

**Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
November 18, 2014
IMU State Room East
3:30 P.M. – 5:30 P.M.**

Attendance

MEMBERS PRESENT: Joelle Bahloul, Marlon Bailey, Abhijit Basu, Purnima Bose, Andy Braden, Michelle Chung, Carrie Docherty, Lori Duggan, David Estell, Alyce Fly, Thomas Gieryn, Laura Ginger, Krista Glazewski, Gerhard Glomm, Margaret Gray, Daphna Rae Greiner, Dennis Groth, Brady Harman, Jeff Hass, Bradley Heim, Israel Herrera, Ed Hirt, Timothy Hoch, Gretchen Horlacher, Cheng Kao, Jonathan Karty, Bradley Levinson, Karma Lochrie, Jon Lozano, Jon Macy, Laura McCloskey, Patricia McManus, Joseph Miller, Sharlene Newman, John Paolillo, Jennifer Pearl, Jamie Prenkert, Lauren Robel, Ben Robinson, Leslie Rutkowski, Steve Sanders, Micol Seigel, Jim Sherman, Catherine Sherwood-Laughlin, Jon Simons, Rebecca Spang, Geoff Sprinkle, Katherine Strand, Cassidy Sugimoto, William Swanson, Alex Tanford, Herbert Terry, Mikel Tiller, Frances Trix, Justin Vasel, Edward Vasquez, Michael Wade, Nona Watt, Sung-Un Yang

MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT: Jeremy Schott (David Fisher); David Daleke (James Wimbush)

MEMBERS ABSENT: David Baxter, Nathan Ensmenger, Lessie Jo Frazier, Michael McRobbie, Deanna Reising, Rega Wood

GUESTS: James Barnes (Law/SPEA); Catherine Dyar (Office of the Provost); Bob Eno; Fred Glass (Athletic Director); Bruce Jaffee (KSOB); Debbie Lemon (Board of Trustees); Mark McConahay (Registrar); Jennifer Piurek (Office of the Provost); MJ Slaby (Herald Times); Dan Smith (IU Foundation); Kurt Zorn (OVPU/ Faculty Athletics Representative)

Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/minutes/14-15/10.21.14.pdf>

2. Executive Committee Business (5 minutes)

(Faculty President Jim Sherman)

3. Presiding Officer's Report (10 minutes)

(Provost Lauren Robel)

4. Resolution from the Executive Committee Concerning the Draft IU Strategic Plan (10 minutes) (Past-president Herb Terry) [DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEM]

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/14-15/B14-2015.pdf>

5. Report of the Athletics Committee (30 minutes)

(Fred Glass, Vice President and Director of Athletics; Professor David Daleke, Chair of the Athletics Committee; Professor Kurt Zorn, Faculty Athletics Representative) [DISCUSSION]

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/policies/intercollegiateAthleticsPolicy.pdf>

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/14-15/aux/BFCReport20132014.pdf>

6. Report from the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (15 minutes)

(Professor James Barnes; Professor Bruce Jaffee; Professor Bob Eno) [DISCUSSION]

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/14-15/aux/COIAIntroduction.pdf>

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/14-15/aux/COIAGuide.pdf>

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/14-15/aux/COIAAntitrustBackground.pdf>

7. News from the Upcoming Bicentennial Campaign from the IU Foundation (15 minutes)

(Professor Dan Smith, President of the IU Foundation) [DISCUSSION]

8. Resolution on Academic Freedom (30 minutes)

(Professor Steve Sanders) [ACTION ITEM]

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/14-15/B9-2015Amend1.pdf>

Minutes

AGENDA ITEM 1: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

ROBEL: [Gavel banging] So why don't we go ahead and get started? Or – or reconvene as the matter – and let me ask this, if you are a voting member of the Bloomington Faculty Council or a designated alternate of the Bloomington Faculty Council, would you please come – sit at a table with a – with something in front of you so I can identify you as such. So John and Micol

SEIGEL: [comment indistinct] there's no space.

ROBEL: – I think there's – there's some right over there. There's – okay. Let's just find space at a table so we can – we can do this.

[Multiple indistinct conversations]

And we – we have just a packed agenda today. So why don't we see if we can't move through it relatively quickly, and I will entertain a motion for the approval of – I – I hesitate to call them minutes. I will – I will – I will take a motion for the approval of our transcript which passes for minutes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So moved.

ROBEL: Okay. Second?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [comment indistinct]

ROBEL: Okay. All in favor? [Aye] Opposed? [Silent] Abstentions? [Silence]. I'm abstaining. I could – I could – I had a lot of trouble reading –

ROBINSON: Rebecca, you haven't read them.

SPANG: I have not read them either.

ROBEL: Okay.

SPANG: I apologize.

ROBEL: Alright.

ROBINSON: You're not the only one.

ROBEL: Let me turn to our President, Jim Sherman, for Executive Committee Business.

AGENDA ITEM 2: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE BUSINESS

SHERMAN: I just want to make a couple of quick announcements.

GIERYN: No mic.

SEIGEL: Can't hear you.

ROBEL: Is – is this a mic?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

ROBEL: Speak – and everybody please speak up because I had a lot of trouble reading the transcript of the last meeting, and I – I think – I could tell from the transcript you had a lot of trouble hearing each other. So, let's work on – on that. We're all teachers. We can be loud.

SHERMAN: I just want to comment very, very briefly on the past and the future. The past hour and a half there was a meeting that many of us attended with Michael Rushton and – and Lauren. It discussed the – the university strategic plan, and I thought it was a – a great meeting and a lot of very smart things were asked and said by faculty members, by students and by staff as well, and I just suggested that we have more opportunities for faculty input and discussion with administration. The future is right after this meeting at 5:30, and the room – is it next door to here?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Federal Room.

SHERMAN: In the Federal Room, there will –

GIERYN: Could you – I’m sorry, Jim – you have got to be really explicit right into that.

SHERMAN: I’m explicit, I’m just not close enough to the microphone.

ROBEL: There you go.

SHERMAN: Use your terms, Tom. Yeah, right after this in the Federal Room there will be a celebration and award for Herb Terry. It won’t take very long, the presentation itself, you can grab a drink. After all these meetings you might need one, so please attend.

AGENDA ITEM 4: RESOLUTION FROM THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONCERNING THE DRAFT IU STRATEGIC PLAN

SHERMAN: And I want to turn it over, the – the reason I’m not using this for my comments is that Herb Terry has a resolution that I hope you all received to present. Is that...?

TERRY: Do you want to go first, Lauren or...?

ROBEL: No.

TERRY: Okay, we will return to the provost. Okay, quickly so we can get to item eight. The Executive Committee presents to you a resolution that is related to the strategic plan. It’s a result of about a week’s worth of frantic e-mails among the Executive Committee shared with a bunch of other people as well. What it says is summed up primarily in the third paragraph of the resolution, and what that basically says is that we want to remind the president, the provost, and the academic officers of the university that the Bloomington campus and Indiana University has faculty constitutions and we have policies [microphone cuts out, no audio] general expectation of engagement with the faculty over such things as the strategic plan and implementing them, and we just express in this our – I believe the word we settled on is, “expectations” that the constitution and the policies will be followed. This began to some extent focused on concerns that were brought to us over what the plan said about reinventing education in the School of Education, but as you can see what we’ve drafted is – is broader. It really applies to all aspects of the plan. And second, I think the – what the plan says about education or how it gets implemented is a bit of a shifting target. We thought it primarily fell to the School of Education. Their policy council is meeting tomorrow. Provost Robel has proposed some changes in how this goes forward for them to consider. So it no longer expressly mentions education. Education’s included in this. We expect policies to be followed when it comes to education, but it’s no longer explicitly focused on that. We scheduled it for only ten

minutes, not because we didn't want to discuss it for longer, but because as Lauren noted – pointed out, we have a busy agenda today. So, I – I will entertain any quick questions if you have any, but we hope that it will simply pass. We will forward it then to the appropriate administrative officers.

ROBEL: Discussion? Yes?

KARTY: What effect will this have once it hits the president's desk, would be the question I have. Maybe I'm being very naive as a first year member.

TERRY: Well, I think the president pays attention to things that hit his desk, and I think this is a reminder to him that we expect the policies to be followed. Beyond that I don't know that he has any express plan not to follow policies, so I don't know that it will affect his behavior at all.

KARTY: I ask that because isn't this meant to be voted on by the Trustees like next month? The –

TERRY: It is.

KARTY: – strategic plan?

TERRY: It is. The – the plan is scheduled for discussion at the Trustees' meeting in December, but it is still being revised. That was a point made in the last meeting we just had. I think it primarily looks not just at the plan being presented, but as it says, lots of things will happen as a result of this plan. There may be reorganization, there may be a bunch of things, and we're just saying, 'Hey, you know, follow the constitution and the policies as you go forward from the adoption of the plan.'

KARTY: Thank you.

ROBEL: Other discussion? Jon?

SIMONS: Yeah, first of all I'd like to thank the Executive Committee very much for getting this together so quickly, and especially, Herb, I know he's also been integral [comment indistinct] And I also want to say how much I appreciate some of the points that are outlined in the discussion, that don't make it into the body of the resolution [comment indistinct] that some of the points are communicated directly to the Trustees as well. I guess, Jim, you're the one who's meeting with the Trustees, so I especially wanted to reiterate the points about how, this is in paragraph three of the discussion, the point that's made here about how these procedures, as it says, "In fact, to the extent that... (these procedures) involve academic structures, curriculum, or the teaching and research missions of schools and individual faculty members, they require faculty approval as well as consultation." So I just wanted to underline that point and hope

very much it is approved in the resolution, that Jim expresses that quite clearly, and directly. As you said, you can be explicit, and you get the microphone close enough.

ROBEL: Thank you. Alright. Yes?

RUTKOWSKI: I just had one question about – so the – this – if it’s passed, this resolution would be shared with the Board of Trustees, is that correct?

SHERMAN: Yes.

RUTKOWSKI: And is it also possible that the School of Education resolution could be shared with the Board of Trustees?

SHERMAN: Yeah, someone suggested that, and we could take that up as a different – as an amendment when we get to the resolution. You – you want it to be with this resolution or – ?

RUTKOWSKI: Yeah.

SHERMAN: Someone suggested it be with the other resolution and my only hesitancy – and we could have that discussion – is that we don’t know that the resolution as written is one – the one that will pass, especially in light of changes that Lauren has made, and that discussion with the School of Education doesn’t go forward until tomorrow so it puts us in a funny position.

ROBEL: Great. Yes?

GRAY: Let me echo the thanks that were expressed to Herb and the Executive Committee and Herb, I just – I’m curious about the choice of verb here – the – the ‘expectation’ will, you know, follow due process. And I wondered if you considered, I do not know, stronger verbs or stronger – such as, “calls upon” or “charges the president with...”

TERRY: The first draft of this, I used the word “hope.” [Laughter] So yes, we considered strengthening the resolution. I don’t know that any other word is – is more demonstrable than that this is what we expect. We mean it.

ROBEL: Okay, other discussion? May I call for a vote then?

SHERMAN: Yes, please.

ROBEL: All in favor? [Aye] All opposed? [Silence] Abstentions? [Silence] Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM 3: PRESIDING OFFICER’S REPORT

ROBEL: Alright, my report, and I will be brief. I wanted to just bring you up to date on a – a couple of things. I – I, unlike David Zaret, am not – I have not made a tradition of the giving of

formal report after I do an overseas trip, but I wanted to talk to you a little bit about that trip, and if you think I should do something broader for the campus, I would be happy to do that. I was in Brazil and Chile for about ten days. I visited four universities on that trip at the request of a number of faculty members and schools who were interested in either continuing programs, or expanding programs, or trying to determine if there were opportunities for graduate students or undergraduate students to come or go. I also visited with the funding agencies in Brazil about the scientific mobility program that has a lot of students coming to IU, and also the CMPQ, which is a little like NSF in – in what it does, although it – I – I will say, I was sort of amazed that they gave faculty members credit cards and said just go for it, you know? But I thought that was kind of nice, but the – at any rate, the one thing that I took away from that is that there are lots of opportunities both for funding for faculty members to go to Brazil to do research, and also for – for graduate students to come from Brazil to our university to work either in a program or for a limited period. I – I – I feel pretty strongly that there would be funding available for just about any graduate student in almost any field that we would accept into our programs, so please convey that back to your – your DGS's and your associate deans for graduate school – graduate studies, and I'll – I'll work my way around the campus on particular potential collaborations that have come directly out of these visits. I also had the opportunity to visit with our alumni in both of these countries, which was – and always is – incredibly moving for me to be able to do that. In Brazil it was mostly Jacobs School – and School of – of – and Kelley School graduates, just who happened to come. In Chile, it was mostly School of Education and Jacobs School alums who happened to come. In both places I also visited with, I think, all of our students who were there on study abroad and put them – invited them to events that involved alumni, so they – and they had opportunities to network with the alumni there. They are also – at least one student – is doing a follow up story on some Jacobs alums. So it was altogether a wonderful, wonderful trip, and made even more wonderful by the fact that I was there the week before the Brazilian presidential elections, so it was incredibly interesting to be able to have the opportunity to talk at every place I went about what people were thinking about that election.

I want to urge all of you if you have not had the opportunity yet to make time in your busy schedules to take advantage of the terrific program that is running for the full year and that involves, I think, so many places on campus, around the centennial of World War I. There is a website that mentions all of these – that lists all of these events and exhibits, and public lectures, and classes, and performances, and I – I do think that this particular set of events, which was kicked off – which has been organized so superbly by Andrea Ciccarelli, and which was kicked off with the – the large collection of diplomatic personnel from all the combatant nations, and the performance of the “War Requiem” at the Jacobs School, and continued last night through Jeff Dyer's wonderful lecture on the – “The Missing of the Somme,” is an example of the kinds of things that the integrated Arts and Humanities section of the Bloomington

campus strategic plan imagined possible, and so I'm – I'm just saying, this is one of those things that really makes a university sing. In the – in the case of the "War Requiem," quite literally but – but please do take advantage of that if you can.

And finally, I – I could save this for later, but I also thought it would be helpful for those of you who weren't in the previous discussion on the strategic plan. I – I've been trying to figure out how to be helpful with the School of Education on the process around this blue ribbon commission because I think the – the conceptual puzzle was that the School of Education external task force was a multi-campus affair. So unlike the engineering task force, which is a campus thing and starts with a faculty group and will move to an external group, this involves every campus of the – of the university. And in trying to think through how to get – to best get faculty voice around this, and input, and engagement, and discussion, and thinking what – what I came to – what the president, and John Applegate, and I came to, and I think – I – I want to thank some of the members of this Council for their thinking around this as well, is to suggest that maybe the core school and the regional schools put together their own task forces to address the issues that are outlined in the proposed charge to the blue ribbon commission, which the School of Education policy committee already has, and – and then use those as inputs for the external group, and then have whatever comes out of the external group go back out to the faculty more generally for comment. So that's what I proposed to the School of Education, and they'll take it up in their policy committee tomorrow, but if you have better ideas than that, I would be happy to – I would be happy to hear them, and I'm sure we will get to them later on the agenda. And with that, I am out of time. So...

We have, I guess the resolution from the Executive Committee concerning the Draft IU – we did that already.

SPANG: We did that.

ROBEL: Okay, great. Good.

SPANG: We're halfway through.

ROBEL: We're halfway through. We do have guests and I would like to invite them forward. We have a report of the Athletics Committee. Fred Glass is joining us. Fred needs no introduction, I think, to this group, but is the – is, well, he – he runs it all when it comes to athletics. And we also have David Daleke, Chair of the Athletics Committee, and Kurt Zorn, who is the Faculty Athletics Representative. Welcome to you, and thank you so much for coming, and I'm hoping – I'm hoping people can hear you, but if they can't I'm more than willing to give up my spot up here and let you come up here.

AGENDA ITEM 5: REPORT OF THE ATHLETICS COMMITTEE

DALEKE: Well I'll – we'll do our best to be –

SHERMAN: Yeah, David let me – let me add that – you may say this as well. Before they came, I had received a number of questions and comments from some BFC members, from other faculty, and some that I generated myself, and I forwarded them all to Dave, and to Kurt, and to Fred, so their – their discussion will take into account things that have come from this body.

ROBEL: Okay.

DALEKE: Thank you, Jim. Provost Robel and President Sherman, members of the BFC, it's our pleasure to present the report for the university athletics and Athletics Committee for – the report will be from last year, because it turns out our activities of last year. But before you on link to the agenda are two documents. One of them is the UFC approved and Board of Trustees' approved university athletics policy, contained in that policy on pages two and three are the stipulations for the composition and the functions of the Athletics Committee. Because we have a short amount of time today I'm not going to go into the details, so I'll just refer you to those pages if you'd like some further details as to the – what the Athletics Committee actually does, but primarily we serve roles to monitor and to promote – help promote – excellence in athletics and in academics for all of our student athletes. And you'll see that one of the major roles that we play and a type of legislative responsibility is in helping to comment on, develop, and help revise policies related to university athletics. The committee is comprised of twelve voting members, all of which who are appointed by the president. The majority of them are faculty, eight voting members, that includes myself and Kurt Zorn, we're both appointed by the president. The six faculty members that serve on the committee were all nominated by the BFC and then subsequently appointed by the president. There are three alumni and two students who are also appointed by the president. In addition to that we have a number of ex officio members that come from the Athletics Department that serve on the committee to help provide expertise in a – a lot of very helpful ways, and of course Vice President - Athletics Director, Fred Glass, comes to all of our meetings and serves in that capacity as well. We receive reports from the athletics director at every one of our meetings. At one of our meetings we also meet with President McRobbie, who will meet with us this December at our next meeting. The functions of the committee are mostly taken – are mostly accomplished through subcommittees, and we have five different subcommittees, that is the Personnel and Academic Issues Subcommittee, a Finance Subcommittee, Student Well-being and Diversity, and then a Sponsorship Subcommittee, and some of the actions that the – that committee – those committees took last year that were brought to the full committee are also in the report that – that you have in front of you. And so, I don't have much else to add at this point about what the committee does because we know you have a lot of questions. As Jim mentioned we were forwarded questions in advance, and so at this point I'll turn it over to Kurt

Zorn, our Faculty Athletics Representative to make some comments and maybe address some of those issues that – that have been brought up. [indistinct comments among the presenters] Okay. So Kurt's deferring to Fred, so we'll start with Fred.

GLASS: Excellent.

DALEKE: Thanks, Kurt.

GLASS: Thank you. Thanks, David. I will try to be very mindful of the time and leave as much time for questions as possible. So I'm going to go through a report to give folks an overview of where we are, but I'll try to do so briskly, and if people want to slow me down or – or go back on something please – please let me know, but I'll – I'll err on the side of kind of moving along here sensitive to the time. Again, thank you for the opportunity to be here. I appreciate our really positive relationship, with both the Athletics Committee and the broader Council. I enjoy our summer meetings with the executive group where we talk about issues and – and set the table really for this meeting. So thank you for that opportunity. I'd really like to organize my report around the five priorities of – of the department. My experience is if you don't have clear cut, well-articulated, oft repeated priorities, then everybody else's priorities become your priorities. The – the urgent displaces the important, the e-mail traffic, the person outside your office, the crisis of the day gets you off of – of – of your agenda, and so we – these are our priorities in order. Number one, we want to play by the rules, and some of the things that we do to ensure that we do that is we have a very large compliance staff. Depending on how you count, we probably have the largest compliance staff in the Big 10. And following the rules is everybody's responsibility, but I don't think you can lay claim to having that be your number one priority if you don't put your money where your mouth is, and your budget. We do have a very large compliance staff. I meet with the senior leadership of that compliance staff every week. So hopefully I don't get caught off guard on any of the issues that are brewing in that area. We have very clear expectations with our student athletes, our coaches, and our staff with regarding to following the rules. We have what we call the openness and teamwork initiative, which the university, human resources folks, helped us put together. Just very briefly I'm – I'm not smart enough to know what the next bad thing's going to be, you know, it was Ohio State, and then it was Miami, and then it was Penn State, and now it's North Carolina, and it's going to be somebody else someday, but you never know what the substantive issues are. To me the commonality is always that people – people knew that something funny was going on and didn't talk about it. They either thought that their supervisors knew or that their supervisors didn't want to know, or that they would be a shot messenger, or – or whatever, so – so – so what we try to do is create an environment where people not only understand that they can tell, but they're expected to tell. And – and – and we do a number of things assisted by the university in trying to create that kind of environment. I also tuck into following the rules,

being financially independent. We are financially self-sustaining. We – we raise or earn our – our own money. We receive no special university subsidy, no student fee, no legislative appropriation, and that's as it should be in my view. And our ten-year financial plan sets out that that will forever be so, that we will be financially self-sustaining, which we think is very important.

Our second priority after following the rules is making sure our student athletes are well in mind, body and spirit. We do a variety of things to try to do that. We have a comprehensive health care for our student athletes at no cost to them or their families for any athletically related injury that they might incur. All of our kids get comprehensive physicals as they come into the program. We have a certified trainer or medical doctor available for all of our competitions and practices. We have two certified sports nutritionists, which distinguishes us from most other athletic departments in the country. I could do more and more on these, but I want to hit the highlights. We have an extensive training table and nutrition center. Since NCAA rules are allowing us to do more for our student athletes in terms of nutrition, we are doing that. I think we're a leader in that area. We're – we're improving security on the athletics campus. We had been a pretty wide open, kind of mom and pop, kind of – kind of place, and in this environment we've – we've made some expenditures to try to have improved security. Our kids travel well, they stay in decent places, they have decent per diem. We always prioritize on our busses and hotels to have Wi-Fi so they can do their school work and so forth while they're there. We pride ourselves on having a culture of trust and respect. It's embodied in our statement of responsibilities for all of our – our participants, and we take that very seriously. And to address one of your questions, Jim, we – we have been mindful on expanding our – our psychological services to our – to our kids. So right now our primary – we outsource our primary care medical services from Premier here in town. They provide us two licensed professionals to help us with psychological services. We also contract with another certified psychologist, and we have a really nice arrangement with the department of – or the School of Public Health with a couple of PhD students that help us as well. As you and I've talked, and others, we – we think we need to ramp that up even more. I think this week we will be posting a new job for a psychologist that will be full-time employed by the department, and I would underscore that – that – that our focus with these psychologists are on wellness – not so much performance in the psychology area – there's, you know, you can – you can get people that, you know, help kids figure out how to jump higher and tune out, you know, people yelling at them and stuff like that, and we think program by program, sport by sport, they can figure out that kind of stuff. But from a department perspective we want to focus on wellness issues, and the reality is a kid will often times present with, 'Hey I cannot hit the free throw in the clutch minute,' but – but that's ultimately a wellness issue because other things going on in his or her – her lives. So that's – that's been our focus there.

Our third priority is to have kids that go to class and graduate. We've made substantial investments in that, including the Shuel Academic Center. We have special diagnostic and support services available to our kids, and we feel like we're starting to see some – some – some outcomes that we think are related to some of our inputs in that area. Fifteen of our teams had a perfect 1,000 APR score. An APR score is a short hand, an immediate snapshot of basically how you're doing progressing toward graduation rates. So graduation rates tend to trail current times by a significant amount of time. The APR is a little bit more of a real time view of how you're doing in that regard, and again, fifteen of our – of our twenty-four sports had a perfect score, and six of our teams were recognized by the NCAA as being elite among their peers in terms of APR. Our average APR is a 992 on a 1,000 point scale. To give some perspective, you generally have to be over a 930 to be eligible for post-season play, and all of our teams are well in excess of that. Our men's basketball program, for example, has had four perfect APR scores in a row. It's the only school to ever do that in men's basketball in the Big 10. We've had more Academic All-Big 10 selections both overall, and in select sports than we've had ever before. In other words, we're setting records in those – in those areas.

Our fourth priority, and we are the athletic department after all, but we get to four before we really get into athletics, and we want to be excellent athletically. We want to compete for individual and team championships, and last year was a good year in that regard. We had four conference team champions, that's the most we'd had in seventeen years; fourteen individual conference champions; five conference athletes of the year; four conference coaches of the year; a national coach of the year; forty-nine All Americans; we had fifteen teams qualified for post-season play, which ties the department record; and we had five finish in the nation's top fifteen.

Our fifth and final priority is we want to be integrated with the university, and we want to be part of something bigger than ourselves. I think it's a trap that athletic departments often fall into, that they want to become an island, or they become an island with all of their own stuff and all their own support, and all their own everything, and they don't interact on purpose with the university, and candidly I think we had maybe fallen into that a little bit before I got here. We've set as a prime directive to be integrated with university, not only because I can come here and shine my halo and say isn't that great that we do that, but – but it's a very selfish thing because the resources of the university are amazing. So we have the J school – or now the M school – help us be on the cutting edge of social media. The Kelley School has done a number of studies for us to help us with our game day experience, and so forth. We work closely with the Jacobs School and others in – in substantive academic areas that help us with our mission. Beyond that, I'm a member of the president's cabinet as a vice president. I think that's very helpful in – in having the athletic department be a real part of the fabric of – of the campus. I meet with the president on a regular basis, we interact with the dean of students' office, the

University Counsel's office, MaryFrances with the – as the CFO, Tom Morrison with facilities and capital projects, the HR folks, and then our faculty athletics representative is probably our closest connector to – to campus. I read with interest the president of Michigan's, the report of the president of Michigan's interaction with their Faculty Senate, and one of the things he said was he really felt like his FAR was getting stiff-armed a little bit by the athletic department, and I think, you know, Kurt can speak for himself, I think the opposite is true. He and I meet on a very regular basis. He can go anywhere he wants. He goes into the locker rooms, he goes into the team meetings, he goes into our team meetings with sport administrators. He always is the first call about any kind of disciplinary or personnel issues. We also keep David Daleke advised as the chairman of our – our committee. Again, enjoy our relationship with this organization. We meet with student group leaders. I meet with every student group leader as a group each semester so that we can hear what some of the general student body thinks. Work with the Foundation, Alumni Association. Our kids are very involved in community service. They did over 3,000 – at least 3,000 hours – that we counted last year. We've been involved in the Greening Cream and Crimson sustainability campaign. I was sort of excited that that was a logo we came up with and the campus actually adopted that, which was kind of fun. Our friends from the Army ROTC are here. We have a great relationship with them and – and they actually, certain of their personnel earned letters – they become lettermen because of what they do in their organization. It's an awesome relationship.

Quick – and – and some of you may have noticed that we've added a priority since last year. I always loved coming in here and saying, we've had four priorities since before I got here and there are four priorities for six years, and last year after this meeting Jim challenged me and he said, you know, you guys seem to be doing a lot of good things with student athlete wellness, but it's not one of your priorities. And – and – and I was – I kept thinking, well it's got to be implicit in one of the other ones or something, because I did not want to change it, because I really liked having four forever, but he was right. It wasn't expressed, and we are doing a lot of things in that area and find it very important, and so we actually added that priority, Jim. So it's – it's in our – it's in our, all of our signage, and – and it's in – it's reflected – I – I circulated the Indiana – Spirit of Indiana 24 sports, one team, and the five priorities are embedded in that, plus some other stuff, and you'll – you'll see that the well-being's in that. So thank you for that suggestion.

Very, very briefly, I think one of the biggest things we did last year was develop and publish the Student Athlete Bill of Rights, and I've shared that with everyone here. It's very self-explanatory, but especially in this environment we thought it was very important that Indiana University lead in the area of well-being and – and providing our student athletes in writing what we intended and would provide them. And the process of developing that was awesome because we found some gaps of where we could do better, and we looked at some best

practices about what other people were doing and – and there are some really, and – and there are some things there that nobody else is doing, but are starting to copy frankly, including our Hoosiers for Life, student athlete guarantee that people can come back and we'll pay for their education if they leave for whatever reason. We're really trying to cut against this idea that universities bring these kids in, wring the value of their eligibility out of them, and then kind of discard them. And so, it – it – it covers what we're doing for them while they're here and even after they leave. Nobody had ever done this before. Several people have copied it since and, you know, I think Indiana University ought to be a leader and ought to be an innovator, and we certainly are in – in that area. I could go more through that, but I'll resist that temptation so that I can turn it over to Kurt – address some of the issues, Jim, some of the other issues that you shared with us and then take questions from the body. So thank you for your attention and opportunity to be here.

ROBEL: We're at about 11 after 4, and we have you scheduled until 4:25, so let's keep that in mind.

ZORN: Okay, I'm – I'm going to try to go quickly through some of the questions that Jim posed. We're going to do a little team work on this. One question was raised about the sponsorship program – the faculty sponsorship program. Let me preface this by saying this is a program that was established by one of my predecessors. I don't know if it was Bruce who's in the back of the room, or somebody before him, but it has become the model for the campus. The Athletics Department had this process, and the admissions office thought it was so good that they now have adopted it for the overall campus for the non-student athletes. Basically, what happens is we have a four person committee consisting of – consisting of David, myself, and two other members of the Athletics Committee who consider all requests by coaches for students who need special admission, because they don't meet the automatic admission standards, and the NCAA eligibility requirements are basically a necessary but not sufficient condition. We use that as a starting point, but by no means is that the measure that we use. We basically are looking at individual cases in depth for the probability of academic success given the certain circumstances, whether it's environmental learning disability or the academic environment that's established by the coach, with the understanding that we will match them up with a faculty member who's willing to serve as a faculty mentor and a sponsor. The numbers, if you're interested in that – now I'm just trying to hit the high points. I'll answer other questions that people have. Indeed, the numbers have increased in the years that I've been faculty athletics rep. The last year Bruce – when Bruce and I were transitioning, 2011-12, there were 35, 2012-13 there were 40, last year there were 53, this year there are 49, but I have to put a star on that, because we do have some midyear sponsors that will add to that number, a handful, maybe a couple, or so. The other point of the question, Jim, I think was you had gone to a meeting, a CIC meeting, and your colleagues claimed that there were no faculty

sponsorship programs. And that's right, and we ought to be proud of that. They have special admission programs, but they do not have the program we have, which does a careful analysis and a mentorship. In fact, when I share this with my faculty athletic colleagues, they're envious very honestly, about it. But they all have special admission programs for their athletes.

SHERMAN: Could you mention – you mentioned how many student athletes there are, how many get turned down that are proposed?

ZORN: That's actually difficult for me to – to say, and the reason – and it's not because I'm trying to be evasive, because there are really three steps to the process. The last step is getting it to the faculty committee, the subcommittee on faculty sponsorship. The first step is the initial eligibility person in compliance, who basically fields initial requests from the faculty – or, well, from Fred's faculty – the coaches – and basically, I don't even know how many come across his desk, but he will stop them dead in their tracks because he knows that I'm not even going to look at them. Secondly, we will sit down, this individual and I, and we will go through those cases. Now there were cases I won't even bring to the committee, because I don't think they're – they even warrant our time. So honestly, I don't know the number, but there – it's greater than zero. Let's put it that way. And the coaches, very honestly, now know what the expectations are, so they don't even propose, in fact, they don't even recruit students who they don't think are going to be worthy of faculty sponsorship, very honestly.

ROBEL: And I might – just to put that in context. I – I asked David Johnson to pull the faculty sponsorship numbers for the campus for the last several years, and I've shared these with Jim Sherman. In 2014, there were 102 faculty sponsors for admitted students, 44 were athletes, 37 were in music, 1 was in theater, and 20 were – general. You know – so – and I – it looks sort of like that the last couple of years. In 2013 there were 118 overall, 45 athletes, 29 music, 2 theatre, and 42 general. So, that's the – that's the bigger –

ZORN: Thank you, Provost Robel, because that's the number I was hoping I could've gotten to know what the universe was so...

ROBEL: Yeah.

ZORN: A second issue that was brought to our attention is the – I think somebody said that it seems like student athletes miss a lot of classes and yes, indeed, they do miss class. Now, first thing is we have to remember that the dean of students sends out at the beginning of every semester a – a memo that says that to the degree possible we should accommodate students when they are doing university sanctioned events, so I want to put it in that context. So there are other students that are asking for time off. We actually have in the Big 10 a requirement that there be a missed class policy on each institution. When I became FAR there were, I think there were twelve members of the Big 10, and there were twelve policies, but one of the

policies was ingenious because the policy was not to have a policy. And that was Michigan. And it was when Anne Curzan who came in as the FAR two years ago, she came in and she said, 'This is ridiculous,' and she has worked hard to institute a policy. They have a policy. The policy was established by your faculty Athletics Committee, and it is regularly reviewed. In fact, it was revised last time in the spring of 2013 – well actually, a small revision was made in our last meeting. We have a requirement of eight – or, I'm sorry – a limit of eight missed class days per semester, and if you ask me where that falls in the scheme of things, well, we have a few schools that are on quarter systems so it's a little hard to match, but I do have a sheet that shows all the policies for all the universities in the Big 10, and we basically are right in the middle of that. There are some that have a few more and some that have a few less. But they're mostly in the seven, eight, nine range for a semester long. Now, I must say that post-season competition is not covered by that policy. So when the soccer team goes to the Big 10, like they just did and to the NCAA – hopefully in further rounds – those would not count toward the eight days. We do have a way to have – where coaches can ask for a waiver of the policy, which happens occasionally in some sports such as baseball and softball where they have to play early parts of their season down in the southern climes because unfortunately, the weather in March is a lot like it is right now, and it's not conducive to softball and so forth. Basketball and football – Bruce, you can answer this – but under my service as FAR, we've never had a request for a waiver of policy. They never even get close to that because of the schedule that they have. They're very careful about that. So that's the missed class. I'll be happy to answer any questions anybody might have specifically on that.

ROBEL: Okay.

ZORN: And then there's a third issue that some people might be a little bit concerned about. There's this little thing that happened at UNC, I'm not quite sure – I'm not quite sure what – what everybody's all upset about. Minor thing, wasn't it? I'm being sarcastic, obviously. Very honestly, I don't like to – to revel in other peoples' problems but we – we're advantaged because when somebody slips up like that, it gives us an opportunity to step back and assess and evaluate. In fact –

GREINER: Can you say what it is?

ZORN: Well, sure. The – the UNC, basically it was a bunch of paper courses, effectively courses with no substance that were being offered to students, not just student athletes. I think about 47% of the – the enrollment were student athletes, but a lot of other students were involved, and this happened over about an 18 year period. It's a – it's an intriguing report. If you're interested send me an e-mail zorn@indiana.edu, I'll send you the PDF copy of the report. It's riveting reading to be very honest. And it's very humbling as a faculty member to think that could be going on. So basically about two years ago I became very aware of this, and this has

been continuing since then, and even at that period we decided to do some evaluation. One thing that came out of that – and I know Mark McConahay, the registrar is here – I went to Mark and I said, ‘Mark, is there any way that we can get an idea of whether we have concentration of student athletes in particular courses?’ So Mark and his staff are generating a report that comes to me twice a semester, which basically shows any course section that has 15% or more student athletes relative to the total enrollment. So that, at least, gives me an idea to ask questions of the athletic academic staff of why those concentrations may be occurring. Those numbers are not very large – the sections – you’d be surprised really are not – but at least I get answers, because I wanted to be proactive. I didn’t want somebody from the *Indianapolis Star* saying, ‘You had 30% student athletes in your course, and as the FAR why is that happening?’ And I’d be sitting there saying, ‘Uh, well, I don’t know.’ But now, if somebody would call me, I’d be able to answer that question. It may be because of practice times. It may be because of majors. It may be for a number of reasons. And if we find ones we can’t answer we investigate and we change the behavior and change the registration. So that happened two years ago after this Weinstein report, I believe it is, came out. I talked with Fred. I talked with Mattie White, who’s the Associate Athletic Director for Academic Services and the Excellence Academy to basically do a little bit of an evaluation to see where we are with regard to our safeguards. And here’s the conclusion that I came up with after talking with everybody. After reviewing the safeguards that are in place both at the campus level and within the Athletics Department, I’m comfortable the existing system of checks and balances is sufficient to ensure the academic integrity and legitimacy of the courses student athletes are enrolled in and the degrees they are working toward. Clearly the monitoring system that I have described in a little report above is predicated on the assumption that individuals perform their duties and responsibilities in good faith and with integrity. Obviously, you have to have people working well within the system. However, it’s my belief that the existing safeguards should be able to identify problems quickly if an individual chooses not to operate responsibly and with integrity. And if people are interested I can go into more detail of what – what the safeguards and so forth are. But my bottom line is I’m comfortable that we’re doing the best we can at IU and that we most likely will not have an issue like UNC. I won’t guarantee we won’t, because there could be a bad egg in the system. Thank you.

ROBEL: Great, we have two minutes for questions – for further questions – for our guests.

GREINER: I just wonder if you could comment at all on anything specific that the Athletics Department might be doing to curb or address what I consider the sort of out of control, alcohol driven, kind of party culture of this campus. And I realize it’s not the responsibility of athletics to deal with that – I mean, not solely the responsibility of athletics – but certainly athletics and party culture go together. There was an article in the IDS a year or so ago about

tailgating, drinking, and all that kind of thing. So I just wondered if you had specific things you might tell us about that.

GLASS: Yes. Perhaps your question's exactly right that – that we're part of the bigger – the bigger challenges. We try to address that in a number of ways. We have a lot of programming and speakers and so forth with our student athletes as part of our life skills to bring people in to really show what happens to your body, and how much it impacts your capacity both academically – for mind and body to perform after you've been drinking and so forth. So there's heavy education with that. You know, the tailgating is a big thing. We've – we've tried to limit that a little bit early on. The – the big crazy tailgate lot across 17th Street stayed open the whole game. When I got here I thought that was kind of crazy, so – so we've worked in great partnership with the dean of students' office, give Pete Goldsmith great – great credit. We – we close that tailgate down at kick off. We have disallowed cars coming in there. We've disallowed all the different people with competing boom boxes, making it even a crazy, more carnival-like atmosphere, with the intent to create more responsibility, and there's still drinking going on there, but I don't think it's the – the free for all that it was before. We've also had conversations with the broader campus about ways that student athletes can be engaged in that, because they can be people that are looked up to or role models to a certain extent. And we've actually had some fairly specific conversations that are in the embryonic stage about – about how to work with that. We've also been doing that in the – in the – what I think's a related area – of sexual assault. So often sexual assault issues are driven by excessive drinking and some of the same issues carry over, and we've been trying to address some of that, and have been very active with the university's efforts to curb issues of sexual assault.

AGENDA ITEM 6: REPORT FROM THE COALITION ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

ROBEL: I want to thank our – our guests. I think we can continue talking athletics with our next set of guests, you know, and still stay on – on task. Thank you so much for coming and I'd like to invite up the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics, which – which I believe is actually Jim Barnes, right? Not Jim Craig, and Bruce Jaffee. It looks like the – and Bob Eno.

SHERMAN: Is Bob here?

ROBEL: Is Bob here?

SHERMAN: Yeah, Bob's here.

ROBEL: Yeah. Hi, Bob. Thank you. Thank you so much.

BARNES: Well initially I'd like to express my appreciation for having the opportunity to follow Bruce here and represent the BFC at the Coalition for Intercollegiate Athletics. I've been a

longtime supporter of many of the IU athletic programs. I've been somebody that has sponsored athletes, but I also share what I think is a strong faculty interest in ensuring the academic integrity of the athletic programs, because I think as we've seen with North Carolina and some of the other universities, when that – when that integrity is challenged it reflects adversely on the entire university. So you have in your course packet three COIA related documents. One of them is a one pager about the Coalition and as some of you know, but maybe not all of you, IU was a – really a founding member of that Coalition, and we're fortunate to have with us the man that put that together, Bob Eno.

ENO: Thanks, Jim. Basically, the reason that the Coalition is represented today at this meeting is because it is a coalition of senates, and it's – am I getting through the – ?

TERRY: Take it off the stand [comment indistinct]

ENO: It is a coalition of senates, and when you have a large coalition of faculty senates – which is an unusual thing to have – it's important to remind senates around the country that are members, that they are members and what membership means. The Coalition of [sic] Intercollegiate Athletics was founded twelve years ago – twelve years ago this week. It was founded in this room, and it – it comes out of the Big 10 originally, and the idea was we had serious problems in intercollegiate athletics, both in terms of conduct, in terms of scandals, and things that have been true for all of the 20th century and more, but also we saw an opportunity to try and address some of these problems, because there was leadership coming into the NCAA that seemed interested in reforming intercollegiate athletics, and the Coalition was formed as a support group for that type of reformist effort. Originally, we hoped we'd have twenty or thirty members of the twenty or thirty senates that would become members of the Coalition and give faculty a national voice in trying to encourage reform wherever it seemed necessary. As it turns out, we now have 64, your circular – you have a circular – that one pager, that says 63, but that's now up to 64. It's much further than we had expected. It's about one half of the total membership of the football bowl championship, or big time athletics division of the NCAA. The goals of the Coalition have to do with trying to advocate for reforms on a national level, not necessarily reforms that would impact every campus individually, but we do try to impact every campus individually by creating best practice guides in various areas, which we've done over the past twelve years, and by bringing to the faculty attention periodically, as we have this year, the need to continually monitor to see whether your athletics governance on campus is running smoothly and whether the role that faculty play in campus athletic governance, on each specific campus, is appropriate in the eyes of the faculty. And that's basically what we've asked the BFC and all other senates who are members of the Coalition to do this year. Take a look at the structure of your athletics governance, listen to the reports of the athletic director and the campus athletic board, and so forth, and see whether or not your

faculty senate is playing the role that your faculty senate thinks it ought to play, and if there are any changes that need to be made, to discuss what those changes might be and advocate for them. That's why we are on the agenda today.

BARNES: Okay thanks, Bob. You have two other documents, one of them relates to some of the issues concerning whether antitrust exemptions should be sought for intercollegiate athletics. That's passed along to you with the idea that in – in – over the next few years we may well have to face the issue of whether such an exemption should be sought. It's really not something that's on the table right now, but the Coalition has put together a list of pros and cons concerning that exemption that would be sought to allow the NCAA members to collaborate together to address some of the financially related issues that have come up concerning intercollegiate athletics and that might – that were further efforts to – to – I was going to say “conspire,” which would be the wrong word, to collaborate, to might run afoul of the antitrust law. So that's just something to put in your back packet, and if that issue comes front and center then you've got – got some thinking for that. The other document in your packet was a – a piece from the steering committee of the Coalition that Bob really has already alluded to but that – that addresses three key issues to each of the member senates in terms of whether they feel capable and willing to engage in athletics issues with implications for athletics, keeping in mind that it's a purely academic policy or oversight question; whether structures and procedures adequate to allow the senate to fulfill its own view of its policy and oversight responsibilities is there and whether changes should be made to improve the senate's capacity and performance. Obviously the discussion that went on earlier from the athletic director and the FAR and the Athletics Committee addressed some of those concerns, and I don't know, Bob said you've been – head both the BFC and were the – I think were the draftsmen maybe of this document. Anything else that you'd like to have on the table here for the BFC at this point in time?

ENO: Well, probably given the time today there's not going to be an opportunity to go through the various bullet points on that list, but the Coalition is going to be sending around a survey to all of its member senates, and it will go to the leadership of the senates. And the survey will simply be an opportunity to respond to – for each senate to respond on whether or not it considers its own responsibilities – the responsibilities it set for itself – to be being met at the current time, what structures it has. We're looking for senates that could be exemplary senates, that can help other senates see better ways to do it. We're looking for senates that want to indicate that they have problems, we may find common problems that senates can address together, and if members were to go through this list and be in touch with the leadership of the BFC so that leadership is in a better response – a – a better position to respond to that survey, knowledge of what faculty members on this body feel, that would probably be the – the way to follow up on the agenda for today.

SHERMAN: Do you want to talk briefly, Jim or Bob or Bruce, about the initiative earlier this year regarding the changes in NCAA structure or not?

BARNES: I – I think I am going to defer to Bob on that. I – I’m the new kid on the block. The first meeting of COIA that I’m going to be attending is set for February, so I’m really both blessed to have both Bruce and Bob available to consult with, but do you want to go Bruce?

JAFFEE: Let me – let me go first on that and – and let me start by – by saying or reiterating some of the points that – that Fred, and Kurt, and Dave raised. I mean, over the years I was on the Athletics Committee and chaired it for a number of years and, as Kurt indicated, I was on the – I served as the Faculty Athletics Representative and I was really lucky that – to be in the search committee that hired such a wonderful athletic director in Fred Glass, but I’ve also been the IU COIA representative before getting my best job namely as an emeritus faculty member – that’s the one I really like – but directing to your question it really relates to a number of kinds of themes and – and issues that – that relate to COIA. I mean, one of the major concerns that COIA has is essentially the sustainability of this model of intercollegiate athletics related to a university. Fred made the really critical point that financially Indiana University is independent and the ten year plan shows independence. That’s really unique. There were very few universities can – that can say that, and I suspect five and ten years from now there’ll even be fewer. That’s a great concern to COIA in that the ways in which these universities are covering the debt, the deficits, are either through [clears throat] – excuse me – in some cases enormous student fees or reallocation, which certainly ought to be concerned by this Council, of reallocation from the academic side of the university to athletics. That’s not happening here, but it’s really of great concern by COIA, and when COIA basically says, and its concern is that the current model – the way things are going – is not sustainable, and that’s, I think, a something that ought to be really focused on by this Council and certainly other groups as well.

ROBEL: Could I ask maybe if we could open it up at this point? We’ve only got four minutes left for this particular topic, and I know there were some questions from before or comments. I thought these materials were fantastic. Thank you for providing them. Yeah, Alex?

TANFORD: Do I gather from this that it will be on our agenda to review the way we as a faculty interact with the athletics department, that is, how we choose – you know, faculty athletic representative, membership of the faculty Athletics Committee – is that what COIA’s asking us to do and is that on our agenda?

SHERMAN: It’s on our agenda if you would like it to be on our agenda. We determine our own agenda. So the answer is – is almost certainly yes, but with regard to the survey that’s coming out, that will be sent when?

ENO: I don’t have a date for you. It should be coming up very soon.

SHERMAN: Okay, so we will have this survey and then that will be part of our agenda to discuss the survey to collect some data and see where we stand. So the answer is, yes.

ROBEL: I – I’d also like to really point you to the membership of the university Athletics Committee, a lot of which is appointed by the Bloomington Faculty Council, because a lot of work – for us to have the opportunity to really discuss things at this meeting – we really should be pushing to the committee structure everything that we possibly can, and that may well be the place where you want to see things go forward.

SHERMAN: Yeah, let me – let me add to that to – we – we send, I believe, two names to the president and the president picks one of them, but we select the two names, and I’ve been on the nominating committee several times, and it – it’s the one committee that we don’t have to seek people out, you know? ‘Do you want to be on the Long Range Planning Committee?’ ‘No.’ ‘Do you want to be on the Budgetary Affairs Committee?’ ‘No.’ ‘How about the Athletic – the faculty Athletic Committee?’ ‘Oh, yeah, yeah.’ But I’ve got to tell you having been on the nominating committee, if you’re a die-hard athletic fan, you got no chance. If someone says, ‘Well, I don’t know how to be on that. I don’t really follow sports.’ It’s like, you’re in. So we try to select people who will be independent thinkers and won’t be caught up in the “Rah – Rah” sport.

ROBEL: David, you want the last – ?

DALEKE: Thanks, I just – thanks again for the pitch for the Athletics Committee. I just want to say if you are interested in athletics and governance of athletics, the committee’s a really wonderful placed to serve. I also wanted to point out, seguing from COIA, that some of the things the Athletics Committee does is to advise the faculty governance bodies – in this case the BFC – on questions having to do with athletics, so if there’s anything you would like us to take on as a question, we’re happy to. For example, COIA had a concussion survey that they submitted to all COIA members and the BFC last year sent it to our committee. We passed it on with the – to the athletics department. We reviewed the results, and we sent it back to the BFC for submission to COIA, and then we analyzed those results when they came back. And that’s just one example of the kinds of things that – that we can do regarding faculty governance and – and athletics.

AGENDA ITEM 7: NEWS FROM THE UPCOMING BICENTENNIAL CAMPAIGN FROM THE IU FOUNDATION

ROBEL: Thank you so much. And with that we’ll turn to our next guest and thank – thank these guests. Thank you very much for being here. [Applause] I’d like to welcome Professor Dan Smith, President of the IU Foundation who’s here to talk about the upcoming bicentennial campaign for the Foundation. Dan?

SMITH: Where do I go with this?

SHERMAN: Oh.

ROBEL: Craig?

SHERMAN: Craig?

ROBEL: Craig?

SPANG: Craig?

ROBEL: He's got slides.

DETHLOFF: Yes, and we've got somebody to handle the slides.

SPANG: Yay!

ROBEL: Yay!

SPANG: We are prepared. We have the technology...

ROBEL: Please feel free if you want to stand up and walk around, Dan. All of you should feel – feel free to do that as well.

SMITH: That looks familiar. Can people see that? Everyone hear me okay? Good, good. Thanks. Thanks for inviting me, I really appreciate it. It's – it's an honor to be here. What I'd like to do is just take a few minutes and – and provide a snapshot of a couple of questions that often come up about the Foundation, and then move into a brief overview of where we are with what you may have heard of as the bicentennial campaign coming up this year, and I'll give you sort of a timeline, and give you a sense of some of the priorities that – that are emerging around that campaign. I'll talk a little bit about also the role of the faculty and next steps. Really, two broad areas. I'd like to give you just a quick update on the role of private support for Indiana University, and kind of what – what does the Foundation do in broad terms? What do all of us do in terms of raising private support for IU? Where does the money go? Where does it come from? That sort of thing, and then get into the campaign. So a lot of people ask, you know that – you're all aware probably of the endowment, and the endowment right now is just shy of \$2 billion dollars - the IU endowment. It's one of the top twenty largest endowments of public schools in the US. I think it's somewhere thereabouts. I haven't seen the most recent statistics, but I – it's consistently in that area, seventeen, sixteen, eighteen – somewhere in that area. But in terms of – of productivity for IU, what happens is we get about \$158 – this was the most recent data – about \$158 million dollars in private support from a whole variety of very generous donors who are very fond of IU. In this regard, when I was at the Kelley School, and

I'll say it to everybody right now, when we talk to donors – when we talk to perspective donors – inevitably what they talk about are the faculty. They talk about special moments that they had in the classroom, ways that conversations that you may have had with – with students that were just throwaways to you in the hallway that stuck and that they remember. So really, a lot of the success we have in fundraising over the years, over the decades, can be traced a lot to just the faculty engagement, and the faculty culture here. It's really a special place. So about \$158 million dollars.

Now, when I was appointed over at the Foundation, my mother read about this appointment, and the endowment, and thought suddenly that was all mine. And she was thoroughly impressed that they were going to pay me that much, and she said that's more than the president of the US makes. And I said well, that'd be really nice, and that's true, but that's not mine, and – so anyway, the – the point is – is that about 97% of the proceeds that come off of the endowment, and about 97% of all private gifts that come into the university are donor designated. They – they say, 'Look, I want to give a scholarship at the music school for a violinist,' and one of the big rules the Foundation plays is to make sure that those funds that people trust us with go exactly where they want. If it says "violin," and Gwyn Richards says, 'Dan, how about – I have got this great viola – I know viola sort of looks like a violin, sort of...' but no – you can't give it away to that. 'Well, I already awarded it.' 'Well, too bad. Guess what? You just bought yourself a viola scholarship, because we can't do that.' It gets into another question a lot of people ask when I'm in social engagements is well, you know, do we worry about donors sort of meddling with academic – the academic mission and – and the answer is no. We shouldn't. I was just talking to one of our colleagues the other day. There was a \$5 million gift on the line, but the person's stipulation was they wanted to be involved in revamping – the donor wanted to be involved in revamping – the doctoral program of this unit, and the program chair said, 'I'm really not comfortable with that.' I said, 'That's really a good answer, because neither am I.' We – we don't let donors get involved in the academic mission. They can designate where they want their gift, as I mentioned earlier, but they don't get involved in choosing their scholarship recipients. They don't get involved in choosing their endowed chair. They don't – they can't shape curriculum. So – I mean – now, they may try. Heh. They may pick up the phone and hound people and say, 'I think we should teach more of X or more of Y, and usually the phrase that a good program chair, department chair, or dean will use is, 'Thank you very much, Mrs. Smith, we'll take that under advisement,' and life goes on. Sometimes, you know, you're going to get good ideas and that's fine. But anyway... So – but they do designate – a lot of that money is pre-designated as to where it goes. About \$64 million of that every year comes into the endowment and another \$94 million last year came off just in in cash to spend to support research and teaching. I'll show you where all that goes in a minute. The endowment pays out just shy of 5% a year for scholarships, endowed chairs, research support and so forth. So total, if you want to think about this is about \$174 million

dollars in private support. That's just a little bit shy of what the state provides the Bloomington campus. So that gives you an idea of kind of the size of – of private support. People ask, where does it go? And what's really kind of cool about it is that a lot of it – as you can see – the bulk of it goes to student support, and faculty research, and faculty support. So if you take a look at it, this really goes to the heart and soul of our academic mission, and – and it really is kind of neat when you talk to donors. This is really what they care most about is faculty research, faculty support, and student access to those – those wonderful resources. Some people ask me once in a while, 'Well, where's the endowment allocated, Dan? Who? Where? Which schools? Which units?' Well, without drilling down, and I'd be happy to do that with anybody who would like, but without drilling down into the actual units, departments, broadly speaking, IU Bloomington has about 45% of that endowment, and then we break apart IUPUI into two pieces, the med school, which is about 30%, and then all other units at IUPUI. And then you can see kind of the regionals have a little and the university holds a little bit. But as you can see, that's kind of how it breaks out. The question always comes up also, 'Well, where does the endowment proceeds go? Where do they go to help IU?' And so, the distribution of endowment income, about \$80 million dollars this year, again, as you can see what's really neat about is – it is squarely in the heart of the academic mission. So about 40% scholarships and then about 36% faculty research, and then 21% for faculty support, this is like endowed chairs and professorships. So if you see, again, it is in two quarters, it's not for buildings. It's – it's largely students and faculty and – and we're going to get to a thought here in a minute on that.

People ask how do we, what goes on in the field for fundraising? I don't want to get bogged down too much in the numbers, but we have right now about 7,000 prospects out there that development officers are calling on. They're – they're courting them, they're asking for support, they're developing relationships. We track this at the Foundation very carefully. The provost, the chancellors, the deans, all get a quarterly report. They're also available online, and we take a look – what we track are how many prospects are we looking at at any time, again, about 7,000. You can see how it's gone up in the last year or so – about 24%. We – we track how many substantive contacts, so how often are these people being called on – and this is a monthly tracking report, so about almost a 1,000 face to face contacts each month as of September – in September. And then we look at what stage of relationship. Is it just relationship development meaning you're having your first cup of coffee or your first dinner together? Or are you at the stage of asking for a gift, and we try to look for kind of a balanced portfolio. One of the challenges that we've had at IU that we're trying to work on – you can see as a percentage, the percent that are at the gift request stage has gone up – is we've been – we have a history – I don't know if it is just nice IU Midwest or what – but we've had trouble asking for money. It's a real problem if you're in development. So – but overall, we're starting to – to elevate that a little bit, and we often times underask, so – so that's coming along nicely. So I

just wanted you to know this is kind of the stuff we track, you know, behind the scenes so that everybody knows kind of what the – the score card is.

So the upcoming campaign – let me put this in – in a broader context. There's something interesting going on in the country right now. Philanthropy as a percent of income has remained relatively stable in recent years, even during the downturn it remained relatively stable as a percent of income. The really interesting news as you can see here is that the percent of philanthropy that's allocated to higher ed has gone up, and it's gone up materially. And as you can see it – it went up from – increased about almost 11% overall while overall giving went up by about 8%. So the question is, why is this happening? And there's two things that seem to be going on. Number one, is a lot of universities have major campaigns going on right now. There was a time when if somebody set a billion dollar campaign that was eye popping. I hate to say it, that's become relatively common. And it's still pretty – pretty amazing, but not unusual. The second thing is there's been a really pronounced shift in the way in which higher education has been marketing itself when it comes to campaigns and even in – in marketing in general. We have taken historically – when I say, "We," I mean higher ed – the tendency to talk to ourselves about ourselves to an art form, and you see now a noticeable shift. Rather than going out and saying, 'Gee, we need scholarships,' or 'we need endowed chairs,' we still ask for support for scholarships, but we start the conversation by talking about how universities create stable communities. Let's take the School of Education. That when you give money for a scholarship at the School of Education, you're not just creating another teacher, you're creating a teacher who creates high school graduates, who go on to create stable, thriving communities, college, and so forth. When we talk about research we talk about the outcomes of your research. The social good that goes on at Indiana University is amazing. You'd be hard pressed to find an institution that does more good for more people on a daily basis. It's really pretty amazing. That's what we talk about – is the work that you do every day. One of the things in this regard as we go into the campaign – and I hope this isn't the first time I get invited back, because I would really like to have a longer time where we could talk about how to market, and how to – how to pursue ideas that you have, and if you want to have that conversation do not hesitate to shoot me an e-mail, we can find a time. But here's what we need from faculty – is ideas that go beyond just traditional funding concepts. So, for example, some of you may know some of the research being done by Bernice, and I am going to always ruin her last name –

[Multiple indistinct comments]

ROBEL: Pescosolido.

SMITH: Thank you. Boy, you're good. I always – I just call her Bernice and so – on stigma. And we talk about this, in that if you can address stigma, and address bullying and so forth, you're

not just addressing stigma you're literally changing lives. Kids go on and commit suicide over it. They're injured on play – it – it – it's a real problem. So the point is – is that – is that she's come up with this thing called the college tool kit to try to start to get students to be more sensitive to stigma surrounding mental illness. It's in a pilot test now. We're taking this out to donors to find ways of finding support to help support her research by helping to fund this college toolbox program. But the money that's raised will support her research. The other thing we need desperately as we go into this campaign are stories of the impact your scholarly work has had. We know it – there's a lot out there. We really want to start promoting the – the impact of the scholarship and the creative activity that goes on at the university.

So in terms of campaign details we're now in the quiet/planning phase. It's a university-wide campaign meaning it will involve Bloomington, IUPUI, and all the regional campuses and we're also coming up with goals right now. You'll hear more about the overall goal, but that's still kind of in the development stage. There'll be a – a public kick off around 2015 in the fall. The campaign will end coincidentally or coinciding with the bicentennial of the university around, you know, at the end of the year in December 2019. In terms of broad priorities, and these are still being worked with, but I think you can find something for a lot of ideas here. The first is around creating global leaders, and again it's not just around study abroad, but around diversity programs and career support, and so forth. There's also obviously right now student success and support is really critical. It's on the front page of every newspaper, with students graduating with debt and without jobs. It's a bad combination, so what can we do to help with that – whoops!

ROBEL: Whoops!

SMITH: Wrong one. I saw the last part. So anyway, we really want to have a section of the campaign focused on research and ideas that transform the way we live. And again, this gets to all the good work that the faculty does. We want to get some funding for endowed chairs, and for research support, and President McRobbie and Provost Robel, and all the chancellors and leaders, generally, we all recognize we – we're really in a good area when it comes to healthcare, whether it's mental health, whether it's public health, whether it's the medical school, our chemistry program, biology, go around the university – we really have a strength in this area of having something to say about improving the health profile of our state and the nation and the world. We want to try to do some things around that. So those are the broad bucket priorities. And I just want to say thanks for your ambassadorship because like I said, when I've been on the road talking to prospective donors you're who they talk about. Thank you. I'll be glad to –

ROBEL: Thank you so much, Dan. [Applause] Well we – we actually have two minutes, if you'd like to ask – thank you so much and thank you very much for everything you're doing to support the work of all of our faculty and our students. It is much, much, much appreciated.

SMITH: Thanks for inviting me, and again – oops! – there's a question.

GLAZEWSKI: Well, I just have a quick question. It strikes me that asking faculty to self-promote or talk about their work is probably one of the things we're least equipped to do, at least in terms of what would garner funding. And so, what are the resources available to kind of know what it is that faculty do that are things that people like to give money to. I think we would all like to know what that direct path is.

SMITH: Yeah, yeah, that's a superb question. And so we actually have a staff – I'm glad you asked that. Just so you know, we have a staff over there in the marketing area of the IU Foundation, that's what they do. They come over. They talk to you. They ask question after question after question, you can speak academic-ese to them, if you want. They'll come back and ask me what does a 2 x 2 cross-sectional experimental field design mean, and I can explain it to them, but – but – well, maybe. But anyway, the point is we'll help you translate that. You'll hear a lot of questions of, so what? So what? Why does that matter? Why does that matter? This is what we did with Bernice and – and it really went well. We're starting those conversations in Geology right now, with Optometry, there's a number of these conversations going around right now and it's a ball. We – we – one of the joys of this right now is we're trying to bring the Foundation into being a helping organization in the day to day life of IU. It's been somewhat of an island over there and we're trying to fix that.

ROBEL: Thank you so much.

SMITH: Anyway – thanks.

TRIX: Could I – ?

SMITH: Oh, sure.

ROBEL: Well, if – if you do, Frances, we'll be off track for the last resolution –

TRIX: It's really short.

ROBEL: – so this is your choice.

SMITH: Okay, and I'll give you a short answer, I promise.

TRIX: Okay, how do you find these donors?

SMITH: How do we find them? [Laughter] You – part of it is, you don't want to know, but we – we have – first of all, the alumni database is very rich and there's all kinds of data analytics on – I mean, start with just the zip codes –

TRIX: Ah.

SMITH: – and you start to get a quick idea of who might be inclined. And also, you know those annoying phone calls you get that interrupt your dinner? Those are often for early donors that haven't been, you know, they've fallen off our radar screen. The second that they hit a certain threshold of giving there – they light up, so to speak, and we start talking to them more directly and more tailored, and that's how it emerges.

TRIX: Thank you.

SMITH: Yeah, there's a whole bunch of other ways, too. But anyway, thanks – thanks, Lauren.

AGENDA ITEM 8: RESOLUTION ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM

ROBEL: Thank you so much, Dan. We have on our agenda for twenty-nine minutes a resolution on academic freedom. While I believe the – the resolution we're considering is in your packet it – as amended by action of October 21st, and I will open the discussion for continued discussion at this point. Jon?

SIMONS: Well, I think people have before them, also circulated, an amendment – a further amendment – so – it's on a white piece of paper. So I'd just like to speak to that briefly.

ROBEL: It has to be proposed and seconded before it becomes – it comes onto the floor. So if you would like to propose it as a motion and then get a second?

SIMONS: I propose it as a motion.

ROBEL: Okay, and this is the small – ?

SPANG: Yeah.

ROBEL: And it's germane to the overall – okay. Is – is it seconded?

LOCHRIE: Seconded.

ROBEL: Okay, thank you.

SIMONS: Well, it might help if I stand up, because it's a bit awkward. Thanks, Craig. Well, firstly I hope that this amendment will not take long to pass because I think what was suggested here is in the spirit of the original resolution so that – just kind of slight points. So the first thing is

about moving the language about schools and departments up to the point where the governance bodies within those are also considered formal bodies. Just, there seemed to be a bit of slippage in the current language as if what, for example, the policy committee of the School of Education was thinking about is not – is not also formal. So that’s just to kind of stress that that’s also formal. And the second point I wanted to make, again, I think, a slight slippage in the language to distinguish between governance bodies such as this one or again a – a – a school policy committee which are elected and have formal kind of rights and responsibilities according to the BFC constitution that they are – they are the kind of primary thing to turn to in terms of faculty authority, they have representative over others and they have the legislative as well as consultative role that – that other kind of informal consultation doesn’t have. So the point of the – of the amendment here is simply to tighten up the language a bit, and I hope it – I know there isn’t formally a kind of friendly amendment –

ROBEL: Nope, there isn’t.

SIMONS: – but that is the way in which this is intended.

ROBEL: Okay. So let’s – let’s open the tradition of you walking the mic to the next person who’s recognized. Discussion on this – this proposed amendment? Okay, the amendment has been proposed and seconded. I’m calling for a vote. All in favor? All opposed? The amendment passes, which takes us back to the circular 89 – or B9-2015.

TANFORD: Point of clarification. The amendment is – the amendment replaces the first paragraph of the main motion, is that correct?

ROBEL: It does. Great. Now – now it’s your turn. [Laughter]

SPANG: [comment indistinct]

ROBEL: Why don’t we wait on – on things like that? Now, coming back to the motion that is on the floor as amended with the replacement of this as the first paragraph. I’ll open it for discussion. Yes?

TANFORD: Figured it’d be the other end of the room.

ROBEL: It’s good for you. Get your fitbit out. [Laughter]

ESTELL: Well, a lot of the language I’ve seen going back and forth, I – sorry I’m at my own little table back here. We seem to be going back and forth on sort of the relative weights of the what are our rights to free speech versus the sort of responsibilities in terms of being accurate and all of those things. And it seemed like a lot of the discussion both online and in this body was going back and forth on should we keep in those paragraphs about “should” in addition to

the paragraphs about “shall” in terms of our rights and things like that in the resolution as it’s sort of picking language from that original policy. But when we were discussing it, it seemed like a lot of people actually liked the original policy as written, especially with the “should”s and “shall”s. So my sort of proposed amendment online if you saw it was basically the point two of this particular resolution would be – instead of quoting parts of the original policy – quoting the entire policy as it is. And basically saying, we are reminding the administration, Trustees, et cetera... everybody that this policy exists, and then maybe putting a little language on there directing the reader of that policy to the “should” and “shall” language. And I’m from Education not Law, but I believe “should” and “shall” have very different meanings legally, and so maybe pointing out the, ‘you shall respect our right to academic freedom,’ and ‘yes, we should be nice when we’re speaking in public,’ but “should” and “shall” are very different things. And, I don’t know, some of the concerns were about what constitutes a community in this current climate. Well, the “should” and “shall” thing might address that a bit. So whatever your particular community should be, be it Twitter, be it, you know, Bloomington, whatever else, you should respect the limits of that community, but you shall not be punished for exercising your academic freedom and your free speech. And so, whatever the definition of community is, we’re still protecting the fact that you shall have the right for academic freedom even if we should be respectful and all that stuff. So I just thought maybe since a lot of people seem comfortable with the original policy as written, instead of trying to excerpt parts of it to emphasize maybe emphasize the entire policy as it was written because it seemed to be very carefully worded in terms of those “should”s and “shall”s. To say, yes, we have a responsibility to be civil as much as we can. At the same time, even if you’re not entirely civil, that does not mean you should incur any penalty for your academic freedom. So I thought that may be one way for us to balance that [comment indistinct] language in terms of our academic freedom versus the civilian aspect, is with the original policy actually seems, as written, to do a pretty good job of that. So don’t excerpt it, just pull the whole thing.

ROBEL: So David would – would your suggestion – I think the – I’d like to know where you go with this in terms of formality. Does that mean that you are suggesting not voting for the proposal as amended, and then we can go back and substitute language? Because the proposal as amended is what’s on the floor –

ESTELL: Okay.

ROBEL: – but it could be amended, as it just was.

ESTELL: David, yeah, I was even the parliamentarian for a semester and here I have no idea. And this was really just a response to the back and forth that was going on on e-mail this morning. And so in terms of official procedures, I’m not sure. It’s just sort of that second point people seemed to be going back and forth on do we include that language or not.

ROBEL: Okay.

ESTELL: I guess I would be – would this be considered an amendment to that second point, or is it down as is and substitute in my proposed – ?

ROBEL: I think what's on the floor right now is this as just amended. And so that's where we – that's where we are. You could – you could propose another amendment that's germane to what's on the floor or you could take the position you just have.

ESTELL: Yeah, I think I'd rather propose an amendment than trying to – because again, I mean with the friendly amendment thing. Part of this is – this is just the idea that occurred to me at like 10AM this morning, and so this is more of discussion issue as it might be some way to balance those competing concerns of we want to reinforce our resolve to support academic freedom but, you know, we've kind of gone back and forth on that "should" language and maybe it's one way to do it. So this isn't – it wasn't intended to be a hard position, but more of a discussion.

ROBEL: Okay.

ESTELL: So I guess amendment to that second piece.

ROBEL: Alright, other discussion that – on what's on the floor?

SHERMAN: [comment indistinct]

SPANG: [comment indistinct] did you propose?

SEIGEL: I just wanted to speak to David's proposal. Is that okay, Lauren? Or – ? I don't know [comment indistinct]

SANDERS: Well [comment indistinct]

ROBEL: There's actually not a proposal on the floor.

SANDERS: David, yeah. We need to either – we need either to move an amendment or not.

ROBEL: Yeah, either – either – you can either take the position that you will at the future move an amendment, or that we should not vote for this and you will substitute something later I think is where we are procedurally. So if you want to speak to what is on the floor, which is this as amended, and David if you'd like to work on your potential amendment –

ESTELL: Yeah, I'd say keep it and – because we can propose an amendment in the future, rather than we – or I – propose that amendment, somebody comes up with a better idea, we keep re-

amending, because maybe this is an ongoing discussion about a future amendment that I will [comment indistinct]

ROBEL: Okay, so there's no –

ESTELL: [comment indistinct] have enough to propose.

ROBEL: – there's no amendment on the floor. What's on the floor is this proposal as – as amended by what John – what you voted for earlier.

SEIGEL: I guess all I have to say then is just that I agreed with what David wrote earlier in his message to us all, and that it seems like the resolution that's on the floor, which is the product of a lot of thoughtfulness, an amendment is consistent with the general suggestion, David. And so I guess what I'm saying is that I urge people to consider this amendment as compatible with that one rather than trying to vote this one down and put another one on table yesterday – in – in the future, especially because we've had such trouble getting enough time to discuss this fully. I think we should move forward with what we have instead of creating more reasons to delay.

ROBEL: John?

PAOLILLO: I just want to encourage us to move expeditiously on a, you know, proposed language that – being this one before us now – as a resolution on academic freedom, and the reason is because there was in the time since we have last discussed this, there was a very acute circumstance that arose for certain faculty members in my school whose research project of several years came under criticism from the United States legislature – members of the legislature – when – once it had been misrepresented in the popular press. And had we acted at an earlier time they might have been a little bit more bolstered, the morale could have been improved by knowing that this Council stood behind their work as an expression of their academic freedom of speech.

ROBEL: Thank you. Jamie?

PRENKERT: I'd like to raise a question about the second paragraph under "Resolved:" the first sentence where it says, "Faculty have the same right and duty as all other citizens to participate in debates, matters of public concern, including the right to express unpopular opinions." I'm not sure that that sentence has meaning any more as the resolution is amended. There is no duty language in the resolution anymore, so it's not clear what duty it refers to. And, in fact, I take the amender's position to be that in fact faculty have a different right than what the general public does, or as all other citizens do. And so I'm not sure what this sentence means

and I think that actually goes in some part to the heart of the conversation that Steve and Ben had on e-mail today.

ROBEL: Alright.

SEIGEL: I – I think the way I understand that sentence is simply that faculty have the right and duty to participate. Not to participate in any one way, but that what we really value is engagement.

SIMONS: Yeah, I agree with Micol there. I think that there's a – a slight confusion that's involved in what we're talking about, because it's a complex issue. And that's – there's a difference between talking about academic freedom, and there's a difference about talking about our freedom as citizens to speak, and so I think the first sentence is less about the question of academic freedom, and more about the freedom of us as people who happen to academics or public employees and whether – whether we're basically – I'll put it this way. Are we allowed to Tweet the way that other people Tweet or not? Are there extra burdens on us because we're academics about the way we Tweet? And I don't think we really want to go that way in terms of suggesting that we have to Tweet in a different way than other people do, because it – first of all, it just – there are – there are no rules about Tweeting anyway. It's kind of an emerging media. People are doing what they want. And in terms of the way it worked in a kind of what's the appropriate restraint on Twitter, I – that's very hard to say. When it's rude place, and it's even sometimes abusive, and therefore kind of saying what's appropriate to a kind of an emerging medium is very hard to say. And – and basically, I think it comes down to issues that are kind of about public culture. And yes, there's – there's a kind of a growing sense within a – a kind of an atmosphere of trial by social media that someone who is a member of an organization in – in some way represents it, can then be held responsible for the image of that organization. So just going back to what we're talking about before, that means like would a student athlete who says something out of turn, out of place, then be held responsible for the image of IU? And I think our answer had to be, well, they're students so we don't hold them responsible in – in – in terms of what they say. We may say it's inappropriate, but that's within the confines of this – of this institution. So really, I don't think we want to go that way of kind of saying that we want to – that the Tweets of us as academics are going – should be subject to a higher standard than any other – any other Tweets of citizens or non-citizens and it's, again, I kind of said this last time, the community that we're talking about is not a local Bloomington community. It's a kind of – it's a global network community, and it has very few rules to be kept.

ROBEL: I think Steve – Steve was next in the queue.

SIMONS: Sorry, I was – had my back to you, Steve.

SANDERS: I'm actually, since there seem to be a lot of people who liked what David suggested, I am going to attempt to – to actually offer an amendment that I think is consistent with what David said, and that would be to keep – just looking at numerated paragraph two. Keeping the first sentence – I appreciate Jamie's concern – but also John's response and the amendment would change the language that says – it would simply say we underscore the IU Policy on Academic Freedom which has been repeatedly affirmed by the Board of Trustees and faculty councils, and which is available at ACA-32, and we could insert the relevant website. We're not picking and choosing. We're not editing. We're not endorsing particular parts and leaving out other parts. We're simply underscoring and reaffirming the existing, written policy available lots of different places on the web of Indiana University related to academic freedom. And so hopefully that's clear enough and I so move.

MULTIPLE UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUALS: Second.

ROBEL: Okay, will you read back please the – the amendment.

SANDERS: Yes, okay. Looking at the last paragraph the change would be after the words, "affirmed by the Board of Trustees and faculty councils, which may be found at... and we can simply insert as a clerical matter the relevant website address on the policies.iu.edu address. It is called ACA-32. I will read the entire policy if you want, but in the interest of time I think we've all looked at it and we seem familiar with it.

BAILEY: Point – point of clarification. Would that – would that still include no limitation shall be placed upon the teachers and that was in the original – oh, okay.

SANDERS: That – that language is in the policy itself.

BAILEY: It will remain in the policy.

ROBEL: Yeah.

SANDERS: Absolutely.

ROBEL: Alright, moved and second?

KARTY: Point of clarification, Provost Robel. Basically that means everything below – "and which states" – everything else is now gone.

SANDERS: That's right. And it's simply being replaced –

KARTY: There's going to be a link to ACA-32.

SANDERS: – with a citation to ACA-32.

KARTY: Making sure that we are all cool with it.

BAILEY: But – but the current sentence –

ROBEL: Wait, wait, wait, wait, wait. I just want to be sure. I want Rebecca to be able to take minutes. It's important to the transparency with your colleagues that this be clear and we not speak over each other. Okay, so –

BAILEY: I just – I had a question about what was just –

ROBEL: And I'd like to recognize you for that question. I just want to be sure that Rebecca has what she needs in order to be accurate.

SPANG: Yep, yep.

ROBEL: Okay, now, Marlon. Thank you.

BAILEY: So my question is, would that mean that the last sentence that is currently stricken – or striked out – would that mean that that would be reinserted – that would remain struck?

SANDERS: No, that – that – that is part of the academic freedom policy that exists right now at Indiana University. We would simply be reaffirming the entire policy as written.

BAILEY: And through reaffirmation you would be re-entering this – this stricken –

SHERMAN: Not in the resolution [comment indistinct]

SANDERS: We refer to the policy, which does include that particular sentence.

SHERMAN: But that sentence wouldn't appear in the resolution.

ROBEL: I – I really need people to – to follow the rules here. Okay, let's see, Rae?

GREINER: I think this might be clarifying. So in our – in one of our previous BFC meetings we voted to strike that sentence even though it does appear in the official UFC policy. So the resolution and the UFC policy would not have matched and not have been identical, and my thought was that we voted in that way precisely because we wanted to take a stronger stand or use a bit of stronger language around the support and commitment to faculty speech, et cetera... as has already been expressed, and that the reason that we wanted to strike that sentence out from our resolution – we cannot of course take it out of UFC policy, but to link to that UFC policy would thereby mean an endorsement of the final sentence which this body did previously already vote to remove from the resolution. So I don't know if that's clarifying at all.

ROBEL: So you're speaking against the amendment that's on the floor.

GREINER: Well, I'm just –

BAILEY: We voted to remove it.

GREINER: – I'm just pointing out that were we to adopt Steve's amendment we would in effect be restoring language that is granted in the UFC policy to the resolution sort of implicitly –

ROBEL: I think it's really clarifying when you get to the, you know, as you go through what you're saying just to say, 'and therefore I'm for or against' –

GREINER: Right, so I would therefore be against –

ROBEL: Thank you.

GREINER: – linking to – and for a second reason – if I may just add – I also don't think it's effective to say, 'Click here.' I don't know that anybody will. I would rather see us just make some strong statement one way or the other, rather than have a kind of link or something. I'm already sick of clicking [comment indistinct].

ROBEL: Okay. Can we get – can we get some broader input from the Council please, people who have not spoken but wish to speak?

SPANG: Cassidy.

ROBEL: Okay, Cassidy?

SEIGEL: Lauren, are you taking a queue?

ROBEL: I – I am taking a queue, but I'm trying to be able to see people in the back, which I haven't been able to see.

CASSIDY: I – I think what Rae brings up here is a really good conversation, whether we're actually trying to deliberate on whether we agree and want to reaffirm ACA-32 or not. In which case, we should be discussing ACA-32. This resolution as it states is a reaffirmation of that policy. That policy is a whole policy. We can't choose to reaffirm parts of that policy. So the conversation, I think, should be either about ACA-32, if that is something that does not resonate with us, that we do not want to reaffirm, then we shouldn't actually have this resolution on the table at all. So in closing, I am in complete support of reaffirming the policy as it states now, but if that is something that people are uncomfortable with, rather than meddling with the language of this resolution, I think a more productive use of our time would be to move forward on looking at ACA-32 in its totality.

ROBEL: Thank you, and then – let’s see – I don’t think, you have spoken. Yeah, you’re not David.

SCHOTT: I am not David Fisher, no. Jeremy Schott for – for David Fisher. As I understand this resolution this is – the – the preamble’s important. This is – this is a resolution made in response to specific present circumstances and the point of the – the point of the resolution is to highlight specific elements of the existing policy. So I’m against the – against the – the – the amendment.

ROBEL: Amendment on the floor.

SCHOTT: Yeah.

ROBEL: Great. Let’s see, I think Herb hasn’t spoken yet and Bradley hasn’t spoken yet.

TERRY: Yeah, I – I would support what Cassidy had to say. That – that if we really object to the University Faculty Council policy we – and the Trustees policy – we should at some point adopt a resolution saying that needs to be changed. But absent that, I think picking and choosing, and that sort of thing is – is for the reasons in part that Steve outlined in his e-mails early this morning, unproductive. And I actually fear it weakens our protection for academic freedom and for expression. The present policy is awfully strong, if it’s just read in its, you know – in — in good faith and I – I think – I would not even support amending the UFC policy, but I am very confident that the UFC and the Trustees – you do not want the UFC and the Trustees reopening any amendment of that policy. Not in the current climate.

ROBEL: So I think Bradley’s next in the queue, and then Alex, and then I think Micol, and then Marlon.

LEVINSON: I think it’s pretty clear that the Salaita affair is – is weighing heavily on our consciences, and in that case, as was mentioned, it was about a person’s speech outside of the – the exercise of his professorial duties as an employee of Virginia Tech or Illinois or whatever. And so what troubles me the most about the policy is precisely the mention of the community and the ambiguity about what the community refers to. About whether that community refers to the academic community at Indiana University or in a much broader sense. So where I stand on this amendment is I would only want to vote in favor of it if I – if I sensed that there was going to be a – a groundswell of interest in actually addressing and changing the wording of that policy to specify what is meant by “community,” and limit that sense of community where we commit ourselves to so called accuracy, restraint, and so forth to our – our IU community and not to our expression of opinion as citizens more broadly.

ROBEL: Okay, I think it’s Alex next, and I will remind everyone it’s 5:26.

TANFORD: I'll be really brief. I am opposed to the amendment. Not every resolution that we pass has to address everything. The reason for this particular proposal being brought was because there was a perception among a number – a number of us that there was in the current political climate an attack, particularly on academic freedom and academic outspokenness, and positions that people took on controversial issues. We don't have to address civic responsibility because there is no current issue or attack on civic responsibility. So I think that we've got a little bit of apple and oranges here. This is not an attempt to rewrite the university policy. The growth – the reason for this – was because they thought part of that policy needed to be reaffirmed in a public statement.

ROBEL: The next person is Micol. I'll remind you it's 5:27.

SEIGEL: Yeah. I'm opposed to the amendment because I think it distorts David's intention, the – which was to affirm the entire policy, but to emphasize, and here I'm reading from his e-mail, "its careful use of SHALL and SHOULD throughout to place the emphasis on freedom of expression first and foremost... with civility/responsibility/etc. being strongly encouraged, but not of equal importance..." And so because the amendment fails to make that distinction and because the resolution on the floor in front of us does make that distinction, I – I oppose Steve's amendment and support the – the amendment that is before – the resolution as amended before us.

ROBEL: Marlon would you like to speak or do you want to vote on stuff?

BAILEY: I – I think I'm going – I'm going to call for – can we vote? Because I – I support the resolution as – as it is.

ROBEL: Okay, so that what's on the – the table right now is a vote on the resol – on the motion to amend, which has been made and seconded. Steve's amendment. Okay, may I ask all in favor to please indicate by raising your hands really high, okay. And I want, in fact, I want to be really careful here because... [provost counts vote]. Do you want people to stand? Mine is up as well.

DETHLOFF: Oh, 36 I have.

ROBEL: We have 36?

SPANG: Do we need somebody else to count?

ROBEL: Or we could stand which would be easier, I think. Why don't you stand if your hand is up? Thank you. Now, let's try it. Would you like us to count off Craig, we could do that, too.

DETHLOFF: 36.

ROBEL: 36, okay.

SPANG: Good job, Craig.

ROBEL: Opposed please stand. [Provost counts vote] 13. The motion carries. Let's move on to the resolution as amended. I think we can vote, folks.

SEIGEL: Can we propose the – another amendment along the lines of –

ROBEL: It's 5:30, you're going to have to move unanimously to continue the meeting.

SEIGEL: I move to continue the meeting.

SHERMAN: We have Herb's thing to do.

SPANG: We have to go to Herb's reception.

ROBEL: We have to go Herb's reception. So we can either vote, which I think we can do in the remaining minute or we can vote unanimously to continue the meeting.

SPANG: Or continue the discussion at another meeting?

ROBEL: Or –

SEIGEL: [comments indistinct]

ROBEL: Okay, there's – there's a resolution on the floor as amended. I would like those in favor of it please, again, to stand. Would you like us to count off? It could be a community builder.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: We can have – can we have now the amendment as – that we are voting on read, before we vote?

SHERMAN: We voted on the amendment.

ROBEL: We did vote on the amendment.

SPANG: "We underscore the IU policy on academic freedom, which has been repeatedly affirmed by the Board of Trustees and faculty councils, and which may be found at 'link' ACA-32."

ROBEL: Okay. Have you got a number?

DETHLOFF: 36.

ROBEL: Okay. All opposed? 12. Okay, the resolution as amended carries.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Uh, abstentions?

ROBEL: I'll take an abstention, okay, there's Alex. We are now, I believe, adjourned so that we can go celebrate Herb Terry, which will be in the Federal Room.

MEETING ADJOURNED: 5:30PM