Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
February 5, 2013
IMU – Georgian Room
3:30 P.M. - 5:30 P.M.

Attendance

MEMBERS PRESENT: Dana Anderson, Lyudmila Bronstein, Carolyn Calloway-Thomas, LaNita Campbell, Mike Conway, Gregory Demas, Marion Frank-Wilson, Donald Gjerdingen, Jason Baird Jackson, Bruce Jaffee, Lynn Jamieson, Peter Kloosterman, Jennifer Laherty, Eugene McGregor, Sherri Michaels, Michael Morrone, Maresa Murray, Michael Ogden, John Paolillo, Deanna Reising, Augustin Ruta, Matt Semadeni, Sandra Shapshay, Jim Sherman, Grant Simpson, Rebecca Spang, J. Kyle Straub, William Swanson, John Tafoya, Herbert Terry, Peggy Thoits, Julie Van Voorhis, Barbara Vance, Edward Vasquez, John Walbridge

MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT: Sarita Soni (Ruth Stone)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Abhijit Basu, Bonnie Brownlee, Gracia Clark, Pnina Fichman, Jeffrey Gershman, Thomas Gieryn, Cassandra Guarino, Vivian Halloran, T. Scott Herring, Robert Jacobs, Dan Knudsen, Lesa Hatley Major, Patricia McManus, Michael McRobbie, Jeff Nelsen, James Perry, Dot Porter, Elizabeth Raff, Edwin Ramos, Lauren Robel, Bret Rothstein, Lisa Sideris, Marietta Simpson, Sonya Stephens, Adam Szczepaniak, Pat Thomas, Frances Trix, William Wheeler, James Wimbush

GUESTS: Cynthia Archer, Alan Bender (Biology), Craig Dethloff (Faculty Council Office), Ken Guan, Yang Hu, Mike Leonard (Herald Times), Roger Levesque (BAC), Doug Porter (Parking Operations), Mercedes Randall (OEM), Laura Ridenour (Faculty Council Office), Brad Wheeler (VPIT)

Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes
http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/minutes/12-13/01.15.13.pdf

2. Memorial Resolutions for Terry Jenkins and Lee Todd

Terry Jenkins: http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/12-13/B16-2013.pdf

Lee Todd: http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/12-13/B17-2013.pdf

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

4. Question/Comment Period[1] (10 minutes)

5. Report from the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (10 minutes)
(Professors Emeriti Herb Terry and Bruce Jaffee) [DISCUSSION]

6. eTexts at IU Bloomington (30 minutes)
(Vice President Brad Wheeler) [DISCUSSION]

7. Parking Concerns Surrounding the New International Studies Building (15 minutes)
(Doug Porter, Director of Parking Operations) [DISCUSSION]

Minutes

AGENDA ITEM 1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Shall I [gavel sound] again? I'd like to call the meeting of the BFC to order. As you can see, Provost Robel is not here today. May I have approval of the minutes? A motion?

SWANSON: I'll second that.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —it has been—

SWANSON: —I made a motion.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Okay, thank you. I was going to say. It has been moved and seconded that we accept the minutes. Is there any discussion? All those in favor please say "aye." [Aye] Those opposed, say "nay." [Silence] The "ayes" have it. The minutes have been approved. Tom Gieryn will not be here, but in his stead, we have the voice of a mathematician, and he is going to read the memorial resolutions for Terry Jenkins and Lee Todd.

AGENDA ITEM 2: MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS FOR TERRY JENKINS AND LEE TODD

KLOOSTERMAN: Terry Jenkins was born in Wisconsin and grew up in the Lake District in the Northwest of England after his father was assigned there to supervise an American-owned evaporated milk factory. He attended the local Heversham Grammar School, and subsequently completed BA and MA degrees, in 1953 and 1956, respectively, at Magdalene College, Cambridge University. He took Part II of the Natural Science Tripos in Biochemistry. He returned to the USA for graduate work in the Department of Biology at the Massachusetts

[1] Faculty who are not members of the Faculty Council and who wish to address questions to President Calloway-Thomas should submit their questions to the Faculty Council Office. Our documents are available at: http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/. To send e-mail to the Faculty Council Office: bfcoff@indiana.edu

Institute of Technology, obtaining a Ph.D. in Biochemistry in 1957. After completing his degree, he stayed on at MIT for one year and then joined the faculty of the Department of Biochemistry at the University of California at Berkeley. He moved to Indiana University in 1966 where he joined the biochemistry group in the Department of Chemistry. He taught biochemistry courses to undergraduate and graduate students in the Department of Chemistry and to medical students in the Medical Sciences Program. He also served the Chemistry Department as graduate advisor and was its undergraduate advisor for several years. He retired as Professor of Chemistry in July 1996.

Terry is best known for his important discovery of how the vitamin-B_6 coenzyme (pyridoxal phosphate) functions in a class of enzymes called transaminases. These enzymes play critical roles in all cells in the synthesis and breakdown of amino acids, the building blocks of proteins. His doctoral dissertation involved the purification and characterization of two transaminases from beef heart. These proteins contain the active form of vitamin B6 and hence are colored. He made use of the changes in their color that occurs with changes in their interactions with their normal reactants. He found that the B6 coenzyme is joined to the enzyme by a chemical linkage that is broken when the enzyme interacts with an amino acid reactant (a substrate). He not only could observe directly an expected enzyme-substrate complex, he also demonstrated that several intermediate states in comparable amounts were involved in the action of his transaminase.

One important generalization that emerged from his studies with enzymes was that when ionic or neutral molecules bind to enzymes, they do so by exchange processes; something has to dissociate from the enzyme when another molecule binds. Furthermore, for charged species the overall net charge change must be zero. Thus, when an anion binds, either an anion must dissociate or a cation must be concomitantly bound. Terry used this important generalization to throw light on many puzzling features of enzymatic reactions, such as the interactions between acidity and salt effects, and the coupling of heat evolving processes with heat absorbing processes in such important reactions as the formation of ATP (adenosine triphosphate) from the condensation of ADP (adenosine diphosphate) with inorganic phosphate.

One of Terry's main interests toward the end of his career was the set of reactions involving adenosine triphosphate (ATP), both enzymatic and non-enzymatic. ATP serves as an energy source for many processes in living organisms, but the details of the chemistries of its reactions are poorly understood. Terry's work helped shed light on some of its reactions, particularly the role of the divalent cations of magnesium and calcium in the hydrolysis of ATP to ADP and phosphate.

Terry lived for many years with his first wife, Sally, and their three children, Christopher, Mary and Mark, out in the county. While there, he served as a volunteer fireman for Bloomington Township, so often he was called away from the lab to help fight a fire somewhere in the township. Sally was always homesick for her native England, and eventually left Bloomington to return to that country. Christopher stayed in the U.S., and received a degree in accounting from the IU Kelley School of Business. A number of years later, Terry married Jeanne Martinez, and after she finished her degree in Spanish they left for Phoenix, Arizona where Jeanne taught at Arizona State University. Terry died in Phoenix on November 7, 2010 after a bout with Alzheimer's disease.

Terry Jenkins devoted himself unstintingly to his profession and the Department of Chemistry at Indiana University. He was a knowledgeable colleague, a wise counselor and a willing helper. We thank him for all that he has given to the Department of Chemistry and to Indiana University.

Lee J. Todd was born in Denver, Colorado and educated in Catholic schools, including a Jesuit high school. He obtained a B.S. in Chemistry from Notre Dame in 1958. He completed an M.S. degree in organic chemistry at Florida State University, working with Professor John Leffler on arylboranes as analogs of carbonium ions, starting a life-long interest in boron chemistry. Lee earned a Ph.D. in 1963 with Professor Riley Schaeffer and joined the faculty of Indiana University in 1968.

Postdoctoral training in organometallic chemistry was obtained at M.I.T. with Professor Dietmar Seyferth (1963-1964), and in the fall of 1964, Lee accepted an assistant professorship at the University of Illinois. In 1968, Lee gave a seminar at Indiana University, and this led to a job offer in the Chemistry Department starting in the fall of 1968. At that time, IU enjoyed a Center of Excellence grant from the federal government to increase the size and strength of the department. In the 1970's, with Professors Schaeffer and Lee on faculty, IU was one of the top centers in the world for the study of boron chemistry. There were several promising applications for boron compounds under investigation at that time, in particular boron cancer therapy.

Lee was exceptionally involved with all the individuals who entered into his realm, either as research workers or in his classes. Lee enjoyed research collaborations with a large number of postdoctoral, graduate and undergraduate students in his research laboratories during his thirty-two years in the department. Many new, interesting boron hydride molecules were prepared during this time period. On October 6, 2000, an Inorganic Mini-Symposium was held in the chemistry department as part of the alumni weekend in honor of Lee Todd. Six speakers

were alumni of Lee's research group. Both the first (Professor Dave Hyatt, PhD 1968) and the last (Dr. Steve Jasper, PhD 1995) doctoral students were in attendance at the symposium.

Lee was truly passionate about boron chemistry, early on for the unusual characteristics of compounds of the boron nuclei contained there, but later in compounds where unusual cage borane anions were attached to transition metal ions, forming compounds where the metal was in an unusually high formal oxidations state. Finally, Lee was active in using boron compounds to attempt to sequester and precipitate radioactive cesium from nuclear reactor wastes, to immobilize them so that they would be rendered "fixed" for long term nuclear waste disposal.

Lee was also very interested, later in his career, with exploiting the high capacity of boron nuclei to capture neutrons for the application in boron neutron capture cancer therapy, where the job of the researcher was to identify boron compounds which would localize in tumors to enable focused radiation therapy on the boron enriched tumor tissue. For example, incorporating boron atoms into amino acid analogs was intended to improve the effectiveness of boron neutron capture therapy.

Lee was involved in collaborations with Czech boron chemists, and attended international boron chemistry conferences around the world, long ago in Moscow and most recently in Spain, to follow his love of that area of chemistry. Lee was a tireless mentor of undergraduate and graduate students, attending to their needs toward developing skills as boron chemists, but also attending to their own life choices and decisions.

With the aid of his long-time friend, Professor Paul Grieco, formerly of the IU Bloomington chemistry department, and three other local farmers, Lee began his education in farming in 1975. As a young man, Lee lived solely in a city environment. Later in life, he lived on a fifty-three acre farm west of Bloomington. Farming activities held his interest for his last years.

Following his retirement, Lee amazed us all in the chemistry department by building up a self-contained laboratory on his farm here in southern Indiana and running a small company which supplied decaborane to researchers around the world to use as a reagent for their own research. Lee had what is almost certainly the only *combined* boron chemical company and beef cattle farm in the world!

Later in life, Lee developed an interest in religion. He audited several courses at IU in the Religious Studies Department, concentrating on the mysticism of several religious traditions of the world.

Lee is survived by three adult children: a daughter, Jackie, a son, John and another son, Gregory, and his longtime partner Marci Ankrom and his step-son Anthony Ankrom.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: As some of you may know, the spouse of our dear colleague and BFC member Bonnie Brownlee passed away on February 3rd, this past Sunday. Emeritus professor George Juergens was a large, sweet soul, and he was an excellent historian. So as we stand and remember our colleagues, Terry Jenkins and Lee Todd, let us also remember the good that George Juergens did while he lived and walked among us. May we please stand? [All rise] [Silence] Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM 3: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE BUSINESS

I had a few items to report on today, starting with a very important development. Yesterday, I learned that several Trustees have expressed a renewed interest in our utilization of classrooms throughout the university. Please recall that in 2011, the BFC discussed the issue, and that we decided to sustain the status quo; that is, we voted to maintain our current practices of having Friday classes. However, the BFC issued three major recommendations regarding Friday classes, and the culture of IU. First, we recommended that the office of the vice provost for undergraduate education gather information from the schools about Friday activities. Second, we recommended that Tom's and Sonya's offices work with the associate deans and the Campus Curriculum Committee, and with the Scheduling and Calendar Committee to identify ways in which scheduling of classes might be better coordinated within and between schools to ensure more efficient and equitable use of classrooms. Finally, the BFC recommended that we study alternative scheduling patterns that make use of Fridays, such as Wednesday through Friday patterns.

As many of you know, members of the Board are keen to ensure that we utilize every inch of available classroom space on all IU campuses. In fact, at one meeting of the Board, one Trustee questioned why we should continue erect buildings on campus if we're not strategically using the space we already have available. Such discussions, of course, must be framed against the backdrop of sweeping changes that confront higher education today, including student financial woes, the skyrocketing cost of education, as well as the 2008 recession, which all—all of which have caused us to look at structures in a new light.

Depending upon what happens next week at the Board of Trustees meeting, we will likely have to confront this issue again, and very soon. Vice President for Regional Planning, John Applegate, Vice Provost Tom Gieryn, Vice President Nasser Paydar at IUPUI, Susan Giesecki, Interim Chancellor at IU Kokomo, and one or two other individuals will make presentations at the February 13th and 14th Board of Trustees meeting, which will be held in Indianapolis. If you

have, in particular, old or new compelling points you'd like me to consider and convey to the Board, please send me a note at calloway@indiana.edu by February 11th, which is Monday.

On Thursday, January 24th, 2013, representatives from Goldman Sachs met separately with each of the three major constituent groups: students, faculty and staff on both campuses, at IUPUI and at IUB. At the meeting with IUB, faculty representatives revisited crucial universal topics, such as: what should be the longevity of a parking contract, that is, should the university travel down the path of privatization, whether there should be an incentive plan for parking, the importance of flexible revenue streams, to what extent will there be a tradeoff between transportation planning and parking, striking a balance between the number of parking spots and the environment, and who should be responsible for maintaining street infrastructure, for example, lighting. The whole committee will meet again on February 19th to determine the recommendations we will submit to President McRobbie who will in turn present a proposal to members of the Board of Trustees for their scrutiny and action. And as you know, an article pertaining to the issue appeared in this past Sunday's Herald-Times, and, for the record, let it be known that columnist appears—is in the back there. So, let's wave to him. [Laughter]

With regard to a search for Neil Theobald's replacement, at a meeting of the UFC Executive Committee on January 27th, Jack and I asked the president again about this matter, and, indeed, each time we meet with the president, we ask him, 'When are you going to appoint a committee to replace—the search for a replacement for Neil Theobald?'

Next week, we will again present that question to the president. And, as you know, this body has already declared to the president that the CFO should be a member of the faculty. On the athletic front, Bruce Jaffee and Herb Terry attended a COIA meeting this past week in Tampa, and we have allocated time on the agenda today for them to give a report primarily because that meeting was devoted to providing a national faculty voice on the interface between athletics and faculty governance. Yesterday, on Monday, February 4th, I met with the College Policy Committee, and I will be meeting with the councils of the Jacobs School of Music and the Kelley School of Business on February 11th and February 25th respectively.

At the College Policy Committee meeting, I learned that some BFC representatives are reporting to their units about the work of the Council, and again this is very good news. The History representative was singled out as a model case. We also discussed the culture of the campus, and how valuing research and teaching over service prevents many faculty from becoming involved in the work of the Council, especially assistant professors. Policy members also noted that some faculty sincerely believe that administrators make most of the decisions on campus, and that this perception acts as a deterrent to faculty engagement. Of course, we have and can see logical dynamics operating here. Faculty believe administrators make the decisions. As a consequence, faculty see no reason to become more engaged, and perceptually and

conceptually administrators continue to make the decisions. For me, this messy entanglement is a compelling reason for us to try harder to improve the situation. Well, what will it take to break it? Does the dynamic signify need for a systemic change in the culture at Indiana University? Should we entertain the possibility of providing more incentives for faculty to participate in faculty governance? And, most crucially, at the current rate of faculty engagement, what will faculty governance and participation look like twenty years from now?

At this very moment, members of the CIC Faculty Governance Committee are grappling with the issue of compensation. This is fresh. Yesterday, my counterpart at Northwestern University sent an email to all CIC council presidents, seeking arguments that she might use to make a case for a compensation package at Northwestern University. I travelled down this road last year before this very body. At Purdue University, the chair of the senate receives $20,000 in a discretionary account. Did you hear that? [Laughter] I had to re-read this. At IUPUI, the Faculty Council chair receives a $5,000 discretionary account. And at University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, for each year of service, the senate chair is awarded a 50% teaching load reduction. Well, my story is [indistinct comment] and part instructive. In the process of what I thought was a most productive discussion, members of the College Policy Committee made an important recommendation that I hope we will be able to implement next year.

In addition to standing committee updates that we have already begun, they recommend that at the beginning of Fall semester, we provide all school councils, as well as faculty, with a preview of important issues that the BFC will likely discuss during the year. Of course, members of the College Policy Committee are mindful that the BFC will not be able to provide a definitive projection of what will come before the body because many variables shape what is going to be discussed at the BFC when and how. This is a fitting, I think, excellent recommendation from the College Policy Committee. One that this Council could easily implement, and I'll urge us to do so beginning in Fall 2013. Of course, we will continue to keep faculty apprised of what is going on through regular channels, including our minutes.

Finally, at this time, I'd like yield the balance of my time—this language sounds like I'm in congress, but not the current one—to president-elect and chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, Herb Terry; and he will give us some updates regarding faculty affairs.

TERRY: Thanks, Carolyn. I would also second Carolyn's comments about the recommendations of the Policy Committee at the College, that it would be a good idea to try to let the campus and committees and schools know the major items that might come before the BFC next year, and, unless there's some overwhelming Council objection to it, I'll work with Craig, and we will get [indistinct comment] we can out as early in the Fall semester as possible.

On the Faculty Affairs Committee front, the main thing to report is the outcome of the meeting—the discussion we had last time about our proposal to reconcile the policies governing—many of the policies governing non-tenure-track faculty appointments under Bloomington—on the Bloomington campus with the policies that cover that from the university system-wide. At the last meeting, Tom Gieryn indicated that the School of Business had gone down a different path, primarily naming lecturers to non-instructional ranks in their undergraduate program, and clinical programs to non—to non-tenure-track ranks in their graduate program, and that they thought there would be some difficult if we changed practice on the Bloomington campus. I took that up with the Faculty Affairs Committee, and we decided we wanted to hear from the representatives of the School of Business, but also from any other school, so I'm reaching out to them, and hopefully any concerned schools will send representatives to our next meeting.

As you know, the last discussion turned into a wide-ranging discussion of the lives of non-tenure-track faculty, and whether we should take a look at them in a more comprehensive fashion in coming months, and perhaps in the coming academic year. I—I think the case is that we probably should, that it probably is time to take a look at many aspects of the lives of our non-tenure-track faculty, given that their numbers are increasing dramatically, and that they are very important members of the campus community. How to do that is, I think, still a little bit up in the air. Certainly, the Faculty Affairs Committee is prepared to do it, but we are aware that there are some other things going on on campus, both in faculty governance in the schools, and administratively on the campus with which our investigation will have to be coordinated. So I am—I am kind of working with the provost and with others to try and make sure that we don't run at cross purposes to other things that may take up the lives and place of the non-tenure-track faculty, but we will not let the issue die.

Finally, one of the things that suggests, maybe, that while we could, or probably still should, reconcile the Bloomington policies to the system policies. One of the things that has come up is that there are people who think it might be time to change system policies on non-tenure-track ranks and titles. There are two primary folks in this category. One are our scientists. Our last discussion focused primarily on non-tenure-track instructional faculty, but we have a rank of scientist. We do not have a rank of research professor, and it turns out that around the country, many universities like us create research professors. And, when people especially apply for grant applications, people here believe that they are somewhat disadvantaged if their application lists a bunch of scientists, and somebody else's application lists a bunch of research professors. The answer to this at IUPUI has been that their equivalent of Tom Gieryn has exercised discretion, and the research scientists at IUPUI are allowed to use the "special title" research professor, and do. It doesn't change their official appointment, but they can put it on letterhead, they can put it in grant applications, and so forth. Tom believes that the special title

discretion he is given is not quite that discretionary, and has not allowed our people to exercise that rank. So we have a group of scientists who think it would be a good idea if we would look back, and see if we want to continue with the ranks of scientist or research, not NTT faculty or want to adopt something like research scientist. I mentioned in a memo to Carolyn today, I have no idea if there is any equivalent of that on the creative side. I don't know if we have anyone who—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —we [indistinct comment]—

TERRY: —was hired primarily to be creative.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: That did not come in the form of a question, so this will not [indistinct comment] discussed.

TERRY: But it's another matter that might come before the Council. Do we want to go down that rank?

And, finally, we've received information from some of our lecturers who would like to take us back to where we were when we created the lecturer rank,. They think confusion results in their lives when they've identified themselves as a lecturer because in many other universities, lecturers are not long-term employees. We have the title, "visiting lecturer." Before we created the long term rank of lecturer, we used it the same way this faculty member would like us to use it. We used it as a temporary appointment—I don't think it could extend for more than three years, and it's the title we gave people who came in without their doctorates completed, and completed and then were automatically promoted to a tenure-track rank. So we have some questions that are raised about the scientist ranks. We have some questions that are raised about the lecturer ranks, and the Faculty Affairs Committee will keep plugging away at this. I have to say that I got a lot—a surprising lot—of emails from non-tenure-track faculty who in one way or another were glad that we were taking up some of these matters, that they do think it would be a good idea, they didn't feel threatened. They think it would be a good idea if we take a look at whether we have the right policies and appropriate policies, necessary policies for non-tenure-track ranks.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Thank you, Herb. Are there any questions for Herb regarding his report, his update? Yes?

JAMIESON: We were on the first reading the last time, so are you saying this is postponed?

TERRY: Well, we don't always do the second reading at the second meeting after. I think we'll decide, as a committee, whether we want to go ahead and continue to try and reconcile these policies, or whether all the other information we've suggested—received—suggests we should

do something else even though if we decided to change from scientist to research professor, that would be a laborious process because it would go through us, it would go through the UFC, and would have to be approved by the Trustees.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Yes, Walbridge?

WALBRIDGE: Yeah, is there some plan to do some sort of systematic survey or study of what the actual situation on the ground is for non-tenure-track faculty?

TERRY: Yes, I think there is. We—we have received an offer from a part of the administration, that we can use some of their survey research capabilities for the business of the Council, and I would like to take them up on that offer, learn more from our non-tenure-track colleagues. And it's also been suggested that maybe we should try to get more systematic data on non-tenure-track titles that are used at comparable institutions.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: We will also entertain the possibility of having a meeting with members of the NTT faculty but, as Herb has indicated, we're still in the planning stages, and we'll report back to the Council regarding what we decide to do. Other questions? Yes, Swanson?

SWANSON: The question on the function, as I understand, the lecturer is teaching only, not service or creative activity, and yet we have appointment who's then given service responsibilities, and when I looked at it, it turns out there's no particular oversight. In other words, if a person is in tenure-track or clinical rank, they eventually will go before the promotion advisory committee who would look at what their function was, but a lecturer doesn't. So a lecturer can be given the title lecturer, which means they do teaching, and then can be given extensive service responsibilities. And so, to me there's a—there's a dissonance between what we define the position as being and what it actually is.

TERRY: We will try to get ahold of that information, try to find out what practice is. I would have to look back. I did think that we allowed lecturers to do service that was in conjunction with their teaching.

SWANSON: Right.

TERRY: And so it might be the type of service that is required, not the thing itself. By the way, I'll throw out another thing from what Bruce and I are about to talk about. We learned at the—one of these meeting that we attended that there are universities around here who define faculty expectations in terms of research, teaching and service and leadership. And maybe leadership is a nice word. I don't know. So—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —the rose by any rose—

TERRY: —throw that out. Other questions for Herb? Lauren and I received no questions—written questions, but we're at the question and comment portion of the agenda, so if you have new and interesting and exciting questions that you'd like to raise, now is the time. Yes?

AGENDA ITEM 4: QUESTION / COMMENT PERIOD

PAOLILLO: So in December I learned about a—a research paper that was published about the Google Scholar citation index. I don't know how many people are aware of this index, but it's now available in a form which purports to give index of scholarly productivity per individual faculty member. That index is known as the H-Index, and it's based on citation rankings. It's a little bit technical, I don't want to go into that, but this is a index that has been used by faculty, such as faculty in my school, in the evaluation of promotion and tenure cases. This research paper, which I learned of in December, indicates the researchers were able to manipulate the H-Index of—the Google Scholar H-Index—of a number of researchers on the paper, and I find this to be highly disturbing, knowing that the index is used, I think we're not alone in Informatics and Computing in using it, probably not just at IU, but across the nation, and I want the—the faculty and the provost, if possible, to be made aware of—of this situation, and I'd like to see that there might be some kind of recommendation coming out about the use of—of indices that are open to manipulation.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Okay. Could you speak more specifically about this whole notion of manipulation? Do you have any examples—

PAOLILLO: —So—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —that you could cite?

PAOLILLO: Of manipulation? Other than that were discussed in this research article, no. I do have a link to the article. It's available on archive.org, the—the repository that Cornell University library runs. There's a number of co-authors so I don't want to list a name, but I can email that to you or share it with the Council.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: I'd appreciate that. I would like to see a show of hands of individuals whose departments readily use that search engine. May I see a hand? Huh, one, two, three, four individuals. How many of you—is this your first hearing? Raise your hand if you are not ashamed to do that? Okay, I'll raise mine. Okay, good, I'm in good company.

BRONSTEIN: I know that our department uses it partial [indistinct comment], but it's not like significant emphasis.

SHERMAN: Can you give us a hint about how it's manipulated?

WALBRIDGE: It might be useful to know.

PAOLILLO: Basically, what—all that the—that an individual has to do is to see a website with a phony research papers that have citations to research—actual research by, you know, whoever's [indistinct comment] they want to manipulate. Google Scholar is not very particular about what it considers to be a citation, and so these things are—are very readily counted. There are many ways to create a phony research paper. They used a very simple one in this particular piece of research and, you know, a—a scholar in many fields will have a—you know, at the time of going up for tenure, might have an index of somewhere around seven. They found it very easy to move the index from seven to a slightly higher number just by having a couple of extra research papers out there that the index would find.

The other disturbing aspect of this was that they did report that they tried to communicate with Google about this particular circumstance, and Google was not very open to discussion with them, and I think that's very concerning because if people—the issue goes beyond actually just what we might use Google Scholar for in—to try to evaluate productivity, but it goes to the actual quality of the index itself. And if this becomes widely known, which I think we can expect it to be, given the nature of things—internet—that the value of the Google Scholar index we may see plummeting in the next several years—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —John, I—

PAOLILLO: —and that's very concerning.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: I do appreciate you bringing that item to our attention because it does seem to have lots of concerning aspects to it, and it also raises issues of integrity if what you report that is in the study itself is indeed accurate. Yes?

BRONSTEIN: I have a short comment about it. So traditionally H-Indexes [indistinct comment], and I absolutely don't understand how it can be manipulated because it determines the amount of papers cited that many times as many papers. So this is the H-Index. And in [indistinct comment] science, I don't see how it can be manipulated.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Well, I'm not sure we wanted to get into discussion of the pros and cons of that, but I do want to be open to comments. Yes?

JACKSON: Just quickly, we need to be careful not to conflate the metric in Google's particular use of it. It's a measurement. It can be used by many different actors. You can calculate it yourself, if you wish, how you do that is going to shape the outcome. I'm sorry that he's not here, but I know that Tom Gieryn has begun investigating the broader realm that [indistinct

comment] here, which is the use of metrics in tenure and promotion decisions, and I know that he's having conversations around campus to learn the variability of this point.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Swanson?

SWANSON: A point that comes up with this is that there are, in some areas, such as what Web of Science covers or the National Library of Medicine covers, there's very carefully controlled indices, but a lot of people do creative activity that's not in those, and that's kind of the challenge is that when we're used to the ones within Web of Science or the National Library of Medicine, we know how that's constructed, but that excludes many areas of creative activity, so those indices first got used when they were carefully controlled, but because they're useful, it's now extended beyond, and that's—that's where this problem comes from.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Jim?

SHERMAN: Yeah, I suspect, just as it may be possible, although I agree, I'm not sure how to inflate an H-Index. It should also be possible to detect whether it has been artificially inflated, and this would be as bad as plagiarism for your career, I would guess. It's a—it would be a pretty serious thing to find out that you're inflating your H-Index. I don't think you'd keep your job, so it's pretty dangerous behavior.

PAOLILLO: Well, we can't be certain of that unless somebody's actually going to do the checking. When I broached this topic with my dean and the two chairs of the departments in our unit, I—I made this point that it's like, okay, so it's fine, but are you going to actually support people doing this checking because you really can't know if the numbers that you get from the Google Scholar H-Index or ISI Thomson are what they should be unless you do the checking. ISI maybe is a little better but it does, as Professor Swanson says, leave some things out.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Herb? This should be the last comment regarding this item.

TERRY: I'd just urge the Council to recognize that in our current environment, we're going to get more and more pressure for matrices and other sorts of things that'd measure faculty productivity, and there are commercial firms out there that offer this, in addition to the ones that are associated with the institutes and this thing, notably Academic Analytics and, you know, I think the Council should take a substantial interest should IU join many universities that are beginning to sign up for Academic Analytics. We should take a careful at what is it really measuring, how accurately is it measuring, is much more than just publication citation, and tries to get into conference presentations, tries to get into dollars and amounts of external funding received. It purports to be quite comprehensive and it is signing up many institutions like us.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Thank you, John. We really do appreciate you bringing that to our attention. As you know, Professors emeriti Herb Terry and Bruce Jaffee had a marvelous time in Tampa, and they are going to talk about that lovely time.

AGENDA ITEM 5: REPORT FROM THE COALITION ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

JAFFEE: Thank you, Carolyn. Let the record show that the weather was pretty cool in Tampa. [Laughter] We were indoors most of the time, and we missed, other than television, the IU/Michigan basketball game.

TERRY: And the superbowl.

JAFFEE: Well, in your case—[indistinct comment]. What I want to talk about or we'll talk about today is—is really the issue that face COIA at this annual meeting, and the process that was followed. I mean this is just a few days after the meeting. We don't have a report to share with you or findings within thirty to forty-five days, the steering committee will put a report based on the meeting together. It will certainly at that point be shared with the—with the full Council, but we thought it'd be useful for you to know what set the stage and what some of the key issues are because it's quite different than in the past.

As we've discussed before in the Council, COIA, the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics, is—is a virtual and loose coalition of approximately sixty-five faculty senates or faculty councils at universities in this country with major intercollegiate athletic programs. This year is the tenth year of COIA, and one of its founding faculty members who was—was at the meeting and played a lead in its organization is Bob Eno who's a former president of the BFC. COIA began now approximately ten years ago when Myles Brand, our previous university president was the president of the NCAA, and he was looking for faculty support for his academic reform agenda. He was successful in getting that reform agenda through with COIA's support, and we now have in intercollegiate athletics, higher and rising initial eligibility requirements for incoming student athletes. We have well publicized academic progress rates and graduation success rate reports that are well publicized down to the level of teams and universities. We have academic progress standards that really require student athletes to major in something and move toward graduation rather than essentially majoring in eligibility.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Don't hold back, Bruce.

JAFFEE: And—and—and we have penalties for schools and programs that don't meet these academic standards, and I just want to mention two that I think people are familiar with. When we had the, let's call it the chaos in our men's basketball program with poor academic performance and retention of student athletes, early in the Coach Crean years, we lost I think a total of three scholarships, and the University of Connecticut this year, you will not see in the

NCAA tournament regardless of its athletic performance because of very poor academic progress rates. So these rates have teeth and have consequences. The issue this year, though, is quite different. The NCAA has—my phrase—has blundered in a variety of different ways in terms of enforcement actions and policies, and it's undergoing major changes in rethinking in how it does business. Several significant staff members were at the meeting last weekend, as was the president of the University of South Florida, Judy Genshaft, who was on the NCAA Executive Committee, one of only about—the Knight—I think a seventeen-member committee, and only six of them represent the major powers, so it was useful to have her around for at least part of the day.

The NCAA has, as one of its initiatives, and there was much publicity about it last fall and last month when the NCAA convention took place, there's a major effort to both simplify and deregulate rules. The phrase "fair competition" has replaced the phrase "competitive equity" that has generated lots of rules historically imposed by the NCAA, the idea of making sure each school essentially had followed the same rules, and this concept of "competitive equity," therefore, is being replaced by something called, vaguely obviously, "fair competition." Rules now—now need to be "meaningful," "enforceable," and "promote student success," student athlete success. I'm not saying those are precise, and that's part of the issue, "meaningful" rules, "enforceable" rules, and "promotes student success." The concept is that rules that are deregulated, that have academic or student welfare implications, will move from the NCAA to possibly the conference level or the institutional level down to the particular school for setting possible standards; that is, in the academic realm, some rules will be now deregulated by the NCAA, and subject to new rules, or nothing for that matter, at the level of the conference or the individual level.

Examples of individual deregulated rules and nothing is—these are based on things that passed in January, but there will be another round later this year and probably for the next list is—is recruiting materials. It's hard to believe the NCAA currently has rules about brochures, whether they can be in black and white or color, how many pages they can be that go to recruits, and what they include. They have to include things like the graduation success rate. A significant one is contact information. Currently there are rules that restrict phone calls to prospects to one per week. They don't allow any text messages. They allow unlimited email contact, however. January said we don't care how much or often or how you contact prospective student athletes. Clearly the text message rule, as you may remember, affected one of our previous basketball coaches who isn't with us anymore. Snacks after practices—there is a—there used to be a rule that got a lot of bad publicity, calling ba—fruits, nuts, and bagels—we weren't allowed to provide any food for many years to student athletes after practice unless there was a meal involved, but you couldn't involve any snacks. About two years ago, you could

provide fruit, nuts, and bagels, not with cream cheese, just bagels. That's being deregulated, so if you want to provide—a

TERRY: —cream cheese—

JAFFEE: —whatever—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —snacks, I love it.

JAFFEE: What happens on—this one is probably more significant. What happens on recruiting visits when a prospect comes to campus, who's part of his or her family, what—how that's organized, who he or she can talk to is noW completely deregulated. Departure—another one that has a clear academic implication, is departure and return times for competitions. The Big Ten has rules on when students can leave campus for a basketball game or a football game or a track meet. The NCAA says we're not in that business anymore.

Academic support, I mean clearly we have discussed as a Council this before the academic support services that are provided under Memorial Stadium for student athletes. There are a variety of restrictions on—that limit the resources that can be provided to those student athletes even though it's well above the campus average to be sure, but that's now completely deregulated and you can provide now unlimited kinds of standards for student athletes. That's not an inclusive list, and more importantly, the list is likely to get longer at the next round later this spring or early summer, and—and next round. The key implication is what is going to be the—the institutional standards, if any, and what might the conference do and the critical issue is who is going to be involved in putting those institutional standards together, and how are they going to be enforced at the institutional level. Basically, the NCAA is out of it. [Indistinct comment] is whether or not COIA, which again is a virtual organization, what role it should play, or more close to the home, what should the Bloomington Faculty Council do in that regard. What's the role of, in our case, our Athletics Committee, which is much more involved and active and related to the Council than most campus athletic boards, and what should be the role of the faculty athletic representative, which at least being a former head of the Athletics Committee and a former faculty athletic rep, I think I'm biased I'm sure, I think the system works reasonably well here, much better than the national average, but I think there's a great opportunity here for more faculty involvement, especially in setting standards and expectations and rules for the way we conduct broadly defined academic activities for prospects and student athletes on this campus, and that's sort of a charge, I think, to the Bloomington Faculty Council.

The Steering Committee of COIA for which both Bob Eno and I are on, essentially its Executive Committee, are working to put together a set of principles, a set of ideas, a set of recommendations, in this regard of how faculty senates should fill this gap, and that's a report that will go to the NCAA and also the Presidents on the Executive Committee on the NCAA. So

this is an opportunity where the NCAA, both by pressure and I think logic, is loosening its hold, but that also creates a need potentially for more input in academic management down to the individual campus, and conference level, and how that's done is—and how effective that will be—is a big question.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Bruce, what is the animating reason for this lessening of—

JAFFEE: Let me let Herb—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —Okay, Herb still has—okay.

TERRY: I'll try and amplify the reason, but Bruce mentioned it, summarized it pretty well. Currently, the NCAA rule book's about six hundred pages, and indeed Mark Emmert's favorite anecdote about why it needs to be reduced is the bagel thing. You know, he does say it's okay to serve them bagels, but you can't serve them bagels with cream cheese, and he just don't think this is the purpose of the NCAA rule book. Being honest, I suspect there may be some other reasons, and Bruce may want to remain silent on this or whatever. One reason for deregulating would be to protect yourself against antitrust action. So at least one thing that the NCAA might, it certainly didn't admit this at the meeting, it may be trying to present—position themselves for is better defense against an antitrust case should we devolve into four, five major conferences, and, as it happened in football, they challenged the NCAA's monopoly over the basketball tournament, and that's basically the major source of the NCAA's money. So, it could be that they're trying to say, 'We don't control everything. We've deregulated a lot of it out into the schools and the conferences.' That would be helpful to them as a legal strategy.

One interesting thing, my academic field is telecommunications law and policy, and as you know, from the 1970s, the Carter administration forward, we went through deregulation of airlines and banking and telecommunications. We had an alternative, though. We could rely on marketplace forces. Here, the interesting thing is that one of the reason many of the regulations have existed is to protect against the impact of marketplace forces, and if you get rid of some of the regulations, and this sort, it may tempt schools to try to run their programs, even more they do at the present, in ways that are bound to their financial advantage, but maybe to the disadvantage of student athletes. I think I mentioned in this Council that—that we're taking $25 million from the Big Ten contract, and using it as partial funding for the International Studies building. The University of Kentucky's athletic department is giving $85 million to the campus for the construction of academic buildings there. In both cases, it's because the campuses have concluded that they can't depend on their state legislatures anymore to build them buildings, and they have to find other ways to find them. And athletics revenue is, as the president of University of South Florida put it, sustainable revenue, or at least it's more sustainable than some other sources that you might go on.

I asked her in the meeting two things. If this trend that was appearing in some parts of the country of presidents finding large amounts of money from their athletics departments was important, you know, and given all the ways all the things university presidents think about, how important is that and how big is it. And she answered basically this trend is both important and big. Now, she confronts problems where for the last four years, the state of Florida has provided no money for construction of anything for kindergarten through universities. Zero. Zero dollars. So it's important to her that she find new ways to get money, and getting it out of the athletic program is important. That's, I think, the underlying reason why I remain involved in COIA.

First of all, I believe student athletics is exceedingly important to this university. Those who were around during the Kelvin Sampson thing know that our reputation suffered as a university. It had adverse effects upon it. These things are very important to alums, and they're important to many of our students. While the attention focuses on the revenue sports—basketball and football—that money supports all of the other sports, and they bring us a lot of good students, and as a result of Title IX, they bring us a lot of good women. And I think, you know, if we stick our heads in the sand and say well, not interested in athletics, that's to ignore a very crucial part of this university, and yet we want it to function in a way that adheres as strictly as possible I think to what the NCAA has always said it's trying to do—to promote a collegiate model based on amateurism rather than a Olympic or semi-professional model in which all we are is the minor leagues for basketball and football. Most of our student athletes will not go on to professional careers in athletics, and what they need is a good education. And so I hope the outcome of this is to do that.

I'll add a few things from what Bruce said. First of all, remember that the NCAA is really an association of college presidents, and lot of what has driven academic reform in the NCAA in the last few years has been Myles Brand's, and now I think President Emmert's increasing attention to what the presidents want as contrasted with what the coaches and other might want. That helps make the NCAA a more academically oriented association. I would agree with Bruce; we're lucky. We have a system, that's been around here for a long time, where our Athletics Committee represents the faculty, used to be that we didn't actually name too many members to it, and now we do. It's a shared function with the president.

A controversy that arose at the COIA meeting was about the FARs. Under the NCAA rule, each institution has a faculty academic representative, but that faculty representative is selected by the president. I would agree with Bruce; we have a long history here of very strong, very good, independent faculty athletic representatives who represent the faculty while being selected by the president, but that's obviously not the case at every institution. We heard many reports from other universities of faculty athletics representatives who don't come, don't interact with

faculty leaders, don't attend the Athletics Committee meeting, and so forth, so a broader controversy for COIA may be whether these deregulatory functions should go somewhere other than the FAR because the FAR isn't representing the faculty very well. There may, however, be quite another reason for another representative, and I think that may be something we discuss later here. The FARs do a lot of work, and typically they are faculty members. Ours is Kurt Zorn at the moment. So Kurt's a faculty member, keeping up his teaching and research. He's an Associate—Associate Vice Provost? Assistant Vice Provost? No one would doubt Kurt's independence, and yet he's got a lot to do. And if this deregulatory thing goes forward at some speed, the FAR could end up having lots more to do, so one thing discussed repeatedly at COIA was whether our institution should suggest an additional FAR, a second FAR or something like that to better represent the faculty when it came to academic integrity, student life and related issues.

One thing that Bruce did not mention is that the NCAA is eliminating its certification process. That's been the big stick, or a big stick, on the part of the NCAA. It means there won't be every ten year comprehensive reviews or programs, and what the substitute will be, I don't know—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —Herb, may I ask you please to—

TERRY: —I will—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —wrap up.

TERRY: Finally, there was discussion on something that could ultimately have a lot of impact on us—student welfare, in terms of concussions and injuries in football. You know, those of you who follow football know that the players are suing the NFL. If you think about it, that could have huge implications for us down the line. We get our players from high school, the NFL gets players from college. If high schools decide that football is not a game that they can support because of its dangers and risk, the supply of athletes dries up. We could find major change in college football in the next few years and that has begun to be a discussion within the NCAA and at this conference. And the meeting Saturday went from 8:00AM-8:30PM. We did not get in the sunrise, sunset.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Thank you both for that important report. We have a few minutes for questions and I see Jim Sherman's hand.

SHERMAN: Bruce, I'm confused about one thing.

JAFFEE: That's pretty good. I usually confuse more than one. [Laughter]

SHERMAN: My understanding has been, and I've read—I've read various articles about it, that very, very, very few D1 schools, their athletic departments, are in the black. You can count

them on one hand. So where is all this money coming from that the university can get from athletic departments to do all these wonderful things when they're in the red? That includes I think almost all—maybe all of the Big Ten universities. So where's the money, unless they go further in the red?

JAFFEE: That—I think that's—I mean, that's a really good point. There are, you know, it depends in how you account these things, but there's maybe twenty or fewer schools that actually are in the black, and while the president—

SHERMAN: —We're not one of them.

JAFFEE: —No, we are one of them.

TERRY: We are one of them.

SHERMAN: We are?

JAFFEE: Yeah. So the reason we're in the black is because we're in the—we're a member of the Big Ten obviously that shares all its revenue equally, including money from the Big Ten Network and all the bowl games that the other Big Ten schools seem to go to. [Laughter] But you got to [indistinct comment] at the University of South Florida, which is basically a commuting school, there is a student fee for intercollegiate athletics that totals approximately $1,000 per student per year, and they have 46,000 students. You can do the math on that one. That's a lot of money, but that—and they, that is a huge—they may end up in the black because their—their—their student government approved close to $1,000 per year payment.

SHERMAN: So the students build the buildings.

JAFFEE: What's that?

SHERMAN: So, the students build the buildings.

JAFFEE: Yeah, sure!

SHERMAN: Right.

JAFFEE: But I do want to indicate something in the environment here that I think Jim's point is—is very well taken. There is an increasing gap between the have and the have-not schools in intercollegiate athletics. Clearly, and I think everybody who is explicit about this, the Big Ten decision to go to fourteen schools, and probably pretty soon to sixteen school, is driven with a—with—driven by money. The president said, hey, we want AAU member schools, but given that, go after money. And there's clear movement to maybe four or five conferences that primarily through bowl tie-ins and broadcast revenue, at least in the short run, will have pretty

good pots of money. But other conferences like the Middle America Conference of the Patriot League, second-tier conferences in a sense, will be getting further and further away from the big conferences and this deregulation is likely to widen the gap.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: I think we might have time for maybe one more pressing question. Someone has a question, you won't be happy unless you ask it? Yes?

JAMIESON: This deregulation I worry about, and I don't know if it came up in the conversation, but how—how are there going to be any standards?

JAFFEE: Well, the academic stan—I mean, that's a really good question, Lynn. The academic standards are staying. So the initial eligibility standards, the progress to degree, the APR stuff will remain the same.

JAMIESON: The recruiting and all of these things have been things that, you know, have gotten out of hand before, and had caused regulation, and now there won't be regulation of those.

JAFFEE: I think the—I—I wanted to specifically mention recruiting because you're absolutely right. At places like Colorado and I think at the University of Miami, I don't want to go into details, but there was pretty inappropriate recruiting activities for prospective student athletes. That—that—that's got to be of great concern to everybody nationally, obviously us locally, as well.

TERRY: And that raises a dimension that may interest this Council. One issue is whether a single school can deal with that or whether it will have to develop on a conference-wide basis. As Carolyn noted, we went to the meeting of the CIC faculty leaders a while ago. This could actually create yet another reason why faculty leaders of athletic conferences should get together from time to time to level the playing field at least among the schools within their conference.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Well, thank you. When the official report is issued, we could probably revisit this issue, but we do have guests in the house, and I think when people come they like to have an opportunity to present, so at this time, we will ask Vice President Brad Wheeler to tell us all the things we need to know about eTexts at IU.

AGENDA ITEM 6: eTEXTS AT IU BLOOMINGTON

WHEELER: Thank you. Greetings, faculty colleagues. This is my fourth time to appear before you to talk about digital textbooks at Indiana University, and it may be prudent to go ahead and just dispatch a couple handouts around since it will take a moment for those to get around. Could you guys start that around and follow with this one please? I hope that most of you know about the word eText or digital text at Indiana University. I continue to talk to faculty who have not

encountered that term before, which seems impossible to me as much as we have screamed it through megaphones and every communication medium known to man. Let me offer, firstly, very quick catch up for those of you who may not have been in this conversation before, and then what I want to do is report to you where we're at after the first full year of implementing the eText fee as an option, and what I see happening in the next few semesters going forward.

In 2009, we began our initial pilots of thinking about what will it be like as these consumer devices continue to proliferate, whether it's iPhones, iPads, Droids, Microsoft tablets, whatever it may be marching forward. It's very clear that the technology was going to march forward; Best Buy was going to pump it out to the rest of the world, and the concern is that we needed to get ahead of the game in shaping how we would buy content as textbooks go from fairly heavy physical things to digital over some amount of time. We began that with a few key policies. One is that our goal—we had four goals in driving that forward. The first is to reduce the cost of materials to students, part of reducing the cost of attendance. The second point is it needs to be the good stuff. If you want to teach with a thirteenth edition of that particular book from that particular publisher, we want to enable that. If it's open access materials, you want to bring in, if it's course packs that you author or edit, this still remains faculty prerogative. We wanted to be able to ensure that these weren't just one trick ponies of like trials, a special deal, but then the next year we couldn't really go there, and then fall apart after that, and we wanted to enable you to experiment with new forms of teaching and learning. So it was fairly clear that the software and the readers, the things that were evolving, enable you to do things that it's not easy to do right now, like for—if you read something compelling this afternoon, and your students were to read a chapter for class tomorrow, you'd have no way to go and add that right to that chapter. But in a digital textbook, you can. Bruce can go out, highlight that paragraph, literally, put a url to something he read, and he just updated every student's textbook, that particular paragraph with those software tools.

So, through two and a half semesters, we made it available to pilots. It was in language courses, science courses, some professional school courses, on different campuses, and finally in the late spring of 2011, we started getting to formal negotiations with the publishers about what the deals would be. We presented with many groups, talked to many student groups, and I want to say, this is one of the things when I talk to my colleagues at other universities, they kind of want to know how did you guys do it, and I said well we talked to everyone who would hold still and a few who wouldn't, and I appreciate the support of the graduate student association, the IU Student—the undergrad student association here and Indianapolis, and the faculty groups and everyone just said, 'Go, go, go. We've got to do something here.' So we worked this all the way through, and we finally did cut some deals with most of the publishers, not quite all of them yet, but many of them. And the way that we're doing this is, this is an option. If you like what you're doing right now and it serves you and it serves your students and prices are okay, do

what you want. But if you look at the cost of the materials that you're wanting to use, and we can offer a better deal through the eText option, then you should consider opting into it.

One of the things in the conversation with the students, we studies thirty sections in the earliest days of this, and looked at mostly big footprint courses. At the cost of buying a used textbook, and the cost—and what you get from selling back a used paper textbook, and we viewed that that really should be the high-water mark for what digital should cost, and most students—or I won't say most—many students do not have that experience. They may end up buying a brand new book, there are no used alternatives, new edition, et cetera… and they may not succeed in selling back for a whole variety of reasons. So the real cost of ownership to many students is not as privileged as what I suggested in buying used, and selling back used.

We've also seen some things that were a little bit disturbing over time, where students, for a fear of not getting in the used book sell back, are dumping books even ahead of final exams, and things like that—no, seriously. So the eText approach that we're using really eliminates all of those concerns. The other thing we were able to do through this, and it was really with everyone's support, is the initial offerings from the publishers were very much in the model of a paper book, and thinking how things may go forward, and they had crazy things like printing restrictions are only available on two devices, or you couldn't read them offline, or bunches of key codes and things like that, and we were able, through negotiations, to get rid of practically all of that stuff. So when students license in eText, they have it as long as they are a student at Indiana University. If it's a sophomore eText, then even all the remaining semesters, they can go back and look. Some may say, 'Well, you know, I kept my paper books from college, and I never really went back and looked at them.' I—I assure you, this version has a better search feature than the version there on your bookshelf. When you need to go back and look up something, and all of the annotations and things that are in there.

So, the handout you have in front of you, the one that has the yellow highlights, this is an update of where we're at. We began in—just a final point—make sure everyone understands the model—the essential trade in the deal with the publishers is if you will dramatically drop your prices, then we will give you our 100% sell-through in a section. So if there's fifty students in a particular instructor's section, and she opts in for her students to have digital text, then those are automatically made available through OnCourse, there's a tool for reading and annotation and such. The students do not have to go book shopping. They have electronic access, and they are bursar billed for the book. So a faculty member obviously shouldn't opt into something if it's not price favorable relative to what they can see out in the marketplace, but what you can also know in doing this is you can know that all of your students have the materials that are required for class this way, where we see a lot of variance in that. I will tell you, and this an appropriate venue to share, the number one concern we have heard from

students on all of these points is faculty listing required texts that are not used in the course. Not optional text. Buy-list optional, but required. That's the number one thing the students are fine, the conversations we've had about a lot of this, but if you say you're going to use and they're going to pay for, it needs to be material to the course.

So what you have in front of you in the first handout with the yellow highlights; that shows where we're at. In the spring was the first semester that we really rolled this out to broad availability. The numbers there are probably suppressed just a little bit. Our largest publisher at that time was Pearson, and they were not in the spring numbers. They did not come in until the sign-up for Summer and Fall classes, so—now, let me say that again. Pearson was not available for eText until January, until this present semester. So, when you signed up for ordering in the Fall, we were able to offer Pearson. We now have four out of five of our largest publishers, and then a number of a smaller publishers have opted in as well. We are just shy of ten thousand students this semester using them, just under about fifty-five hundred on the Bloomington campus, and two hundred and fifty sections in total.

To be clear on this, this is not only an alternative to a paper textbook. Many of you may be working with publishers who have tutorials or simulations or e-labs or videos or things. We—anything digital is what we're talking about. Our deals that we've worked out with the publishers are for even those simulations and such, and the reason I want to raise that is this is one of the most important economic angles that we're working here. When we talk about a paper book that is also available as a digital book, there are substitutes. You can make some choices there, but when you start to talk about an online learning experience, it's a simulation, my labs, exercises, things like that, and you assign it, particularly if it's graded and you make some material part of a course grade, may be based on performance and experience in that, there are no substitutes. There is no used book market. There is no competitor. It is a monopolistic good. And so, if we don't find a way to use some of the throw weight of the university, the heft of the university, to negotiate favorable terms for those, our students really would be thrown to a pure monopolistic pricing market for where that would go. There's even been some concerns raised in Canada about how that's unfolding up there as essentially it's required if grades are collected through it.

So, with that, the other two items that you have are—this stuff is in the press everywhere, and I want to say, when you read articles in the *Chronicle* or other places right now where they talk about eText this or that, almost always they are not talking about what we're doing. They are writing about a retail consumer experience where a student goes and buys an eText. It's not connected to the learning management system. It doesn't know who the classmates are. The instructor can't go out and annotate it. It often goes away after a hundred and fifty days or a hundred and eighty days. It may be tied to different devices. So the vast majority of what you're

reading is not the experience of what we are doing here. And with that, I'm happy—oh, there's—the other handout is just one from *The Atlantic*, and if you think the healthcare curve is scary, you see the graph there documented as well. I'm happy to take your questions.

RUTA: I'd like to say something just more of a comment, and kind of [indistinct comment] because IUSA has done a lot of research around the academic environment of IU in general, but eText in particular really got a lot of attention with the VOICE report—VOICE project—that you might have heard Provost Robel allude to in the last meeting. And really, we really see a big push from the students on further institutionalizing this, and really gaining support from all parties within the university, especially faculty adoption. We actually conducted two rounds of surveys from students, and we had—so, from last spring and this spring, looking at things like what kind of technology they're using, why they're using it, what they want to see, and everything is trending up. So we're in an environment where over eighty-two percent of the students have smartphones, and of those about seventy-five percent of them are using those smartphones for academic purposes. And it's the same with tablets. That's—everything is trending up, and people are starting to see that this—this mobile technology environment can really further their learning. And I—and eText is really well suited for that, I think. And so, one of the—one of the—and I think this might be changing with the adoption of Pearson, but most students—almost half the students didn't use eText in any of their courses last semester. So, there's—there's a lot of opportunity, I think to—to—and to increase the adoption we see in classes, so I'd just really like to kind of further the students' sentiment in saying that I think, in general, students really want to see a further institutionalized eText adoption.

WHEELER: If I could offer two other comments on this because last time I was before the Council, Herb asked about page fidelity. You know, you look on a Kindle, you don't know what page anything is. It doesn't match up the way it flows the text. The eText approach we have has full page fidelity to a printed book. Students can also get a printed book if they want. So I think that's been an important piece. Likewise, what students—two other things students have reported through the surveys in working with them. What they—one of the things that they value most is when faculty do use the tools to annotate the text and note things maybe on an exam obviously, provide links to other materials, say, and you can just mark it up and connect the book. They really value what the faculty do. Students have such a—from the beginning, it was extremely important to not make this a paper or digital debate. If they want to study by paper, provide a means of doing that, we have unlimited printing. Students can personally print the whole book, or they can get a nice bound version done. That is the perceptual measure of what students tell us. I will tell you the behavior data show they don't print much at all.

SEMADENI: On that point, you mentioned here the MBA core packet is electronic, and I teach in that program. I know you, in prior years, taught there as well. We—we've offered this for

two years, and they do—they don't—they all receive it electronically. Seventy percent also purchase the paper as well.

WHEELER: And in the MBA case—

SEMADENI: —and we're still very much in transition here.

WHEELER: Yeah. We are in transition. The MBA reading packet is a great example. It's a faculty authored set of materials. It has a couple of simulations licensed with it as well, and we cut the price of that in half. This is a twelve-hour course, as I recall. It's about—I forgot the price point. It was like about six hundred dollars, and we cut it roughly in half.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Other questions? Thoits and then Simpson.

THOITS: I'm really ignorant about this, alright? If I assign a text in a course, why doesn't the bookstore automatically offer students the choice of getting the paper or getting the e-version?

WHEELER: They do. And that's in a consumer model, and students can choose to not buy any of your materials. They can choose to buy digital and paper. They can—whatever, and that is a consumer retail price point. Our eText model really is the university buying wholesale, and then building it—I being metaphorical here, but it's a substantially lower price point to the students than what they would see retail.

THOITS: So, professors need to inform students that they'll get a better deal if they go with the university version of the eText?

WHEELER: No, so to be clear, right now if you want students to use an eText or a retail sales model or whatever, you don't need to involve any of this. If you choose to assign an eText through the eText program, when the students enroll, at the time of enrollment, when they pick a section, it will say that your section has an eText, and eText fee. It gives a price point there. They will automatically be billed for it on their bursar billing, and they will get it digitally when they long into OnCourse.

THOITS: I guess I'm confused about why that hasn't merged with the bookstore function.

WHEELER: The—in this—the bookstore function isn't really needed to get a text from McGraw-Hill to a student. Because it's not a paper book; there's nothing physical to put on a shelf. Let me catch you afterwards, and maybe...

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Grant, I believe.

G. SIMPSON: I'm interested in hearing about the agreement with the publishers and the persons that matter what requirements we have for disability accessibility of the textbooks.

WHEELER: Great question. This is an area we've worked very hard on, and particularly our adaptive technology center here has worked very closely. Courseload is the platform provider, and this is another key point. In the absence of the university taking a position in how we're going to receive eText, you would see a variety of publishers wanting a variety of different software platforms. So a particular a student might have four or five different pieces of software just to read books for a particular semester. We chose not to do that, and we've licensed a platform called Courseload. As you know, under federal law, we have to provide access for students with disabilities that may be hearing impaired, it may be difficulty with attention. There's a variety of disabilities—sight can be one of those as well. So Courseload has worked very, very closely on—with the National Federation of the Blind and others, of moving their accessibility forward.

The version we—that they put out for January that we are using right now is highly compliant. And these are one of these things, there's always sorts of shade of gray of everything, but they've done a remarkable job, and there's a short video posted that links off of our eText site. It shows what they have done in working with our center here with disabilities. We—as of the Fall, students who were sight impaired, could use JAWS and other things like that for reading the text, but the last step that we got for January is students authoring annotations to classmates or being able to navigate annotations that the instructor may have made.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: John, I believe, is next. John, did I see your hand?

PAOLILLO: Yeah. I had looked into whether there would be eTexts available for adoption for my courses. I found it extremely frustrating to use the search features. Are there going to be any improvements in that in the future, and—

WHEELER: —There are already. And you're right. We are pushing the publishers faster than their back offices ready to provide information for this, and we've worked really hard to iron that out a great deal. So that the website, as you note at the bottom, is the etext.iu.edu also, just in January, some tools have been released for your departmental administrative assistants and such, who may coordinate textbook ordering in the department. We've automated a lot of this from the faculty through the folks who are in school—have those responsibilities. If we haven't yet solved the problem you're after, send me a note to make sure, and I'd be happy to dig into it a bit more.

LAHERTY: I was just wondering if you could speak a little bit about the projects underway with the Office of Scholarly Publishing.

WHEELER: Yes. When you look at kind of a more economic sense of this, if we have faculty authors sitting here at IU, and they're laboring and putting out pretty good work, and then they're licensing those rights over to a publisher who's added some—some value, publishers

do. They do copyright clearance. They do layout. They do all—lots of editorial and such, but then by the time our students buy it back, you know, the faculty member didn't end up with that much money, but the students were paying a lot. Perhaps there's an opportunity to bring some of that in-house. And so we've long done that with course packs, but maybe we can do that in a more formal way that really writes textbooks, and so the Office of Scholarly Publishing, which is pulling together part of the press and eText authoring in some of the online journals. The Kelley School has launched two projects for in-house faculty authoring for being able to produce it digitally, and then take it to the students at a vastly discounted price.

So if I speak just one moment to the future. I think we're there in—it's all there. It works. It's getting better. The devices are going to continue to march on along. We're really at the point now of figuring out how to drive it further and faster. Comparisons are imperfect, and we can debate at great length with anyone, but I will tell you, when we looked at the roster from last Spring of the books that were in the eText program, and we did our own web shop, and what's the cheapest you can get it on Amazon, what's the cheapest on a buy and a sell back and all, conservatively, we can say our students last Spring saved a hundred thousand dollars through the eText deal, and I'm still finishing the final analysis for last Fall, but I feel pretty comfortable saying right now already more than two hundred thousand just from the Fall semester, and this will be our first semester of having Pearson in. So, there's real money to be saved here. The utility of it is growing. I do think we have to continue to find the most effective means of communicating with the faculty and schools and departments, and I will say our office—we remain very willing to come to departmental meetings; there's various seminars that the Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning runs. If there is—there's video on the website, little short snippet videos. So, if there's any way we can help, we would like to do so, and Fall book orders are due very soon. And the reason I say that is, this came from the students, we've worked with them. We don't surprise students. At the time they begin enrolling in March, we make clear if a student—if a section is opting in, so they don't have to go out and scurry and try to buy books, you know, on the open market and find it. So faculty making those choices early is very important. I appreciate everyone's time.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Well, thank you so much for coming and giving us such good information regarding eText. I think some of you know that library faculty and staff are very concerned about the effects that the construction of the new International Building will have on parking spaces at IU, so we've asked Doug Porter, Director, to come and tell us all about it.

AGENDA ITEM 7: PARKING CONCERNS SURROUNDING THE NEW INTERNATIONAL STUDIES BUILDING

PORTER: Well, I'm Doug Porter from Parking Operations, and there are probably a couple topics we could talk about related to parking, but I think the fifteen minutes I've been given, the topic is the library parking lot, and the area where the—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —Well we have thirty minutes, so if you—

PORTER: —Oh, we have thirty minutes? I was hoping we had fifteen minutes, so. Well, I'll see how much I can expand.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: [Indistinct comment]

PORTER: Just to give you a quick overview, I'm sure you'd probably rather ask specific questions, but to give you a quick overview of what we're talking about, the Global and International Studies Center building has been in the news for actually several years. They showed us a plan for that building probably three or four years ago, and funding wasn't available, and funding has become available, and so it's on the—at the top of the priority list for construction. The location will be to fill in an area between the main library and Radio and TV in the library parking lot. And so, unlike some building projects on campus that affect parking, it's not like a utility project where we can—we tear up an area, we can't use it for a while, but we put it all back together, and we get it back. It's not like remodeling a building that we do around here all the time, and we have a construction lay down area, but we get it back.

So this is new construction in an area that will definitely impact parking. The library parking lot is our biggest surface parking lot in the academic area. To find parking lots that are bigger, you have to go around to the parking lot adjacent to the residence halls that are out towards the Athletic Department. And so, it's a huge impact for the center of campus, and we don't have—again, we don't have very many projects like this, or haven't had in the past very many major projects like this—of new construction, new buildings, that have impacted parking on this scale. So, you know, the first thing it's going to create is really, definitely a new reality for that part of campus. Once this project's started, that area will never look like it did before. We won't have the opportunity to go back to the way it was before. So it's going to be a major change. It's my understanding that the building site itself will take up basically the west half of the parking lot, and just in round numbers, the parking lot has about four hundred spaces in it. It's about a hundred and thirty five "A" spaces. There are about two hundred "C" spaces. I think we're up to about forty-five parking meters in that parking lot. They're very—very short-term parking meters to get people in and out of the library. There are about twenty-five handicapped spaces in that parking lot, and we have fifteen or sixteen service vehicle spaces and reserved spaces that are primarily for department vehicles and for the service needs that we have in that area, since it—that parking lot, of course, serves—we call it the library parking lot, but it serves the library, Radio and TV, Fine Arts, the Auditorium at certain times, the Cinema at certain times,

definitely the Theatre Department, some smaller departments that are located on Seventh Street all suround that parking lot, and so people are going a lot of different directions other than just to the library.

So we're talking about four hundred spaces if the library—if the—if the building itself takes up the west half of the parking lot, that will be approximately two hundred spaces, and then the other half, the east half of the parking lot, is going to become predominately the construction area and the lay down area and the materials, and all the space that they need to be able to build this parking lot. So, not necessarily every single space will disappear. Currently, we hope that we can at least accommodate some handicap parking still in that area, and in the final plan, when it all comes together, there will be a new building, and there will be some of the parking lot, I think, in the plan returns. There will be extra landscaping, and so we won't get every single parking space back on the east half, but we'll get some of that back. So, the schedule, as I understand it, is to start construction right after commencement in May, very early in May, and I think it's probably a—maybe a two-year project. I'm not sure they can—I think that's kind of the schedule they'll be on, and I think they'll probably be pushing that, but… So, that's just the overview. So, I think probably the best way to proceed would be to let you ask questions.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Well, you know we're very concerned because this is going to affect students' capability for going to the library, so I'd like to know whether you're considering any innovative ways of addressing the loss of some of these parking spaces.

PORTER: To tell you the truth, I think that the—we think that students will still get there the same way they get now—get there now. So, during the day, the parking lot is "A" and "C," so it's a—a permit is required Monday through Friday. We do a little bit of enforcement on Sunday afternoon, but we usually don't enforce that parking lot on Saturdays, so it's available. If you have any kind of valid permit, you can park in the non-twenty-four hour spaces after five o'clock, so it's more likely that when the employees leave at the end of the day, that the students will move in the evening, but what we would tell students is that the main way to get around campus, if you live in a residence hall, you may be eligible for permit to park next to your residence building, but for the most part, everybody that lives off campus, we expect them to buy an "E" permit, park at the stadium, and ride the bus. So they may walk in, they may park elsewhere, they may ride a bike, they may not have a car, they may be riding with somebody. There are other options that they can use, but really, during the day, when you see all those kids out on Tenth Street, standing at that bus stop, and you see all the kids that pour off of those buses, and they're standing room only at certain times, that's really how we expect them to get to the library.

So, other than the fact that there's going to be this big construction site that they have to walk around, I don't think that it's going to impact them greatly. If they come back in the evening,

and we hope they come back to the library in the evening, if they have any kind if valid permit again, they can use the Eleventh and Fee Lane parking garage, and the Jordan Avenue parking garage. There's probably—combined there's about twelve hundred spaces in those two parking garages. So there are—they have—I think they have the access. So, I'm not so sure that we're—we're—we feel like we're going to be impacting the student population that much. The big—the big test or the big complication on this will be trying to get the employees close. And again, it's going to be a big change. Once this starts, it's not going to come back to the way it was. So, it may take—we may be trying to change a culture, which is going to be a lot more difficult than just directing people in certain—to a certain parking lot, or another way to get around.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: So I understand that two hundred staff work for the library.

LAHERTY: There's three hundred—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —Three hundred! Okay, thank you!

LAHERTY: In Wells alone—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —Okay, I was thinking two hundred—

LAHERTY: —[Indistinct comment]—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —Thank you. Yes? I believe Bruce, and then Walbridge, and then Herb, and then, in that order.

JAFFEE: So, what's the—what's your prediction of what's the future of the dorm parking on Seventh Street, west of Jordan, or the predominately dorm parking on the north side of Tenth Street, west of Jordan?

PORTER: Yeah, we [indistinct comment]—

JAFFEE: —[indistinct comment]—

PORTER: —the Tenth Street lot at Sunrise and Tenth Street. It's directly south of the Rec Sports center, and so it's the Health Center and cross town and that area. The residence halls would like to keep that parking as residence hall parking, and so I suppose there's a possibility that we could temporarily ask them to vacate some spaces. The long range plan, I think that that's the site of our next parking garage. And it takes a couple years to build a parking—to design and build a parking garage, so that's not something that's going to help us immediately on this. And if—if you look at the master plan for the campus, it shows a couple buildings on that site with a parking garage, and so I think we may not necessarily take the Tenth Street parking lot, which is about five hundred spaces, and we may not necessarily take the Tenth Street parking lot, and just necessarily put a deck on top of it. I think it's probably going to be shifted down a little bit

towards the Health Center, take up the grassy area where the old Nursing School building was that burnt down. There may be an access out to Jordan Avenue passed the Health Center, but I think that somewhere down the line, in the next couple of years, it'll be the site of the next parking garage, and that decision hasn't necessarily been finalized, and I think the—this deal we've got on the possibility a concession they're taking over parking maybe has slowed it down just a little bit, but I think we'll have a decision on that quick enough that it—it won't delay it too much.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: John, I believe you were next.

WALBRIDGE: Yeah, the other variable in this is that you're going to be moving fifteen to twenty units into the new building, most of which are now on the—basically along the south edge of the campus, the old quadrangle, Ballantine Hall, Atwater even. What is the provision for parking with reasonable access for people in those units?

PORTER: Well, you know, the parking situation is kind of like water flowing and finding its own level. People just kind of go where it fits, and where they're comfortable, and where it kind of makes sense. So there are things we can do with possibly rezoning some of the surface parking lots maybe to make up for the "C" parking that we're going to lose in this parking—that we're going to lose on this building site. There are some things that we can do in the way we manage the parking garages, specifically Eleventh-Fee Lane and Jordan Avenue, to try to free up spaces for employees. We'll, of course, promote the campus bus system. I think we'll probably talk to them about the possibility of a more specific route, and maybe something a little bit more dedicated to—to employees, to get them in. We've got, and I preach this all the time, and then people usually don't believe me I guess, but we have empty spaces every single day. We've always got a place to put people's cars. It's just trying to get them close enough. It's a convenience issue. And so, if there are—if there is possibility in any way that we can make the spaces, say north of Seventeenth Street, more attractive, which really, on a straight bus line down Fee Lane to Tenth Street, can get you there in just a few minutes, those are the kinds of things we'll try to promote.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Herb?

TERRY: You addressed the Tenth Street garage. I mean, the one thing I would point out is that ever since Trustee Talbot, when this International Studies building has come up at a Trustees meeting, she or some other Trustee has asked what about parking, and the Trustees have basically been told that this parking ramp in—on Tenth Street is coming in very soon, and will solve the problem. So—so there's that. But that leads to another issue, which is, you know, not for you, but for Tom Morrison. This is yet another example of our—our chronic failure to plan for the infrastructure needs of the buildings that we build, whether it is—whether we have the

cooling capacity for them or the parking for them, or the telecommunication services for them, we repeatedly build buildings, and then for several years, we try and figure out how to build what we should have built [indistinct comment]. I would hope that in the future, since the state is not going to build buildings for us, that we have a way of folding into these construction projects the necessary infrastructure to support whatever we build, and we do it concurrently rather than consecutively.

PORTER: We've got a long history—excuse me, we've got a long history of following the problem, and so we built the Poplars garage because the university took over the Poplars building, and added all those administrative offices. We waited 'til that happened, then we built the Poplars garage. We built the Tenth and Fee Lane parking garage, and—which turned into the Eleventh and Fee Lane parking garage, but we built the Tenth and Fee Lane parking garage because they attached SPEA to the School of Business, and all the sudden we had a big panic on that side of—side of campus. We built the Jordan Avenue parking garage after we built the School of Education. So, we've kind of—and maybe the Henderson parking garage, where my office is located, is—is the exception to that model, but, you're exactly right, that we're always a little bit behind, and I think we can build—we—we could probably build a parking garage faster than they can build this building.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: [Indistinct comment]

G. SIMPSON: I recently met with the library professional staff, and they gave me a whole list of concerns that I can pass along, but I think the two key points that they had were what to do in the meantime, and then what to do after. In terms of the meantime, they don't feel like they've been told what their options are other than, you know, take the X bus or bike. So—so they would like to have some articulation about what—what the parking around there, what the options could be.

Secondly, in terms of the long term, there's a general sense that what's going to happen is a garage that's going to move everyone to needing "A" stickers, and there's a huge concern that especially in the lower salary bands for the library staff, that's not going to be affordable, and so they, you know, they wanted me to communicate the fact that the sort of "'A'-or-pay" kind of approach is going to drastically shift what the sort of parking culture there is now.

PORTER: Well, I would mention that I'd be glad to come over to the library and meet with them. I'd really like to hear what their suggestions are, and I'd be glad to talk to them about what—what some of the possibilities are. And I'm available to do that. In—in the past, when we build a parking garage, we've assumed that people with an "A" permit can use that parking garage, and so, in those areas where we build a parking garage, we've had pretty good luck changing surface "A" spaces to "C" spaces to try to make up for a loss of the "C" spaces. The

Henderson parking garage is on a site that was predominately “C” spaces, and so the people that have “A”—“A” permits can park in the Henderson parking garage, but we went both directions, to the east, along Atwater, and down Indiana Avenue, and changed surface “A” spaces to “C” spaces, so where we can do that, we usually don’t have the opportunity to increase the number of “C” spaces, we’d like to try to maintain the status quo. So, we’ll be looking for the opportunity to try to do that again.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Anymore—oh, yes, I’m sorry. Jim?

SHERMAN: I just want one promise, Doug, that you won’t take any or all of the Arboretum and turn it into parking.

PORTER: Well, I’ve threatened to do that. I’ve threatened to turn in a work request to pave Dunn Meadow or Dunn’s Woods or the Arboretum, and I continually get turned down, so I don’t think that—I don’t think that’s going to happen.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: I don’t think so.

SHERMAN: Please don’t make any requests.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Other concerns, issues, questions, comments? Yes?

SHAPSHAY: Just a small one, if a number of people assigned to bike in instead of trying to find parking or take the bus, will there be additional bike racks put in the library area?

PORTER: I think they’ve been pretty good about putting in bike racks where they’ve been requested, and parking operations does pay for most of the bike racks on campus. Very few are added in for—by anybody else on campus, so if you’ve got a door of a building, a side of a building, sometimes we, you know, we put them in one location, and that’s not the direction people are coming, and so they don’t give us credit for that, or they don’t realize that they’re there. So, if you’ve got a suggestion on a place where we need bike racks, let me know, but I can assure you that we’ll have some bike racks in this project. I’m not exactly sure how many.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: I hear sounds of silence. I take it that we have exhausted our questions, and that we wish to adjourn. Let it be. Thank you.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 5:15PM