

Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
September 20, 2011
IMU Georgian Room
3:30 P.M. - 5:30 P.M.

Attendance

MEMBERS PRESENT: Randy Arnold, Abhijit Basu, Bonnie Brownlee, Carolyn Calloway-Thomas, LaNita Campebl, Shu Cole, Tony Fargo, Pnina Fichman, Jeffrey Gershman, Donald Gjerdingen, Matthew Guterl, Lesa Hatley Major, Robert Jacobs, Bruce Jaffee, Edwin Jimenez, Padraic Kenny, Justin Kingsolver, Susan Kovacich, Rebecca Manring, Jane McLeod, Patricia McManus, Sherri Michaels, Theresa Ochoa, John Paolillo, Mary Popp, Deanna Reising, Patricia Riesenman, Bret Rothstein, John Schlib, Jim Sherman, Grant Simpson, Andrea Singer, Bryce Smedley, Sarita Soni, Sonya Stephens, Jerrold Stern, H. Wayne Storey, John Tafoya, Herbert Terry, Frances Trix, Jason Turner, Barbara Vance, Maxine Watson, William Wheeler

MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT:

MEMBERS ABSENT: Joyce Byrer, Kevin Courtney, Constantine Deliyannis, Gregory Demas, Mark Deuze, David Estell, Karen Hanson, Diane Henshel, T. Scott Herring, Michael McRobbie, James Perry, Elizabeth Raff, Sima Setayeshgar, Marietta Simpson, Geoff Sprinkle, William Swanson, Joey Tartell, Pat Thomas, Tony White, James Wimbush

GUESTS: Alan Bender, Maria Bucur-Deckard, Amanda Ciccarelli, Craig Dethloff (Faculty Council Office), Mike Leonard, Robert Levesque, Mark McConahay, John Murray, Caty Pilachowski, Jean Robinson, Richard Stryker, Larry Singell, Ruth Stone, Barbara Wallace (Faculty Council Office), Kurt Zorn

Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes

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

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

September 6, 2011: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/minutes/11-12/09.06.11.pdf>

2. Memorial Resolutions for Goro Azumaya and Aubrey Epstein

Goro Azumaya: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/11-12/B7-2012.pdf>

Aubrey Epstein: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/11-12/B8-2012.pdf>

3. Agenda Committee Business (10 minutes)

(Faculty President Carolyn Calloway-Thomas)

4. Question / Comment Period* (10 minutes)

5. Status and Privileges of Retired Faculty Members and Librarians Policy Revision (30 minutes)
(Professor Tom Gieryn, Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs) [FIRST READING]
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/11-12/B9-2012.pdf>

6. Discussion of FLAG EAS (30 minutes)
(Professor Kurt Zorn, Associate Vice Provost; Jim Murray, Student Enrollment Services; Mark McConahay, Interim Registrar) [DISCUSSION]
<https://ussu.iu.edu/sites/IUEarlyAlertSystem/SitePages/Home.aspx>

7. Dean of the College Introduction and Report (30 minutes)
(Professor Larry Singell, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences) [DISCUSSION]

8. Old Business/New Business

Minutes

AGENDA ITEM 1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: [Gavel bangs] I've wanted to do that for a while. I know that all of you have been reading lots of things in the newspapers, in the Herald-Times and the IDS regarding Provost Hanson, but I do want you to know that she is not going to be here today because she's at a meeting. We have three sets of minutes for approval and I'd like for us to bundle those minutes if possible. Can we get a motion?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So moved.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Can I hear a second? Although a second is not necessary. So it has been moved that we approve the minutes of April 5th, April 19th, and September 6th. All those in favor please signify by saying "aye." [Aye]. All those opposed say "nay." [Silence] The minutes have been approved. Thank you. We have two memorial resolutions. Tom, please.

AGENDA ITEM 2: MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS FOR GORO AZUMAYA AND AUBREY EPSTEIN

GIERYN: I'll apologize in advance for a cough. Professor Goro Azumaya was born in Yokohama, Japan, and raised in Osaka. He obtained his undergraduate degree from Tokyo University and his doctorate in mathematics from Nagoya University in 1949. His thesis advisor was the number theorist Professor Shokichi Iyanaga. Professor Azumaya was an assistant professor at Nagoya University until 1953, when he moved to Hokkaido University to become a full professor. From 1956 to 1959 he visited in the United States, for two years at Yale followed by

one year at Northwestern. He then returned to Hokkaido University until 1964, when he visited at the University of Massachusetts. The following year he visited here at Indiana. He returned to Japan for one more year before accepting a permanent position at IU in 1968.

Professor Azumaya had an international reputation in mathematics. In addition to the United States and Japan he gave invited addresses in Germany, Hungary, Belgium, Switzerland, France and China. In 1975-76 he was a visiting professor at the University of Munich and in 1983-84 he was a research member at ETH in Switzerland. He was author thirty-six mathematical research papers, published in major journals.

Professor Azumaya made many important contributions to modern abstract algebra. In 1951 in a fundamental paper entitled, "Maximally central algebras," he introduced the notion of what have been come to be called Azumaya algebras and investigated their important basic properties. He then proceeded to classify such algebras over so-called henselian rings. Today these objects are a standard part of noncommutative algebra with important applications to geometry and number theory. He also made important contributions to the theory of group actions on rings and to module theory. In particular there is the standard result in the theory of module decompositions referred to as the Krull-Schmidt-Azumaya theorem. Of equal importance was his work in 1959 on a duality theory of modules, and early version of what is now called Morita duality theory.

While at Indiana Professor Azumaya had sixteen doctoral students. In 1971 alone seven students obtained their doctoral degrees under his guidance.

Among the honors bestowed on him was the Chunichi prize, given annually to five people living in the Nagoya area for excellence in the sciences and arts. He received the prize in 1949. It was awarded to him jointly with another distinguished mathematician, Professor Nakayama, for research on infinite dimensional algebras. His sixtieth birthday was celebrated in Japan with a special volume of papers dedicated to him. In May of 1990 there was a conference here at Indiana University held in celebration of Professor Azumaya's seventieth birthday. The conference, supported by the National Science Foundation, attracted over a hundred mathematicians, including many of the most distinguished algebraists of the time.

Professor Azumaya and his wife Matsuko, were a quiet, unassuming couple. They were also gracious hosts and gave special support to Japanese students and visitors at IU. After his retirement they remained in Bloomington until the year before his death, when they returned to Japan.

Professor Emeritus of Speech and Hearing Sciences, Aubrey Epstein, died July 22, 2010 in Berkeley, California at the age of eighty-eight years. Prior to moving to the bay area to be nearer to family members, he and his wife resided at Meadowood Retirement Community in Bloomington. Professor Epstein was highly regarded for his influential research in the area of Hearing Science, and contributed significantly to the development of research-based evaluation and treatment protocols for deaf and hearing-impaired individuals. He always told students that as well as being exceptionally well prepared, they also needed to be sensitive to the perspectives and needs of patients and their families. He was himself an outstanding clinician. He enjoyed clinical practice so much that for many years after he retired he worked as a volunteer helping elderly patients with their hearing aids and assisting his colleague John Seward M.D. with challenging cases at the Bedford Medical Center in Indiana.

His studies of the use of objective measures of recruitment of loudness were funded by NIH, and his many scholarly articles appeared in the most prestigious journals in his field. He was a dedicated and resourceful educator and a committed mentor to junior faculty as well as to students. He was most unselfish in promoting the careers of young colleagues and graduate students with whom he collaborated. He served on many national and state committees related to pre-professional and professional preparation, certification and accreditation and helped construct the first national examination for clinical competence in Audiology. He directed the Indiana University Audiology Clinic throughout his tenure here as well as maintaining an active research laboratory. He developed many off-campus clinical training sites at schools, prisons, hospitals, infant nurseries and private medical practices. His style of supervision was genial and encouraging, but he was uncompromising in his insistence that the service that students provided the public be of a consistently high quality.

Aubrey Epstein was born in Detroit, Michigan, on June 4, 1922 and received an Associate Degree in General Studies from the University of Florida in 1941, prior to serving in the Armed Services during World War II. On the recommendation of friends, at the completion of his military service he enrolled at IU Bloomington and completed his B.A. in 1947 with a double major in literature and audiology. He served as a radio announcer during this period, hosting his own program, and his warm and resonant voice throughout his life often prompted spontaneous comments from listeners that he had the perfect voice for radio. He received a Master's Degree in Audiology from Western Reserve in 1948, and there he met his future wife, Irene, a native of Hungary who was attending Nursing School at the same university in Cleveland. In 1953 he received his Ph.D. from the University of Iowa, which was the center of the emerging profession of Speech Pathology and Audiology at that time. In 1963, he returned to Indiana, this time as an Associate Professor of Speech and Theater. When the departments

split in 1967, his appointment was changed to Speech and Hearing Sciences. He was promoted to full professor in 1969 and retired in June of 1987.

He was often described by his colleagues as a renaissance man because of his breadth and depth of knowledge and his range of interests in science, literature, art, music, theatre, electronics, and so on. He absolutely loved poetry and could recite long passages of Shakespeare. He especially savored the cadence of limericks and could produce an appropriate one, either from memory or freshly minted in the moment, for any occasion. E.E. Cummings was his favorite limerick writer, and with an engaging smile and with a twinkle in his eye, Aubrey could always be relied on to perform Cummings' pieces with style and verve. He had a prodigious memory, a fertile and creative mind and great generosity of spirit. He is remembered with affection and pride by his students, a great number of whom have had outstanding careers. He was the quintessential college professor of his generation, always perfectly groomed in casual cashmere sweaters and beautifully tailored jackets, and complete with the obligatory untidy office, from which he could immediately produce any item that colleague or student asked for, as if by magic. His colleagues recall that there was rarely a faculty meeting for which he was on time; however, this was easy to tolerate because he was always able to find the appropriate words to speak, once he arrived. He showed as well as engendered respect. He had a humane approach to problem solving and brought distinction to his university and his profession. Aubrey Epstein will be missed.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Will members of the Council please rise for a moment of silence in remembrance of professors Azumaya and Epstein. [Silence is observed]. Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM 3: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: I have a few items to come before the body today. First, I'd like to start with some good news about the IU etext model. Since we last met, I received a note from Brad Wheeler informing me that since our last meeting that McGraw-Hill has joined the IU etext model, and this is particularly significant because McGraw-Hill is one of the largest content providers to IU in terms of money, so we're very pleased about that. If you or one of your colleagues are interested in finding out more about this, you can go to the website: <http://etexts.iu.edu>. The point is, according to Brad Wheeler, that students will be enrolling in classes for the Spring semester in October and he'd like to have etext fees visible before students enroll, so that's another significant part of this equation. So that's the first thing that I'd like to share with you today. Next, I'd like you to know that President McRobbie will be giving his State of the University Address one week from today at 2:00PM in the Frangipani Room. This is in keeping with Article III, Section 3.2 of the Constitution of the University Faculty Council, and we'd like to invite you to come and invite you to invite other people to come.

We'd like to have a significant showing because I think this is going to be a milestone of a speech, so would you please do that for us. There will be a reception following President McRobbie's presentation and it will take place in the East Lounge, which is located next to the Frangipani Room.

Third, the Research Committee is preparing for an upcoming treat with Vice President of Research José. And Vice President José is in the process of forming a committee. It's going to be called, "Vice President for Research Advisory Council." And the Council will have a key responsibility which will be to assist in our research efforts in the areas of scholarship, in the areas of research, and in the areas of creative enterprise. So if you have or know of anyone who has done significant research, stellar research, extraordinary research, or someone in the process of becoming a stellar scholar, would you please submit the names to us because we have to make nominations for membership on that Committee – on that Advisory Council. So if you'd do that as soon as possible. Vice President José has given us September 26th as a deadline, which means that I'll need to have your nominations as soon as possible, as soon as you leave this building, think of someone and bring them to our attention. Thank you.

And finally, I think all of you know that the UFC has been, shall we say, dysfunctional, and as a consequence, members of the UFC, the two co-secretaries, Jack Windsor and myself, along with other members of councils in the IU system, will be meeting regularly with President McRobbie, and our first meeting will be held on October 3rd. So again, if you have any compelling ideas on suggestions and issues that you would like for us to bring before the President, would you also slip us a note or send us an email. You can send it to Craig or you can send it to me. Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM 4: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: I do not have any questions from anyone, are there any questions from the floor? Yes?

TERRY: [indistinct comment], does that mean we're eliminating meetings of the UFC?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: No, it does not mean that we're eliminating meetings, but it means that we're substituting meetings in those instances which the Council is not meeting. And this is just a way of making certain that the work of the Council gets done on a regular routine basis, but those meetings will continue.

TERRY: Will there summaries or something coming out of those meetings that you have with the president that will get back to the campuses so they—?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: We have not discussed that, but I think that's a good idea.

TERRY: Okay.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Yes, thank you. Any more questions? Comments? [Pause for questions]. Okay. Hi, Tom. You're on again.

AGENDA ITEM 5: STATUS AND PRIVILEGES OF RETIRED FACULTY MEMBERS AND LIBRARIANS POLICY REVISION

GIERYN: I should have just stayed put. I brought with me Dick Stryker, a long time participant in faculty governance activities. Dick is now the director of the Emeriti House, and that sets in the subject for this first agenda item. What you have before you is a policy heavily edited with proposed revisions regarding the status and privileges of retired faculty members and librarians. What I'd like to do briefly is review how we got to this policy revision, that is what triggered the revision at this particular time, and then lay out some of the reasons why we made the revisions, and then go through the specifics that we're proposing, a very short text to replace a very long and cumbersome text.

What drove the policy revision was, as so often happens, a very specific case involving a group of faculty members from Fine Arts who have variously, for the last ten years or so, occupied space out at 10th and the Bypass in Building E5. Artists love big, empty spaces and that was a big empty space that otherwise was not needed by the university. All good things come to an end. The artists were told that the building would be demolished and that set in motion a review of retirees' space, which triggered the revision of this particular policy. I won't say any more about the specific case. What it did compel us to do was take a look at the policy, and when we did look at the policy on retiree space, frankly both Provost Hanson and I were horrified at the extent to which it was both obsolete and completely inconsistent, indeed irrelevant to existing administrative practice. So we set about to look through what we felt was possible, doable, desirable given the current situations and how we had handled requests for retiree space, and the result is the revision.

I will say there's a third driver that I'll get to in just a minute, and that is the increasing problems with providing adequate space for our faculty and students. The pressures are, if anything, getting greater and that's another context for this revision.

I begin with what horrified Karen and me, which were a set of obsolete and irrelevant aspects to policy, however well-intentioned they might have been when the BFC wrote this policy initially back in '78. If you really don't want to read all the stuff crossed out, here's what's crossed out: stuff that we probably have never done, and if we did, it hasn't been in a long time. Okay? [Laughter]. And there are seven such things that we haven't done in a very long time, if ever. The first is a survey of retired faculty members about their committee interests. [Laughter] This is the one substantive change that does not involve space. Dick tells me that this has been done, was done, once upon a time. I think it partly was a casualty of the split of

the dean of faculties office. It never got on to my agenda. I wasn't aware of it. It hasn't been done and the university has continued to function.

Secondly, the vice provost for faculty and academic affairs is expected, according to this policy, to survey the space needs of retired faculty. I haven't done it.

Third, faculty members who were fully active in research and/or teaching were supposed to be provided office, lab and studio space as they need it. The language used in the policy was "entitled to." So far as anyone can remember, entitlement is not a good description of retired faculty members' access to space.

Fourth, the policy includes provisions for common spaces to be distributed evenly throughout the campus for retirees to use. Again, we've never done that. We have Emeriti House that's located in one place, you might argue, not so centrally, and in some cases dangerously on Atwater Avenue, but it exists as a shared space, common space.

Fifth, those same fully active faculty, if they have to be moved from their existing office, it becomes the obligation of my office to find them alternative space, and I assure you in three years, I have never found anyone an office.

Sixth, the provost was expected to create a special pot of money to support retiree space. This has not been done. She has no such money, but she does support as generously as needed, the Emeriti House.

Last but not least, seventh, there is something in the policy called, "The Retiree Space Committee," which was intended to be a place where faculty members who would like to raise a grievance or seek mediation could go. I asked Carolyn and Craig about this committee. It has never been appointed in anyone's recent memory. Obsolete.

All of that has been stricken, and I'm getting to the replacement in a minute, but first I want to just suggest how bad things are with respect to space. We are essentially at capacity. If you found an empty office, it's a mistake. Somebody is supposed to be there. The problem is this: getting new money for new construction will be, is and will be extremely difficult in the short term. Couple that with the fact that we are at capacity, and coupled with the fact that we continue to hire more faculty, new faculty, and you see the problem. We expect turnover, that is we expect when we hire people—in the last week, you'll be happy to know I've approved no fewer than twenty-five vacancy notices for tenure-track faculty. This is suggesting we're going to be hiring more this year than we have in the last couple of years, but it makes the problem more acute. We assume that when we bring faculty members in, others are vacating their offices to make room. If we allow or treat retiree offices and labs and studios as entitlements,

we're not going to have that turnover and we won't have room for our newest colleagues. That's the crux of the problem.

It's compounded by the fact that two outside constituencies have an interest in watching over space on the Bloomington campus, indeed all the campuses, the Board of Trustees and the higher education commission of the state. Both of them approach space with an efficiency model that is deeply rooted in corporate assumptions. For example, they are taken—the Board of Trustees was quite taken—by the new computer...

STEPHENS: Cyberinfrastructure.

GIERYN: ...cyber instructor...

STEPHENS: Cyberinfrastructure.

GIERYN: —Whatever she said— [Laughter] out on 10th and the Bypass, again, and it's a building that appealed to them because, in effect, the space needs per person were about 30% lower than for a conventional chock-a-block office building, achieved by clustering open workstations and having some set aside offices with doors that are worked out as hotel spaces where people sign up if they really need to have a private office. Otherwise, they could use cubicles and move around. That kind of thinking is going to make it even more difficult for us to justify future, new space needs. The higher education commission—I just had a meeting this morning with Vice President Morrison who is in charge of all of this—and he told me that the commissioners, if we request new space to be built on the Bloomington campus, their first question is, 'What will you take out of service?' In other words, they're disinclined to approve any physical growth in the Bloomington campus in terms of workspaces. Those pressures aren't going to go away. They're acute already. We have to use, whether you adopt a business model or not, our spaces more efficiently. Providing spaces as entitlements to retirees does not fit with that model very well. What does the revision do? It replaces a lot of things and obligations that we have not done with the following four points—and these are on the second page I think, if you'll see the new underlined text there.

First, the policy suggests that we will pursue reasonable efforts to find space for retirees. Reasonable space, but that no guarantees or entitlements are suggested. That space will be provided on a space available basis, that if there is room that can be used and people are justified in terms of continuing their careers one way or another that they can have that space, but it's not a guarantee. This is consistent with existing practice.

Secondly, faculty members who retire have sixty days to move out of their space. This is in the existing policy and remains unchanged.

Third, retired faculty seeking space on campus would begin a set of negotiations with the chair or dean and the Office of Space Management. This is, in fact, what happens now. We're putting it into the policy.

And finally, a reminder that we do have Emeriti House for those faculty who need space or an opportunity to meet with their peers in social and scholarly activities, a very robust program that Dick and his colleagues organize.

Finally, and I should say we didn't put it in the policy, we could add it I suppose if you felt it necessary, that retired faculty would retain their grievance rights if they felt that decisions about space, suppose space was available and they felt that they were just prejudicially denied access to that space, they could take a case to mediation or the Faculty Board of Review.

Finally, there are at the very end of the policy a set of special benefits that won't change. We did need to clarify two pieces of this pertaining to information technology. UITS has a set of policies that we will somehow have to make consistent in this new policy of ours, such that both retirees and the spouses and partners of deceased retirees may continue to use their email, enjoy email privileges, subject to certain—they have to fill out forms and somebody has to sponsor the request. However, in terms of buying or enjoying downloading software that the university provides through IUware, that is not available under our contracts to spouses and partners of deceased faculty. Those—that software is available to retirees.

I'm open for questions and Carolyn, whatever you'd like to do.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Yes, questions and discussion, as you know, this is a first reading, and there will be no action taken and this item will go before the Benefits Committee, the Fringe Benefits Committee. Whose hand did I see first? I don't know. Alright, Herb, since you're—

TERRY: I have been here too long.

GIERYN: But you're not retired? [Laughter]

TERRY: No, not yet. But I do remember that one of the most contentious disputes over retiree workspace once came from a librarian, from a faculty member, and so I'm kind of wondering in one and two and four, why we talk only about retired faculty members and their space.

GIERYN: I'll correct it.

TERRY: Yeah, so, to anticipate the librarians, I think that would be useful. That librarian did indeed pursue grievances, so I would think we should add the grievance—

GIERYN: It would have never have happened if Erika were still...

TERRY: ...yeah, language in there. Do we know that no changes are required then in what is listed under “Special Benefits?” And the reason specifically I raise that is the change—the budgetary status of the Optometry clinic. It’s an auxiliary now. It has to be economically self-supporting. I have no idea if they have actually given special breaks or if they can Dick’s office would know I think, so that’s...

GIERYN: Dick, do you know off hand?

STRYKER: I don’t.

TERRY: I don’t know if that list has been reviewed as carefully as your list of the seven things that we never did anyway, and that [indistinct comment] should be checked for budgetary reality. And I think, too, maybe two may be too precise. We might in the future change tuition cross-subsidies, or the Trustees might change medical care or something. I think maybe it should say that they’re entitled to certain other university benefits, and these details are available from the university Human Resources, so that we again have a policy that lasts a few years instead of...

GIERYN: I included that point, partly as a reminder. It was not in the existing policy, but I felt that it was useful simply since it appeared that we were actually taking away a bunch of benefits. I don’t think we are, practically, compared to our reality, but I thought it was important just to mention that these other ones—the fact that, I think it’s a good point, Herb. These could change as benefits do.

TERRY: And my question is, the sixty says came from the old policy.

GIERYN: Yep.

TERRY: Why didn’t you say, “a reasonable amount of time.”

GIERYN: I don’t know. I did couple it with a point that I didn’t mention. The second sentence in point number two, “Vacated offices, labs, studios must be left empty and ready for immediate use by a successor faculty member.” I kind of felt that I needed to give a sufficient time if we were going to ask faculty to leave it in a clean state. That was put in there following my awareness of a case in one of the sciences where a lab was left in a not-ready state, and this created a complication. I know the dean of the College is concerned about the costs involved in cleaning up labs prior to their occupancy by a new scientist. So, I guess I felt that sixty days was a good tradeoff for the expectation that the retiring faculty member would have to prepare the office for the next occupant.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Francis?

TRIX: Yeah, I meet regularly with a group of emeriti, and they were not—they understood about the space and I thought they'd sent this to Tom, but their concerns were more with participation and they felt the indignities they suffered were more in not getting information about meetings, and having staff say things like one, they changed the key to the reading room, and one of the staff said, 'Well, you don't teach here anymore.' So they wouldn't give them the key. And the person had donated books to the reading room and wanted to check a reference, so they thought that there should be a preamble under "Participation" that the "Emeriti are a benefit to the university," needs to be stated directly and I will send you their language. And that they should be told about events directly and that the staff need to be told that again and again and again. They also felt that retired faculty and librarians are encouraged to submit faculty reports, not just invited. And they—these are really active scholars, and they really are a benefit to the university. They sit on doctoral committees, and we shouldn't take them for granted. And they also said the Emeriti House is very nice, but it's puny. [Laughter]. I'm sorry.

GIERYN: Hah!

TRIX: Okay?

STRYKER: "Puny." I don't care for "puny." I'd say it's small, but [indistinct comment] space. "Cozy."

TRIX: I mean it's better than nothing, but space wasn't their main thing. It's the indignities they felt. I mean these are people that used to sit on this Council.

GIERYN: Absolutely. I'm completely sympathetic—

TRIX: —So the language should reflect that. And I will send you that language.

GIERYN: Thank you. I easily add that as a preamble. I think it's a very thoughtful and important—

TRIX: —And there should be—I think there should be—some way that we can use them more. I know that when I interviewed here, it was having lunch with two emeriti professors that made me decide I wanted to come to IU. I mean they're an impressive group.

GIERYN: Sure.

TRIX: And somehow they need to be used better.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Bruce is next.

JAFFEE: I don't want to use the word "indignity," but there is a transition I think for retired status whereby announcements, especially email announcements, that retired faculty member

or a librarian is dropped from that distribution list. I would think that maybe people from the current faculty would be delighted to be dropped. [Laughter]. Given that that can't be done, and won't be done, later on in the fall, if you want to continue on this list rather than not. I say that particularly because there is a fair number of—it's small—but a fair number of people who do retire but continue to be, even in the classroom, [indistinct comment], there are a few people in the law school that collect 18/20 and continue to teach—

GIERYN: —Cannot be paid—

JAFFEE: --teaching and they ought to know, if they didn't get the announcement. So we do think that the [indistinct comment] should not be [indistinct comment] distribution list [indistinct comment].

GIERYN: Excellent.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Bill, did I see your hand?

WHEELER: Yes, you did. So, I have been here even longer than Herb, and as it happens, I was one of the two co-drafters in the 1978 proposal. [Laughter]. I'm disappointed to see that I'm obsolete before I even retire. [Laughter]. Del Miller chaired that for me. But, you know, I recognize that the space things—we certainly have that problem in the Mathematics Department—but, you know, that a survey hasn't been done for several years, I don't think is a reason for saying it shouldn't be done in the future, for example in number four. And I would like to hope that—thinking back to the original, the original committee—what I learned from Bill Miller, you know, the Committee felt that—well, the thing was we always knew space was going to be a problem. But at the same time, we had to write language so that the administration would feel an obligation to try and meet the needs of the emeriti because without some measure of a sense of obligation, it is too easy to say, 'Well, we just don't have space.' So, I don't have language on the tip of my tongue, but I would have hoped for something which, you know, to merely say, "make reasonable efforts." It's so easy for an administrator to say, 'I make reasonable efforts,' but they may have been minimal efforts. It's expected that there will be some pain involved for the administration to try and meet the needs of emeriti faculty, and I have reservations about the language we currently have, or the language that's proposed.

GIERYN: Bill, I think what we were trying to do is not just remove obsolete language, but bring a policy into being that would allow faculty to have honest expectations as they approach retirement. A policy that expresses hopes that can't be delivered upon is not a good policy, because first it raises false hopes that an active faculty member is entitled to space that we can't provide; and secondly when a faculty, and I'll now reference the situation in Fine Arts, finds themselves moved or forced to vacate because the space is needed for some other

purpose, then feels aggrieved because the policy seems to suggest that they are entitled to that space. We need—and I appreciate this—reasonable efforts can be no efforts. We use language like “reasonable efforts” in a lot of our policies to express the preference that an attempt will be made, and specifying that the attempt should be the responsibility of the department chair, dean, and Space Management to work with the faculty, gives some details as to how the reasonable efforts will be pursued. For us to go further than that is going to suffer all the faults that I’ve mentioned. I think it raises expectations that can’t be met, and creates serious problems when we have a case where we have to ask a faculty member—retired faculty member—to vacate space that he or she has had for some time.

WHEELER: Would you be open to the friendly amendment of saying, “The University will make every reasonable effort?”

GIERYN: And we often add that word whenever we say, “reasonable effort.” I think the wordsmithing will have to come from the committee, Bill. I’m certainly welcome to whatever suggestions the Benefits Committee wants to make.

WHEELER: I hope that the statement about the Grievance Committee, will find its way in to [indistinct comment].

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Are there other questions, comments? We only have about five or six more minutes for this discussion as we have a few other items.

GIERYN: Dick, do you have anything to say—to add? I made Dick trot over here and I’d like to have—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: He can speak.

STRYKER: Well it may come as a shock to you that emeriti are no more likely to read university documents than active faculty, and so I had never read this text before and I was astonished by it. My first thought was to find out where this Grievance Committee was so I could go to Tom and get some space for myself, but the Grievance Committee has never existed with respect to space—access to space. I encountered this issue primarily because, as Director of Emeriti House, faculty approach me and assume or hope that there will be office space at Emeriti House, and I invite them to come over and look. What we have are, apart from common space for programs to take place, we have about a dozen computer work stations. You can’t leave anything there. You can come in and use a computer. You can even meet with a student, but then you’d have to take your materials with you at the end of the day when Emeriti House is locked, and it’s not staffed twelve months a year, forty hours a week. So, I’ve always been in the, sort of, awkward position of saying, ‘Well, Emeriti House sounds like something you have in mind, but I’m afraid it’s not. It is, if not puny, very small.’ And it was astonishing to come

across this language, and when Tom apprised me of it, I couldn't believe that it hadn't been revised long ago because it hasn't been—it's not just now that it's not feasible—it hasn't been feasible for a very long time, unfortunately. I wanted to break in to song as Eliza Doolittle, and sing "Wouldn't it be Lovely." [Laughter]. But it just isn't feasible.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Will this be pithy?

TERRY: If it isn't under "Emeritus Faculty" in the Academic Handbook somewhere, I think this would be an opportunity to write a paragraph dealing with some of these issues, in which we indicate why we value emeritus faculty, that they may typically continue to have active research programs, they may teach, that sort of thing, and that the university will try within the limits of budget and space constraints to facilitate that, and that these policies are intended to guide departments and emeritus faculty, and that—because we don't have that much here about their status—we have privileges listed and so forth. We should come up with something that explains what they can do, why we're providing the privileges for them, and that we value those activities.

AGENDA ITEM 6: DISCUSSION OF FLAG EAS

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Okay, thank you. Kurt Zorn and others? Jim Murray, Mark McConahay are here to discuss FLAG EAS. Thank you for coming and thank you, Tom, for that report.

ZORN: A couple weeks ago, I was here and gave you a little bit of a background on the EAS—FLAG EAS program—and thought I'd start from the beginning and give you the overall scheme of—excuse me, I'm suffering from a cold today, so if there are lapses in my thought process, that's the reason. So, Mark will give me an elbow. The goals and objectives of FLAG EAS are to improve student learning and college success, to also provide another method to allow students feedback with regard to their academic success, to improve retention, to assist with assessment—something that we're going to be dealing with on this campus very soon—and it's truly a student service. The other important point is that the FLAG EAS program is not a Bloomington specific program; it is a system wide program. So even though we may not be as concerned about retention here because our retention numbers are quite good, but they always can be improved, I always want to put that note in. The regional campuses and Indianapolis, of course, have concerns about retention.

Just a real brief history. We started off as the Early Warning Committee, and our charge was to look at vended products and choose—after analyzing some vended products—come up with an RFP to buy a product. When we went through the process of looking at four or five vendors, we realized pretty quickly that no particular program that's on the shelves, so to speak, meets the needs of Indiana University, and, more importantly, there would be a lot of work that would be necessary to get our current information systems to talk to these programs. So, the decision

was made, at that point, to basically build our own. So, then we morphed into what is called the Steering Committee for the Early Warning System, and soon we decided “warning” was not an appropriate word so it’s Early Alert, and then FLAG stands for Fostering Learning Achievement and Graduation. Some people put an S on the end which means Success. So if you want to put Success in, you can call it FLAGS. I have a tendency to call it FLAG, but neither here nor there.

The point is that it wasn’t until April, mid to late April, that we finally had come to this decision to build our own, and got approval by the ALC to go ahead and build with the proviso that we had something ready by Fall semester 2011. So we had a very short period of time to build the project, and the guy on my right, Jim Murray, is the project leader and gets a lot of credit for leading the project teams to get what we call phase one of the project up and running. I’m going to turn it over to Jim to explain the project a little bit more.

MURRAY: In broad view, the issue is really that what we saw when we looked at the vended products and what we discovered elsewhere is that for retention and success purposes, conducting, soliciting grade information from faculty somewhere near midterm is simply not the right kind of data in the right time frame to really affect retention and success efforts. So it’s become more of a national best practice revolves around more complicated gathering of data. So the idea is roughly this. We want to combine several kinds of data into an accumulated view for the people doing the retention and success work. Ultimately, I hope that this will be more than just retention and improving graduation rates, but I think it can significantly contribute to the academic culture on our campuses. I hope that it can significantly—it offers another opportunity for faculty and staff to build relationships with students, and I hope that those two will result in students graduating with a more competitive set of skills.

So the kind of data that we want that is being gathered elsewhere and that we want to emulate here; first, there is preadmission data, more properly called pre-matriculation data, and this is identifying individuals and groups of students who might be at risk based on ACT, SAT scores, based on high school grades, based on difficulty of high school courses. We take the information that we gather from students through the admission process and do some work to identify a potential risk there.

The second category of risk involves two different kinds. The first one, most of you are probably familiar with it at this point, it’s getting data from faculty, in a timely manner, about student behaviors in the classroom that may identify them as warranting a phone call or some kind of risk intervention. We really want this data in the first three weeks—three/four weeks. But getting information from faculty all term long, or most of the term, can be very useful to the people who are following up with students. The other kind of data is data that we can’t get

from a roster or from faculty evaluations of students' activities in the classroom. So perhaps something like a student survey; perhaps gathering other kinds of the input from other staff or faculty relationships around campus. Have you set enough time for studying? What are your time management skills like? Are you in a roommate relationship in the dormitories or elsewhere where your roommates are supportive of your studying habits? Do you need a change there? Just the kinds of information that we couldn't get from a roster.

The third general statistical category is then to look at the students who don't graduate in a timely manner or the students that we failed to retain, and do some data mining on them. It's running decision trees and identifying attributes under certain conditions, and then using those attributes to look at our current students and identify another risk value. So the ultimate goal of the project is the system, the FLAG system, generates and consolidates this data, and then programmers, program directors, retention and success or otherwise, on the campuses, use that data to actually intervene with students.

ZORN: So what we have right now is we have phase one that's completed and that is called the Student Performance Roster. Each campus—again this is system-wide—each campus chose to roll it out to the degree and to the extent that they thought was most appropriate. So there are some regional campuses, for example, that have done what I call a “hard” roll out. They have up and running and are requiring faculty in a number of courses to use the Student Performance Roster. On the Bloomington campus, we have what I've called, and a couple of you have heard me say this, it's a soft, soft, very, very, very, very soft roll out. And what I mean by that is, it's not—it's there if people want to adopt it now, but we have not done any education. We haven't had any discussions about the Student Performance Roster yet among faculty and the Bloomington Faculty Council. So it's much different. There's been some misunderstanding, I think, thinking that it's been required, and Mark will talk a minute ago about where that misunderstanding may have come up.

The other thing that Jim didn't mention, I don't think, clearly was we've only finished phase one. Now we have phase two and phase three which will incorporate some of the things Jim was talking about in terms of possible surveys and pre-matriculation data, stuff like that.

MURRAY: I can talk very briefly on that. There are four teams working on the project; the Roster Team that built, designed the Student Performance Roster that you've seen; a Survey Team looking loosely at that non-roster, but post-matriculation data; the Business Intelligence and Reporting Team, which is gathering all the data and presenting it in an intelligible way; and then the Advising Records Team, which will build what will ultimately be, I hesitate to use the word “portal,” but the interface or dashboard through which various users can access all this information in a convenient and concise way. So those are running, we hope with deliverable timelines, next spring—late next spring.

ZORN: And let me just re-emphasize that the timeline for adopting the first phase, getting the roster—what we call the Student Performance Roster was very short, April to August 1st. And again, very well done. The in-house approach was most appropriate because we wanted to find something that was user friendly, at least in concept, something that would tie in with existing systems, such as the SIS Oncourse and so forth, and our intent was to make it as seamless as possible for faculty to be involved in this. And Mark, you might want to take that as a segue.

MCCONAHAY: First of all, I'm here as the Interim Registrar, as you guys may or may not know. Roland Coté has retired, or is in the process of retiring—how apropos given the first agenda item here. He does happen to be around. I spoke to him right before I came. He basically told me two things right before I came. The first thing he said is to say, "Bonjour!" to you all, as only he would say. And secondly that I shouldn't be afraid of you, you're not nearly as scary as you all appear. [Laughter]. So, with that in mind, let me proceed. My role in this is really where the rubber hits the road with all of this. The—each term, all of you are basically charged with doing at least two things, and now with this institutional initiative, there are now three things.

The first one was enrollment verification. It's been around long enough. It was pink sheets, if not, you've basically seen a couple of different forms of them electronically. They were first performed because we had a fiduciary role to come up with the best possible record we could at the conclusion of the semester for transcribing and record-keeping purposes. That was goal number one. So at the time of final grades, we had a good, solid final roster to give you for the purpose of grading.

Number two, it was a student service. Often, after we get through all the periods of drop and add, students find that they're going to classes in which they're not enrolled and the reverse of that is true. They feel they've dropped a class, they're not attending, but in fact our records show them as enrolled. So, with the feedback we've received from all the instructors, we take that information, contact all of the students, basically tell them we have this conundrum for you to work out, and try and get this done before the auto-W period.

Last, but not least, particularly in the late '90s as a result of a federal audit, and ultimately in compliance with federal aid, we had to augment that process to include some collection about attendance *per se*. Those who had never attended and the last date of attendance, both collected because we were federally mandated to do so. So that's process number one.

Process number two, called a variety of things. The terminology can be confusing here, so this, in the old world, was midterm grades. It's now called the Early Evaluation Roster. Early Evaluation Roster has objectives associated with it, very similar to what Jim and Kurt have articulated in terms of the Early Alert System, the idea that students, advisors and instructors all alike need early information about performance in particular classes. The midterm grades or

the Early Evaluation Rosters were the means by which that information was collected and disseminated back out to the students. Initially it was done for all freshman and sophomores in University Division. Last year, in circular B9-2010, it was augmented, to include all students who are enrolled in the General Education curriculum. So, that is process number two. That comes up really at about, through the fourth through the sixth week.

Third, is the new initiative of the Performance Roster. So really, those first two are BFC mandates or BFC policies. This one is a new institutional initiative. The salient point here is that as we were looking at the Performance Roster, one of the key components of that Performance Roster was attendance. Enrollment verification also had a key component that was attendance. And in an effort to be—to minimize the impact on instructors, we thought, you know, if we put out three rosters, and two of them have to do with attendance, everybody's going to come back to me and say, 'Mark, how come you're collecting attendance so many times?' So, in fact, what we did is decide to combine those two processes, the attendance component and the attendance component that's part of the performance roster, into one tool. Yes, two purposes still, but one tool. The timeline was moved forward as well. And in—primarily to correspond to the goal of early information on the part of the student, to provide that, you know, that interactive information they need if they were intending but not enrolled or enrolled, but not attending, try and get that done before the end of the refund period, and in plenty of time before the auto-W period. Now, having gone through the process, and recognizing that we moved it forward, and this has always been the case, we acknowledge and know that there are times when it's very difficult to collect that kind of information about attendance in classes because it doesn't meet the pedagogical schedule of the particular course in mind. We're really cognizant of that. That was actually an issue, even in the old system, and of course if you move it forward, it becomes an even bigger concern. We acknowledge that. And, you know, in hindsight, I think the conundrum we had is whether or not it was—I mean we really had two choices. One of the things we could have done is implement all three rosters all at the same time. And I think we would have isolated basically the purpose of the Performance Roster generally making the enrollment verification and the Early Evaluation Rosters independent. We didn't do that and the reason we didn't do that, believe it or not, was with good intentions, was so that we didn't have to force all the instructors to take attendance multiple times, and then turn it in multiple times.

The last thing to say, if indeed, and I think this is something Kurt will say as well, we recognize and acknowledge that we need more input on the part of the faculty. When we get to that point, we'll also include these other fiduciary responsibilities that we have and see how they all tie together.

ZORN: And where do we go from here? Obviously, the Student Performance Roster has not been officially rolled out on the Bloomington campus. It was always my intent as the liaison with the Bloomington campus to have these discussions this fall, or at least start the discussions this fall. I have talked briefly with both Vice Provost Gieryn and Vice Provost Stephens about putting together a committee that, on the Bloomington campus, that would own this project. That is one of the difficulties right now. There is no logical body on the Bloomington campus to own this project and see it through. So I've looked at what IUPUI has done. They have a Student Success and Retention Committee. They are using that to help implement up in the Indianapolis campus, so I am going to go back to Tom and Sonya and hopefully we can get a committee formed here, which would have both faculty representation plus representation from the Registrar's Office and other important offices to basically decide how we roll this out, and on what timeline. Questions like, 'Should we do a pilot in some of the departments and academic units?' 'Should this be a voluntary or a mandatory project?' and also, 'What do we do once we collect all these data, how do we give the feedback to the students?' And Jim didn't mention it, a part of this is there is an advising, what do you call it Jim? The advising...?

MURRAY: I'm not sure.

ZORN: The advising center thing, the project, the separate project...?

MURRAY: Oh, the advising record?

ZORN: Right, there's already an ongoing advising records project going on that will serve as sort of the central command area for the FLAG EAS. In other words, the idea is to have that information flow in to this advising center, and therefore to the advisors who would then contact the student. So it won't just be faculty contacting the students. It will be basically that information being collected by advisors and then using that information to do a better job of advising and catching difficulties along the way. I think we've covered everything. So I'd be willing to answer any questions.

TRIX: Why so early? In my mind, it was a week early. My classes had met five times. I didn't know—and the first week was the Muslim holidays. So I had students who had missed two classes. One was maybe a Muslim holiday, one was another. Did I say they had a problem with attendance? I didn't know. I think it came much too early. Why did you have it so soon?

MCCONAHAY: We had it early for a couple of reasons. Primarily it was a student service. It was trying to get the information back to them in time for them to take some action before both auto-W and before—

ZORN: Refunds.

MCCONAHAY: Refunds, which ends, you know, Friday. This week.

TRIX: Could you have done it one week later?

MCCONAHAY: Yes, but we would have missed the refund schedule.

TRIX: Oh, because, you know, the quality of data going in is—you got crummy data from most faculty. I mean really crummy as far as satisfaction went, we don't know our students yet!

MCMANUS: How would we know?

TRIX: How do we know what they're like? We're just getting to know them.

MCCONAHAY: Right—

ZORN: [Aside to McConhay] Attendance versus performance.

MCCONAHAY: Yeah. Actually he said it. And let me take a step back—

ZORN: —I mentioned it to Mark on side comment. Attendance versus performance. Attendance, we not asking you to fill out the Student Performance Roster and comment on performance. We are really, my understanding is, we are asking to verify enrollment basically.

TRIX: But we were stuck on that satisfaction...

ZORN: And one of the difficulties with a quick adoption is we realize this would not be perfect the first time through. We're taking suggestions and comments. In fact, today, the Steering Committee met and dealt directly with the comments that are raised by Herb and a few others with regard to the concern about satisfaction. And we do have agreed as a Steering Committee to institute a toggle which will allow somebody, instead of defaulting to satisfactory, to toggle—default to “blank” in the future. The problem is we're not going to do that in the middle of the semester because that throws other campuses that are actively adopted—have actively adopted and used the student performance roster into disarray. So the whole idea is to do this for the spring semester. So next time you see these for the Enrollment Verification, you will have the option to choose a default of “blank” so when you mark who's attending and who's not attending, it won't send out an automatic satisfactory message. So that's an example of the kind of input we're trying to take, and make changes to react to this input.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: I believe Jim [indistinct comment], and then [indistinct comment], and then Kenney, and then Bill. Please remember the order.

SHERMAN: I have a couple of specific questions, and then maybe a suggestion. I got the email about going to Student Performance Roster and doing attendance, and maybe I missed

something, but it seemed to me that I had to do each student one after another after another. They were all blank. Was there a choice I missed where I could have defaulted to all attending and then changing them. I missed it. Okay. That's fine. I was going to suggest if you didn't do that... Second, to be honest—

MCCONAHAY: It defaults to attending.

SHERMAN: ...in the classes that I teach—it wasn't obvious so you might do something to make that a little more obvious or just make the default attending, attending... do you want to change it? I don't know. Speaking for me, and the classes that I teach, I really have no intention of taking attendance. So my suggestion is if it's mandated or you really want it, then maybe you should go to a system like SRSC where when students come in to a room, they scan their ID card and it will show up for every class, every time. But, you know, to do it once, it will give you very bad data. If I have to do it every time, I ain't going to do it. I assume a lot of you ain't going to do it either. So I don't know what you do about that, but there's got to be a better way if you really need it.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: [indistinct comment]

MCMANUS: Okay, Kurt, I appreciate—I think I have heard it three or four times, that this is a system-wide project and so we have to be sensitive to the system, and yet this—there's multiple goals here, and in terms of student progress and retention, I mean, this is exception processing on the Bloomington campus. Fortunately, we can improve our retention, but our retention is pretty good. I want to begin just by asking a couple of questions. And Mark, I appreciate the fact that you gave us, you know, sort of an overview of the multiple things that are going on. And so here's a basic and quite naïve question. Why can't we just send an email to students saying, "This is what you are going to be charged for. If you are not enrolled, better do something about it,"? Just, I mean, why do the faculty have to get involved with telling the students whether or not they're enrolled in a course? So that's one basic question. And maybe it's just very naïve.

Second, in terms of reporting on student progress. We can say it's not, but it is. And you've heard enough about this, but it might be very useful. I actually spend way too much time because I tried to change things. So there's software issues. That was a big mistake because then no one likes to be told you can't change this without changing that, you have to—so there are software issues. So I just wonder, at what point are faculty going to be involved with the design? After we have to use it? I guess. I guess.

ZORN: That's an easy answer. Faculty have been involved. We have—Mark and Jim—

MCMANUS: --so okay, that's something that didn't come out.

ZORN: Jim can explain.

MURRAY: Yes, there are a number of faculty involved in the process and in the design process. They're listed on the website. The specific metric subcommittee that designed the values in progress and recommended actions, as well as the faculty on the other teams in the Steering Committee. We conducted five web based design reviews and invited faculty. We had close to two dozen or more faculty from around the system.

MCMANUS: And the Bloomington campus...?

MURRAY: Well, Bloomington participation is kind of a different issue.

MCMANUS: I see.

MURRAY: We had great response from elsewhere, and—

MCMANUS: —Different needs, maybe.

MURRAY: Yeah, and just not so much from here. So, I think, I just want to be sensitive to the issue that there was a great deal of faculty input into this including people who've been doing retention and success work for some time, and that that's different from whether Bloomington was involved to its own satisfaction and maybe there's something we need to work on there. Certainly any— I'll work anybody into the team and the process who wants to get involved.

MCMANUS: So maybe I can just ask Mark to start with my naïve question.

MCCONAHAY: Well, and certainly we have the records to determine whether or not someone is enrolled in a specific class. What we often find, though, is that reality isn't what our set of records or trend, whatever that word is, in other words, people do think they are enrolled in a class and will attend, and in fact we have a spot, we used to collect it as a hand written note on the pink sheet, that says, 'Hey look, this person is attending my class, but I have no record of them. It doesn't appear on the roster.' So we try and get that person enrolled so they get the appropriate credit for the course. The reverse of that is true as well. People end up on your roster, never show up, but they believe they've dropped.

MCMANUS: So again, why don't we give this information to the student directly? I mean I'm really naïve here. Why can't we just say, 'Here's what you are enrolled in,' and that's it? 'You are not enrolled—if it's not here, you are not enrolled?' I mean, is that too stupid of me?

MCCONAHAY: Well, no. I mean, yes. You're basically saying, 'Why do we have to be active in the dissemination of this inform--.' I mean quite frankly they have access to their schedule. They know it—you know, it lives on SIS, it lives on OnCourse, it's available to them in any number of ways. In fact, it is even available to them on a mobile device. Now, the deal is,

though, that unless they are actively engaged, unless you ping them, they won't take action and actually see what it is they're doing. They may say, 'I'm in—.' Gosh, you're with Sociology, right? [Laughter]. You're in Sociology S101, and they see Sociology S101, it meets at 10, I'm going. It turns out, though, that the class number they're in actually meets completely somewhere different. They believe they're all okay, but we don't have the records to correspond to that. So that is what we are trying to do with the Enrollment Verification piece. Now, ultimately, you know, which is why the BFC ultimately passed a policy to do this, is ultimately we do have some responsibilities for federal aid compliance, and in response to a federal audit, to take this kind of information.

MCMANUS: Yeah, and that's not now, right?

MCCONAHAY: No, that is now.

MCMAMUS: It is now? So they want to know that students are attending?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: [indistinct comment] we do have other questions. I believe, Kenney, was next, [indistinct comment].

KENNEY: First, I just wanted to let you know, that the Education Policies Committee did meet with Kurt, Mark and Jim yesterday and I want to thank them for meeting with us, which led to a discussion, I guess about an hour long. Two areas that got a great deal of our time have already been aired here, so I'll just mention them. We spent a fair amount of time talking through these technical issues, having a default of "no response" rather than the default of "satisfactory." And second, we talked a great deal about faculty input, especially the need for input from Bloomington faculty since our needs and expectations may be different apparently from those other campuses. So that's there. I just want to offer, I think a big picture that seems to be sort of missing here. It seems to me that there are two problems with—it's not meant as criticism—but my reflection on this is that there are two problems with talking about this as a soft roll out. First, I think it's sort of a classroom terminology here I think probably one of the reasons the faculty are reacting the way they are is that we understand that something is rolled out when we go on to Oncourse and there it is, and soft or not, it has been rolled out. And I recognize, and it makes perfect sense, that from a different perspective, it isn't really rolled out because you can completely ignore it, you don't have to evaluate students in this way. I gather that a number of faculty have, and hopefully in good ways and bad ways it can be figured out. So, it might be helpful to sort of clarify that soft roll out or not, it has been fully, in some ways, from a faculty perspective it has in fact rolled out, because there it is.

The other point I want to raise, which has been alluded to in your comments, but I want to emphasize this, we don't operate in the legendary faculty—or legendary university environment that maybe never really existed where the faculty member knows all of his or her

students, and sees them regularly, and can say, 'Hey, you're not in my class,' 'You aren't showing up,' and so on. I think we all sort of have this in the back of our heads as a place where we exist, but we don't and it hasn't been true for a long, long time. I think the really important thing here is that there is an intermediary step between that non-existent world and the one which has been created here, and that is the role of the academic advisor. And it can't be emphasized enough how incredibly essential the role of that advisor is because all of this data, if it's just going from faculty as sort of an automatically generated ping to a student, that's not really great. If it's going through the Registrar's Office, that sort of gets stripped of all its academic meaning, and end up being in the end, just a very official notification. This is going to have value, in my opinion, only when this data is going to advisors who can manage this data in a way that those legendary faculty members of yore would.

So we're not there yet either because advisors have not been empowered in the way they should be. And so this is partly pleading for the Provost, who is not with us today, that this project is going to make sense when advising is empowered the way it really should be on this campus. And ideally, I recognize, that should already have happened. And this project would be working with a fully empowered advisory system. I wish we were already there. I certainly [indistinct comment] this has already come and I understand we can't wait forever for advising to get its [indistinct comment].

OCHOA: Do we know if this—whether the information the faculty submitted has been in fact used by any advisors or that the information has gotten to some students?

MURRAY: We know that the information has gotten to some students because when a faculty saves that roster, that current value appears on the "My Grades" page in the Student Center. So students are seeing whatever information is submitted by faculty.

OCHOA: Okay so—

MURRAY: —it varies—sorry. It varies campus to campus on what the intervention programs are and so some have very aggressive follows up, and I think the status here is that that's a plan to work on that for the fall.

OCHOA: So then I have possibly good news to share. I will self-disclose that I am with you all in terms of this being a cumbersome project. And I teach in a class of 117 students and going through them one by one was a bit of a nightmare, but I had two students who I thought were going to drop or had dropped and hadn't gotten around to it, but I entered the last day of appearance, and all of a sudden, who shows up? Two students who have had those absences, with all of their assignments turned in and, 'I'm so sorry I haven't been out,' so if we can somehow—and this is going back to your suggestion—if we can make sure that that the information gets to the student in a timely fashion, I think this has the potential to do us good.

Years ago, I had to decide for myself when I was going to have those “come to Jesus” talks with my students about either you come or you’re going to fail or I’m going to drop you and that’s it. I really can’t drop them, but I threaten them and I figure it was worth a try. So, for me, it was a matter of when I spent the time with the student because I was going to spend time with them anyway. So I either spend it up front, trying to be proactive, or I spend it afterwards when they are begging me, ‘Please don’t fail me, please.’ And I get to hear all their story about why they haven’t been attending. So, I was pleased that these two students, who I thought had dropped and I know would have been a pain for me later on, are back in my class and I didn’t have to do anything. I didn’t have to invite them to come visit me in my office because presumably, or I’m hoping, this information would get to them. So, for me at least, yes it’s cumbersome but I’m willing to invest the time. But I do want to encourage you to get faculty input as to what works and what doesn’t, and I promise you that I will be patient, because I know how difficult it is to get something functioning. So thank you for doing this.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: I believe Basu is next. And then Arnold and—oh, yes! McLeod you’re next, and then Basu. And then Bill. Oh dear, we have a line up here.

MCLEOD: I will try and be brief then. My colleague, Patricia McManus, and I solicited feedback from our constituents and based on that feedback, I have three comments that I think are consistent with some of the other things that have been said. I heard from instructors of large courses who feel that they don’t have the resources to implement the current system effectively. One non-tenure-track faculty member teaches a 400 student section of an introductory course and has one graduate assistant. This instructor does not take attendance regularly, as I suspect is typical in those very large courses, tries very hard to get two quizzes in before the first information is due at the three week point to give students early feedback, but also to gauge who’s actually coming to the course, finds that extraordinarily difficult, even just to get the information for that attendance piece, and doesn’t quite know how to provide meaningful feedback about the performance of 400 students throughout the entire semester with the limited assistance that she receives. So the concern, I guess, is sort of the bad data concern, that this is maybe for people in other sections quite onerous, so what you get back from those people may not be useful. And students may get pinged with a satisfactory when their performance is nothing but satisfactory in the course, but there hasn’t really been an opportunity for the faculty member to provide that appropriate feedback to them.

Some faculty who teach small courses also question whether this requirement achieves its goals in those courses. For example, some faculty teach or have undergraduate students who work in their labs and take those labs through many different core sections, and found it kind of both silly and annoying to have to open each section and report that one student was attending and performing satisfactorily. As this faculty member noted, “If students are not attending and

are not performing satisfactorily, they hear about it from me.” So, that they felt that that feedback is more useful to the student than getting a ping about poor progress in their student center.

But finally, unless these recommended student actions are tightly coupled with relevant support, it’s unclear whether they’ll really be helpful, so the student could get a ping saying your performance is declining and you ought to go get a tutor. So where is a tutor? And how much does it cost? We need to seek campus help in reading, but where is it and when is that open? So again, depending on how well this information can be used by advisors to help them, that may or may not be helpful. In addition, we know when there are dramatic declines in performance in courses that can occur for many reasons. In particular, students who develop serious mental health problems, an onset of a depressive episode, a severe anxiety, often experience severe declines in their course performance. Because faculty don’t know the reasons for that, if I understand correctly, the student will get pinged for the poor performance and go see a tutor, which may not be helpful feedback in that particular instance.

So I just wanted to, I guess, think about how we can couple the assessments and the information that students and advisors receive with meaningful supports on campus.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Okay. Thank you. Bill?

WHEELER: I agree with everything that’s been said. Just several key things, you know, this Council own—I mean, Kurt was saying “ownership,”—this Council owns policies. There’s early, there’s too early, for example. This Council several years ago debated exactly that issue and decided that the fourth week was the appropriate time. There is policy out there about when to [indistinct comment] performance stuff and so I think it’s important for all of us to remember, we have these concerns that we actually own some of this issue, and I want to reinforce what Padraic said, that the EPC is discussing this and has several motions before it at this point in time, and encourage you to send your suggestions and recommendations not only to the project team, but to the EPC, to Padraic, so that we can take the actions that we think are appropriate.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Thank you. Basu, you’re next, and then Arnold. We will stop discussing this item around five o’clock, so we will still have some time. Okay, who’s next? And then Basu. Basu, you’ll yield then to him, yes?

PAOLILLO: I’ll try to be brief. I’m really deeply concerned that we are doing things in the wrong order with this project. You’ve explained a very detailed four fit part plan to enact some interventions for the purpose of retention and [indistinct comment], but it strikes me as going about things the wrong way to do this by implementing it through the information system. The policy should be decided first, and then implemented in the information system. What we’re

doing is we're creating a policy that has some open spaces in it, has some vacant areas in it, and this is going to lead to misunderstandings of the sort that you've heard about it. And you'll continue to hear about them because the misunderstandings will continue and then they will compound as these go on. But your ideas are so specific that they even go down to what kind of statistical model you would use for the data mining, and you know, there just simply isn't the data to say that that would be the valid model to use for that. So I really think that we need to take a different approach to this. We need to take an approach where we actually sit down and understand what we're doing first before we implement this in an information system. Doing it the other way around is going to be very, very hazardous.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Did anyone wish to respond to any of the comments or are just in listening mode?

ZORN: Well, the implication that we didn't think this through is not quite correct in response to your last comment. We did look at the best practices, vended products. We've been involving faculty and others that have expertise in this area. So we've—the system is not perfect, but it certainly is a good start and it borrows from some of the other indicators that we've seen in other programs, and again, there was a Committee consisting of faculty and staff, that made these decisions with regard to what the indicators should be. So I just want to make it clear, that this has not been done in a vacuum, it has been thoughtfully done, and you could just sit down some time and talk with Jim. Jim might have gotten in a little bit many specifics with his—but that's because of his earnestness with regard to this. He's very dedicated to this, having been an advisor at one point, and Director of Advising in the Business School. So I invite you to talk to Jim. He's very interesting and has some very good insight, but the things he was talking about earlier have not been decided. He was giving you a broad brush of things that we are considering, not—the decisions have not been made. Decisions have been made only on Phase One.

PAOLILLO: Who will decide? Who will decide what's a valid statistical model to use for that data?

MURRAY: This is a really good and interesting question, and our approach to this is to hire a principle academic researcher, and charge that person with making the suggestion of an initial model for each campus, and then working to refine that. Now, part of what we were up against with the ALC is we were hearing that, you know, you promise us these kinds of things and then it just never gets off the ground. We don't ever really see anything delivered and we need a system like this [bangs on table for emphasis]—excuse me—and we could—I could—even using a principle academic researcher, I could send that person around to consult with faculty, and we could spend years debating what are the proper data models to use for this work. In fact, we started to go down that path on several subcommittee meetings. We got five or six of the

experts at IUPUI and Bloomington together and started having this debate. They could—none of them could agree. So the process, in order to get something in place, is to hire one person, let them propose a model, and then justify it by refining it over the years.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: We have time for two more comments. Basu and then Arnold, and then our time for discussion will probably have to end because we have another agenda item.

BASU: I don't have any statistical basis for I'm asking you, but I have taught about a hundred student freshman classes for twenty years now, almost every semester. I understand the problem of retention. I understand the problem of graduation the University is facing, and I understand where you are coming from, my only question is, that making this mandatory for all faculty requires a whole lot of faculty time when you add them up. Is it worth it?

ZORN: I just want to again make the clarification; FLAG EAS is different than the Enrollment Verification Roster. The Enrollment Verification Roster, as Mark pointed out, has been something that's been required for a long period of time. It's getting mixed up, but the FLAG EAS is not required at this point. As I said before, we are going to have that discussion on the Bloomington campus to decide how to roll it out with timeline with regard to the performance or roster is concerned. The Enrollment Verification, Mark has already mentioned, has been required and presumably we've been doing it however we've done it. I mean I have taught large classes, small classes, and I've figured out ways to try and verify the attendance of my students by the time that the deadline comes up, just like you.

BASU: In these twenty years, only one student has mistakenly attended my class. That is my experience. The other point that you made is a very good point, and that's where I'm coming from somewhat. Is that instead of casting us in the roll of policeman, that's how students may perceive us to be, rightly or wrongly, that's a perception. A student of mine, at this time, I reported that he's not attending, got a note from the "Registrar's office" that he will fail this course if you don't do that, it was very threatening for him. Instead of threatening our students we have worked, despite the large number of students, one on one, [indistinct comment] have not been attending, their scores have not been very good. If there is a problem, please come to see me or a TA. That's also faculty time, but that's part of our job.

MURRAY: If—for what it's worth—if I can—

BASU: Then question is why do it so early, within the first two weeks?

MURRAY: —is it just for the attendance or is it for the student performance?

BASU: No, that's just the supplementary part using the best of faculty time, what is the best use of faculty time?

ZORN: As Mark has mentioned, it was moved up this year because the, again, we were trying to provide a student service so if we can alert a student that he or she may be enrolled in the wrong class and can save them a little bit of money where they can get a refund before the end of the refund period, that was the idea. Now, if that turns out to be a bad idea, it can be changed next year. The horse is out of the barn this semester. We're taking comments and if it's really a problem, if there is a significant difference between two weeks to three weeks or four weeks, then I'm pretty sure that Mark and the Registrar's office will be willing to look at that.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Arnold will have the last word.

ARNOLD: Yeah, I just had a comment, and this is kind of related back to what Padraic said about the faculty and students and there's some intermediary, and especially in the large science classes. I'm teaching 500 students right now. I have, and I think the intermediary that I'm thinking is important is actually the Associate Instructors because they're the ones who actually know the students by name and can see if there are performance issues, but I guess the concern that I have, and I have eleven different Associate Instructors for my course, is I would have to rely on them for performance evaluations, but I wouldn't have any way of setting criteria for them to be able to provide this consistent feedback across all those different sections, right? This is a lab course so they are in labs, so they are doing things like writing. It would be great to give them feedback, but the real conundrum that I would face is, how do I give them consistent feedback because some of them know each other, right? So a student who's roommates with somebody else are in different lab sections, one of their AI's thinks that the writing is terrible maybe go see writing services, the other person may write worse but their AI might not recognize that. So I'd be giving inconsistent feedback, and I appreciate the fact that any feedback would be better than none, but I just think that's an issue that needs to be kind of kept in mind that sometimes the instructor for the course can't have a good handle on what the appropriate feedback should be, and if there's any way to make it so that, if there's any kind of measure to help instructors in that situation, that would probably be really valuable, especially for the large courses where the feedback would probably really be much appreciated by the students...

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: This has been very productive and very thoughtful, and I'm sure the committee members have learned a great deal, and have gotten lots of important suggestions and recommendations and concerns. So thank you. From time to time, we invite newly arriving administrators to come before the Bloomington Faculty Council and we're very pleased to have with us today Dean Singell, and Dean Singell, we normally invite our guest to sit in the reserved section.

SINGELL: Okay, reserved?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Yes. Thank you.

SINGELL: I feel a little isolated over here, though.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: It's a friendly, warm place. [Laughter].

AGENDA ITEM 7: DEAN OF THE COLLEGE INTRODUCTION AND REPORT

SINGELL: So, thank you for the opportunity to speak with you. It's always a great opportunity to have a chance to talk about the College, and so I'm very happy to get that opportunity to do so. What I wanted to do is just to tell you a little about what I've been up to, and what my team has been up to. Since July 1 when I arrived, they were [indistinct comment] sitting in the back of the room. I think this was an opportunity for them to just relax because I've been keeping them pretty busy over this time period. So let me tell you a little bit about sort of my thought process for the College and what I've been thinking.

First thing that when I got to campus, I had a lot of ideas, and so we wanted to try to find a way to bring those ideas in to some kind of policy types of statements so we went on a retreat, all the way to Indianapolis, but it was very nice and we got an opportunity to sit around and talk about some things. And one of the things I wanted to have up front and in the center is a mission statement for the College. I wanted to be able to have something that was on the front of our webpage, something that I could talk to, that we could point to that says, whenever we're making any decisions, any kind of thought process with regard to the allocation of resources, how does it fit within our mission. And so we have a mission statement now. It is up on the webpage. And I wanted to read it to you. And there are a couple of words that I've underlined here, that I am going to want to talk about in some detail because I think they're important in terms of what we are trying to say. So, let me read it and then I'll talk a little bit about it.

“The College is a professional organization of eighty departments and programs that span the arts and humanities, social sciences, and sciences collectively dedicated to the mission of liberal education and engaged and creative activity, basic and applied research, and scholarship with the purpose of serving IU, the state of Indiana, the U.S., and the World.”

So there are a couple of things that are in there, and one of the things that I want to do automatically is pick something that I thought was a little bit provocative, but I, in fact, was important to me, and that's the first words, “professional organization.” Typically, the College of Arts and Sciences would not be attributed or associated with those words “professional,” but in fact one of the things I wanted to do is to say we have a profession in the College, just like those other professional schools that serve a particular set of constituents. We have a—we are a professional organization, dedicated to a set of tasks. One of those tasks is liberal education,

and liberal education is something that spans both the sciences, the social sciences, and the humanities, and this notion is really important to me. In order to be—to effectively deliver a liberal education, it's important that all of those things are housed within one unit, the College. I know that you've been talking about the New Academic Directions Report, and to me, one of the things that was really, really important to emphasize is that, in fact, we are a lot stronger together than separate. And so, I wanted to emphasize that in fact, that that was true, and that we are dedicated to the liberal education, and that requires this partnership across all. And so, in fact, this word "collectively" is really important in there. We are all jointly involved in this exercise, and I think that one of the things that the New Academic Directions talked about was, in fact, the existence of borders that prevented people moving in ways that they might otherwise do so, and it's this notion of collective exercise and not creating these boundaries that I think is really, really important.

And then, we're not only dedicated to liberal education in the classroom, we're dedicated to liberal education that comes out of our research, and our research spans creative activity, both basic and applied research, and scholarship. And our role in doing both of those things is to serve. One of the things that's often to lose sight of as faculty members and as administrators, is our job is to serve, and, in fact, that's what we are purposing to do with regard to this mission statement, is saying that our job, even though it's not always pleasant, and even sometimes students may get on our nerves or do the things we don't want them to do, our goal is to serve our students and our constituents, as outlined here. And so, it was important to have that down on paper in something that we could point to whenever we're making decisions, how does it sit with regard to our mission. Now, in order to achieve our mission, there are certain things with regard to resource allocation, and my research approach. And so let me talk to you a little bit about my thinkings with regard to this. And I already introduced this to the chairs and directors in the chairs and directors meeting, so I'm not telling you anything that I haven't already told them.

So when I arrived on campus as a candidate for the dean, it just so happened that the National Research Council had come out with their assessment of programs, and so one of the things I did before I arrived was to look at the quality of the programs at Indiana University and the College, and be able to compare those to other places in the United States, and one of the things that became apparent and clear very—from the very beginning with it, the College of Arts and Sciences has strength across an incredible width and breadth and depth of areas in such a way that this is something that we should be really proud of, and the real strength of the College is its faculty. And so, really anything that I do is going to be trying to make use of the best asset that is in the College, and that's its faculty. And the chairs and directors are going to be critical to that success because those are the individuals who really manage the most valuable asset most directly, so I am an economist and, you know, I made it through the process

with people knowing that [Laughter], and so one of the things I want to do is emphasize that, in fact, I typically view the world as an economist and so there are some certain things that I believe, and my policies that I developed are going to reflect this.

The first is that I believe in unarticulated social processes and well defined institutional structures that communicate the values and the visions of the institution. What do I mean by— what's an example of an unarticulated social process? A market. I really do believe that incentive structures are something that we need to do and try to align those with what our visions are, and I hope to be able to do that, and set up institutional structures that create those incentives, and as such that it's going to communicate our values and our vision.

The second thing that I believe is that decisions are made best when they are made closest to where the resources are employed. And so, one of the things that I do not want to do is to set up a papacy in the dean's office where people come kiss the ring and get some kind of an allocation. I don't have the ring to do it, and I am not interested in acquiring one. I really do want to set up a situation where there are natural processes by where resources are distributed to departments and they make decisions on the basis of the resources that are their own. And I am willing to work as a partner to try to help them move in those directions, and so the resources that I have in the dean's office will inevitably be used in the way of partnering with the resources that are there in the department so that they can move their organization in the direction that they feel is best, and they're best in the position to evaluate.

So, my role in the dean's office is really going to develop those institutions that allows chairs to manage their own resources, and this is going to take some time, and I plan to do this over the next couple of years. One of the things I did tell the chairs and directors was that one of the things I do not plan to change in any substantive way is the promotion process. I think the reason why the faculty are excellent in the way that they are is because the promotion process must be working. So I don't anticipate making any substantive changes to that, although we may review about how those processes and procedures are done at some later date.

But, let me tell you a little bit about some of my plans then in terms of how I'm going to put these policies in place. The first thing that I think is going to be really important is for me to go out and visit all of the departments in the College, and I've plotted it out. It is actually going to take me a year and half. It's a big place. But I plan to go out and try to get to know all the chairs and their faculty directly and to talk to them about what their concerns are because any decisions that I make need to be done in the context of how the department is already situated. So I really do want to go out there and get to know who my faculty are, and what they do, what their strengths are, what their concerns are, and so I plan to be quite systematic about that.

In terms of the way in which I plan to allocate resources, I've told the heads that I am going to allocate resources on the basis of four principles, and any request for lines or other types of resources are going to be done in the context of these four principles. The first principle is research excellence. We are a tier one research institution, and anything that we do, they are going to need to be able to speak to why the resource that they're allocating is going to be able to further that in some particular way and be able to argue for that.

The second is teaching mission and student credit hours. We need to think about what is our goal, our objective is to a liberal education. How does that fit the mission that we are engaged in, and how does it take care of student credit hours? We're going to have to think about that in the College in a very systematic way. And so, for example, faculty members do not have a right to teach four graduate seminars. In fact, their responsibility is to think about coming and teaching a portfolio of classes that are going to involve undergraduate classes, large ones if they are capable of doing it, but a set of undergraduate classes, and as well as smaller undergraduate classes and graduate classes. And everyone needs to think about it. And that needs to be important. If it is the case, and there are some faculty that may not be well suited in a large lecture class, I know of a few, and you wouldn't want to do that, but if that is the case that that's an individual, then that individual needs to say, "Well what else am I going to contribute such that I'm contributing to the mission of the department if that's not my strength?" And so we're going to need to think about that and whatever resource is allocated, how are they using their teaching resources in the way that's effective and doing it.

The third is vision. The departments are going to be—have been asked to come up with a vision for where they're headed. They cannot get to where they want to go if they don't know where they're going, and so they need to think about and have a very specific idea about what it is that their goals are, where they want to be, what are the objectives that they're going to have, and all their requests need to be in the context of that.

Fourth, and this is one that they—that was actually got some chuckles, but I'm quite serious about it, and it's a really important, and that is harmony. It is—academics inevitably disagree, that is our birthright and is something that, in fact, I would never expect to disappear. But nonetheless, when decisions have been made, my expectation is that the hatchets will be buried and that they're going to move on in some kind of collective way that is harmonious in the sense that they are all the oars are moving in the same direction. It is not that I expect to have agreement, but I expect them to behave in a collective way. These rules are going to be applied to us as well. One of the things I am going to expect is decorum and proper behavior from faculty, and they can expect it from us. We're not going to be difficult or harsh in our email communications. We expect the same from that in terms of both personal interactions

and in the way in which they communicate by email. And we've already had some learning—teachable moments—on that at the College [Laughter].

So, some of these things in which we are going to be able to do that is going to be with regard to the way in which we're organized. And so, one of the things I'm embarking is a reorganization of the College and the way that the College dean's office is organized. One of the reasons why this is true is that any healthy professional organization, and I emphasize this word "professional," we are in the business of doing this well, should contemplate whether it's organized effectively on a reasonably regular basis, and transitions and leadership are a good time, in fact, when you should be able to contemplate these things. And so, we're in the process of having these conversations to do it. It's also the case that when I was here as a dean's candidate, both fellow administrators and faculty indicated that there were some places in which they felt like clear contact points in the College could be improved. And so we're trying to do that. The New Academic Directions Report talked about this is one of the things I got right after I accepted the position, which was one of the recommendations was to potentially break up the College. I thought that was a bad—perhaps a bad career move on my part, but nonetheless I think it's a mistake and my mission statement explains why I think it's a mistake, but at the same time, it did communicate some things about, perhaps, that there were some weaknesses in the current organizational structure from an external point of view.

The College is a big place with—and it's perhaps something in which it's hard to navigate. And so one of the things that I'm planning on doing, and we have an organizational chart that I've already shared with the College Policy Committee. This week, I am also going to share it with the chairs and directors, and we're going to propose a divisional structure for the College, in which there will be an executive associate dean still as we have now, and then, three divisional deans that will cover arts and humanities, social sciences, and the sciences. And then a fourth half-time position as for a person in charge of undergraduate education and policy. And so, the notion is that these are the portals in which you can approach the College. The College is a big place. What this is going to do is to provide easily identifiable points of contact for both internally and externally, in terms of if you're trying to deal with particular things with regard to the College. It'll also ensure, by organizational structure, that there will be a portfolio of expertise in the dean's office that spans the three divisions in the College. The social sciences, sciences, and humanities have issues that face them that are distinct and different, and I need to make sure I have that perspective in the dean's office, and this will guarantee it.

It's also one of my objectives is to enhance and manage the undergraduate mission in a way. One of the things that was brought to my attention was that the market share of the College had been declining for a long period of time. I'm happy to say that's not true this year. In fact, the market share of the College went up. I can take—I can take no credit for it. All of the things

that were set in place took place before I arrived, but nonetheless, these are the types of things where we need to think about it. There is no doubt that undergraduate education is important from the perspective of the resources that come to the College, but if they're important, market share is also communication to some degree about whether the College is doing a good job, and one of the things we need to do is take our undergraduate education seriously, and I want to have that position in the dean's office so that this is something that we are taking in a serious way.

I want to treat enrollment management and undergraduate mission in a more holistic manner and comprehensive manner, and so I have also in my portfolio elevated Scott Feickert in to an Enrollment Management position that is more holistic in terms of both looking at the numbers end in recruiting for the College. And so we're thinking about that in a way. It's also going to have a position that's elevated that's going to deal with international programs in a way that's more holistic. One of the incredible strengths of the College and of Indiana University is our international programs, and I want to make that more important.

And then I am an economist and I want to know the numbers, and so one of the other things I'm trying to do is to change the shape of the Budget Office in some ways, and so that I'm going to guarantee that I get good data because I need good data in order to make good decisions.

Let me just talk briefly about three initiatives that are in the College, plus one other thing, and I'll just talk about them very shortly. I have put together three committees that are considering an international study school. Maria Bucur is heading a committee that has ten members from the College and six from the professional schools to talk about international studies in a very serious way, and I hope to have a program outlined from that committee by November 18th is their deadline. This is just a beginning of this discussion, but it's something that will at least give us the groundwork for putting something in place. I have also had a committee put together for—to examine communications and media that has both people from both Telecommunications, Communications and Culture, and the Journalism school to try to find out ways in which we can develop a program in which students can traverse those boundaries between those programs—those three programs, and others. So, for example, if you're interested in film, there are many ways in which film is taught in the College and outside the College, and can we develop a mechanism by which an individual who's interested in film can have access to all of those?

And then also, something for Earth and Environmental Sciences, we're really trying—we put together a committee to try to develop a program working both with SPEA and ourselves and other professional programs in the university to try to develop a program that would allow students interested in those areas that cross boundaries between the College and the other schools.

The last thing, and it's just really short is that the dean's office is moving. I have an article in the paper from—a newspaper article—from 1989, that says that this was going to happen. I started my career in 1988, so this has been promised, but I believe the ink is actually dry, and the plans are that we will be in Owen Hall in August of next year. And so, in fact, this is really important for the College because we will be together in one place and have a place to show off what the College is doing. We can take our important guests into Wells' office and sit him down at the wonderful table that's there, and have a door front that looks and treats the College with the respect I think that it deserves.

So, anyway, those are the things that are in the process. I wanted to give you a little bit of time for questions, and so we have ten minutes and I'm happy to answer any questions to that.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: No questions?

SINGELL: Terry?

TERRY: [indistinct comment]. One of the—we face many challenges—but one of them is responding to our external constituencies and their demands for accountability, their demands for assessment of student learning, and other sorts of things like that. And much of that has been put in Sonya's portfolio as the vice provost for undergraduate education. I'm wondering what your thoughts are on how the College will respond to these requests for assessment, and frankly, can we do it with a little more faculty input than resulted in the faculty—the Student Performance Roster—so that we get assessment means that work—that we can live with, and actually don't just satisfy our external constituents, but provide data that helps.

SINGELL: Well, I'm actually glad that you asked that. One of the things that's going to be in the portfolio of that point five position is assessment. That's actually written into the job description. We actually wrote up job descriptions. It's actually an interesting exercise. I had to write my own, and it's a very interesting exercise. If you've never done it, you should try it. But anyway in that job portfolio is assessment. Assessment is one of those things that's kind of funny for a university because we believe that we've been doing assessment all along. And this—it seems funny to ask those types of questions. There have been a lot of studies that have—that are in economics that have tried to look at how does one evaluate value added of a university education. It's not something that's easy—very easy to do. I think we need to treat this assessment exercise seriously, and whatever we do, do something that would be consistent with what we view our vision of appropriate assessment would be. And, I mean I've actually thought about this some because the assessment bug that has bitten IU has bitten every other institution, and their accrediting agencies. So this is not unique to hear. So, I mean I really do believe whatever we do, we need to do appropriately.

There are some areas in the College, I think, that do assessment well already, and I think that those are the places we can potentially learn from. In the College at Oregon, I was in charge of trying to do this, and we identified three departments that had things in place that had been identified by the external constituencies as good assessment exercises in advance, and we had them run through the process of assessment in advance. And then, they produced these reports that then, across the three divisions—because we were organized in divisional structure—and those were given to departments as a potential template that potentially could be used for others.

So, to be honest with you, I'm going to learn from others, I'm going to work with everyone else that's in charge with regard to this. I do think faculty input is important, and I think we need—I do think that we're going to need to have a particular plan about how we plan to do—how to do this in which faculty are involved. The reason why I like this department approach is that faculty were involved. They were in fact developing things in their own departments, and they were good models for other departments in terms of setting up the assessment exercises.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: You mentioned that each department is going to be required to have a vision statement. Have you a timetable for that?

SINGELL: Yes, I do and they have a timetable too, because they are going to have to make requests for resources in the spring, and in order for them to be able to articulate why I should give them resources in the spring, they are going to need to be able to give me their vision for where they're headed. So, this is really about resource allocation, and so they're going to have to have that vision in place by the time in which they're making requests for resources.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Yes?

BROWNLEE: You have a bunch of people in this room who are in some way connected to Journalism, Telecom, and various media or related areas. I am wondering if you could give us, maybe it's too soon for you to think this, but you've got a committee set up now to deal with communication and media issues. Do you have a perspective on how you would like to see this all come out?

SINGELL: Well, I mean, it is a little early. I mean, I know I don't want to prescribe what works best for them, but what I can tell you is that, when I came back to visit—I think it was in May—I had dinner with Alex Doty and Brad Hamm and Walter Gantz. Walter was very gracious and hosted us all. And we sat and had dinner together and a couple glasses of wine were critical to having some discussion about what we might envision this might look like. And what I'm envisioning is the following, which is that I think that when you have boundaries, RCM boundaries, the problem that happens is that there's concern about financial allocations and decisions that are going to happen. And so one of the things I told them is I said is that I don't

want you to think what the financial implications of these decisions are. What I want to do is to think about how would you design a program if you were going to design it from scratch. Brad and I are going to have to talk about those financial implications when they are done, and we're going to have to have conversations with central administration if it had those effects. But what I want them to do is to develop a program that says alright, if I'm interested in a particular area, if there are particular things in which we identify in media and communications that people are interested in, and I gave you the example of film, how would you design a program where the person could potentially major in Telecommunications or be a Journalism major, but have access to all of the things that are—all of the areas of film so that they could design a major in a meaningful way that would give them access to all of those things and they wouldn't be prevented from taking them?

And so, what I'm hoping for them to do is to come up with a way in which an individual could get a major in one of those areas, and get a certificate or some kind of degree that would allow them to traverse all of those areas in a relatively easy way; help them see how they can take various interests that they have and work their way through all of the myriads of opportunities that are available at IU, and design a degree that will allow them to do that.

The one thing that's going to be an issue, and I don't think they are going to be able to solve, at least initially, is things that have major RCM implications. So let me give you an example of that. Right now, most of the resources in regard to the production are in Telecommunications. If you're in Journalism and you want to teach a broadcasting class, and you don't have access to that, that's going to be hard for you to get access to that because it's in Telecommunications. And so one of the things, I think, we are going to have to do is to develop some kind of committee structure, something that mimics a market that allows Journalism to potentially get access to those resources in a way that would be to the mutual interest of both parties, alright? And if you gain from trade occur when both parties have these benefits and they can work across those things. And so we are going to have to set up mechanisms in order to do that.

I think it's going to be hard for them, that Committee, to be able to come up to a solution of those types of things, but long term, I think that's something that we're going to have to do. Ultimately, I believe that that's going to require collocation. And one of the things I plan to turn back to the Trustees when I read in the newspaper, one of the things they said is, 'How long could this possibly take.' And they think that it should be done quickly. One of the things that I would like to turn over to them, is how long should it possibly take for them to be able to put together the resources so that those programs should be collocated. And I really do believe that there is—in order for us to—some of the—there's already a fair amount of interaction between the faculty in those programs, but it would be really greatly facilitated if they were in a similar location. And so I actually think that some of that has to happen. And that does not

require mashing them all together into—I mean it doesn't require taking Telecommunications and Communications and Culture out of the College, but it does require setting up some mechanisms by which they communicate in a very systematic way, and where resource allocation problems can be solved in a way where they have the freedom to be able to solve resource allocation problems. So, I do have some thoughts about that, and so I think the tasks that [indistinct comment] for them in this term is smaller, which is really curricular in nature, with existing curriculum that exists on the campus. But I think long term, we are going to need to solve some of the problems which is the curriculum that could exist that doesn't.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: There must be one final question. Well, I believe we stand adjourned. Thank you, dean for coming. [Applause].

MEETING ADJOURNED: 5:28PM