

Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
March 6, 2012
IMU State Room East
3:30 P.M. - 5:30 P.M.

Attendance

MEMBERS PRESENT: Randy Arnold, Abhijit Basu, Bonnie Brownlee, Carolyn Calloway-Thomas, Shu Cole, Tony Fargo, Pnina Fichman, Jeffrey Gershman, Thomas Gieryn, Donald Gjerdingen, Lesa Hatley Major, Robert Jacobs, Bruce Jaffee, Edwin Jimenez, Pdraic Kenney, Susan Kovacich, Rebecca Manring, Moira Marsh, Lane McLeod, Patricia McManus, Sherri Michaels, John Paolillo, Deanna Reising, Patricia Riesenman, Lauren Robel, Bret Rothstein, John Schilb, Jim Sherman, Grant Simpson, Edward Vasquez, Geoff Sprinkle, Sonya Stephens, H. Wayne Storey, William Swanson, John Tafoya, Joey Tartell, Herbert Terry, Francis Trix, Barbara Vance, Maxine Watson, William Wheeler, James Wimbush

MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT: Mary Popp (Chanitra Bishop), Dot Porter (Angela Courtney), Sarita Soni (Ruth Stone), Jason Turner (James Ferguson)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Joyce Byrer, LaNita Campbell, Kevin Courtney, Constantine Deliyannis, Gregory Demas, Mark Deuze, David Estell, Cassandra Guarino, Matthew Guterl, Justin Kingsolver, Michael McRobbie, Tim Mickleborough, James Perry, Elizabeth Raff, Sima Setayeshgar, Marietta Simpson, Pat Thomas

GUESTS: Abeer Bar, Maria Bucur-Deckard, Craig Dethloff (Faculty Council Office), James Kennedy, Stephen Keucher, Roger Levesque, Aaron Lower, Mark McConahay, Barbara Wallace (Faculty Council Office), R.J. Woodring, David Zaret

Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/minutes/11-12/02.21.12.pdf>
2. Memorial Resolution for William W. Lynch
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/11-12/B36-2012.pdf>
3. Executive Committee Business (10 minutes)
(Faculty President Carolyn Calloway-Thomas)
4. Presiding Officer's Report (10 minutes)
(Interim Provost Lauren Robel)

5. Question / Comment Period¹

6. International Affairs Report

(Professor David Zaret, Vice President for International Affairs) (30 minutes)

7. Education Policies Committee Response to Phase 1 of the Student Services Initiative (30 minutes)

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

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/11-12/B35-2012.pdf>

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/11-12/auxiliary/SSIPhase1Report.pdf>

8. Review of Non-Reappointments for Tenure Probationary Faculty and Librarians (30 minutes)

(Professor Pnina Fichman, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee) [FIRST READING]

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/11-12/B37-2012.pdf>

Minutes

AGENDA ITEM 1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

ROBEL: This always makes me feel right at home when I—I have a gavel. So, we begin as usual with the approval of the minutes. Do I have a motion? Thank you, Bruce. And a second? Thank you. All in favor? [Aye]. Opposed? [Silence]. Thank you very much. And Tom, can I turn to you for the memorial resolution, please?

AGENDA ITEM 2: MEMORIAL RESOLUTION FOR WILILAM W. LYNCH

GIERYN: Bill Lynch was born in the copper mining town of Jerome, Arizona to William W. Lynch, a mining engineer, and Miriam Hatch Lynch. He was raised in Connecticut and graduated with honors in geology from Williams College in Williamstown, Massachusetts. After college, Bill served in the U.S. Army during World War II. His service abroad, in General Patton's army, took him from Normandy to the Battle of the Bulge. Near the end of the war his division met the Russian army in Austria.

After the war, Bill was chosen to attend Cambridge University in England. This experience, according to Bill, was one of the highlights of his life. Another highlight of his life was his sixty-

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 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

seven years of marriage to Violet Dobson Cook. He and “Cookie” met as young teens, dated in college, and were married in 1944, while Bill was on leave from basic training.

After Cambridge he taught math and science for a year before attending Yale University, where he earned both a masters and a doctoral degree in educational psychology. He then taught at New Haven State Teachers College and at the University of New Hampshire in Durham before accepting a faculty position at the Indiana University, in 1952. Here he enjoyed a long and illustrious career, guiding the development of many graduate students as well as aspiring teachers. He retired in 1987.

Initially at IU Bill taught five courses each semester plus weekend teaching at regional campuses (then called “extension campuses”). Within a few years he had become recognized as a leader among the faculty, both in the School of Education and throughout the University. Beginning in 1955 he served for thirteen years as Chair of the Educational Psychology Department. These were formative years for the School, and Bill played a large role in shaping School structure and policies. In 1964 he participated in the establishment of the Center for Innovation in Teaching the Handicapped, and then, after leaving the chairship of the department, he served for nine years as a senior researcher there. Bill was an active champion of faculty governance at IU, and he served several times on both the Bloomington Faculty Council and the University Faculty Council. In 1978 he was selected to be an Associate Dean of Faculties, and he served twice as Acting Dean of Faculties.

Bill was known for his dedication to rigorous scholarship. His research interests included teaching styles in handicapped classrooms, observation methods for research in classrooms, classroom communication, and the effects of teachers’ cognitive demands on student learning. In 1960, Bill was awarded a Fulbright Fellowship to teach at the University of Amsterdam. In 1963, he spent a year as visiting professor with the Joseph P. Kennedy Foundation, at the George Peabody College for Teachers (now part of Vanderbilt) in Nashville, Tennessee, teaching and researching in special education. Bill met President John F. Kennedy in the spring of 1963 in Nashville, and visited the Shriver family at their Maryland home. In 1973 he returned to the Netherlands to conduct research on teaching styles.

Bill and Cookie were founding members of the Unitarian Universalist Church in Bloomington where they were active members and leaders for over sixty years. Both served as presidents of the congregation and in many other roles. In church, on campus and in the community, Bill was always supportive of issues of peace, individual rights and human justice. In recent years Bill and Cookie facilitated a life-story writing group at the church and enjoyed remembering and writing many family stories for their offspring. Bill was also a mainstay of the church choir from its inception. Music was always his great love, and Bloomington’s rich classical music scene was a perfect place.

Bill and Cookie loved the experience of living in different cultures. They also cherished their annual return to the East Coast – to Connecticut, Star Island, and Maine. After retirement, Bill said that one of his most satisfying experiences in education was as assistant teacher at Templeton School. He loved helping the children plant a garden, learn to ice skate, and go on field trips. He also relished playing tennis three days a week in a collegial doubles group.

An unselfish and caring person, Bill was loved and admired by family and colleagues. He was truly a gentle person and a man of rare integrity. His warm, smiling presence made family gatherings a joy and drew students, friends and colleagues to him. He will be dearly missed by family and friends.

ROBEL: Thank you. [Silence observed]. Madam President?

AGENDA ITEM 3: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE BUSINESS

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: I cannot resist saying good afternoon to all of you on this exquisite day. I don't know why we're not outside enjoying the beauty and elegance of the land. When I became president of the Council last year, I declared forthrightly and vigorously that I was going to send out BFC agendas at least one week prior to all Council meetings. [laughter] When I mentioned this to Chief of Staff Craig, he looked at me in a complex but concerning manner, as if to say, 'Carolyn, don't you know that...' Now I understand more fully Craig's non-verbal behavior. Although we have published some agendas well in advance of Council meetings, and we're proud of this, soberly, very soberly, I have come to realize that there are many stages and people involved in publishing an agenda, and that it is not as easy as simply saying, 'It shall be,' because from the moment members of the BFC Executive Committee craft an agenda until you receive one, we are literally at the mercy of so many folks, committees, reports, constraints, and schedules. For example, in some instances, we have to wait until we receive an attachment from a committee. But I want you to know that at the end of every BFC Executive Committee meeting, we have a draft agenda, but we simply do not want to send out several iterations of changing agendas, since this would be very confusing indeed. For this reason, we wait until everything is in place before sending out an official agenda.

So today, I wanted to contextualize things, and give you the back story, because I know you're always eager, as you should be, to get a copy of the BFC agenda as early as possible so that you can prepare for the meetings. So on any given day, when you go to your email box, you do not see a copy of the agenda, please know that Craig is still diligently and actively working on it. We are mindful. Craig and his staff are excellent people, and they do excellent work. Craig is very conscientious, thoughtful, and meticulous, and we are very fortunate to have him in the BFC office. In light of things, perhaps we should revisit the protocols involved in getting agendas out, and so I will be bringing this matter to the attention of the BFC Executive Committee.

Now to other quick items of concern. First, please note that the New Academic Directions Report calls for the formation of an administrative burden group. And Matthew Guterl and members of the Long Range Planning Committee have been very, very robustly involved in this item. As a consequence, we know that such a group has been established under the co-chairmanship of Vice President John Applegate and Vice President Neil Theobald. According to Applegate, I'm quoting here, without his permission, "The group is focusing on two issues. One, how to develop a culture saying 'yes' to good ideas, and a correlative process that does not have so many 'no' points—that's n-o points. And two, how to review administrative policies to ensure that they're actually necessary, and that they do not, in effect, shift administrative burdens from administration to faculty." John wants us to know that the guiding spirit of the group is for administrators to grant faculty as much time as possible to spend on research and teaching activities.

Second, a UFC draft policy from the Merger, Reorganization, and Elimination Committee is now in the process of being edited, and should be ready for consideration at the next meeting of the UFC.

Third, the UFC Benefits Committee will be meeting with Associate Vice President Dan Rives on March 12th. That's next week, next Monday, and I attended a meeting of the BFC Benefits Committee last Wednesday, and at the meeting, Dan unveiled some new and exciting initiatives regarding healthcare that are being considered by human resources, including a woman's guide to savings and investment programs, which is going to be initiated on March 26th, 2012. After other programs are finalized, I will report back to the Council. Please know that a major concern of the UFC Benefits Committee and the BFC Benefits Committee is to ensure that there is communication between administrative staff, and faculty, and also to ensure that all of us will be in a position to make good, robust decisions regarding healthcare.

Fourth, a policy on mass email distribution, which was brought before this Council this past October, as I recall, is finished, and should be presented at the March 20th meeting. Hal Evans and members of the Technology Committee are currently soliciting comments from IU administrators and other potentially affected groups. Recall the discussion, it was a vigorous discussion that we had last October, regarding concerns, such as who has the authority to distribute mass emails to faculty, whether there will be a content police person who will determine what is or is not within the bounds of distribution, and who will keep track of things that go out from the university. So we are really waiting for this report.

Fifth, the Online Course Evaluation and Mentoring policies—those are two separate items—will also appear on the March 20th Council agenda.

Sixth, at the next meeting of the UFC, members will be voting on policies and procedures regarding research misconduct, and the charges—changes will involve bringing the language in line with federal regulations. There will be no attempt to do a wholesale overhaul of the research policies.

And finally, I would like to report on the findings of the polling from the first round of voting for nominees for President-elect. Remember that we created a new officer structure, such that we will have a President, a President-elect, and a past President. So right now, we are trying to find two nominees who are willing and able and eager and excited about running for president-elect. Recall we had a balloting the last time, and I want to give you the results from that ballot, and not the numbers, but rather the individuals who emerged as eager. [Laughter] Bonnie Brownlee—Bonnie, raise your hand, please—, Pnina Fichman—Pnina, Herb Terry, Elizabeth Raff; is Elizabeth here today? No. Frances Trix and William Wheeler. Now William indicated to members of the BFC Executive Committee that he would like to remove his name from consideration because he has two, or three, or five books that he is planning to write, but you might still be able to prevail upon him to keep his name in the hopper. He's over there. Bill? Thank you. So today, we're going to do a second balloting, and I don't know whether Craig, you want to do this now or wait until the end—have those ballots been passed out?

DETHLOFF: Yeah, you won't be able to leave here today unless you hand me your ballot. [Laughter]

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: And remember that this individual, who's—will be successfully elected, will start in Fall 2013. That person will become President in Fall 2013 because I have one more year to serve, and thereafter I will be past—become past-president. Yes?

ROBEL: Is this long list the ballot? Can you repeat the names again?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Of the ones who are tops in terms of balloting? Bonnie Brownlee, Pnina Fichman, Elizabeth Raff, Herb Terry, Frances Trix, and William Wheeler. And I suppose we should ask whether there is anyone present who wishes his or her name to be removed so that we'll know how to move our balloting forward. Is there anyone present who wishes to have his or her name removed from consideration, other than Bill Wheeler. [laughter] And Pnina, are you doing this? Oh, okay. Alright. So, we have remaining Bonnie Brownlee, Elizabeth Raff, Herb Terry, and Frances Trix. Thank you. Thank you, Provost.

AGENDA ITEM 4: PRESIDING OFFICER'S REPORT

ROBEL: Thank you so much. I think the reason we're in here and not outside in the beautiful weather is because we all thought it was snowing, not that it was beautiful. The—my report today will be quite brief because I think the only thing I have done since I saw you last is budget

meetings, and I think the only person who has done more—as many budget meetings as I have is Roger Levesque. You owe thanks to all of the members of the Budgetary Affairs Committee, many of you have been actually at these meetings, but Roger has been just such a stalwart, and I was saying to him on the way over, it's great to have somebody who can see consistently across the various kinds of requests, the things that are thematic, in terms of campus need, and I will say that the one thing that has been just clear across the board from every direction we look, is the need for finding sources for increased graduate student support. With that, I'll stop. I'll do something else between now and the next meeting. Are there comments or questions at this point? Yes, Jim?

AGENDA ITEM 5: QUESTION / COMMENT PERIOD

SHERMAN: At a previous meeting, I—during one of the presentations by the Fringe Benefits Committee, I asked that if any of you had experiences, either positive or especially negative with any of the plans—the healthcare plans, or with—and especially with the new prescription people, MedCo, to please let me know, to email me. And I have gotten several, especially regarding MedCo. Some of them were pretty egregious differences in what people were paying last year and what they're paying this year. In one case, it was under \$20 to \$500 for I believe a three months' supply of one medication. Now a couple of these have been settled because there was some problem with communication with MedCo, but others are not yet settled. So, if you've got problems, please let me know. We're collecting them, and you know, the more we have and the more we know, the more likely we are at being able to fix it.

ROBEL: Thank you, Jim. Other comments or questions? Yes?

FARGO: Has anything happened with the freight train that Carolyn spoke of last week?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: What?

FARGO: The freight train.

ROBEL: Oh, what did you refer to as a freight train?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: I have heard nothing, other than it's still going, but I don't know anything. I reported last time about the meeting of the Trustees, which was so exciting and exhilarating for me, and I used the metaphor "freight train" as a way of summarizing what members of the Board of Trustees said about, you know, things needs to move quickly and faster.

ROBEL: So I've spent all my time in budget meetings. I would not describe those as freight train-like really. The—

PAOLILLO: [indistinct comment]

ROBEL: Pardon me.

PAOLILLO: They are slow and lumbering.

ROBEL: They are actually fascinating. They are fascinating. In fact, I was interviewed in a—for a radio podcast by President McRobbie, and he said what was the most surprising thing since you've been in this position, and I said physical plant. It is riveting. So—it is riveting. Don't laugh.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Oh, no, no. I'm not—I'm being empathetic with you.

ROBEL: But no, there has—I think that what you're describing though is the difference in the felt sense of time. You know, the Trustees gather when they gather, and not as often as they used to, but they gather when they gather, and they expect the kinds of progress from meeting to meeting that Carolyn was describing last time, and I think that part of the process with the Trustees around New Academic Directions in particular, that needs to happen in between the meetings is to have more conversations with them so that they get a better sense of what the—of what the realistic timeline is around initiatives that really do require faculty to coalesce around powerful ideas, and so that's—I would not say freight train.

PAOLILLO: I'm concerned about that. The reason why I'm asking, and I think I will—I would like to have a policy of asking or hearing something about this at every BFC meeting is that we really, at least as far as my experience as a faculty member, and other faculty members that I speak with, we have very little information about what is even being considered or what is even being discussed with respect to the response to New Academic Directions. It looks for all the world like the response to the New Academic Directions is a top-down response, and doesn't have a lot of action going on at the level of faculty, and it doesn't look to me like there's going to be a lot of buy in at the level of faculty, at least until we get some information about what it is that we're supposed to get on or buy into.

ROBEL: I would agree with you that New Academic Directions at this point, if you're not involved in one of the initiatives as a faculty member, you're probably not getting a lot of information, and some of that I suspect is because the things that were—that were moderately, I wouldn't say they were at all easy to do, but the things that could be done administratively have, by and large, been winding down. The things that did not have the major academic content have been winding to a close, so the example I would give, for instance, is the School of Continuing Studies, where the programs have been transferred, to the extent that they're going to be transferred, for the most part to where they're going with one piece—the IU High School, that is still being worked out by Vice Provost Stephens, but we're very close to being done with,

but the issues that are deeply academic, the curricular changes, the degree creation, those are with faculty at this point. They're in faculty committees, so there is a committee on international studies that is a faculty committee. There is a committee on communication and media that is a faculty committee. I'm less clear about where a couple of the others are in terms of process. I don't think far enough along the line that—that faculty actually should be worried that there's something going on that they don't know about. I'd be more worried that what—what not having information means is that there really is not anything going on. So, I don't know if that's at all helpful to you, but that's what I see from where I sit. Are there counterexamples you want to give?

PAOLILLO: I think I'll just let your answer, at this point, suffice, and then maybe we can pick it up later.

ROBEL: Sure.

JACOBS: I have a question. This is just—I thought it was interesting on a commercial last night that the state governor was pushing this online university, and, you know, we're talking about coordinating across the campuses and stuff, I get the feeling that we're [comment indistinct] to be really coerced into accepting credits and these things from Ivy Tech and online university, and all these kinds of things. Have you heard anything—is there anything in the air—

ROBEL: —Yeah—

JACOBS: —they're trying to push this type of integration [indistinct comment] implications?

ROBEL: It has huge implications, and the—there are lots of ways in which it has implications, and that, too, has been a theme of some of the budget conferences, and again, Vice Provost Stephens is here and could probably speak to some of this because she's been in the trenches around it, but the—there are some real structural questions going forward, and they're not—you know, it's—I think it's easy to think of them as the state government having initiatives to require us to set say, prices for online education or to accept credits, all of which have huge implications for the—for the financial structure.

JACOBS: The quality, too.

ROBEL: And the quality of our institution, and so that's been another theme of the budget hearings, is—and I think it's one that has to be taken up in a bigger way as a piece of having a coordinated plan for how we approach this. The—from the administrative side, it has certainly been important for—for the administration to try to resist the pieces of this that impinge on our ability to make decisions both about quality and about cost, particularly when we know what the cost of instruction is, but there is a real—

JACOBS: I would hate for the Board of Trustees to come down with some kind of a thing, you know, from Indianapolis—through Indianapolis that, I mean—

ROBEL: —It's not that—I don't think it's actually that. I don't think that's the issue.

JACOBS: Okay.

ROBEL: I think that, in fact, the real—the real serious issue is the question of who sets the terms, the financial terms, and the academic terms for our institution, and the Board of Trustees, I think, is where it has been situated by statute and tradition for a long time, the Board of Trustees has the institution's interest, as—Indiana University's interest—as it's only charge, and not all parts of the body politic have the institution's interest as its only charge. Well, we have with us today Vice President Zaret, who was kind enough last time to allow us to bump him from the agenda, and kind enough to return after having been bumped, so, David, if I could invite you up. How about right up here?

ZARET: Over here?

ROBEL: Yes, thank you. No PowerPoint?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: No PowerPoint for us?

AGENDA ITEM 6: INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS REPORT

ZARET: You shouldn't confuse me with Brad Wheeler. [Laughter] Thank you for giving me an opportunity to come before you on this beautiful, late winter day. Can we go outside and hold class outside, perhaps? What I'd like to do is give you an update on current initiatives and new developments in IU International Activities. First, let me say something very quickly about my office, which would be helpful to keep in mind. Like many other central university offices, mine has two overlapping roles. On the one hand, my office is responsible for many international activities that occur specifically on the Bloomington campus. On the other hand, my office also has system-wide oversight and responsibility for a wide range of policies relating to international activities, and so some of the initiatives that I'll talk about pertain to the first area, and some pertain to the second.

First, what you should know about IU International Activities is that we continue to be one of this nation's leading universities in the area of institutional development, that is in projects that are designed to help build principally higher education institutions overseas or to otherwise enhance their capacity to achieve their—their goals. This is nothing new. As some of you know, it goes back to the end of World War II, when Herman Wells was stationed in Berlin, and in 1948 and 1949, he was instrumental in the creation of what is one of Germany's premier institutions, the Freie Universität—the Free University of Berlin. This year, we've announced

two new USAID projects, a rather large \$7.2 million grant from USAID where we are taking the lead role in helping the University of Liberia to rebuild its capacity to turn out health professionals, that is nurses and doctors. During the civil war not too many years ago, the university was literally looted, and this is a country in desperate need of health professionals, so we announced this project about the middle of the fall semester.

Toward the end of the fall semester, we became engaged in another USAID project. This is with Chemonics in Indonesia, where we're helping to create graduate level programs in higher education administration. These would be examples of institutional development projects that operate out of my office. There are similar projects that operate from several other schools, notably the School of Education, where Terry Mason and his colleagues are engaged in a very important project to develop a capacity for English language instruction in Afghanistan under extremely difficult conditions. And the Institute for International Affairs and the cyber center at the Kelley School has also been involved with this activity.

Where these activities involve coordination among a number of schools, typically Charles Reafsnnyder, in my office, will take a lead role; where these activities focus pretty much on one school, as in the case of Education, then we're only involved peripherally as advisors. I've mentioned two new programs.

I had an overwhelming experience earlier this fall in looking at the culmination of one of these programs when I went with President McRobbie to Macedonia. The president was invited there to receive a medal in conjunction with the tenth anniversary of the founding of Southeast European University. This was a university that IU took the lead role in founding ten years ago. It was a project jointly with the Soros Foundation and USAID, and the explicit intent in founding this university was to create the first institution of higher education in Macedonia that offers instruction in Macedonian, in Albanian, and English; and the deliberate intent was to try to integrate Macedonian and Albanian students, and lower the level of ethnic violence and conflict that, at that time, was raging in that country as a consequence of the dissolution of the former Republic of Yugoslavia. When I got there, I encountered an institution with faculty and staff with a profound love for this institution. Almost all of the faculty over the last ten years have been to this campus or to IUPUI for training. We've lent them all sorts of technical assistance, and they're doing well. In fact, in the recent Shanghai Index that ranks, for better or worse, world universities, Southeast European University was ranked the number two institution behind only the University of Skopje in that country. So all of you, all of us, should feel, I think, quite proud of the good that IU has done and continues to do in the world with regard to development projects, mostly related to higher education.

Another new initiative, which coincides with my move into this position, is to work more closely than has been the case in the past with the IU Alumni Association and the IU Foundation; and

so members of my staff are working with members of Gene Tempel and J.T. Forbes' staff in finding new opportunities to engage our alums around the world to IU, to find programming for them. I think there is a lot of undeveloped capacity on the development front to take advantage of the enormous goodwill that prevails among our alums across the world.

This is also a self-interested activity, not only because of the potential for development, but also because our overseas alums are ambassadors of goodwill, and in many instances they play a key role in helping to recruit students to Indiana University. I think over the course of this current academic year, there have been four spontaneously organized meetings, hosted by our alumni in China for perspective IU students. This is self-organized activity. We didn't organize it. We didn't know about it. We are immensely grateful for it.

So far this year, we have opened two new alumni chapters. One in New Delhi in India, which complements our alumni chapter in Mumbai; and in October I was in Poland, and attended the creation of an alumni chapter, actually an association of alumni and friends at the University of Warsaw, where we have many people, some of whom were here in the late 1950's and early 1960's who are still active in several different units at the University of Warsaw. So there are new efforts to try to do more on the—with our alums with fundraising.

Overseas study is a very important activity. I think most of you remember the announcement early this fall that IU has now moved among the nation's top ten institutions with regard to the number of students that we send from Bloomington for an overseas study experience. If we limit this only to students who go on one semester or longer exchanges, we currently are number six in the nation, and we'd like—we would like to do more. About a month and a half ago, we announced a new \$20 million campaign to raise scholarships to help defray the extra costs that students encounter when they attend overseas study. This \$20 million will be used as a match to encourage donations on all eight IU campuses. The logic of this follows the same as the faculty—the match program for faculty endowments. And we're hoping over a three-year period to be able to spend all of that money in this campaign.

International student services and recruitment is another area of activity in my office. There are several new developments cooking here. The Bloomington campus is served by my office for international services, visa processing, both for students as well as international scholars. As of July 1 this past summer, my office assumed responsibility for the recruitment of international undergraduates to the Bloomington campus. There is a parallel office on the IUPUI campus that performs similar functions with regard to recruitment and visa activity.

The intent in shifting undergraduate international student recruitment from OEM to my office had the goal of more tightly integrating recruitment activity, student support services, and compliance with SEVIS and other homeland security requirements. And so, we are now in the

middle of our first recruitment cycle in which Chris Viers in my office is working with a group of recruiters; we have reformulated the organization of the office. We've added staff. We are taking a somewhat different approach in the handling and processing of applications. Nineteen separate shadow systems have disappeared. We now have a fully functional integrated system, and we are hoping to do much better than the past track record in which it took, on average, about, for last year, thirty-six days between receipt of an inquiry from a prospective student and a response from Indiana University. The nationwide average is about eighteen or nineteen days, and we are determined to get down to that and perhaps better it.

As many of you know, this past July a new requirement for English language proficiency was put into place for the application process, and we are now processing applications, and in line with this new proficiency requirement. We are running somewhat behind last year's admissions pace. The target goal for this year for new international beginning freshman students was eight hundred students. I think we may be somewhat closer to the six hundred level, but we'll see. It's still early in the year.

The—there's one other aspect to this that I do want to share with you. We carefully monitor the experiences of our international students. For the last three years, we have engaged in an initiative with a private outfit called Insight International that administers a thoughtfully constructed questionnaire to international students. They do this with about two hundred and three institutions in eighteen different countries. This year there were responses from two hundred and three thousand new international students. The response rate on this campus was almost fifty percent, which was heartening. And what the data show for this year as for the last two years is that compared to other institutions in the United States as well as benchmarking against other institutions throughout the world, we do a very good job with regard to the experiences that these students have in the classroom, in the residence facilities, in the orientation, in the visa advising. We are above where others are on just about all accounts, and so I just do want to assure you that, you know, we are looking carefully at the types of experiences that these students obtain after they arrive; and the data suggests, again, that we can be quite proud of what it is that we offer students. They're rational actors. We attract them because they indicate they are attracted to the quality of the programs. They report extremely high satisfaction levels with the quality of instruction as well as satisfaction with other experiences—co-curricular experiences outside the classroom.

Finally, one last initiative, I announced to the Trustees at their meeting in February, I would describe this not so much as a freight train as a sail boat gliding swiftly across the waters. I think the time has come for Indiana University to try to enhance and ramp up our international activities abroad, both in terms of faculty research opportunities, alumni engagement, development that is across the range of academic and non-academic international activities.

We need to enhance these by establishing a physical presence overseas. I am not at all referring to any intention of creating a branch campus. I use the term “gateway facility” deliberately to signal that this is something less than a branch campus, but I do think talking with individual researchers, talking with the heads of the deans of various schools, the IU Foundation, the Alumni Association, and others, we need a base of operations where we can showcase faculty talent, where faculty can have, if you will, a place where they can organize conferences and workshops with colleagues, a place where we can do programming for alumni. Beijing would probably be the first site for such a gateway facility if we do decide to move forward with this initiative. One partner would be IU Health, that is the corporate side of our hospital system, which is already quite active in China, and so my intent or strategy, broadly described, is to bring in as many partners as possible, widely distribute the costs and the risks so that the net cost to academic units would be comparatively low.

The Kelley School is actively exploring options for a similar facility in New Delhi, and so we will look into prospects for establishing a similar gateway facility in New Delhi. If an assessment of needs and interests in a reasonable business model can work out, and if these experiments prove successful, I would hope to be able to move on next to Istanbul. Aside from the fact that it’s my favorite city in the world, a more substantial reason for doing this is that it would enable us to link up with some of the extremely high quality institutions that now exist in Istanbul; here I’m thinking of Koç University, perhaps. And it would also, perhaps, give us a leg up in beginning to recruit more students from Turkey.

We do have a strategic plan for Bloomington international student recruitment, which envisions trying to diversify a bit more away from our overwhelming reliance on China. I think we have significant opportunities in recruiting undergraduates from India and Turkey. I think the two reasons, one, both produce high quality undergraduates with very limited spaces in quality institutions; and second, English language familiarity and issues of cultural dissonance, I think, would be more manageable. So, you know, many of these different initiatives that I’ve described to you, the institutional development gateway facility, student recruitment, all of these—all of these initiatives, in different ways, link up and, I think, tend to promote the greater cause. Why don’t I stop there, and I’d be happy to respond to any questions, concerns, or comments that you may have. Yeah, Herb?

TERRY: I have one quick question, and one that’s more substantial. You’re eight hundred or six hundred figure, that’s the number of students that we would deem admissible and to whom we’d extend an admissions offer. What kind of a yield do we—

ZARET: Oh, I am referring to, well, a caveat and then a response to your question. I am not an expert in the arts of enrollment management. The six hundred to eight hundred is the estimate for the number of admits who would accept.

TERRY: It is the yield.

ZARET: Yeah, okay. So, the yield, right. I cannot tell you offhand what fraction that represents, but I can certainly get you that number.

TERRY: [indistinct comment]. What percentage of our freshman would that leave us with?

ZARET: Well, the target was eleven percent for this recruitment cycle, which translated into that eight hundred number. Again, it's still early in the recruitment cycle. I'm told by our international admissions staff that, in many instances, they have applications that do not have the English language test scores. Part of the reason for that is that there was no information disclosed about that requirement prior to July 1 this summer, when my office took over that activity. So, we're playing catch up. I can assure you that responsible decisions will be made. I can also report that my International Admissions Office works very closely with OEM in doing this, so there's good communication back and forth, and we'll see where we land. So, more than six hundred, less than eight hundred is my seat of the pants, uninformed, rash projection.

TERRY: And then my more substantial question. Many universities are engaging in joint degree programs with foreign institutions. You come, you spend some time at this institution, and then the other, and you end up with degrees from both or something like that. I think those are excellent ideas if they're run right, but there are other universities like Dickinson State that have seriously mismanaged that process. To what extent are we exploring joint degree programs with—?

ZARET: — That's a very good question. We are looking at it very closely. There are issues. Let us distinguish between a joint and a dual degree. Most of the—at the undergraduate level, certainly are dual degrees. Often these go—they're known as two plus two programs. A student does two years abroad, comes to IU, does two years, they end up with a baccalaureate degree from both institutions. This is increasingly popular, sometimes for the right reasons, sometimes not. In the not category would be institutions that do this as a mechanism for recruiting international students. That's putting the cart before the horse in my mind. There is a growing accreditation issue; it's been flagged by the Western Association. If a student does two years at one institution, two years at another institution, and there's nothing value added, what is the justification for being awarded two degrees? Bill Plater from IUPUI is a member—is one of the accreditors in the western region, and I've talked with him about this. Guidelines—new accreditation guidelines will force all California institutions within the next two or three years to have two plus two programs that have some other component—an additional year of study or some other value added component to justify the dual degrees. We have yet to confront that issue here at Indiana University. It's—but it's on the agenda, and we are—we're looking at it.

TRIX: This gateway facility, I know this is just an idea. You're thinking of like an apartment with a staff person where you could have people meet. Can you tell me a little bit more what you have in mind?

ZARET: Well, I'm not sure we want the meeting in someone's private apartment, but if you go to the University of Chicago website, and Google around for China facility, you will see pictures and a narrative of the gateway facility that Chicago opened in the Fall of 2010 in Beijing. We are thinking along broadly similar lines. The space would come in three or four types. There would be individual office space for faculty. There would be small conference or seminar rooms with a teleconferencing capacity. You would want a small classroom or auditorium in the thirty to sixty seat range, but we would want space configured along those lines to facilitate small workshops, meetings, presentations. The Chicago facility came forward in 2008 as a faculty proposal, from the faculty, for a seven thousand square foot facility. The facility that was created is a twenty-three thousand square foot facility. We are not thinking about anything quite as grand along those lines, but in terms of the functionality and the type of facility, Chicago would be a good example of what we have in mind. Ohio State has a gateway facility. It's had it for a while in Shanghai. They're moving to open a satellite operation in Beijing, and they will have a facility in New Delhi. So, yeah, other institutions have found this be necessary in order to leverage and advance the nature and range of their international engagements, but this wouldn't include residential facilities, apartments for people.

TRIX: I was just thinking it of a space [indistinct comment], but okay.

ROBEL: Shu?

COLE: In the big scheme of things that's happening in your office, I think this probably will be a very minor issue, but I do think it probably has some relevance or a significance to our students—international students. I wonder if in your office there are any kind of psychological services for international students because in some Asian countries, for example, psychological counseling is a really foreign topic. This past weekend, for example, in HPER, we had one international student pass away, and then I was talking to one of the student leaders in the Asian community, and they were talking about their friends were very, very close to this particular person who may not know how to deal with their grief. But—so, I recommended, because our dean sent it out in email, and told people to go to counseling service, so I reiterated that, but the student specifically said well what if they don't even know, or they can't even relate to that. But I was just thinking as the number of international students that's coming to our campus—if there was any specialized who might know these kinds of issues because Asian—especially in a lot of Asian countries, counseling is not in their dictionary.

ZARET: Yeah, no that's an excellent point. We still do not know the cause of the student's death. The mother, the father, and a son will be flying here. We will do everything we can with the US Embassy in China to expedite emergency visas. Personnel in my office will take them from the airport. We'll find housing. We, you know, we have, unfortunately, a lot of experience in dealing with situations like this. In these situations, we work very closely with CAPS, which is the psychological counseling facility. They're outstanding. They have some counselors who are especially adept at working with international student populations, and we also work very closely with Carol McCord and Pete Goldsmith in the dean of the students. So the short answer to your question is no. We're not going to, and I don't think it would be wise for us, to duplicate or recreate the kinds of counseling services that CAPS organizes. They're very, very good at what they do. But we work very closely with them, so it's a team approach with them, the dean of students, the IU Police Department. I watched this email traffic go by, and it's a moving experience. I mean, I'm proud of the very good job that we do. We're compassionate, and we're adept at it. We deal with large numbers of students, and in large-end situations, bad things happen at a certain frequency.

COLE: I was thinking—I can assume there is probably a mechanism for students if they go to international student services because that's often—our international students, whenever there's a problem, they would go to you, but I assume that there's a mechanism for directing them if there's any suspicion that there's something going on.

ZARET: Absolutely. We work very closely with CAPS. Bruce?

JAFFEE: I'd like to get your philosophy or view of memos of understanding or agreements with other universities. I think my understanding is when President McRobbie started, he was surprised by the number of MOU's that we had, and eliminated a lot of them, and had a very strategic choice of looking at MOU's that were with leading research institutions of certain key geographic areas. In your opening remarks, which I thought were very good, you know, you talked about SEEU and Liberia, which certainly aren't top-notch research universities. I think what we do there is great, but what's your view in terms of future MOU's or other ties between IU and other universities?

ZARET: Yeah, no good question. I did not, in my remarks, say anything about inter-institutional agreements that we sign. My philosophy, if it's as grand as that, is that these agreements should enhance the reputation of Indiana University, and that means there's a bias toward agreements with institutions that reasonably can be regarded as peer institutions. We have a strategic plan for international activities in 2008 that enunciates that philosophy, and delineates thirty-two priority countries, but in international affairs, one size does not fit all. So, if we were rigorously to adhere to the principle of dealing with peer institutions, we would not

be engaged in institutional development activity. You know, Oxford University and Cambridge don't need us to help them build anything. A war-torn Berlin did. Liberia does.

So, the philosophy does not apply to institutional development. That would be the—it's an exception, but then there are lots of those in higher education. So, yeah, there is the bias that it should be a peer institution, but again, there will be exceptions, and it could be based on a very specific programmatic need. We signed agreements recently with three institutions in Ghana. I think they have a unique set of assets that overlap with the interests of faculty who have substantial expertise in the anthropology and the politics of West Africa and, you know, there's a compelling reason to say, okay, this may not be level one, but it's level two, and it fits with other considerations.

ROBEL: David, thank you so much for that wonderful report.

ZARET: You're welcome. Thank you. [Applause]

ROBEL: Well, we are right on time. So, I will turn to Padraic Kenney for renewal of our discussion from last time from the EPC.

AGENDA ITEM 7: EDUCATION POLICIES COMMITTEE RESPONSE TO PHASE 1 OF THE STUDENT SERVICES INITIATIVE

KENNEY: Okay, thank you very much. Well, I really hope that you all did your homework. I will remind you of that homework. There will not be a test, but I'll know who passed. Last time, I presented to you the results of the Educational Policies Committee review of what we know so far about the Shared Services Initiative, and I see that now we have members of the Shared Services Initiative with us today. I don't think I need to say a great deal about the document that we gave you last time and this time, except I'll characterize it again because I want to be clear about this. This is not a list of complaints. It is not a list of flaws. It is rather, if we're going to have a faculty conversation about the Shared Services Initiative, which we should, and the Educational Policies Committee is asked to get that conversation going, here's some issues that we felt could be part of such a conversation. They relate to the ways that policies are created on this campus, the various bodies with which the EPC and, therefore, the BFC interact. They relate, I guess, indirectly, as I said at the last meeting, they relate indirectly to the nature of faculty governance. I don't want to blow this up into, you know, the great subject of faculty governance, but it does, of course, relate to that question. And I think I will stop there. I did not give you a very long document, so you can skim it if you didn't look at it before, you won't be able to do that with the Phase 1 report, but you read it, so I think I'm done.

ROBEL: And thank you, maybe I'll introduce our guests.

KENNEY: Yes.

ROBEL: Alright! Jim Kennedy has been the project director of this—of this project, but you know him better as associate vice president for university student services and systems, and Steve Keucher as associate vice president in that regard, and I think it would be helpful probably, at this point, Jim—probably Jim, if you would take the lead here, and just describe your objectives with the SSI project, and then we'll open it up for questions.

KENNEDY: Sure, great. Thank you. I appreciate that, and thank you everyone for the time today. We really appreciate the opportunity to come here today and talk about Student Services Initiative, and answer any questions you have about the project, and we very much value your input as we move forward this initiative. I thought I'd just give a little bit of background. I know there was a discussion about this at the last meeting. We know last year there was some benchmark studies done on student services, on HR, on marketing, and with those benchmark studies, the Trustees asked us to go ahead and move forward with the Student Services Initiative, to basically look at the back office processes with student services, and to see what we can do better, for better service, and also to look—while we're looking at these processes, if there is an opportunity for some cost savings. So, with that, we started this project last fall.

Initially, Accenture, who was part of the benchmarking, indicated that we could come up with \$21 million in savings on the student services area. So we went through phase one of the report, which is this—Padraic was referring to this big report that came out, this forty-two page report, which is our preliminary report to kind of look through and see where we're at with student services with the admissions, the records side, the financial aid, the student financials or bursar, and advising. Mostly on advising are the advising tools that are used. Just to take a look at this and see if there's some opportunity. So, this report is a preliminary report. It's just to get a better indication where we're at. And the best part about this report, it was compiled by—with representation from all the campuses. We worked through this, and we came through. We indicate that we could come up with maybe about \$7 million—\$7.7 million in savings. So we were able to adjust that figure downward quite a bit with this report, and really just to take a look at the back office processes and see what we can do different as we move forward.

So, last fall, we put together this report. The last couple of months, Steve and I have been out to all the campuses. We talked to various groups about this report, getting feedback, concerns. Padraic's been really good talking to us about some of the concerns that have come up here and at the EPC. The real work that we will embark on coming up here is in phase three, where we really look at the detailed processes, to see where the actual savings will come from. At this point, it's been really kind of a high level, preliminary, very much high level to see where we're at. And a lot of the pieces in the report will really depend on technology initiatives that we need

to put in place. And when I talk about that, it's document imaging, it's CRM, it's workflow, it's some things that we really need to work on at the university to help us automate some of the back office processes.

Another thing we are really looking at is, you know, we have a very complicated student information system, Oracle, PeopleSoft, you remember that name some years ago. It's a very complicated—

ROBEL: Some of us still flinch when we—

KENNEDY: —I know, I noticed that. [Laughter] There's individuals that work in that system. They're very expensive individuals with a high skill set, and we're trying to see, do we really need seven of those individuals across all the campuses, or can we share some of those and maybe have two or three experts that could do the services for all the campuses. So there's lots of things that are going on with this initial report, our review. And then we'll move into phase three, but I think two pieces that Steve and I have talked quite a bit to the different campus about two issues that keep coming up, and I think they're a lot of what Padraic has brought up is the academic harmonization; that piece has been brought up, a lot of questions about that.

And I want to be clear, because in the report, I don't think it was very—it wasn't stated exactly the way I would have liked to have it. When we look at that, we're really looking at is there some academic policies that we can compile that maybe there could be some efficiencies gained. That would have to go to the faculty for review and change. That is just a compilation. It's not to say that with this initiative we're going to go in and change those policies. Basically, what it means is that we would like to bring those forward for review at some point, and if it's hey, you know, that's the way it is, we really need to have it this way, great, that's the end of it. But I think what we tried to say in this report is some of those academic policies, which are different across all the campuses, if we could bring those forward and take a look, and there is some harmonization there. There could be some cost savings with that piece, but, like I said, that would really be a faculty decision; that would not be a decision what we would make, and I wish we had initially put that a little bit better in the report.

The second piece we've had a lot of questions on is the notion of a university registrar. Believe it or not, we used to have a university registrar at IU. We're really looking at somebody that can help us with the back office pieces, and how we can work these together. We really, with the technology and the business processes, we will still have a registrar at each campus, and that person will continue to work with the faculty; they will be the liaison with the policy pieces, but the university registrar would really be working with all the campuses to look at the standardization of a lot of the processes and see what we can do better.

So those are really two of the big pieces that—two questions that we received a lot of comments and questions about as we've gone to the different groups and discussed. The big piece of the report will happen in phase three where we'll really get the campus representation together, and really work through the business processes, and see what we can propose to do better. Not only the business processes, but also incorporating some of the technology into those pieces. So, with that, I thought I would open it up for quick questions.

KENNEY: Jim, could I ask you just to clarify a bit more on this relationship between the registrar and the university registrar because, when you're describing what the university registrar would do, those, to me, sounded like initial tasks, like the first things in the door would be to look at some policies and to figure out what needs to be harmonized. And I guess one could ask well, then what, after—and that sounds like it's sort of an extension of a part of the Student Services Initiative itself, and that's fine, but then I'm wondering what happens after that, once the university registrar has surveyed the scene and identified some policies—what would he or she do, and what would the relationship be to campus registrars whom you describe as a liaison, I believe.

KENNEDY: Well, the work would still continue on, just like we have a university financial aid director. The work would continue. There's a lot of changes in higher education, a lot of things happening, and we would continue to work on the back office business processes as they change, what we can do better. We're working on the technology pieces, looking at ways that we can be more efficient, and we would, you know, that person would lead those initiatives to see what we can do better. And things change so fast; so many of the different things that are going on with student records or the other modules that we believe that having that person in that lead role could really help coordinate those changes and keep us reviewing, and how to do things better in the future.

ROBEL: I think it might be good to have a concrete example here, that would probably be helpful—a kind of task that you're imagining.

KENNEDY: Sure. So, maybe a good example would be we decide, as we're working through generating transcripts, let's say electronic transcripts, we decide there's a way that we want to do that where we have one place where a student can go get a transcript, right? If they apply online, there's one place we generate it for all the campuses, right? We would still have a way—a local flavor to that, right? So, if a student came in, and they wanted a transcript right away, we would have that still locally, too, but maybe for all the campuses, we have a way that you can electronically apply for a transcript, right? Well, those things change a lot, you know, we move from a PDF format, to electronically sending those, to being secure. There's a lot of technology changes that happen with generating those transcripts, and there's changes that are mandated or worked through that we have to look at those. So, when we go through that

process, that person would continue to work on those initiatives to see what we can do different. That's—maybe that's an example that we could look at.

KENNEY: But that's—sorry, the second part of the question that how does that work relate—what's the relationship between that work and the work that a campus level registrar does?

KENNEDY: Well, they would coordinate that with the other registrars. So it would be a collaborative effort with the other registrars to work on those initiatives together on the back office pieces.

KENNEY: Okay, and something that's generated from a campus registrar—what's the—I mean, presumably, while some things we have the university registrar surveying the domain and creating initiatives that then are worked on with the campus registrars, I'm having a hard time picturing then what happens with the relationship with the campus registrar to the university registrar. The campus registrars wait for initiatives that they then are coordinated?

KENNEDY: Well, I think that they'd all work together, and I think, you know, they would work on the initiatives as a group. There would be best practices that would be described. Getting, you know, especially from the Bloomington perspective, the Registrar involved in the decisions with the other campuses, from the back office perspective, you know, working on better ways to improve the processes as we move forward. So, I think that would be ongoing.

KENNEY: Do registrars now ever meet?

KENNEDY: Yes, they do.

KENNEY: So, how would that be different? It sounds like the same thing then, only with an additional person.

KENNEDY: Well, I think there could be some more efficiencies because right now we're very different at the campus for the back office processes. So, if you look at some of the ways that we do things, we—this is one of the struggles we have with this project, and I gave the example last time of—of processing a Pell grant. So, at the end of the day, we all want the Pell grant to be paid, and the student to have their money, but we do it seven different ways. Some are manual, some use the system. Is there a way that we can streamline those to make it more efficient, and maybe, with that, have some cost savings as well. So, that's where we're looking at because there's some campuses that have really, really good processes. They're ahead of the game, they're national experts we have in some of these offices, and we have some of the campuses that are way behind. So, can we leverage that together and get everybody up to speed?

ROBEL: So the students can have their money.

KENNEDY: That's right, so everybody can have their money. Exactly.

ROBEL: Let's see. I think, Frances has had her hand up for a while.

TRIX: This report make me really nervous. I also never found phase two. You went from phase one to phase three, but I will jump that. It's page three that makes me particularly nervous, at the bottom. And when I was listening to the report the last time we met, I was trying to listen to Padraic talking about harmonization, and I have trouble with these lovely, you know, Student Service Initiative and harmonization, and you're cutting lots of staff, and you're cutting fifty-nine positions, and I picked up on that last time, but if you look below that—everybody see at the bottom? It goes on from there. Then they want to cut fifty-eight, and then it goes on even more. And I don't think there's that much fat in this system. There may be different ways of doing things, but what I'm missing in this report, and I come from an industrial background, what I'm missing in this report is the downside of these cuts.

When you—when you make changes, there's downsides, and I don't see any looking at the downsides, so this report looks to me you will—forgive me, pie in the sky because oh, we could cut all these, and we will save these, but in all these changes, there's going to be downsides, too. So whenever I see a report like this, I like to see that people have thought what are going to lose with this? Fifty-nine people, you're going to lose things with this. So I want people to have thought through that, too. And I didn't find that aspect in this report.

KENNEDY: Maybe I could address—

TRIX: — Do you hear me?

KENNEDY: I do hear you, and let me—maybe I could address your questions. I mean, the project is broken under the three phases, and phase two is really the presentation. We're going to getting input from the campuses on the report like we're doing today. So that's really phase two of the report.

On the bottom of page three, I think we've—on purpose, we've listed two bullet points there. The first bullet point is the savings of \$7.7 million. That is the estimate that we came up with with working together with all the different campuses, and the representation on the campuses, right? The next bullet point is Accenture's estimate. And we've clearly made sure that those are on different lines, and if you look at the actual savings on page six and seven, we put—on page six, that the estimated savings that we've come up with, and then on page seven is from Accenture. So we've—on purpose, we've made these clearly distinct, I believe, that there's a difference between the two. Now, of the fifty-nine that we have in scope, we did this benchmark study last year, and we've already had early retirements, and we've had attrition,

which we will already have a reduction in that fifty-nine; we've already had some reduction in that already.

So, I think—I think you're point is very good, and I think we really need to look at this as we go forward with phase three because when we do phase three, we are going to be looking at the detailed business processes to see. This report could be wrong. Some of it will need to be reevaluated as well. This is a high level review of where we're at, and as we get into phase three, we'll get more of an understanding of what we can make local, what needs to be in a shared service, and what are the potential cost-savings.

TRIX: I mean, what I find with changes, again and again, I asked some of the staff, I said what happened with the last "quality" cut, and it was I think in purchasing, and they said they used to have somebody who did purchasing of computers at each campus, but now, apparently, if you want computers, you have to go through Indianapolis. Is that right? I mean I just asked one person. Usually I would ask more than one. And they said, that's an expensive thing, and it used to be somebody who knew the needs on campus. Now you have to go through somebody who doesn't know the needs. Now, is—my question is do we do evaluations after you make these changes ever to know if you've really saved anything? I don't think people do that. I think you just live with it.

KENNEDY: Well, here's the difference. When we're doing this report, in the next phase and phase three, we are doing with all the campuses. We are—there's going to be representation—

TRIX: —Are you talking to staff people, not just administrators because I looked at your list and they look like a heck of a lot of administrators?

KENNEDY: Well, we're going to get a wide variety of individuals involved in looking at the model, and that's what we're putting together.

TRIX: Will there be staff people in those people?

KENNEDY: We will include staff people as well, that's correct. And the one thing that we've had with this is we've been given an opportunity. I mean, the Trustees were giving a figure of \$21 million that could be potential cuts, and we've been given the opportunity to say let's take a look at this and see—can we put a better model in place? Can we do some of the examples we talked about where maybe we can leverage individuals to do other tasks besides just at their campus? So I think, you know, there is some concerns there, but we're trying to figure out a new model and to see if we can find better ways to do things, and maybe potentially come up with some cost-savings as well.

TRIX: I don't know—

ROBEL: —I think we really need to let other people ask questions, too. Thanks. Bill you had your hand up?

WHEELER: Thank you. I would like to turn Jim's attention to a question. I sent him an email along with several other people, shifting from harmonization of existing policies to implementation of future policies. In order to be concrete, this is only still hypothetical, what you mentioned that the EPC has been asked to consider a proposal to restrict the number of W's that students might be allowed to have. And I say, you know, we have not talked about this, but as a hypothetical example, if in fact the EPC were to bring the proposal to the Council and the Council were to adopt a policy, then in the present situation we would then go to the Bloomington registrar and development and to try to implement such a limit would proceed apace with the registrar. Under the shared services situation, it seems to be rather different. You know, the development would not be going on on the Bloomington campus and Bloomington registrar's office. And it seems as though this—on page twenty-four, this Enterprise Student Systems Executive Committee, you know, would have a role where they might even overrule possibly on the actions of the Council. So I'm wondering, if you could please discuss, you know, if—for regards to future policy initiatives for the Bloomington campus, you know, how will that be impacted, and how will that be handled in this new environment?

KENNEDY: Well, if the Bloomington Faculty Council or the University Faculty Council comes up with an initiative that has to be done, we will implement it. So, the process will be pretty much the same. It would go to the registrar at the Bloomington campus, and it will be worked in to the student information system, and we would consider an initiative from the Bloomington Faculty Council or one of the faculty councils the top initiative that we need to get in place as soon as possible.

WHEELER: Thank you.

ROBEL: Let's see, Herb?

TERRY: I would like to follow up on that. I mean, that was not the pattern when we implemented PeopleSoft. There were a number of policies on this campus and others, and indeed, PeopleSoft originally proved impossible to implement across all campuses. President Herbert focused it on IUPUI and Bloomington for a while. We lost, for example, both a policy and a system that we received an award for, the waitlist guarantees, for students who weren't able to get into a course one semester and where they were promised they would get placed the next time. That was useful for planning in schools and anticipating how many courses, and basically the explanation that was given for its disappearance was that PeopleSoft couldn't do it. We could change PeopleSoft to do it, but it would cost us a lot of money to change

PeopleSoft to do it, and, furthermore, it wouldn't be a one-time cost, that we would fund this to be changed in PeopleSoft once, and then the next time PeopleSoft issued a revision of its system, we would have to pay PeopleSoft again to up—to change the implement, and so that the [indistinct comment] grew, you know, that PeopleSoft made us do it. You seem to be saying that that's changed, that we are now prepared to spend the money to produce the information systems to execute the policies of the campuses as well as the system. Is that really true? Can we really change where we'll spend that money?

KENNEDY: Well, I mean I think we would definitely take a look at the pieces you brought up. I mean, PeopleSoft has come a long way since we put it in in 2003-04, 04-05, I mean we're talking eight years ago. We've come a long way with the system, and, you know, I think it's true that there was some, you know, and the old system had some great functionality, but, on the other hand, it didn't do financial aid and admissions and other things very well at all. So I think there was a tradeoff with that system. I think we've come a long way with the system. I don't hear a lot about PeopleSoft. I hope people don't either. I mean, it's pretty much behind the scenes now at the point, and I think we've been able to move ahead with some pretty good initiatives for the university. The one that Bill sent me an email on about, you know, withdrawals. I mean, that would be something that we could put in place without a lot of programming. We would definitely make it a priority for—if that's a faculty initiative.

TERRY: But what is the answer to my question? Will we do this routinely when the campuses say here's a policy that, for one reason or another, needs to be the way it is?

KENNEDY: Right, I think the answer is yes. We would definitely look at that.

SWANSON: On page six, it described a hundred and seventeen FTE that will be ideally reduced, and those are people getting paid, it looks like [indistinct comment] about \$18 an hour. [Indistinct comment]. What kind of person is going to be removed? We're going to lose a hundred and seventeen of these people who on average make about \$18 an hour. So those are going to disappear because it's going to be centralized. I try to think about, in my institution, who's that going to be. Does it mean I can no longer walk down the hall when I have a problem that needs to be settled, but I need to do an email across campus? So I read the whole document, and I see these things that show shared support and so forth, but I really can't, from this, visualize okay, who are those people? It's a hundred and seventeen poorly paid people that are going to be removed, and every time I've seen staff reductions, it just means more work is put on the faculty, and I just filled out one of the faculty workload things because I'm a researcher. You know, there's a lot of concern about the fact that the workload of faculty just keeps going up. And when I see the hundred and seventeen, I can't think of who that is; I'm really curious, some kind of example of how that's going to go forward without being disruptive.

KENNEDY: Well, let me start, and then I'll have Steve answer some of the specific number pieces. Your point is very well taken. I mean, this was a very high level review to try to really, you know, look at the overall processes. We were originally changed with \$21 million in savings when we came up with going through this with the \$7.7 million figure. So, using—and to come up with that, you know, there's some direct savings. We have the fifty-nine, but then the other pieces of it are more of in the departments, which are really out of scope for this project because we're not looking at the departments for savings. We're saying that if we can do some of these automation processes with imaging and work flow, maybe there would be some roll over to the other departments. But from the departmental prospective, they're really out of scope. So, it's really a high level review.

KEUCHER: The other thing to say about it is that this wasn't an identification of specific people, specific positions on specific campuses. The review that was done in phase one was, as Jim said, a high level review of the business processes. So we came up with an estimate of the FTE that there was a potential to save. In order to put a dollar figure on it, we took the average compensation per FTE that had been identified in the benchmarking study. So there was nothing scientific about it. There was nothing—no—absolutely no attempt to determine whose position or even on what campus or certainly not in what department. And so we ended up with a figure representing a potential for savings. What we will do in phase three, as Jim said, is do the business process redesign, which will get into the—far more detail in to what's involved in doing each one of these steps and these processes, and determine where those are going to be, ideally, and what kind of FTE it's going to take in order to get them done.

ROBEL: John?

PAOLILLO: So, it seems to me that the logic of this process is that there's some body of policy which bears on students and the repository for that policy is a database system. And the logic of database systems is that they're best used when efficiencies can be achieved, and efficiencies can be achieved greatest when they're pushed out to the largest number of places that can use them. And then when you push them out to the largest number of places that can use them, that means that there are things which may be different in those places—done differently in those places, which have to be harmonized. Okay, so then we have essentially a policy database, and then taking the database and pushing it into other places, and then that means essentially harmonizing or actually changing policy. In addition, you're also centralizing the way that policy is going to be shaped. I think it's really, really important that you brought up PeopleSoft and that it's being kicked around because I think PeopleSoft provides us a valuable lesson about the kinds of costs that are involved in doing these kinds of implementation in a database, and a lot of the costs, and you may say, well, you know, I hope that, you know, PeopleSoft is—it's not really on anybody's minds right now, but, in fact, a lot of the costs that

you have in working with a database system like that are things that are a little bit, all the time, over a long period of time.

And then the other cost that's involved is when we get to a point, and we decide that we have to chuck the whole thing, like whatever was done when PeopleSoft was put in place, is an enormously expensive database migration. I would like to suggest that this is probably not the best way to go about making policy.

KENNEDY: Well, I guess I would agree with you. This is really looking at a lot of the back office processes we do. I mean, that's the primary focus, and what we're really trying to do is look in phase three at ways that we can gain efficiencies. That's what we're really focused on with this system. It's a powerful system, regardless if it's PeopleSoft or some other ERP system, we are trying to look the way we can leverage this system to do things better, to get away from manual processes, and to see if there's a potential for some cost-savings. And that's something we'll be looking at in phase three of this project.

ROBEL: Thank—we're at five o'clock, so I suspect we need to move on, and I really want to thank the two of you for coming. And I also just want to make a kind of framing point, and that is that it's—it is important when we read fairly technical reports like this one, to put them back into the context that generated them. I don't think anybody in a million years would go through a process like this for the fun of it. You know, the reason you go through a process like this is because the state has been financially strapped and the financial exigencies the state has been under, and it's sense of priorities, relative priorities, has required that we have less money coming from state support, which means we have to make hard choices, and so it's—I think it's important, whenever we look at things like this, that we kind of put them in that context. It may change absolutely nothing about the way we feel about the, you know, the end result. We may still have exactly the same reactions, but it's not a contextless exercise, and I understand the difficulties that you're working under. I think when we focus on something this technical, and we think about back office processes, you know, it's often not apparent, in sort of the way Frances was talking about, what's the downside that we're not seeing. It's also not apparent what the tradeoffs are, and I think that the guiding principle behind this has been to tradeoff everything that we can to protect the core academic mission. And we can all disagree, and we all will, because that's a reasonable—it's reasonable to do so about how you get there, but that's the context. Well, thank you so much.

KENNEDY: Thanks for your time today.

ROBEL: Thank you, Padraic, for looking so carefully at this. Thanks.

JIMENEZ: I didn't want to criticize [indistinct comment], but I just wanted to make a comment to add to what she said that since I'm the only student representative here right now, that

students services is what it says on the front of the report, and as people are thinking about their criticisms and considerations and things like that, that students should be involved and thought about in that process as well because I'm all for the saving money and everything else, but if the students, which is in the front of the report, suffer for it in many different ways, then I think that's something that people should be mindful of, too.

ROBEL: I think everybody agrees with you on that. The idea is to protect the places where students interact with systems, and to get as much as you can out of places where they're not interacting directly. And that's a wonderful principle if we're able to implement it, and if, you know, but it's everything is in the implementation. We have a report from the Faculty Affairs Committee, and from Pnina Fichman. Pnina?

AGENDA ITEM 8: REVIEW OF NON-REAPPOINTMENTS FOR TENURE PROBATIONARY FACULTY AND LIBRARIANS

FICHMAN: Thank you. So, what we have in front of us is a proposal for policy E17, review of reappointment of tenure-track faculty. Speak to the microphone. E17 deals with reappointment—review of reappointment. E17 does not deal with the review and the decision of reappointment or non-reappointment. That part is discussed in policy E9. E9 describes the process of review, and decisions of reappointment and non-reappointment including notification and explanation of the decision. So E17 policy is a BFC policy, and E9 policy is UFC policy. E17 was approved here at the BFC in 2003, and apparently is unclear. It is open for multiple interpretations. So we've all seen an effort that was done by Vice Provost Gieryn to clarify the policy, the existing policy, and we've discussed it here on January 24th, and as a result of this discussion, the Faculty Affairs Committee was asked to address this policy, and seek feedback from the Policy Council, from Tom's office, and come up with a proposal this semester because the policy is unclear and there are increasing number of cases of non-reappointment that may or may not go through review. So what happened since January 24th is that Faculty Affairs Committee met several times, asked for feedback from Policy Council, chair of Policy Councils, met with Tom Gieryn several times, and met with associate deans and deans from seven different units. We collected all of this information, and thought about this process, and came up with what you see in front of you, a proposal for a policy.

So the proposal itself, the policy itself, suggests first that faculty that get a decision about non-reappointment, receive a decision about non-reappointment at any point during the probationary period, can request further review. This is different than the existing policy that differentiates between year two and three, and year four and five, or basically it does not address year two and three, but only allows for further review for faculty who are not reappointment on year four and five. The idea that faculty at any point during their probationary period will be entitled for a further review seems to be—to get a lot of support

from everyone—or almost everyone. [Laughter] The other aspect that this policy addresses is what kind of further review can a candidate request, and the further review that we propose is, in a way, analogous to a tenure review. That means that the review will be done outside of the unit, or will go through committees outside of the unit, at the school, and at the campus.

What we have in this policy, in addition, is also a responsibility on the candidate itself to request this review, whereas in the current policy, it's the default, that the non-reappointment faculty or candidate would have to ask not to go for further review. The candidate who would request further review, would have to collect additional materials and compile what we call augmented dossier that will go through his or her unit first, and then through others, administrators and faculty committees.

We do understand that, despite the fact that there is an increasing number of cases, we're still talking about very few. So, in the last three years, and Tom has the numbers with him, the last three years, for example, we had no cases during one year, three cases in the following year, and two cases in the next year, and we're thinking about the number of faculty who are being reappointed or not reappointed. This is a very minor—not many cases that we're talking about. And each one of these cases is very different—is unique. So, I think I'm done with introduction, and open for discussion.

ROBEL: It's a first reading, so this is a discussion item, right?

FICHMAN: Yes.

ROBEL: Randy?

ARNOLD: Yeah, I have a detail question. Under item A, it says request further review within thirty days, and subsequently assemble the augmented dossier. Is it the expectation that within that initial thirty days, the dossier will be submitted, or is there a timeline or is that just determined by the chair or dean how long they have to assemble the dossier? That's my question.

FICHMAN: So we did not address the time that they would have to assemble the dossier. We only wanted to have deadline for the notification, whether they would like to have further review or not. Now, because each case is different and the amount of materials would differ, right, depends on the individual candidate, we did not ask for a particular deadline. So it can last—

ARNOLD: —Presumably it's before their contract would end, right? Before it could be reviewed, they couldn't say oh I want to [indistinct comment] my dossier, and the next day [indistinct

comment] for another year? I don't know if it needs to be more explicit and state that more specifically.

BASU: Yeah, I brought up the same kind of question last time, three meetings ago that unless there are explicit deadlines, the protection is not really there. If the fact—let us say the department has to—I'm just making this up—the department has to notify by the 30th of September, or 15th of October, I don't care which one you say. After that, one month later, if it's 30th of September, 30th of October would be the deadline, and then what is the deadline for the department or the dean's office depending on the unit to tell the candidate if his case would move forward or if the case stalls, when that person then moves to meditation—mediation. I would prefer that to be spelled out.

FICHMAN: So, the timeline. The deadline for that. So we had a lot of discussion about that, and we understand that in some cases, it can be done within the same semester, right? By the end of the spring semester. But sometimes, it would actually last and continue during the following academic year. We were thinking whether we would like to add something about a requirement in the policy that the decision must be made by the end of the next or following academic year. It's an option. I'm not sure if it would be helpful, but if you all think it is, it's easy to add that.

BASU: Just want to add that if we have deadlines, then things, they move smoothly. And it is—the cases that you suggest that sometimes this happens, sometimes that doesn't, those cases could be taken up through petition. We have deadlines, and then we take up the exceptional cases through petition.

GIERYN: The possibility of putting deadlines was, as Pnina indicated, was discussed at FAC, and they consulted with me on that. I believe the thinking is that these cases unfold on very different kinds of schedules, depending on the nature of the augmentation that the candidate wants to prepare, the difficulty in assembling review committees at the school level, on the campus level. It's tough to fit it all in. It's—I don't think anybody would want to prolong the process simply to prolong it, and, moreover, Basu, even if it became protracted and approached the end of the candidate's contract, at that point, they could go to the Faculty Board of Review or to mediation, and that committee could request an extension of the appointment pending a resolution of the problem. So there is some protection to faculty. Ordinarily, as a matter of course, we would not extend the contract except in response to a request from the Faculty Board of Review to the provost, who could make a decision about whether or not we needed more time, simply to bring the process to closure.

BASU: So you think of the flexibility built into this document is the more preferred pragmatic approach?

GIERYN: I believe it is the more pragmatic approach.

ROBEL: Yes?

WATSON: I have a question then about the meaning of it being a third year review. If somebody is taking another year and a half or two years to document their third year review, then they're in a very different position than someone who's in their third year going through a review, so if it's the process that takes a long time, then I think there should be some closure to when the dossier needs to be finalized so that there's some comparability in the notion of being a third year review. It doesn't make sense to me otherwise, although I don't think there's anything sacred about it being three years.

GIERYN: Maxine, a third year review is making a decision about year five. If the decision in year three is negative, the contract would end at the end of year four. That creates the deadline, except in instances that we just discussed about a grievance to the Faculty Board of Review. That sets the calendar, and if you would like, as a Faculty Council, to restrict the time that both the candidate has and the review committees have, that's your prerogative. I'm recommending that I don't think that is the most pragmatic and flexible approach for something like this that happens so rarely and where the circumstances, at least the cases that I've seen, don't fall in to any obvious pattern. They're very different one to the next, as you could imagine.

WATSON: And you're not then concerned about it bleeding over to a tenure review of there being—

GIERYN: I got a "beep beep" over here right in the middle, I'm sorry.

WATSON: If there—that it bleed in to the tenure process where—when in the time course someone's evaluated?

GIERYN: Yeah, I could see that problem if the non-reappointment decision happened let's say in the middle of year five, when the tenure review process, in effect, begins at its earliest point at the end of year five with the solicitation of external letters. Typically, what would happen is if there were problems along the way, they would probably be identified no later than year four. I'd find it highly unlikely. What most departments do, and most academic units do is if there are positive recommendations through the first four years of the probationary period, they might actually waive a full review in year five, and just move directly to the tenure process. And if there were problems, they would come up during the tenure process. It certainly doesn't mean to conflict with the tenure review process.

WATSON: Yeah, I think I was concerned, and I must say I'm just playing devil's advocate now because I like the idea of flexibility, but I was concerned that if someone was being brought up

for tenure, and had a paper coming out the following year, that might be a game changer. Does this create a precedent that would allow them to argue that the window in which things qualified for going in the dossier is a slippery slope.

GIERYN: Throughout the review process, whether it's during the probationary period or a tenure review, candidates have the right to add materials as soon as they wish, at any moment. And there is an expectation that all review committees would consider those new materials as they made their decision. So, for example, if the further review were requested, and we were in the middle of that review, circumstances change. The material would go into the dossier and be considered; in that sense, and I emphasize in that sense, it is like the tenure review.

WATSON: Right, except that the tenure review process takes place in a more defined time period. So just the nature of that action, it seems like there are time limits on when information can go in.

GIERYN: In this case, the time limit would be through the end of the candidate's contract or the candidate's decision not to pursue the matter any further.

MARSH: The—I'm speaking on behalf of the Executive Committee of the Bloomington Chapter of AAUP. We discussed this draft just last night, actually. I'm also speaking as current chair of Committee A of AAUP because we've assisted a few colleagues who have not been reappointed, and we wanted to convey that we like this draft very much. We think it's an improvement on the original. We like the idea of extending to our most junior colleagues the same kind of protections that, you know, occur later in the process. That's an excellent thing. We did have a couple of suggestions.

The main one being that it currently though, that where it says the candidate receives written notice among reappointment, we recommend that that written notice of non-reappointment include an explanation on the reasons on which the decision was based, otherwise the person before augmenting their materials has no idea what to augment or to leave out.

In addition to that, I'm not quite sure what language to suggest, but there needs to be something in here that suggests that—this gets back to the question of timelines again. When can we—when can we say that a candidate has received their notice? Sometimes things get sent by email, sometimes things they get handed over in person. Sometimes that the day that the letter was written, forwarded a week earlier. Sometimes things get put in mailboxes and the candidate in question may be on the other side of the country, and so on and so on. So there needs to be some kind of language in here—I mean, sure we don't want to require these to be delivered by singing telegram, obviously, but something that says is there a reason—we have a reasonable expectation that the candidate has, in fact, received, that not just delivered but received, so that's where the thirty days would start.

FICHMAN: As far as I understand, policy E9 address the notification to a candidate. It's in section three, notice requirement. And what the candidate can do, in terms of asking for explanation, so the problem with addressing it in E17 is that we don't want to contradict what UFC policy suggests to do, and so we have to work along the lines that are here. And here there are thirty days—okay, the time are problematics here, they should be notified as soon as possible of a decision, “At the time that a faculty member or librarian is notified of a negative recommendation or reappointment or tenure he or she shall be provided with a written statement,” of policies. Following that, “Upon receiving notice of the negative recommendation or decision on reappointment...the first recourse of the faculty member of librarian shall be to request an oral explanation from his or her principle administrative officer,” that's the—you're looking at E9. And then, “Upon written request,” to the candidate, “then submitted within thirty days,” so we're talking about the same thirty days, right, “of notification to the proper administrative officer, the officer shall provide the faculty member or librarian within a reasonable period of time with a written statement of the reasons for non-reappointment.” So what we can do is add or explain or elaborate what is a reasonable time. So, we can say that we didn't—

MARSH: —So, if we had wanted, just as a procedural thing, I guess, or since this is in the Handbook, this supersedes anything we pass here, if we wish to make this process or improve this, we'd have to do it at the UFC level?

FICHMAN: Yeah. So we cannot change that, right?

MARSH: Yeah, we've got three steps in the process now at least and the candidate has to initiate each one, and that seems to me an unnecessary burden, but I understand the point.

GIERYN: Full disclosure that in my administrative role I've worked between the Faculty Affairs Committee and, principally, the academic associate deans in developing the policy. I don't want to speak for the academic associate deans. This is a first reading. They just received, as you did, the new version yesterday, so that there's still some reading going on and discussing among them. I would expect that either individually or collectively, they will respond to this policy before the vote at the next meeting. I've been asked by the provost to, and Pnina and I have affected a division of labor here, to get some information about peer institutions. It's not as easy as you might expect to find this, certainly from websites, I found it more effective to call my peers at CIC schools, and I've reached three so far who were in a position to answer. None of them have review at the school or campus level in cases like this. I've talked to me counterparts at Wisconsin, Michigan, and Minnesota. At Wisconsin, it's a departmental decision involving the department's executive committee and the chair; it pretty much ends there. In the University of Michigan, it stays in the department; there is no university or school level review. At the University of Minnesota, and Arlene Carney is still checking on this further, so it's

not an absolute decision. From her understanding, the only recourse would be, in effect, what we call a grievance to the Faculty Board of Review. They call it to their Judicial Committee. The policy that we're proposing, and the Faculty Affairs seems to be, at least from this first pass, at variance with our peer institutions.

FICHMAN: The existing policy is also, right?

ROBEL: Bonnie?

BROWNLEE: I'm hearing all you're saying, and I understand the need for flexibility. Over the years, I've worked a lot with the Mediation Committee and the Board of Review with candidates who have been—received non-reappointment letters, for one reason or another, and I can't speak for them exactly, except I feel like there's a—there's such a high level of anxiety, uncertainty, you know, bad feelings among these people. They feel like they don't know what's going on. And from what—I think it would be very useful, both for the candidates and for the units themselves, to have some kind of guidelines on the timeline. You know, if you say well, it's just open ended, well that doesn't help anybody. It doesn't help the candidate who is trying to figure out what she or he did wrong, and what they need to do to put things back together. It doesn't help the unit in trying to move this thing along. Often the colleagues in the unit are kind of interested in getting moving this along, and moving the person out, that's true. I mean, that certainly happens in some cases. And so, I would—I hope you'll rethink this a little bit about a—you don't have to say exactly thirty days, but you could say, you know, normally this process would be completed within whatever time. And then the further fact is that if you get to the end of this, and it's sustained, the candidate then has an opportunity to go through the mediation process, so that, you know, further prolongs this thing to the next year.

FICHMAN: Yeah, thank you. Personally, I completely agree with you.

GIERYN: I can report in cases that have gone—that some you know well Bonnie, the difficulties of sticking to deadlines simply because of end of semester, breaks, leaves, forming committees; there are a variety of reasons why it's very difficult for us when we get in to these tough cases actually to sustain the schedules that the Faculty Council might wish to set up.

BROWNLEE: No, I know that.

ROBEL: Herb?

TERRY: I want to note there's a part of this thing that has not come up from this discussion I think is very important. This makes it quite clear what the basis must be for non-reappointment for a tenure probationary faculty member. It's when a school concludes that a positive tenure decision is unlikely. I think that offers a very substantial protection for probationary faculty,

especially in the coming difficult financial times. It can't be that some department has, within the first two years of this poor person's appointment, reached some stage of departmental financial exigency. It can't be because they have decided that they were going to go in that direction, but now they're going to some—go in some other direction. They will have to demonstrate that they have concluded that it is unlikely that a positive decision—tenure decision will be unlikely. I think that's a fair way to treat somebody, in whom we have invested, but who has also invested the early part of their career with us. If you come on the expectation of tenure failure to be making progress toward that goal should be the only reason for denying one of these early cases, and this helps. This points, 'That's the reason.'

ROBEL: Could I make two comments here because I am feeling in both of these situations like, you know, as somebody who's been in administration for a very long time, I may see things slightly differently, and on this one, there are two things that I was concerned about. One of them that comes from my administrative life, and one that comes from my life as a lawyer. That from the administrative side, we're creating a big record for these young faculty members, and that big record may be as much of a liability for those faculty members as a benefit, and I want—I just want to be sure that we've thought through that as carefully as we possibly can. I know one of the things that we really want to see with people for whom our institution does not work is not to block their future elsewhere, and so I want to be sure that we're not inadvertently doing something that could cause a record to be created, a, you know, a series of letters to be generated that would really be an impediment to somebody getting a fresh start elsewhere. So that's one piece.

The other piece is, I said at the first meeting I appeared at, you have a general counsel, and I'm not it, but it is the case that tenure has a legal meaning, and that legal meaning has to do with the set of expectations that are put up around the process of non-renewal of, you know, what is a high enough barrier for non-renewal, and a tenure—tenure is a property right. It's a constitutionally protected right. What makes it a property right is the accumulation of protections in documents like this. So, I think it might be worthwhile actually taking this to our general counsel and saying how close are we getting to actually providing what is indistinguishable from tenure at a much earlier point in the process, because if it's indistinguishable from tenure, if tenure is really a set of procedural protections that exist around a right, a set of rights, then we may also inadvertently be walking into a tenure system at a much earlier point in people's careers, and I don't think that was what we're intending here either. So if both of those things are at least in the mix for—and I—excuse me if I'm being too transparent or frank, I don't know what the traditions are of the person in my position interacting in these ways, but at least with my—the faculty I've been at, I would speak so we're at 5:31.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Would you please make certain that you leave your ballots with Craig before you leave? This is a pass to get out of the building. [Laughter] Thank you.

ROBEL: Great work!

MEETING ADJOURNED: 5:31PM