

**Indiana University**  
**BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL**  
**November 15, 2011**  
**IMU Georgian Room**  
**3:30 P.M. – 5:30 P.M.**

**Attendance**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Randy Arnold, Abijit Basu, Bonnie Brownlee, Carolyn Calloway-Thomas, LaNita Campbell, Shu Cole, Tony Fargo, Thomas Gieryn, Donald Gjerdingen, Matthew Guterl, Karen Hanson, Lesa Hatley Major, Robert Jacobs, Edwin Jimenez, Padraic Kenney, Susan Kovacich, Rebecca Manring, Jane McLeod, Patricia McManus, Sherri Michaels, Theresa Ochoa, John Paolillo, Mary Popp, Elizabeth Raff, Patricia Riesenman, Bret Rothstein, John Schilb, Jim Sherman, Grant Simpson, Andrea Singer, Sarita Soni, Jerrold Stern, William Swanson, John Tafoya, Herbert Terry, Pat Thomas, Frances Trix, Maxine Watson, William Wheeler, James Wimbush

**MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT:** Pnina Fichman (Ron Day), Sonya Stephens (Kurt Zorn)

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Justin Kingsolver, Michael McRobbie, Tim Mickleborough, James Perry, Deanna Reising, Sima Setayeshgar, Marietta Simpson, Bryce Smedley, Geoff Sprinkle, H. Wayne Storey, Joey Tartell, Jaso Turner, Barbara Vance, Tony White

**GUESTS:** Amanda Ciccarelli, Dave Daleke, Craig Dethloff (Faculty Council Office), Howard Rosenbaum, Julia Lamber, Mike Leonard, Roger Levesque, Barbara Wallace (Faculty Council Office), Patricia Wheeler

**Agenda**

1. Approval of Minutes

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/minutes/11-12/10.18.11.pdf>

2. Memorial Resolutions for Donald Edward Robinson and Murlin Croucher:

Donald Edward Robinson: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/11-12/B25-2012.pdf>

Murlin Croucher: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/11-12/B26-2012.pdf>

3. Executive Committee Business (10 minutes)  
(Faculty President Carolyn Calloway-Thomas)

4. Presiding Officer's Report (10 minutes)

(Provost Karen Hanson)

5. Question / Comment Period

6. Annual Report of the Athletics Committee (30 minutes)

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

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/11-12/auxiliary/AthCom1011.pdf>

7. Resolution on Extended-X Policy (15 minutes)

(Professors Padraic Kenney and William Wheeler, Co-Chairs of the Educational Policy Committee) [FIRST READING]

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/11-12/B27-2012.pdf>

<http://enrollmentbulletin.indiana.edu/pages/data.php?Term=2>

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

8. Recommendations to the Bloomington Faculty Council on Friday Classes (15 minutes)

(Professors Padraic Kenney and William Wheeler, Co-Chairs of the Educational Policy Committee) [DISCUSSION]

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

9. Status and Privileges of Retired Faculty Members and Librarians Policy Revision (20 minutes)

(Professor Brian Horne, Co-Chair of the Benefits Committee) [ACTION ITEM]

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/11-12/B9-2012Rev11.09.pdf>

10. UFC Reform Proposals (20 minutes)

(Professor Calloway-Thomas, Bloomington Faculty President) [DISCUSSION]

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY12/U4-2012.pdf>

## Minutes

### **AGENDA ITEM 1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**HANSON:** It is time to begin. So the first item of business today is the approval of the minutes of the October 18<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**G. SIMPSON:** I have a couple of corrections, page 29 says “unknown male speaker,” that was John Schilb from English. And on 37, it says “Connell” but it should be “Carroll,” that was Mike Carroll from the registrar.

**HANSON:** Any other corrections or comments? Now is the procedure to approve them pending the—I mean assuming the assumption, I mean assuming that we'll correct those? Anyone move approval?

**UNKNOWN MALE SPEAKER:** So moved.

**HANSON:** Anyone second?

**UNKNOWN MALE SPEAKER:** Second.

**HANSON:** Did someone second?

**UNKNOWN MALE SPEAKER:** I just did it.

**HANSON:** Okay. All in favor? [Aye]. Opposed? [Silence]. Thank you. We have two memorial resolutions today, so I'll turn to Vice Provost Gieryn.

## **AGENDA ITEM 2: MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS FOR DONALD EDWARD ROBINSON AND MURLIN CROUCHER**

**GIERYN:** At Don Robinson's Celebration of Life, speakers described his various roles as colleague, friend, mentor, husband, scientist, parent, and teacher, but it was this last role that seemed to be the most inclusive. A born teacher. Whether he was explaining chi square to a group of undergraduates in a statistics class or laying out the pros and cons of oval vs. rectangular swimming pools or developing mathematical model of binaural processing for his colleagues or describing the best way to make Texas chili, Don was a teacher in the classroom, in his office, in his laboratory. Indeed, for Don, teaching didn't end at 5:00 p. m., but often continued at Nick's with his graduate students and colleagues. Students recall how they saved, for later study, numerous napkins covered with equations.

Don's work with graduate students was extraordinary. Certainly his students learned about hearing, stimulus control, psychophysical procedures, and modeling, but more importantly they learned about being a scientist, respecting data, even if it didn't agree with your theory, and doing the absolute best job you could. Indeed, as his students report, teaching didn't end with receiving your PhD: Don formed a lasting relationship with his students.

As a scientist, Don made important contributions in two major areas, auditory psychophysics and signal detection theory and its application to decision making. His work on models of how the two ears work together to improve our ability to perceive auditory signals and his work on how to optimally use information to make decisions still influences current research. His work on serial decision processing has important implications in dealing with alarm signals in hospitals, in nuclear power plants, and in air-traffic control centers. His work was supported by

such agencies as the Federal Aviation Administration, National Science Foundation, and the National Institutes of Health.

As one of the first persons in the Psychology Department to embrace computer technology, Don became our resident expert. He was the person you went to for advice in setting up lab web pages or in developing course material using the web. He chaired the University's Academic Computing Policy Committee for a number of years. Don was also the person you frequently went to for advice on research problems. Combining his expertise on signal detection theory and statistics, Don was a magnet for knotty research problems. Numerous graduate students and faculty members, including me, trooped to Don's office with often ill-formed problems. Don would begin by asking you question, finding out what you were really trying to measure, what your assumptions were, and so forth. The solution was a collaborative effort, and it was only in hindsight that you realized who was doing most of the heavy lifting.

Retiring from IU in 2000, Don and his wife Donna returned to his beloved Texas where Don found new interests and one that I could not have predicted, butterflies. Don became a master naturalist and worked at the Kerrville Schreiner Park Butterfly Garden, Kerrville, Texas.

Don referred to himself as a "curmudgeon" as did others but prefaced the word with "loveable." When he was asked what he wanted his new granddaughter to call him, he replied, "Herr Doctor Professor Robinson." He returned from his visit to her, as many grandfathers do, with stories of her cleverness and cuteness, now being called "Grandpop" and no further mention of "Herr Doctor." To further clarify that label "curmudgeon," one of his co-worker at the Kerrville Schreiner Park tells the story of the ongoing debate that she and Don were having about the use of chemical herbicides in the garden—Don on the pro-side, she very much against it. While she was on vacation, Don sent her an email with a photo attached: Don, big grin, sitting on a garden bench in the park holding a can of Round-Up. He could have, but he didn't use it.

"Tell me truth," a standard greeting when you came to Don's office and one he lived by.

This memorial resolution is presented to his family: his wife Donna, his two children, Linda Robinson Barr and Robert L. Robinson and his wife Celeste, and grandchildren Sarah Robinson, Audrey Robinson, and Connor Barr.

Murlin Croucher was born on August 24<sup>th</sup>, 1941 in Rochester, New York. He graduated from high school in Rochester and studied the violin at the Eastman School of Music. Mr. Croucher attended the University of Chicago and the University of Montreal before entering the United States Army on June 30, 1963. While in the military, he studied at the Defense Language Institute in Monterey, California. He completed the arduous 37-week intensive training program in the Russian language on June 19, 1964. Mr. Croucher then spent the remaining

years of his service in West Germany, leaving active duty with an honorable discharge on June 9, 1967.

After leaving the military, he studied at Arizona State University and completed his B.A. in Russian in 1968. Mr. Croucher then entered the graduate program in Slavic Languages and Literatures at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in the fall of 1968. He completed his M.A. in that department in 1972, writing his thesis on "The Relation of Genre to the Incidence of the Dactylic Caesura in the Russian Six-Foot Iamb During the Eighteenth Century." Prior to completing his M.A., Mr. Croucher had obtained his M.S. in the School of Information and Library Science in 1971, writing on "A Selected, Annotated Bibliography of English Language Translations and Criticisms of Brazilian Prose Fiction and Drama of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries."

In 1971 Mr. Croucher began his career as a librarian, working at the Academic Affairs Library at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill as a Slavic language cataloger. Within a few years he became the Slavic Bibliographer there. Mr. Croucher spent time in the former Czechoslovakia between 1970 and 1980, enrolling twice in the Summer Program in Czech Language and Literature at Charles University in Prague.

In 1980 he left the University of North Carolina to become the Slavic Bibliographer here at Indiana University, Bloomington. As the bibliographer for the collection, Mr. Croucher continued to build Indiana's strong Slavic collection. Today, due in part to his dedicated work, the general Slavic collection (including Albanian, Baltic, Hungarian, and Romanian language holdings) is one of the larger research collections in that area in the Western hemisphere. In addition to developing the Slavic collection, he was also responsible for strengthening the prestigious Central Asian and Tibetan collections for the Indiana University Libraries.

As part of his work to develop the collections, Mr Croucher established several successful book exchanges to support Indiana's curriculum with major and minor libraries throughout the Soviet Bloc, a difficult task during the Cold War. He made many book buying trips to Eastern Europe and Russia, and he used these trips as an opportunity to maintain and further develop the exchange programs. He also managed a flourishing duplicate book exchange with several academic libraries in the United States. As the Slavic bibliographer, he met with countless foreign guests, gave tours of the collection, and volunteered his time for many library and Russian and East European Institute activities.

During his tenure at Indiana, Mr. Croucher served on many library and university committees, working closely with the Russian and East European Institute and several academic departments. As an adjunct assistant professor of Library Science and an affiliated faculty member of the Russian and East European Institute, he taught the three-credit course

L525/R525, "Soviet and East European Library Materials," cross listed in the curricula for the School of Library and Information Science and the Russian and East European Institute. Due to advances in the field it was renumbered and renamed as L620/R620, "Topics in Information Literature, Bibliography: Slavic." The course provided library science and other interested students the opportunity for greater in-depth study of the information and literature sources of the Slavic area. In addition to teaching this class several times, Mr. Croucher gave numerous guest lectures in other courses.

The Russian and East European Institute, a federally funded Department of Education Title VI National Resource Center, relied heavily on Mr. Croucher for his expertise in its periodic renewal of grant applications. In addition he was instrumental in the IU Libraries successful grant application to the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation for \$164,000 to prepare future Slavic librarians. He also played a primary role in a \$240,000 Department of Education grant to digitize a twenty-year run (1956-1975) of *Letopis' Zhurnal'nykh Statei*. This project converted citations from the Soviet index to journal articles into digital form, producing a keyword-searchable bibliographic database. He discussed the details of the project in "Digitizing and Making a Web Site for the Soviet *Letopis' Zhurnal'nykh Statei*, 1956-1975" in *Slavic and East European Information Resources*, volume 3, issue 2-3, 2002.

In addition to performing his numerous duties as Slavic bibliographer, Mr. Croucher was a productive scholar. He published translations and numerous book reviews. He frequently participated in the annual Slavic Librarians Workshop, part of the Summer Research Laboratory on Russia, Eastern Europe, and Eurasia held at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. He was a frequent presenter at national and international conferences.

He co-authored with Eliska Ryznar *Books in Czechoslovakia: Past and Present* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1989), the second volume of the series "Publishing, Bibliography, Libraries, and Archives in Russia and Eastern Europe" of the Association of Collection and Research Libraries' Slavic and East European Section. He wrote *Slavic Area-Studies Serials on Standing Order at Indiana University, 1994, July* (Bloomington: Indiana University Library Slavic Office, 1994). With the help of Gregory Keller and Carlton Stokes, Mr. Croucher wrote *Polish Literature in Translation, 1976-1996: A Guide to Monographic Works Housed in Indiana University's Main Library* (Bloomington: Indiana University, 1998), an offprint of *Indiana Slavic Studies*, volume 9, 1998.

Mr. Croucher's most important work is the two-volume *Slavic Studies: A Guide to Bibliographies, Encyclopedias, and Handbooks* (Wilmington: Scholarly Resources, 1993). This is an essential reference work available at any institution seriously studying the region. Zdeněk V. David of the Woodrow Wilson Center for Scholars published a review of the work in *Slavic Review*, volume 53, number 1 (Spring 1994). David described the work as "the largest and most

comprehensive reference work in its field.” The review went on to say, “The two volumes do represent a unique and most welcome contribution to the area of Slavic reference work and should be used profitably by both scholars and information specialists for years to come.” A revised and expanded edition was planned, but it was not ready for publication at the time of his death.

Mr. Croucher retired from the IU Libraries in August 2005 after twenty-five years as the Slavic Bibliographer at Indiana University and almost a total of thirty-five years in the field of Slavic librarianship. He remained in Bloomington until his death in July 2011. A festschrift was published to honor Mr. Croucher, “Books, Bibliographies, and Pugs: a Festschrift to Honor Murlin Croucher” (Bloomington: Slavica, 2006 – in *Indiana Slavic Studies*, volume 16). The book was edited by Gregory C. Ference and Bradley L. Schaffner, two of Mr. Croucher’s former assistants in the IU Libraries. Contributions to the festschrift were also made by eight other Slavic librarians whose careers had been greatly influenced by Mr. Croucher.

Mr. Croucher will be fondly remembered by those who knew him as a kind and gentle man with a wonderful sense of humor. He was dedicated to his profession and to his beloved pugs, one of whom, Carlin, survived him and now has a new good home. His legacy will continue through the wonderful collections that he developed and through the work of all of the librarians whom he inspired and taught.

In recognition of his service to Indiana University and his profession, be it resolved that this resolution be a part of the minutes of the Bloomington Faculty Council and that a copy be sent to his sister, Shirley Hanlon from Enfield, CT, his nephew, Raymond Croucher from Rochester, NY, and to his close friend, Fred Clark from Chapel Hill, NC.

**HANSON:** Thank you, Tom. May we stand for a moment of silence for our colleagues. Thank you. We have Executive Committee Business, President Calloway-Thomas.

### **AGENDA ITEM 3: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** The following are matters that I would like to mention today. Under the UFC Reform Committee Business, Jack Windsor, members of the UFC Reform Committee, and I are pleased to announce that the document has been distributed to individual councils and we have proposed a December 5<sup>th</sup> deadline for scrutiny of the document by all councils. And we will, of course, discuss the document later today.

With regard to a letter supporting Dr. Gros Louis, it is available for your signature today, and we hope that you will sign it, so that we can send it to members of the Board of Trustees. I am John Hancock today, and I fixed my signature to that document, and Barbara, I believe, will begin circulating that letter for our signature. Following a discussion of the matter at the last

Council meeting, I received several verbal and written comments from members of the faculty praising us for our action on behalf of the university chancellor, and I will quote from one letter. After noting that he was distressed by the Trustees action, one faculty member wrote, "Long ago he," Gros Louis, "earned the respect and affection of faculty, students, and staff. This is not the IU way of doing things."

In the area of healthcare, I think all of us know that the healthcare issue is increasing in intensity and resonance, and a resolution will be coming before this Council for our consideration at the December 6<sup>th</sup> meeting. Within the past month, Jack Windsor, my co-secretary and I, have met with President McRobbie, we've met with Dan Rives, we've met with Vice President Neil Theobald on trying to make sense of this healthcare issue and trying to determine what is it that we might be able to do at this particular moment in time, and all of the members with whom we have met expressed a willingness to work with the Council in addressing the matter, and I'm sure some of those individuals will be present at the December 6<sup>th</sup> meeting when we deal with that issue.

With regard to the IRB update, as you know, during the week of October 10<sup>th</sup>, a firestorm erupted over the backlog of cases in the Human Subjects Office. Today I'm pleased to report that there is good news in the land regarding this item. Vice President José and the Human Subjects Office are making impressive progress in reducing the backlog of submissions awaiting approval. They have already reduced and surpassed the goal that was set for the end of November of reducing by at least 50% the long-term backlog of items received on or before October 20<sup>th</sup>. By November 10<sup>th</sup>, the Human Subjects Office had reviewed 74% of those items. Given this progress, according to Vice President José, the office will be able to clear at least 80% of the long-term backlog and 50% of the overall backlog by December 1, which will be a significant increase over the commitment, that is the original commitment. So, I would say to all of us, we should individually and collectively send a thank you to Vice President José and his staff for their beautiful efforts on our behalf.

The Ed Policies Committee will withdraw its proposal that is currently before the BFC and proposes the following: 1) EPC will convene a subcommittee on FLAGS which will include some membership from other BFC committees and will report back to the EPC on issues arising from the FLAGS system, and 2) the EPC suggests that a similar committee, a subcommittee, be convened by the Student Affairs Committee. Jack Windsor and I also met with President McRobbie on November 9<sup>th</sup>, and since I had the president's ear, I took the opportunity to raise an issue that came before the BFC Executive Committee with regard to a shared services initiative, which I understand is being developed, and that will save IU \$21 million dollars. That initiative is being discussed. That initiative will include the following offices: enrollment services, the registrar's office, as well as student services. Some individuals are calling this

initiative that is under consideration, a move towards centralization, and others are calling it a shared services initiative, so select your nomenclature. In light of this initiative, members of the BFC Executive Committee will study the academic implications of the proposed changes.

And finally, President McRobbie reported that the university has been getting very good press from the governor, from the chamber of commerce, and other groups regarding the 25% reduction in summer fees for IU students. So, a shout out with regard to that good news.

And I'd also like to invite and stress, encourage, all of the members of the Council to vote. As you know, the final day for voting is November 18<sup>th</sup>, which is, I believe, this week. Yes, Friday. Thank you.

**HANSON:** That's it?

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Yes.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 4: PRESIDING OFFICER'S REPORT**

**HANSON:** Thanks, Carolyn. I just have a couple of items of business, and then a handful of questions that have been received ahead of time. One thing to mention is that we have had two of the campus fora on the New Academic Directions Report, you know, moderately attended. And we have the last one this Friday, so I will probably send—what?

**GIERYN:** I believe it's Thursday.

**HANSON:** Thursday?

**GIERYN:** The next one.

**HANSON:** Oh, whenever. [Laughter]. We'll send me a reminder. We'll send out a reminder. I'll look at my calendar. I promise I'll show up. We have a room reserved.

**GIERYN:** Thursday at—

**SONI:** —Thursday at five.

**HANSON:** Okay. Thursday at five. Sorry, didn't check this well enough. So if you—the other two were on Mondays late in the afternoon, so if those were times that were difficult for you and you want to come to that, please do come to the one on Thursday. We have had an interesting series of sessions for people to talk about new ways of garnering or making use of campus and external support. Just wanted to make you aware of that. We had a useful session with the vice president from the Foundation who has Bloomington responsibilities with center and institute directors in the last week to help them write case statements and think about

developing sources of external fundings, and I think that they found that useful. And Sarita and Vice President José are also making themselves available, along with some of the folks in the College office, for an upcoming session that is particularly focused on the humanities and the humanistic social sciences to have some discussion about how best to use internal resources for the support of research in those areas. So those things are—have been on the docket since the last BFC meeting. They're coming up.

Any—I have some questions that have come in ahead of time. Should I move right to those or do people have any questions or comments they want to raise first?

**TERRY:** I have a comment, but I'll wait.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 5: QUESTION / COMMENT PERIOD**

**HANSON:** Okay. The first one has to do—was a question sent to me and Carolyn about the IU Outdoor Pool, and it asks if we could provide the Council an update on the pool, and its needed renovations. Apparently people got a note—I don't know how Bill Ramos knew who the swimmers were, but he sent a note to the swimmers indicating that there were repairs needed in the pool, and that he is moving on to a new role, but he was hoping people could, you know, rally some support for renovations in the pool. I did ask Vice President Morrison about this and the pool is currently part of HPER's operations. It's not part of Rec Sports, and there is some issue about whether or not that actually makes sense in the long run, particularly with the transformation of HPER to a School of Public Health. Vice President Morrison says there is not a problem with opening the pool the next season, and it is not at the—it's true, it's not at the top of the list for where R & R money would be spent, but if HPER wanted to allocate money, it could do that at the moment, or if Rec Sports takes it over and wants to allocate money, it can do that, but it's not at—it's not above certain academic needs at the moment, so it's—but also Vice President Morrison doesn't think it's in such dire straits. I haven't been there. I don't know, but that is the report I got. Any questions or comments about that?

**COLE:** I have a comment. Because currently the IU pool is actually operated by our department, which is Recreation, Parks, and Tourism, so probably the issue is our department, as an academic unit, does not have \$125,000 dollars to fix the lining – provide the lining for next year. So, what was—I mean I wasn't clear on what was Vice President Morrison was saying about the lining that needs to be fixed in order for the next academic year?

**HANSON:** He says it doesn't need to be fixed in order to be opened for the summer. But he also did say that if indeed it needs repairs, it's not at the top of the list for the campus on where to put R & R money, but there also might be other ways of thinking about this. You're quite right, it is odd for HPER to spend its academic funds for something like this, but it may also be that

there would be some other administrative option here, although that's not actually on the table, I'm just mentioning that he mentioned it. Okay. Yes?

**TRIX:** This is more about an earlier topic, the IRB. And I don't really want to send a "Great job, well done."

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Well, that is—you don't have to.

**TRIX:** No, I mean you are so kind. And I'm so peeved.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** But I think reinforcement is a good thing.

**TRIX:** Yeah. Reinforcement is good, but the more I found out about the situation, the more peeved I got, and I would like to hold Dr. José a little bit to the fire longer.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Alright.

**TRIX:** And he was less than candid to us. And I would like it clear that applications for IRB approval from Bloomington would be taken care of in the Bloomington office, because my understanding was he was sending all the exempt ones up to Indianapolis, and I really don't like that because you work with people and you build relationships, and they were all being sent up to three staffers there, that's what I was told by people on the IRB board. And that's where the bottleneck was, so, you know, for exempt review to be treated with less respect than the others, that's why I'm really not impressed, and there's a secondary issue. So, I want to hold it a little bit longer. I also think that that CITI exam, and I don't know how many people have had the unpleasant job of taking that extended thing from the University of Miami. At the end of it, you get to fill out a survey if you've survived the hours, and it goes to the University of Miami, but I would love to send something to the IRB of what I think of that. It has nothing to do with human subjects, and I took it—it took me five hours. Now my time is more valuable than that. I am not going to be on campus for that research time, but I think other faculty I've talked to feel the same about that exam. It has nothing to do with human subjects, and it's a colossal waste of time. So let's hold Dr. José to a few more standards here.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Okay, shall we say that those individuals who feel moved to do so, can send him a congratulatory letter? But I'd like to speak with regard to your concerns. And I think those concerns also resonate with other individuals of the UFC. This morning, for example, a proposal came from the IUPUI group suggesting that we should have an external review committee, and that the president should appoint such a committee to discuss the issues that you raised. So this is not the end of it, but it's just along the way, it's not a bad thing to encourage people to keep the fires burning.

**TRIX:** You're so much sweeter than I am. But it's really nice because we need to be balanced.

**HANSON:** Okay. I have---any other comment on this? I have two other questions that came in initially—well, actually one other set of questions and one other communication that I was asked to present to you which comes from the Board of Trustees, from the Chair of the Board of Trustees who—I will just, I asked his permission to read it and I will read it to you:

“Dear Provost Hanson, I read the article in the IDS regarding Faculty Council questions relating to the IUBOT not renewing support for an office for University Chancellor Ken Gros Louis. Below are items you may find useful in talking with our Faculty Council. Please feel free to call me personally for any additional thoughts.”

I actually didn’t call him. I was actually out of town, but, in any case, I didn’t have questions about this.

“1. The position of Chancellor was actually discontinued when the position of Provost was reformed with enhanced duties. This was a decision in part based on experiences with recruiting confusion. Candidates who applied for the Chancellor position assumed its portfolio was that of campus President, similar to the duties of a Chancellor of Berkeley or Michigan. As you know, the position of University Chancellor is an honorary title.

2. Ken Gros Louis’s arrangements, including expenses, offices (3) and two support staff came from an agreement with departing President Adam Herbert, who tendered a contract for five years. That contract has timed out and will not be renewed.”

I actually did check on that. There is—that the appointment did come from President Herbert.

“3. The decision to close the offices, those in Owen Hall, flowed from the adoption of the Master Plan that anticipates building renovation and repurpose of the building. It has been discussed that it will become the central location for the College. I anticipate that Herman Wells’ office, of considerable size, will be maintained as a conference room, appropriately preserved, but actively used.

4. With repurpose of the offices (the three rooms) to relieve campus space scarcity and with budget considerations in mind, financial support for staff was not continued. The IDS article suggested that a minimum cost over five years had been \$5,000,—I’m sorry—“\$540,000 exclusive of expense account. I’m told that positions for Ken’s staff will be found within the university.”

Actually, that’s—I’ll just add—I’m departing from the text a little bit here. But the two staff positions, I understand, one I believe had actually already retired and then came back to work, and so as far as I know, she has gone back to retirement, and the other position, and I believe is not within the university, but the person has found a job, but I—I don’t have details.

“5. As the office was no longer being supported, to hold an administrative review of previous performance seemed moot. I should add, as I told Ken when I met with him in his office, any review we might have held would have been quite a good report. I told him I spoke with 4 or 5 Trustees independently and they agreed that his excellent performance was not an issue.

6. The Trustees did vote to honor Ken with the title of University Chancellor Emeritus as an indication of their appreciation for the value of his services.

7. When I met with Ken, I told him that I had found that his Dean would work with him to provide teaching opportunities, if Ken so wished. I checked with the IU Foundation and was told that he would be provided, as before, with support for travel and expenses for any projects that they might jointly agree upon.

8. It is my understanding, from the IDS article, among other reports, that University Chancellor Emeritus Ken Gros Louis continues to volunteer, as the Trustees had hoped, to counsel students in an office on campus.” Signed, Bill Cast, Chair, Indiana Board of Trustees.

**SHERMAN:** Could you circulate that and make it available to the Faculty Council members?

**HANSON:** Well, it’s available—it will be available in the transcript. They can send us a note to me, however, already Cast said he wanted it conveyed by the provost. So, I’ve conveyed it. It will appear in the minutes.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** I presume, despite this letter, that we still wish to send our concerns to members of the Board of Trustees?

**SHERMAN:** Well, I think we should look over their response a little more carefully, and perhaps at the next meeting, I’ll have some suggestions.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** So the question is, do we wish to go forward with that letter or not?

**SHERMAN:** Which letter? I’m sorry.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** The letter that we’re circulating that we’d like to send to members of the Board of Trustees, the letter that we discussed at the last meeting.

**SHERMAN:** Yeah, I think it becomes a moot point, given that they’ve responded.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Yeah, that’s what I was thinking.

**HANSON:** But would you like me to ask Chairman Cast if it’s okay just to circulate the attachment he sent to me instead of waiting for the minutes?

**SHERMAN:** Yeah, I think that would be great. Thank you.

**HANSON:** Okay, anything else? Third, and this is a set of questions addressed to me on behalf of the faculty. This is from John, and it said it was okay to identify you I take it, and there may be someone here from SLIS as well. John was formally with SLIS and he's now with Informatics and Computing. And, if I may, let me just read some of this to make sure I don't miss anything. It is a long set of questions.

"Faculty in Informatics and Computing have recently been informed that the Provost's office has had discussions with SLIS faculty"—it isn't actually the provost's office, it was the provost, I mean, I went over to SLIS and talked with them awhile—"regarding merging SLIS into the School of Informatics and Computing. Faculty in Informatics and Computing are concerned, as the possibility of a merger is now presented as a 'done deal.'"—That I would say is a mischaracterization. The discussion was about what, if there were to be a merger, what would the SLIS faculty want to have preserved. It "is now presented as a 'done deal' to be executed by the end of the academic year,"—That's absolutely not—there is—there was—

**PAOLILLO:** — It is actually what we were told in the division meeting on Friday.

**HANSON:** The division meeting of Informatics?

**PAOLILLO:** They mentioned it in Informatics and Computing.

**HANSON:** Well that is a separate story. I'm telling you what—this says that—

**PAOLILLO:** I mean, this is composed based on the best information I had at the time.

**HANSON:** Okay, well I do not know about any end point of that sort, so maybe somebody else does. After all, I'm on the way out, [laughter], but as far as I know, there was no timeline. There are some things that could influence a timeline, but there is not—there is not a done deal with a fixed timeline. Okay, when they have had no collective input in the process. It would be useful if the faculty in the School of Informatics and Computing, if the Provost could answer the following questions.

So here are the questions: what procedure is being followed regarding the proposed merger of SLIS and the School of Informatics and Computing, and whose initiative is this being considered, and what is the rationale for the proposal? Let me address the first part of that. This is in the works, obviously, because of the NAD Report, which suggested that smaller schools, and it sort of targeted SLIS, among others, a lot of others on the Indianapolis campus, or portions of our core schools needed to be examined in this regard. So, it is being brought up because of this. Whose initiative is it being considered? Well, it came out of the committee, that and then that was a report to the President and then that was accepted by the Board of Trustees, so it is being followed down. You know, again, no foregone conclusion, but it is being followed down.

What is the rationale for the proposal? The general rationale for looking at small schools, what was one based on spending less on the administration of schools, so that if you didn't have to have separate [indistinct comment] offices for every school, could we merge people—or merge units—on the basis of some kind of, you know, intellectual contiguity, then you might be able to save money for the academic enterprise. But the rationale for looking at these two in particular is a slightly different question. There has to—you have to have some discussion of whether or not there really is intellectual connection for something like that to make sense. A connection in the research and teaching mission. So that's sort of what's being examined. There is not a—that was one on the table, and let's be honest, it has been on the table over the course of decades. So, it's because there is thought to be some connection between the School of Library and Information Science and Informatics. The School of Informatics was begun with an allocation of state funding, and it—I believe, again, I wasn't a party to this, but I believe it was thought that, you know, it was the formation of a new school, which would lead to a state allocation for this, not the infusion of funds in to an existing School of Information Science, but the issue has come up repeatedly about whether or not there is redundancies there. There are clearly things that are different in each school, but there is not a—they are not overlaps, but there—excuse me—there may be overlaps in certain areas, such as social informatics, for example.

Okay, so that is why this is on the table. Questions—but then the question goes on to say, the question is raised because few faculty in the School of Informatics and Computing seem to be in favor of the proposed merger. The presentation or lack thereof is complicating the School of Informatics and Computing internal discussions of reorganization. Now, I don't know about them, whether or not people there are in favor of it, I have not had discussions with them, and that is something that I think, actually, will be left to the next Provost, but it is also a discussion that should begin internally first, which is something that had already begun in SLIS. Now, I understand that the Dean of Informatics and Computing had begun that discussion, and, in fact, it may be that this is complicating internal discussions. I mean, I am not close enough to it to know that. The Dean of Informatics, however, has said that he actually thought you were the one who was most opposed to it. That you were the only one who was overtly opposed to it, and he said it was okay to convey this, I asked him about it. He says most of our faculty are probably closer to neutral on the merger than overtly in favor, but his view is that the School of Informatics and Computing faculty are not—the idea that they are opposed to it, is not to his understanding he says true, but a number do overtly favor it for some reasons, but he grants that they are only beginning discussions on this, which is, you know, fair enough there only being discussions.

So, secondly, the School of Informatics and Computing and SLIS already considered the possibility of a merger at an earlier point. And again, I guess we'd say repeatedly. What has

changed since then that requires the question of a merger being reconsidered? Again, that is, I think, the same answer I gave to the earlier one, people are looking for other administrative efficiencies, and SLIS in particular is quite a small school and there are some thematic overlaps with the social informatics.

Question arises because strong reasons against the possibility of merger were given by SLIS faculty at that earlier time, and a number of those same arguments are assumed to be relevant. I, again, do not know about the arguments that led to not making any changes the earlier time, but I do know, from the discussion I had with the SLIS folks, and from the document that they sent me, which I have not had a chance to read, but which was conveyed to me by Dean Shaw, that they are not strongly opposed to any merger at this time, but there are certain things that they want to see preserved if any kind of merger takes place. So, it may be that some of those arguments are indeed relevant. It may also be that faculty views have changed. It may also be that some faculty have changed. I don't know, but there is—they certainly are talking productively and constructively about this right now. So there was a new—there was a new policy approved April 19<sup>th</sup>, 2011, and I think it is absolutely right that that should be pulled in to play here, and I think it actually is, that is—the idea here is that consultation with the faculty and the faculty coming up with its own self-determination about what it thinks the prospects of a merger portend for their work is exactly what is going on. And I know, from my own case, that is what the discussion with SLIS faculty was about, and I—the question goes on to say, to what extent will School of Informatics and Computing faculty be involved in discussions and planning. Again, they would have to be completely involved, but I assume those discussions would start first with them, that SLIS would have its own discussions, which it is having. School of Informatics and Computing would have its own discussions, and then they would bring themselves together.

Question is raised because School of Informatics and Computing faculty are aware of the proposal—again there is no real proposal on the table. There is just this idea about what would it be—

**PAOLILLO:** --but it is a very vague awareness.

**HANSON:** Okay, well it is a very vague—there is no proposal. I mean there is an awareness that talk of merger is in the air. That is right. Talk of merger is in the air. But there is no particular proposal for merger that is in the air. SLIS faculty, though, have at this point, after discussion a few weeks ago, and I think some ongoing discussions among themselves, come up with a document indicating a number of desiderata for them, if there were any kind of merger, things that they want to make sure were attended to, things they want to preserve about their own status, their own research and teaching circumstances.

Okay, so the School of Informatics faculty have yet to be formally consulted. I checked with Bobby, I know that is true, there have been some discussions among some groups of people, but I believe there is an all school discussion scheduled Friday. Maybe that was what I was thinking of. But there is one—well there is one—

**PAOLILLO:** Friday there are other meetings that are [indistinct comment] they would conflict.

**HANSON:** Well, in any case, the Dean did tell me that discussions will be taking place. Again, we can all see I am not all together reliable with dates here. But, you know, then everybody does recognize Informatics would have to have a discussion among itself, and I think that is likely to be led most productively just within the school. I went to talk to with SLIS for a variety of reasons that were connected with discussions that I had with the Dean there, but, and I'd be happy to come to talk to Informatics as well if people want that, but the other was a, in some sense, a [indistinct comment].

Okay, number four. Principles in consultation in faculty response indicate that consultation should occur early, and certain BFC mechanisms should be invoked as well. What is the Provost's office, and by that I take it you mean the Provost, thinking regarding the timeline of the proposal? There is no timeline right now. I am—I actually think—and this is what I have said to the SLIS faculty, which may have led to a sense of urgency about it, that in all likelihood, this isn't going to—discussion of this is not going to drag on for years. They said, well what do you think, you know, end of this term, end of the year? And I said, well, you know, I actually think you need to think in terms of thinking this through this year because the Trustees asked for an update on all elements of the NAD at every single Trustee meeting, and they are—they want to know what is happening with every recommendation, the idea that we are waiting to have a discussion I think will be seen as in appropriate. So there—while there is no end point to this, I urged them to begin discussions and to try to work with some alacrity. If only, you know, to protect their own interests instead of sort of waiting for something that didn't come up organically from them.

What time will available for discussion and response according to the mechanisms outlined? Again, I'm giving you my best guess, that the schools should work this through this year, but it is not as if there is some timeline by which some drop-dead date comes and it will either be finished or not finished. But if I were offering prudential advice that is what it would be. And that is probably the source of the idea of a timeline.

Concern is raised because the timeline we are presented with is already very short. And again, I just say there is no fixed timeline, but I think you shouldn't think of an academic year as short. You should begin those discussions. So if the academic year deadline is imposed, discussion

among the School of Informatics faculty may be entirely cut off. I certainly hope not. I think you should begin those discussions within the School.

**PAOLILLO:** [indistinct comment]. It seems to me that a key problem in these ongoings is that certain discussions are going on in certain quarters or different things are said in those different discussions, and there isn't any general way that information about those discussions is really being shared. And so, Informatics and Computing faculty are pretty much in the dark about anything involving a potential merger with SLIS, other than that it has been mentioned at some faculty meetings, along with other business. You know, some things have been said about what sort of merger is envisioned and things like that, and different things have been said about timelines, and again, this news comes from—these come from different discussions, you know, the end of the academic year is one that I heard repeatedly. I spoke with another faculty member who is party to leadership council discussions in the School of Informatics and Computing, and he said he heard a timeline of two months. So, there is really quite a variety of information that is going around. We need to do something to correct that situation. In particular, if the things that you want to be communicated to these faculty are communicated correctly. The other thing that I—

**HANSON:** Well actually—can we stop on that? I guess what is it that you think would be ameliorative here? It [indistinct comment]—one other thing I can tell you is that the SLIS faculty had a meeting where everybody from Indianapolis and Bloomington was invited. All— all the SLIS faculty so they could have a joint discussion. I tried to give them my best sense of where I think the NAD recommendation will be putting pressure on them to make some kind of response, and then tried to give some direction about what I thought would be a constructive way for them to think about their responses, but then they went off to think about this themselves. They had a—we had a discussion at the time, but then went away to think about it. If—and then produced a paper, which I take it they may communicate to the Informatics folks, but I think it is incumbent on the School of Informatics to have some similar kind of meeting, but I—we have all campus, and then if the idea is getting them to—the two together, well that is the next step. We have all campus meetings and we have school meetings.

**PAOLILLO:** Even if we say, you know, that the School of Informatics and Computing should be having these discussions, already perhaps, maybe that is true. My question is, what is the trigger? Just reading the NAD report, is that the trigger, and then we are supposed to initiate these discussions, or because, you know, some will characterize the amount of text that pertains to us is being—in that report is being all of two sentences.

**HANSON:** Right.

**PAOLILLO:** And, you know, many of us read the report very keenly for those two sentences, and, you know, and then the other of it with interest. But it is unclear, then, if that is taking this, the initiation of, you know, of the formal initiation of these procedures now are supposed to have these discussions and if that is the case, then who is supposed to be arranging them?

**HANSON:** Your Dean. You or your Dean. And this is a point I have been making in the all campus discussions.

**PAOLILLO:** Let me just say that is not happening. So this needs to be looked at.

**HANSON:** Okay, there are two—with respect to a lot of these kind of suggestive remarks in the NAD report, some, I think, actually are appropriately taken up by groups of faculty. I think they have got thematic interests in a given area, say environmental science or sustainability, and that can—then they can think, look there is an opportunity here for us to get a particular program going here. The way some other kinds of programs grow up. If there is an issue of an administrative reorganization, it obviously does have to be something that involves the administrative structure of the current school. So my expectation is that, and I'm sure the expectation of the successor, is that the schools themselves will have those discussions presumably under the guidance of a dean or an associate dean, or, you know, the faculty could take the bit in their teeth and, you know, arrange a meeting without the dean, but the trigger is the report. I mean, that is the, you know, everybody should start thinking, hmmm this looks like something, you know, that has been endorsed by the Trustees, what are we—when we seem to be implicated, what do we think about this. So, if you want a trigger, I actually think you have got the trigger now.

**PAOLILLO:** Well, and another thing that I have now is that I have your answers to these questions which I can report to the faculty and then they can take it further.

**SHERMAN:** Karen, can I ask a quick question? There used to be a BFC committee, Merger, Reorganization, Elimination, does it still exist?

**HANSON:** No.

**SHERMAN:** It was eliminated?

**HANSON:** Well—

**SHERMAN:** By its own—

**HANSON:** No, it was improved—it was, a new policy was passed on April 19<sup>th</sup> of 2010, which provided general guidelines for faculty consultation, and any kind of discussion of this, and it was produced by the Faculty Council with the knowledge that this NAD report was coming. So

it was meant to highlight the important role of faculty discussions and faculty consultation in any kind of administrative reorganization.

**SHERMAN:** Thank you.

**SINGER:** Do the roles of adjunct faculty and students vary by school in a process like this?

**HANSON:** I can imagine they might, I mean, you know, with something like SLIS, which is an all-graduate school, there are various kinds of considerations that would come to the floor in the discussions that are going on, for example, between journalism and some of the departments in the College. Their primary focus has been on some things connected with undergraduates, and whether or not they—to what extent they bring those students in for present shaping of whatever kind of proposals or next steps they want to move on to, you know, probably does vary by certain—by those kinds of circumstances.

Jim, you are over getting popcorn or something, but I just wanted to remind you that, as you probably well remember, the earlier procedures on MRE had grown out of a particular situation where an elimination was proposed. It wasn't a sort of wholesale issue about restructuring on the campus or looking for new directions. So, both of these policies have sort of come out of the circumstances that were [indistinct comment], and I think that the new policy is actually quite a good one for dealing with the next phases of the NAD. That is part of—but I guess last week, the other thing I was mentioning, is that the IUPUI procedures are quite different from the ones that the BFC adopted in April, and that poses another layer of complexity here because there isn't any UFC policy on administrative reorganization. That is clearly relevant including in this case we are talking about right now because both of those schools are core schools with operations on both campuses. But that is, if I may say so, that is another reason why, in some sense, this can't exactly be directed by either the Provost or the Chancellor, that was begun at IUPUI. It has got to come from a discussion within the schools. Other questions or comments?

**TERRY:** I had a comment that—we have guests and other sorts of things—but the approval of Carol and [indistinct comment] might comment to writing and asked that she distributed to the Council members.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Thank you, in the interest of time—

**HANSON:** Anything else? Then we will move on to the two items of business. One is the annual report of the Athletics Committee, so Julia and—Julia Lamber, Chair of the Athletics Committee—and Kurt Zorn, the faculty athletics rep, and Fred Glass is here.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 6: ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ATHLETICS COMMITTEE**

**LAMBER:** So I have distributed a written report, which is in your materials. I'll just remind you that the Athletics Committee is composed of the faculty athletic rep, the chair of the Committee, Kurt and me, six elected faculty members that you elect, three alumni representatives that the President appoints, and two students. And then we have various ex-officio members. We meet on a Wednesday about three or four times a semester, so if you ever want to contact us or want to come to a meeting or anything like that, just let us know.

This is—you'll remember that last year I said that one of the major functions of the Committee was to select a new faculty athletic rep because Bruce Jaffee had—was retiring. We were fortunate to convince—the President was fortunate to convince Kurt to become the faculty athletic rep, so Kurt, and then Fred is going to really do all of our work for us.

**ZORN:** I am going to be very brief. I am still obviously on a learning curve, but much to the thanks of Bruce and his mentorship, the learning curve is less steep than it could possibly have been. So I am enjoying my new role and I have got a lot to learn, but it is a great group of people to be working with, both the Athletic Committee, and all the wonderful people over in the Athletic Department.

**GLASS:** Well thank you for the opportunity to present today. I will try to be fairly brief and kind of hit the high spots and leave time for questions and answers because I'd rather talk about what you want to talk about, than what I want to talk about. This overview will follow pretty closely the presentation I made to the Board of Trustees earlier this year, so I will be sharing with you really what I shared earlier with the Board of Trustees, and chat at least a little bit with the Executive Committee, as has been our practice the last couple years. I met at a luncheon with the executive group, including Coach Wilson as well, and so that was much appreciated, so thank you for the opportunity to do that as well.

As I have mentioned here before, I think it is very important that we have focused priorities in the Athletic Department, just like I think any organization needs focused priorities, otherwise everybody else's priorities tend to become your priorities. Ours are: number one, playing by the rule; number two, achieving academically, making sure our kids go to class and graduate, then and only then, being excellent athletically; and then finally, being integrated with the University and the community as a whole. And those were the priorities that I set out before I was even actually the AD when I was announced back in October of '08. They were the same ones when I started in January of '09, and they are the same ones that I report to you today. I think we have made progress by focusing on those priorities.

Number one, playing by the rules, making sure we are following compliance. We have added staff, we have professionalized the work environment that had been there before. We had an audit by a national firm to help us understand more what is out there that might not necessarily

be on our radar screen. We have instituted monthly meetings that are now mandatory, had not been previously with our coaching staff. I attend those as well. I meet every week with our senior compliance leadership to try to make sure that I am on top of the issues that are merging within the Department. And those are some of the measures that we have taken to make sure our—putting our money with our mouth is in terms of making sure we follow the rules.

Achieving academically, we have had a lot of inputs. We are now starting to see some outputs, but first of all, I think a major input is the new tool, Academic Center, on the athletic campus that was dedicated in September of this year. As many of you probably know, and some of you may not know, while in the evenings the Academic Center is focused on the tutoring and academic study tables for our student athletes, during the day it is available to the campus, and in light of the classroom shortage, we have made that available. The Registrar assigns classes there. We have a hundred and thirty-three hours of class time, which is about 74% of the capacity of the building. So if you have classes that you would like to have there, it is a pretty—it is a nice space, there is parking, we are eager to have kids come in to our facility to take away a little bit of the mystery that may be around the Athletic Department. The majority of our courses right now are English as a second language, we teach twenty—or we have twenty eight different sessions of that, and we have three or four HPER classes that are there, so it is utilized heavily by the campus as well as the Athletic Department. We are real pleased about that.

That sort of fits in without our fourth priority as well, being more integrated with our University. Over half of our sports, thirteen of the twenty four, earned a perfect single year APR score, that is up from ten the year before. As many of you know, that is the measurement the NCA gives us for a short hand measurement, how we are doing on making sure our students graduate. Four of our sports are recognized by the NCA for multi-year APR scores are in the top ten percent of the country, that is up from two the year before. Five of our student athletes were named [indistinct comment] Academic All-Americans, that is up from four the year before. Two hundred and forty two of our student athletes were named Academic All Big Ten, that is up from two hundred and twenty seven the year before. Three hundred and thirty eight of our student athletes had a GPA of 3.0 or higher, which is almost 60% of our student athlete population, and our student athletes cumulative GPA is 3.07, which is up from the previous year.

Turning to exceling athletically, so first we follow the rules, then we try to make sure our academics are in order, only then do we get to exceling athletically. We think we have been making progress in that area as well. We've had—we've had six Big Ten athletes of the year last year, which is the most in the conference last year. We have had fourteen since I've become Athletic Director. That is the most in the conference. We have had ten top twenty-five finishes in the [indistinct comment] Field Directors Cup Standings, that is up from seven the

year before. We matched our best finish in the [indistinct comment] Field Cup Standings which is a measurement of the overall health of your athletic program, measuring not only the major revenue generating sports, but the Olympic sports as well. Important to us, we have won the Crimson and Gold challenge, which is the head to head competition with Purdue. Every year since I have been here, we've won conference championships, three conference championships, Women's swimming and diving, men's soccer, and water polo. Last year, we had sixty-seven All Americans representing eleven sports, which is up from forty nine, representing nine sports the year before.

I often say, my recollection is that Herman Wells said something like, "Faculty are what makes a university famous." I like to say, "Coaches are what make an Athletic Department famous." Coaches are our faculty. You can have all the great facilities you want, and policies you want, and this you want, and that you want, but it is really about the coaches and their commitment to our priorities. So we focus on trying to identify, recruit, and retain the best coaches possible. Last year, we added Coach [indistinct comment] as our men's soccer coach. He was named Big Ten Coach of the Year. Our swimming coach was named Big Ten Coach of the Year. Our track and field coach was named Regional Coach of the Year. And we also worked to retain our baseball coach, Tracey Smith, signed him to a long term contract, extended our volleyball coach's contract, extended our women's basketball contract, and hired a new football coach, and his staff, recognizing, again, that the coaches are a major part of what we try to accomplish.

Marketing is part of what we do. Not only to generate revenues, but to also have our student athletes participate in an environment that is exciting for them, and exciting for people we are trying to recruit. Our football attendance last year was the highest level since 1992. Our season ticket sales are up by 20%. Our young alumni season ticket sales are up over 1600%, as a result of us extending the \$5 ticket to young alumni, three years out or less. So that—and hopefully they get in the habit of doing that. Our youth season ticket sales have gone up 50%. Even with the challenges on the court, our attendance for men's basketball is second in the conference, and twelfth nationally. We reestablished the faculty and staff discounts for football and men's basketball, established free admission for faculty and staff and a guest to all of our Olympic sports, and are just trying to create an atmosphere that helps us get folks in to see our players.

Integrating with the University is our fourth priority. We have tried to do a variety of things to make that a reality. We have worked with—a lot of functions that [indistinct comment] had been done internally to athletics, we are trying to piggy back on to the support that the University already has, so we have cut staff in UITS, cut staff in physical plant, cut staff in HR, so we can rely more upon and be more efficient in the delivery of those services through the University. We have engaged the Kelley School of Business, the Journalism School, and others

to take us on in studies on things like marketing, social media, to try to take benefit from the resources that we have in the University. The—on a sustainability initiative, we are trying to be able to lay claim to being the greenest athletic department in the Big Ten and have a variety of initiatives consistent with that. We meet with student leaders. I meet every semester with student leaders. I have student—general student body availabilities each semester to be engaged with the student body. We meet with the Foundation, the Alumni Association. We've—last year, and I restate the interest in meeting with the Budgetary Affairs Committee, although my understanding is we are technically outside the purview of that, but we are happy to engage that body, and show where we are in terms of our fiscal management. Our student athletes performed over thirty-two hundred hours of community service. This is a fine point, but something I am excited about, the Big Ten Network, we are able in working with the telecommunications folks, to give real-life experience in production and, you know, be in the talent on Big Ten broadcasts, that has been a great partnership. So we continue to look for ways to integrate with our University, not only because I like to come in here and say that and shine my halo about that, but really selfishly, there is all these great resources that we want to [indistinct comment] on to that does make it easier for us to do our work when we can get those resources.

We also presented to the Board, our ten year financial plan. It is in the black. We are in balance, if you will, each and every year, and I would emphasize that we are an auxiliary, and we are financially independent. We are not subsidized by the University. In fact, we write, you know, gigantic checks to the University every year for our student athletes for room and board, tuition, books, fees, so forth, and so on. And we take very seriously the importance of us continuing to be able to say that we are one of the handful of major football schools that are in fact financially independent.

We are a [indistinct comment] and hearty group, we are the most—we are the, I would submit to you, that we are the most underfunded public university's Athletic Department in the Big Ten. That is, if you take our budget, divide it by the number of sports that we produce, we have the lowest number for any school other than Northwestern, and so we have got to do things like borrow, you know, leverage resources from the University, try to be more nimble in a variety of things because while a sixty-fix million dollar budget is a significant budget, it is on the low end in dealing with the Big Ten. This sort of brings in to focus, Penn State, Ohio State, Michigan, will each make more money in one football Saturday than we will on our entire six game schedule. So that is who we are competing against in our Conference. I mentioned our Scholarships. We spend about twelve million dollars a year on scholarships, room and board, tuition, books and fees, and so forth. That has gone up fifty-six percent in the last six years. We are spending \$4.6 million more than we did just six years ago to pay that bill. So we have to run

a lot faster just to stay in place on the annual monies that we have to raise to pay our tuition bill.

We are facing a variety of other economic issues, the general economic environment, increased travel cost, costs of maintaining facilities, and so forth. The way we are addressing that is number one, we are trying to save more money. When I got here, there were nine associate Athletic Directors reporting to me. I think that was a vestige of me being the fifth Athletic Director in eight years. We were sort of adding people at the top and not winnowing them back down. That number is now five, so we have cut almost 50% of the senior staff in the Department, and taken that over half million dollars and reallocated it in to other things that touch students athletes, academic advisors, trainers, and so forth. Cutting travel, we are busing more in places where we used to fly. Leveraging the—some of the resources that are already in place at the University. So we are saving more money, we are trying to raise more money. Even in this economic environment, and even though we haven't exactly been setting the world on fire in football and basketball, we have had record fundraising years, and that is due to the good work of our Varsity Club, and the support of our donors. We had the best annual giving year ever last year at \$7.9 million, and the best overall fundraising year ever last year at thirteen and half million dollars. So we are saving money, we are asking for more money, we are trying to make more money. We have renegotiated our media rights deal with our [indistinct comment] Field that does that work for us, that has added a million dollars annually to our bottom line. We are working to increase football attendance. The good news is, we have got lots if inventory, and so it costs us the same amount to have a game for twelve thousand, thirty thousand, or fifty thousand, so as we fill that stadium, that money should fall to the bottom line. That is a big opportunity for us. We are trying to pursue creative ways to generate more funds, including the crossroads classic that we are going to have in Indianapolis, with Notre Dame, Purdue, Butler, and us.

The Big Ten Network continues to be a source of potential additional monies. We take an even slice out of that, so we get an even share, it is about \$16 million. That feels like more money to us on a sixty-five million dollar budget than it may to Ohio State that has a hundred and forty million dollar budget, and so I think that is one of the great things about the Big Ten as a conference, we share gate revenues, which is really good. I like that, because I am a donee on gate revenues. And we share media revenues. But I do think it is part of the magic of the Big Ten because it helps the programs be pretty strong from top to bottom. So that is a pretty quick overview. I will stop there. I know we ran out of time last time, so I want to make sure I leave time to answer any questions there may be.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** You mentioned a national firm that audited something. What was audited, and what were some of the findings and conclusions and suggestions that came out?

**GLASS:** We hired a group that is called The Compliance Group, TCG, out of Kansas City, Missouri, and they—because they council with departments and actually the NCAA all around the country, they sometimes are aware of the next thing that kind of, you know, may be looked at. Or what people are getting in trouble for, what they are not monitoring about, what they are not educating about. So it gives us a national perspective, and they can look at our monitoring functions, for example, and say, “You know, we are not sure,” I’m making this up, but, “we are not sure—we are not sure you are monitoring your, you know, courtesy car program the way you ought to be,” or, “we are not sure you are monitoring, you know, cell phone calls by coaches the way you ought to be.” And so they gave us a list of like thirty things and, you know, we have documented that we have done all of those things. So, A, hopefully that helps us avoid those pitfalls, and B, hopefully it demonstrates to people that care that, you know, we are putting out money where our mouth is to try to make sure we are following the rules.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** And how much did that cost, if you don’t mind telling us?

**GLASS:** You know, I don’t know the answer to that. I don’t know the answer to that question. A guess would be in the neighborhood of like twenty thousand dollars, but that would be a guess.

**HANSON:** Jim?

**SHERMAN:** Thanks for coming. I want to mention three things that you didn’t mention, Fred, that maybe you should have. First is the faculty sponsorship program for student athletes that, in my opinion, is the best in the country. Bruce Jaffee did a terrific job at presiding over it, and Kurt has been involved in being a faculty sponsor for many years. I’m sure he will do the same, and I would encourage anyone here who hasn’t done it to think about doing it. You know, these kids really work hard, and it is a tough life to be a student athlete. And the help that they get from faculty is very important to the—

**ZORN:** It is also very rewarding to work with them.

**SHERMAN:** It is.

**ZORN:** So if you are interested, [zorn@indiana.edu](mailto:zorn@indiana.edu). Seriously. My last name, [zorn@indiana.edu](mailto:zorn@indiana.edu).

**SHERMAN:** The second thing is that I noticed you mentioned in the report the online ticket options for football and basketball. And even though the city has gone back to paper ballots, I hope that despite the glitch in the basketball seating that you will stay with it. It is really a good program. And one that makes it easier for all of us. And third, another thing you didn’t mention was I think there has been a really good emphasis on the health of student athletes. Recently there was a nutritionist, and the training table foods have changed, and the focus on the health

of student athletes I think has become a point of emphasis over the last few years, and I think it has been very important. So, congratulations on doing that. And then I have a question, a simple question.

**LAMBER:** We paid Jim to say all of those things.

**SHERMAN:** A simple question, no doubt, is what can you do, or what can we do to increase attendance at women's sports?

**GLASS:** Well first of all, thanks for your comments on those three things. And let me just, on the last thing, student wellbeing is a major focus that we have had. Jim referenced that. We have hired only the second full-time sports nutritionist in the conference. There is only a handful in the entire country. She is doing a fabulous job, improved our training table, not only what we serve the student athletes there, but she literally goes to the grocery store with them as they transition out of student housing, helps them shop for what they are, you know, to shop in a nutritious way. We have bought this thing called a bod-pod, which cost about forty five thousand dollars. It looks like this little egg thing, and they can get in it, and measure in a non-intrusive way, body fat, and leanness, and you know, keep that up. We have psychologists on contract to provide support services for the student athletes, and we are proud of what we think is a holistic approach, not only for athletics, but also academics, and wellness.

In terms of coming to not only our women sports, but all of our Olympic sports, we are eager to have ideas for that. We try to promote that. I sort of skipped over it kind of quickly. We have got a Crimson rewards program, where we give the students points for coming to a big volleyball match, or big field hockey match, and they get online, and we will say triple points because we are playing Purdue, or something like that, and they collect points and then redeem them for things that we give out. We are trying to rejuvenate the Student Athletic Board, which when I was a student here, was a really, really big deal. It seems like it had gotten to be less of a big deal. We are trying to get it back to where it had been. Really competitive with the IU Student Foundation and other groups as a prestigious group, and they do a lot of staffing and support in trying to generate attendance at the non-revenue sports. So we are trying to do that. Those sports are like really, really fun. If you've never been to a volleyball game or a field hockey game or a softball game, a water polo match, you are really missing out. Thanks, Jim, appreciate that. Yes?

**BASU:** I'm pretty impressed with the [indistinct comment] that have been in my class [indistinct comment], but my question today is from a different side that is what are student costs for athletic advising? It is higher, as I understand it, than student costs of University Division or College advising. And, if so, where does the money come from? Some years ago we heard that some of the taxation money that is on the College goes higher, but the College was not advising

student athletes. It would be the Athletic Division that would be advising student athletes, yet the cost would be paid by the College at a higher rate, does it still go on?

**GLASS:** I appreciate the question, and I don't know those figures as I sit here today, but I'd be happy to get them back and they could be circulated, in terms of those cost comparisons, I just don't know that. It is accurate that there is, you guys might know more of the details of this, but there is University money that is utilized for advising that takes place in athletics that, therefore, does not need to take place through the University Division or other places. Whether there is being a premium paid for that, I don't know that. But I can look at the numbers and get that back.

**ZORN:** I can address that a little bit. I don't remember the exact number, it is something over \$800,000 that the campus support use—provides a support, but the important point is the advisors in the Department of Athletics are University Division advisors. And maybe what you are getting at, Basu, is the ratio of student athletes to advisors lower than it is for the general UD students? And that partially, I think, and now, in my role as faculty athletics representative, is due to the NCAA and Big Ten requirements to make sure they are making good progress to degree for eligibility and so forth.

**BASU:** --aware of that are now opposing. Where I am coming from is what is coming back to now six or seven years ago, so, I mean, if he was the Dean of the [indistinct comment] the taxation off the College [indistinct comment], he said if the Athletics Division wants to do their advising their way, it is wonderful, let them do it, but it should not be—the College should not be taxed for it. If the College is taxed, the College will pay only at the rate at which the College pays for their own advising.

**GLASS:** That makes sense. I don't know if there is a delta there or not, but--

**BASU:** It's a taxation question.

**KOVACICH:** I have a question and a comment. Where are the women's volleyball games held?

**GLASS:** In the University school—the old University school gym.

**KOVACICH:** Tenth and Bypass, right?

**GLASS:** Yes.

**KOVACICH:** My comment would be maybe make it more centrally located. I drive by and I see the signs, but I would think that is a little off campus. Maybe making it more centrally located it would get more attendance.

**GLASS:** Yeah, it is really challenging, because as that has grown up, it is hard to find it with a compass and bread crumbs even if you know where you are going. So we have tried to put out little flags and stuff like that. In our master plan, eventually I would envision us bringing—wrestling is there too—to bring that on to the athletic campus. But for now, you know, it will probably be there.

**HANSON:** Herb?

**TERRY:** --how you are tracking what is going with Penn State. The interim President at Penn State has announced that he plans to create a campus ethics office, it is not too clear whether he means an [indistinct comment] or something like that, but apparently grows from a concern, that given the cultural hierarchy within the athletics or academics low ranking employees or students may not feel too good complaining about something unethical or illegal by supervisors or coaches, or supervising professors. And so I guess I am asking both of you if there is anything so far about that that you think we need to look at or we would be advised to follow, or to what extent are you tracking, and I hope we don't have a similar sort of problem here, but there is more things than just following the rules. There is creating an environment which is possible to be [indistinct comment], and I am wondering if anything has come up so far that you are looking at implementing or doing here.

**ZORN:** Herb, may I comment on it? Maybe before Fred and Karen. As faculty athletics representative, I take very serious, and I know Bruce did, the role of being an overseer of what we call institutional control, and for those of you that know me, I think you probably realize that I would never be shy, and I don't think Bruce would have been shy of sounding the alarm if necessary and going to the correct people, and being fairly [indistinct comment] that way, so I'm not tooting my own horn, but I am basically saying that that is the culture that the faculty athletics representatives have had here as long as I can recall, going back to Bill Perkins and [indistinct comment] Murray, and others. So that is an important component of this. Now, I am not necessarily casting dispersions on the faculty reps at Penn State, because I am not sure how aware they might have been, but I just wanted to at least say that.

**LAMBER:** And I'll say with more with various—having had various jobs on the campus over the years that I have been a faculty member here, several years in the Office for Women's Affairs, several years in Affirmative Action and so forth, I think one of the wonderful things about this campus, although maddening to others, is that we have always had a culture of having lots of places for people to go. So lots of places for students to go, lots of places for faculty, staff to go with various issues. And I think, and I know Affirmative Action does training and has specific training with the Athletic Department, and with student athletes to say, you know, remember you are part of the rest of the University, and all these resources are available to you. And

encourage people to use them if they need to. So I—but I think that is a culture of the campus that has been here for a really long time. Now you can answer.

**GLASS:** Herb, I might just affirm your observations about the unbelievably tumultuous nature of intercollegiate athletics, and, you know, the Penn State allegations are beyond reprehensible. Just, you know, horrific and hardly believable. You know, before that, the allegations at the University of Miami that in a different context were sort of beyond the pale, and then the Ohio State, and you know, you kind of unfortunately go down the list. Our approach is not to sit back and smugly say that could never happen here, as I sometimes hear from other institutions and sort of marvel at that response, but really there but for the grace of God go I, what can I learn—what can we learn from that that they paid a price to learn that. We can sort of learn for free. So even if it is something like the collapse of the stage at the Indiana State Fair, the minute I heard about that, we were reviewing our emergency preparedness protocols, and making sure there was somebody in charge and we knew what to do if there was a tornado warning in Monroe County at the time there was a practice or a competition. Or the University Miami things, you know what are we doing to make sure we know who is on our sidelines, and that we are accountable for who gets access to special areas that they might try to leverage for one nefarious reason or another. So I can assure you that when any of these things happen, we try to turn a mirror back and say what can we learn, how can we head that off at the pass and institute protocols or other things to try to make sure they don't happen.

One of the things that I talked about with President McRobbie when he hired me was I said, you know, no one can be a guarantor that something bad is not going to happen. I can't do that, other people can't do that. In a heavily regulated area where you are dealing with, you know, young kids, and eager coaches, you know, things are probably going to happen. So I can't tell you that by hiring me that they won't happen because they will. But what I can commit to him and commit to you is we are going to do everything we can to create a culture that favors compliance, whether it is the monthly, you know, meetings with the coaches that I attend, the weekly meetings with the senior staff, the outside auditor, the meetings with the President where compliance is always the first agenda item, we will create an environment where that is known to be a high priority. And then if and when it happens, we will deal with it professionally, and transparently, and in a way that would make people at the institution proud of the way we have handled it. And so that is the approach that we have tried to take, transparency, acknowledgement of the public trust, and trying to create a culture of openness, you know, both informally and formally. After the Miami—and I'm sorry to go on and on, but I'll just stop here. The Miami of Florida thing, all these—a lot of these things that happened that were so outrageous were sort of open secrets within the Department. A lot of people knew about them. I don't think the Athletic Director knew about them, but a lot of people did. And when that happened, I sent that article to every single person in our department, and said,

don't assume people know. You know, it is not only your—it is your responsibility to let us know when something funny is going on. And so we are trying to create that culture.

**HANSON:** Bill?

**WHEELER:** Thank you. I'd like to ask two questions. One at least is serious. Going back to your issue about classrooms and finding classrooms. I do need classrooms next Fall. How large is that classroom? [Laughter]

**GLASS:** We have a variety of classrooms, from small kind of seminar, twenty-ish, to fairly big, auditorium type rooms that probably have, you know, a hundred people or so.

**WHEELER:** Actually, I need a hundred and sixty. [Laughter]

**ZORN:** I don't think it's that large.

**WHEELER:** The second one, you know, [indistinct comment] for a long time here, and this one is a little light hearted, but when I was an undergraduate we had Saturday morning classes, and you'd go to your Saturday morning class, and then you would go down to the football stadium or basketball or [indistinct comment] afternoon game. We always [indistinct comment]. And I have had occasion to [indistinct comment] to Tom on the matter of Friday classes several weeks ago, somewhat tongue in cheek, but now a little bit more seriously, what I said was you know, I would be willing to teach Saturday classes if I had tickets to give to student to reward them for coming. And I [indistinct comment] to teach a Saturday class, Tuesday, Thursday, Saturday class, [indistinct comment] on your facilities, [laughter], [indistinct comment], go on over to the stadium or to the basketball courts, actually somewhat seriously.

**GLASS:** Well, that would hit at least two of our priorities. So I think we would be open to talk about how to make that work. I actually did some Saturday classes too when I was here, so you may have been here when the coal strike happened and they struck down campus for three weeks, and we caught up with some Saturday classes, and so that was a joy to be part of that.

**HANSON:** You are all getting too relaxed. So it may be, unless there are other pressing questions right now, we should thank the—

**GLASS:** --Thank you for the opportunity. Appreciate it.

**HANSON:** Thank you. And we are not, I think, going to be able to get through all the agenda items, and my suggestion would be that if you want to go get something to refresh yourself, that you just do that, but we not take a break. The next item on the agenda is the resolution on the Extended-X policy, and Padraic Kenney and Bill Wheeler are up to talk about that.

**AGENDA ITEM 7: RESOLUTION ON EXTENDED-X POLICY**

**KENNEY:** Sure, I am going to try to make this as [indistinct comment] as possible. Those of you who were on the BFC two years ago, we brought this to you and, well, those of you who were on the Committee two years ago, you saw we brought this forward and we are not bringing the Extended-X policy back to you, although you may have comments or questions. Basically one concern came up on the EPC, during EPC discussions, and that is that the system as we revised it two years ago, led to a situation where petitions for late approval of extended-x were coming to—especially to University Division, but to all the schools and colleges, and first of all, policy does not state how petitions might be dealt with. Some schools are saying there is no petitions, therefore, if you miss the deadline, too bad. Others are trying to deal with this. They are finding that dealing with petitions are taking a great deal of time. Beyond that, they are also discovering that there are few—few types of students for whom this is a particular problem, especially international students who are not figuring out the system in time. So it needed to be addressed. We talked about moving the deadline, we talked about maybe having automatic systems, so if you retake a class, that automatically x's out the previous grade. But a great deal of the discussion lead to the conclusion that the simplest thing, which would not pose a problem, would be to essentially get rid of the deadline entirely.

Let me just explain a couple of things about the revision you have here, and the data you have. The data is not labeled, but is something everybody asks about, so we thought you'd be interested in seeing it. How often do people ask for extended-x, and in what departments are the classes in which they are asking for extended-x? You have here, this is the 2010-2011 data. As you can see, the substantial portion amounting to nearly half—well no, about a third of the applications are for extended-X class are business and math classes. A large portion are for several other science classes. That is what that is.

Secondly, you might want to know, we did give you the data, how many students ever ask for extended-X? Students who came in in Fall 2007, seven thousand plus students, eighty five percent of the students never asked for extended-X at all. About nine point five percent do this once over their career. Four percent do it twice. Slightly over one percent ask for, what is essentially the maximum, to do this three times. So it is essentially the maximum [indistinct comment] ten credits if you do it more, if you are X-ing out courses that are smaller than three credits. So a relatively small proportion of our students. I suppose you could look at a different way and say that is actually a lot, a thousand students in any cohort might be doing this.

Finally, how many petitions are we talking about? We don't have the statistics for the entire campus, but in the University Division, which is the bulk of the petitions, in the last academic year, there were ninety six requests. Again, that is either a lot or not very many depending on how you look at it. Thirty six of them were approved, of either people who requests—people who missed the deadline. Thirty six were approved, ten were denied, and forty nine of them,

and I find this rather significant, students did not follow up. And again I find that significant because these might be precisely the students who are just completely confused by what exactly they are being asked to do. It seemed logical that of course they can X a class out and so on.

One friendly correction that has come in since this document went to press, this was from Mark [indistinct comment] earlier today, suggesting that the best language is instead of or what you have here, up until the time of degree application, be replaced with prior to graduation. I anticipated this in the language that you've got, that might turn out slightly differently. And prior to graduation, may essentially turn out to be the same thing. We would expect that most students, I mean the process of applying for graduation is complicated enough, engaged enough. Any advisor will tell you that a lot of students get really confused by it, that presumably at that time most students would be prompted to realize they need to take care of it, but there might be some students who up until graduation—actual graduation, might still need to apply. There you have it.

**HANSON:** Questions or comments?

**TERRY:** The specific change I think addresses this specific problem. I have two questions. How much variability really is there among the schools in honoring this policy for purposes of school [indistinct comment] graduation and probation determination?

**KENNEY:** We didn't gather on how each school handles it. We were told that there is a fair amount of variation, and that that is part of the problem. And so, again, that variation comes with—since the policy does not specify petitions, you know dealing with the problem.

**TERRY:** And may be an issue for some future time. Somewhat related to that, I was surprised there is school variability in fulfillment of the new Gen Ed requirements. If a student wants to [indistinct comment] introductory level courses, extended-X, something that they took as a Gen Ed course when they were subject to the University Division, would the schools have to honor that eventually when they got to graduation?

**KENNEY:** Well, extended-X itself does not vary across the campus. It is only been this little [indistinct comment] that we created where there have been variations. So, if we approve this change, then, you know, there shouldn't be any variations. I think the variation was understandable. College was trying to deal with something that was not anticipated in the policy. But I think that this would iron that out, and that shouldn't pose a problem relating to Gen Ed or anything else. I'm as helpful now as I was two years ago.

**TRIX:** I just have a question of information, is this a common policy with other colleges?

**KENNEY:** You mean other universities around the country? We did look at this a little bit, and yes most schools have, I mean I don't know about most school, but other schools have such policies. Basically there are three different things you can do. One is you can have some kind of a policy such as we have, which requires a student to do something, to check a box, to file a letter, to something saying I am X-ing out that course. Some schools have a policy where it is automatic if you sign up for that math class a second time, the other grade goes away in some way. And then some schools don't do this at all. But it is pretty common.

**TRIX:** I mean, I don't remember it, so obviously it is since my years. Is it from the 90s?

**KENNEY:** You asking a historian, I'm sorry. I don't know how far back it goes. Pat, do you know?

**P. WHEELER:** I think in the 70s actually at IU, but it has been [indistinct comment], so failing grades could be dealt with. One reason [indistinct comment] is some faculty said they were asked to sign an F when they felt the grade earned was a D, and that was [indistinct comment] to some faculty.

**HANSON:** Any other questions or comments?

**GIERYN:** Where is this policy? I can't find it. The Extended-X implementation policies? This is the current one, right?

**DETHLOFF:** Right. It is on the Registrar website.

**GIERYN:** So it is not an academic policy in the academic guide?

**P. WHEELER:** It should be in the academic guide. I thought it was at one time.

**MCLEOD:** If it has slipped out of there, [indistinct comment] make sure it gets back.

**GIERYN:** We don't let things slip. [Laughter] Keep looking, if anyone can help me find it [indistinct comment].

**P. WHEELER:** I can probably help you find it from, you know, a couple of years ago. It is definitely in there.

**BASU:** [indistinct comment]

**HANSON:** Any other questions or comments? You'll bring it back?

## **AGENDA ITEM 8: RECOMMENDATION TO THE BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL ON FRIDAY CLASSES**

**KENNEY:** Yes, we will bring it back. Shall I go quickly on to Friday—this is a point of information essentially, though [indistinct comment] time on, or we spent a lot of time discussing it. The question [indistinct comment] Friday classes. When this came up the EPC and the Faculty Affairs Committee were asked to look in to it and come up with some kind of a solution, and you will recall that one of possibilities was maybe there should be some kind of targets that would be set for the campus or for individual colleges and schools. Well, we did meet. We thought about that. We thought about it hard. And there were, I guess I would say there were two reasons why we turned away from targets—setting targets [indistinct comment]. One was that numbers didn't seem all that far off, as was explained in the memo. If twelve percent of classes are being taught on Fridays and our realistic goal would be fourteen to fifteen percent, then it is not clear that that is really effective path to go.

Secondly, the data that was presented to the BFC, I'm sure I was not the only one who was saying, wow I thought the problem was bigger than this. The College, you know, plenty of people are taking class on Friday, freshman, sophomores are taking plenty. So it is a wealthy, localized problem, both in time and space. And while conceivably one could then say, oh there are certain schools and certain students who are not doing what they should, that didn't seem like the kind of thing that the EPC and FAC should be dealing with, especially because, as quite [indistinct comment] presented at that meeting, that lots of things are going on in both among juniors and seniors who are doing interviews or internships or whatever, and in the schools where the Friday class attendance is relatively low. But we don't want to leave it there and say, oh well, they said things are great, let's just tell the world things are fine. Rather, what we would like to do is use this as an opportunity, if you like, a teaching opportunity. Essentially what we are saying is, alright, if that is what is happening on Fridays, let's brand Fridays. Let's tell the world these are all the exciting things that are happening on this campus on Fridays. If, indeed, various schools are full of people doing student teaching, and internships, and interviews, and what not, at the moment, that seemed to be sort of operating at the level of legend. And I'm sure it is really fantastic. Let's bring that out there.

So that is the main thing we are asking for. And then secondly, B and C are rather more technical issues. Which may have a substantial effect, it may not, but because one of these essentially is a direction or sort of an asking for a kind of a branding again, and the others are more technical, we are bringing this not as an action item, it's not a policy, but this is a [indistinct comment] information and discussion.

**HANSON:** Any discussion?

**GIERYN:** I think I read the document as trying to be helpful. And I'd like to work with the EPC towards something that perhaps is more along the lines of what we brought to the Bloomington Faculty Council at its most recent meeting. This is a quick turnaround, gentleman.

Thank you. I think collecting information about what is happening on Friday is a good idea. I also think that it is a good suggestion and a positive move to ask the administration to work with some of the schools that are really contributing more to the problem than others and say what can you do to beef up instructional activities. What we are asking from the Bloomington Faculty Council is a little bit of support in that initiative. We are really asking for a statement that says, “In so far as it seems to be consistent with the vision of the school or department, and you can find ways to do so creatively and effectively, would you please increase the amount of instructional—scheduled instructional activities on Friday.” We are looking for that kind of an endorsement.

We really, I think, agree that we can’t get in to the scheduling of classes of each of the departments and tell them how to do that. We are not going to be able to do that. The reason why we went with a target, and a deadline for that target is just so that we can keep monitoring the situation and know whether or not we have made any progress. It is telling, it seems to me that for Monday through Friday, the proportion of students who don’t have any classes on Monday through Friday is about 4%. That gives you a baseline. Ninety-six percent of our undergraduates have at least one class Monday through Thursday. But on Friday, the proportion of undergraduates who have no scheduled classes rises to 33% percent. And, of course, it varies dramatically, as you pointed out, across from freshman to seniors. If we could take that 32.9% and set a target so that—a reasonable target—28%, 25%, simply say campus-wide, in a couple of years, say three, we’d like to see the needle down to about 25%. And simply have the support of the Council in that endeavor. It would be a lot easier for people like me, the Provost, the Provost’s successor, to deal with the deans and say, what are you doing about Friday classes? Have you come up with any good ideas that would, in particular, speak to the lack of—seeming lack of activity, especially for seniors and juniors. That is all we are asking for. And I am—I’d like to urge the committee on the Council to consider something along those lines. It does not have to be a policy, I agree, but just a statement that this might be a good thing for the schools.

**KENNEY:** I think that it wouldn’t be difficult for us to bring a statement about Friday classes as a value to the BFC relatively quickly, and I think that is a good idea, seeing that we didn’t actually discuss simply affirming the value that we often take for granted. I guess I don’t see a good way to combine that with a target, in part because—I guess at least at the moment, I’d like to take it face value, the assertions or take as plausible, the assertions that we have heard in this room, and also during the EPC discussion, that a whole lot is going on on Fridays. It is possible that all that information will come in and then the EPC, for example, could look at and say that is not very much. We are underwhelmed, therefore, there is a need to get—to come back to that. But I’d like to sort of have that information to be able to look at and say, okay, how many students have these interviews on Friday, how many students are doing student teaching on

Fridays, and then, you know, look at that and say, wow we are really impressed that Friday is just an incredible day at IU, or we are underwhelmed. Does that make sense?

**GIERYN:** Could we, if targets and deadlines are not what you'd like to pursue, how about the possibility of a request from the BFC that the administration collect these data on a regular basis so that we can monitor what is happening. I mean, a general endorsement of the desirability to expanding instructional activities, coupled with an annual monitoring that would be reviewed on a routine basis, and reported back to the EPC. How is that?

**KENNEY:** Yeah, makes sense to me.

**HANSON:** Randy?

**ARNOLD:** Tom, and maybe you can't even answer this question, do we know how difficult it might be to get similar data from other schools, just about what—the one point you mentioned about number of students who do or don't have a class on a given day of the week. If we just went with that one piece of data, do you think it would be difficult to ask Registrars from other maybe around the Big Ten if they would mind sharing that information? They may have similar concerns or may not.

**GIERYN:** The risk of piling on the [indistinct comment] been asked to provide a lot of information lately. We could certainly find that out.

**HANSON:** I also do think you kind of need to ask yourselves why are you engaged in this at all. The truth is that the administration could tell the schools we are not scheduling your classes unless you reach this goal. I mean, the scheduling of the classroom space is kind of an administrative matter, not so much a faculty matter, but what I think the Faculty Council needs to take up is the issue of the educational climate for the students, and so really, you can look at some things like what is happening elsewhere, but I think that partly we do have to look at the conditions here on our campus, and think what do we want for our students.

**TERRY:** I think related to that, I would like to know more about how you—your Committee especially—assessed the data that Dean Goldsmith presented on alcohol and other violations being so much higher on Thursdays—Thursday nights, and that sort of thing. And that seems to have kind of gotten lost in this discussion. The goal is to improve the campus educational climate. I don't think either that this can go too far without being honest about some of our own biases in this situation, and we have faculty that will not teach on Fridays. Friday is their research day. Or Friday is a day for graduate student lab meetings, and things like that. Just as we need to know, perhaps, what we are doing on Friday—what undergraduates are doing on Fridays, maybe we need to know more about what faculty and graduate students are doing on Fridays, then we can [indistinct comment]. Overall, I [indistinct comment] gathering the data,

but I think Provost—. Oh, one other thing, I think we should know, exactly how does the Commission for Higher Education and the General Assembly calculate classroom utilization. That, it seems to me, might affect setting some kind of a point or a target. We are [indistinct comment] in trying to build not necessarily new classrooms, but we've got reasonable amounts of [indistinct comment] space, not the right kind of classroom space for twenty-first century instruction. But as long as the General Assembly and the Commission for Higher Education [indistinct comment] basis of whatever analysis they have performed, we are under-utilizing our classroom space, especially [indistinct comment]. I think we need a much better [indistinct comment] understanding of how they come to that conclusion and what their formulae are.

**HANSON:** Any other questions or comments? This isn't an action item, so we will move on. We have very little time left. Carolyn wanted me to let you know that she had to go catch a plane, but let's take up item nine and Professor Horne, maybe you could kind of move us through that. We may not have enough time to act on it today, but perhaps we [indistinct comment].

#### **AGENDA ITEM 9: STATUS AND PRIVILEGES OF RETIRED FACULTY MEMBERS AND LIBRARIANS POLICY REVISION**

**HORNE:** Well, good afternoon. It is good to be back with you again. This is essentially something you have seen, I believe, twice before. There are significant changes since the last time I was here two weeks ago that I believe will satisfy the principle difficulties with the document principally from Tom Gieryn who came and talked to the Committee and the Committee agreed to reword it. So hopefully those objections have been kind of met and satisfied, and so I am here just to see if there are any other questions I can answer for you in the next six minutes.

**HANSON:** I think you caught them off-guard. Is there a certain thing you want summarized about it?

**HORNE:** Well, sure. Again, this is, again, I believe the third time this has come up, this document. This is about the status and privileges of retired faculty members and librarians as you see at the title. The principle conversation the last time was about the use of space. And just the difficulty in the fact that retired faculty members sometimes need or would like to have space to continue mentoring students on who's doctoral committees they serve, artists who want to continue their work, research laboratories, researchers, thing like that, who want to have that space, and yet, there is a chronic space shortage, so it is difficult to come by. So this deals with that, under University office, University of a University—excuse me, use of a University office, laboratory, or studio space there, and essentially it makes what is current practice. The first step is to talk to their Dean or Department Chair to see if something can be done. With the understanding that the University would like to help them but there is chronic

space shortages, and there is bound to be for some time chronic space shortages there. And that section was the major section where we redid it since the last meeting. Other than that, this is essentially the same thing that we dealt with before. The preamble is meant to express in a sincere way, the value that we hold in retired and Emeriti faculty, that listing section is more or less a formality. And the final special benefits section was redone a little bit to make note of the fact that we don't really control that. At the current time, these are benefits that retirees and that Emeriti faculty can expect. That could change at any time depending on the Athletic Director or various policies with the speech and hearing clinic, and so forth. But at this time, those are benefits that are going to retired and Emeriti faculty. Yes sir?

**WHEELER:** My recollection of our last discussion was that Tom had proposed a friendly amendment, and that you said that you thought your co-chair would not be accepting that friendly amendment, and of course from this one, we don't see what was added or changed, whereas last time we had all these colors.

**HORNE:** That's right.

**WHEELER:** I actually confused the issues and didn't know what was going on there. So is it—under use of University office, laboratory, or studio space, I think it was item one.

**HORNE:** It was, in fact.

**WHEELER:** And is this now, then, the friendly amendment that Tom had proposed because he had said that—my recollection is that the previous one had some statement about that, you know, about assigning priorities—

**HORNE:** --Priorities, yes—

**WHEELER:** --if it was a sufficient use, and that Tom had suggested that all of that language be deleted and that we stop at a certain point. I don't have that with me, but is this then essentially Tom's friendly amendment, and the Committee has not accepted that.

**HORNE:** It is essentially, yes. And I misspoke, Professor Gjerdingen sent me that in the record. If I said my co-chair I really misspoke. It was the entire Committee, and I don't want to say that they would have agreed or didn't agree. I wasn't assured that they would agree with that and I was not about to take that step without seeking their permission to do that. But that is essentially—I have previous versions of it if you'd like me to read from that, but that is essentially point number one, where it had a part, if you look at what now says, "the University will make every reasonable effort." That used to be sentence number one, and then it followed with, you know, retirees should make their case known that they want to have this space, and they would—there would be a discussion of priorities, given that we are, you know, limited

resources, things like that. And that met with objection with Tom and I believe the Provost as well, which I certainly understood, and we have already talked about why I did not want to just unilaterally agree to that. He met with the Committee, we have satisfied that in various ways with the Committee and with Tom, and so now we are promote—we are presenting this as something that is acceptable to us. We also changed ninety to sixty days in number two. We made some other changes, but the primary change was exactly [indistinct comment]. And if you would like me to read the previous version, I have it.

**WHEELER:** No, no. I just wanted—my memory was vague.

**HORNE:** Yeah. That was, in fact, it. That it was about, that we did not want to leave the impression that we were going to have a discussion every time this came up about the priority about this faculty's work was more important than this faculty's work, so this faculty member gets the office. We don't want to—we would not want to leave that impression. Really it is more about this faculty retires in this particular building, and there happens to be some space, as opposed to someone who retires next year and there may or may not be.

**HANSON:** We have about three minutes left. So if you—let's see if there are more comments, and then perhaps you want to [indistinct comment].

**SHERMAN:** Yeah, I just have two comments that I made at the Committee meeting. Number one, this is a really non-trivial issue. It may seem trivial to some, but my department is not different from many others. We currently have one tenure-track faculty member under thirty five years old, and nineteen on a forty-nine, who are sixty or over. So, the retirees are going to have to play a big role in the academic life of the department, and I think one of the purposes in drafting this was to try to make it easier for the department and the retiree to keep working together and adding to the academic climate of the department. Second, I would suggest that each department have its own retiree committee, because the decisions about space and teaching, and everything else will ultimately be made at the department level, and it is important for each department to have a standing committee that tries to resolve these issues. This is a global general statement, which is good, but what your department does specifically will depend on your space and your needs and your wishes.

**TERRY:** I have a quick question. Second line of statement, I'm assuming that's sound. If you meant redound, I don't know what the word means.

**HORNE:** Where is this, please?

**TERRY:** Second line under statement. Redound?

**SHERMAN:** What does it mean? Look it up. [Laughter]

**TERRY:** I will do that.

**HANSON:** Are there any other comments?

**GIERYN** I just want to thank the Committee [indistinct comment] and very great [indistinct comment] share for drafting a policy. I think it is a terrific wording and a significant policy revision.

**HANSON:** Any other questions or comments? Do people want to bring this to a vote? It [indistinct comment] moved and seconded. All in favor? [Aye] Opposed? [Silence]. Abstentions? [Silence]. It carries. Thank you very much.

**MEETING ADJOURNED: 5:28pm**