

Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
April 3, 2012
IMU Georgian Room
3:30 P.M. - 5:30 P.M.

Attendance

MEMBERS PRESENT: Randy Arnold, Abhijit Basu, Bonnie Brownlee, Carolyn-Calloway Thomas, LaNita Campbell, Shu Cole, David Estell, Tony Fargo, Pnina Fichman, Jeffery Gershman, Thomas Gieryn, Donald Gjerdingen, Cassandra Guarino, Lesa Hatley Major, Bruce Jaffee, Edwin Jimenez, Padraic Kenney, Susan Kovacich, Rebecca Manring, Jane McLeod, Patricia McManus, Sherri Michaels, John Paolillo, James Perry, Mary Popp, Dot Porter, Patricia Riesenman, Lauren Robel, Bret Rothstein, John Schilb, Jim Sherman, Marietta Simpson, Sarita Soni, Geoff Sprinkle, Sonya Stephens, H. Wayne Storey, William Swanson, Herbert Terry, Francis Trix, Barbara Vance, Edward Vasquez, Maxine Watson, William Wheeler

MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT: Moira Marsh (Luis A. Gonzalez), Sima Setayeshgar (Jon Urheim), Jason Turner (James Ferguson)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Joyce Byrer, Kevin Courtney, Constantine Deliyannis, Gregory Demas, Mark Deuze, Matthew Guterl, T. Scott Herring, Robert Jacobs, Justin Kingsolver, Michael McRobbie, Elizabeth Raff, Deanna Reising, Grant Simpson, Andrea Singer,

GUESTS: Alan Bender, Steve Burns, Kirsten Clark, Craig Dethloff (Faculty Council Office), Harold Evans, Dennis Groth, Roger Levesque, Barbara Wallace (Faculty Council Office)

Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/minutes/11-12/03.20.12.pdf>
2. Executive Committee Business (10 minutes)
(Faculty President Carolyn Calloway-Thomas)
3. Presiding Officer's Report (10 minutes)
(Interim Provost Lauren Robel)
4. Question / Comment Period¹

¹ Faculty who are not members of the Faculty Council and who wish to address questions to Interim Provost Robel or President Calloway-Thomas should submit their questions to the

5. Mass Email Policy (20 minutes)

(Professor Hal Evans, Chair of the Technology Policies Committee) [FIRST READING]

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/11-12/B41-2012.pdf>

http://hep.physics.indiana.edu/~hgevans/tpc/mass_email/best_practices.html

6. Policy on Financial Conflicts of Interest in Research (20 minutes)

(Professor Steve Burns, Chair of the Research Affairs Committee) [DISCUSSION]

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY12/U10-2012.pdf>

7. Education Policies Draft Policy on Online Course Evaluations (35 minutes)

(Professor Padraic Kenney, Chair of the Educational Policies Committee) [SECOND READING]

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/11-12/B40-2012REV.pdf>

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/11-12/auxiliary/ItemExecSummary.pdf>

8. Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion Review at Indiana University Bloomington
(20 minutes)

(Professor Tom Gieryn, Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs) [DISCUSSION]

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/11-12/auxiliary/PTGuidelines.pdf>

Minutes

AGENDA ITEM 1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: That was a pleasurable activity. We'll try it again. The provost is on her way, but we thought we might expedite matters if we got started, so the first item on the agenda is approval of the minutes. Can we get a motion to approve the minutes? Second? All those persons in favor of approving the minutes, please signify by saying "aye." [Aye]. All those opposed say "nay." [Silence]. So the minutes have been approved. Okay.

AGENDA ITEM 2: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE BUSINESS

I only have a few items for our consideration this afternoon, and the lead category is the beautiful fact that we do not have to vote today because we have two individuals who received the highest number of tallies, and who have agreed to run for President-elect of the BFC, and

Faculty Council Office. Our documents are available at: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/>. To send e-mail to the Faculty Council Office: bfcoff@indiana.edu

they are John Paolillo and Herb Terry. Please raise your hands so—yes. [Applause] We really thank you. We really do thank you for accepting this important assignment so we're giving a shout out to you both.

I'm also pleased to report that the UFC Reform document that we labored over for such a long time was voted on and passed at last Tuesday's UFC meeting. This is especially good news, as you know, and at the end of this meeting, we will have an opportunity for those of you who have any questions that you'd like to put to members of the UFC regarding the Constitution, which will be voted on in April or early May. Please stay at the end for that activity. The Constitution and the reform document itself will come before the Council in April or May for votes. So be watchful of that. The UFC Benefits Committee will meet on Monday, which is April 9th, and we have a special website for committee members that is being launched and we, just this week, received a pile of—of information that will populate that site. And finally, on April 17th, at the last meeting of the Council, the Affirmative Action Officer, Julie Knost, will report on what's happening on the campus in terms of the number of tenure faculty we have, the number of minority faculty members we have, gains and losses, and how we compare with our CIC institutions. So those are the items that I had for discussion today. Next is Provost Lauren. She's not here, so I suppose now we wait.

DETHLOFF: —We can have that discussion on the—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —Okay—

DETHLOFF: —UFC now.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Yes, yes a good idea. Have you any questions concerning the Constitutional revisions and changes. If so, this would be a good time for us to address those. Everyone has a copy of the Constitution, and they are really slight modifications, as you can see—basically name changes. One important change that should claim your attention is that the co-Secretaries of the UFC will no longer automatically come from Indiana University Bloomington and IUPUI. That is left open, so please note that. I think that's the most significant change to the document.

UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER: Where is that?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: 4.4, section 4.4. These pages are not—but it says at the bottom, University Faculty Council shall have two co-Secretaries who must be from different campuses of the university, and it used to stipulate that the individuals should come from IUB and IUPUI. Yes?

WHEELER: Just a second for clarification—so, the timeline of this is that at some point of time this goes for a vote by the faculty as a whole—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —The entire faculty, yes—

WHEELER: —of the university as a whole—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —yes—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —and the point in time after that if it's approved, then when does this take place?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: It's supposed to take effect immediately upon approval, yes—

WHEELER: —upon approval?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Upon approval, yes.

WHEELER: And do you expect to have that vote this spring?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Yes, in April or May. It depends on how soon all the councils have their open hearings. As soon as they have the open hearings, we're ready to present the Constitution to the membership for a vote.

WHEELER: When are we having ours?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: We're having it now. Hello, Bill. [Laughter]

WHEELER: Glad to have that corrected.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Yes?

TERRY: Even if you haven't looked at the document, it's also intended to make the University Faculty Council smaller than it has been. It disenfranchises a fair number of administrators, of chancellors at regional campuses, and that sort of thing, who often didn't appear or participate, and were part of the problem of the Council often not getting a quorum, so it could conduct business. It changes the student membership slightly than what it was. The most substantial changes are actually in the Bylaws which the UFC has the power to adopt. The Bylaws will empower the Executive Committee to take some actions that in the past have been taken by the full Council, but they will require—Carolyn, what is it, once a year or once a semester—meetings of the full Council? I can't remember.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Once per year.

TERRY: Once per year?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: But please note, Herb, that the members of this Council have already seen the UFC reform document, and they've already voted on it, and approved that. I just wanted to make certain that everybody is mindful.

TERRY: So that—the constitutional changes are pretty minor—it's the changes in the Bylaws that will really effectuate many of the hoped efficiencies of the UFC.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Thank you. Alright, our provost has arrived. Are other concerns, questions, issue, commentaries—

TERRY: —about the Constitution.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —speeches with regard to the Constitution?

ROBEL: And not more generally speaking.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Terrific, yes, the gavel is yours.

AGENDA ITEM 3: PRESIDING OFFICER'S REPORT

ROBEL: The gavel is mine. Well good! I went over to the business school. Luckily, the—and dragged the vice provost with me over to the business school, but luckily did manage to pick up one of your members over there and bring him back. So I apologize for that.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: For bringing him back?

ROBEL: No. [Laughter] For the long route by which I—I will go to the ends of the campus, Carolyn, to make sure that everyone who's supposed to be in this room, is in this room! I—and I think my lateness has probably caused me to forfeit what would otherwise be my ten minutes of time, particularly given the large number of cases. I will just say one quick thing about promotion and tenure cases for this year because that is a big piece of what I've been spending my time on, and delightfully so. It's wonderful to read people's accomplishments in this way. There were—there were forty-seven tenure cases, and twenty-seven promotion cases, and they—I think that this [indistinct comment] to our President, but I will note that on tenure this year, fifty-five percent of the tenure cases were women, which I just think is a moment that we ought to note as we move along. It's a really—just an interestingly kind of wonderful milestone for us, and on that, I think I'll just stop, and—because you have a mass, mass agenda. Yes?

TRIX: What percent of the promotions were there?

ROBEL: Well, let me check. Uh, twenty-five percent.

TRIX: That's where we've been for a long time.

ROBEL: Okay. So that—but—on the other, it's good news.

TRIX: It's not improvement, though.

PERRY: Fifty-five percent will eventually be—

GIERYN: —but it basically does reflect the pattern of recruitment over time. If you think that people coming up for promotion to full are at a later life-stage, if I felt that it really was a reflection of the sum judgments about the capabilities of associate professors who happen to be women, I would report that to the provost. It's not the case. It's simply reflecting the demography, and the age and gender distribution of the faculty.

TRIX: But we should be aware of it.

ROBEL: But let's celebrate the other two, Frances, I think. I think that would be a lovely thing as well. So, comment and question, anything that needs to come up at this point? Bill?

AGENDA ITEM 4: QUESTION / COMMENT PERIOD

WHEELER: I would like to make a motion concerning the order on the agenda. It seems to me that two very contentious issues concerning the policy on online course questionnaires, one of which is whether student surveys and evaluations should be used in tenure, promotion and merit reviews. That's really more an issue concerning the campus guidelines for tenure and promotion, than an issue concerning the online course questionnaires, which is really more—that policy is really more concerned with how to handle the data that comes from the questionnaires, rather than how that data is used. And so I would like to move to switch the order of items seven and eight. With eight being restricted to specifically the section of the two paragraphs in the guidelines concerning assessment of learning outcomes and student course evaluations because our Vice Provost Gieryn has indicated that he would appreciate a bit more time to [indistinct comment] to discuss the rest of the document, but I think it's important that we go ahead and discuss the issue of the role of student surveys and evaluations for content—[indistinct comment] promotion and tenure before we turn to the much more limited scope of the policy on online course questionnaires. So may I please move to switch the order accordingly?

ROBEL: There's a motion.

TERRY: I'll second.

ROBEL: Second. Discussion? This is a procedural motion, do we really need a discussion? Yeah, Frances?

TRIX: I just have a point that I kind of thought—I support this, but I would actually make it even stronger. I think item number eight, which is people may not even see on the back, I would rather bring that up to five. That just seems so important. I'm not really very interested in mass email policy. Five and six seem tedious.

ROBEL: Well, perhaps we can move through them quickly then, but yeah.

WHEELER: If I can speak on behalf of the Executive Committee. You know, item number five was on the agenda last time, and it was actually skipped so that we could have a little extra time for the questionnaire issue, and it may be very quick to do.

TRIX: So we could—could we do five and six quickly?

WHEELER: And six is something that we have to get done because otherwise it's going to be out of compliance with government regulations over the summer, causing massive problems.

TRIX: I yield to—

WHEELER: —so hopefully they are short. Hopefully they will short—be short, and we can—

ROBEL: So the motion is simply to—and second, that we just switch the agenda items. Can we do that by consent? Yeah. Okay, thank you. Let's see if we can move through the things that were left from last time—the start—unless there's something else. Okay. Herb?

TERRY: I'd just like to ask one question that at an early UFC meeting, I asked President McRobbie what the schedule was going to be to name a search committee and get a permanent provost. I'm wondering what that schedule is.

ROBEL: I think you should ask the President again.

TERRY: And that's what I would recommend we do and find out. But that's an important issue for this campus and I would hope that the Council would decide to ask for instance what's up with that.

ROBEL: Okay, thank you, Herb. Mass email policy, this comes to us from the Technology Policies Committee, and who's presenting it? Hal?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Hal is.

ROBEL: Where is Hal? Oh, here he is.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Making his way.

ROBEL: Thank you, Hal.

AGENDA ITEM 5: MASS EMAIL POLICY

EVANS: So, I'm going to try to be short here. This has been going on for a very long time, and I think we should—we should finish off. We presented a zeroth reading, I guess, in October of a policy that'd been redrafted from the original 2009 policy, and the redrafting started very shortly after the 2009 policy was approved, so this has been ongoing for several years. The current policy that you have before you has two major changes based on the comments that we received during the—during the reading in October, and we thank everybody for all the very helpful comments and insightful comments that they made on the initial draft of the policy. The two major changes are, first of all, the—the definition of mass email has been substantially altered. In the previous version, it was—a mass email was any email that was sent to ten percent of say faculty or ten percent or more of students. That's now been changed so that the only emails that are covered by this policy are emails sent out to what we kind of clumsily referred to as officially administered email lists. If anyone has a better name for this, please let us know. So—so those are the only emails that are—that are now covered in this policy, and it has essentially become a policy to tell you how you'll request access to those officially administered email lists. Then the second change that's been—that was made to the policy with respect to the one that you saw in October, is that the section on sanctions has been removed because there's no need for sanctions. This is purely an informative policy.

So I don't—in the name of taking the smallest amount of time possible, I think that's all I'll say, and I'll open up for questions or comments from anyone else.

ROBEL: Comments, questions? Randy?

ARNOLD: The document—the policy refers a lot to the best practices. My assumption is that we can update the best practices document without needing further approval, but the policy will remain constant. Is that the way it should work?

EVANS: That's the intent, and we've been working with UITS to get a first draft—well, we have a first draft of the best practices, but to get a more complete first draft of the best practices, but I think the policy can go online without the best practices being fully complete since it is an evolving document.

ROBEL: Other comments for anybody? Alright, this is a first reading so it comes back, right? Thank you for your patience and hard work. This is a tough one. Alright. The next item is the policy on financial conflicts of interest in research, and it's coming through Steve Burns, Chair of the Research Affairs Committee. Where's Steve?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Perhaps he thought we were going to be—

ROBEL: —Slower?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Slower than—yeah. So he'll probably come in.

ROBEL: Okay. So, is there anyone else? I guess there's no one else from Research Affairs. Okay, we'll put that on hold, and then by consent, we'll move on to guidelines for tenure and promotion review. And that will be Tom.

AGENDA ITEM 8: GUIDELINES FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEW AT INDIANA UNIVERSITY BLOOMINGTON

GIERYN: I appreciate the restrictions that Bill placed on the discussion, focusing exclusively on the discussion of online course evaluations as it pertains to P and T guidelines, however, I really must give a brief preamble about this document, and that will, of necessity, take me into other areas. Depending on when you went up for tenure and/or promotion, you might remember this, the Tenure and Promotion Handbook. If it was more recent, you might remember the guidelines that are online now and have been around for at least ten or fifteen years. It's been that long—this book, by the way, is out of print, but was in print from 1999. We haven't taken a look at the guidelines for promotion and tenure in at least fifteen years. Our office, with encouragement from the provost's office—Karen Hanson, in this case—decided that it was high time to do so. The document you have before you is different from these predecessors, largely because they speak not just to the construction of the dossier and documentation of achievements, but they speak also to the procedures that are used, not the expectations and criteria so much as how we review candidates for promotion and tenure. Emphatically, the document that I'm bringing to the Faculty Council is not a policy document. Neither of these documents were ever brought to the Faculty Council as far as we can tell, and you've searched the record, Craig, but I've been told by Susan McCammon that none of these predecessor documents were brought to the Faculty Council.

I'm bringing this document to the Faculty Council because I'm committed to shared governance, and I would like to have the input from faculty, but, having said that, this is an administrative document. It is a set of guidelines. It is in the category of information that we routinely provide at workshops for chairs and for faculty members who are coming up for tenure and promotion. It's not—it's not a set of faculties—of policies. As such, it's my understanding that the Faculty Council is welcome to make suggestions, and, indeed, I welcome them, but this is not a document that will be voted on by the Faculty Council, and we've reviewed that set of circumstances with the Executive Committee.

When we looked at other peer universities, in terms of how they handle this kind of help; some universities have two quite separate sets of documents, a set of documents for candidates and a set of documents for review committees. We didn't see the value in that because, it seems to

me that each of the those parties is going to want to know what the other knows, so we've written a set of guidelines that is meant to be useful, both for candidate for promotion and tenure, and all of the people who are involved in reviewing them, faculty committees, as well as administrators. One of the reasons why we decided now to undertake this revision, the academy has changed in dramatic ways. I need not rehearse all of that. Among other things, we've got a New Academic Directors proposal, in which that committee and the President recommended, among other things, that we consider changes in the world of scholarship; for example, removing barriers to interdisciplinary research. To our knowledge, we've never had the word interdisciplinary in any of our documents pertaining to promotion and tenure. It's probably time we address the issue along with many other issues that you can read in the document that try to take account of changes in the way we do scholarship and the organization of the university and so forth.

So, the document I bring to you is for your comment. It is very much a document in flux. It's being read by administrators. I hope it will be read by faculty when we get a further along draft. I intend to put it on our website, and let people comment as they will. Now, let's go to the paragraph in question. It's on page seven of the document. It's under a section called "Considerations," and I need to say a word about that. It's called "Considerations," because these discussions are matters that we are suggesting to both review bodies, administrators, and the candidates to consider as they go about their work, either preparing a dossier or reviewing a candidate. They are not explicit in our policy necessarily, but matters of consideration. On student course evaluations, I was asked to read the paragraph. Would you like me to do that?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Please.

GIERYN: "Judgments about teaching effectiveness cannot be reduced to a single indicator or measure. Quantitative data from student course evaluations should be interpreted in the context of other materials assembled to document pedagogical achievements, and should not be given greater weight. Student course evaluations may be most useful for tracking improvements over time, and especially for identifying teaching problems, and measuring the impact of efforts to solve them. Statistical data should be presented in a summary spreadsheet or graph showing core semester year results on core survey items, enabling trends, and comparisons to norm groups to be easily discerned." I should say that since Vice Provost Stephens and I co-chaired the committee on the online course evaluation that this paragraph was written and meant to dovetail with the efforts to develop the online course evaluation.

ROBEL: And these, just to be—just to set the context, the promotion and tenure rules for each school and the College, are adopted by the faculty. So this is a guideline document to help us in our work in evaluating people under the standards that are adopted within each of our faculties, okay?

GIERYN: Absolutely.

SCHILB: I don't see how that paragraph dovetails with this, and I [indistinct comment] can't help referring to the online course questionnaire sheet. Because that sort of muddies the waters of discussion by—I don't see how it dovetails with item number five about student return questions. If it is recommended that students have available about an instructor, whether a student would recommend the course, whether a student would recommend an instructor and the student's estimation of workload, I don't see how that dovetails with the statement, "Judgments about teaching effectiveness cannot be reduced to a single indicator or measure." Student course evaluations may be most useful, not for evaluating—telling students, you know, how to be good shoppers of courses, but for tracking improvements over time, and especially for identifying teaching problems and measuring the impact of efforts to solve them. I do not see the spirit—I actually do approve of this, Tom, but I don't see it dovetailing with item number five, student return questions.

ROBEL: Bill?

WHEELER: I had a question of Tom. One has to remember the student return questions are not part of the tenure and promotion dossier. They do not go into that, and they are not supposed to. And in fact right now, an individual faculty member could, if he or she chose to put them in there, but the recommendation would be that they should not. There are problems that could cause, in particular, the only things that are—when, you know, one has to attend to the sentence that says results on core survey items, and the core survey items that are being referred to, you know, in that paragraph that Tom read, that said, "results on core survey items," and the core survey items are the ones that were on the item—the executive summary that was distributed at the last meeting. So that's the only way that dovetails, that there are different categories of questions, and the part that the online survey that will dovetail with this would be the ones that are listed in that one, not the student return questions.

SCHILB: But the thinking identified in this, I—I disagree. The thinking identified here, "Judgments about teaching cannot be reduced to a single indicator or measure," does not dovetail with the recommendation that students have available answers, among other questions, whether a student would recommend the instructor. That does not comport with the principles articulated there. It really doesn't dovetail—

WHEELER: —It's unrelated, they're completely separate. You know, that is to say, you know, there is a portion on the questionnaire that is concerned with tenure and promotion, there's a question of the questionnaire that may be concerned with General Education. There may be a section concerned with campus environment. There may be a section concerned with student return issues, and—and so the dovetailing is not from—to the whole questionnaire, there may

be questions of departments and schools, and other sources, so it's not supposed to dovetail with that, and the student return questions, you know, are not supposed to be part of the tenure review process.

SCHILB: Well, I don't want to keep reiterating. We're going back and forth. I've expressed my position. I think the word "dovetail" is very misleading.

WHEELER: Well, we'll have—I think we'll have a chance to discuss—

SCHILB: —I think we will.

ROBEL: Alright...

WHEELER: The question that I want to put to Tom myself is one of the new faculty members in my department, Mathematics, has very strongly voiced the view that the research on course evaluations does not support—support the validity for use in—in tenure and promotion reviews, and I wonder if I could ask you, perhaps, to respond to that particular issue that Professor Livingston has raised.

GIERYN: No, I think it's a question of how student course evaluation materials are used in promotion and tenure decision. If we reduce the judgment of teaching down to a single indicator, and said if you don't get above a whatever on this score, or you're not effective or you're not excellent, I'd agree with you completely. Can student course evaluations be useful in assessing the teaching performance of faculty? Absolutely. In the context of a wide range of other materials, which is the point of that first sentence. What we're suggesting is, and this paragraph that we wrote in the T and P—the P and T guidelines, is intended to suggest that it's most—these evaluations are most useful for charting improvements over time. This is how I'm really thinking about a tenure candidate who arrives, who doesn't have a lot of teaching experience, may have some wobbles the first year or two—most of us did, but teaching evaluations, student course evaluations can be part of a story of improvement, can be part of a story where problems are identified, then the faculty member can say in response to student course evaluations, I adjusted X, Y, and Z in consultation with CITL, and look, my scores went up. That's how I envision, rather than some absolute number or reduction to a single measure of performance. So I think it's how they're being used, rather than whether they should be used. My answer to the last question is absolutely, if they're used in the way I'm thinking.

ROBEL: Other advice for Tom on the promotion and tenure problems?

JAFFEE: Tom, I mean, I agree with your point about not putting this down into a single number, but I'm bewildered by the phrase student evaluations should not get a "greater weight." I guess from an operational point of view, I don't know what that means, but it certainly suggests that

you weigh various things, and you come up with a number, so I—I don't see any value of that phrase in there—"greater weight." I mean it suggests that you try to measure something in a scale, so the phrase "greater weight" doesn't help me if I was on a tenure and promotion committee.

GIERYN: Judgments for promotion and tenure are always taking into account multiple factors, and it has to assign some kind of weight. Some issues are relatively trivial. Some issues become very important. The reason that sentence is in there is because that the group of us in our office putting together these guidelines wanted to prevent that possibility that student course evaluation results could overwhelm all of the other measures of teaching performance, including the candidate's statement on teaching, the course materials, syllabi and so forth, observations by peers of the classroom, judgment by mentors, any number—teaching publications, awards and honors and so forth, all of those—we certainly don't want to come up with the idea that tenure and promotion decisions represent a calculus, and that we could put a number on it. Quite the contrary, the notion of weighting was using informally, loosely, to suggest that we really didn't want committees to give too much weight, and there's an appeal there because they are numbers, and they sort of have that hard edge of objectivity. That's precisely what we were concerned about in drafting this paragraph.

JAFFEE: Well, that's pretty—I mean—I mean if—the phrase before that seems very reasonable to me, but I don't know if I want to give greater—you don't say anything about greater weight from two peer evaluations, as opposed to possibly two to three thousand students. So, I just would question the idea of finding it operational in that sense. Each case is—could be different.

ROBEL: Thank you. Other comments on this topic for Tom?

BROWNLEE: I'm still not clear what the core survey items are. Are they defined somewhere? Are they the same ones that are over on this other document? The statement under student course evaluations that, 'Statistical data will be presented—'

WHEELER: No, no, no. It's this handout from last time. That is called "Online Course Evaluation Task Force, Item Subcommittee Effort Context and Overview," and then on pages two, three, and four, there are listed nine questions.

BROWNLEE: Those are the core ones?

ROBEL: So this is actually a cross reference to the proposed online—

GIERYN: Yes, the questions that we would be using in promotion and tenure, and for that matter, reappointment and merit evaluations, would be those core questions that have been proposed by the committee and by the EPC, and they're in your packet. You found them?

BROWNLEE: Yeah, I just didn't know if they were the same [indistinct comment] faculty member is outstanding.

STEPHENS: [indistinct comment] you're referring to one of the currently the global items on the evaluation?

BROWNLEE: Yes.

STEPHENS: No, those questions were reviewed in the light of research and deliberation, and these were the items the subcommittee of the Online Course Evaluations Committee that looked at a whole range of questions, including those that currently exist, including those that are used by a whole range of companies that do this work for you—the research on questions, and then they talk to various schools, and these were the eight that they were proposing as core items, and that are being proposed now. So these—these would replace those global items that we currently refer—as we refer to them currently.

GIERYN: And there was considerable discussion about using the two questions; basically rate my instructor, rate this course, as opposed to a more elaborated set, and the judgment was that we would learn more with slightly fewer questions. We didn't want to increase the number of the core questions excessively, but we felt that we would learn more about what it was about this instructor that made them an effective or an ineffective teacher from these questions.

ROBEL: Frances?

TRIX: This assessment of learning outcomes—I know that's in fashion now, and I know it's gaining traction. I'm not always sure how to do this, and I know we're all going to have to learn how to do this. I mean, I haven't seen this in recent tenure files. This is new, isn't it? Isn't this fairly new?

GIERYN: Yeah.

TRIX: So this is a new criteria—a new consideration? I mean, maybe people at education schools know how to do this better, but a lot of us in the humanities—I mean, I say in my courses, I want my students in five years' time to read articles—I'm talking about general humanities courses—in five years' time, I want them to be still interested in that field and read on it. Now, that's not going to work here because you want short term. Will you be presenting models of stuff you want for this?

STEPHENS: [Aside] You want me to answer that? So, one of the things that is happening currently is it's—the General Education Committee—there was a white paper on the General

Education curriculum, which requires all faculty teaching General Education courses to have learning outcomes.

TRIX: Yeah.

STEPHENS: And so that is policy for General Education, but this is in a context where increasingly we're required by external bodies as well as by internal organizations to say something about what our students are learning, and so it's very difficult for us to say anything what our students are learning unless we define what we expect them to learn in any course, and so increasingly there is going to be a request—and your question is will there be support for faculty in this effort?

TRIX: Yes.

STEPHENS: Yes, there will. We're—we're just now working on the second year of General Education and the outcomes in world languages and world cultures, and all of this—all of the intelligence we gather, and all of the [indistinct comment] in these areas, will become available as a kind of resource for faculty across the campus.

TRIX: So they'll know what you mean by this?

STEPHENS: Well, we certainly hope that we—as the Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning will work with departments and work with individual faculty to help them articulate those things that they really want them to learn in their course. It's a very individual thing. You know what you want your students to learn. What you really want is somebody to help you articulate that for your course, and that—we see that as our responsibility.

TRIX: Yeah, because this hasn't been so in the past.

STEPHENS: Right, and we understand—we do very much understand that.

TRIX: Okay.

ROBEL: And just to be clear, is it the general sense of the body that we want to [indistinct comment] the discussion of this document on the broader points or we might as well since we've already opened it, and then move on to the other? Is that [instinct comment]?

WHEELER: [indistinct comment]?

ROBEL: Yeah.

WHEELER: Well, I think Tom would ask that we continue that part of discussion based on [indistinct comment].

ROBEL: For the next meeting?

GIERYN: My—not necessarily. It depends on time. My preference would be to resume the regular agenda, and have a discussion of the online course evaluation. I really do believe that the proposal from the ECP [sic] is probably further along than the P and T guidelines.

ROBEL: Okay. Well that will give—what that would do is it would give everybody a chance to really spend some time thinking about it, and how these guidelines actually reflect or don't reflect the P and T documents within the schools. So—yes?

TRIX: Could I ask one question of clarification? I was kind of upset when I looked at this because I should look—and I was looking at much earlier pages, mostly pages two made me very nervous because what I pulled up from a website I got from your office, I was looking at policies governing reappointment and non-reappointment during the probationary period, and it was 1991, so I'm worried I have an out of date thing, and I guess what I want to know is which in—which things in the earlier part of this document are new? Are there any new things in the earlier part of the document, or am I just out of date?

GIERYN: The—and if you send me the link or whatever took you to a 1991 page, we'll fix it, okay? Apologies for that. This document was written more or less from scratch. It drew on the Handbook and the existing guidelines, but basic—

TRIX: —I'm sorry, you didn't change anything in the first few pages?

GIERYN: Depends on what you mean from "change." As I say, the document is essentially written anew.

ROBEL: And I think the other point here is that the faculty have never really considered the guidelines before. That was a point that Tom made in the beginning, so to the extent there were existing things, they were guidelines that had accreted over time. I think through the accumulated, and I would say, having gone through one promotion and tenure season with him, substantial knowledge accumulated in the office—in Tom's office. So, I think it would make sense for everybody to give it a good read—

TRIX: I would like to know how much this is changed from the last—

GIERYN: —The last version of the guidelines?

TRIX: Yep!

GIERYN: Significantly.

TRIX: Yeah, okay. Well, I would like those underlined.

GIERYN: I can't do that. I rewrote—I could underline the entire text because it would take that. I rewrote this from scratch. [indistinct comment] the guidelines—

TRIX: —Could you send us the previous guidelines then?

GIERYN: You have it. It's on our website right now. If you go to—

TRIX: —What's the date?

ROBEL: I think that we could probably have this conversation offline, and focus in—

GIERYN: —Alright, 3/11.

TRIX: 3/11?

ROBEL: —and focus in on things that we have to do collectively, but—but thank you so much for getting to us so that we have an opportunity to read it. If we're done then with the—with the discussion of the online course intersection with the policy guidelines, is there still a question on that one?

SWANSON: I just want to say I emailed Steve Burns, and he said he's on his way.

ROBEL: Oh good. [Laughter] Thank you. Let's—let's move on then to a continuation of our discussion of the online course evaluations, and I'll turn it back over to Padraic. Thanks so much.

AGENDA ITEM 7: EDUCATION POLICIES DRAFT POLICY ON ONLINE COURSE EVALUATIONS

KENNEY: Okay, well what I'd like to do today is first briefly remind you, especially since some of you may not have been here last week, of the timeline over the last two years that this has been in the works. Secondly, I'm going to say a few things about the changes in the document you have in front of you compared to the one you looked at two weeks ago. And then I want to say a few things generally about some of the issues that have been expressed to me and to others on the EPC over the last few days. And, as I do so, I want to recognize that there are some things that are a bit—not only beyond my competence—but beyond the purview of the EPC, because I do want to stress that this is not a comprehensive policy governing all things about online course questionnaires, but, in addition to Vice Provost Stephens and Gieryn, we also have with us Associate Vice Provost, Dennis Groth, from OVPUE who can speak to some of the issues including some of the ones you may raise in your questions. So, the first thing is that the process of developing the online course questionnaires has been going on for two years, and it has come before the BFC, I wanted to underline this, one year ago this month when I presented to the BFC a report on the EPC's deliberations on online course questionnaires,

because at that time it was too early for a policy, but I felt it was important to let the BFC members know what kinds of issues were on the horizon.

In that document, which I don't have the BFC version of it that appeared on your table a year ago, but I have my own version of it—it was dated 19th of April, the following points were made. First of all, it was clear that online course evaluations would essentially make these universal and obligatory; no longer could one decide I'm just not going to bother my students with them. Secondly, at several points in that document—the question was raised of what kind of access would be given to students, and to the public? And third, there were actually eleven points, but I'm not going to bother you with all of them, third there was also discussion of how the document—how online course questionnaires would be stored, how they would be searched, how they would be used by administrators, and so on. That's sort of the pre-history, but it's important because I have gotten a sense over the last week or so that this is the first time that this has emerged on people's horizons, which is unfortunate because of those of you who weren't on the BFC last year, representatives from your schools were and they could have brought information to you.

This year, as you may know, there has been a—the task forces created by the OVPUE and OVPFAA have created pilot questions after a great deal of research, and I have to say that speaking with them, I think the EPC certainly had the impression that they had done a great deal of research on the appropriateness of the questions. Those questions were piloted in a number of classes last December—anyone who volunteered. I volunteered my class, and I know many others did. Subsequent to that, the EPC then began working on a policy. Now, as we began working on a policy, it became clear to us that there are some things which are really not matters for policy, although they could be, but those matters included, for example, the fact that there will be evaluations, the fact that they will be online, and the exact nature of the questions. That is—while we had a great deal of discussion about the wording of the questions, and went back and forth quite a bit, the questions themselves are going to be an ongoing—and should be a living document if you will. There will be reasons, perhaps in the very near future, for someone to decide that question should be asked in a slightly different way, perhaps when more data—when data has been collected over a few years, and P and T committees have had a chance to try to make sense of the data, and say 'I'd like to have something different.' For that reason, it did not make sense for the EPC, and I think by extension the BFC, to try to legislate the precise wording of the questions. However, I will direct your attention to point six in the document which makes it clear that the EPC is consulted on changes to campus-wide questions, which are developed and maintained by the OVPUE and OVPFAA.

So, in the document before you, there are the—there are some smaller changes, but I'll highlight the major ones. The first one is in the title. Several people pointed out that, hey, are

we really asking students to evaluate courses? Well, maybe we are, and maybe students will see it that way, but that isn't the only thing that's going on, and so a wording change seemed appropriate, so these are online course questionnaires. That's not a—an entirely a cosmetic change; I think it also maybe conveys better what students are being asked to do, and I think also very—perhaps very, very subtly, conveys the point that this is not the only means by which teaching is evaluated. It is one of many, so it's calling—the evaluation suggests that this is it, calling questionnaires reminds us that it is not.

In point two, there are a couple of changes, one very subtle—that in the first sentence, which makes clear that the data from the campus common questions go to instructors and department chairs, school deans, as they do now, and that those—the instructors and the deans then provide that information further to the Vice Provost. Secondly, the more—maybe more significant change is in the next to last sentence of number two, generally within the same school or college. Several people have asked, well, you know, the courses taught in our school are very different from those taught in other schools, how can you possibly have a global comparison in which some small seminar, which is the way we teach in our college or school, would be compared with some gigantic intro class. And that would never have been the case because it makes—it is—it should be clear in the rest of that sentence that courses are compared to those of similar courses, and a small graduate seminar taught in one school is not a course similar to an introductory lecture course taught in another school that might have more undergraduates, but this—this clause makes that clearer.

Let's see, the next—a small change in number four, which clarifies what departments, schools, colleges, and programs can do with the questions that they create. Those questions are for their consumption, but if they want to share them further, as for example, the department might well want to on a self-study in the process of program review, well, that's what they can do. There is one additional change in number four, the word “programs” is intended to be a reference both to a large comprehensive or broad program like the Gen Ed program, but also conceivably a program that is smaller than a department, such as a degree program within the larger department that has several different degrees.

The biggest change is in number five. As I explained it the last meeting, maybe an hour before the last meeting, it finally became clear, talking to University Counsel that really, unlike in some states, we cannot, without going through a lot of complicated and unnecessary hoops, we cannot make campus common questions, which are being used for evaluation, we cannot make them available to anybody else, that just muddies the waters in ways we don't really want to contemplate. Question five, therefore, creates a new category of questions—and when I say new, I want to make clear that something like this was discussed last year as well, and has been part of task force discussions, I think from the beginning because it has been clear from the

beginning that one of the things which should happen is that students should get access to some form of data. Since they cannot get access to the campus common questions, which could be colloquially, and for all I know will be colloquially referred to as the P and T questions, although I'd prefer not to use that term because they do other things than that. For example, they are useful in mentoring. The student return questions are intended to provide some minimal form of data to students. These questions have not, as far as I'm aware, been written, although a draft of them, I believe, exists, but this—but, of course, again, you'll be reminded that the EPC will be continually consulted on these questions, and this document merely recommends more or less what they ought to—the kinds of things that should be measured. I'll have a little bit more to say about that in just a moment. An additional point that comes up in that question is password protected Indiana University website accessible to the IU community.

The last change, and then I'll say a few things about issues that have emerged recently. The last change that comes up is in item number seven, or point seven—paragraph seven, where—this seemed to be a neat little idea that faculty could get feedback on their independent study courses, which, after all, are usually taken by students who like us, and have a great experience, so wouldn't it be nice if that information could then appear in some way, but it was pointed out that after all the instructor of record is the chair, and then this gets incredibly complicated and confusing. This last sentence is meant to address that, and actually, once again, gesture to the fact that there are multiple forms of evaluating teaching, that if you do a lot of independent study, probably you want to make use of this in some different form, which would then count as measuring your teaching in yet another way, and the more ways you measure your teaching, the more thoughtful at least you look. That lies beyond the realm of—of this policy, and maybe beyond what the EPC can and should do, although perhaps we could revisit that, but we simply wanted to indicate that this is a different form of teaching that can't be addressed by online course questionnaires, but it should be evaluated, whether this should be evaluated in some universal way, I think I can leave that to next year.

Okay, let me just briefly indicate some of the issues that have been coming up. There may be others. The first one, which has come up in a number of emails, is well why go online? I think I'm just going to say that this is going to happen. From my perspective, I think it is clear that online course evaluations are going to happen because it is easier to use. It is going to make things easier for P and T committees, for department chairs. It is going to make it easier to use such data for mentoring faculty, and so on. I can't see a way in which this would not happen. Therefore, what the EPC is doing is responding to that, and finding ways for faculty to exert their control, influence if you will, over that process. We can debate whether online course evaluations are a good idea, and one issue of course is a question of response rate, but that is something for—I think for continual monitoring, and I don't think we gain much by deciding we're not going to do it.

A question has been raised about universality—do we all have to, for example, have this set of questions. Well, I think the previous discussion frames that really well. Promotion and tenure is a— is a campus-wide issue. A campus-wide issue— a campus-wide process, excuse me. I think that that process is not helped if different schools do it in different ways, but I—to schools that are concerned about whether one size really fits all, I'll make two comments. One is again, the change in paragraph four—excuse me, paragraph two—about comparability, and that just emphasizes the point of comparability. Yes, the law school and music school, the College, the business school teach in different ways, and comparison will be among similar courses.

The second point is that it is expected that schools will add their own questions. I guess there's a third point. One could still say, well, but we're going to have different types of responses to certain of the questions because of the way we do things differently. I think we're all educated adults, and will be able to interpret that data, not as meaning, wow, that entire school is dysfunctional, look at their answers to that one question. I think really it falls upon people to find examples of entire schools being, I don't know, closed down because of lower data on question number six or something like that. I mean, doomsday scenarios just really don't get us very far. Finally, I'll make the point that universality, I think, protects faculty. I think having all the same questions protect faculty by having some sense that we are all measured in broadly similar ways with the opportunity to show ways in which the measurement, which after all is only one of the evaluative tools in which those—that measurement falls short for our type of teaching, our school, or discipline.

The next point that's been raised, the question of the validity of data. This is not a perfect instrument, but that is not the point, and that's why it's not—the instrument itself is not the subject of policy. I think it should be clear that this is going to be an ongoing question that we will constantly want to come back and say, are these the right questions? But sometimes under the question of validity of data is really the question of should there be questions at all because if we say these questions aren't valid, have they been tested? Well, they have been—can they be tested thoroughly enough so they'll all be happy? No. It's an ongoing process; no instrument is perfect, but the EPC, I promise you, will be continually apprised of that process, and will be engaged in that process as it was this year.

Finally, the question of student access to data, and here I think there are three separate questions. One is if students have access to some data, and again not the so called P and T questions, but data that they will get back, they'll misuse it in some way as they're responding. So, for example, they will respond maliciously. Well, we already know that if you—if you have a class of thirty students, there are always a few who just habitually give low scores, or maybe habitually give high scores. That can't be avoided, but this is data, not individual plot points that are going to be revealed, and the information balances out.

Here's a possibility of misuse by the readers of that information. They are not going to know how to interpret it. I think we're already aware that students manage to choose courses already, getting advice from their peers, getting advice from advisors, getting advice from other faculty, getting advice from their circadian rhythms, and not choosing classes before a certain time, and getting advice from their preferences, what they are interested in. They do that. This will be another data point; I do not think that students will throw out all that other information, and in favor of justice one data point. Again, I think we should give students a little bit of the benefit of the doubt.

Finally, there's that possibility of the data leaking out beyond that password protection, and being used in all sorts of unfortunate ways. And here, too, a doomsday scenario; I'm not aware of that happening. As I mentioned last time, I taught in a school where the data was public, not behind a password protected site forever, and I went back this week and looked at the student media there, and I looked at the local media, and tried to find an example where somebody had taken the data and said here are the ten best or ten worst teachers, according to the course evaluations; it didn't happen. I don't recall a legislator ever standing up before the Colorado House and saying here are the list of the crappy teachers up at Boulder, et cetera. Those things could happen; again, if somebody has examples of those happening, that would be useful. They go after us for other things, for political affiliation, for campaign contributions, for the titles of our courses, but so far that hasn't happened, at least as far as I'm aware.

Alright, and I'll just finish by saying this, that okay, there are all of those possibilities. For me, they are so fundamentally outweighed by the benefits of saying to students thank you for helping us to evaluate ourselves, our programs, our departments, our university. In return, we're aware that a little bit of data might be useful, and we trust you to use it responsibly. What I hear is that, in fact, online course questionnaires increase the sense of responsibility, which students feel. That they don't do this while they're on some other video games or on drugs or something like that, but they actually sit down and think I'd like to get some feedback for that instructor, and I have more time than I usually do. And I think the benefit of us saying to students you have this responsibility, we appreciate it, here's a little bit of information back, I think that outweighs the possible misuses.

That's all I had to say. I wonder if I could turn to Vice Provost and Associate Vice Provost, and whether—ask whether there's additional information that would be useful at this time; if not, I'm happy to—

STEPHENS: I thought that was an extremely useful summary, and it captures the spirit of the work that the committee's been doing. Dennis, I can't see you because you're behind the pillar so you can't see I'm addressing you, but I know that you want to say a little bit about the research that underpinned this on the existing questionnaire, and why we felt this was

necessary, and I would just say that this original—this project originally came from the student trustee who did an honors thesis on it in the Kelley School of Business, and took it to the Trustees, and the Trustees had said it was worth exploring, and that's where the work began and...

GROTH: Thank you. I can add a few things. First, thank you for having me here. I'm near the door [Laughter] but I'm not leaving [indistinct comment]. This idea of online course evaluations, I'm going to first separate out the questions—the core questions that are being utilized and discussed as well from just the idea of online evaluation because I'm responsible for the unit that does the scanning of the current paper evaluations, the best office here on campus, and we have been continuously, over the last several years, been asked when will you support online evaluations, to the extent that programs are already making a move to support them on their own for which this makes sense for the programs to do that, but doesn't make sense for the campus to allow or to be in a position where it couldn't support all the academic units in this way because each academic unit might choose their own approach to doing this, and therefore, you know, wasting scant resources as it is to do this. So early research that we looked at here included looking at current response rates for some of our classes already, which are also—which are relatively low; in many instances they're high for small classes, but low for very large classes, in fact, less than 50% in general, under the existing set of forms. There's always exceptions to that.

As we've moved forward, we've done a number of different pilots. There was a pilot of the questionnaire—the questions in the fall. There was also a parallel pilot of just systems, because as we start looking at this, we want to be able to understand how can we support this, what would be the impact on the staff to support this, what will it cost to actually move forward with this, and just to get experience. So we did a pilot in the fall where we used twenty-five courses. Seventeen were from the Kelley School, eight were from Informatics and Computing; we had around nine hundred students participate in this. We ended up with a 59% response rate from that. It varied by the programs for the Informatics and Computing program, there was a 75% response rate, and for the Kelley program, a 53% response rate. Previously, so this was a decline for the Kelley program, slight decline; as some research has shown in controlled studies that moving to online evaluations will—has the potential for decreasing, not always, but has the potential for decreasing. The previous response rate for the Informatics and Computing classes on a direct comparison was 76%, so factually, there was a decline, there was a decline of one percentage point there.

Qualitatively, looking at the data that was returned, one of the benefits that the research in this area has shown is that students will actually provide richer data as a result of being provided more time or more freedom to express themselves. We saw this in this pilot as well. We did see

a, on the average for the Kelley program, twenty words per student evaluation were provided. You can look back at your own evaluations, and see whether that's more or less. We didn't have data from Kelley on how that compared to previous years. For the Informatics program, we had, as you know, the computer people are quite loquacious, we can speak on and on and on [Laughter] and there were fifty-six words per evaluation, which was a 100% increase over the prior term for those classes, and I'm not also counting acronyms that might be in there, so there might be some really rich information in there.

For the item pilot, and that was done in parallel, we had a 64% response rate, so the response rate's actually pretty good, could always be better, and there are programs around the country that have taken different approaches to try and address that. There are universities, for example, that have significantly improved response rates by providing information back to students, and that their means for gaining access to it was actually providing the data, so it's secure, and then you get access to it if you do your evaluation, so it's sort of your ticket to the data as your actually contribution of the data. That, for example, is done at Northwestern. I have to say, just for the record, Northwestern has a very open policy on evaluations, even though it's secure. They do provide the full evaluation out to the student, including the written comments, and I know that's not what we're talking about—about here.

For the spring, we're continuing our pilot with Informatics and Computing, Kelley, and the LAMP program in the College. We just finished an evaluation of the ICORE program, which had eight-hundred and sixty three students, and for that, you'll have to understand for ICORE that the course component of it ends last week, I believe. Maybe Bruce you know this, but—and then they have their actual case that they work on. So the evaluation period, and that actually occurs before the end of the semester, for that we had a 75.6% response rate, and there were no sections lower than 71%. So, I guess one of the questions that came up is what can we expect with response—response rates. Our data tells us that we're doing okay. Will this be the same for all instances? This is not an exact predictor. We did—because we used the existing instrument on one of these pilots, so that we could do a comparison of were the students saying something—not only did they say more words, but were they actually scoring—doing the ratings different. We found information which was consistent with other research that's been done in the past, which is that there's no strong indicator that online evaluation provides a different quantitative answer in terms of the summary data. The Kelley classes in the fall, for example, were pretty much spot on, in terms of the means of the scores. The Informatics classes actually improved by a significant amount, and I won't spend the time to try and explain why that was the case, but there are some very specific reasons for that, but we didn't see a vast difference. We saw a pretty decent response from that.

KENNEY: Thank you.

ROBEL: Thank you. Just to keep us on track, the research policy, we can talk about that a little bit later, so if we could get through this discussion maybe by ten—about ten after, maybe a little bit beyond there, that would be terrific, so let's open it up at this point. Thanks for those helpful summaries. Don?

GJERDINGEN: I've got a question about the comparability, and if the—this was raised back in April—the issue of comparability was raised, and it also was raised in the minutes about the role that each individual school would play. It was clear that there was a need, and I agree with it, to have online evaluations—of evaluations of some kind. There was also a need to have a good idea to leverage the technology. What wasn't clear is what would be done after that, and let me describe the situation we have, and I think I'm speaking on part of some schools other than the undergrad, where I know this was primarily aimed at. The law school is very, very heavily regulated. I mean heavily regulated. Our students are publicly tested afterwards. We have always had student evaluations. We've had them as long as I've been here. It's been twenty-five years. We have them in class. We have just about a hundred. Most important, over the last three years, our faculty decided to redo and to study what evaluations we have. We had it for two years. We had many, many discussions. We had two full faculty meetings, and we have our form that we felt was best for us, that we felt was the best for our accreditors, and best for our students, and we're very happy with this. And that literally just a few weeks ago we found out the following, and here's where the issue is with me. It's not that there wouldn't be student evaluations, which we already have; it wasn't that there wouldn't be online. It's that somebody else would be asked—would be drafting the questions for us, in part, that we had no say over, had no input in, and may not apply to us, and second that they may be public, and the concerns I have with that are two-fold.

The first one is comparability, if we no longer—if these are just, these are not going to be compared across places, then why have the same questions, number one. And number two, it—I think it's a matter of faculty governance. If this passes, I have to go back and tell my faculty that they had no business doing this, that all the work they did, this is for naught, and that somebody else across campus with another discipline, other students, other accreditors, who has never been in our classroom, is going to demand that some—not that they have student evaluations, not that they'd be online—but these are the questions that you will use, even though you didn't have any input on it, and even though you studied this, and I just don't think that's a good model for faculty governance. As an example, if we go through this, imagine what you would think if a year from now, UFC has a thing on course evaluations, and they tell us no, you're going to do something different, or higher education commission comes up and says no you're going to do something different. I'm worried about that. I'm worried about that. Not that there's not going to be one, but that somebody else is telling our faculty what questions have to be in. It's not that we don't have questions; it's not that we're not satisfied with them,

but why—justify, I guess, why those questions have to be answered by us, even though we’ve gone through it, we’re satisfied as a faculty, and we actually chose not to do that.

KENNEY: I think I’ll just say two brief things. First of all, I would hope that in that discussion that you’re imagining back in the law school that someone will ask whoever was representing the law school, and the BFC last year, why they did not apprise the law school that this had—

GJERDINGEN: —They did. It was me, and the minutes show that I asked the question.

KENNEY: Uh-huh.

GJERDINGEN: I could read it here. The question says, “I’m just curious about the role of the individual schools in this process? Can you describe what’s being talked about? ... is this campus-wide? ... An individual school, what would [sic] be looking at? ... This is a follow up. Is there any room for differentiation at the schools as far as these other policies, for example how ... public would these be [sic]? Will this be a single policy, or this [sic] is something that would be taken up that each school can have a say in?”²

KENNEY: And what was the answer?

GJERDINGEN: And the answers were that we do want evaluations, we do want to have it, but these are things for consideration. We weren’t represented on the committee, and nobody talked to us. At all. So I think that—I mean, the idea that—we only knew for sure what the answer was going to be literally two weeks ago. Literally two weeks ago. And the question is not that there aren’t student evaluations, it’s that you’re telling us you will use these questions that we drafted for you, even though you wanted something else, and we may—well, by the way, we may make them public.

KENNEY: Could I just make clear that I did not draft the questions, and I’m not—

GJERDINGEN: —but you’re responsible for the questions.

KENNEY: I’m sorry, I’m going to abdicate that responsibility.

GJERDINGEN: Well, can we talk about the questions? If it says recommending, I don’t know what this means; that’s another issue I have. Is it, on the one hand, if I’m a student, am I supposed—well, am I supposed—if a required course, am I supposed to say yes, that of course you take required courses, that’s an easy answer? Or do I say no, I’m not going to recommend that because I don’t have any choice in it, and I didn’t have an answer? That’s an issue. Now, if you—what do you do in the following situation, if you go to the school, and it says here’s your courses, here’s what you’re going to take, and oh, by the way, here’s the instructor you’re going

² Reference is to the meeting of the BFC on April 19, 2011, transcript page 27.

to take, here's your first year, welcome to IU. We're glad you're here; we're going to have a lot of fun. Answering recommended, what—how does recommending classes apply in that situation? And I just described the first year at the law school. Every class is required; you are assigned your professor. We have a small school. They know everything, and they talk, so the idea of information... So even the questions that you want to ask don't apply in a good way to us, and the fact that there are any questions that we didn't have any say in is not sitting well with my faculty at all.

ROBEL: Are there other discussions? Let me see. [indistinct comment]

COLE: Well, I was thinking that, you know, these common questions, these recommended questions—will students recommend a course or whether they would recommend the instructor, I personally am more concerned about will this become a popularity contest among professors. Are we really—it's not that we can't evaluate, I mean how—what will be the best way to evaluate the effectiveness of the course, what are the learning outcomes, have students learned what they're supposed to learn, because it wouldn't be rare for students to say, well, I will recommend it, because it's fun. The professor was fun. Fun! That doesn't mean I learned a lot or why would they recommend. I think that maybe there's better ways to ask these questions to really help—whether it's administrators, whether it's the instructor—in terms of how these courses, you know, are they effective or not rather than just, well do you like the instructor, you know?

KENNEY: You're mixing two categories here because the set of campus common questions, which you have in this document, specifically deal with effectiveness of teaching.

COLE: Right.

KENNEY: Right, and so that is [indistinct comment]—that will be used, therefore, to help administrators and instructors. Separate from that is information provided to students. And I guess the question I would ask in return is whether your concern is that any information at all is provided to students, and your suggesting that students should not be provided with information or whether your concern is that the particular wording of saying would you recommend this course would lead students to provide inaccurate, or, in your view, not useful information.

COLE: Well, I guess the thinking is if you have these three questions as available to students, not linking with the other—the whole picture. So, I'm just thinking that whatever—whoever sees just the answer to these three questions may not understand the full picture of why the student would recommend or not recommend, but I don't have the answer, in terms of how to linking these to really make this useful for students.

KENNEY: Well we can't link them, but it's true, I mean that simply is off the table, but it is true, for legal reasons, but it is true that, you know, questions could be asked in a different way. The—and the student questions are, I believe, also going to be piloted this spring, and so there will be an opportunity to see if they're useful. So, for example, in my class, where I have fifty-five students, I'll take a look and see, did they say the course was really effective, but I wouldn't recommend it, or vice versa, and then we'll have an idea of, you know, what happened there.

ROBEL: I think John was next.

SCHILB: I think in our discussions, and this was a case in point the danger of pushing things together, we really have two main functions or almost entities that are under discussion. In other words, one could be extremely enthusiastic, very much share the vision of the committee, and Sonya, and Tom, and Dennis about the common—the campus common questions [indistinct comment]—the campus common questions geared to T and P, right? And one could be disturbed by the—making access, making data accessible to students. It seems to me these are two very separate things, and I actually think procedurally, at some point, there might be wisdom in voting on them separately because one, you wouldn't want somebody upset about the student business who might be enthusiastic about the T and P common questions, feeling that he or she has to vote no because both are put in the same package.

To go to the point about the student data, I will be strong, and I do not believe, I do not share the feeling it is clear that students should get access to some form of data. The way I might put it differently is it is not clear that IU should officially sponsor a shopping guide to its courses and instructors, including its associate instructors. And that's what the university would be doing even with a password protected website. That would be the function. That would be what the university is standing for. I'm curious whether the administrators of the university [indistinct comment] equally enthusiastic about playing that role as they are about the T and P common questions. I think we also have to acknowledge, aren't we all thinking about likely faculty reaction to this. I think many faculty, I don't venture to say how many, I'm not in tune with the [indistinct comment], I think a number of faculty will bristle at the campus common questions, but, you know, maybe that'll go over. I'm pretty sure most of the faculty will hate the making access to student data, and so there's got to be a sterling substantial, far from—it is clear, a kind of apodictic, the defense of that, before that goes over.

Part of the problem for me, and I return to a concern I brought up at the last meeting, is associate instructors, and that was an issue I was bringing up at the last meeting, but I haven't heard any further reference to that today. I do see the password protected website addition as maybe addressing some of my concern about what future employers might see, but let me relate—and I promise to be very brief here—a common situation for us in the English department. We who have directed the first year writing program. We work with our first year

A.I.'s their first semester. They have a summer workshop, they're taking a pro-seminar. They're being monitored by experienced associate instructors. We sit down with them, we who administer the program, once they get the BEST forms back, we go over with them how to interpret those forms. They're nervous. They're first time instructors. To post whether students should take their courses in the future, right after their first semester of teaching, I think will be so incredibly demoralizing, so incredibly obstructive of our educational mission. Our conception of our graduate students, our associate instructors, as people in the process of learning, that that factor alone makes me very hesitant about endorsing item number five.

SWANSON: I just wanted to reiterate that everything you heard about the law school applies to Optometry. We have plenty fewer, about seventy-five, eighty students, they all have to take the same classes. They're assigned to them. They go in lock-step for three years, so when they're filling out those evaluations, they're all doing it with each other in a format that we understand. Our faculty are quite concerned that we have a valuable tool that we learn from that's going to be destroyed by this. And so, we're in a very similar situation to Law that there's a lot of different departments here, things can be useful in different ways, and this is being presented to us and this would be the response I get from our faculty is we have a valuable tool that's going to be taken away for no particular benefit. I'd go on at length, but you've described in great detail for Law what applies to us.

STEPHENS: Can I just respond there? I mean, I'm going to apologize on behalf of the committee that the two schools that have been mentioned were not part of the deliberations at the start. This was a very big committee, as it went along in this process, it drew in more people and more schools and more representation from those schools, as well as from the Faculty Affairs Committee and the Educational Policies Committee. We tried to be as inclusive as we could. I want to make that apology formal that the Law and Optometry were not consulted on the questions. I think the matter was—I need to get back and check this, but I'm pretty confident that [indistinct comment] Campus Curriculum Committee at a given point that this was under discussion. It's not being hidden, but it hasn't been as consultative with these two schools as it might have been, and so, you know, please register this as a formal apology. I think that there are no other schools that are in that situation. So...

ROBEL: There are no other schools also that are only graduate schools.

STEPHENS: Well, there's SLIS, and SLIS has been heavily involved in this.

ROBEL: Was SLIS involved?

STEPHENS: Yeah.

ROBEL: Okay.

BASU: I start with a premise. And the premise, and I quote, “Learning is the only goal of the process we call teaching.” This document does not, in my opinion, address that. This document addresses another very important issue, and that is about teaching assessment. If the teaching assessment can be done through a one single, general, one-size-fits-all kind of a questionnaire, through online evaluation or not, at the present time, I’ll defer that judgment to those who have read a huge volume of literature that exists on this issue. For example, a tiny, dark-skinned woman in a non-Western dress, let’s say a saree or a sari, in a school in southern Indiana, inspires much less confidence among students—from student—than a middle aged, slightly grey, not as much you and certainly not as much as [indistinct comment] [Laughter], with a tweed coat but I do not have patches, and going about with a pipe. That’s an example. So with respect we have to be careful about that, but again, I defer it to the committee, and the people in the committee who are more aware of these things. Yes.

STEPHENS: One other thing, I mean I wouldn’t want you all to have the impression that these are the only questions on the questionnaire. There’s been a great deal of deliberation about—around the freedom of the instructor to determine some questions for their own diagnostic purposes, the freedom of the department to do things for program purposes, or the school. And also around how we might create some kind of online toolbox that would allow faculty to do midterm evaluations relatively easily and quickly that would get them the kind of diagnostic information that course questionnaires are really designed to deliver to our faculty because it is about learning.

BASU: To answer that point, if you increase the number of questions, the variability goes up by the square of that number, and it makes it even worse to be universal, but I didn’t finish. I mean, I was interrupted.

STEPHENS: Sorry, I—I...

BASU: No, you didn’t—you spoke to a particular point. Since the second document came out, I have contacted several chairs of several science departments who have consulted with their faculty, and except for one faculty member, each one, to varying extents, said, ‘Basu, please go and vote no to everything.’ You may have been comprehensive with respect to membership of that committee, but it is not comprehensive with respect to consulting or asking their chairs. I truly think that even if we think about assessment, and given what I have heard from several science departments, number five does not contribute at all to assessment. Getting it back to the students, as you said, students are doing this, therefore we owe them something. That is completely separate from assessment. This has been, this is what I’ve received so far. I’m representing not only—to some extent myself, but I’m representing Unit F, three science departments, and I’ve consulted about four others, but this will be two other units, and except one—as I said, one single faculty member, other than that, many faculty members wrote to me

in a matter of just three days over the weekend and even today up to about 2:30, said ‘Basu, go and vote no.’ So I recommend to the EPC, and perhaps even ask BFC here, that we expunge number five completely from this deliberation until we have a better feel for what faculty members feel, not only outside the College, even within the College, there is so much of non-information or non-analysis of these documents.

ROBEL: I think I saw [indistinct comment], Cassie?

GUARINO: Thank you.

ROBEL: Both of you have had your hands up for quite a while I think.

GUARINO: Yeah so, I’m worried about giving the access to the information to students also. I think that it could have a powerful impact on new professors, and professors who are given a lot of new classes to teach all the time, rather than the lucky ones who get like one class, and they teach it over and over again, because I think we all do get better as we teach a class several times. I also wonder if it could potentially—I mean, first of all, the online aspect is fine. You know, it’s going to possibly impact response rates, and I think they’re, you know, review committees pretty much know that these should be taken as adjusted. They’re imprecise, and they’re selection biased [indistinct comment] that could be involved in them, but review committees, I think, because they’re in the same boat, they know, you know, how to take these things. Whereas, opening it up to students, I just think it could have a powerful impact, a differential impact on certain types of faculty. And also, it could lead to grade inflation, you know, this sort of popularity, you know, and—potentially even a narrowing of the curriculum because as electives are tried out, and may be not successful the first time around. There’s nothing—I mean, everybody’s—in schools where there are electives, like my school, the School of Education, you’re really not safe unless you teach a required class, and so I think this is just making that a little bit harder.

ROBEL: [indistinct comment]

URHEIM: So, first of all, I’m Jon Urheim from Physics, filling in for someone who is not able to make it today, and just one point. I don’t know that you contacted every faculty over in the sciences, certainly some of us in Physics were not, but what I wanted to do, I was contacted—Sima was contacted—by a member of the math department who wrote a little letter—asks to be read here, and I think it bears a little on some of the points that have been made by various folks here in some of the earlier discussions about the learning objectives question. So I’m just going to read this. It says—this is from Professor Davis in the math department. It says:

“Dear BFC Member, as a member of the BFC, I urge you to vote to postpone approval of the proposed course evaluations. If postponement is not possible, I urge you to vote no. The format

for these online course evaluations was proposed by administrators, the offices of the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, and the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs. In particular, both offices will submit questions to be included on faculty's course evaluations. These administrative offices have, of course, different agendas than that of the faculty. I personally do not believe that the format is a good one, that even if the BFC feels it must follow the administrative directives with regard to the format, I urge the BFC not to approve the online course evaluations until they have seen the specific perform proposal for what questions will be on the evaluations. For example, in the executive summary of the online course evaluation taskforce, included in the BFC meeting agenda the question, "How clearly were course learning goals and objectives communicated to you?" was included. I think the motivation for including this question was to encourage every faculty member to spend the beginning and end of each class discussing learning objectives. While some people might view this as a laudatory goal, others will bemoan the lack of freedom such encouragement entails. From what I have heard, questions on the executive summary will be modified. Please don't approve the policy until we know exactly what modifications there are. All the best, James Davis, Mathematics."

And so, I think part of the idea here is to, and I don't think this has been something that's been mentioned, at least at this meeting exactly, is to indicate the impact of the questions on the faculty member's judgment, and how the person's presented, and some possible incursion into the faculty member's own interpretation of the best way to present the course material.

ROBEL: I'm hearing—let me tell you what I'm hearing, and then we can decide what to do because we don't have a lot of time left to discuss this if we're going to get to the research policy, too, so I don't know whether we want to take the entire policy to—as they're fond of saying in the Senate, an up or down vote, but I'm not hearing a lot of disagreement with the idea that evaluations should be done at all. Is that correct?

TERRY: That's correct.

ROBEL: Okay. Or that they should be done consistently across the campus—not consistently in terms of questions, but that it should be a common commitment of faculty members, departments, schools, the College, to actually assure that courses are evaluated routinely. Does that all—that isn't controversial. So what I'm hearing essentially is controversy about the fact of common questions, the—and the possibility of, or the mandate to release information from the questionnaire to students. Is there any other piece that is—that is controversial here?

BASU: [indistinct comment]

ROBEL: Is online controversial?

TERRY: Yes.

ROBEL: Is the fact of doing this online as opposed to paper and pencil controversial? How controversial? Can we do kind of a straw poll? How many of you think it's a bad—you wouldn't vote for that? Okay. So mildly.

BASU: May I say just one thing here? With respect to making it available to IU community, it is *de facto* public. IU community, if it is defined as email addresses of IU—of IU—then it includes the one who is junior in high school, and his or her helicopter parents to the spouse of a deceased colleague who might be living outside Indiana, if not outside this continent. It is *de facto* public.

ROBEL: So, the public, I think, what I meant by that was what the committee was describing which was password protected. So, I guess what I'd like to do is turn back to the committee, and ask, given the discussion here today, what would you prefer to do on the—on the policy? We could continue it. We could—and have you take another pass at it?

KENNEY: I mean, we're not scheduled for a vote anyway.

ROBEL: Well, it's a second reading, so the parliamentarian has told me that there's some—we have an option.

KENNEY: I mean, I understood that we were going to go—

ROBEL: —To the next one?

KENNEY: Yeah.

ROBEL: Okay.

TRIX: There's some people with their hands been up for a long time.

ROBEL: Oh, I haven't seen them. I'm sorry. Well, I know—I know Bill's hand is up, but—I'm going to people who haven't spoken yet before I go back to people who already have.

MCMANUS: These are just a couple a couple of issues I want us to keep in mind, and I—I want to underscore the separation of the core from the other questions as an important issue. But, with regard to watching my own trajectory or P and T within the department, for example, we see, or my department has tended to see that response rates are informative, and that's because response rates happen within the classroom, and so response rates tell us about attendance. There's no doubt one can manipulate this. You know, candy on Tuesday if you show. And there's no doubt that students can choose not to respond, but response rates are informative, and this changes the information because students don't have to show up. So, so this—this is just one thing I think we need to keep in mind for our own assessment and for others.

The second is the piece about how we—ideally if we were doing this in a transition, we would norm it nicely so that we know—so that we’re having the same students fill out the in-class, department constructed surveys, and they’re also doing the campus-wide surveys so that we could actually say, how do these map together? This is a nice—you know, a nice way of doing it, so that we can do it, and I don’t expect that that’s—I don’t hear that that’s a part of it, in any sense. But one of the important things, we have nine questions, is that what it is? Nine questions that are core? We know this is—perhaps we know how much time students spent. I know if you’re using a Qualtrics survey, you got the time in and time out, so you know how much time they’re spending. We do know, in general, that online surveys--there’s survey fatigue. Perhaps, as in my department, I want to make sure my core questions, there’s only two perhaps, are key. Are those going to be at the top of the line? What does that mean for the campus? Are we randomizing to make sure that if there is survey fatigue that we randomly drop? So these are just things to think in terms of an instrumentation of it.

ROBEL: Oh I’m sorry. I haven’t seen you back there. Wave!

JIMENEZ: That’s okay. I usually sit up front, so. I just wanted to briefly comment on number five because I’m listening to your concerns, and I’m the only student in the room. So, I can tell you what we think. I think it’s a good idea, and I’ll tell you why. Because the concerns about vindictive students or negative evaluations, and I look at this from both sides of the table because I did teach a class, too, are going to get out there. We have ways of communicating with each other, and this isn’t going to stop us. So if you have a professor who isn’t very popular, it’s not going to matter whether you decide to have number five or not. Word of mouth is going to get out there, and the students are going to communicate with each other, and that’s probably actually going to be more hurtful than something like this which would provide, I would think, a balance to the word of mouth, where you have an actual database where a student can go and say, well, X, Y, and Z person who are probably not the best students in the school and everything else said this professor is terrible, but here’s a whole database that demonstrates actually the majority of students thought this professor was good. Maybe I should take that class. So I’m trying to look at it from the perspective that this could serve a more beneficial purpose to professors who may be concerned about negative evaluations or negative thoughts. As opposed to, frankly, if you want to be realistic here, more popular students who have a bigger voice who may not have liked a professor and are on the narrow end of the bell curve in terms of evaluations. So I just want people to keep that in mind because I taught a class, too, and not everybody liked me either, but the majority of students did, and if you leave it up to a couple of people whose voices may be louder than others, it will silence the people that I think something like this would actually give voice to. There’s even a website out there. Maybe you know, maybe you don’t. I think it’s badprofessor.com or something, ratemyprofessor.com, where you can go on this and find out what they think about you, if

you're really that concerned and so, you know, this—saying no to this is not going to stop someone from going there and looking. On the contrary, I think it's going to provide an opportunity to give them somewhere else to look, where maybe the non-vindictive students like myself, who have always been very nice to all of you [Laughter]. That's just my thought.

ROBEL: I'd like—what I would—

ESTELL: —could I comment on it really quickly? If I had thought of the same thing, and I looked up ratemyprofessor.com, and the four items are easiness, helpfulness, clarity, and the rater interest with the option of rating their teacher's hotness.

ROBEL: Hot tamales, yep.

ESTELL: Yeah, and if you look on it, they overwhelmingly tend to be negative because somebody to go actually go out and find a site, rather than to provide it for you, it's when you want to vent. And so, yeah, those things are kind of already out there, and of course you get all of the—yeah, I agree, I hate this professor, and it's like somebody whose taught thirty classes, and there's four ratings on them. And so you kind of assume you're getting a very selective group, but if that's the only information they have. And I'm not saying I'm entirely in favor, but it seems like question five could counter that. And a part of this for both the main questions and that is that those aren't set in stone yet, and it actually sounds like some people would say we want them sort of set in stone before we vote on it, so we know for sure which questions go, but we don't have to say recommend. We could say something else about—that we think might be more meaningful for students to recommend to each other.

ROBEL: I think we are not going to be able to get to voting on this today given the hour. So is it helpful, and Bill has had his hand up for a very long time as I've been working my way around everybody else, so how about, Bill, can I give you the last word on this topic, and then we can move on and see if we can at least get the discussion out on financial conflicts of interest and let the committee take back what it's heard today?

WHEELER: I'll skip over one, two, three, and four, but I think it would be helpful to the committee if we might at least have a straw vote on whether to vote to keep or remove item number five for the sake of the committee because as you said, we didn't plan to have a vote on this today in terms of actually passing something, but time will be brief at our next meeting, so I would like to move that we have a straw vote by a show of hands on keeping versus dropping item five, [indistinct comment] questions to be returned to students.

ROBEL: Okay.

PERRY: We did have one person that wanted to speak, [indistinct comment].

ROBEL: Sorry, John.

PAOLILLO: I'll keep my comments brief, and confined to two things. I also have faculty who are concerned about number five. The second thing is that you could make the argument that—that there are these unofficial sites out there that rate professors, and things like that, but none of those have the IU imprimatur. None of them have the IU seal. None of them have any IU brand associated with them. We are doing a very different thing when we then go and make this part of our institutional culture. It is a very different thing, and I think that we have to be prepared to acknowledge that there will be mission creep, and it's already latent in the recommended questions where you have whether a student would recommend the instructor. That becomes an evaluation of the instructor, and it becomes part of the discourse around questions having to do with promotion and tenure, and one of my faculty members did communicate to me his concern about number five. He said if he were a—a junior candidate for a position at IU, found out that we did this, he would look elsewhere. Maybe not to Northwestern, maybe not to Colorado, but he would look elsewhere for employment.

ROBEL: So recruitment—that's a new one. [Laughter] Alright, so we have a—we're at twenty after—would it be helpful to the committee at this point to—?

KENNEY: It would not.

ROBEL: It would not.

KENNEY: I would rather that we, you know, at the next meeting, I think if someone wants we can separate out—you know there can be a motion at that time to separate out point five, and vote on that separately, but I think it would not be helpful at this point.

ROBEL: I agree. It's been a very, very helpful discussion. I think the committee can take all of this back at this point. Thank—thank you all for talking to folks in your schools and departments. If—Steve is here, right? Okay. Let's see if we can at least get this one out on the table.

AGENDA ITEM 6: POLICY ON FINANCIAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST IN RESEARCH

BURNS: I apologize for the rescheduling, but I think actually it may have been beneficial because there are a lot of major issues for decision making on this previous issue. This one, unfortunately, there's not a lot of room for maneuvers, so I'll give you quickly the background of why it's before you, because the National Institute of Health says it must be before you, or they will not fund any individuals at IU starting in August 28th I believe is the date. [Laughter] So, it's before us because it has—[Laughter]. So it has to be before us. And this came up as a result of conflict of interest rules, which were common at most universities. At Emory, they had

one where they said, 'Oh, I have not received an excess of \$10,000 from any company.' Well, many companies now, especially in the pharma industry, publish databases of how much money people get. One individual who had signed this disclosure, on those databases, got I think on the order of a quarter—three quarters of a million dollars. Congress got upset. So conflict of interest rules have ratcheted up. The goals here are, and this has been presented for a first reading at the UFC, but we wanted to let the BFC and all of you know why this is coming down the line, is to meet these new requirements of the National Institutes of Health and the Public Health Service. Basically, it increases the level of disclosure. It decreases the thresholds that you have to disclose. I think the numbers now are \$5,000 you have to disclose. If you get money for travel from anybody but a university or a government agency—and that includes non-profits—you will have to tell the university you're getting this kind of support.

There's still the conflict of interest committee we always have that will review these disclosures that you make every year. So all of us make a disclosure every year. We'll just have to disclose more. The fact that you're disclosing things doesn't mean you have to have a management committee, but there could be if you reach certain levels or they're concerned, they would set up management committees, just as they do now, to help manage the conflict. So a conflict of interest does not mean you cannot pursue the research or have an association with, you know—in the extreme, that some of us get money from non-profits because we're on boards or we're traveling for them—we will have to disclose that. So the goal of this is primarily to meet those new regulations. There's also been some work by the Conflict of Interest Committee to make some of the definitions a little clearer. We don't have distinctions based on whether you're a faculty member or not. People who have direct control of the research, and that can be interacting with subjects—I'll concentrate that way, but it applies to all of us whether you do health related research or not—are investigators, and so they have to disclose. So we'll all have to disclose more, and at that point, because we're on a time scale, I'd rather just open it to questions and responses. Sarita, I think, knows a lot about this and the background, and we can maybe fill you in.

ROBEL: Steve, you're not asking for action today.

BURNS: I don't think so. It's coming to the UFC though, so if there are high levels of concern, I don't know how it will change things, but we'd like to hear them and maybe we can accommodate you. I mean, nobody wanted it to come to this, but actually I think the law was handed down to the university in November, and it had to go through the committees and there was no room to maneuver so... Yep?

MCMANUS: This is just a clarification, and I've read quickly as you [indistinct comment]. I'm thinking about travel, which is so trivial in a way, but if, for example, my grant is from Ford, that would have to be reported?

BURNS: If Ford is paying the university, and the university is reimbursing you, then it's coming from an educational institution. If it's Ford's paying you to go to their annual meeting, and they're paying you directly, you'd disclose it. Is that correct, Sarita? I think that is. I don't know if Eric's here.

MCMANUS: Thanks. That clarifies. Thank you.

ROBEL: Any other discussion?

TERRY: I have served on the UFC. We've seen this. What I would urge members of the Council to do is if you read this thing, and come up with other questions or whatever, quickly send them to Steve, I think. And that way that can be reflected at the next meeting of the UFC.

BURNS: And even copy Craig because if I'm offline for some reason, he can forward them to other committee members to make sure that people are looking at them, if Craig doesn't mind that.

TERRY: And BFC members will represent you on the UFC?

BURNS: Yeah.

ROBEL: Any other [indistinct comment] for the committee? Well, thank you very much, Steve, for presenting this, and thank you to all of you. I know that as you've been listening to this discussion, you've all googled yourself on ratemyprofessor, and that some of you are indeed hot tamales. [Laughter] We will—we'll continue this discussion at the next meeting. Thank you for all of your hard work on this.

MEETING ADJOURNED: 5:28PM