirds of the students don't succeed in sell back or end up with a very disposable price for the book and in this situation – I know for me as a professor and teaching – a lot of times I would like my students to have those books for later courses and so they lose them. You can see the net cost here is about 40 to 65% for students. I think most everyone around the room would agree that the world is changing. We can start to see iPads and Kindles and all sorts of new devices emerging, where the students are reading on their PCs and laptops. We see emerging content models from the publishers. And so there is no doubt, just as music went through a big change and movies and video have gone through a big change, textbooks are poised to start going through a change over the coming years. I think it's also very important to point out, this is absolutely a zero debate about a digital text verses a physical printed book. Nick's got a couple of print-on-demand books he can just start passing around. The way the publishers are shifting is pay a license for a digital book, you can print things yourself if they allow them or you

can pay a small up charge and have a print-on-demand version. A nice professionally bound quality book like we are sending around now. So it's not a debate about one or the other. Students who want the physical book can still obtain it. So very quickly while in the abbreviated version of the slides, I know these are somewhat small, Nick's going to be teaching a course in the Kelley semester so we grabbed his book for comparison shopping. Retail price is $202, it ranges all the way down to used book being available supposedly for $128. You don't know how many of those are available or if you can succeed in buying it. Rental was $60 or an eTextbook in a model that we're looking at right now, available for $70 which would have perpetual access while someone is a student at Indiana University. So we are very engaged in an eText pilot right now. We're in the midst of completing the third semester in that pilot with the fourth one to begin in the spring. And this is somewhat the urgency of wanting to be sure this was brought to the BFC's attention so you know about it, know what's going on. Here are the four objectives that we're going after: number one, number one, number one is to drive down the cost to students for textbooks, 2) it's got to be the materials that faculty want to use from the best books, the best publishers, the best things that you would like to see made available. We see tools emerging that allow students to do social annotation, mark the book up, digitally share that with their study group, professor being able to annotate the book and have it show up in every student's book immediately – when they connect that is. So some pretty cool stuff going on and we're really trying to not focus on things that are one hit wonders that make a great splash, but what is a sustainable model that we could really start building in to the way IU approaches and does things. So this is the key slide, if you are dozing a bit this is the moment, wake up! [laughter] So three pass forward here, first one is the best way to drive down the price of textbooks is if they cost zero and that is, you know about open source software, there are open educational resources out there where materials are freely available. That 500 page statistics book that's coming around is a free book. You can read it online at Connexions and you can have it printed for about $20. So to the extent faculty find resources or want to contribute to that, we're all for it and IU is involved in those. Second point is right now students buy as a business like a publisher or big retailer selling to a consumer and you can imagine students do not have great negotiating power in that relationship with the publisher. The third model, and let me be clear, if you want to teach with an eText today you could assign it, they're sold through Barnes and Noble, they're sold through Amazon, nothing needs to change. So that's available to you right now under the terms that they wish to sell. What we're looking at though is changing the balance of the negotiating power. If the university is negotiating prices with a publisher it's a big university negotiating with a big publisher and we have the opportunity to drive down costs just as we did with the Microsoft deal or the Adobe deal, we can negotiate far better prices and far better terms. So we call this the "Move the Tollbooth" model. Instead of students paying retail at the end when they see a book assigned, it would work similar to a course fee. So if you're in Chemistry 101 and the book has cost $100, we negotiate a deal with the publisher through one company or another and it drives that price down to – right now we're at $35. And that give the student perpetual access to the book, all the annotation tools, it's delivered right in

Oncourse. They can work offline. They don't have to be connected while they do it. And this would be a course fee or an eText fee model. While I can't promise, it is my perception that with more experience we can drive the price down into the 20's probably into the 20 – 25% range over time with this. That would be a substantial savings to the students. Obviously this is a very environmentally friendly approach to doing things in terms of not printing all those books and shipping them around. We are in the midst of the third semester right now trying this. We have an IRB approved study that has done reports of students' perceptions of using and working in this way. Those reports are posted. I'll show you in a moment. I think another very important point is we are in a perishable window with the publishers to shape the terms of the deal. If we just let things run for a year or two some habits and approaches of selling are going to lock in that may not be in the interest of our students or the university. Right now the publishers are trying to figure it out as well. So we're in and we are being influential. Like they say, 'No, we're not going to let students print,' and we've said, 'No, that's unacceptable.' Okay, they'll let students print but only one chapter, and we've said, 'No that's unacceptable.' And we've done that about ten times and we've prevailed on every point of argument so far, and I think that is very important for us. Second to last slide – I recognize this may be a bit small – as we go into the spring semester, we've got about ten courses here on the Bloomington campus, some in the College, some in the Kelley School of Business, that you can see for the first one a retail price of $173 for the book. Amazon sells it for $116. The course load or the eText price being $54, and so there's a whole range of those that we will be putting into the spring semester. So let me just say we have a boatload of policies to work through regarding this. When a professor starts just, you know, assigning lots of texts that they don't really need but they happen to be the author of those texts and there are automatic fees, well we need to have policies around that. What if students drop, do they have to pay a fee again next semester? Well they pay the Bunsen burner fee again if they drop and take chemistry over, but do they do it for this? Probably not. You know, we want to resolve those policies in the favor of students as much as possible. We will be working with BFC committees, with University Counsel, with UFC we have a lot of this to work through and the best place to see what's going on is a website called etexts.iu.edu. We have an FAQ up there that's got about 25 or 30 questions so far. I've been meeting with every student group that would hold still to talk with them about this and answer their questions and there's just a lot of information that we'll be continually updating there on etext.iu.edu. Thank you.

HANSON: Thank you. [remarks indistinct] stuff. (Laughter) There better not be any questions. [laughter] You may have questions, but you can raise them later.

WHEELER: Yeah, I'm happy to stay around and if people want to come up and ask me questions I'll just stay around for a little bit.

HANSON: Unless you want to extend unanimously. Alright, so with the thank you we are adjourned.

MEETING ADJOURNED: 5:32PM