

Minutes
Indiana University
UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL
University Place Conference Center 231
Indianapolis Campus
March 11, 2003
1:30 pm – 4:30 pm

AGENDA

1. Presiding Officer's Business
(Interim President Gerald Bepko)
2. Agenda Committee Business
(Professors Robert Eno and Mary Fisher)
3. Question / Comment Period*
(President Bepko and Professors Eno and Fisher)
(10 minutes)
4. Creating a Common Pool of Virtual Library Resources
(Dean Suzanne Thorin, University Libraries)
(Professors Richard Carr and Andre DeTienne, Library Committee)
5. Discussion of Chancellor Review Procedures
(Professors Eno and Fisher)
(Circular U6-2003)
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/circulars/02-03/U6-2003.htm>
6. Procedures for Athletics Committee
(Professor Eno)
(Circular U5-2003)
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/circulars/02-03/U5-2003.htm>
7. By 4:00: Executive Session: Honorary Degrees to Be Awarded
(Professor Abhijit Basu, Honorary Degrees Committee)

ATTENDANCE:

Members Present: Anne Allen, Jim Baldwin, Abhijit Basu, Gerald Bepko, Bruce Bergland, Julie Bobay, Polly Boruff-Jones, Richard Carr, Don Coffin, Jeffrey Dean, Andre DeTienne, Bob Eno, Deborah Finkel, Mary Fisher, Janice Froehlich, Ann Gellis, Laura Ginger, Marilyn Kintzele, Anna McDaniel, Mark Pescovitz, Mary Pagliero Popp, Vandana Rao-Dev, John Ross, Cynthia Roy, Al Ruesink, William Schneider, Roy Schreiber, Dennis Senchuk, Sarita Soni, Kizhanipuram Vinodgopal, David Vollrath, Kim Walker, Richard Ward, Jeffery Watt, Patricia Wittberg, Enid Zwirn

Members Absent with Alternates: Markus Pomper for Michael Foos; Martin Spechler for Robert Tarver

Members Absent: Judd Arnold, Simon Atkinson, Sharon Brehm, David Daleke, David Fulton, William Gray, Peter Iadicola, Chandana Kakani, Michael Nusbaumer, Judith Palmer, Sandra Patterson-Randles, Ruth Person, Una Mae Reck, Barry Rubin, Josh Runyan, Moira Smith, Rosann Spiro, George Walker, Michael Wartell, Nanci Yokom

Visitors: Suzanne Thorin, David Lewis

AGENDA ITEM#1: PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS
(Interim President Gerald Bepko)

BEPKO: I think we're ready to begin the meeting and I'm happy to be able to welcome you to this March meeting of the University Faculty Council. The first order of business is the Presiding Officers' Business and I guess it's been tradition for the Presiding Office to say a word or two about matters in general within the university. Let me just repeat what I think I said at the last meeting and that is how pleased I am to be able to serve in this role for this interim period. I'm having a great time meeting lots of wonderful people, believe it or not a great time. And it is a rare perspective to be able to go across the University; I visited all of our campuses now since the first part of December and to see the extraordinary resources that Indiana University provides to the state of Indiana and the nation through its campuses, to renew acquaintances with all those wonderful people that I've known, maybe a little some better than others over the years. To meet some new people, that I haven't had the pleasure of meeting before, it's very uplifting...this is an extraordinarily great institution populated by absolutely wonderful people and it's a thrill and a joy to be associated in the way that I am right now. And I wish I could take each and every one of you along with me to share in the uplifting experience that I've had the last couple of months. Most of the news is good from the University. The only negative news that we continue to encounter these days has to do with our state's income and the likelihood that there will not be a good result at the 2003 General Assembly session. You can read about that in the paper and see on television reports about the decline and the disappointment in the most recent income figures. I think it's still too early to talk specifically about what the result is likely to be but so far we have not been very fortunate with respect to state revenue. We were hoping to have better reports for January and for February. Maybe the March report and the April revenue forecast will be brighter. But despite this gloomy state news we continue to succeed in all the other ways that it is important for the new public university to succeed. We have record enrollments, our spring term enrollments are as high as they've ever been and I think the enrollment increases claim themselves in every part of the university...we're fortunate to have growth everywhere. We have continued growth in our grant income. We think the earnest parts of the university that generate grant activity are doing better and better and better and that's all good news for the University. I think we're in the places where we have the greatest potential, taking better advantage of some of the research activity that we generate by way of establishing our ownership of intellectual property; we have more patents, more disclosure, and more licensing arrangements. And we hope at some point that we'll see the income from licensing activities increase the same way that the validation of intellectual property has increased over the years. Last year, higher education earned \$1 billion in licensing income; Indiana University ought to have its fair share of that kind of revenue and I think we can achieve that without any sacrifice of our academic values. At any rate, the progress looks good and we've also had really good progress with respect to philanthropy, our year-end giving to the University was very strong and we have various campaigns in different stages of completion...all of them look to be very successful. We should have continuing growth in our private support through philanthropy. We have lots of interesting events that will be on the calendar this spring, lots of building dedications and ground breakings all across the University. I think we've established that we have a special capacity and have a special presence in Indiana with respect to the life sciences and with respect to information technology and we're going to try to take advantage of those things. Those strengths that are developing and we think Indiana University presents...take advantage of those more in dealing

with the state government and showing our value to the state as an engine for economic growth. At the same time, we want to build on our core strengths in the arts and humanities. This is more and more an issue for state's that are interested in economic development. You can't just create jobs alone, for a society of only scientists would be quite barren. As good as they may be...Indiana has to have a balance, it has to cultivate the arts and cultural institutions of the state and the most important cultural institution and the most important reflection of the arts in Indiana is found in Indiana University. We have a new strategy, Myles Brand invited Kim Walker to be the leader of arts and humanities emphasis for the university and outreach program. I am a member of the mayor's commission, it was originally titled Cultural Tourism, but now it's titled Cultural Development for the region. We hope that we can make it clear and we hope that the state understands that a driving economy and a high quality of life for our, built on a broad array of strengths including strengths in the arts and in our cultural institutions, and Indiana University is an indispensable ingredient for the state as well as the nation. At any rate, you'll, I hope will hear more about that and more about how we have to recruit the creative class of people and retain their creative class of people in Indiana. And Indiana University will be a central factor in that effort. So, welcome and we move then to the Agenda Committee Business and Bob Eno and Mary Fisher will both participate in that.

**AGENDA ITEM #2: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS
(Professors Mary Fisher and Robert Eno)**

FISHER: Thank you. One piece of Agenda Committee business as we do want to welcome Molly Martin. She is the Coordinator for the IUPUI Faculty and Staff Councils and when UFC is here in Indianapolis she is the point person to help us with our meetings so thank you Molly for being with us.

MARTIN: Thank you.

ENO: We really don't have any other pieces of Agenda Committee business today, Mike Foos our Parliamentarian couldn't be with us today so we're free for all. [Laughter]. We have this wonderful august room in which we can all see the back of each others' head, except for us up front we get to see the front of your heads and we're given this room because we have the privilege not to be paying customers and we've been bumped by paying customers from the rooms that we're accustomed to. But we'll make do with these; please don't feel that you're not welcome to speak just because you're speaking over the heads of other colleagues. We probably should get onto business because we have quite an array of things to get to today. Start with the question and comment.

**AGENDA ITEM #3: QUESTION AND COMMENT PERIOD
(President Bepko and Professors Eno and Fisher)**

ENO: Questions and comments?

SPECHLER: Gerry, I have a question about the status of our international students who are so important on all of our campuses and lend an important element of diversity to our student experience. You certainly know as a result of 9/11 and its aftermath foreign students generally

have been required to register and we have to keep closer track of them than we ever did in the past. And there are other consequences of the world in which we live. Do you have any idea whether that is hurting our enrollment of international students and whether we're being able to fulfill our obligations under law to track these students as a condition for their continued enrollment?

BEPKO: That's a good question, I have asked myself. I think there has been a little drop off in international enrollments but I don't have data. Does anyone? Is there someone here from I guess not? I'll send a memo to the UFC, Martin, to respond to your question. I think it's a very good one, I don't know the data well enough to be able to give you figures. I think there has been a little drop off in international enrollments. We suspect that it's caused by the greater difficulty in managing through the processes of immigration and it may also be that there are some cost factors that are starting to enter more into the equation, but it is very worrisome because you're right because some of our enrollment growth, I just mentioned our enrollments are at record levels everywhere. I think everywhere some of that record enrollment is international students; I think there's been growth on every campus, not only because of the fact that we wish to have as many students as we can possibly accommodate. But also because the culture that we create, the educational environment that we create is dependent on the diversity that the international students bring.

ENO: I might make note that the same question has been asked with different angles to it down in Bloomington and we're going to have a visit from the Associate Dean for International Students to our next faculty council meeting on the 25th of March, Martin. He's going to be giving a presentation on a variety of issues which may include the level of enrollment issues, accessibility issues. He's also going to be talk about the obligations of the University in tracking international students and the way that we're trying to balance those obligations against obligations to protect student privacy. It's a very complex issue. If you happen to be in Bloomington on that Tuesday you might want to come by and hear what he has to report because our Council is also very concerned with that.

BEPKO: Bill?

SCHNEIDER: At the IUPUI campus the Graduate Affairs committee had a briefing by our International Affairs office about these rules for the most part in terms of graduate and professional students and that had to do less with the ability to recruit and get international students and more on the new development of a database I think that will be unveiled shortly which requires the immediate reporting of when students drop out and in addition to when they drop out there's this issue of tracking and it's all theoretically suppose to work like clock-work and there are sanctions and obligations and mostly to let students know about it. The International Affairs Office is on top of that. I don't know how widely they communicate with faculty but maybe it would be helpful this year.

BEPKO: We'll put that in the memo. I know actually the government wasn't ready to accommodate the transfer of information and it was confusing. The initial statement of the regulations on this were ambiguous and people were having difficulty figuring it out and even if they could figure it out they couldn't find a way to get it back to the government so I do think

they postponed the effective date. But they're getting a lot of pressure from Congress to make these things effective and to combat terrorism so this will be a very good thing to get a report on. Martin?

SPECHLER: I have a different matter. Some of us have received communication somehow from the Trustees directly or indirectly about the very likely increase in the cost of health benefits likely to be 15 or even more percent this year, imposing a very heavy burden on the University budget. And in that communication as I remember it the Trustees asked the faculty for ideas on how to bear that burden which must be in several million dollars actually in increased cost. It said that if the increase were over a certain threshold that the Trustees would not be prepared to bear those increased costs an interesting idea. Now I wrote Trustee Ferguson, who I happen to know, about this and offered a number of suggestions which he had requested of how to save money and increase income at the University. But I'm just one person and my ideas might not be very good ones in addition so what I'd like to ask Bob and Mary is whether we can't get the Budgetary Affairs or the Finance Committees of the faculty council involved. This really is the first time, I may say, in fifteen years, when anyone has ever asked me to save a dime for the University. And I think it's about time that we look at ways, not only to save money, but also to generate more income. And we're the ones who are in the trenches, we're doing the work, we notice the waste and we also may notice opportunities to increase income. Both are important. But, any one of us only knows a small fraction of those possibilities. There may be things in the Medical School that I'm not at all aware of. So what I'd like to request from the Agenda Council is that we take this opportunity when the Trustees are asking for ideas to eliminate waste or unnecessary expenses and to generate more income. For us to generate a list of suggestions to respond to the Trustees and indicate to them that yes, we're partners in the fiscal stability of Indiana University. And I think that if we work together we could generate quite a good and detailed list of opportunities as I say both to save money and to generate more income.

FISHER: Martin, first just to inform you, as soon as we saw the resolution that came from the Trustees about the keeping the costs between the 14 and 18 percent range...the first thing I did was give that to David Malik and the Budgetary Affairs, on our campus, and they are going to be looking into that and seeing how it might impact us and also how they might participate in trying to resolve that. So that's been underway from the day, a week ago Monday I believe it was that it came out. And I can't speak to what's happening on the Bloomington campus but we are starting to do that at IUPUI at least.

ENO: I think you've got two issues there Martin, you've got a cost-savings issue and you have an issue about fringe benefits. The Trustees at their meeting a week ago Friday passed a resolution asking that the human resources make every effort to hold further increments after this year to 14 to 18 percent. This year's increment is going to be higher, I think it's going to be 21 percent. Sixteen million dollars if I remember from 73-89 million. It's an enormous cost and the cost ultimately will come from the units because we're trimmed fairly bare as a result of the budget cuts from the state, we're trimmed fairly bare in central administration. One of the things that Myles did in his approach to dealing with those costs was to put a very high proportion of those on central administration, particularly in UITs. And the increments that come in benefits are being charged to the units because they're part of our compensation packages. In terms of cost cutting, we can look for places to cut costs and I think it's always a good idea to do that. I

didn't receive a message from the Trustees myself to that effect, I'm not sure what you might have gotten, but it's always a good idea to do that. There's no guarantee that costs we identify will be put into a pool for fringe benefits. We don't really have a budget mechanism that allows us to do that easily but it's always a good idea to look for cost cutting. As far as the fringe benefits issue it's quite clear that if we continue to have this type of increment in fringe benefits we're going to be faced with a situation where the University can't possibly meet that benefit straight up front by taxing the units because that will be a simple reallocation from our programs to our benefits and will be done without planning if we do it in that way. Therefore one of the issues the faculty are probably going to have to face is if we continue to have these sorts of increments in health care, and of course we had them in the early 1990s and then it slacked off, but if this is unabated and if there is no response to this on a national level that will help us out because everybody's in the same boat as we are how do we want to take our compensation? Do we want to take our compensation in terms of a combination of salary and fringe benefits? Where the fringe benefits increase and the university increases its contribution to the fringe benefits that comes out of salary seeing it as a total benefits/total compensation package? Do we want to protect salaries because that's the area where we're most competitive and obviously competitive when we recruit with others and find another way to cover fringe benefits perhaps by increased contributions for us? Do we want to see reallocations from our programs in order to cover total compensation in either of those two ways? Those are just issues the faculty are going to have to address and they're going to have to address them soon. Right now in addition to the Budgetary Affairs committees on both campuses, the Fringe Benefits Committees are addressing it and the Health Commission, which is a group that is called by Human Resources, called together and includes people who are in the medical fields and also faculty representatives from the various campuses who deal with this and it's a sitting, long-term commission that's been grappling with these questions increasingly over the years. All of these groups are addressing these problems now and sooner or later it's going to come down to a faculty discussion. How will we want to take our compensation? To what degree do we want our programs protected? Because these sorts of increments are on a scale that universities such as ours simply can't respond to and of course the state is in no position to help us out right now.

BEPKO: I think the Trustees would be pleased to hear from faculty or staff or students, the administration, anyone about ways to lower costs and increase our output at the same time, and quality at the same time. I think that this is something that higher education has been asked to do for quite a number of years and I think we have responded well but the process never ends. We have to keep reinventing ourselves to be successful in new eras.

ENO: Is that all for questions and comments?

BEPKO: I think so and we move to...Creating a Common Pool of Virtual Library Resources and Suzanne Thorin is here to talk about that along with Professors Richard Carr and Andre DeTienne from the Library Committee.

**AGENDA ITEM #4: Creating a Common Pool of Virtual Library Resources
(Dean Suzanne Thorin, University Libraries)
(Professors Richard Carr and Andre DeTienne, Library Committee)**

CARR: I'm a member of what is called very politely "the older generation." And as such I contest that I am still in awe of the computer. Not only has it revolutionized the way we work and the way we teach but it has also facilitated our research. No where on our campuses is that revolution more apparent than in our University Libraries. The Computer Age has transformed that old fashioned repository of knowledge with dizzying speed. True, it's [a few words unclear] accommodations, but at the same time it's offered opportunities and invited initiatives. We're fortunate to have as Dean of the University Libraries a person of vision who is fully aware of these opportunities. Dean Suzanne Thorin would appreciate hearing your reaction to an initiative "Creating a common pool of virtual library resources." Suzanne.

THORIN: Thank you Richard and Andre. I am delighted to be here today I want to make sure that you all have handouts.

ENO: Big packet of white...

THORIN: Big packet of white. That actually has a label on it "Opportunities to enrich Indian University's teaching, learning, and research environment." I just want to make sure it was passed out. It should have 4 attachments that we'll get to as I talk through this. Is everybody have the same?

ENO: We have extras if any of you are...

THORIN: It's not my intention to read the document but I wanted to give you something to take away to look at more in depth after this meeting and what I'll do is I'll hit the high points. And actually I'm going to talk to you today about three efforts, three endeavors that are going on that are system-wide in the libraries and where we believe that your research and teaching environment will be enriched and we need your feedback and comments and I'll say that all the way through. I'm going to start with the main topic and that is expanding our common pool of virtual library resources. Before I jump into that though I want to let you know something that you may know already and that is for a long time we have shared the collections of all of the libraries on the campuses as the major print book collection and we've done that through a mechanism called loaned. We've worked for several years, among the librarians, to put forth a new model so that you didn't have to return something if you were at IUPUI and you got something from the Bloomington campus, that you could return it sort of in a circulating fashion as you would on your home campus and this fall we initiated a concept which we called One Collection so now you don't get something, so you now can not borrow on an interlibrary loan but you can actually have circulated to you the general circulating collections from any campus to any other campus and to do that we made everybody's loan 120 days. Why did we choose this particular time? Well because we also initiated online loan, online renewal for you. So at a touch of the computer you may see what you have out and that's in your possession and you may renew it right from your desktop. This is going really well thus far, it's not complete yet because we still have some work to do with our technical infrastructure in order for you to be able to put something on hold. You can still recall anything if you find that you need it back again. I want to thank the faculty for the trust that you have in the libraries to implement such a program because it means that I know in Bloomington or here at IUPUI, oh no the shelves will be barren because someone is going to grab all of my materials. But you really have a great deal of trust in us that

we can recall or get back to you the materials that you need or to buy additional copies. And this is all in a test phase and we invite your comment, your complaints, and your praise from this new program. We also know, jumping into the virtual environment, that we get a series of complaint if you're a graduate faculty member at South Bend or if you're a Bloomington faculty member trying to get a database through August that's closed off to you that you wonder why only certain things are available on one campus and it becomes frustrating in teaching and using Oncourse and within your research environment. We take your concerns very seriously. Some of the Chancellors made their views known a while back to the Board of Trustees so I was asked last December to talk to the Board of Trustees to a committee called the Committee on Academic Excellence and that the Chancellors are usually a part of this group as to what the state was of our virtual environment and what/how we intended to expand it. And so I did that. I mentioned some of the points and I'm going just sort of refer to a couple of these bulleted points in the paper if I go along that we brought out of this meeting. And the first bullet at the bottom that students who are pursuing the same degree on different campuses and faculty who teach these students don't have the same access to their resources. As Trustee Shoulders likes to say they all get the same degree at the end, it doesn't say Kokomo or IUPUI or Bloomington, but right now they don't have the rich resources available on one campus or another. And one program I will mention will be Informatics because it just expanded to South Bend from IUPUI and Bloomington and we don't have a core plan for the resources that the students in that program will be able to use on their computer. We also know that Oncourse is rapidly being increased in its use and some of the materials used in Oncourse are materials that are electronic materials either created by the libraries or licensed by the libraries. And finally over on the second page on the top I just mentioned Informatics as being one of those expanding all campus programs but I believe the Board of Trustees is struggling with how to present this to the Commission for Higher Education because it will be implemented as campuses are able to do so. And finally, at the complaints from those of you on the graduate faculty and even some of you who aren't, who are trying to conduct your research and feel you're blocked in terms of your access. So I gave a presentation and tried to, it was really kind of a map that I threw out and my goals were to say that we can get organized better in the libraries but you're going to have to infuse this program with money. We can pull cost-savings from a more cohesive program but it still will need money to flower completely. At that meeting, or just after that meeting, the Chancellors empowered the Head Librarians from each campus, and two actually from this campus to include the Medical School Library, to be a committee to pursue the next steps to create such a common virtual environment and your attachment one shows you you're librarian on your campus or your librarians. I then in January and part of February went out to each campus to meet with the Chancellor and the Head Librarian and whoever else the Chancellor and Head Librarian wanted to bring into the environment and I learned a lot. I like to visit the campuses and there's just a different point of view when you're on somebody else's turf and they talk in a different way to you and we had a series of some really rich meetings where I brought back a lot of information and opinions that are helping to shape this proposal...what will be a proposal eventually. The first thing that I got under my belt was that one of the commonalities in building such an environment is to enrich undergraduate education...something in common with most units and certainly on all campuses. So we developed principles and I've listed them there on the fourth page and I asked each campus, I invited them to add other principles, and we looked at them and recombined them and what you have here is a list of four which is: to build a substantial body of full-text undergraduate resources, to provide better research resources for IU graduate students

and faculty, and to really foster an enrich the same courses and degrees on the various IU campuses and to encourage and broaden and enrich opportunities for distance and distributed education. And then a full set of bullets and some of which are sort of contained in the principles but I won't read all of them but I want to highlight a couple of them at the middle of page 3. It is clear that faculty support through initial consultation and continuing consultation will be the mainstay of success of this program. And I think the librarians look forward to this as an opportunity for better, broader, and deeper consultation with you and as to what your needs are. You and your students, and your research needs, will eventually make the size of this environment what it should be. We started out by saying hey it should be 4 million, it should be 1 million...we now are saying that it will grow to the extent that you need it to grow and that we have money to make it grow. We are developing, we're looking at business models right now, but the one thing we know is that the more people that get together to do something in this crazy vendor environment that we're in, the more leverage we have with those vendors who, from whom we get these databases and to whom we pay money. So with a consorted approach at the University through whatever we create in the end to do this, a person or an office, will help us to drive down prices overall. If we don't, we have failed. And units that do this find these statements, if they do it right. And finally I'm going to have to thank Bob Eno for this feedback. We need to assume we're going to get it wrong a few times and so we have to build into our planning and our implementation plan easily changed mechanisms that will respond to the feedback that you and others give us. We need to find an assessment mechanism each year whether we're going to renew certain databases or not and we need to get faculty and campus input into that decision-making. We also need to use user statistics, even though they are problematical, across the different databases, because nothing is the same in this world right now, that we need to make you more aware of who is using what and who isn't using what so that we can make that an ingredient in our discussions. After all of this feedback the Council of Head Librarians, which included the group that is in the handout, met for a long meeting and talked through many of the issues that I have mentioned today and many more like how would we do this? How would we create a governance model? How would your interests on your campuses be represented in the pool? And so we...there's a paragraph and in the first paragraph there are two points that the librarians asked me to make and that is that they wanted to be sure that the individual pockets on each campus that make each campus so different continue to be recognized. And in that respect we would never stuff everything into a common pool; there would always be part of the library budget that would be devoted to, on each campus, to individual needs, specific needs of the campus that we don't find anywhere else. We need to find a way to make sure that when those needs grow similar that they get placed in the common environment. And also particularly for the Medical School library that we need to recognize that they have specific needs for their users and we need to recognize that in any common pool that those needs would remain uncompromised for a lot of good reasons. So, it's a very difficult discussion because we're talking about sharing across the campuses and cooperating so just when we thought we had reached the end of the road somebody, I think it was David Lewis who suggested, well let's see what we do agree on. And so what we found out is that we agreed on a heck of a lot in terms of our planning. So at the bottom of the third page I just listed where we believe that we do agree and that leads us to attachment 2. we never compiled data before about what we do together now, we may do it in a somewhat inefficient fashion. But we discovered to the best of our knowledge and we're improving and revising these documents, that we do share over 1 million dollars of common databases right now. And if you go down this list and you get

to 7 you will find out it's nearly 1.3 and so on down the list. This list though has not been developed in any kind of a way that reflects what the priorities are that we've gotten out of all of the campuses. So what are we doing with this list right now? We're trying to make it accurate first of all, both in money and who gets what, we're trying to add anything that isn't on this list that campuses have negotiated on their own and then we're trying to match some of these databases to the priorities and the framework we're developing to see if we can place any of them in the context of what we would want to do in the future. Some of them are very easy, some of them are not so easy. We are also have a subgroup developing a beginning list, a draft list of databases, full text databases of undergraduate education. These will be documents that the librarians will come back to you and say hey what do you think of these and then lastly they are trying to develop a list of common resources, leaving aside the money right now, that might be welcomed by the campuses. So that's what we're going right now, that's really in numbers 1 and 2. And now moving on to page 3 you can read for yourself what some of our other commonalities are. Actually, the big area where we disagreed was in how we would put this together...would we use monies on the campus and come to agreement and do it pretty much like we're going now only more efficiently? Or will the Board of Trustees assess, through an assessment put money in a common pool? That we can suspend for a while because when I went back to the Board of Trustees with the librarians request we requested three more months to do planning and to codify some of the materials that I've mentioned. One that I haven't mentioned which I think you'll be very interested in, is the handout 3 where as far as I know this is the first time that anybody has put together common programs in this particular way, common programs across the campuses. It's not a done document, the librarians on each campus have brought this back to their home turf to ask for corrections, updates, and amplifications. The questions are just a list of numbers, how many graduate students are here and there, how many students are here, how many faculty? But when you get into the rest of this document you can begin to see where there are programs and degrees that are comparable across the campuses and some obvious points would be...we have business. We either have a business school, a Kelley school, or business degrees on all of the campuses of IU. It may be small, it may be large, but they are there and they are being taught. We are educating teachers all over, we are giving degrees in education. These are two obvious examples and so on down into the more technical areas. What we're going to try to do here with your help is to develop this profile even further so what's the size of the program on each of the campuses, how many students are graduating? Each of the librarians are going to come back to our next meeting with a statement of emerging priorities...what are your particular campus characteristics? What are your values on the campus and where do you see emerging priorities? We saw IU South Bend come up with a degree in Informatics and that's an emerging priority on their campus so we want to get these pieces of input so we aren't just arguing what I think or what someone else thinks, but what does the data tell us about what's going on on the campuses. So, what do I need from you on this issue? I think that the three months that the Trustees gave us to plan should be spent in fruitful conversation and planning and some of that should happen with faculty. So the paragraph I call your attention to right before number 2 is that we earnestly invite your feedback on what we're doing and we will be sharing with you the documents as they come out and we want to hear about your frustrations when you're using Oncouse, when you're teaching, when you can't get a database. What are the things that bother you the most...feed them into your librarian or send them directly to me or anyone on the committee. Do you want me to mention the other two things before we have questions or not?

BEPKO: Well, why don't you go ahead and take questions, Martin has a question now...

SPECHLER: It's a wonderful thing that you're doing and particularly for the increasing amount of research being done on the smaller campuses and at IUPUI. And I know that the emphasis of this initiative is on the electronic things which cost money so my comment is directed to finding the money to do this better. And it does seem to me and it has always seemed to me that there's enormous duplication in the library system in ordering conventional materials...serials and especially books. I talked to a friend, a respected Senior Acquisitions Librarian on the Indianapolis campus just a couple of days ago. And as I understand it on the Indianapolis campus where we have this beautiful new library, essentially our acquisitions are irrespective and independent of what is available in the Main Library in Bloomington. I was very surprised that that's true and I ask why is it true? Why is true that we're duplicating books in the Indianapolis library which could be obtained from the Main Library if they're not heavily used? What would the answer be? The answer is that our Interlibrary Loan, our process of moving books from campus to campus is woefully behind and terribly slow and if you cannot count on getting a book from the Main Library in Bloomington to Indianapolis or any of the other campuses in any kind of reasonable time. In many other system wide universities...

[End of Tape 1, Side A. Side B of tape did not record properly. All subsequent dialogue is missing.]

**AGENDA ITEM #5: Discussion of Chancellor Review Procedures
(Professors Eno and Fisher)
(Circular U6-2003)**

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/circulars/02-03/U6-2003.htm>

**AGENDA ITEM #6: Procedures for Athletics Committee
(Professor Eno)
(Circular U5-2003)**

<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/circulars/02-03/U5-2003.htm>