

**Indiana University**  
**BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL**  
**April 1, 2014**  
**Indiana Memorial Union – IMU Georgian Room**  
**3:30 P.M. – 5:30 P.M.**

**Attendance**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Abhijit Basu, David Baxter, Claude Clegg, Mike Conway, Carrie Docherty, Nathan Ensmenger, Alyce Fly, Marion Frank–Wilson, Thomas Gieryn, Donald Gjerdingen, Krista Glazewski, Dennis Groth, Brady Harman, Bradley Heim, Gretchen Horlacher, Jason Baird Jackson, Bradley Levinson, Karma Lochrie, Patricia McManus, Sherri Michaels, Joseph Miller, Michael Morrone, Jamie Prenkert, Deanna Reising, Lauren Robel, Dia Sharma, Jim Sherman, Rebecca Spang, Cassidy Sugimoto, Herbert Terry, Peggy Thoits, Johannes Turk, Julie Van Voorhis, Edward Vasquez, John Walbridge, Nona Watt, Rega Wood

**MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT:** Timothy Hoch (Mike Hoadley)

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Joelle Bahloul, Zach Bailey, Lyudmila Bronstein, Carolyn Calloway–Thomas, Gracia Clark, Ying Ding, Jake Docking, Jeffrey Gershman, Vivian Halloran, Jeff Hass, Cheng Kao, Christopher Kauffman, Peter Kloosterman, Dan Knudsen, Eugene McGregor, Michael McRobbie, Jose Mitjavila, Maresa Murray, Jeff Nelsen, Matt Semadeni, Sandra Shapshay, Lisa Sideris, Sarita Soni, William Swanson, Adam Szczepaniak, Kelly Thacker, Mikel Tiller, Jessica Tooker, James Wimbush

**GUESTS:** Craig Dethloff (Chief of Staff, Faculty Counsel Office), Catherine Dyar (Office of the Provost), Matthew Gough (INPIRG), Riley Hull (INPRIG), Bob Kravchuk (BFC–BAC Co–Chair), Ariadne Rehbein (Faculty Council Office), Katherine Schulze (IDS), Eleanor Spolyar (INPIRG)

**Agenda**

1. Memorial Resolutions for Denis Sinor and Alexander Doty

Denis Sinor: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/13-14/B27-2014.pdf>

Alexander Doty: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/13-14/B28-2014.pdf>

2. Executive Committee Business (20 minutes)  
(Faculty President Herb Terry)

3. Presiding Officer’s Report (10 minutes)  
(Provost Lauren Robel)

4. Question/Comment Period\* (10 minutes)

5. BFC Election Update (10 minutes)

(President Herb Terry and Chief of Staff Craig Dethloff) [DISCUSSION]

6. Revisions to IUB Principles and Policies on Tenure and Promotion (45 minutes)

(Professor Claude Clegg, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee) [FIRST READING]

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/13-14/B29-2014.pdf>

7. INPIRG Presentation on Open Textbooks (15 minutes)

(Professor Cassidy Sugimoto, co-Chair of the Educational Policies Committee and Matthey Gough, Krishna Hedge, Riley Hull, Eleanor Spolyar) [DISCUSSION]

PLEASE NOTE: There will be an additional meeting of the Bloomington Faculty Council on Tuesday, April 29<sup>th</sup> in IMU State Room East from 3:30PM – 5:30PM

\*Faculty who are not members of the Faculty Council and who wish to address questions to Provost Robel or President Terry should submit their questions to the Faculty Council Office. Our documents are available at: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/>. To send e-mail to the Faculty Council Office: [bfcoff@indiana.edu](mailto:bfcoff@indiana.edu)

### Minutes

#### **AGENDA ITEM 1: MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS FOR DENIS SINOR AND ALEXANDER DOTY**

**ROBEL:** I'm gaveling in the meeting.

**GIERYN:** Can't hear you.

**ROBEL:** Welcome everybody. I'm – I'm acutely aware of two things, the first is that it is a gorgeous day outside, the – one of the very first gorgeous days after a wretched, lengthy winter. And in addition to putting on my li – my "to do" list, finding the Bloomington Faculty Council a place to meet that involves windows. I'm also – I'm also not wanting to keep – keep your vitamin D deprived selves in here any longer than – than necessary, and that we have a pretty important major to talk about today, so with both of those things in mind I'd like to turn to our vice provost, the father of a –

**GIERYN:** Minutes?

**ROBEL:** I don't even see the minutes on the agenda.

**DETHLOFF:** No.

**GIERYN:** No minutes?

**ROBEL:** We have no minutes. I'll turn to the vice provost the father of a – a newly – a new member of the bar of Illinois to –

**GIERYN:** My son, not me. That would be a little late. [laughter]

**ROBEL:** Well, I'm just requiring all the vice provosts to become members of the bar, that's their [laughter] – to – to present some memorial resolutions. Thank you, Tom.

**GIERYN:** Denis Sinor was born on April 17, 1916, in Kolozsvár, Hungary (now Cluj, Romania) to Miklos and Marguerite Sinor. His personal life saw him married to Jacqueline Fauçon of France who predeceased him in 2005, to Irene Montjoye of Austria with whom he came to the United States of America in 1961 but who eventually returned to Vienna, and subsequently to Eugenia (Jean) Trinajstic whom he met in Bloomington and who predeceased him in 1999. He had two children, Christophe (who predeceased his father) and Sophie (Berman) now a scholar of philosophy in whose accomplishments Denis took much pride. A sister (Maria Pierre), three grandchildren (Edouard, Manuel, and Sarah), and four great-grandchildren completed his immediate family.

Educated in Hungary, Switzerland, and France, Denis studied Turkish, Mongol, and other Central Eurasian languages and visited Germany in 1937 to examine Old Turkic manuscripts. Between 1939 and 1948 Denis was attached to CNRS in Paris, studying with the master scholar Paul Pelliot. It was in his French period that Denis coined the phrase "Central Eurasia." During World War II, he served in the French Resistance, and briefly participated with French forces in the postwar occupation of Germany. Moving to England, he obtained an MA from Cambridge University (1948). Appointed to its Faculty of Oriental Studies, Denis taught there until 1962.

In 1962 Denis moved yet again, this time to Indiana University in Bloomington as a Visiting Professor. That relocation to the American Midwest became permanent when he was appointed to head the Uralic and Altaic program here. Denis would become the doyen of a new academic area of studies, one stretching from Finland and Hungary across Turkey and Central Asia to Mongolia. The academic department that Denis nurtured, guided, and led to global prominence, and whose name changed periodically to accommodate intellectual and pedagogical expansions, is now IU's world-famous Department of Central Eurasian Studies (CEUS).

Owing to his prodigious contributions to Central Eurasian studies, Denis Sinor would be honored by elevation to Indiana University's highest academic rank: Distinguished Professor (1975–1986) and subsequently Distinguished Professor Emeritus (1986–2011). He also was awarded honorary Doctorates by the University of Szeged (1971) and the University of the Humanities in Kazan (2007). Elected an Honorary Member of the Hungarian Academy of Arts

and Sciences in 1981, awarded two highly recognized Guggenheim Fellowships (1968–1969 and 1981–1982) and two US National Endowment for the Humanities fellowships (1981, 1987–1988), Denis’s breathtaking career was crowned by receipt of the Gold Medal from the Permanent International Altaistic Conference in 1982 and again in 1996, the Hungarian Order of the Star in 1986, the UNESCO Medal in 2005, and the Middle Cross Hungarian Order of Merit in 2006.

Denis was famous for traveling far and wide. Perhaps his greatest voyage took place in 2004 when he reached the North Pole aboard a Russia icebreaker. In his younger days, he would travel to conferences – even ones hundreds of miles away – on a motorbike, enjoying the wind in his hair and the freedom of the open road. A great regret of his golden years was surrendering control of two–wheeled transports and eventually four–wheeled ones.

On January 12, 2011, Denis’ long life came to a close. Comfortable in his book–filled home on Lampkins Ridge, and tendered by his companion Ilona Janosi, he slipped away to ride with the heavenly host and feel the rush of the celestial wind in his hair.

Alexander Doty passed away on August 5, 2012 after being struck by a motorcycle while on vacation in Bermuda. He was fifty–eight years old. In 2008 he had moved to Indiana University at Bloomington to become Professor of Gender Studies and Communication and Culture; he was Chair of the Department of Communication and Culture at the time of his death.

Born in Waltham, Massachusetts, into a military family that moved around a lot, Alex’s early life was peripatetic. His family lived in New Jersey, Germany, and Japan, before putting down roots in El Paso, Texas. When Alex’s father died suddenly in 1972, the eighteen–year old Alex stayed close to home, helping to raise his four younger siblings, and attending the University of Texas at El Paso. He left Texas in 1976 to attend the University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign where he would receive his MA and PhD. Always the trailblazer, Alex was among the first group of students at Illinois to write a dissertation on film under the supervision of Robert Carringer. It was called *Alfred Hitchcock’s Films of the 1940s: The Emergence of Personal Style and Theme Within the American Studio System*.

In 1984 Alex took his first academic job at the American University in Cairo, Egypt, where he taught courses on film history, including Egyptian cinema. Alex took a tenure track job as Assistant Professor of English at Lehigh University in August 1986, where he would eventually come to serve as both the Chair of the Department of English and Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. At Lehigh Alex taught courses on cult film, science fiction, subversive cinema, introductory aesthetics, feminist film theory, film history, Hitchcock, medievalism in film, American literature, and popular culture. In 1989, in one of his annual reports, Alex wrote that he would be delivering at a conference in Iowa City “a paper which marks my first official

work . . . in the area of gay theory and criticism.” And so began a career that would transform the field of what we now call queer studies.

Alex authored two influential books, *Making Things Perfectly Queer: Interpreting Mass Culture* (Minnesota, 1993), and *Flaming Classics: Queering the Film Canon* (Routledge, 2000), as well as numerous essays on a wide range of topics, including queer authorship, Hollywood stars, and feminist and queer representation in mainstream media. He edited two special issues of *Camera Obscura* (Divas, I and Divas, II), and co-edited (with Corey K. Creekmur) *Out in Culture: Gay, Lesbian, and Queer Essays on Popular Culture* (Duke, 1995). He served on the editorial board of many journals, including *Camera Obscura*, *The Quarterly Review of Film and Video*, *The Velvet Light Trap*, and *GLQ: A Journal of Gay and Lesbian Studies*. His most recent work appears in an anthology entitled, *Mad Men, Mad World: Sex, Politics, Style, and the 60s* (Duke, 2013), and a co-authored forthcoming chapbook entitled *The Witch and the Hysteric: the Monstrous Medievalism of Benjamin Christensen’s Håxan*. (punctum press, 2014).

A "male feminist" and gay film scholar, Alex embraced "queerness" in his work and teaching. He found queerness not only in the alternative work of queer artists on the margins, but also at the very heart of mainstream, popular culture. His readings of seemingly "straight" films and television programs are dazzling, supremely "teachable." A longtime member of the Society for Cinema Studies and The Society for Cinema and Media Studies, one of Alex's most notable contributions to the organization was as a founder, then co-chair of the Lesbian and Gay (now Queer) Caucus. He was an enthusiastic participant in a mentorship program that paired senior and junior scholars, a mentorship program which now bears his name. Alex was truly a generous and witty person whose research and activism were deeply intertwined.

At IU Alex quickly became an indispensable presence on campus—a much admired graduate mentor, a fantastic colleague, a generous, even tireless, administrator, and an important figure in Bloomington's queer community. He was particularly excited to be affiliated with the university that had supported Dr. Alfred C. Kinsey's pioneering work in sexuality studies, and he was especially honored to become a member of the Kinsey Institute's Board of Trustees.

The faculty, students, and staff in the Departments of Communication and Culture and Gender Studies are grateful that Alex helped to make our worlds so very much better for the time he was with us. Along with his friends in the wider IU community, we continue to mourn his loss.

**ROBEL:** His peripatetic beginnings according to him and this will – this will make you all smile a little bit about Alex, I think – began being “born in the trunk of the – at the Princess Theatre in Pocatello, Idaho,” which you will all be able to – to think of the reference from – but that – please we should stand and think about it for a moment. [All stand in silence] Thank you so much. [All sit]. What astonishing colleagues, both of them. Let me recognize our President, Herb Terry, for Executive Committee Business.

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

**TERRY:** Well, thank you. As the provost mentioned we have an agenda with very important items so I will hurry through a bunch of things that are largely just to update you on developments. I've updated you several times on the Degree Mapping Task Force. That's that legislative requirement that – effective with – whenever students start registering for Fall 2014 classes. All parts of Indiana University, all campuses, must provide them with a – begin providing them with degree maps that will help them see how they can graduate in – in four years. It has a variety of long-term consequences for us. What I can tell you is that number one I continue to insist on that task force that whatever it takes in terms of technology we make sure that the maps map the curricula that the faculty have approved and not that the curricula get shaped by the maps, and so far I think I'm still successful in that. The second thing that is emerging is there are things we have to tell students when we give them this map. Not only because we wouldn't want to just hand them a map without instructions, but also because there are things the legislature requires us to tell them. That's being drafted now and – and I'm working with a bunch of people on the Bloomington campus to try and make sure that the letter conveys with the law, does tell them what this thing is, but at the same time it – it indicates to them something that – that is a – an important value to many faculty I think, and that is that students are helped by having a map, but the most important thing is that they get a good education. And they get the education that matches their – their talents and their interests and – and their aspirations so that rather than it being a technical thing, sort of, 'Here's your map, follow this, you can get done in four years.' I hope we can say things that are – that are more encouraging to students exploring all the options that they have at – at Indiana University. I attended last week – I think it was last week – the charge meeting for the search for the vice provost for undergraduate education, so that's going on. This is to replace Sonia who, as you know, left for a – a higher calling last year. That's going to be an internal search and Lauren might have more to say about it, I don't know, but – but I just wanted you to know that that's on its way. Also on its way, I think, is the Trustee-mandated common calendar across all IU campuses. Yesterday was the last day that we left open for faculty councils of the various campuses to let us know if they had any problems with it. We hadn't heard much. The most divergent campus was IU Northwest and rather happily it quickly decided as soon as it was offered the opportunity to revise its calendar and make its calendar match the – the common calendar. So that's coming our way. It will have minor consequences for us, however there will be one thing that we will have to deal with, and that is why – one of the reasons for the – and the April meeting that I'll talk about at the end of my comments – we will have to change the date for FX – I'm sorry for automatic withdrawal – from the middle of the ninth week of the semester to the end of the ninth week of the semester. So far as I can tell that has – doesn't have any consequences, but we've referred it to the EPC to see if it has any. If you

think it has any, by all means write Cassidy or Jim Sherman or me and – and let me know. That – that will be coming your way shortly.

Last week of course we heard from Provost Robel on the progress on the IU Bloomington strategic plan. The final version of that is due in the hands of the president April 15. I hope she remembers to give him that and not her taxes since she explained at the meeting that it – that the date was at least coincident. What I anticipate as the final draft will continue to recommend that the Council take a look at faculty and shared governance at IU Bloomington and come up with a report by the end of December on whether or not we want to propose changes. If so, what they would be? We'll pay attention to the comments in the strategic plan and the report from team faculty that would be our starting point. What the Executive Committee has decided to do is look for a very small number of very dedicated folks willing to form the core of the group to work on this issue beginning immediately, and we have started to identify those people. I'm looking for people with some experience in faculty governance, some experience in governance at the school level as well because the proposal from team faculty and the strategic plan – unless it's changed – is to do something that has an organic relationship between the school governance units and the campus governance units. What I imagine is that we'll give that group a pretty detailed assignment saying here's the things we hope you will learn or address in the course of studying the problem and we'll create an advisory committee for them that will be larger. That would mean, I think that the small group can get some meaningful work done over the summer by working as much as it can to progress, and it will be ready to go as soon as things resume in the fall and we'll meet the December 2014 deadline.

Also coming your way is the Indiana University strategic plan. I would like to bring people who are associated with that to the Council. We had a presentation from a faculty member in SPEA who's sort of the principal person now in John Applegate's office developing that plan at the UFC meeting. It would have been nice to have him at this meeting, but we had other agenda items. I would like to hear more about that. What I can tell you is that my colleague at IUPUI and I are both working hard to try to make sure that that thing progresses in such a way that there is meaningful impact and contributions to it just as there was meaningful impact and contributions to the IU Bloomington strategic plan. We've been asked by the administration – the UFC has been asked by the administration – to create a very small group to provide advice on the movement of UFC policies into a new web-based form that will be managed by John Applegate's office. It's sort of a grand effort to put together in one electronically accessible place the – the policies of Indiana University, not just those from the faculty but from the Trustees, and from others. I think it's useful to do that. In the course of doing that, John's office has identified some policies that are probably obsolete. They – they govern things we no longer do or are directed at parts of the university that no longer exist. They probably are

obsolete. Some that may require revision, and some where you just want faculty members looking at how they get integrated into the overall policy matrix. We're naming that group now. There'll be – you agreed? – Don will represent IU Bloomington on this. There's a representative from the regional campuses, and there will be a representative from IUPUI. It will work under John Applegate's office and I – I think the main thing is just to make sure that it's an honest transference of policies and some useful review of ones that may require further attention by the UFC. Some of the ones that may require attention by the UFC might end up also requiring attention by next year's BFC as well depending on what they are. So that's coming your way. We also need to name a representative to COIA, the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics. Under Bob Eno's leadership, IU was one of the founders of COIA. It really is a group of the leaders of faculty councils in bowl-eligible schools, universities, colleges, universities around the [comment indistinct]. It's been concerned recently with the concussion issue given Kentucky's progress in the NCAA tournament. It may return to the question of can you win the NCAA tournament if you're not playing with student athletes. We'll see. But in any event, we will be naming somebody to that. If you, again, have anybody that you think would be a good contribution for that, leader – represent us in that let me know. Some background in intercollegiate athletics would be useful, we're primarily looking at people who have served on the Athletics Committee, but we can look at others as well. I hope before the semester ends we'll have a presentation on a task that – that we gave to the Library Committee this year. Many universities, especially research intensive universities, research extensive universities around the country have adopted policies known as Green Open Access. Basically what these policies indicate is that it's a general presumption – there are ways out of doing it – but it's a general presumption that faculty, particularly to begin with – with journal articles will submit the last version that they control of their article to their university where it is entered into a database and becomes electronically available. Harvard has adopted such a policy. Probably the impetus for us to take a look at it occurred in the summer when the University of California system, all of their campuses, adopted such a policy. I asked the Library Committee to take a look at it. My colleague at IUPUI asked a group there to take a look at it. They came to different – but also in some ways overlapping – conclusions. The IUPUI group decided that they thought Indiana University should proceed with the adoption of such a university-wide policy, and they recommend basically that IUPUI adopt one very close to the policy that Harvard has. Our committee decided that they weren't ready at the moment to recommend that IU Bloomington endorse a Green Access – Green Open Access policy, but what they agreed upon, both of them, was that the issue required a substantial amount of discussion with faculty. Some – some faculty have immediate adverse reactions to this, that when they learned more about actually how it works often, but not always, dissipate. The Executive Committee has decided that we are going to work with the Executive Committee at IUPUI, and the Executive Committee of the UFC to be – to have that conversation across the entire Indiana University



system, and to create a group in the UFC that will look at whether or not we want to do this, and they will start with the reports from the IUPUI committee and from the IU Bloomington committee. I don't know how much progress that group will make this summer, but I hope it will make some. And I also hope we'll have an opportunity yet this year for a report from Jason who can tell you more about what the Library Committee here discussed and decided, which leads to the subtle, little, underlying bold face note on the bottom of your agenda. A reminder of something I warned you about several times, and that is that we do have to have one more Bloomington Faculty Meeting – Council Meeting beyond the scheduled list that was published early in the year. We have room for it on Tuesday the 29<sup>th</sup>. We will lose our esteemed provost because she has to go preside over something – I – or not preside – I don't know what she's doing – but be at something I wish I could go at, a wonderful naming ceremony for the former head of the Law Library where the reading room there will be named in – in Colleen's honor, and then she has to lead a celebration for faculty members wise enough to retire and actually mean it. So I will end up presiding at that last meeting. We need it in part because we've adjusted the schedule a little bit to accommodate the strategic plan. We also have a number of, I think, not particularly controversial issues coming through the Educational Policies Committee now that we should address this year because they relate to broader efforts of the university to respond to the pressures we face to reduce time to graduation, deal with student advising, and that sort of thing. I don't think they'll turn out to be very controversial, but I wanted the Educational Policies Committee to take a look at them and there's probably no way they can conclude them nor are we going to have time if we just have our April 15<sup>th</sup> meeting where we will conclude our discussion of principles of promotion and tenure. So please put on your calendar that there is one more meeting the 29<sup>th</sup> in addition to the one that's already been scheduled for some time on the 15<sup>th</sup>. And that's it.

#### **AGENDA ITEMS 3 AND 4: PRESIDING OFFICER'S REPORT AND QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD**

**ROBEL:** Great, well I will skip my comments today since so many of you actually heard the State of the Campus address only recently, and I feel I've more than used up my allotted amount of time with the Bloomington Faculty Council and move on to the question and comment period. I don't think we received anything ahead of time. [Silence]. And then back to President Terry for the BFC election update.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 5: BFC ELECTION UPDATE**

**TERRY:** Okay. In your packets at your table, a white piece of paper headed "Nominee Selection for Bloomington Faculty Council President-Elect for 2014-15." Listed on this paper are all of the people eligible to become the president-elect of the Bloomington Faculty Council for 2014-15. Under our, not so terribly recently revised constitution, the president-elect must be a member of this year's Council. You are not exempt just because your term is expiring this year. Your

term can – that’s how you got me. Okay? Your – your term can be extended if you are selected by the campus – this is ultimately a campus vote – and willing to serve. The Council functions as a nominating body for the president-elect, so you are the nominators and Craig and I have prepared this ballot, this list, of people who are eligible. A few people are not eligible because they have served excessive numbers of years, I’m one of those and there are some others. But otherwise you should find everyone else here. Craig is going to guard that door at the end of the meeting. I’m going to guard that one. No one may leave by that one, and would you please on your way out return to us a ballot nominating people to serve. The Executive Committee will then tally those sorts of things and we’ll start contacting people because while we hope if you are nominated by your colleagues you will agree to serve, sometimes people wish not to and we’re not going to – we may not accept your first ‘no,’ but we’re not going to try and – and draft the totally unwilling. So please send us – give this to us. You may nominate yourself and that is certainly welcome, and you obviously may nominate your colleagues. If we get lots of nominations we won’t bug you with this again. If we don’t get lots of nominations we will bug you repeatedly. So please think carefully of who you would like to serve and Craig or I will take a ballot, you can fold it in half if you wish, and we’ll see how this goes. Craig’s going to talk a little bit about some of the other mechanics and the general upcoming BFC election.

**DETHLOFF:** Well, we are almost there. We are waiting for responses from one or two people, namely from the School of Journalism if Mike Conway is here. You can pass that along to your colleagues that we’re waiting on that response. We are still working on the functionality of the website a little bit. We have some back buttons that are in some funky places but it shouldn’t be too much. We’ve already notified the developers of the issue and they should have that done by the end of the week, maybe another week. But really the – the key thing is to get these nominees for president-elect. Last year we spent quite a bit of time, almost too much time, time which we really don’t have now on April 1<sup>st</sup>. So please nominate your friends, nominate yourself, nominate your enemies, just nominate somebody so that we can get somebody to ask and – and just work our way through it. I’m happy to take any questions that you might have about the process. [Silence]

**TERRY:** Alright.

**ROBEL:** Great, hearing none. And let me just add my plea, it’s such an important position, so important to be able to have both continuity but – but also the thoughtfulness that – that the leadership brings, and the ability to be in contact with faculty at – at this – at the campus level, and so I – I really hope that you will all listen to the – just nominate your friends, colleagues or – or yourself. Yeah, Rebecca?

**SPANG:** Question that follows from what Herb said about forming a small group of people to address – address the question of faculty governance. Isn’t it possible that what could come

out of that conversation is that there wouldn't be a BFC, so that whoever is president-elect next year would be president-elect of an institution that didn't actually exist the following year?

**TERRY:** That would be correct.

**ROBEL:** It's possible.

**TERRY:** Yes, but we don't know that.

**SPANG:** Always the bridesmaid never the bride. [laughter]

**ROBEL:** But we don't know that. We really don't have any concrete plan in front of us at all. We just have a thought paper, so... And we will need some form of transition even if we come up with a – a different approach to shared – to shared governance so...

**TERRY:** And the office of the president-elect is not without duties and responsibilities. I've included Jim in – in as many things as possible this year along with the co-secretary of the UFC. As co-secretary of the UFC, I meet with President McRobbie about once a month. We've included Jim in that. It – it – we need a president-elect even if the nature of the body should change dramatically. That said; let me remind you why we created the president-elect. It was indeed to give somebody who might not be, you know, overly committed and steeped in faculty governance the opportunity to learn for a year before assuming responsibility of the job, and if you're interested in long range leadership opportunities, not just in faculty governance, but even in administration, it's a good opportunity to learn how this place functions and – and I can tell you that it has its bad days but it certainly has its good days as well. And it's a – it's a great challenge because you have absolutely no power or resources. So whenever you accomplish anything – whenever you accomplish something there's a feeling that you won on merit. Okay? And so –

**ROBEL:** Alright –

**SPANG:** [comment indistinct]

**ROBEL:** Remind me not to have you recruiting anyone in the future, Herb. [laughter] Actually, there – there are lots of reasons why the leadership positions at the BFC are important to the campus, and not the least of them will be evident in the – the work you're about to hear about from – from Claude Clegg. So if we can turn to that, I would like to turn things over to Claude and – and just – which I think is next on the agenda, right? And this is a first reading so this is really to orient us into the – into the – the document that has been circulated. Tremendous work on a very compressed time line, so thank you so much for all of the work here.

**AGENDA ITEM 6: REVISIONS TO IUB PRINCIPLES AND POLICIES ON TENURE AND PROMOTION**

**CLEGG:** Okay, can everyone hear me okay? In the back especially? Okay, first of all a number of people to thank and units to thank for their work on this. It was genuinely a collective effort. I'd first like to thank my colleagues on the Faculty Affairs Committee of the BFC for their diligence and their advisement, their patience and persistence in regard to reading a number of the P & T policies that the campus has in circulation, guidelines and so forth their collegiality and just being a really great group of individuals to work with, the Faculty Affairs Committee. I'd also like to thank the schools and the school policy committees and their equivalents for their – their very serious review and vetting of the drafts of the document that we have shared with them. The schools, almost to a school, had very thoughtful things to say about promotion and tenure and rank advancement of colleagues here, and the sorts of principles and procedures that would be fitting of a university of the caliber of IU. Many thanks to those colleagues and associate deans, and school policy committee members and so forth. Thanks especially to Tom Gieryn's office, the office of vice provost for faculty and academic affairs. He has been very generous in regard to his time, his effort, his wisdom and his guidance. He has been in the thick of these things of course, he's the executive point person for promotion and tenure on this campus, and certainly it showed in regard to the amount of information and knowledge that he brought to bear as an *ex officio* member of the Faculty Affairs Committee and also as the vice provost, as – as a colleague who I think was genuinely concerned that we get this right, and hopefully we have done that. I'd like to thank Herb Terry, the President of the BFC for his, not only his attendance at the FAC meetings, but his institutional memory and his care, particularly as an emeritus professor, a – a person who by default you wouldn't think to be necessarily invested in faculty governance. But he was as invested as any faculty member currently employed by the institution as I can think of and his guidance and – and again his care about how we tenure, promote, treat colleagues was a wonder to see.

**TERRY:** Thank you.

**CLEGG:** There are others to be thanked as well, but certainly those institutions and those individuals I think deserve a mention up front. In regard to our process here I thought it might be useful if we – if I went through the document for about ten minutes and just highlighted some of the new parts of the document. I can't do them all. It is a new document. It's not what we're used to, the sort of – the document in which you have a long list of amendments and resolutions. We're trying to actually put that process to bed with this document. So it's a new document, a lot of new things, and I won't be able to go through all of the new language and procedures, and processes, but I certainly wanted to give you a general overview of what is new here, and what is a carryover, or built upon the foundations of the previous documents. The purpose here of the document is to articulate our principles as a campus in regard to how we promote, how we advance the careers of our colleagues, also to articulate a procedural logic for how we do those things. That is a suite of processes – interconnected processes – and again

ideally with their own driving logic engine that shows why over the career arc of a person during the probationary period, through associate rank, full professor why does this – this career narrative take the shape it does at this particular institution. It also provides, the document provides, a guidance for the appointment of committees, voted – voter eligibility, assemblage of dossiers, particularly in this moment that we're going to transition to a digital system I understand in the fall, evaluative – evaluative categories, peoples' processes, and a general framework for how we should, as a campus, judge the performance of our colleagues in research, creative activity, teaching and service. So I want, again, I want to walk through the document for about ten minutes, hopefully no longer than that, and then open the floor for your comments and your feedback.

The document starts with a statement of principles which is new. It's not new in the sense that previous documents did not have statements of principles, they indeed did, but in regard to the elaboration of what our principles as a campus should be in regard to rank advancement, promotion, and tenure, this is new, the sort of sustained several paragraphs of this discussion of our principles. The section articulates how we value academic freedom, the enduring value of peer review, and the mutual responsibilities created by tenure and promotion on the part of the candidate and also on the part of the institution. The committee explicitly included guarantees to a fair, transparent, timely, and procedurally sound tenure and promotion process, and appeals processes as well. We recognize the necessity for the campus to be cognizant of the role of interdisciplinarity which I think we'll – we're seeing a lot of as it is, and I think we're going to see more of it in coming years. The role of new media in the way we express our creative activities, our research, our scholarship, our lab findings, and so forth in this digital world. So the – the document is cognizant of that new turn in the way that our materials and our works are presented and preserved. Also the document rec – explicitly codifies and recognizes local needs of units such as departments and schools regarding cultures of tenure and promotion, that is, the document as a general framework for how the campus should approach tenure and promotion and rank advancement. But again within that framework it is recognized that individual schools, schools within schools, departments, should have a say, should have some latitude in the construction of tenure and promotion policies, again within the larger parameters of this campus policy.

The section, "Authority and Application of Policy," which follows this statement of principles on page five codifies the legislative authority of the BFC as the faculty senate and the representative of the faculty of – on the IUB campus, recognizing its authority to craft and to apply promotion and tenure policy. It also recognizes the interpretive role of the vice provost for faculty and academic affairs in the practical application of this document. Again, local needs and coaches of promotion and tenure, that is, the department at the school level will recognize allowing these entities, these units some latitude in promotion and tenure procedures and

practices. This document supersedes, lays to rest, retires the BFC's tenure and promotion statements. It also modifies, updates, and refines the page in the IU Bloomington Academic Guide entitled "Tenure, Reappointment, Promotion and Salary" and I have revised language to provide to whomever is responsible I couldn't – I didn't know if it was Craig, that you're responsible for updating the guide or changing the language but –

**ROBEL:** Tom.

**CLEGG:** Oh, Professor Gieryn then. He and I will get that – the Guide – arranged in a fashion that reflects whatever you agreed upon – agree upon in regard to the final document.

The section on documentation and distribution of department, or departmental school – departmental and school policies – codifies the ability of again, the schools and departments, to shape their own tenure and promotion guidelines devolving to them the purview and jurisdiction to do this and instances in which said purview and jurisdiction is not in the hands of this document and the BFC has explicitly stated in – in these principles and polices.

Tenure prob – the section on the tenure probationary period outlines the arc of the tenure probationary status and rank of assistant professors. It recognizes the tenure clock and those instances in which the tenure clock can be stopped mostly having to do with medical leaves, family leaves, maternity leaves, paternity leaves as well. It also explicitly states that only one full tenure review is allowed. When I say full tenure review that is a review that gets to the level where the – the president of the university is making a recommendation to the Board of Trustees, that is, a person who is going up for tenure who let's say gets a negative vote from their school can stop the process there. That's not a full review. However, if the process is allowed to go on to the president – the president is going to make a recommendation to the Board of Trustees – and then the person says, this is not going so well, let's stop it there, that's too late. That's considered a full review by the time the president is making a recommendation to the Board of Trustees. The section also allows for an early application for tenure by the applicant as well, but again with the caveat that you will only get one full review.

Section on promotion from associate to full professor, which follows this, is on page seven, outlines nomination for promotion to full professor, and the ability of candidates to apply for the rank multiple times, although it discourages serial applications for promotion to full professor without some kind of concomitant enhancement for the person's credentials for that rank.

Promotion and tenure of librarians. We thought this section was necessary. Although much of this policy does apply to both librarians and faculty members, we thought that this section was necessary because there are difference between the promotion and tenure procedures and practices regarding our librarian colleagues compared to the faculty members of IU

Bloomington. For example, the performance categories are different, and a number of other things – expectations are different as well, so we make reference here to the IU Library Faculty Handbook. My sense is since the School of Library and Information Sciences has been folded into the School for Informatics and Computing, and become a department, my assumption is – is that school is going through some massaging of their tenure and promotion guidelines as – as the librarians are going from school to department. And this document wants to allow that sort of leeway, but at the same time to recognize that there are differences between faculty members, performance categories applied to faculty members and so forth, and expectations of librarians, particularly as – I imagine – the librarians are acclimating to their new home in the School for Informatics and – and Computation – is that right? – Computing.

“Promotion and Tenure Committees,” there’s nothing new in this section. It’s more or less a compilation and synthesis of existing guidelines in regard to how committees are structured for tenure and promotion purposes, and a lot of this is allowed for – or the schools are allowed a lot of leeway in regard to how committees are a composed. Committee membership has to be made public, but for the most part there’s nothing new in this particular section.

The voting section that proceeds, or succeeds this particular section on page eight is new. Much of it is inspired by the vice provost of faculty and academic affairs’ guidelines in regard to voting. It’s designed to protect the integrity of our voting practices in regard to secret balloting being required, no double-voting being allowed as well, rank appropriate voting, that is, typically you – people who are eligible to vote are individuals who have the rank that’s being applied for by the candidate. So in the case of an assistant professor voting, it’d be associate professors and full professors who would be doing the voting. Other assistant professors would not be voting on the tenure cases of assistant professors.

Application for promotion and tenure, the next section. It recognizes the coming change to digital dossiers, electronic dossiers and how those will be handled. I imagine that’s going to be something that’s going to evolve over time. We’ve tried to be open enough in this language to capture the move to digital dossiers in the expectation that candidates will be participating in a way that facilitates the process. We also recognize that it may be a reason for there to be physical components to a dossier, even as we move on to a digital age of – of tenure and promotion applications. So for the most part that’s the big thing, new in regard to that section. Also the letters, the required letters, the numbers are codified, six. Again, with some leeway in regard to an increased number allowed by the department or the school if they have good reasons for doing so, and we’ve also opened up the range of letter writers. Typically it will be expected that letter writers will be from peer institutions – of course rank appropriate, people above the rank of the individual who is applying – but there were instances, and we heard back from the schools on this – there were instances in which we could imagine a person not in

academia who would be an appropriate letter writer, and our thinking is this should be an uncommon situation. Most of letter writers should be in fact in academia, leaders in their field, et cetera... An instance came from the business school – how about an individual who was at the Federal Reserve who might be a really good letter writer who might have an undeniable expert – expertise in regard to whatever economic theory or business practices that the candidate is familiar with. Why would that person automatically be dismissed out of hand by not being in an academic institution? We found that a compelling example and we could think of others in which individuals not at academic institutions might be phenomenal letter writers. They might have the sort of stature in the candidate’s field, and in the candidate’s discipline that would rival or surpass many in academia itself.

Evaluative categories, and this folds into the next section as well on tenure, promotion, and performance areas, we recognize four explicitly. In regard to research and creative activity and service we recognize the categories of “excellence,” “very good,” “satisfactory,” and “unsatisfactory.” In regard to teaching we recognize the categories of “excellence,” “very good,” “effective,” and “ineffective.” These are categories that are inspired by the categories in the guidelines emanating from the office of the vice provost for faculty and academic affairs – academic affairs – the vice provost for faculty and academic – am I getting it right?

**ROBEL:** Yeah.

**CLEGG:** Okay. Tenure, promotion, performance salaries. We set standards in general for promotion or tenure from assistant to associate professor that require national and/or international visibility and reputation in regard to research if that’s the performance area of choice, teaching, or service. In regard to promotion from associate to full professor – professor we generally require national and/or international leadership in their chosen field or fields of expertise. So those are in general the parameters, and again these are to be fleshed out even further at the local or department and the school level in regard to what “excellence” looks like or “very good” looks like in research and so forth. We explicitly recognize the balanced case which has not previously been explicitly recognized in any of the campus policies on tenure and promotion, that is that term “balanced case.” The language “balanced” has been in those previous documents, but we recognized a balanced case. A lot of feedback, a lot of helpful, thoughtful feedback from the schools in regards to the balanced case convinced us that we needed to explicitly recognize this, and also metrics for judging the balanced case which required the ranking of “very good” across the three performance categories.

Negative decisions and appeals processes established the avenues of recourse for faculty members who received non-appointment or reappointment, or negative tenure decisions, that’s page eleven, and in the appendices of this document there are six different sections of the appendices – outline procedures which are carry overs from previous documents approved



by the BFC and usually the UFC as well. So there is an elaboration of appeals processes involving negative decisions regarding tenure and non-reappointment.

Joint appointments and multi-campus faculty, this is page twelve. The big change here has to do with the expectation as codified here that IUB-based faculty members will be the only ones eligible to vote on IUB promotion and tenure cases with the exception of multi-campus faculty appointments in which a – a committee based here in Bloomington handling a P & T case can solicit, if it thinks necessary or warranted, additional input from other campuses within the system for a multi-campus appointment of a faculty member that's going up for promotion or tenure. Otherwise this particular section is a carry over and a synthesis and a bit of a cleaning up of frag – fragments of policies having to do with joint appointments and multi-campus faculty in previous iterations of our – of our statutes.

Tenure status for noncitizens. This is a direct carry over from the UFC policies.

Authorization to change faculty ranks. This is a direct carry over as well, leaving with the BFC the rights – the legislative authority – to define what faculty ranks are.

A review of the policy, we imagine this policy to be a living document, and a living document that would be recreated every five to seven years. You wouldn't have a situation as we had with the previous document which it simply accretes over a period of decades in which you have the core document with – with appended to the back of it resolution, after resolution, after resolution, amendments where you'd have to read through the entire document to make sure that you didn't miss that amendment or resolution that changed something on page one. We thought that the faculty and our colleagues – the institution deserves better than that. So our process here, again, is to create a living document, a self-conscious document in which at the end of the lifespan of whatever policy you all choose to vote on, at the end of five year to seven year life span another committee would be appointed by the BFC president or whatever iteration of leadership we have in regard to a faculty senate, and another document would be created. Maybe it looks a lot like this document, but it will benefit from that particular historical moment in this institution's life, and the needs that we need in five to seven years to be addressed by a document such as this. So the expectation is that we'd have a new document ever five to seven years, perhaps one that looks a lot like the old document, but one that's not just a simple accretion of a document over a period of decades. I – I think – and I think, speaking on behalf of my colleagues on the Faculty Affairs Committee that we're better than that. We can – for something this important, every five to seven years we can take a good, fresh look at this and come up with another document that suits the needs of that historical moment in the evolution of the – the campus. Finally, availability of previous policies, digitally and in print, we would like those to be available at the office of the Bloomington Faculty Council so that the document – that this document will ideally retire the Bloomington Faculty

Council Tenure and Promotion statements will be available in the Bloomington Faculty Office, and other documents, legacy documents would of course be there as well. Again, following those pages are appendices. The notes and the sources section give a documentary genealogy of the document so that if you have questions as you, as one is reading through this particular document the foot – or the endnotes should point you to the sources that we built upon, or used to build this document on.

**ROBEL:** Alright. Thank you so much. Open it up for questions, comments, thoughts. I'll note that there's someone in back of you, too, but I'll let you take it from here.

**SHERMAN:** Alright, I saw Rega first so if she...

**WOOD:** So I have a couple of questions. One, at least in our department, the chair doesn't vote when the department makes a [comment indistinct] their decision, but he does participate in the deliberations of that. [comment indistinct] send something forward with his judgment. So that looks like this would be prohibited here or have I misunderstood? You see on page eight where it says, [comment indistinct] So it looks to me like in our case a chair is substantially involved in the deliberations, does not vote, but subsequently casts a vote in terms of a recommendation upward –

**CLEGG:** MmHmm.

**WOOD:** – and so I'm wondering, is that consistent with what's written here or....

**CLEGG:** Yes, it is. It sounds like your chair votes once and that's more or less in the letter that the chair's writing.

**WOOD:** Well it says here, you shouldn't have been substantially involved in the deliberations so the chair typically is substantially involved in the deliberations prior to committee of the department.

**CLEGG:** Read the whole sentence, yeah.

**GIERYN:** [comment indistinct] Negative to negative.

**CLEGG:** Right.

**GIERYN:** It says you're in – ineligible –

**CLEGG:** Right.

**GIERYN:** – if you don't materially participate in the deliberations. It doesn't mean you are –

**SHERMAN:** It would be bad if only those uninvolved voted –

**CLEGG:** Right, so if the – if the

**GIERYN:** You see? You get it?

**WOOD:** I get it, okay. Sorry.

**GIERYN:** Okay.

**WOOD:** I should've read it carefully, more carefully. And then there's a statement that's saying that an applicant for promotion will always have the ability to choose procedures that were in force when they were –

**CLEGG:** Correct.

**WOOD:** [comment indistinct] – and that seems to be different from the policy. So as far as I've been told, I could be wrong again, for [comment indistinct] tenure you always have the option of choosing the procedures under which you were initially [indistinct] but that's not the case for promotion.

**CLEGG:** Actually, you mentioned a very – a point that I'd like to ask for the body to amend. In the first instance, and this is – this is on page six and it's the second full paragraph towards the end, "For matters of tenure, each faculty member shall be allowed to prepare and to have evaluated his or her supporting documentation under either the unit statement on tenure in existence in the unit at the time of his or her appointment or the statement in effect at the time the dossier is forwarded for consideration for tenure." And I – we – that's what we believe should be the case. However, at the very end of the document on page 13, it says, "Each faculty member or librarian will have the option being considered for promotion and tenure under – under any newly implemented campus policy or under the policy in operation at the time of their initial hiring." I would like to strike the word "promotion" in here – and just have "each faculty member or librarian will have the option of being considered for tenure under any newly implemented et cetera..." And the reason for that is while a person who comes in for tenure has a clock of about seven years – six or seven years – to get tenure and tenure is such a monumental thing, they should have that ability to be under the old policies, under new policy, but a person coming in, let's say it's an associate professor and they take twenty-five years to be promoted to full professor, I don't know if we want them to have the prerogative of saying, I want to be judged by the policy that was in place twenty-five years ago. So, to put the two places in line, that is, what we are calling for our departments to do in regard to allowing a grandfathering of tenure applicants into a previous policy that was in place when they came in or a new policy, I want that to be the campus policy as – as a whole. That is, you can't – you can't revert back to a policy in regard to promotion to full that was in place when you were hired. You'll have to be under the policy that was – that is – that's currently in place. So I think

striking that place, that language on page 13, “promotion and” – in the second paragraph under review of campus policy would achieve that. And Rega would that address your concern?

**WOOD:** I would be – I – I wasn’t protesting it. I just noticed that it was different from the policy that we were aware of.

**CLEGG:** Okay. Tom?

**GIERYN:** Just a very subtle emendation. The – this discussion is premised on a distinction between the criteria or expectations for tenure – what you’ve got to do to get tenure or promotion – and the procedures, for example, the body that reviews you. And with respect to promotion to full professor, Claude’s absolutely right. That has to come up under the present, or the current expectations and procedures. With respect to tenure it’s different. The candidate has the choice to come up for tenure under either the criteria that were in place when he or she was hired, or the current criteria. However, the procedures, that is the structure of the review process, has to be the current one, and this comes into play when we reorganize units so that we feel – and this is matter, again, of faculty governance – it’s vitally important that the unit to which the candidate seeks tenure should be the unit that votes on the tenure case, not a historical vestige of a unit that no longer exists. Did that confuse everybody?

**MULTIPLE INDIVIDUALS SPEAKING:** No.

**ROBEL:** No, I don’t think so.

**SHERMAN:** Is this a friendly amendment, Claude?

**CLEGG:** I’m – I’m wondering – Tom, would – would this be the place for that sort of language about the morphing of units and – and that sort of thing to be included or – what do you think?

**GIERYN:** It’s restated pretty clearly in the policy on merger, reorganization, and elimination, so –

**CLEGG:** Okay.

**GIERYN:** I’m not sure.

**CLEGG:** Okay.

**GIERYN:** It’s – it’s up to you, but it – it’s –

**CLEGG:** It is there.

**GIERYN:** What I just said is in that policy.

**CLEGG:** Okay.

**ROBEL:** Jim is back her and then Peggy can –

**CLEGG:** Yes, Jim.

**SHERMAN:** I have a question about voting procedures. I discovered, I guess many years ago, in the votes for either tenure and promotion, or promotion to full professor that at least in our department we are told that a vote – an abstention is counted as a no vote which surprised me at the time, but I know we still do it. I don't know if this is an urban myth or whether – but we were told that if we are – we don't feel prepared to vote because no participation or information we should just vote 'not present' rather than abstain. Now I don't know how this works at the upper level, but if that's true I think it's important that everyone know that. And people abstain for a number of reasons which don't always mean I'm on the fence –

**CLEGG:** Right, you're right.

**SHERMAN:** So...

**CLEGG:** I can certainly talk about it locally with History and what the – the History Department and what the intent of this policy is. The practice in my home department has been that – no measure whether it's a personnel measure, tenure and promotion measure, it has to have the majority of 'yes' votes to succeed. That is, even if it has a plurality of yes votes, it has some mix of no and abstentions, okay? – in that instance the abstentions count as 'no' votes. That is even if you have more 'yes' votes than 'no' votes, or more 'yes' votes than abstentions, but abstentions and 'no' votes are majority of how people voted, the effect is that the abstentions count as those 'no' votes. I'm not sure, again, this is the first time I've seen any of the policies for the campus for promotion and tenure anything referencing how voting – our votes are counted in that fashion. Whether it's a secret balloting, questions of abstentions and that – that sort of thing, but that had been the practice in History. Tom, I don't know if you have a broader sense of what it looks like campus-wide and – and the voting cases that you've seen – but that has been the understanding, that you had to have a majority of 'yes' votes, and they'd have to trump all of the other combinations of votes, the 'no' and the abstention votes, for it to go forward. A plurality of yes votes was not enough.

**GIERYN:** You know, at the campus level though we've never had a case where there was such a high number of abstentions and absences combined that would bring in the – the problem that you've raise of not having, of those who voted, the majority of the total wouldn't be there. My – my feeling on the abstentions is that the faculty member decides to forgo their right to vote on a case for a variety of reasons. If the reasons are indicated somewhere I'm – I'm not sure exactly how, but they could be indicated. That would be helpful. Frankly, at the level when I

review the votes and make a recommendation to Lauren and the president, I'm looking at the votes actually cast. The only time I look at absences and abstentions to see how many totally there are – and if I see a significant number then I'm worried – but it doesn't – what it suggests is that a bunch of faculty probably just said I'm not going to bother voting this time, and I might go back to a dean or chair and say this a problem if it persists. But for me I'm going to take a positive recommendation as a majority of the votes actually cast not including abstention. So it's a little different, Claude, although I can see why at the local level you might take that position.

**CLEGG:** Okay. Is there something to be elaborated planning your guidelines?

**GIERYN:** I think so. I've made a note.

**CLEGG:** Okay.

**ROBEL:** [comment indistinct] location on that?

**THOITS:** On that webs – yeah.

**WALBRIDGE:** Yeah, actually the College has gotten quite strict about not voting if you're not actually there. My department as least is – probably spend – the average people spend about a quarter of their time abroad. So not voting may just simply be [comment indistinct] the wrong continent [comment indistinct]

**GIERYN:** That issue came up, John, as you know a couple of years ago with a UFC discussion of the matter and Bloomington lobbied very hard not disenfranchise eligible voters by virtue of their being absent from an actual vote meeting. We thought it was important to preserve that so long as the faculty member demonstrated material involvement with the materials. They read the materials, perhaps talked with the colleagues, talked with the chair, no proxy votes – you can't give your votes to somebody – but you can give a vote – your vote – in advance to the chair, so I – schools vary on this. Maurer, for example, requires physical co-presence. Fine. But as a matter of campus policy we allow you to vote if you are materially engaged, but not physically co-present.

**WALBRIDGE:** Thank you.

**THOITS:** I have two questions one is about a statement on page six, in "The Tenure-Probationary Period," paragraph at the bottom of the page six which says – toward the end of the paragraph, "each candidate is allowed only one tenure review that reaches the level of an executive recommend – recommendation to the Board of Trustees." And this may just be my own ignorance, but what if someone successfully sues, on the grounds of discrimination, say, to

have a 'no' vote overturned? In that situation would that person have to come up for a repeated tenure review? A new tenure review? And this – this line prevent that?

**CLEGG:** Well, the – the document does not deal with the – the realm of litigation and I think that this is the institution's process. If a person decides for whatever reason whether it's some form of discrimination or – or – or – or some other untoward thing happening within the process that requires legal action, I – I think that that goes outside of the purview of this document. When one is talking about legal action I think that goes to the University Counsel and that's a whole separate process altogether. So, yeah, I think you could go through this process. It could go through the Board of Trustees, and the Board of Trustees vote down a tenure case. That's the process that's recognized in this document. I think if that person wants to go into the courts this document can't speak to that process because all the different reasons a person might go into the courts with – with claims about discrimination or unfairness, et cetera... We can control what happens sort of indoors, or within the institution in regard to trying to allow people a fair and transparent and timely procedurally sound process, but if a person wants to take our decisions into the civil courts we, again, that's – that's outside of our purview and outside the jurisdic – the jurisdiction of the document.

**ROBEL:** Well, and – and I don't think there's a court that's going to consider our sentence in here as a barrier to ordering a remedy that – to – to a violation of civil rights, for instance. This – this wouldn't stand in the way.

**GIERYN:** The – the grievance procedure – you're absolutely right, Peggy, we need to be a little bit more careful on this one. If a candidate is denied tenure and it goes all the way to the executive level and the decision is reached there not to tenure or promote – to promote, and they file a grievance to the BFC's Faculty Board of Review. The grievance committee – that committee – recommends to the provost that we do another review, and the provost accepts that recommendation, yes, you'd get another review. So I think we, Claude, I think it's a very simple amendment there to suggest except in cases of a grievance it would be another review. I could complicate it further by pointing to the reconsideration possibility which typically precedes a grievance. Again, in a way that's another review, but we consider that all part of the same review. Within the document the only mechanism for a second review after one complete one is a grievance that is upheld by the provost through the Faculty Board of Review.

**CLEGG:** Okay.

**THOITS:** My second question has to do with slightly vague wording on page twenty-one in part "e.," the last sentence. These are in case of decision of non-reappointment. It's the last sentence under part "e.," "The petition should be initiated within a reasonable period following the receipt by the faculty member or librarian of the written statement of the reasons for non-

reappointment.” Unlike the entire document there is no timeline given here where there is no body that sets the timeline and, I think, a reasonable period is too vague for a document like this, that it needs to be clarified. Other places we say thirty days, another place we say that, I think, some – associate provost maybe makes the timing –

**GIERYN:** We – we did – in the – in the document that we considered a couple of meetings ago called the guidelines, which as Claude pointed out is some detail to help people understand what’s going on. In that document – and again, the question is whether to embrace this language in the policy document – an appeal, the candidate must submit materials to the Faculty Board of Review within two months following notification of the negative decision by the executive level or within one month following completion of the reconsideration policy. That specifies “reasonable period.”

**CLEGG:** In the document – in the document you have before you on page eleven which refers back to the Appendix – Appendix VI which you were just reading from – we left it up to actually Tom’s office, vice provost of faculty and academic affairs, that last two sentences on page eleven, “Faculty members who choose to appeal a negative reappointment decision may do so in accordance with the process described in Appendix VI,” which is what we just looked at, “The Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs shall determine reasonable due dates for appeals [sic] and the submission of related materials.”

**THOITS:** Okay, so I suggest then that perhaps on page twenty-one, that “reasonable period” phrase should come out and the – the determination of the due dates by the vice provost should be clarified here just to maintain consistency.

**CLEGG:** Okay, that – that makes a lot of sense. Just procedurally, the Appendix here is something that was amended and approved by the UFC and went to the Trustees. So to do exactly what you said would mean us agreeing to the language that you just did, just put forward, which is reasonable language, approving it here, it going to the UFC for them to approve and then to the Trustees to overturn what’s here now.

**THOITS:** I see, okay.

**CLEGG:** So we thought it simpler just to leave it like this, but in the document itself, append more or less on page eleven, we’re going to point to the office of the vice provost for academic affairs to define reasonable.

**THOITS:** Yeah.

**CLEGG:** Perhaps not the –



**THOITS:** Having once been on the grievance committee I'm really sensitive to these kinds of contradictions that can create all kinds of problems, but I – I understand the procedural – procedural problem of – of getting that fixed, thanks.

**GROTH:** We got to get Jason. He's –

**CLEGG:** Yeah, Jason – Jason's been up for a while.

**ROBEL:** Okay.

**BAIRD JACKSON:** I wanted – I wanted to comment on your comments introducing the document and draw our attention to the librarian paragraph. I don't have qualms with the paragraph, but if you'll let me, I'd like to amend your comments. You described this paragraph as interfacing [multiple comments indistinct] School of Library and Information Science, who are now part of the School of Informatics are teaching faculty like I am the librarians in Wells and elsewhere on campus are also tenured, or tenureable faculty, but not – they don't have the right relationship with the library academic pro – the Library and Information Science academic program so then, this language which I endorse, and I think is reasonable, acquaints to the different issues associated with having a tenured or promoted librarian that's not in the library separate from the library department.

**CLEGG:** Okay, thank you for that, Jason.

**BAXTER:** I wanted to follow up on a couple of clarifications that Tom gave to some earlier questions.

**CLEGG:** Sure.

**BAXTER:** That I think the language in the document [comment indistinct] particularly on page six where we were talking about the tenure – the option to go up for tenure on the basis of the policy, or the criteria that were in place at the time of hire as opposed to the time you're going up. The language here says "shall be allowed to prepare and... ..have evaluated his... ..supporting documentation under either the unit statement on tenure in existence... at the time..." That seems to not capture Tom's distinction between criteria and procedures. If I'm preparing according to the criteria in place, that sounds to me a procedural matter not just a criteria matter, and I worry that the language here could lead to some confusion. So maybe we should have Tom comment on it or have anybody else comment about whether I'm barking up the wrong tree on that one, and then we can go on to the other one.

**CLEGG:** Sure.

**ROBEL:** You'd like that to specify substantive criteria.

**BAXTER:** Yeah, you know, I think it should specify the criteria and – and perhaps even specify that the procedures to be followed are going to be in line with what’s – what’s in place at the time of – of the process.

**CLEGG:** So, what would – what would be your proposed language or amendment? Do you have – ?

**BAXTER:** I didn’t come up with the language. I just wanted to make sure we were flagging it.

**ROBEL:** I think we can fix that one.

**BAXTER:** Yeah.

**CLEGG:** Okay.

**BAXTER:** And then similarly I think it was on page eleven, or no – no – oh, right! On the – this is in the case on page eight, the questions of how – who is eligible for voting and so forth. The language here says “including participation in deliberations related to the case,” which sounds like it’s requiring physical presence rather than just material engagement. Can we –

**GIERYN:** I prefer the slippery language of material engagement.

**BAXTER:** Yeah.

**GIERYN:** I think it gives more latitude for faculty who happen to be on an academic conference on the day of the vote, but otherwise had been involved in all earlier deliberations and reviewed the materials. So I – I agree with that.

**CLEGG:** So in –

**BAXTER:** So instead of participating in deliberations, say “including material engagement in – ?”

**GIERYN:** “– with the materials.”

**BAXTER:** “– with the materials relevant to the case,” or something like that.

**CLEGG:** “Including material engagement with – ”

**BAXTER:** – the materials –

**SPANG:** [comment indistinct]

**BAXTER:** “– material engagement with the – ”

**GIERYN:** “– with the case.”

**BAXTER:** “– with the case.”

**CLEGG:** Okay, thank you.

**ROBEL:** Okay? I think Brad – Bradley’s had his had up for a while.

**LEVINSON:** Yeah, yeah, I just have one very minor friendly amendment. Perhaps, it may seem absurd but in the middle paragraph on page ten about balanced cases – I would recommend that we insert the phrase “at least” before “very good” just to make it absolutely clear that [comment indistinct] will not be penalized for actually being “excellent” in one of those categories.

**GIERYN:** No.

**ROBEL:** No, no.

**GIERYN:** If – if – if – there’s only one category higher than “very good” and it’s “excellent,” and “excellent” –

**LEVINSON:** Then that person–

**GIERYN:** – if it’s voted is sufficient for a positive decision in a vote. So we – we kicked this around a lot in the committee as you recall, and it seems wrong to somehow just to limit it, but really that’s it. If in fact somebody, a group or an administrator, committee or an administrator, judges a body of work to be “excellent” that is sufficient to justify a positive recommendation of [comment indistinct] you got me?

**LEVINSON:** Yeah, I got you.

**GIERYN:** What you want to do is you say –

**LEVINSON:** Between the initial determination that’s made by a chair of the candidate to come up on balanced case, and the assessment that emerges amongst colleagues or amongst [comments indistinct] that in fact they are “excellent.” [comments indistinct] something that one can check off as a possibility [comments indistinct]

**GIERYN:** Welcome to my world. Faculty aside, if they want to go freestyle with respect to voting on a candidate with complete disregard for the performance basis chosen by the candidate –

**LEVINSON:** Okay.

**GIERYN:** – faculty who are eligible do have a right to vote on the basis of anything. When I get a note, this is why now going back to Provost Hanson’s insistence that we record not only the

overall vote for promotion and tenure but the votes in each specific performance area, and you know what, logically, sometimes they still don't match up and I spend time trying to sort out how they ended up with eight positive votes with this array of judgments of research, teaching, and service. It takes time. It takes time.

**ROBEL:** And patience.

**CLEGG:** I think Tom is right on this. Members of the Faculty Affairs Committee will recall if there's a single thing that absorbed most of our time, it was the balanced case, and how to judge the balanced case. It was the thing that was commented on more often than anything else in regard to what the school's had to say and the school policy committees had to say and so forth, I haven't – not necessarily been burned, but certainly haven't been taken to task by the schools in presenting the balanced case with different sorts of metrics for evaluating this. I think that this is the best compromise that we – we can have is the balanced case requiring the categories or the evaluative terms "very good" across the three performance areas. It's not, and I think Tom will be among the first to say, it's not the perfect solution, and that we heard a lot of really reasonable people make really reasonable critiques of it. But in an imperfect world, this is probably the – the least of the imperfect things that we could do in regard to the balanced case. So I – again, I think Bradley you're exactly right that it sort of strait jackets us in a – in a way that –

**BAXTER:** What I forgot was that in any case if a chair doing his or her job then the ballot is going to in fact specify that that is what – what one is supposed to be voting on, and it would take an exceptional case of someone overriding that and sort of – as in a write-in vote saying, no I think this person is "excellent," which I'm sure will happen as time as testified. [comment indistinct] that according to the criteria of the balanced case [comment indistinct] could actually say [comment indistinct]

**CLEGG:** No, no in a balanced – in a perfect world, you're exactly right. People will follow the instructions on the ballot, but it's just –

**LEVINSON** So, if I – if I can glean –

**CLEGG:** Yes?

**LEVINSON:** for – for consideration in – among other, as – as you recall, in – in committee we talked about what is the practice in my department which is that in fact non-IUB Bloomington faculty have voted on tenure and promotion cases specifically because we are core campus, School of Education, and because my department which is Education Leadership and Policy Studies, we have a couple of program areas where the degree of collaboration in fact is quite robust. So, in leadership and administration, where there is a principalship Ed.D., supervisor –

supervisorship, superintendencies P – Ed.D., you know, higher education program, there's quite a bit of traffic back and forth, faculty going back to teaching and back and forth, cohorts from one place or another coming down taking courses in one place or another. It would seem as though that the intention behind the wording here would be one which well, I am the faculty member among who know my IUB colleagues best, but in fact, quite the opposite in this case. IUPUI based faculty in the leadership program area, in the higher ed program area, all really know my IUB faculty in those program areas better than I do, and I don't think that they should be prohibited from voting because of circumstance [comment indistinct]. The question is whether the phrasing as a general rule is sufficiently capacious and will allow for what may otherwise seem like a practice that is out of compliance with what the spirit of it was. What – you know whether we ought to have, you know I just put this out for your consideration, do we want to really insist that only IUB policy – IUB faculty – be able to vote for tenure and promotion for IUB faculty, or in these particular kinds of core campus situations are we to allow or even encourage non-IUB faculty to vote. So this is happening in – in practice and has been for quite some time. So will we now be out of compliance with this new policy unless we accommodate it somehow?

**CLEGG:** Right, the short – the short answer that I would have for you Bradley is no you wouldn't be out of compliance. That is, the policy is written in a roomy enough way that says that the expectation is kind of like the policy is written in regard to our external letters, an expectation that other academics at peer institutions who in the rank above the rank above that's been applied for [comment indistinct] the letter writers, accept their – these other instances in which non-academics who are well placed in non-academic institutions could write letters. I – I read in that way that in general IU based faculty members will be the only ones eligible to vote on promotion and tenure pol – or cases, but the clause that follows that I think at least that the goal was to make it sufficiently lenient, or sufficiently broad enough to say there may be these other cases in which you have multi-campus appointments, or in your case core school in which you have people on other campuses in some way affiliated with that core school. There are instances in which their opinions and their input and their feedback on these tenure and promotion cases, these kinds of tenure and promotion cases count, would matter, might be solicited.

**LEVINSON:** That's still not a vote.

**GIERYN:** Can I re – can I [comment indistinct]

**CLEGG:** It's not explicitly a vote. It's not explicitly a vote, but it's not saying that it could not be a vote says as –

**GIERYN:** I would reduce the – with – lobby the Council to reduce the capaciousness of that line, and if your interpretation is that the wording here allows for a vote from your colleagues in Indianapolis, then I want to change the wording. We’re going back to the last time this got aired completely by the UFC, which is the proper body. Back in ‘09 it’s a circular that Claude and the Faculty Affairs Committee considered called “Adoption of Principles for P & T Procedures of the Campuses of IU,” and it points out item number nine, “Tenure at Indiana University is campus specific.” Now, that has translated into dramatically different documents, descriptions, procedures between the two campuses despite the fact that some core schools like Education can point to common expectations. The problem we have in Education and SPEA is that the voters from Indianapolis are – are really approaching the matter of tenure and promotion voting from a different stand point. They’ve grown up in different cultures, in different review procedures, different expectations, sometimes in the case of SPEA. What I think is important is what – what Claude said at the end. We’re not trying to suggest that your colleagues at Indy don’t have any input. That input is valuable but should take the form of an internal letter, possibly solicited by the Bloomington chair or dean, that comes in and becomes part of the dossier as a letter for example, written by somebody outside the home department who is involved in the candidate’s service activities and wants to say how wonderful that activity was. I can see that kind of input, it has to stop short of a vote, and we’re working carefully with SPEA who has a formal committee, it’s the committee that – that straddles the two campuses to eliminate that, and associate dean – Executive Associate Dean Reingold has re-written the policies and seeking the approval of the faculty. I think it makes a great deal of sense and if Bradley your reading of that in – in your mind would allow for an actual vote by Indy, I’d like to propose that we get some less capacious language.

**LEVINSON:** Well, it says, “As a general rule,” so that suggests that there is some leeway, but then the subsequent phrase about soliciting input makes it clear that it’s not inviting voting so there’s a little bit of ambiguity between – between those two, so to put it simply, remove the “As a general rule,” phrase.

**CLEGG:** So the language would...

**ROBEL:** What page is this again, Bradley?

**LEVINSON:** This is page twelve.

**CLEGG:** Twelve.

**LEVINSON:** Twelve. Middle of page twelve.

**TERRY:** Third paragraph.

**CLEGG:** So, “As a general rule,” would be struck and it would just start that sentence as, “Only Bloomington faculty – faculty are eligible, et cetera?”

**ROBEL:** Would – would the word Blooming – would – would it make more sense to say “Bloomington-appointed faculty” than “Bloomington-based?”

**CLEGG:** Yeah, that would be more specific. Yes.

**GIERYN:** Good, because we have some Bloomington-based who are appointed through the School of Medicine in Indy that’s – that’s right.

**CLEGG:** Okay.

**LEVINSON:** I would just – how about deliberations and say solicit input. You talk about the example of soliciting an internal letter, or practice, of course, is also to have – we hold joint meetings through video conference. Would you rather not have IUPUI faculty deliberating [comments indistinct]

**GIERYN:** I’m going to let that, in my judgment, be a matter for local bodies to decide. I think really the key is the vote statement.

**CLEGG:** I think that’s reasonable.

**ROBEL:** Other? Let’s see –

**MORRONE:** Just to kind of follow up on that, for a matter of clarification, but it seemed like the “though” part of that says there’s an exception and then it says, that you can have input which may be solicited, and it doesn’t specify the kind of input. So maybe it should say “input other than votes may be solicited,” or “non-voting input,” or something like that.

**ROBEL:** I wonder if there is isn’t a compromise that is – that restricts voting to the Bloomington-appointed faculty but requires solicitation of – of input for people with multi-campus appointments. I don’t know if there are such people. Are there people with multi-campus appointments? It – that would seem to be inconsistent with what you just said, Tom.

**GIERYN:** I think there are – I’m – I’m –

**REISING:** No, I would just say that input comes in the determination of the P & T criteria by the school. That’s where the input comes from, all the campus faculty.

**ROBEL:** Are there people with multi-campus appointments?

**GIERYN:** Anybody know of any? I don’t.

**ROBEL:** Does anybody know of anybody?

**LEVINSON:** Multi-campus responsibilities, but not –

**GIERYN:** Yeah, and those – those are written into the letters of your appointees, but it doesn't translate into FTE, and I don't know how else you would decide that somebody is split. So in every letter of appointment that goes out from Education it says you may be asked to teach and do other responsibilities on another campus, and that language may exist in other schools, but the appointment is 1.0 Bloomington, despite that phrase. So I think the answer's no. I think the question is what role our colleagues in core schools play. I think it's enough to say that voting is restricted to Bloomington-appointed faculty and –

**ROBEL:** And leave it to the –

**GIERYN:** – we – we collect input from all kinds of sources including colleagues in Indianapolis or wherever, so I'm – I'm not sure we need anything more, other than the restriction to Bloomington-appointed faculty in terms of voting

**CLEGG:** Okay.

**TERRY:** I think the only issues that we have are with what are formally designated as core schools, and the Medical Sciences programs. Other than that I don't think this issue arises in any – it might arise with Social Work. I have no idea how Social Work works since that's the remaining system school to be honest, but – but core school is a well understood term, and if your intent is to reach faculty and how this – how this decision is to be done when a Bloomington unit of a core school is involved it seems to me that the best thing to do might be just say "core schools," if that covers Medical Sciences. We'll have to think about how that would play out with Medical Sciences.

**CLEGG:** So perhaps just have the statement restricting the voting to Bloomington-appointed faculty, put a period at the end of "IUB unit," and strike that clause, and the assumption would be that any arrangements for further input would be local, that is it would be the schools that would come up with whether a letter can be solicited or whether someone can participate in the video conference about a case, but not to hear – have the window open – for any explicit mention of multiple campus appointments needing input, or may solicit input from pertinent units on other campuses.

**GIERYN:** Since this is a first reading maybe we can work on that –

**ROBEL:** Yeah.

**GIERYN:** – but I'd also propose more broadly to delete the final sentence of that paragraph.



**ROBEL:** Yeah, I was thinking the same.

**GIERYN:** I'm not sure that there is any commitment to the idea that the unit must move towards common standards. The mission of – of Indianapolis with respect to some of the core schools is different from the mission of the same school here in Bloomington.

**CLEGG:** MmHm. Okay, so starting with, "While..."

**GIERYN:** I'd delete that sentence.

**CLEGG:** Uh-huh.

**ROBEL:** Yes.

**CLEGG:** Okay.

**ROBEL:** Does anybody have an opinion on that? I – I think it's inconsistent with the notion of mission differentiation which has been a – a pretty consistent concept at the university level.

**TERRY:** I think there may be another reason for eliminating. That's our movement toward various forms of online instruction which really don't take place on any campus in some sense. And while that's likely to be something that the five-year review will deal with when we get there, the idea that – that you teach on a campus might itself be something that is sort of changing.

**CLEGG:** Rega?

**WOOD:** I wanted to return to this issue about whether you have the option to be considered for promotion under the rules in place when you were first hired. So the distinction you made between tenure where there's this – there's a clock running, and other sorts of promotions which could occur after twenty-five years seems a tad unusual to me. But I do know that some of the new associate professors with whom I've spoken feel harm done a lot by this difference, and so I wonder whether it would be possible to consider for their sakes something like, "In the case of promotion the option of being considered under the policy and operate – in operation at the time of hire, will be restricted to cases considered within five years of the tenure decision." So that would allow – rather than your simple suggestion of striking the word "promotion" – add a sentence restricting the time period in which a person would be permitted the option of being considered under the original.

**GIERYN:** Could I respond? I think that the distinction is not just the time frame, but a feature which is the obligatory nature of a tenure review and the voluntary nature of a review for promotion to full. Presumably a candidate, somebody who's an associate professor thinking about going up for promotion to full is going to be involved in whatever local school or

department level proposals may be afoot to change expectations or procedures, and might in fact be able to put themselves up prior to those changes or at least in some way try to influence those changes with his or her colleagues. So I'm not sure if – Rega, we can certainly so that if you think it's a – it's a wise idea. I honestly have not faced this as a problem from the faculty, which is to say I don't have an associate professor that I can recall coming in and complaining about that, okay? Partly because we don't change expectations and policies willy nilly, this is one of the rare moments when we're really doing something and it's not changing that much. It's codifying and clarifying. So I'm – I'm not sure.

**WOOD:** The only thing that's different as far as I'm concerned is that I have [comment indistinct]

**CLEGG:** I personally would lean towards Tom's sense on this insofar as the stakes being so much higher in a tenure case and shifting the rules of the goalpost in the midst of a tenure case just seem patently unfair as opposed to a promotion case where a person – the stakes are important but they're – they're different stakes at the time. The clock is not ticking, so to speak, and I think if we got into a case in which we we're trying to keep up with every associate professor and when that – that five year window closes on whether or not they can be grandfathered in to assistant that previously existed, I – I think that might lead to some complications that, I don't know –

**SHERMAN:** I – I would suggest that the criteria for promotion to full professor are unlikely to change very much over time, and if they do change than we could add something to say that someone would be eligible under the old system if there's a change. I haven't seen a change in all of the years that I've been here in terms of the way people view promotion to full professor so I – I think Tom hasn't heard anything about it because it's kind of been a non-issue. I don't think anything has changed.

**WOOD:** I'll report that my valiant efforts were disengaged.

**WALBRIDGE:** You're conscious is clear.

**CLEGG:** They're well taken.

**ROBEL:** We do have a – another item on the agenda so I want to be sure that we – we give that item some time as well. So what I would like to encourage is if everyone as you're focusing in on this document, if you see things that – that you think need – need additional thought before a second reading next time you can trans – transmit those thoughts to Claude and the Faculty Affairs Committee and then we'll have another opportunity to look at this next time through. Thank you for your tremendous work on this.

**CLEGG:** Thank you all for – for your comments and your close reading.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 7: INPIRG PRESENTATION ON OPEN TEXTBOOKS**

**ROBEL:** Now I'll turn to Cassidy, co-chair of the Educational Policies Committee, and I suspect a number of students perhaps to talk about the open textbooks – and Jim.

**SHERMAN:** I think Cassidy and I agree that since I'm here, and I spent a little bit of time on this that I would –

**ROBEL:** That's true.

**SHERMAN:** – I would do it, and she's going to do the EPC meeting tomorrow. Let me – let me just say I – I think I've never been so happy to be at a BFC meeting as today. As some of you know I've had some disc problems with a lot of referred nerve pain and having had both kidney stones and referred nerve pain in the spine, I'll take kidney stones any day.

**ROBEL:** Oh, god.

**SHERMAN:** So, anyway, just to be here is a – feels good.

**ROBEL:** We're so glad to have you.

**SHERMAN:** In – in terms of what the students are bringing forth, in terms of open access for textbooks, you heard earlier Herb mention the – the work that's been going on with the – with committees here and with the Executive Committee regarding open access regarding journal publications, and the – the truth is that open access is coming and it ain't slow. And it'll be coming not only for journal publications, but also for textbooks for students. I really appreciate the students coming forth with this because honestly, I didn't know a whole lot about open access options and I spent the last few days educating myself about it, and was quite surprised to learn that there were open access options inside psychology for texts written by colleagues that I value a lot and who do good work, and who write good things so the – the – the fact that as a university we should at least be open to the idea of looking at open access textbooks is certainly a good one. I think the – what the students are proposing, although they do understand that it ain't going to happen this semester, is that perhaps first thing in the fall, they will bring forward a resolution that goes to the Educational Policies Committee regarding this and it'll then go through the usual process and will presumably come back to BFC sometime early to mid next fall. So let me give the time to students who brought this forward.

**SPOLYAR:** Thank you.

**ROBEL:** Do you need a USB disk or something?

**HULL:** I have one –

**ROBEL:** Or a disk drive that you could –

**HULL:** [comment indistinct].

**ROBEL:** Yeah, I probably have one.

**HULL:** Great, thanks so much.

**ROBEL:** Try that. Do you think you can maybe start the presentation and then catch up with the PowerPoint?

**HULL:** Well, it starts with the chair.

**SPOLYAR:** Okay. Hello, everyone. We're here to present our open textbook campaign.

**SHERMAN:** Why don't you say who you are?

**SPOLYAR:** My name is Eleanor Spolyar, I am the – I'm a first-year student, a business major. And this is –

**HULL:** My name's Riley Hull. I am a senior here at IU studying journalism. I'm the treasurer for the INPIRG state board.

**ROBEL:** Great, thanks.

**UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:** Could you use a mic – a microphone?

**SPOLYAR:** Yeah.

**UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:** Would you like to just sit here?

**GIERYN:** Yeah, if you're going to do the talking.

**SPOLYAR:** So, as all of you know textbook prices are becoming really out of control. The average student is spending \$1200 per year on textbooks and supplies. This is a source from the College Board, a highly reputable source. Textbook costs are comparable to 26% of the tuition at a four-year public college and 72% of tuition at community colleges, and 7 in 10 students are reporting they're not purchasing their textbooks. So instead they're – they just don't purchase their textbooks and are losing valuable resources.

**HULL:** Okay, so open textbooks. Open textbooks are textbooks published under an open copyright license and distributed for free public use. These books are created by faculty, colleges, or publishers and contain comparable material to a – to any other kind of traditional

text. They – they're available to read freely online, can be downloaded to laptops or readers like Kindle, what have you, and can be printed for sale in a bookstore for about \$20 – \$40 dollars. A lot of them are also actually available for purchase on, like, mainstream sites like amazon.com for, like, as little as \$9, I think. So, yeah, they cost about 80% less than traditional textbooks on average, which adds up to about \$10,000 in savings for the typical 100 student college class.

**SPOLYAR:** So you might be wondering the – is this – the legal – the legality of this. So open textbooks are emerging and affordable option that can reduce cost and increase flexibility for both students and faculty. So we – instead of costing \$100 to \$200 open textbooks are free to access online, and we'll show you an example if we get this to work. But the difference is that – some believe it's similar to e-text, but the difference is that open textbooks are distributed online and licensed to a lot of students and faculty to access, reformat, which is one key point, and adapt at no additional cost. So basically, you can put in your information as a professor and add things and – just to make it specific to your lesson.

**HULL:** So a couple ways that these are similar to the e-texts or the – the textbooks that we already have is they are written and peer reviewed by experts in the field. Table of contents, chapters, exercises; basically the format's the same. Like we've said they are available in – in print. They can be sold in the campus bookstore. I've actually – I've actually had a couple of courses myself where, you know, I have the option to either access a free book online or print one for \$15 – \$20. So, yeah, the – the – the open license actually allows professors to adapt and redistribute copies of the text, so that allows for, like, a better professor/text relationship, I guess you could say. I mean I've – I've had, you know, a professor here and there that was not really that thrilled with some of the aspects of the textbook from which they were teaching so that – that increased, you know, teacher/text relationship that we get from this, I think would allow for a much better educational experience.

**SPOLYAR:** As you can see, open textbooks are used now more than 3,000 professors world – across the nation. Colleges that have adopted this include Harvard, MIT, University of Maryland, University of Illinois, and Rice College. So, you see the traditional textbook of *Principles of Economics*, George Mankiw, which in an open textbook format would be almost the – the same things made by a reputable authors and just online at a cheaper price. So some common questions include how can the quality of open textbooks match to traditional textbooks if they are free to download? And the answer to that question is, just like traditional textbooks, open textbooks are written by faculty, leaders in their field, people who pride themselves on creating a strong body of work that will be reviewed positively among their peers. In many cases because a textbook is not restricted by traditional publish – publisher requirements, faculty can engage in even – in an even broader spectrum of their peers in the

creation and review process. Many, if not most, of the open textbooks that are available today are peer reviewed, so you know that you're getting a quality textbook.

**HULL:** Another common question that we would run into is compensation. I mean, if these books are free there could be some impact on the incentive and financial support to write a good textbook, and we understand that it takes a lot of work to write a good textbook, and we don't expect faculty to do it for free. There are currently a lot of grants and other forms of funding for these. Actually, the University of Illinois has been the recipient of a Congressionally direct grant in the amount of \$150,000 to design, create, and implement open source texts for use in introductory level courses. So, yeah, in – in answer to the question of incentive and – and – and funding there are federal and state level grants. You know, funds – funds can be allocated by the college, there are also several non-profit organizations, one of them – what was it called – OpenStax is a non for profit organization that has been, you know, funding basically an online, freely accessible library of open source texts. So basically there are a lot of different funding options out there for however you would choose to approach that.

**SPOLYAR:** Another question you might be wondering is – is it the same as e-textbooks? Not exactly. Open textbooks are similar to e-texts in some ways like being in digital and usable on laptops, tablets and smartphones. However, e-texts have drawbacks like access expiration dates, and limiting on printing. In contrast, open textbooks are free online, never expire, and cost \$20 – \$40 dollars only to print.

**HULL:** For one last common question that might be linked to the adoption of e-texts is the legality. Is it legal to share and adopt open text – texts? And the answer is yes. By definition open textbooks are released under a license that lets everyone copy, distribute, and print text without need special permission. Open textbooks are free to use, but they are protected by the same slander and misrepresentation laws as traditional textbooks would be.

**SPOLYAR:** So we hope this presentation just starts the idea of introducing open textbooks on campus. We would also like to talk to you, hear your insight about this idea, and we thank you for your time.

**ROBEL:** Thank you so much for the – that presentation and I'm sorry for our technological limitations here. Did – is your proposal to – to simply have us start to think about the possibilities that might be available through open access textbooks?

**SPOLYAR:** Yes.

**HULL:** For sure.

**GOUGH:** We're hoping to kind of start that conversation, reach out to professors here in Bloomington, talk to you guys about it, see what you think, and then move towards maybe substantial adoption here. And so this is kind of the first step in that process.

**ROBEL:** Okay.

**SHERMAN:** Yeah, I – I would suggest that before, sometime between now and mid-summer I – I know you've worked on a resolution and in light of feedback you get and things that you hear, come forward with that resolution to the Education Policies Committee, and then it would move forward from there. I think that would be best. Thanks for your presentation.

**ROBEL:** Thank you so much.

**SHERMAN:** It was really, really well done.

**GOUGH:** No problem. You're welcome.

**ROBEL:** Are there questions for our – our presenters?

**HULL:** Wood?

**WOOD:** What would be involved in the campus adopting open textbook policy? What – what would that ask of us as faculty members?

**GOUGH:** Yeah, so like that, you know, in proposing the resolution is something that we hope to do next semester. It would be adopting this policy to kind of educate professors about the fact that open source textbooks exist, having this adoption would increase awareness, get more professors potentially using these in classes, and having more professors involved in this process creates the infrastructure for getting grants here at the university, for running pilot programs at other universities, like University of Maryland have done, and increasing higher education affordability. So that kind of resolution that we're thinking about passing would be just one of support, not one of mandatory adoption. One encouraging exploration, I guess.

**HULL:** You have any other questions?

**BAXTER:** It was a similar question but I was curious. It sounded like you gave one example for Maryland, but you identified a number of universities that have "adopted" this. I was wondering what sort of formal policy? Does that mean that there were professors at Harvard that have used this or is there something formal at the campus level?

**HULL:** I believe University of Minnesota is probably the shining start of open source text adoption. I believe what – what is it? Like 3,000 professors?

**GOUGH:** MmHm.

**HULL:** At University –

**GOUGH:** Nationwide

**HULL:** I'm sorry?

**GOUGH:** 3,000 professors nationwide.

**HULL:** That's national. Okay. Still, University of Minnesota is basically spearheading. I think they – they currently have the largest library of open source text. We were going to show you an example from Google, you can within two minutes, a few clicks, you can get to a library of open source texts on economics, mathematics, sciences, anatomy, you name it.

**GOUGH:** And – and just to answer your question in a little more detail. There are professors at Harvard who are using open source textbooks. There's not an actual policy at the University of Harvard that supports it right now, but there are also professors who've actually written open source textbooks from Harvard. One of them is the open intro to statistics, and that one is really easy to find on the University of Minnesota page.

**ROBEL:** Thank you.

**TERRY:** I – I also had the pleasure of meeting with this group, and basically I think the draft resolutions that I saw were basically saying that this is a good thing for faculty to consider doing and that we should make sure that it works as seamlessly as possible with the mechanisms that we have for supporting instruction and – and that sort of things. That's one of the things that I would urge them to look at more closely. I sent them to see our e-text initiative because we're trying to create a system in which e-texts become an integral part of general course and instructional management technologies and – and it will be important for faculty to make full use of anything whether it's an e-text or an open source book. That it work well with the course management system, or whatever replaces Oncourse and – and – and that sort of thing. But those are matters that can be considered later. In the interest of full disclosure I once in my checkered past worked for Ralph Nader, Inc. and so I was happy to meet with – with INPIRG. I never told Ralph that I drove a Corvair to college and still own it. I never restored it, but generally I'm – I'm, you know, grateful that Ralph warned me of the – the failures of my car and – and happy when you look over the country at these organizations that have emerged in many states in – in – in the Nader empire, and this seemed to me and to Jim to be a – an important thing to bring to Council so you can know, as Jim said, that basically the world of textbook publishing is changing every bit as much as the world of scholarly publishing is changing, and this is an important, current opportunity for faculty.



**ROBEL:** Jason?

**BAIRD JACKSON:** Thank you for your presentation. [comment indistinct] Policy Committee to be the central venue, but I want you to all to be aware that the Library Committee of the Bloomington Faculty Council, but also the Advisory Committee for the Office of Scholarly Publishing, those are two other groups that have been discussing these issues. I [comment indistinct] a bit of time with the executive director of the OSP would be helpful, I think, at this moment, as that new body is staking its role in a number of domains including open publishing and open educational resources of the sort that you're talking about. And one of the issues that students face, of course, is that the timeline in which we work is longer than the ones that you work under. For example, this was probably before any of you enrolled here but we hosted the leader of the Connexions project at Rice, you mentioned OpenStax, so that there are people on this campus who you can dialogue with, the projects that you are discussing, but they're not in this room right now, but they're still to be found so I'd be happy to get connected those most interested in your project around campus.

**SPOLYAR:** Thank you.

**HULL:** That'd be great, yeah. Thanks.

**ROBEL:** Thank you so much.

**SPOLYAR:** Thank you.

**ROBEL:** And I am going to remind you that Herb and Craig are not going to let you out of the room.

**TERRY:** Actually, we're going to assign Don to that door, Craig will go there, and I will go there. So you may not escape.

**ROBEL:** Thank you all so – so much I am – I am hearing a motion for adjournment, and I'm hearing an utter agreement with that motion.