

**Indiana University**  
**BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL**  
**October 4, 2011**  
**IMU Georgian Room**  
**3:30 P.M. – 5:30 P.M.**

**Attendance**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Randy Arnold, Abhijit Basu, Bonnie Brownlee, Carolyn Calloway-Thomas, LaNita Campbell, Shu Cole, Tony Fargo, Jeffrey Gershman, Thomas Gieryn, Donald Gjerdingen, Matthew Guterl, Karen Hanson, T. Scott Herring, Bruce Jaffee, Edwin Jimenez, Padraic Kenney, Justin Kingsolver, Susan Kovacich, Jane McLeod, Patricia McManus, Sherri Michaels, Theresa Ochoa, John Paolillo, Mary Popp, Patricia Riesenman, Bret Rothstein, Jim Sherman, Grant Simpson, Marietta Simpson, Andrea Singer, Sarita Soni, Sonya Stephens, Jerrold Stern, H. Wayne Storey, William Swanson, Herbert Terry, Frances Trix, Jason Turner, Barbara Vance, Maxine Watson, William Wheeler, Tony White, James Wimbush

**MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT:**

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Joyce Byrer, Kevin Courtney, Constantine Deliyannis, Gregory Demas, Mark Deuze, David Estell, Pnina Fichman, Lesa Hatley Major, Diane Henshel, Robert Jacobs, Rebecca Manring, Michael McRobbie, James Perry, Elizabeth Raff, Deanna Reising, John Schilb, Sima Setayeshgar, Bryce Smedley, Geoff Sprinkle, John Tafoya, Joey Tartell, Pat Thomas

**GUESTS:** Mary Ellen Anderson, Alan Bender, Amanda Ciccarelli, Craig Dethloff (Faculty Council Office), Melissa Gonnerman, Roger Levesque, Anne Palmer, Barbara Wallace (Faculty Council Office), Laura Wisley

**Agenda**

1. Approval of Minutes  
September 20, 2011: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/minutes/11-12/09.20.11.pdf>
2. Memorial Resolutions for John Brothers and Lisbet Oinas  
  
John Brothers: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/11-12/B10-2012.pdf>  
  
Lisbet Oinas: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/11-12/B11-2012.pdf>
3. Agenda Committee Business (10 minutes)  
(Faculty President Carolyn Calloway-Thomas)
4. Presiding Officer's Report (10 minutes)

(Provost Karen Hanson)

5. Question / Comment Period\*

6. Mass Email Procedures and Restrictions (30 minutes)

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

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/11-12/B12-2012.pdf>

[http://hep.physics.indiana.edu/~hgevans/tpc/mass\\_email/best\\_practices.html](http://hep.physics.indiana.edu/~hgevans/tpc/mass_email/best_practices.html)

7. Resolution on the Possibility of Instituting an Admissions Essay at IU Bloomington (30 minutes)

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

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/11-12/B13-2012.pdf>

8. Old Business/New Business

### Minutes

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

**HANSON:** The first item of business today is the approval of the minutes of the September 20<sup>th</sup> meeting. Bill?

**WHEELER:** May I...? I have one correction on page 13. In my remarks concerning the emeriti proposal, the chair of the committee that wrote the first one was not Bill Miller it was Del as in Delbert Miller. So if that could please be corrected.

**HANSON:** Got that?

**TERRY:** I unfortunately did not start reading these until a while ago, and I found Bill's error, but lots of others. I'd like to vote that we postpone this, and I'll read it and get it to Craig. Mostly they're typographical errors, transcription errors, but there were numerous in this set for some reason.

**HANSON:** That's what happens when people read them. Okay, any—is that okay with everybody? We'll just postpone this until people have a chance to really look through it? Okay, great. And then we have today two memorial resolutions and so I'll turn to Tom Gieryn.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 2: MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS FOR JOHN BROTHERS AND LISBET OINAS**

**GIERYN:** John Brothers, professor of mathematics at Indiana University from 1966 to 2002, began his mathematical career in Utah, earning both his B.S. and M.S. degrees from the University of Utah. In 1960 he moved east to pursue the Ph.D. at Brown University, where he

wrote a dissertation under Herbert Federer, one of the giants and founders of modern geometric measure theory. While at Brown, Brothers also read the manuscript for Professor Wendell Fleming's 1965 text, *Functions of Several Variables*. Fleming credits him with many valuable suggestions, and the text, widely used ever since, is still in print.

After earning the Ph.D. in 1964, John served in the U.S. Army for two years before joining the Mathematics Department at IU. Except for a one-year visit to the Institute of Advanced Studies in 1973-74, John did all his research, teaching, and a considerable amount of service at Indiana University.

Brothers' research focused on the consequences of symmetry in minimal surfaces, rectifiable currents, tangent cones and other objects studied by geometric measure theory. His interests overlapped extensively with those of Professor William P. Ziemer, another Brown University alum and a good friend. Besides collaborating on several research projects, they ran an analysis seminar together, and oversaw the *Indiana University Mathematics Journal* for more than two decades. John served as Managing Editor for the *Journal* from 1981 to 1990. During the 1970's and 80's, he also directed four graduate students successfully toward their doctorates in geometry.

While most research happens behind closed doors, teaching activities are much more visible, and especially so in John's case: he felt very strongly about undergraduate education. His legacy in that regard is ubiquitous, for John was Director of Undergraduate Studies several times, Director of Graduate Studies, and MAT advisor (Masters in Teaching program) for many years. He also served on dozens of committees regarding curriculum, textbooks, and so forth. John established an examination center for the Society of Actuaries at the Math Department, and he himself conducted review sessions for the exams. No colleague took mathematics education more seriously than John, and his office seemed always to be filled with students.

Despite the enormous energy he devoted to the Math Department's teaching mission, John somehow found time to render substantial service outside the department too. He served on the Budget Committee of the Bloomington Faculty Council for many years, and was the Bloomington campus faculty advisor for Habitat for Humanity. John was perhaps the only faculty member of the Mathematics Department regularly seen driving around town in a pick-up truck full of tools.

John left a lasting legacy in the Math Department and on campus. He will be deeply missed.

Lisbet Kove Oinas, known by her friends and colleagues as Betti Oinas, was born on July 12, 1915 in Kambja, Estonia. She graduated from the Business College in Tartu, Estonia in 1935. Betti then studied economics from 1935 to 1937 at Tartu University.

Betti married the late IU Professor of Slavic Studies and of Folklore, Felix Oinas, who passed away September 25, 2004. The Oinases have two children. Their son Valdar taught physics and astronomy at the City University of New York and is a researcher at the Goddard Institute for Space Studies. Their daughter Helina Oinas Piano taught French and Russian at Mount Vernon Nazarene University in Mount Vernon, OH.

The Oinas family left Estonia in 1944 because of the Second World War and political changes in their homeland. From 1944-1949 they lived in Geislingen, Germany. In 1949 the family emigrated to the U.S., moving to Bloomington after spending one year in Detroit. In Bloomington, Betti continued her education and taught Estonian in IU's Air Force Language Program. She became a naturalized citizen in 1955.

Betti began her career at the IU Libraries in 1957, beginning as a Bibliographic Assistant in the Acquisitions Department. In 1961-1962 she took advantage of her husband's sabbatical in Finland to study at Helsinki University. Upon her return she was appointed Slavic Bibliographer in the Libraries, assigned to process Slavic and East European materials and to maintain exchange programs and relations with institutions of higher learning in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. Betti was tenured in 1974 and became an Assistant Librarian at that time. She retired from the Libraries on June 29, 1983.

In addition to her career as a librarian, Betti translated Gustav Rank's *Old Estonia: The People and Culture* from Estonian into English in 1976. She also helped Felix with the compilation of the book *Basic Course in Estonian*, published in 1966.

Betti is fondly remembered by those privileged to work with her as a kind and gentle woman who was dedicated to her work in helping to build the impressive Slavic and East European Collection in the Libraries. As her supervisor, the late Oleg Kudryk, wrote on the occasion of her retirement, "Perhaps her most valuable contribution is her philosophy of service: to assist others and to be kind and generous. Betti Oinas has put a great deal of enthusiasm, hard work, and skill into her job since she joined us nearly twenty years ago. We shall miss her sorely in the future."

In recognition of her commitment and devotion to Indiana University and to her profession, be it resolved that this resolution be a part of the minutes of the Bloomington Faculty Council, and that copies be sent to her children, Valdar Oinas and Helina Oinas Piano.

**HANSON:** Please stand for a moment of silence in memory of our colleagues. [Silence observed] Thank you. We have Agenda Committee business.

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

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Thank you. In his State of the University Address that occurred on September 27<sup>th</sup>, President McRobbie talked a great deal about the fact that IU's share of state support revenues is declining. He noted, for example, that state support for IU Bloomington has decreased by 30%, in what he termed "constant dollars," over the past twenty years. Well, one consequence of declining dollars soon will be felt in the area of healthcare cost, which will be going up, according to Vice President and Chief Financial Officer Neil Theobald, and Associate Vice President for University Human Relations, or Human Resources, Dan Rives. Implementation of this soon to come proposed plan means that seventeen thousand IU employees on all campuses will see a significant increase in their healthcare cost in 2012. And here is what I know so far that I would like to share with you today. For fiscal year 2011-2012, Indiana University's budget for employee healthcare cost was a hundred—or it is \$186.6 million, a \$10.6 million increase over the prior fiscal year, that is, over last year. This imbalance means that IU employees' contributions will increase for 2012 to cover the difference between total healthcare program cost and the university's budget.

The new employee contribution structure for 2012 will, I understand, consist of greater subsidy for lower compensated employees with higher compensated employees paying a greater share based upon income. In other words, there's going to be a sliding scale based upon income, such that, for example, individuals who are earning \$30,000 or less may pay 10%, and those earning \$100,000-\$150,000 will pay more, those of us who are earning that in this room today. Although there will be a new fee structure, there will be no change in the four medical plan options that are now available. Those will continue for 2012. And the particulars about this increase in health cost will be forthcoming on October 12<sup>th</sup>, and as you know, we normally receive our open enrollment detail statements around November, but I understand that maybe two days after the roll out of the increase, which will be on October 12<sup>th</sup>, we should hear from the enrollment services indicating the change.

I understand that the changes which will occur on January 2012 are animated by two keenly felt, but unmatched forces. One is the fact that healthcare is outpacing inflation nationally, and two the fact that the amount of money that IU is putting into healthcare is constraining other university programs. So, we will hear more about this change later. I am just the messenger here.

On a nicer front, we submitted names of individuals who serve on the Research Advisory Council and on the Burden Committee to Vice President José and Provost Hanson respectively, so they have all of those names. I understand from you, Karen, that—

**HANSON:** —you didn't send me the things on the Burden Committee.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Well, okay. That's right, President Applegate received those. But, we sent to you copies of the names of individuals who will be serving on the Review Committee for Dean Schnabel, who is up for review this year. And I also received a flu shot announcement. I was told to make certain that everyone knows that flu shot clinic at the Health Center is coming soon. It will be available, that is, flu shots will be available and provided by the IU Health Center from October 17<sup>th</sup> through the 28<sup>th</sup>, and employees who are covered under an IU sponsored medical plan who present their ID will not have to pay anything, but if you do not present your ID card, you will have to pay \$22. And those who are not covered under an IU sponsored medical plan will also have to pay \$22. And former employees with IU retirement status will pay \$22.

And I also wanted to announce under the goodwill/humor relations category, and I don't think she is here today, but we should know that Diane Henshel will be resigning from the Faculty Council on October 7<sup>th</sup>, not because she's unhappy and not because she's tired of the business of the Council, but rather because she's taking a leave from IU and starting at the Environmental Protection Agency, so I wanted us to wish her well in her pursuits. And, when you see her say, "we will miss you." Thank you.

**HANSON:** Is that it?

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Mmhmm.

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

**HANSON:** Thanks, Carolyn. I just have a couple of things to report. One of them is something that Carolyn mentioned. Bobby Schnabel, the Dean of Informatics, is due for five-year review this year, so we're putting that review committee together. The next dean up for review is John Graham in SPEA, but that's not until next year.

The—actually, the mention of John Brothers' involvement in Habitat makes me want to draw your attention to the fact that there is another Habitat house being built on the campus, the second house. And it's going up in a week because of the terrific work of our students and staff. And it'll be dedicated next Saturday at the football game. It's also, you know, right there by the DeVault Center so people can both see it and it also encourages those who have come out for other activities on those weekends to see what can be accomplished constructively by our students.

The other thing that I wanted to mention is that I'll be forming a committee soon with the cooperation of the Council. And we haven't quite worked this out yet—which group will be making nominations—but to look over some of the issues connected with the FLAGS, the Early Warning System, but also to have a broader remit to talk about other measures that we might

employ to enhance student success at this institution and retention. I know that I have gotten a variety of reactions, and I know that you folks talked about this last week. I've gotten a lot of emails, particularly, if I may say so, from younger faculty who are saying they're very happy to be doing this. I don't know what—I think they are keeping figures on how many people have used the system now, but a number have and a number have been happy to have that as an avenue to—an additional avenue to communicate with their students.

I have been reminded by a couple of the very sad incidents of the last week. You know, we've lost two students really in the last week. Another student died this past weekend in awful circumstances, but we have a lot to do in building the—rebuilding the culture, I think, on this campus. One of the things that our folks in Counseling and Psychological Services and the dean's office—the dean of student's office—have been monitoring is the kinds of things that are markers for trouble for students, that could leave them either in to dangerous behaviors or a disengagement that is—

**SIMPSON:** I'm sorry, it's practically impossible to hear over here.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** We are trying to—

**DETHLOFF:** we're working on it.

**HANSON:** —I'll just speak up! [laughter]. How about that? I thought this was working! I said we have a lot to do to rebuild a healthier culture on this campus, particularly for our undergraduate students. And the very sad deaths of a couple of students this week, and within the last week, really remind us of that. We have a lot of evidence that some of the structural features of our university, I think, are contributing to some of the problems that we have, and I think there are some things we could do besides exhortation to make—to build a healthier environment for our students.

You know, we can't do everything and we can't be with every student at every moment, and they are in the process of, the undergraduates particularly, in the process of growing up, but it is a difficult transition for many of them, and I think we need to think hard about how we keep them safe as well as keep them successful. So, I'm going to ask for this committee to be working on a broad range of problems, again connected with student success, and that is in part, you know, helping them to become engaged in the right way and the right activities aside from classes on this campus, and stay engaged in their classroom work as well. So, we'll—and again, I will be working with the Council in trying to staff that committee, but we'll cross a number of offices in doing this, and have administrative support from a variety of quarters, but it is also, you know, an important faculty responsibility, I think, and so we would like heavy faculty involvement in this. So, I'll be in touch with you guys later about that, and then we'll

announce the committee, and the remit of the committee shortly after that. Any questions or comments?

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

**TERRY:** I'm an At-large member of the Council and actually my comment or question bubbled up from a member of the faculty. I got an email last week talking about something that was reported in the IDS on September 21<sup>st</sup>. I didn't see the story when it first appeared. And it basically reports—the IDS reports—that the dean of student's office has signed a thing called the "Hoosier PACT," Proactive Alcohol Care and Treatment Plan. And what the IDS reports is that this basically is designed to reduce the hesitancy of students to report others who are suffering medical emergencies because of alcohol by saying that the individual involved will not—with the medical problem—will not under most circumstances, face judicial sanctions, that other individuals who seek assistance for that person and stay with them will not be subject to sanctions, and that student organizations who seek medical help will not be subject to sanctions. The faculty member who wrote to me wrote because they thought this was a bad idea.

My concern is different. The Code of Student Conduct and the procedures implementing it are the work product of this Council. We write those things and then we send them to the Trustees, and I don't know that we send the Bloomington Procedures, but we do send the Code to the Trustees and they approve of it. I think the last time the Council took the Code under review, this kind of an amnesty system was discussed, at least in the committees that considered it, and the Council decided not to do this at this time. This may be a good idea or it may be a bad one, but I can't find, having reviewed the Code and the Bloomington Procedures that the dean of students has the authority to sign this agreement at least as it is written up in the IDS. So I would hope that the Council would take a look at how this came about, whether or not it is something that the dean of students can do, and especially if the conclusion is that it's not something that the dean of students can do, then it should come back to this Council and the Code might be reviewed. It's a matter, not so much, of whether it's a good idea or not, but the integrity of the Council's control over the Code and the Procedures.

**HANSON:** I think—let me say a couple of things—oh?

**KINGSOLVER:** Yeah, I wrote "Hoosier PACT," so I was its principle author, along with the IU Student Association. The IDS mischaracterized the proposal, I guess the agreement now, a little bit in that it's not an amnesty system there. There are two competing types of these policies that have been implemented on college campuses across the country. There are a hundred and ten that currently have them. I think we were the hundred and eleventh. So there's a medical amnesty type process where a student will face absolutely no repercussions, which is the type



of process that was rejected by this Council when this was considered the last time. And then there's a different type of system, which is an alternative consequence. Instead of having your university status questioned or having a negative mark placed upon your university record, instead, you'll be put into an educational, I guess, component, an alternative consequence. It's not removing the consequences. It's mitigating them into something that is more productive. So what we're finding is that, in the state of Indiana, over the past ten years, at least two students have died every single year because of an alcohol overdose. And we, as students, know that every alcohol case does not have to lead to death. It's a completely preventable death if that person goes to the hospital. So we're trying to impact that point of decision that you're not necessarily going to lose your position in the university, you're not going to be under review, potentially expelled from the university, if it's a repeated offense, but you will, instead, have every incentive to call an ambulance and save that student's life.

**TERRY:** I agree. My issue is not with the substance of the policy. It's with whether or not the dean of students or this Council has the authority to create anything like this.

**HANSON:** Well, let me just say a word about that. I didn't read the IDS story and, you know, I don't have those facts on it, but I know there was some discussion among the various parties and there was, you know, an understanding that we were not in a position to sign the sort of broad medical amnesty. But one of the things that was pointed out, for example, by our chief of police is there's a lot of discretion that is exercised in any case in these circumstances by first responders. And I think that part of what might be at stake here is an attitude or stance towards extreme circumstances, but not a necessarily a redoing of the disciplinary code, and so I think we need more facts and details about this, but there was an understanding that there was a sort of limit. And if I may just add one other thing on the student disciplinary code, although the Faculty Council will be asked to take this up, there has been another modification of the disciplinary code, but it is required by the Office of Civil Rights, this is on a different matter connected with sexual assault and the way in which we process them. So sometimes, the elements of the Code have to be changed to comply with the law, and so what we do—this is—Pete has asked to have this brought back to the Council, and I think he was in touch with you. We will be looking at this probably, I mean, the Executive Committee will set this, but I think probably next time or something because there are some other elements that need to be looked at.

**TERRY:** This could be examined at the same time.

**HANSON:** Right.

**TERRY:** That's fine.

**KENNEY:** Just quickly on the committee FLAGS and retention and other things related, I just wanted to signal that the Educational Policies Committee discussed precisely such an idea yesterday, and I'm not going to say that we came to a conclusion, we discussed further, but I think there was a sense among many in the room that not only was a faculty committee needed in relation to FLAG, but that in the same direction that this was part of a larger issue. And the word that was most on the table was engagement, student engagement. So I can't say that we agree because we didn't decide anything, but this goes along with the direction that EPC [indistinct comment].

**HANSON:** Thanks, I think that's terrific! Sorry for that, yeah?

**WHEELER:** With regard to the emeriti proposal that we received last time, may I please inquire whether there had been any [indistinct comment] on the campus demand for office use that takes in to account the possibility that we are actually at peak demand for emeriti offices right now due to, well, first, last year's Early Retirement Initiative that resulted in emeriti that—people were becoming emeriti that otherwise would not have; two, that the bulge in the faculty age distribution due to the hiring between 1961 and 1972 has now passed the 65 age—the age point of 65, so that new emeriti office demand should begin declining; and then third, that the—the direct quantitative comparison is not to compare the number of new hires to the number of just retired emeriti, but rather to compare the number of new hires to the number of older emeriti who are relinquishing their offices. At some point, the demand—the new demand—due to the new emeriti will actually be less than the supply released by the older emeriti, which will result in a surplus of offices both for the emeriti and for the campus as a whole.

**HANSON:** I wasn't here for this discussion. I see some heads nodding or not nodding actually. I have no idea [laughter]. Tom?

**GIERYN:** Bill, I did not do the demographic analysis that you suggested it might be worthwhile to do. The issue has been delivered to the Benefits Committee. I think that your comment could certainly be directed to them for follow-up. I will say this, at present, we're packed to the gills. Whether or not down the line some combination of the extension of the professional life cycle and hiring fewer faculty could reduce the demand, that's entirely possible. The proposal that's on the table doesn't say, "No retired faculty members should ever have an office." It said that should not be expected as an entitlement, and if space allows, that can be negotiated with the chair and dean, and Office of Space Management. So I presume that—that if the demand for offices does decline, as you suggest, that there'll be more opportunities for those sorts of negotiations.

**HANSON:** Again, I can't imagine anybody thinks that we just get rid of the emeriti. There's room for them.

**TERRY:** One of the advantages of reading the minutes is that I was reminded that Carolyn, the last time, noted that she and Jack Windsor were going to meet with the President October 3<sup>rd</sup>, and that these were sort of, in a way, to be substitutes for the dysfunctional UFC. I wonder if there's anything you can report on what we need to know.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** We will be meeting pretty soon. We did meet after President McRobbie's speech last Tuesday, and that was a general kind of discussion about the declining state appropriations. What do we do? What's motivating those declines? General stuff. Nothing that I thought should come before the Council at this time.

**TERRY:** So you didn't meet yesterday?

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** No, we did not.

**HANSON:** I'll mention that one thing though, that I think this Council should ponder a little bit—maybe I already did—but the question of any form of reorganization that impinges on a core school is without faculty guidance procedures at the moment. There was a procedure approved by this Council for operations in Bloomington. There is an old procedure that the Indianapolis campus has, but there's nothing that deals with an issue of when, for example, there might be differences of opinion among the, say, Indy component and the Bloomington component of a core school. And presumably, that's something that the UFC would be addressing, but as far as I know, there is no policy, and some of those issues are starting to surface because of the ways in which these discussions are proceeding, particularly at the moment in Indianapolis, but it's a pressing issue right now.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** And I will add, as well, Herb, that the UFC members are meeting with the president tomorrow. So if you have any ideas, suggestions, and—yes, the UFC. [Discussion amongst members]. Yes, the co-presidents of the UFC.

**TERRY:** Okay.

**HANSON:** Any other questions or comments? Yes, Bruce?

**JAFFEE:** Karen, in your remarks about the unfortunate recent deaths of two undergraduates, you mentioned in passing a concern about maybe unique structural issues at IU, not that contributed to it, that are of concern. Could you elaborate, without being too specific, of what you mean by structural issues on campus?

**HANSON:** Well, I think there are certain things within the faculty's control, when we offer classes, what we expect of our students, whether or not we—again to take up the FLAGS thing—whether or not we see it as our responsibility to reach out to them if they seem to be absent or floundering in their work. You know, we always say, as we're recruiting students, that this is a large campus with rich opportunities, but there are a variety of ways to make it smaller, and for people to form the communities that are going to be most conducive to their success. I think that's true, and I think it's a promise we deliver on for many, many of our students. But, it is easy in circumstances like this with a very large campus, with a traditional age population of eighteen to twenty-two year olds as the bulk of our undergraduate body, who are in a period of transition, often away from home for the first time, to have difficulties in adjusting, and I think that that's something that we as the faculty have to recognize and try to be responsive to. And we can think of a variety of ways in which we might do that, and I know all of you do it individually with various students whom you meet and who are in your classes, but there may be other ways in which the structures and the support systems that we have here can be improved, and that's, you know—I mean I think we do a lot of wonderful things on all those fronts, but there may be ways in which we can look at it afresh and think of some additional improvements, and so that's the kind of thing I had in mind, and it's one of the things that I hope this kind of joint committee will work on. Any other questions or comments? Okay, then the first order of business is a first reading on the Mass Email Procedures and Restrictions. Professor Evans?

#### **AGENDA ITEM 6: MASS EMAIL PROCEDURES AND RESTRICTIONS**

**EVANS:** So I'm here on behalf of the Technology Policy Committee to talk to you about the Mass Email Policy Revision that we've been putting together over the past few years. To give you some history of where this has started from and where it's going, the current policy that's on the books from the BFC about mass emails was written in 2003, and was revised in 2009. Shortly after that revision, we were contacted to make a more dramatic revision of the policy, to overhaul it a little bit more completely than had been done previously, and so we started that work in 2009 in November, and over the ensuing two years, the policy has fluctuated in terms of how elaborate and restrictive it is, and it has ended up now, to be something that's relatively similar to the current policy, although there are some differences which I will go over as we talk about this. We—in this whole process, we have consulted with all of the administrative bodies that are directly affected by the policy, so faculty, students, staff, UITS, legal office, et cetera, et cetera..., and now, we think it is time for the faculty to weigh in on this policy because we would very much like it to be something that's useful to everybody.

And so, the goals of the policy, the primary goals of it, are first of all, to keep the volume of unwanted emails from IU showing up in your mailbox as small as possible. Unfortunately, of

course, we can't do anything about Viagra ads, [laughter] but we can at least help you out with emails from your colleagues. Secondly, we'd like to make this approval process, how we go about approving mass emails for distribution to large groups at IU, we'd like to make that as clear as possible for both the senders of these emails, and for the approvers. And so to do that, we'd like—we're hoping to simplify the existing policy and to clarify a lot of the items in it that have caused confusion in the past. In fact, over the last year, we've had several requests for clarification on the policy, which has given this a little bit of urgency, so we would like to get the new policy in place, assuming that people are happy with it, as quickly as we possibly can.

So, the basic idea behind the new version of the policy is to strip it down so that it only states requirements for mass emails, that is what you must do in order to send out a mass email, and I'll define a mass email in just a second. The rest of the information around mass emails, what makes a good mass email, what you need to do to get it approved efficiently, that goes into a best practices document, and if you went to the link off of the agenda of today's meeting, you've seen that that mass practices document is currently a skeleton, which we're working on, in fact, I have a meeting with people at UITS later this week to discuss getting input on that so that we can have that as technically clear as possible. So, the idea, then, is the policy is very, very quick, very brief, and very to the point, and the best practices document tells you, gives you some pointers on how to craft an appropriate email that's likely to get approved by the people that are approving it. So, the other idea of this policy is that the policy itself is something that won't change as technology changes, that it outlines global principles that we want—that we all want to adhere to, but that the best practices document is something that evolves. So, for example, attachments are an issue that was one of the motivations of changing the policy initially, is how we deal with attachments. That's—our plan is to put that in to the best practices document because that's something, as technology gets better, we can find different or better ways to deal with those of you that want to send large volume emails that contain graphics and things like that, webpages, or whatever, that changes with time and we don't want to write that into the policy.

The other issue here is opt-out techniques. So, for those non—for those emails that are not mandatory that you receive, we'd like to encourage opt-out options for those emails, but exactly how that gets done is something that changes every year with the technology that we use here at IU, and so we don't want to write things like that into the policy. That would mean that we'd have to revisit the policy quite frequently. The best practices document, on the other hand, is something that we would change often, would be part of the Knowledge Base here at IU.

So, the differences of this policy with respect to the current policy, the policy that you have in front of you with respect to the current policy, are fairly small. First of all, as you'll notice, it's

substantially shorter than the current policy. That was one of our goals. Nearly all of the background and justification information that are in the existing policy will be moved in to the best practices document. I don't think any of you need to be told again that email is an important means of communication these days, so that gets taken out. The other thing is in the current policy, there are a variety of recommendations of how approvers should go about approving emails, of how people that send them should go about crafting them. Most of those are also moved to the best practices, and it's only requirements that are left.

Then in terms of substantive changes, there are a few substantive changes. The first one is that as the policy is now written, it applies only to the Bloomington campus. We were advised that this was the best way to proceed: start with the Bloomington campus, if other campuses are interested in adopting this policy, then we can update it for the other campuses, but this is, for the time being, a Bloomington-only policy.

The second change is that the definition of mass emails is now simplified. In the current policy, mass emails are defined as, "an email that goes to a 'substantial portion' of faculty, students, or staff." In the current policy, we have defined a mass email to be "an email that is sent to 10% of one or more of those communities," so 10% of students, 10% of faculty, 10% of staff is the cutoff point for a mass email. And there's some wording in the policy that prevents people from sending two emails that go to 5% each of the students in getting around the policy. The other—another change with respect to the current policy is that we have removed some restriction on content of mass emails, so for example, in the current policy, mass emails are required to be text-only, and can have no attachments, and this we feel is something that should go into the best practices document that we recommend that such emails are unlikely to be approved by the official approvers if they contain, you know, ten megabyte pictures attached to them, or if they are very large, likely to clog up people's inboxes.

And finally, the list of approvers—of official approvers of mass emails has been updated to reflect the current structure of the administration here at IU. So that, in a nutshell, is what we've done. I think now is the time for you all to comment to us, and tell us what you think, and how the policy might be improved, and whether it's suiting your needs.

**HANSON:** Thank you.

**WHEELER:** My first reaction is that I wonder where this begins to infringe upon the faculty's right of free academic speech because it is—you know, it's—10% of the faculty, actually, is a relatively small number, and it was certainly my impression that if a faculty member wanted to express a perspective related to some academic [indistinct comment] university community, that as a matter of free speech, the faculty member had the right to communicate that to other faculty, and this appears to impose a limitation on it that in order to exercise that free speech,

the faculty member might first have to get approval from an administrative officer, and the subject of that free speech might actually be that administrative officer. I don't anticipate anything like that, but one cannot exclude that possibility. So, has the committee considered the relationship between this and the principles of free speech for faculty?

**EVANS:** Absolutely, so the first thing I'd like to point out is in the current policy, a faculty member would not be allowed to do that. And so this is, I think, a valid question that we should ask, should we have such a policy? If we decide that we don't want a policy like that, then we need to remove the existing policy. So this policy right now, if you wanted to send out an email to a large fraction of the faculty, you would be required to go through Tom Gieryn's office to do it, according to current policy.

**WHEELER:** Is that just, is that only if one wants to use a university mailing list?

**EVANS:** No, in principle, it's anything. Maybe Tom can clarify it.

**GIERYN:** I want to first thank Hal and his committee for some very fine work. This was a multi-year effort. They solicited opinions far and wide, and I think have done a good job to bring the policy to the point where we can now discuss these kinds of issues. There were a set of problems, and I won't go in to all of them, that prompted me to seek out Hal and get some policy revisions. One of them was the issue of what we could call "rogue" mail lists. They are lists put together by sometimes other offices within the university, sometimes put together by people who are just trying to reach out, sometimes people doing research projects who want to solicit opinions from faculty, students, and staff. We really had a problem with rogue email. A couple of years ago when I came in to this office, I was hearing from a number of faculty that they were irritated by being surveyed, by receiving mail they felt was inappropriate, and that's why we came to Hal for some revision.

As I understand it, the policy reads now that if you are sending a message to 10% of the faculty or of the campus writ large, and it has not been approved, you are in violation of this policy. That it is not just the university supplied mail lists that this applies to. I think I'm right on that, Hal.

**EVANS:** That's correct. That's the intent.

**GIERYN:** And the reason why this is important is rogue email lists can easily circumvent the review of the approval process. I can't control what—some people were complaining at one point about TLTC, Teaching and Learning Technology Center, for sending out a lot of emails about their workshops. I was assured by TLTC that the people who were receiving those messages put themselves on an email list at some time. Fine, if you put yourself on an email list, you're going to get email from those people. But the real problem is there were people

putting together, by various means, sometimes just hand-typing huge lists and sending messages out. We had to come up with a policy that would say no to that. The problem with those rogue lists, whether it's legitimate, like TLTC, or not, is that those lists go out of date every year. The only list, to my knowledge, that is updated regularly in terms of incoming faculty, students, and staff, and outgoing ones, is the list that the university keeps, in its various information services. And we provide that list to legitimate users. So when CITO, for example, which sends out a very nice, periodic newsletter, very informative I think, they come to us, they get a list, and they know that it goes to all the people that it's supposed to go to. They don't have to worry about missing some faculty or administrators. So I think the answer to your question is, you know, free speech, I'm all for it, but do you really want to not have a policy that would allow us, as administrators, to say to somebody, "Hang on now, is this a message that we really we need to broadcast to this many faculty, or are there other channels and other means?"

**HANSON:** I would something to that, I mean, you refer to Don or somebody from the law school, but I always thought it was the case that the right to free speech doesn't entail a right to printing press, or something like that. I mean, you're not necessarily entitled to a particular means to express your opinions. I think you really are best off thinking about what you really want here. I mean, so if you think, no we would really like some other way to have access to this if what we want to do is, you know, have a certain kind of discussion that is, you know, that might involve, as you said, the subject of one of the approvers or something like that. I think you really need to confront that on its merits, and sort of think, what do—how do we want email to work around here.

**EVANS:** That is correct. We checked with Beth Cate, and that was her interpretation of the free speech issues, so... But again, you know, this policy is [indistinct comment], and if it's not, then we should change it so that it does.

**TERRY:** I think my take on the free speech area might be different than Beth. I mean this is an area in which I teach and do research, the purposes of the First Amendment, we are the government in this case. We can't act like a private employer, which would not have to worry about the First Amendment. We do have to worry about it, and we certainly should worry about it in an academic institution, and it is very important, a very old principle of freedom of expression, that basically arose out of the Supreme Court case involving an adult movie theatre that operated in a drive-in, and people on the hill could see the adult movies, and basically the principle was that you have a duty to avert your eyes from constitutionally protected expression, and we have a duty to hit the delete button, I think, if we receive messages we don't like. I think this has turned out, based on Tom's comments, to be much over-inclusive from what I might be able to support. If somebody wishes, on campus or off campus faculty,



staff, union members, or whatever, to go to the difficulty of assembling what Tom was calling a rogue email list, I think they should be allowed to do that, even if it becomes the duty of the person who receives the email to delete it. Trying to create a state government censorship system based on content or sender messages at a public university, seems to me to be the most unlikely to succeed effort, and one that's been temporarily limiting. And you're right, now we're dealing with email policy. We may have to deal with who knows what other means [indistinct comment] that people can use to send information to others. Sometime ago, AAUP wanted to contact the members of the faculty, send them their annual report. Tom, I think, applying the current policy said no to that. So AAUP assembled a rogue mailing list of the faculty members because there wasn't any alternative. But that was to speak on matters that may be called "faculty politics," but at least were political and important to faculty members, and I would hate to see this.

Two years ago, I was elected to represent Unit D of this Council, and I created a mailing list of the members of Unit D, and I rather regularly consulted with them, and in fact I recently consulted with them again to find out what their experience with the FLAG system was, because I had the mailing list. As I noted, I'm now At-large. I might want to communicate with all of the members of the Council, since I am their—of the faculty—since I am their At-large elected representative. Until you clarify that what's written here is intended not to apply to senders using university maintained lists, but to anyone in the university community who creates a list, I wasn't too troubled by this. But if that is your intent, and that's not clear in what is written here—

**EVANS:** That—to be clear—that is the intention of the current draft—

**TERRY:** —I think this is tremendously over-inclusive, and goes further than I think we should go in an institution that values freedom of expression.

**HANSON:** John?

**PAOLILLO:** So, I mean to elaborate this point a little bit, one of the things that [indistinct comment] to be concerned about with these kinds of examples is what comes under Section 6, and where sanctions are discussed. What is mentioned here is really, also, open-ended and wide-ranging, so "Failure to comply with the university policies may result in sanctions related to the individual's employment (up to and including immediate termination of employment in accordance with applicable university policy)," where it's quite unclear what applicable university policy would be, such as in the cases that Herb was talking about.

**EVANS:** So I have to admit that that's—I copied that from another policy.

**HANSON:** Yes?

**SIMPSON:** The Professional Council's concerned with the way this is written. Largely on behalf of us and other groups that have standing on—oh, okay, speak up!—the Professional Council's concerned with the way this is written, on behalf of groups like us and other groups that have standing on campus but aren't administrative units or schools, such as IUSA, GPSO, [indistinct comment], etc... that this would place a lot of burden on us doing things that we have to do in terms of informing our constituents, getting members, soliciting nominations, elections, etc... And also, in our case, we run auctions that are our main fundraising activity, and my understanding is since we would contact 10% of the staff, which professional staff count as more than 10% of the staff, we would have to get, for each of those, an exception from Dan Rives.

**EVANS:** As you do currently. Under the current policy, you also have to do this. So, I think we should be clear here, you know, this is very similar to the current policy. If we don't like it, we need to change the current policy. We need to do something about getting rid of the current policy, right? That particular aspect of it is a very minor change to what's written in the current policy. I think we need to be very clear, and I personally, you know, I'm supposed to be representing all of you, so whatever you want, I'm happy to do.

**HANSON:** Justin?

**KINGSOLVER:** I would support the idea that you just, maybe put forward, and revisit the policy at this point, because I, as the student body president, cannot email the student body. And I have to go through another avenue, an administrative avenue, to tell me what is acceptable or what is unacceptable for me to send to the student body. And I don't think that any student government, or any organization or unions or whatever organization really should have to have our content sorted through by an administrative unit when sometimes the things that I would like to send out, might be contrary to the administrators' goals because my job, as the student body president, is to advocate for students, even when, you know, it doesn't necessarily line up with administrative goals. So, I guess, I'd like to ask a question here, while in addition voicing my concern that maybe in this policy we should make more broad exceptions for, you know, some of these other organizations of standing on campus. But my main question is what characteristics of an email merit approval? I mean, is it—are there specific—I know there's the best practices document, but are there specific outlined characteristics if I would like to send an email to the student body that are completely objective? That's my worry, that if I would like to send something out like that, that might be politically unpopular with the administration, me or my successors, that that could eventually be a problem.

**EVANS:** So that's certainly the goal. I think the idea is that these guidelines for mass emails are structural rather than content driven. So, for example, if you want to send out an email to all the students that has a 10 megabyte picture attached to it, that's not a very good idea. And so,

an email like that would be refused. But if you want to send out an email that's just a text message saying whatever you want to say, in my opinion, that's not something that should be censored. So, perhaps I could bring up another possibility here, which is that there could be—we could explore the possibility of having blanket approvals. So, a recognized university body could have a blanket approval from the appropriate administrator to send out emails to the groups—to their constituency. And, of course, if they started to abuse that, and the administrator started to get complaints because the approvers of these emails are the people to whom complaints will be directed, that they could be—discussions could start. That's a possibility.

**HANSON:** Tom, did you want to say something?

**GIERYN:** Yeah, I'm kind of uncomfortable with the easy slide from "approve" to "censor." I'm not sure exactly where the language came from. The approval process, and I think Pete Goldsmith would say the same thing, and Karen at her level, and the president at that level, it is not so much trying to censor as to make reasonable decisions about what is an appropriate email message for the intended body. Most of our requests are approved if the content of the message, as well as its style to some extent, but it's mainly content of its message, is something that we believe, or I believe in the case of the faculty, the faculty as a whole would want to know. I mean if you want to say that I make judgments, in some cases, where faculty might not be in a position to really need to know, for example, a very—a talk that might appeal to a very limited sector of the campus, in terms of its topic. My response to that is going to be, 'Perhaps you need a more targeted mailing list. You're more likely to get people. I'm not going to bring such a thing to the attention of the entire Bloomington faculty.' If I did that, I would have to then send out messages from anyone asking to publicize a fairly narrow talk, and I can't do that. Your email would be flooded with more messages than you would like to see, setting aside the Viagra problem. So one of the reasons why the policy is this way is because we want to make sure that the messages that do come out to all faculty have a certain amount of weight. Okay? You can easily dilute certain messages by having them get lost in a ton of other messages. Are we getting a ton of other messages now? Yeah, that's true, but at least we're putting a lid on a lot of them, and I do believe that's a—that's not censorship so much as trying to respect faculty interest and faculty patience.

Hal just raised another problem. If we open it up, and allow rogue emails, and that's fine, we'll live with that. Who does one complain to when one gets a message that they consider inappropriate? You can hit the delete button. It is annoying, never the less, to need to hit the delete button over and over again with people who may choose to abuse that rogue email list, and repeatedly send messages out to all of us.

Finally, the new policy and the old policy did give us some guidelines in terms of substance. No personal, no political, and no commercial messages would go out. That was the grounds, Herb, that I had to use on the AAUP issue, feeling that it was political, in that sense. Objective messages of information that would be, in my case, necessary for faculty to know, for example, emergency issues, a safety issue on campus, a major policy change, we'd approve those in a heartbeat.

**HANSON:** Jim?

**SHERMAN:** Yeah, two I guess quick questions, I hope. Number one, will the restriction apply to paper mail as well? And number two, if I send a message to the entire faculty from my home, from a Gmail account, and I get the faculty list from—it's a public list—is that a problem for me?

**EVANS:** So, the answer to your first question, no it does not apply to paper mail, it does not apply to text messaging. It's purely an email policy.

**HANSON:** There is a policy on paper mail. You are not supposed to use the campus mail service for personal or political purposes, nor the campus paper or envelopes. So there is—

**SHERMAN:** —But I can—

-----end of CD, part 1----- [Due to an equipment failure, the audiocassette did not capture this portion of the meeting. Some remarks lost]

**HANSON:**

**SHERMAN:**

**HANSON:**

**GIERYN:**

**EVANS:**

**HANSON:**

-----start of CD, part 2-----

**WHEELER:** ---where is the AFT when one needs it? And those who've been here for years know that we actually did used to get emails—through the campus mail system, we did get things from the AFT, and we did get things through the AAUP. And I have to say that I'm disturbed to hear that the AAUP was restricted from sending something to the faculty. That gives me great pause.

**GIERYN:** Bill, it gave me great pause, which is why I worked with Hal's committee to see if we couldn't bring this policy into a new form, and consider it in this body. It may seem like I am defending a very restrictive view. I'm not necessarily doing that, and Hal will attest, the problem that I brought to him was, I need clearer guidelines as to what is acceptable that I should approve, or Karen should approve, and what isn't. And we've done a little bit of that, but really it's a big discussion that we need to have. The AAU—it came up again, believe it or not, with the BFC's own communication and whether or not they needed approval from our office in order to send messages to the faculty. Well, I would think that that in our efforts to encourage campus-wide interest in faculty governance, that the BFC should have pretty much the ability to send what they need to send. Now I—I feel I trust the BFC leadership not to send junk, although there were some things that were... [laughter]. It has been the case since that particular episode, the leadership of the BFC has been very kind to send me the proposed messages beforehand, and I appreciate that, but I believe they've all been approved in every case. Can I say one thing that really triggered this, and believe me, this was not an issue I was looking for. It came from irritated faculty members, some of whom were responding in particular to a couple of surveys that came out now two years ago. One of them had to do with your use of SRSC or HPER facilities. There was another about the farmer's market. We got a couple of surveys, and I heard from our colleagues.

**SHERMAN:** How many?

**GIERYN:** How many colleagues did I hear from?

**SHERMAN:** Yeah.

**GIERYN:** Oh, I don't know. It was probably ten. I've probably got a stack—

**SHERMAN:** —so if you had heard from twenty saying, 'I like getting them,' you know? Would that—I mean, you know, that's a very small—

**GIERYN:** —Jim, I didn't hear from anybody expressing—

**SHERMAN:** —well, you wouldn't. I mean, obviously, you wouldn't.

**GIERYN:** No, you're right. I wouldn't.

**SHERMAN:** But if you polled us, some of us might say, 'I don't mind getting them—'

**GIERYN:** --we're doing that right now.

**HANSON:** Tony?

**FARGO:** Yeah, just a follow up a little bit of what Herb was saying earlier. I think what bothers me a little bit about the way this is written is there doesn't seem to be any viewpoint neutrality requirements as far as how people judge these emails, and I think that kind of comes up with the AAUP example, is I'm not, you know, nothing against Tom, I'm not sure I want anybody necessarily deciding is the AAUP's business too political or too whatever, if they're in an administrative post. What I could support is a time, place, and manner restriction essentially saying that certain types of attachments and these types of things are not—will not be approved, but the administrator will essentially not censor messages on the basis of what the viewpoint expressed in the message is.

**HANSON:** Jim?

**SHERMAN:** Despite my comments, I don't see this as any big deal. I trust that almost all of these get approved, and the ones that don't get approved shouldn't. And the imposition of me having to ask is a lot less than most impositions that I have to go through to get things done here. [Laughter]. So I just, you know, I don't see this as, you know, a big deal or—yes, it may be a restriction of First Amendment, but, you know, it's so minor and such a small imposition that, you know, I'm willing to say, use your judgment and I'm not bothered by it.

**HANSON:** Randy?

**ARNOLD:** Yeah, I had a question about whether the offices and the university system in general, I'm thinking of in between cases, where somebody wants to reach a large portion of a population, but not the full population, maybe all undergraduate seniors, or maybe all undergraduate freshman, and it would be a message that would be approved, but is it the responsibility of the sender to create the list of who that goes out to, or do these offices have the ability to actually help a sender find the right audience? I mean, there are some messages, you know, that would apply to some subset of the population.

**EVANS:** So, that's right. They already have—these offices do have that capability and with Constituent Relationship Management, which is in the works, that capability will be enhanced. So, we will be able to target to lists much more easily than we currently can.

**HANSON:** John?

**PAOLILLO:** So, I want to ask a question, and I want to explain why I am asking the question, and I'm coming back to Section 6 again of sanctions. The way I understand this policy, and that would cover the previous policy as well, the existing policy, is that if you use a rogue email list, then you could lose your IU employment. And that seems quite serious to me, and if one could imagine there being many different gradations of violations in the use of a rogue email list, different levels of seriousness, and there's no recognition of that in this. Nor is there any

indication of who makes that call, who makes that decision about what kind of violation has been committed, and what kinds of sanction is appropriate? These are really, really deeply concerning, and I think that the concern about a chilling effect on free speech is something that goes and points directly to this. If we don't know what the sanctions are, and if we don't know what the mechanisms are by which the sanctions are meted out, then it becomes very unclear, what actually is permitted speech, and what is actual censorship.

**EVANS:** So I agree with you completely on this, a very important point. It's a bigger point than you think, because I did not—I didn't make this up, I copied this from another email policy already on the books. So, we—this is a serious concern, but in order to address it, we're going to have to go through all of the policies on the books currently, and find out whether they fall in to this category because, as I said before, this is not from me. I copied it word from word from another policy.

**TERRY:** Another IU policy?

**EVANS:** Another IU policy from the BFC. Okay? So, be aware, this is a big job, but it's an important one as well.

**HANSON:** Maxine?

**WATSON:** Well, I have a question about oversight creep, so I'm sort of looking at the overseers and looking down the people who make it effective, but let's say somebody sends out a controversial email that they've been authorized to send out, but someone [indistinct comment] authorizes is not happy about it. I mean we've certainly seen behaviors akin to that in other situations, and I would like to know whether there's anything we can do about what I'll call oversight "oversight creep," assuming, you know, we allow those close to us to make those decisions, I fear as much from that.

**HANSON:** Other questions or comments?

**TERRY:** I just—you know, I will have a very hard time when this comes back if it not in the end content-neutral, in other words it doesn't pay much attention to what the content is. If it is not, as Tony indicated, basically a well-established area of First Amendment law, time, place, and manner sort of regulations, and if it isn't designed in terms of potential sanctions to deal with the questions of chilling effect, and frankly it's an odd thing for the Faculty Council to be debating. You know, we are not going to lose tenure because of an unauthorized email, but staff and students I think are the ones who probably have the greatest interest in being secure in their ability to speak out and be advocates and ask for opinion, which is kind of a survey, in order to perform their functions with representing students and representing staff. So I'm afraid I think it needs a lot of work, and I will have a hard time supporting it if it leaves Tom

either as the campus censor or the campus approver. It sounds like a kind of a George Bush word, but... [laughter]. But it doesn't work, historically.

**HANSON:** May I just say one thing about the—in my teaching of courses that involve First Amendment issues—I think as this is just a first reading and people are going to go—I mean should be sending suggestions and concerns to Hal, I take it, and to other members of the Committee, but Tony's point, I think, is very well taken about the things that you might build in in a neutral way to get after the worry about the censorship, but I'd ask you to consider a few different kinds of cases. Suppose someone constructs a rogue email list to solicit contributions for a particular political party and candidate, and uses the university things for that, that might be a minor thing, but many, many people would worry about whether or not the university resources were being used for that kind of political end, and that's one of the reasons, I think, the political part often comes into it. Compare that with an instance where—well, you've talked about not having attachments—but suppose, say, a faculty member gains possession of a, say a photograph of a student naked, and sends it around—you know some deranged faculty member—sends it around to everyone. That might be something where you actually think sanctions might be appropriate. I mean that is such bad behavior. I think you need to think of the range of things that you might be sending around, and think about why there might be some concerns about content, in a particular kind of community, as well as a sort of, you know, concern about time, place, and the institutional effect, which is what we've mostly focused on, of having a barrage of unwanted emails taking away attention from the emails that people have to pay attention to. But, I didn't even see this beforehand. I'm not plumping for this in this form, but I really do want you to think about the uses to which email can be put in this day and age, and think about whether or not you think—no matter what the institution has no stake in that.

**EVANS:** So, I think that to move forward, there are two things that we need to do. First one is we need to decide whether a policy where emails are approved, or mass emails are approved by approvers is an appropriate policy to begin with. If it's not, then we have to work to remove the current policy. If we feel that that is a structure that we can live with, then I think the next step is clearly for us on the Technology Policy Committee to come up with a final version or a temporary version of the best practices document, so that everyone can see exactly what we mean by an appropriate email. I think that would have helped in a lot of the discussion that we're having about content censorship, and clearly we have to be very sensitive in crafting this best practices document to make sure that we are not promoting censorship of content in these policies. But, this—it's been a very, very helpful discussion for me, and please, those of you that feel strongly on this, do contact me and let me know your opinions and suggestions for ways that we can improve the document or scrap it all together, things that we should add to



the best practices. It will be very, very helpful for us to get some—get a wider range of views. So please, don't hesitate to send me email about this.

**WHEELER:** And your email address is...? [Laughter]

**EVANS:** And I'm not 10% of the faculty, you can do it with no fear of repercussions! [Laughter]  
It is hgevans@indiana.edu.

**HANSON:** Thanks very much, Hal. Do you want to take a very short break, and then we have one other agenda item, or do you—?

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Yes.

**HANSON:** Okay.

### **BRIEF RECESS**

**HANSON:** —Five, ten minutes here? The last item is the Resolution on the Possibility of Instituting an Admissions Essay, and this comes from the EPC, so Padraic?

### **AGENDA ITEM 7: RESOLUTION ON THE POSSIBILITY OF INSTITUTING AN ADMISSIONS ESSAY AT IU BLOOMINGTON**

**KENNEY:** Okay, thank you, Karen. Let me be as brief as possible. This question, which I understand is not the first time it's ever emerged on this campus, came out of discussions around the admissions standards last year. You will recall there was a concern about the math standards that were instituted in effect this year, for the students entering this year. And we dealt with that, and that's past, but while that discussion was ongoing, suddenly the admissions essay question emerged, and we began to talk a bit about possibly the admissions essay. The main thing I want to convey is that the EPC realized, I think rather quickly, that this is a different kind of component of an admissions process compared to a transcript or SAT score, and so on, because admissions essay is not mainly about a bar to clear, it's a qualitative not a quantitative marker of course, and that is—so it's not so much a threshold or a bar as a means of evaluation. We recognize that it had several different possible uses.

First, for a subset of the—or several different subsets of incoming students—for example, for the consideration of awards or scholarships, for a direct admission to certain schools, and so on; second, this was not inconsiderable in our discussion, in fact, in some ways, it was the instigator, that it's a real signal sender. My daughter's applying to colleges this year, and just a week ago she said, "Wait a second, IU doesn't require an essay." That was not a good thing when she said that. [Laughter] 'Sweet! I'm applying.' 'Why then would I apply?' I will leave the

rest of that conversation aside [Laughter], but that signals [indistinct comment] is one that we thought a great deal about.

As our discussion went on though, and I recognize that all these questions have probably come up before, many times, but we also realize that the way we're talking about students and our understanding of them is changing in the context of the increased use of and increased discussion of assessment and measurement of student achievement, and began to think about the possibility that an admissions essay could also play a role as a particularly useful marker of where a student is when they're in the fall or spring of their senior year in high school, possibly comparable or could be compared, then, to where they are four or four and a half years later. And I want to end with that point because it is for that reason in particular that we came to realize that in the context of ongoing discussions over what constitutes—around what constitutes excellence at IU that an admissions essay seen in that context, not just as a bar to get over, then you're at IU and you forget about that essay, but as a way of—further way of approaching of what constitutes excellence over a student's career at IU. That we decided first that this question was worth reviewing, and second, that the best way to do so would be by a new taskforce and that that task force should be convened under the auspices of the office of vice provost for undergraduate education. So, indeed, you'll notice that we're not asking for the vice provost for enrollment management to take this over, not because it's not an issue related to enrollment management, but because we felt that it was a question larger than that, and that it needed to be looked at from a new angle of the students' total IU career, and not simply enrollment and the management thereof.

**HANSON:** Thank you. Any questions? Discussion?

**KINGSOLVER:** Yeah, I think I'm the person who most recently filled out an IU application in this room. I applied to five schools, IU, Notre Dame, Princeton, Georgetown, and Harvard, and of those schools, IU was the only school that didn't require an essay, and not only that, they were the only school that did not require three essays. And if we're—if our goal as an institution is to create a student body that aspires to higher education, then we're going to need to recruit students who have that same desire. If the student can't fill out—can't write a five paragraph essay or a one take essay before they get to school, it's likely going to send them the signal that we don't stand for something like that. And I know I'm applying to law schools now, and now it's five or six or however many essays. I think that—I also have a freshman internship program in the IU Student Association, and one of our lesser freshman interns, who might not be the best representative of IU, said that she applied to IU—came to IU because it was the easiest application of the Big 10 schools that she had to fill out. So, I don't know if that's necessarily the signal that we want to be sending, so I really think this is a really, really good idea.

**HANSON:** Yes?

**OCHOA:** With regard to your comment, I do agree that sending the right message about what we expect students to come in with and what we will then promote afterwards is very important. But I also think it's equally important to be sure that in going towards requiring an essay, that we are certain we don't have enough information that we need to attract the most qualified students here. If everyone is doing something that's wrong, I don't necessarily think we should follow them because we want to compare ourselves to them. But if we get to the point where we say, 'How can we attract better students, because we are not attracting them, and the essay's going to be that vehicle,' then I'm all for it. But we do need to consider that evaluating essays is very time consuming in order to do it right. I don't know what other universities do to evaluate them, but it's very costly and we need to do it in a very good way, and that would be my only caution. But I also don't really understand what it is that we are being asked to do here. I don't think we're being asked to consider the pros and cons, but we're asked to, in essence, give permission to form this other group, correct?

**KENNEY:** That's right.

**OCHOA:** Alright, then that's what we need to discuss.

**HANSON:** But there is a sense in which nobody needs permission to set up a task force, and so I think the other thing that you want is a sort of sense of the assembled body, right? About whether or not this is a good idea or what considerations are relevant and that kind of thing?

**KENNEY:** Right, but while nobody need permission to set up a task force, I think this would, by agreeing that it's appropriate for the vice provost's office to create a task force, that's the faculty saying, 'Okay we are interested in this. We would like input and we'd like input in this way.'

**HANSON:** Herb?

**TERRY:** I have to say, when I saw the resolution, I turned to a much more prosaic problem than attracting the best students. What I immediately thought of is maybe this can help us get students with college level writing abilities. I saw this more as a writing sample in some ways, than a polished, refined, essay making a pitch for yourself for admission to a major university. And that led me to think of something else if you look at this as a writing sample. I think our admissions process should stress skills that they have to have to succeed at this university, and I then began to wonder if there's any sense in requiring a writing sample, since I routinely require students to write in my class, and they tell me no one else ever has. They don't write much here, that they take multiple choice and true/false exams, they write short essays sometimes, but anything longer than a page is uncommon. So then I began to wonder if a writing exercise was useful. I began to think that maybe it would be more useful to determine coming in that they can read at a college level than that they can write at a college level. As

you've explained this, I like the breadth that is behind the idea of this task force. To respond to Karen's observation, I hope we simply send the message to the people who create the task force that there are many things that might be obtained by getting some example of student writing, and that it might be, you know, I get to work on it in advance and make it perfect and put it in my application kind of thing, or if such things exist, it might be some online timed writing exercise that would really test whether students, when confronted with something that they have to read and write about, can do it. You know, we are supposed to get out of the business of remedial education, the state has mandated that, and I'm afraid we have a lot of students whose entry and exit writing skills or reading skills are not what I would expect of a college graduate of a major university. This may be an opportunity to look at that at the beginning, and I would hope that this task force, if it's created, has a very broad notion of what an admissions essay might be. And then does look at the possibility of maybe it includes writing something in reaction to something that they read.

**HANSON:** Maxine?

**WATSON:** I think there are a number of different things that are of concern to me. One is, I like the idea of being able to strengthen the quality of the students we attract and to have our application process look reasonable, I think is a good idea. On the other hand, we serve a very broad spectrum of students. Some of them first generation, some of them underrepresented minorities, who may or may not have access to high school advising that really teaches them what's expected in an admission essay. So I think there is issues of access that concern me. On the flip side, and Karen, you can speak to this probably better than I can, the Honors College is really there to serve our very strongest students, and what I can't remember is does the Honors College require an essay just for financial aid or for admissions to the Honors College period?

**HANSON:** Well, I'm not that certain what it's doing now, but when I was there, I put it in so that people had to make an affirmative step and that meant that they wrote one. It's used for financial aid.

**WATSON:** So maybe then we need a two-tiered process that seeks to make us stronger or a more robust application for our strongest students, which I know is counter-intuitive, but would allow us to assess them through their admission process into the Honors College, and while still allowing access to people who may not themselves at that time have access to appropriate counseling and instruction. It's just, you know, we're always weighing those two ends of our spectrum, and it's difficult.

**SHERMAN:** I guess the questions that I would ask about the requirement of an essay are number one, does it have any diagnostic value for student success? How much diagnostic value? Can we assess the diagnostic value given that we may not even know who helped with

the essay or who wrote the essay, and it may be that we then take in students that have got the smartest parents, rather than the best students? And is it worth the time and effort to try to assess that diagnostic value? If the purpose is just so that we look like we're in the same boat as Harvard, Princeton, Michigan, Purdue, or you name it, then it seems like a silly exercise. If we think we have good diagnostic criteria now, and this isn't going to add to it, I mean, I would be hesitant to give people a lot of work for the purpose of looking like we're a serious university.

**MCMANUS:** I'd like to think that these are important issues and that the task force take into account just consider how it might affect our applicant pool, and I am concerned about certainly—I agree that it could be one other diagnostic in a form, but I'm also concerned about how it might affect students who might be intimidated by the thought of writing an essay, just as much as students who are, you know, really terrific essay writers. We now have a policy, if I understand, that if students meet certain criteria for grades and SAT scores, they get \$9,000 automatic scholarships or something like that, and that seems to be an appropriate place to add on an essay if we want to do that, to make sure these students are motivated. So I just would like to see that the task force is considering how it might affect the applicant pool, how it might be used, if at all, in the admissions process. But also, how it sets the bar for who it is that we have to—not just for the student's own progress, but what do we have to do in terms—I don't think many of our students come in with the writing skills that we expect them to leave with. That's why we have writing requirements here. But it could really set the bar for what we expect or what we believe we need to have incorporated into our curriculum as the basic writing program, granted that to the very best students, their parents are doing a great job of writing their essays.

**HANSON:** Justin?

**KINGSOLVER:** Just one quick point, kind of combining Professor Terry's and Professor Watson's comments, that I've seen a new phenomenon, I've been speaking with several people at Teach for America, and one of their new, I guess, strategies for motivating high school seniors and high school juniors to write is to use a college application essay. And to have that be their kind of culminating piece of writing, that as Professor Terry said, you know, they revise that as something they can be very proud of. So, I don't know what implication that would have here, but I do know that several charter schools, and some alternative teacher programs are starting to recommend that, so maybe that could attract more underrepresented minorities who might not have thought that college was an option for them.

**HANSON:** The director of admissions is here, and so it may be that you have...do you want to say anything or do people want to ask any questions?

**ANDERSON:** I think it might be helpful, if it's okay, just so everyone knows, and this is something that is relatively new, any student who is considered for those automatic awards, the \$9,000 award especially, is also invited to selective scholarship—a selective scholarship process or selective scholar program process, that all requires essays. So there are actually a number of students who are coming to Indiana today who are writing essays as part of the process. All students in the Hutton Honors College, part of that process, essays are required. All group students are writing essays as part of the group's program. Any student we are requesting additional information from, if we see in their application a blip in grades or something that doesn't seem quite right, those students are required to write a personal statement. So we're talking about actually two different things, essays and/or personal statements, and of the eleven public universities in the Big 10, five require either essays or personal statements, and those can be very different; one school, it's optional to provide it or not; and one school, University of Michigan, is a common-app school, and common-app schools do require essays. And these are all discussions that we're having in the admissions office here as well. So I just want everyone to know that where we put the essay will be if a student is invited to be considered for a selective scholarship or scholar program, the Hutton Honors College, the Kelley Scholar Program, the College of Arts and Sciences, essays are required.

**HANSON:** Comment?

**CAMPBELL:** Yeah, I mean, thank you for bringing that up because what I was going to say is that if we're looking, if your task force is looking, to implement a personal statement or essay, at my undergraduate institution, it was thought of as not a pitch *per se*, but almost an addendum to explain more fully why you are a well-rounded student, and not so focused in one area of academics or athletics, and that you didn't put down groups just to say you were in certain, you know, organizations at your school. So I think of the essay almost as a chance to explain more fully, you know, here's what my grades are, but academics mean something else to me, athletics or, you know, philanthropy, or community service, anything else. But since she explained that, you know, for different programs they are invited to write an addendum to explain a certain gap or, you know, explain something further, it does make sense. But I do think of it—it's nice to think of it not as a pitch, but as something to explain something more fully than your numbers and your quantitative analysis of the application.

**JIMENEZ:** I just wanted to say also because I understand the concerns with who you attract and, like, minority students and things like that. In New York, which is where I am from and studied, I went to City University of New York, which traditionally serves underrepresented and minority student populations, and they require it. So, I don't think that it's going to be as much of a—people are not going to not apply here because of the essay. And, in terms of actual intimidation factor, I feel a little concerned with that comment because if you are intimidated

to ask them for an essay from the get-go, no one's going to be intimidated when they get that syllabus on day one, and there's a final paper that's due in a couple of months, or there's an essay that's due within the first month of school. So, it almost seems contradictory that you wouldn't expect it just to get in, but as soon as you're here, you're expected to start producing a body of work that you don't really need to show. And since I am a graduate student, I had to do a personal statement or an essay, so if they don't, can we not either? [Laughter].

**HANSON:** Other questions or comments? Yes, Bruce?

**JAFFEE:** Really a question to Mary Ellen. If you had one additional piece of information that you'd like to get in deciding who gets admitted or denied at IU, is it a writing sample or is it something else?

**ANDERSON:** That's a great question, Bruce. All students who come to IU are going to write, no matter what. Regardless of the program, there will be a writing requirement, so as someone has mentioned, if we require—if we start requiring essays, we're going to have to be very deliberate about what we want and why we want it and where it will go and who will review it. There is some data that would say that a better predictor of academic success on the college level is the actual writing scores for the SAT and ACT, but the very best predictor, supposedly is, the high school grade point average, that consistency day in and day out. So, we haven't really talked about what would be something else that could predict success. I think that's where we need to go next, and especially as we talk about early warning systems, and students who supposedly seem capable of doing college level work, get here and don't. But on the other hand, you have the students who might be a little marginal coming in who do just fine. So I think we really do—need to do as a university, a lot more research. So that is really not an answer to your question, because I don't have one. [Laughter].

**HANSON:** Herb?

**TERRY:** I can't resist a reaction to Maxine's observation. I hope this task force operates, recognizing that we are now in an environment where, as the president pointed out in his State of the Union—or State of the University Address, our funding from the Indiana General Assembly is based on some types of performance measures, and their primary measures at the moment are graduation rates and retention rates and that sort of thing. We will have to think about how important it is for us to sometimes take students who, for various other reasons, might be at risk of not being academic stars, even if in doing that we run a risk of diminished state funding. And so as we design this thing, I think we need to ask ourselves whether we're going to use it as a mechanism for increasing retention and graduation by getting students who come in ever and ever better prepared, or whether we're going to acknowledge that we have a

responsibility to take in students who for social or whatever reasons aren't as well prepared as others, but if we give them a chance, have some prospect of success.

**HANSON:** Any other comments? Questions? Yes?

**TRIX:** I just have a question. What do you do with these essays you get?

**ANDERSON:** We don't get them. They go to the academic units, so they would go to the Hutton Honors College. If we get an essay with an application, I shouldn't say we don't get essays, because many times we do. Students send personal statements or essays, whatever you want to call them, that goes in the file. We read them, but currently, we make our admissions decisions based primarily on, first of all, the coursework from high school has been talked about, the specific number the courses, the actual curriculum, the grades or grade point average from high school, and the standardized test. Currently, that is how the admissions decision is made. We look at grades, grade patterns, all of those things. But many students, when they apply to college, will send an essay, period, no matter what. So, those go into the file. In terms of the Big 10 schools that require a writing sample of some sort, some will use that in the admissions decision, others will use it against a student if it is optional and the student doesn't provide a writing sample or a personal statement, for the most part, not really an essay but a personal statement because the school isn't certain how serious that applicant is about that particular institution. So these things are used in all sorts of ways.

**HANSON:** In answer to your question, you know, about what happens, though, with the essays when they move on from admissions, they're read by faculty groups who score them. I mean, the directors of these various units that use them, appoint committees and, you know, at least in the Honors College, it's all faculty who read a chunk of them and score them.

**TRIX:** And they determine whether they'll be in the Honors College on the basis of that?

**HANSON:** The main purpose of that is to decide scholarship awards, but the students write them for entry anyway. So, when they've completed that, that shows that they want to be in the Honors College, they have to score well on it, and on other aspects of their application in order to be awarded an additional scholarship. And I know Hudson Holland uses a scholarship. I mean, so there are a lot of programs of the same scholarship application—and as Mary Ellen points out, groups use these kinds of statements. So they are used in different ways, and people appoint the readers and reviewers in different ways. Yes?

**KENNEY:** I just wanted to make one further observation about the post-admission life of an essay. Because I really think that's one of the most important issues here. Imagine, you know, forget about the best students, imagine you have a freshman who's sort of lost his way and is starting to fail in a lot of classes, and so on, goes to see his advisor, and says, 'You know, I just



took a look at your admission's essay and you said you were interested in such and such and such and such. That really seemed to move you. Where is that, you know, where is that for you now?' That's an opportunity for the advisor to connect with a student, and if you've ever talked to an advisor, you know how hard it is for them to find out what it is the students are interested in. So to have that little message from their past that can be used in a very concrete way, would I think really revolutionize the advising experience for a lot of students.

**TERRY:** Perhaps the task force could keep one other thing in mind and that's whether this writing, whatever it is, should work the same way for domestic and for international students. I don't know what the answer to that is, but international students, I think, have special needs to be able to write well, but they also may have obstacles to learning good writing skills in their home countries.

**HANSON:** Okay, we are approaching mandatory adjournment, but this is an action item, and a resolution that comes from the EPC, so it's moved and seconded. Are you prepared to vote on it right now? Okay. All in favor? [Aye]. Opposed? Abstentions? Passes. So we are adjourned. Thank you.

**MEETING ADJOURNED: 5:24PM**