

Minutes
Indiana University
UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL
February 10, 2004
1:30 – 4:30 pm
University Place Conference Center Room 132
Indianapolis Campus

Summary of Actions Taken:

The Council heard informational reports regarding the non-tenure track versus tenure-track composition at Indiana University and a proposal to modify the Conflict of Interest Policy. The Conflict of Interest Policy amendments will be considered at the next meeting of the UFC. The Honorary Degrees Committee made recommendations to the UFC for honorary degree recipients in executive session.

Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes

September 24, 2002

<http://www.iub.edu/~ufc/docs/AY03/minutes/09-24-2002.minutes.htm>

October 8, 2002

<http://www.iub.edu/~ufc/docs/AY03/minutes/10-08-2002.minutes.htm>

November 12, 2002

<http://www.iub.edu/~ufc/docs/AY03/minutes/11-12-2002.minutes.htm>

October 14, 2003

<http://www.iub.edu/~ufc/docs/AY04/minutes/10-14-2003.htm>

November 11, 2003

<http://www.iub.edu/~ufc/docs/AY04/minutes/11-11-2003.htm>

2. Agenda Committee Business

(Professors Mary Fisher and David Daleke)

3. Presiding Officer's Business

(Ken Gros Louis, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs)

4. Question /Comment Period

(Ken Gros Louis, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, Professors Mary Fisher and David Daleke)

5. Report of Faculty Composition at Indiana University

(Ted Miller, Co-Chair, UFC Faculty Affairs Committee; Ken Gros Louis, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs)

6. Proposal to Amend Conflict of Interest Policy (First Reading)

(Professor Ann Gellis, Associate Dean of Research Compliance)

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/AY04/circulars/U5-2004.htm>

7. Executive Session: Honorary Degrees Committee
(Professor John Ross, Chair, Honorary Degrees Committee)

ATTENDANCE:

Members Present: David Fulton, Ken Gros Louis, Michael McRobbie, Simon Atkinson, James Baldwin, Chris Bjornson, Bonnie Brownlee, Donald Coffin, David Daleke, Mary Fisher, Janice Froehlich, Ann Gellis, Laura Ginger, Joanna Goldstein, Dolores Hoyt, Thomas Hurley, Marilyn Kintzele, Anna McDaniel, Ted Miller, Richard Nash, Harold Ogren, Markus Pomper, Mary Popp, John Ross, Martin Spechler, Herbert Terry, David Vollrath, Richard Ward, William Wheeler, Patricia Wittberg, Enid Zwirn, Paul Galanti

Members Absent: Charles Bantz, Bruce Bergland, Adam Herbert, Sandra Patterson-Randles, Ruth Person, Una Mae Reck, Michael Wartell, Erik Bucy, Bernd Fischer, Cathy Ludlum Foos, Kathleen Gilbert, Peter Iadicola, Elizabeth Johnson, Michael Nusbaumer, James Patterson, Mark Pescovitz, Roy Schreiber, Sarita Soni, Robert Tarver, Kizhanipuram Vinodgopal, Jeffrey Watt, Nanci Yokom, Casey Cox, Andrew Hutton, Grant McFann, Josh Runyan

AGENDA ITEM #1: Approval of Minutes

GROS LOUIS: We can begin. The President sends his regrets but he's at meetings in Florida, which is where the Foundation...is the microphone working? Is it working yet?

The President sends his regrets but he's doing both some club meetings and fundraising in Florida following the Foundation Board of Directors meeting last week. So the first item on the agenda today is the approval of five sets of minutes.

Anyone have any corrections, additions, deletions, changes to these five sets of minutes?

If not, a motion to approve?

SPECHLER: So moved.

GROS LOUIS: Second?

ZWIRN: Second.

GROS LOUIS: Any discussion? All those in favor say Aye [aye]. Opposed [none]? Abstain [none]? OK.

AGENDA ITEM #2: Agenda Committee Business (Professors Mary Fisher and David Daleke)

GROS LOUIS: Then we'll go on to the Agenda Committee business and I'll call on Mary.

FISHER: Thank you. The Agenda Committee met today and we have talked about several things and we are going to dispose of them in various ways—we'll try to catch you up. Some of them will come up under the Presiding Officer's Business and I'll let Ken discuss them.

We also had a discussion about a recommendation that came from Kokomo that faculty who are on ten-month appointments have the option of getting 12 month salaries, or 12 month salaries over 10 months—no, getting their 10 month salary over 12 months. And, so we had a discussion about the ability of PeopleSoft to do that and we were assured by Ted Miller who is on the committee that is basically, the supervisory committee for the project, right Ted? The policy committee?

MILLER: Well, no it's not a policy committee it's a steering committee which hears reports periodically about what's going on.

FISHER: And they were basically told, because Ted has been asking this question for us for a while, and basically they've been told that there are some technical issues with the

module that would have to do that and they're not too sure how successful that would be. So that's one issue, the technical ability. Go ahead Ted.

MILLER: The way I would say it is that what I've heard is that if every 10-month appointee would agree to go to a 10 over 12 system that would be doable.

FISHER: Yeah.

MILLER: But if some of them want to stay with their 10-month system, others want to go to 10 over 12 that would be very, very, very, very, very, very difficult.

FISHER: Yes. And the whole issue is choice and we certainly should pursue it with the idea that if we have some colleagues who want to do this we should try to find a way to have choice. We then also asked Ken to tell us what the Chief Academic Officers' philosophy is and he told us that he felt that we should make that a goal if this is what some faculty want, but clearly we need not to mandate it for everyone if other people do not want that. So what the Agenda Committee decided is that we will advance this to the Benefits Committees to discuss and also there are some contact people that we can contact having to do with the technical aspects of it—Susan McCammon—and we will try to get some kind of technical ruling that will tell us the exact capability of the system and find out from that. But generally we were all in agreement that this should be a goal if we can accomplish it. And of course it may have something to do with the timing of it depending on the implementation. It may have to be something that waits until after implementation as well. So we'll get some information. Yes, Michael?

MCROBBIE: I suggest that the person you want to contact is Laurie Sullivan as the overall project manager. I'd be happy to take care of that for you, but Laurie's the best one to ask.

FISHER: OK. Laurie's the best one?

MCROBBIE: Yes.

FISHER: OK. Thank you. Great. So we thought we would take that particular tact on that. The other thing that we began to talk about working with the Honorary Degrees chair is the notion of how honorary degrees are generated. We did have a report that one of our campuses has an honorary degrees committee and does some generation of recommendations coming from the faculty as well as dealing with administrative recommendations from that campus.

So the Presidents of the various campuses are going to go back to their campuses and try to explore the notion of whether this would be a structure that would be beneficial for all the campuses. The idea being that the faculty become more engaged in identifying candidates for honorary degrees that are academic candidates. So we'll hear more about that later most likely.

And that was really the most important part of our business. In addition to that Vice President McRobbie gave a very comprehensive report, along with Ann Gellis, about the IRB situation on all the campuses. And I think that probably the best way to summarize it is that we were given a lot more specific information about the kinds of problems that the IRBs had at the time that they were audited. And also what the plan is—the educational plan that has been put in place to educate the IRBs on all the campuses and also try to unify the documentation system, the forms that are being used, and make sure that all the processes are being used adequately on all the campuses. So there is a plan in place, it is being implemented. And I think we were totally updated on that concept. And certainly we can, Vice McRobbie is here today, we can address more of those issues if you have questions at the end or during question and answer. I think that's the end of my report. David do you have anything else?

DALEKE: No I don't. Did you want to make any comments about upcoming agendas, what we might be doing next time?

FISHER: Go ahead.

DALEKE: Well we have our first reading today of the Conflict of Interest policy which we will initiate the discussion—I just want to point out that we're going to come back to this at our next meeting so we don't expect to come to a resolution necessarily today. We also have a number of other things that will come and I guess we'll just send an email notifying everybody of this over the next week or couple of weeks.

FISHER: Sure.

**AGENDA ITEM #3: Presiding Officer's Business
(Ken Gros Louis, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs)**

GROS LOUIS: I have several items that I discussed with the Agenda Committee that I'd like to bring to your attention. The first is that the review of the Graduate School is underway; Trevor Brown is chairing the review committee. The President met with the committee on January 28. Its main charge is to look at the responsibilities of the Graduate School to see if there are other options besides having a graduate school and if so what those options might be. To consider the relationship between the Graduate School and the various campuses and the Graduate School and the professional schools. The President has asked for a draft report by April 1st for that committee.

I mentioned, and I think it's important for everyone to know, that John Slattery as many of you know is the new Dean of the Graduate School. He has indicated to me in a conversation we had in December that had the President not decided to do a review of the Graduate School he would have just to see how it's functioning and he's very comfortable with the review. He and the President have discussed it. And the President made clear to John that he, the President, had no preconceived notions of what the answer should be about the Graduate School, the nature of the Graduate School. John is also an ex-officio on the committee; he'll go to those meetings when it's appropriate. He'll be

excluded from some meetings as he understands and he has volunteered that he won't go to when the committee is interviewing deans or chancellors—it would be awkward to have him there.

Secondly, the committee to review the School of Continuing Studies has not met. Don Gray is chairing that. The issue there is similar to the Graduate School in that the main question is should there continue to be a university-wide School of Continuing Studies and should that school set the requirements and authorize the degrees for the associate and bachelor's of general studies. Other questions such as the relationship between the School and other distance education operations, relationship between the School, should it continue to exist as a university-wide school, and the other campuses, etc. Again, the President has asked for a report by April 1 on that question.

I brought to the attention of the Agenda Committee two articulation agreements with Ivy Tech. One I think many campuses have and that's Bloomington just recently had an articulation agreement with the General Studies degree. So the Associate of Science in General Studies at Ivy Tech will now articulate into the Bachelor's of Science in General Studies in the School of Continuing Studies on the Bloomington campus.

The other one is unique and has implications if the path continues—and that is the Commission last January approved the Associate of Arts in History offered by Ivy Tech at South Bend and Elkhart. At the same time, South Bend has signed an agreement—the two chancellors from South Bend and from Ivy Tech—have signed an articulation agreement indicating that the AA in History at Ivy Tech will articulate into the Bachelor of Arts in History at IU South Bend. There are three conditions attached to the approval. One is, first there is to be a trial period and only if both institutions are comfortable with the results of the initial trial—meaning probably, it says two years but it's likely to be longer than that before students finish the associate of arts and go over to the bachelor arts if they choose to do so. The second condition is really quite extraordinary it seems to me. That is that the permanent approval will have to await a similar articulation agreement with the Associate of Arts in History at Ivy Tech—articulation agreement with all four-year public institutions in the state of Indiana, which will take some time. And the third condition is that this has to be approved by North Central Accrediting Body. And I'm assuming that's there, I don't really know for us, that the Ivy Tech itself may not be authorized to give Associate of Arts degrees. Ken Sauer explained this to me by saying that simply that Vincennes was not, it was not yet prepared to go to South Bend and Elkhart and so it's just a question of a minor change in implementation. But as all of you in the room can understand if Ivy Tech begins to offer large numbers of associates' degrees in the liberal arts areas that will certainly put pressure on each campus to articulate to our liberal arts programs—four-year programs.

I also wanted to mention to you that the President's Inauguration will take place on Thursday April 15th—that all the faculty from all campuses will be invited to participate and by robing and marching in the academic procession. The presidents of the academic senates on all campuses will be included in a special delegates section; along with representatives from staff and students from all campuses. Mary Fisher as Senior UFC

Co-Secretary will be asked to deliver brief greetings to the President during the ceremony. After the ceremony there will be a reception in the lobby of the Auditorium in Bloomington.

The Agenda Committee also asked what was the status of the planning for the search for the permanent Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Bloomington Chancellor. And I really repeated what the President said when he met with the Bloomington Faculty Council on January 20th and that is that he has asked me to prepare a list of items that the chancellors would send to the Senior VP for Academic Affairs on a routine basis. Some of them already do it and already know it but there are several new chancellors and he thought it would be good to get it in writing. Behind that notion is of course the creation of a job description for the Senior Vice President for AA. It will be discussed, it being the list, will be discussed with the chancellors of course and then with the UFC Co-Secretaries and if they so choose with the entire UFC.

Secondly he will then ask me to prepare a job description, list of duties for the Bloomington Chancellor and that will be discussed with the Bloomington Faculty Council Agenda Committee and if they so choose with the Faculty Council in Bloomington. The point of both of these operations, which by the way he hopes to get done this semester, is to create a job description that will be attractive enough to invite a strong pool of candidates when the time for the search comes. Part of my responsibility in fact, in this interim role, is to define the job, especially the Senior VPAA job. As he indicated the Senior is not an accident; he wanted to indicate that this is the academics is the most important thing that we do as an institution and that in no way do the other vice presidents report to the senior vice president, but that the senior vice president has a very close relationship with the President. And that the Senior Vice President and the President would do a lot of the planning for the institution in a number of areas.

So that's that plan. And there's something else I talked about that Mary said I shouldn't talk about here.

FISHER: What was that?

GROS LOUIS: It was the Management Advisory Group, but I gather that the President mentioned that at your meeting last month.

FISHER: Yeah.

GROS LOUIS: And there's not much more to report. I did ask one of the members of the committee over the weekend over email but they've only had one meeting and it really was just to assign who was going to do what, where, that's all I can say.

That's the end of my report.

AGENDA ITEM #4: Question /Comment Period

(Ken Gros Louis, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, Professors Mary Fisher and David Daleke)

GROS LOUIS: The floor is open for questions and comments. Marty?

SPECHLER: Ken, it's wonderful to have you with us, Ken.

GROS LOUIS: I'm so happy to be here rather than Santa Barbara. [Laughter.]

SPECHLER: Seeing you there gives me the impression that at least on occasion time can actually march backwards—and at my age that's a wonderful prospect. I'd like to ask you a question about something that's come up nationally and is now appears to impact the Bloomington campus at least. And that's the issue of diversity. You're probably aware that the House of Representatives has passed a bill which would institute some kind of supervisory body over area studies centers funded by the federal government and perhaps more than that. And it's been alleged that the reason for that is that insufficient diversity of opinion in some centers and perhaps departments and in particular unwillingness to allow or encourage students to enter government service. Such are the allegations that have been published in the Chronicle of Higher Education for February 6. Now I, people who know you treasure your judgment and experience on such matters of diversity and I wanted to invite you to give us your opinion on what the university ought to do with respect to this legislation and what we ought to do more generally with respect to assuring our students proper diversity educational experience.

GROS LOUIS: Well first of all my personal opinion is that it's a bad piece of legislation. And I say that because my concern is, and I've discussed this with Patrick O'Meara, my concern is that the, especially the Title XI funding of area studies programs, that those in Title XI offices will be considering whether they've heard or whether its rumored that a particular bias is being taught in a Middle Eastern studies center, an African Studies Center, and that's of concern to me. What we as an institution do—I don't speak for the university on government relations and so I really shouldn't answer that part of the question, Marty. But I know Patrick is concerned and he plans to have a conversation with his other colleagues in the CIC, that is other colleagues in International Programs, to see if they as a group are interested in communicating with our delegation to at least express their concerns so that people are on the alert that this may be an under current in the legislation—which I think you're implying as well. That doesn't fully answer your question I understand, but...

SPECHLER: And the other part of the question is what do you think the responsibility is of universities and ours in particular to assure diversity, proper diversity, of educational experience?

GROS LOUIS: Well, as you know I think, our obligation is significant in that we need to be preparing our students for a society in the United States that's going to look much different 25 years from now than it does now—not only in terms of expansion of the Hispanic population but the influx, unless the current administration in Washington

continues to limit immigration, the influx of individuals from other parts of the world, especially what we call Third World countries. As you know there are large numbers of international students in Bloomington, there's a large number at South Bend, don't know about IUPUI, but I think the same thing is true here. And we're fortunate in that they come from a large number of countries. That is, by that I mean, some years ago when the Shah of Iran was deposed several universities in this country had over 1,000 Iranian students who were suddenly cut off from their income, etc. and it caused severe problems for them.

Other questions or comments? Hearing none then we'll move to the next item on the agenda which is the report of the faculty composition of Indiana University. I'm listed here with Ted Miller, but Ted actually has the information, much of which he's been working on for a number of years.

**AGENDA ITEM #5: Report of Faculty Composition at Indiana University
(Ted Miller, Co-Chair, UFC Faculty Affairs Committee; Ken Gros Louis, Senior
Vice President for Academic Affairs)**

GROS LOUIS: Ted?

MILLER: Some of you who were members of the Council three years ago will recall that we approved at that time policy on academic appointments. The main thrust of that policy was to make this appointment category lecturer and draft regulations on how they would be promoted, and what their rights and responsibilities were, etc.

Included in that policy was a requirement that annually reports would be given to the University Faculty Council regarding the composition of the Indiana University faculty. And in addition to that beyond the numbers of faculty that are in the various appointment categories there also was a requirement that we focus on—since the categories that were primarily in play at that point were instructional categories—there was a requirement that we report on what kind of teaching was being done by these various appointment categories.

Now I review this just to let you know that the Faculty Affairs Committee of the UFC has not forgotten that that's what is supposed to be happening. But at present we are really in a position only to do a part of what we are required to do. What we have in front of us today, this is in the white document in particular, is essentially an accounting of how many faculty members there are from the various campuses, in the various units of the various campuses—full-time, part-time, how many faculty members are there? We do not have any information about the instructional roles of these faculty categories. My sense is that we are going to have to have the Student Information System part of PeopleSoft kind of up and running, in terms of registering students and so forth and so on, before we're going to be able to get that kind of information together with the data about faculty that comes from the other side of PeopleSoft. So this whole system is going to have to be up and functioning before we can actually get the instructional report that we want. I'm hopeful that in a year from now we will be able to do that. Although I'm not totally

confident we'll be able to do it in a year, but I think that we should try in a year to have that kind of information.

So this year what we have in front of us in the white document is basically a count. And I, you know, it's not that I think we need to spend a great deal of time looking at each number on the page—this is a piece of information for the Council. It's significant I think really because this, I believe, is the first time that it actually has been possible to provide consistent information about each of the campuses, with respect to how many faculty members there actually are. In our previous Human Resource management arrangement, essentially the campuses were doing their own thing basically. We didn't have consistent definitions, we didn't have consistent categories, and so it's not that we didn't have data, but it's very difficult to know whether we were comparing the same thing.

And so this document comes out of the PeopleSoft system using the same data elements for every campus, for every unit. And so in principle at least this is comparable information across the system.

Now one of the things that you'll note is that we do not have all of the academic categories accounted for here. There are some categories in our policy that are not included in this white document. There are, for example, the research scholars and the research scientists, one of our academic categories, that group is not in here. The Librarians are one of the main academic categories and they are not included in our document here. This report that we're looking at is kind of an off-the-shelf report and it's not clear that this is really the one that we want to work with in perpetuity. And so the committee, and I'm hoping the committee will spend some time reviewing this report, and I think there are certain revisions that need to be made. That's one of the reasons that this document is not up on the web as an accessible document. It isn't clear to me that we're at a point where we actually want to put this up there and let everybody look at it. I'm not sure this is the format that we want and we need to think about this a little bit more before we get into that.

But it is for your information, information about your campus. Now there's information about full-time appointees at the beginning through page 16, this is full-time appointment information. And then beginning on page 17 there is aggregated, campus-level information about part-time appointees. The first part of that is a count of part-time appointments and then when you get to page 25 we have the FTE for the part-time appointments. Again, this is aggregated at the campus level.

So this is information for the faculty on the various campuses to look at to take into account and to use in thinking about what is happening on the campus. Now one of the problems with the information that we have is that it only pertains to this particular academic year—this is the 2003-2004 academic year. The data here is based on the October 1st so called frozen file which is kind of the official date when the university decides what the structure of the university is for that particular year. So we have the 2003 data.

Now on the pink sheets there is some, there is kind of a separate report that focuses only on Bloomington and on the first page of that you'll see a 10 year history across the various categories. You'll notice that the categories on the pink sheet are more inclusive than on the white sheet. But this is a report that we have for Bloomington that shows the ten-year trends across these categories. Of course the main conclusion that one would come to when looking at this is that the tenured faculty is declining a bit, it's kind of stable I guess, but the non-tenure track faculty is increasing and has increased substantially. That certainly would be where the growth in the Bloomington faculty is.

Now we were unable, we are unable I believe to produce a report like this for each campus and that's because the information here goes back into those historical records and the consistency in this data just isn't there so someone in Bloomington could not make up a report like this for each campus. I think it would be useful to have a report like this for each campus and I think it would be very good for the Faculty Affairs committees on the various campuses to try to work up such a document.

So that first page of the pink report is kind of the different information. On the back page it's a percentage version of the information. You see that the tenure-faculty component in Bloomington is a little higher than 70%; the non-tenure faculty is around 28%.

FISHER: That was going to be my question, Ted. For the 60/40 policy do we have that kind of split for all the campuses?

MILLER: What the policy now says, Mary, is that within each unit of the, within each academic unit of the university the faculty is supposed to decide what the proportion between tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty is supposed to be—what the maximum proportion of non-tenure track faculty can be. It doesn't say that that maximum has to be smaller than 40 percent; the policy no longer says that. It basically can be any number that the faculty in the unit decide that it can be. The forty percent rule that we now have applies to the voting authority within the unit.

FISHER: Yeah.

MILLER: So if the percentage is higher than forty percent, of non-tenure track faculty—and this of course assumes that the non-tenure track faculty are participating in faculty governance, which I'm not sure is clear is happening in all the units, but let's suppose that it was in that unit—then the voting power would have to be structured in that unit to ensure that the tenure-track faculty had sixty percent of the voting, of the votes. No matter what the proportion of the tenure-track faculty is they have to have sixty percent of the votes.

Now, this is a relatively new arrangement that we have and this was something that was changed I think three years ago, but prior to that we had sort of a forty percent limit. And you know this is something that I think the Faculty Council should probably think about often; about whether we're really on the right track here. In part it depends on what these data are like. And so if we have units that end up with 1 percent tenure-track faculty, and

that clearly isn't something that we want to happen. So it depends on experience and I think over time we need to reevaluate just where we are with respect to that particular ratio.

GROS LOUIS: It's clear that the faculty composition is extremely important to know. Ted's already touched on one reason—that's faculty governance. But it also affects the curriculum, it could affect advising, it could affect who's teaching our students and at what level. So it's very important information indeed.

Other questions of Ted now? Marty?

SPECHLER: Many will remember, certainly Ted will, that one of the concerns of the Faculty Affairs Committee over these last years has been the defense of academic freedom and the right of faculty within their own disciplines and fields to express their opinion as they see fit. And the concern was that untenured faculty generally might feel under some pressure to conform to what they saw as the acceptable view and that that would detract from the vitality of the university.

Now I don't know that that's really occurring; I don't see any real problem about full-time lecturer appointments with these new safeguards, nor with Clinical professorships that we also accrued a few years ago, but I do have a big concern over this Visiting position. Take a look at that, especially on the Bloomington campus if I may say so—it looks like 10 percent, nearly 10 percent of the full-time faculty are now visitors. Now, of course, visitors have always had a welcome role in any university faculty. And you would assume, at least I would assume, that a stable proportion of visitors to fill in to bring us new views or even to be tryout for a full-time position—all that is certainly appropriate. But look at the growth of the number of visitors—it's roughly 50 percent, 57 percent—where the number of tenured faculty, especially, has actually been shrinking.

So what that means is that we have many, many more visitors per full-time tenured faculty member at the Bloomington campus, though apparently not on the smaller campuses, than we had ten years ago. I think that's a curious fact and it worries me that people are being kept on in visiting positions which would, like any short-term position, fall into question their academic freedom as well as their personal security. And I wonder what the Faculty Affairs Committee thinks about that. Undoubtedly Ted noticed it.

MILLER: Well let me say two things about that Marty. One is that on the white sheets, the Visiting category is not a category that's included so we really don't know what the visiting situation is like on the various campuses—the only one we have the data for is in Bloomington. But what strikes me as being interesting about the Bloomington situation is that this number of visitors was a fairly stable number right up until our new policy was implemented. And it's right at that year that it jumped from 140 to 160. Now, you know, I don't really know what the deal was, but I'm somehow I'm thinking that there must be some connection. If there are people who were in old categories that are, as a temporary measure, being employed as visitors. I'm really not sure about that. I'm really not sure. But it is striking to me that the really big jump happens in 2002.

SPECHLER: And it continues in 2003.

MILLER: I can see it, I don't know why it is.

GROS LOUIS: Any comments on this point, Bill?

WHEELER: I just have two. The first one is are post-docs listed as visitors in this?

MILLER: No, post-docs are not included in this.

WHEELER: I noticed the other thing in this in that same year if you look down at our part-time IRPs seem to drop of about 40. When this document was presented down in Bloomington it was explained to us that there was reassignment of titles for some of those people. And I wonder if that is in fact what's happening because you see there's a drop in part-time IRPs at about the same time you see an increase in the Visiting full-time. And prior to that change we were told that part-time was used as a title even for full-time people. You could be a part-time professor—a non-tenure track full-time person was called part-time—but when there's a change in title then they had to have a change in that title and some of them may have become lecturers in order to continue to have “associate professor” or something like that. So if you were previously a part-time assistant professor even if you did not have tenure-track you then became, rather than becoming a lecturer, that you could become, perhaps a Visiting Assistant Professor or something like that. So there may be, rather than [inaudible].

GROS LOUIS: I think the majority of the change in the IRPs accounts for the big jump in the Lecturer number.

FISHER: Yeah.

GROS LOUIS: In other words they had the option of going to Lecturer, I believe.

MILLER: If you look across the columns here you'll find that in a number of the categories between 2001 and 2002 there are some significant changes. And I think it's pretty clear that it has to do with this appointment policy that we approved but I don't think anybody, or at least I do not understand the dynamics of this completely. I think it's something we probably should know more about, but I really don't know.

GROS LOUIS: I don't know either.

MILLER: We would need the Dean of Faculties here to maybe help us understand what actually is going on.

GROS LOUIS: Let's see Don?

COFFIN: Just a technical question, Ted? What's the formula you used to translate the department into full-time equivalent?

MILLER: I don't know.

COFFIN: OK.

MILLER: It's an official formula I know that. But whatever it is I don't know.

GROS LOUIS: Yes?

NASH: I'm curious, Ted how you factor in work done by an AI appointees here. That seems not to be a category at all.

MILLER: The AIs are not included in this, no. But to the extent that we come to this point where we were going to have a report dealing with the instructional effort, AIs are certainly going to have to be a part of that report.

NASH: The reason I ask has to do in some ways with Marty's question as well. That is, and I'm thinking now anecdotally from my own department, which at one time had a very large number of AIs teaching. We made the decision in the early 1990s to cut back on the number of graduate students and the programs; we became smaller, we had fewer AIs. One of the things that enabled us to do was to create a number of positions that I believe are classified as Visiting appointments for those people who go through the program, complete their PhD, and for up to 3 years while they're on the market looking for work elsewhere are employed as Visiting appointments. And it occurs to me that one of the things that might be worth looking at as we look at the change in, increase in non-tenure appointees, to see what change, if any, in the amount of teaching being done by AIs? One thing that occurs to me here is that the non-tenure appointees are being hired largely to replace a smaller cohort of AIs. That's one possibility.

MILLER: It's a possibility.

GROS LOUIS: Other questions of Ted? I think that's a very, very useful report and it will be good to get it for all campuses I think, at some point.

AGENDA ITEM #6: Proposal to Amend Conflict of Interest Policy (First Reading)
(Professor Ann Gellis, Associate Dean of Research Compliance)
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/AY04/circulars/U5-2004.htm>

GROS LOUIS: Then we move to the next item on the agenda which is the proposal to amend the Conflict of Interest Policy, first reading. And I'll call on Ann Gellis.

GELLIS: Thank you. What you have in front of you are some proposed revisions to the Policy on Conflict of Interest and we're hoping that we will be able to move this process along so that the Trustees will be able to look at the revisions this summer so that by the

time the next cycle of annual reports come through we will be operating under our revised policy.

To explain the proposed revisions let me give you some background about the current policy and what the current policy provides. The policy was enacted by the UFC and Board of Trustees in September 2000. It had been drafted for about 4 or 5 years and it was implemented in 2002. The years in between its adoption and implementation were spent developing procedures for implementing the policy on the campuses. Now the policy that was adopted in 2000 was a significant change from the policy that existed before 2000. And that is, prior to 2000 the university was subject to federal regulations that required that persons doing, receiving, federal money had to comply with the regulations that are out there by NIH on conflicts of interest. So that prior to 2000 only those people who received federal funds were required to file and update financial conflict of interest disclosure forms.

The shift in 2000 was to make the provisions that in the past had applied only to those getting federal funds and make those provisions, keeping the federal terms, forms, regulations, the same. But to make those provisions applicable to all employees so that, at least from the faculty's point of view, it no longer makes any difference whether you are funded by the federal government or do your activities based on your compensation from IU. Everyone is required to make a disclosure of any significant financial interests—and those terms are defined and they are the federal definitions.

We had discovered in implementing the policy at least three things. One is that it's been very difficult to explain the policy to the faculty and I think we had trouble. Two, the policy is extremely broad in its scope, that is it's [end of tape 1, side a, some words lost]...faculty that we have, and instructors, and clinical people, but it also covers professional staff and non-professional staff. And clearly, yet if you look at the provisions and the questions that are asked, they're all basically from the NIH regulations that are concerned with preserving research integrity. That is, the reasons for the federal regulations and I believe the reasons why the policy was expanded, at least in respect to faculty not receiving federal funds, was that we wanted to make sure that the research that was done at IU was and was perceived by the public to be objective and not influenced perhaps and biased by some outside financial interest.

So that's the focus of the document—and in fact what the policy says...it says well you're to disclose significant financial interests that might reasonably appear to be affect or be affected by your research, teaching, and service activities at the University. So it's saying that the policy as it speaks right now says do you have any significant financial interests, and that's a defined term, that a reasonable person would think would affect how you do your research, how you do your teaching, and how you do your service. OK?

One step is that this clearly is not the way to go for non-faculty type persons. And so in fact the non-staff end of this has been taken out and Human Resources has developed a policy both on financial conflicts of interest and conflicts of commitment for staff.

The other thing that we discovered in terms of this sort of broad scope of the policy is that when we looked at the annual reports, at least in Bloomington, that were coming in, that we were getting thousands and thousands of no's and quite a lot of "I'm not sure I understand what this means, I teach this course does that mean if I serve on the Monroe County Library that's a conflict?" And it became apparent I think to those of us who had to administer it that in fact the issue of the financial conflicts of interest relates predominantly, overwhelmingly, to this issue of research objectivity. And that issues related to teaching and service do not, very often, come up in the issue of financial conflicts of interest, but rather they come up in the back half of the current policy which is Conflicts of Commitment. That is in teaching and service the more likely conflict that we see is we have someone who has an outside interest—that interest could be professional or it could be person or doing community work, or any combination of the fact—but as a consequence that person is not meeting his/her university obligations as defined by the unit in which that person is employed. So the person is not there to meet with students, or the person is meeting all the classes, or the person is basically out of the building 9/10ths of everyday.

Those are Conflicts of Commitment and those conflicts are better dealt with through the schools, the unit heads, and the Dean of Faculties. They are not really issues of research. The current policy puts both Conflicts of Interest and Conflicts of Commitment under the jurisdiction of the Vice President for Research and it's really doesn't really belong there. The revisions, so let me then take you through the revisions.

Basically we have formulated a policy that now speaks solely to issues of research activities we have taken out the Conflict of Commitment from the document. It will stand as a separate policy. We had a little urging on that because NIH doesn't like to see the Conflict of Interest policies combined with any other policies. So there was another reason to separate the two policies.

We've taken out the state law conflict of interest policies which also go to much more to whether faculty are using their own textbooks and receiving royalties from their students and those have to be reported to the Board of Trustees, as generally has been handled through the University Counsel's office. So we've dropped the, I mean, the Conflicts of Commitment and we've dropped the state law policies—those policies will continue to exist but not in this document.

The other thing is that we have limited the reach of the Conflict of Interest Policy to persons who are doing research. So it would reach faculty who are doing research, visiting faculty who are doing research, post-docs that are doing research, professional staff who may be considered doing research, graduate students, and so on. But the defining element is that these are persons engaging in research and what we want to know is do they have outside significant financial interests that will affect, or be affected by, their research activities. So we have dropped the reference to teaching and service activities as part of the text. We're looking at researchers and we're looking at their research activities.

And those are the main sort of really structural revisions. There have been a couple of other changes which I will highlight. There's been a change in the definition of financial interest. I think you people have this master document December 3rd, I'm not exactly sure of the numbering of this but December 3rd. If you look at—first of all in the applicability section it was pointed out to us by the Bloomington Research Affairs Committee that we need to add librarians. And we will add librarians—again, librarians who are doing research would be covered.

When you get down into the definitions you get to “financial interest” which is 2i on page 10. You will see that it says it excepts from the definition of “financial interest” “compensation from Indiana University.” The remainder of that sentence is new, “expect that royalty income distributed by University IP policy shall be considered a “financial interest.” Basically what this does is says that to the extent that faculty receive royalty income, whatever its source, whether it's from ARTI through a licensing agreement done through the university, or whether it's been done elsewhere, that those royalties will be counted as constituting a financial interest.

Other, I think major change in the definitions, if you go over to page 11 at the top and this is the definition of “significant” financial interest. The definitions of significant interest and financial interest are taken pretty much word for word from the federal regulations. The federal regulations have in them the \$10,000 threshold or the 5% ownership interest. And so that's what we have, it's been everybody's intention—that is the people who drafted it and the Board of Trustees—to stick to, so that we had one set of regulations to deal with, to stick with those regulations of the federal government.

However, since the NIH has enacted its regulations which were in I think 1996 there's been significant movement about, and discussion about, conflict of interest especially as it pertains to research involving human subjects. And that this is an area in which people who are doing research with human subjects should disclose any outside financial interests without regard to a monetary threshold. And so the paragraph that begins, “However, Covered Persons engaged in medical or clinical trial research shall disclose all financial interests of themselves, or of outside entities in which they hold significant financial interests, that reasonably would appear to affect or be affected by that research, without regard to any monetary threshold.” This has been the recommendation of the American Medical Colleges Association and has been adopted by most major medical research institutions. For those of you who are doing behavioral type research with human subjects you would still be able to use the \$10,000 threshold and 5% equity goals.

Finally, the other change in the agreement is that the policy—current policy refers to the University Research Policy Committee as advising and assisting both faculty and the Vice President for Research on resolving policy issues or specific issues of conflict of interest. The University Research Policy Committee as many of you know, no longer exists, and so what we have done in those places is substituting the relevant conflict of interest committees or persons who are responsible for conflict of interest on the campuses to be the advisor both to the faculty and the Vice President for Research. So for

example on the Bloomington campus it would be the Bloomington Conflict of Interest Committee and Indianapolis has two committees—it would be whichever committee is involved in the particular conflict or if it's just simply a policy issue the Vice President for Research will consult with both committees. And on the regional campuses it would either be their own Conflict of Interest committees or if they don't have one, the person who administers the program on the campus.

Those, I think, are the changes.

GROS LOUIS: Thank you, Ann. You have the document before you and you should get a chance to go through it. Are there questions of Ann since this is noted on the agenda as a first reading and it will come back.

FISHER: I do have one question, Ann, based on something you said. Would it be possible then that the faculty member who is doing research would they have to fill out two Conflict of Interest forms? One for their research and one for let's say one for what's happening with their class and royalties from their books or whatever.

GELLIS: Royalties, if they obtain royalties from their books that they...

FISHER: Use in class...

GELLIS: use in class, then they would have to fill out the state form. But they already do that. So we're not adding anything, it's simply just.

FISHER: Would it be two different forms or are they going to be in one form?

GELLIS: No, there are two different forms. They have to be two different forms. What we do now is we ask on our disclosure form some basic questions—two of the questions relate to the state conflict of interest policy and the instructions say if you answer yes to this question you must fill out this form and it gives the URL for that form. But the state has its own form and the forms go to two different places.

FISHER: That's going to confuse people I'm afraid.

GELLIS: I'm doing my best.

FISHER: We know, thanks Ann.

GROS LOUIS: Yes, Don?

COFFIN: Two questions. One actually comes from a colleague of mine who asked whether the impetus for these revisions come from any specific cases of problems or issues with conflict of interest or more generally just because of documentation?

GELLIS: It was all just simply watching the system work.

COFFIN: And the second question is one that I have when I'm reading the definition of "financial interest" and in particular the bullet that refers to "any financial interest arising solely by means of investment in a mutual, pension, or other institutional investment fund where the Covered Person does not exercise control over the management and investments of such fund." Those would be excluded? Those would not be counted as financial conflicts.

GELLIS: Right

COFFIN: My question is this. I know a large number of us have 403-Bs and I know that it's possible for those 403bs to be invested in individual stocks. And as such we would in fact have control over the investment or utilization of those funds and I suspect large numbers of us have more than \$10,000 in 403b accounts and many of us may have more than \$10,000 of valued stock, of individual stock in 403bs. Was the intention, is that included to exclude 403bs or are we going to have to deal with that issue.

GELLIS: This is the, these are the federal regulations and so I don't know what their intention was.

COFFIN: OK

GELLIS: But I would say that if in fact you do have control of them then you would need to disclose them. Now they may not affect your research. So, you know, first they have to reach the significant financial threshold, but even then you should disclose them but the answer would be that they don't affect my research. If they do, for example, if you owned, if you were a researcher here and you were a medical researcher doing drug trials and you happen to own a million dollars worth of Lilly stock—that would be a situation in which we would want to know that you owned it and that might in fact be an actual conflict in terms of your research. But by the same token if you're this researcher in drug trials owning a million dollars worth of IBM or Microsoft, General Motors—that's a good one!—then you would not have an actual or a potential conflict. All of the information that you disclose is kept confidential. And the old policy and the new policy are very specific that none of this information can be obtained in an annual report in the process of annual reports. So it's completely separate from other personnel information.

GROS LOUIS: Other questions?

GALANTI: What about the problems of not knowing when you invest in a company stock and you really don't know what they're doing, what their other activities are. Is that a problem, Ann?

GELLIS: I don't know. I assume when it comes up is as you discover it later that the fact is they were doing this and I think all you do is file a new, you amend your report and say

I discovered that this company does in fact make library books and that's my area.

GROS LOUIS: When the state policy was first introduced some of you may remember that University Counsel indicated that if you thought that there might be a conflict of interest it was in your best interest to file the form

GELLIS: There would be criminal penalties.

GROS LOUIS: To have the form on file.

GELLIS: You've committed a crime if you don't.

GROS LOUIS: Herb?

TERRY: It may not be easy to do this, simply put. If the disclosed information is confidential and not closed then what happens with it? What actually is done with all of this information?

GELLIS: Well, we weed out those which we feel raise, I mean, in fact we have people who may have conflicts, or potential or actual conflicts. And at least, and this differs from campus to campus, but on Bloomington campus we, as you know, the form is submitted by the faculty to the unit head. The unit head has to check, you know, there's no conflict disclosed, conflict is disclosed but does not constitute an actual conflict, or there is an actual conflict. And then it comes to the Office of the Vice President for Research and they are, all those that have any yes answers are read and a preliminary determination is made as to whether what has been disclosed is the kind of conflict, or poses the potential of the kind of conflict that we're concerned about. And if it is then we send it to the Conflict of Interest committee, which is a BFC committee made up of faculty picked by the BFC; there are certain members who are on the CIC by position, certain associate deans, for example the associate dean from COAS, from Optometry, from Business. And then the BFC chooses the other members of the committee and the chair of that committee is jointly chosen by the Nominations Committee of the BFC and the Vice President for Research. And it's an obligation of that committee to examine the conflicts and decide how best to resolve them or manage them or maybe come to the conclusion that there is no conflict. So basically it's that body that's going to be making the decision whether they think there is something to be monitored or if it can be resolved in some way. And finally, if for example, you have an actual conflict and the Conflict of Interest Committee says well we think you need a management committee, which is what they have done in the past, and the faculty member says no way. We go to Vice President McRobbie. Does that answer the question?

NASH: Ann, I'd like to pick up on something you said earlier about response rates. You indicated that most of us indicate either that we have no financial conflict of interest or we don't know what we're doing with the form. And it seems to me that when you give academics a long form like this to fill out.

GELLIS: Oh, it's shortened.

NASH: And ask them to do it year after year especially if they think they're saying no but they're not quite sure; you're going to get an accelerated rate of non-response. And it seems to me we could, it would be a good thing, if we could find a way to do a short-form that would say simply "I have previously filed a disclosure form indicating no conflict of interest and I have no new conflict of interest."

GELLIS: I think that's a terrific idea and I will institute that as soon as I can.

FISHER: Save some trees.

GROS LOUIS: Yes, Bill?

SCHNEIDER: With permission to speak. Ann, having wrestled with this for the last five years in the School of Liberal Arts at IUPUI I like most of the changes, especially separating out research from the rest. We just went through going through lots of forms. I also like the way that you've left the flexibility for implementing this to the campuses. But the question I have has to do with something very specific that's new and I wonder why. It's actually a two-part question. First of all, why you picked a particular date, a month and day of the year, why you didn't leave that up to the local campuses and units. And the second is that I understand if you own stock that you can come up with a value of the stock that particular day but a lot of this is income and the question is, is it income on the date you fill it out, is it income for anticipated.

GELLIS: Anticipated.

SCHNEIDER: So, it's anticipated.

GELLIS: As far as the date we were simply trying to communicate that we ought to have one date in which everybody follows and not...when you have someone who comes in joins the faculty in December, they will fill out conflict of interest forms in December but, well rather than say ok that person doesn't have to file until next December. It would basically say that come September, even though it's less than a year, we're going to start you on the new cycle. I don't really care, I mean, I can phrase it to get that point across about giving a specific date.

Our reporting to the federal government is in the fall and so there is a very strong desire on the part of those of us that have to do this to have everybody do the annual reporting in the fall as opposed to in April or what have you. But I don't really care if it's September 1st or even October 1st kind of thing. So I'd be happy to make that change.

GROS LOUIS: Yes?

OGREN: As you indicated, Ann, that this was required for all faculty, but what is the consequence for not filing? For someone, let's say, who's not doing any research?

GELLIS: If you say no, you answer the form no, no, no, no.

OGREN: Or just...

GELLIS: If you don't file and I catch you I will ask you to do it. Essentially if you don't and, we try to ask people to help us to meet the responsibilities that we have both to the federal government and to the university, under university policy. Faculty, as we all know, are pretty independent minded people. We're trying to make it simple and as painless as possible. People who do not file and do in fact have conflicts to report subject themselves to the possibility of a variety of remedial actions including being charged with Research Misconduct.

OGREN: Yes, but the...an external funding agency like NIH does not require that all faculty at the university file, I'm pretty sure. They just probably require the principal investigator or the investigators file so if you're not

GELLIS: No, no, no, no. They require anyone who has any part in the design or conducting the research file. So to that extent anyone who works on the research, and sometimes, in some cases it may be someone who is not a student or a faculty member. It could be a professional person who is involved in the data analysis or putting it together. All those people are required by NIH to have filed Conflict of Interest forms.

TERRY: On page 10 is domestic partner our definition of domestic partner, does it have to be a same-sex?

GELLIS: It's our definition.

TERRY: It's our definition.

GELLIS: Maybe I should make that clearer

GROS LOUIS: Any other questions of Ann? Ted?

MILLER: Ann, I would say that one of the points of this policy that is of interest to me currently is the one addressed in footnote number one on page 9.

GELLIS: I was thinking of taking that out.

MILLER: I'm sorry?

GELLIS: I said I was thinking of deleting this.

MILLER: Oh, Well

GELLIS: It seems not to answer the questions.

MILLER: Well, the...I guess my question that I'd like to ask you is where do you think we stand across the university with respect to the understanding of the faculty, within the contexts of their units in terms of what the unit expectations are, the unit ideas about this. Where do we stand with regard to people actually understanding what this is about?

GELLIS: This footnote basically it relates to the Conflicts of Commitment more than it does, and that's why I think it should come out of this. Where we stand is a very interesting question because we just, I had a two hour meeting of the Conflict of Interest Committee yesterday in Bloomington discussing this very interest in what should be, was there a consensus on what was ok to do and what was not ok to do? To what extent are there problems with people abusing the system in some ways? The Conflict of Commitment and enforcing both the Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment situations is that the policy keeps in place what has been traditional throughout all major research universities and that is the one day a week that faculty are given to engage in outside professional activities.

For one thing most faculty think that's one day a week to engage in any activities—it's not. It's supposed to be professional, it's supposed to be, the purpose of it is supposed to be to inform you, to better your research or teaching, and to do service as well. And therefore have a synergy between your experience outside the ivy walls and what you do within them. I think over time no one paid much attention to this. So I think, as I say, there are a lot of people who feel that they can do any, that they will do anything they want in that period of time. Now that's something that's very difficult to deal with. As far as commitment, I mean the issue of what people do in terms of consulting, I don't know that there is a uniform sense of what can be done and what not to do. We had a very rigorous conversation about this. I mean one of the things I discovered which was quite surprising to me, a) is how entrepreneurial we are as a group! Most, many, many faculty—not a small number—do consulting, that's not so surprising, but they have set up their own corporations and web pages and so on and they carry out consulting business via their corporations. Again, that doesn't necessarily mean anything. Some of these consulting entities are not consulting entities to consult with say other companies on how something that's related to their research. Some of these companies simply compete with the university for opportunities. We have a number of instances in which the faculty member has a company that is basically saying well, I can do this as research but I can make more money if I do it in my company. And this is absolutely acknowledged, and as I say, a lot of people think that that's just fine as long as you don't abuse it—I don't know what it means to abuse it. I think there's a lot to be discussed about the policy. The last time we discussed this policy in 2000 at the UFC I remember a discussion going along the lines of we're in a changing world and we're going to see more conflicts of interest. And I certainly think since 2000 that that has been the case. It is an inevitable consequence of increased commercialization and intellectual property. It's an consequence of needing support from the private sector. And so all those things all push, especially when you push the extra day in there, all push faculty to this other world of enterprise. It's clear that we're not all caught up. The long answer is that I don't know that there is any common understanding, etc. that the one day a week is sacrosanct.

MILLER: If you think about it in the most basic terms we all understand that the faculty's activities are viewed in terms of teaching, research, and service. Consulting is, you know, how the idea of consulting relates to that, it seems to me, is really an important question in what you're talking about. And I have a feeling if you were to go around the faculty and ask them how they think about consulting and how that relates to teaching, research, and service, I think you'd probably find that some faculty would say well it's ok, it's something different. But I'm sure there are other faculty members who see their consulting as being part of their research, part of their service, part of their teaching.

GELLIS: And I think they're right in many cases.

MILLER: But are we asking the academic units, do I understand that this policy is basically asking the academic units to set some kind of guidelines for their faculty.

GELLIS: Not this no.

MILLER: No?

GELLIS: Conflict of Commitment policy does. Conflict of Commitment policy was part of this policy that passed in 2000 asks that the, essentially, that the schools as the lowest unit have developed some kind of expectations as to what a faculty is supposed to do with that unit. So that one can have a sense of whether they are off the mark or not and as you know, and I said it at the BFC many times, that's going to be one hell of a discussion.

FISHER: But your intention is to bring the Conflict of Commitment Policy at some point in time.

GELLIS: No, we're not changing it. We're just taking it out.

FISHER: OK. So, we're changing this and the other one is just going to be as it is but separate.

GELLIS: Right.

FISHER: OK.

BALDWIN: Does the university have any way of policing the 20 percent [inaudible]? Has it ever been involved in a punitive way?

GELLIS: Not that I know of. Essentially, this is a task for the chair or the dean. They know whether someone's there or if they're not there.

BALDWIN: Some of these are competing with what the university is trying to do at some level, do you agree?

GELLIS: I agree. But in some ways [inaudible] as to whether they are really conflicts because that person does other things for the unit.

GROS LOUIS: Further questions of Ann on this first reading of this policy? Thank you very much.

FISHER: Do you want to mention the email?

GELLIS: His concerns do not go to anything that our revisions would take care of. Professor Cooper is from England and not, despite my efforts, well versed in the legal system here. And I assume actually it's the same in England since we share the same Anglo-Saxon American judicial system. But in any case, I have tried to explain to Dominic that the NIH, he is right, the NIH does not require people who do not get federal funds to meet their regulations with respect to conflicts of interest. There are two things that Dominic tends to be confused on: one is that initially he said that the regulations were not law because they were not part of the statute. And I tried to explain that the regulations of the federal government were part—we seemed to have gotten past that. It is true, as I said that he is right, that the federal law does not require people not receiving federal funds to do anything vis-à-vis conflict of interest—it is university policy that does that. And I can give an explanation of why the policy was changed to include everyone, and not just people who had federal funds. But I hope I can convince you that I am not telling you or saying that you ought to pass a policy because the federal government is making us do it. The federal government is not making us do it, it is our own policy passed by and adopted by us and the Board of Trustees that requires us to do it. So that's number one. So to the extent that any of you thought that if you didn't comply you were in a breach of federal law—you may or may not have been.

Family members. I have had two faculty members on the Bloomington campus who have adamantly refused to include their wives financial interest. I don't know if there are thousands of you out there who feel the same intrusion. First of all I will say that the federal government makes me do it. This is part of the federal regulations. That is, we took the definitions of how you calculate financial interest and significant financial interest right out of the federal regulations so that we had one set of regulations to comply with and that all faculty were subject to the same rules. The policy behind why the federal government cares whether a family member or a dependent who is living in your house whether they also have financial interests when aggregated with yours would make you reach the threshold and cause you to have, ask the question Do I have a Conflict of Interest? There is an assumption, perhaps wrong in some people's cases that if my spouse owns a million dollars of Lilly stock and I do research at Lilly or for Lilly on drug trials, I knowing that my wife has a million dollars invested might be influenced, and that might in fact influence my research, whether I find out that the drug trials are successful or not successful. If the drug trials are really great and it cures everything well I would expect the Lilly stock to go up and that's going to make my spouse wealthy. So that's the theory. That people know about the large financial interests that the people who share their home have, and that that might exert the same type of influence as having that financial interest in your own name. We are not peeping into your financial life; we try not to.

FISHER: What about the sex life?

GELLIS: Let me tell you, I, know you, I don't know maybe sex life would be more interesting. This stuff is really dull. But that is, the minor point about the 10K again, NIH has not raised the number. I think there is some sentiment out there that the number is too low but right now our approach has been to stick with what the federal government is happy with.

FISHER: Thank you.

GELLIS: Because again, for those people who have federal funds they will be subjected to that threshold. So there's probably not a very good reason to have two different levels.

GROS LOUIS: Thank you Ann. Let's move to the last item on the agenda, where we will go into Executive Session with recommendations from the Honorary Degrees Committee.