

Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
February 3, 2015
Kelley School of Business – CG 1034
3:30 P.M. – 5:30 P.M.

Attendance

MEMBERS PRESENT: Abhijit Basu, Andy Braden, Michelle Chung, Carrie Docherty, Lori Duggan, Nathan Ensmenger, David Estell, Lessie Jo Frazier, John Gibson, Thomas Gieryn, Gerhard Glomm, Dennis Groth, Brady Harman, Jeff Hass, Bradley Heim, Timothy Hoch, Jonathan Karty, Bradley Levinson, Jon Lozano, Jon Macy, Patricia McManus, Joseph Miller, Sharlene Newman, John Paolillo, Jennifer Pearl, Jamie Prenkert, Deanna Reising, Lauren Robel, Ben Robinson, Steve Sanders, Jim Sherman, Catherine Sherwood-Laughlin, Jon Simons, Rebecca Spang, Geoff Sprinkle, Cassidy Sugimoto, Frances Trix, Justin Vasel, Nona Watt

MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT: Herbert Terry (Don Gjerdingen), James Wimbush (David Daleke)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Joelle Bahloul, Marlon Bailey, David Baxter, Purnima Bose, David Fisher, Alyce Fly, Laura Ginger, Krista Glazewski, Margaret Gray, Daphna Rae Greiner, Israel Herrera, Ed Hirt, Gretchen Horlacher, Cheng Kao, Karma Lochrie, Laura McCloskey, Michael McRobbie, Leslie Rutkowski, Micol Seigel, William Swanson, Alex Tanford, Mikel Tiller, Michael Wade, Rega Wood, Sun-Un Yang

GUESTS: Catherine Dyar (Office of the Provost); Linda Gales (CWA Local 4730); Debbie Lemon (Board of Trustees); Xiqian Liu; Ashleigh Sherman (Indiana Daily Student); Tanner N. Terrill (Disability Services)

Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/minutes/14-15/01.20.15.pdf>

2. Memorial Resolutions for Charles Jelavich and Colleen Kristl Pauwels

Charles Jelavich: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/14-15/B24-2015.pdf>

Colleen Kristl Pauwels: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/14-15/B25-2015.pdf>

3. Executive Committee Business (10 minutes)
(Faculty President Jim Sherman)

4. Presiding Officer's Report (10 minutes)
(Provost Lauren Robel)

5. Question / Comment Period¹

6. BFC Resolution on AAUP Centennial Declaration (35 minutes)

(Professor Ben Robinson) [FIRST READING]

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/14-15/B26-2015.pdf>

7. Update on Government Relations (35 minutes)

(Faculty President Jim Sherman, Mike Sample, Vice President, Public Affairs and Government Relations and Jeff Linder, Associate Vice President, State Government Relations) [DISCUSSION]

8. Old Business/New Business

Minutes

AGENDA ITEM 1: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

SHERMAN: I – I assume that Lauren will be here momentarily, but why don't we get started with things we can get started with until she gets here. So, the first item is approval of minutes from – from January 20th? Is that the only date, Craig?

DETHLOFF: Yeah.

SHERMAN: Okay. Alright. So do I hear a motion for approval of minutes from January 20?

GIERYN: [Comment indistinct]

SHERMAN: Second? All in favor? [Aye] Okay, opposed? [Silence] Those minutes are approved. Tom, do you want to do the memorial resolutions?

AGENDA ITEM 2: MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS FOR CHARLES JELAVICH AND COLLEEN KRISTL PAUWELS

GIERYN: Charles Jelavich was born and grew up in the Santa Clara valley town of Mountain View. Now part of the densely settled "Silicon Valley," Mountain View when Charles lived there was a small community surrounded by orchards. His parents, immigrants from the Austrian Empire with only grammar school educations, were cherry and apricot farmers. Charles played

¹ Faculty who are not members of the Faculty Council and who wish to address questions to Provost Robel or President Sherman 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

multiple sports in high school and also did well enough scholastically to receive two scholarships to continue his studies at the nearby University of California, Berkeley.

“I was going to start out by taking Spanish,” he explained in a 2005 interview conducted by emeritus professor Robert W. Campbell. “I had to make a choice of a language, and a very good friend of mine said, ‘What language are you going to take?’ I said that I was going to take Spanish, and he said, ‘Why?’ ‘Because it is the easiest language.’ He said, ‘That is a hell of a reason for taking a language.’ I said, ‘What should I take?’ He said, ‘Why don’t you take Russian?’ I didn’t even know where Russia was. Not knowing any better, I decided to take Russian to study Slavic languages.”

Charles very soon found out where Russia was and how much he delighted in learning Russian, Serbo-Croatian, and a few more European languages. He completed his bachelor’s degree at Berkeley in 1944 in Slavic languages. In the same year he married Barbara Brightfield, a fellow student, and began a life-long intellectual collaboration with her.

After a stint in the U.S. Army from 1944 to 1946, where he acted as an interpreter in the office of the Supreme Headquarters, Allied Expeditionary Force, Charles returned to Berkeley to complete his master’s and doctoral degrees (in 1947 and 1949 respectively), this time in history. He joined the faculty of the Department of History at Berkeley, teaching in his special area of Balkan and Hapsburg history. He progressed through the ranks from instructor to associate professor.

A source of disappointment, however, was the inability of his wife, now Barbara Jelavich, to obtain a teaching position at Berkeley, despite her impressive accomplishments as a published scholar of diplomatic history. Robert F. Byrnes, chair of the Department of History at Indiana University, seized this opportunity to lure the Jelaviches to IU with the offer of a professorship for each of them. Byrnes was then in the process of building the largest program of Russian and East European studies in the country. The addition of Charles and Barbara Jelavich soon made IU the premier U.S. school for the production of historians in the fields of Central Europe and the Balkans.

The main focus of Charles’s research throughout his career was modern nationalism among the peoples of the Balkan Peninsula. He produced two major monographs on this subject, *Tsarist Russia and Balkan Nationalism: Russian Influence in the Internal Affairs of Bulgaria and Serbia, 1879-1886* (University of California Press, 1958), and *South Slav Nationalisms: Textbooks and Yugoslav Union before 1914* (Ohio State University Press, 1990). During the thirty-two years intervening between these books, Charles was not idle. He co-wrote or co-edited with Barbara six additional books on Balkan history, and produced another essay collection, co-edited with

Tihomir Vulovic, on modern literary developments in Yugoslavia and America. He also published more than thirty scholarly articles on related topics.

Recognition and support for his scholarly work came from a variety of sources, including the Ford Foundation, Social Science Research Council, American Philosophical Society, American Council of Learned Societies, National Endowment for the Humanities, Fulbright-Hays, International Research and Exchanges Board, Woodrow Wilson Center, Mellon Foundation, and Indiana University. In 1992 the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, the leading North American professional organization for specialists in Russian and East European fields, jointly bestowed on Charles and Barbara its highest honor, the Award for Distinguished Contributions to Slavic Studies.

Charles was an enthusiastic advocate for foreign language and area studies education. He was regularly asked to serve on national and international committees of Slavic Studies and to organize international conferences and workshops. He also served on the editorial boards of nine scholarly journals, most with an interdisciplinary profile. His service to the profession culminated in his election to the presidency of the interdisciplinary American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies in 1987.

Despite his many contributions to interdisciplinary organizations, Charles believed firmly that scholars ought to find their home in a disciplinary department. "I think that a student should have a degree in a discipline," he explained to an interviewer in 1993, "and then you should take courses in other fields. Degrees in Slavic Studies were worthless because who knew what to do with these people? We had students [at Berkeley] with PhDs in Slavic Studies... and it was a disaster. Who would hire them?" Experience had taught him that a Russian department would want only instructors with a Russian degree, a history department a scholar with a history degree. So, while Charles promoted area studies, he thought that specialists should get a broad view of the field at an early stage and then concentrate on a disciplinary field for their PhD.

He also had strong feelings about what he believed was an illegitimate pairing of East European studies and Russian studies. He spoke passionately for the study of East Europe and East Central Europe for their own sakes and regarded these regions as belonging more to the sphere of European than of Russian history. But Charles conceded that the creation of centers of Russian and East European studies was necessary during the Cold War. "We would never have gotten one penny [for East European studies] from the United States government if we tried to separate Russia and Eastern Europe," he declared in the 1993 interview.

Charles's professional engagement and strong opinions made him a sought-after teacher. He was a popular undergraduate teacher who introduced many Indiana students to what for them

must have been a remote and mysterious corner of the globe. The widest impact of his teaching was, however, at the graduate level. He inspired many young people in our master's degree programs in history and in area studies to go on to careers in the field of Russian and East European studies. Among these were Robert Gates, later Director of the Central Intelligence Agency and Secretary of Defense. A number of other students of Charles went on to distinguished careers in the Foreign Service.

At the PhD level, he and Barbara shared duties, regularly supervising the studies of a couple of dozen candidates. Charles himself served on more than fifty dissertation committees, and together they produced fifty-nine PhDs at IU. One of his doctoral students, Nick Novosel, recently commented that, "classes with Charles were always entertaining—often a whirlwind of the exploits of Serbs, Croats, Slovenes, and other East Europeans," with an occasional pause to let people catch their breath. Novosel continued, "Above all... mentoring was where Charles excelled. His characteristic integrity, consistency, and reliance on common sense were trademarks."

Charles was also a good mentor to his two sons. Both became academics, Mark a professor of economics, and Peter an intellectual historian.

Charles's greatest legacy is undoubtedly his students. They can be found throughout the United States and abroad in college teaching positions, university administration, government service, and international organizations.

Finally, no biography of Charles would be complete without mentioning his enthusiasm for sports. In high school he played football, basketball, and baseball, and his interest in sports continued throughout his career. He was a lifetime season ticket holder to IU basketball and rarely missed a game. As for baseball, his San Francisco Bay Area roots endured in his support for the Giants. He and Barbara traveled to Cincinnati to catch a game when the Giants were in town.

Colleen Kristl Pauwels, Associate Professor of Law and Director of the Law Library Emerita at the Maurer School of Law, passed away on April 24, 2013 at the age of sixty-seven in Bloomington, Indiana. Colleen served as Director for over thirty years, and under her leadership the Law Library flourished. Her energy, creativity, and unfailing optimism left a lasting impact on the Law Library and all those who were fortunate enough to work with her.

Colleen was born Chicago and spent her early years in Washington, Indiana until her family moved to South Bend, Indiana where she attended grade school and high school. In high school Colleen was a state champion swimmer in breaststroke, fueling a competitive spirit and desire to excel which remained through her entire life. She received her A.B. from Barat College in Lake Forest, IL in 1968. She moved to Bloomington in 1971 with her husband, where he

attended graduate school. During this time Colleen began working in the Government Documents Department at the University Library (now Wells Library). This experience convinced her to pursue a career in librarianship, so she began taking classes at the School of Library and Information Science while continuing to work full-time. In 1975, shortly after completing her M.L.S., Colleen accepted an appointment as Public Services Librarian at the Indiana University Law Library.

Although she had no thoughts of spending her entire career at Indiana, fate had a different idea. In 1978, after being at the Law Library for only three years, she was named Acting Director. This was supposed to be a short-term appointment, but it became obvious to everyone that this position was a natural fit for her talents and vision, and she officially became the permanent Director in 1983. Concluding that a law degree was essential to her success, Colleen began taking courses, completing her J.D. at Indiana University in 1986, just three years after starting classes while continuing to work full-time.

Colleen inherited a library that urgently needed more funding, more staff, and more space. She always explained her enormous success by claiming that it was easy to look good in the early days because doing anything made one appear to be a genius. As usual, she was being too modest. Under Colleen's leadership the Law Library was transformed from a facility that struggled to meet the basic needs of its faculty and students to a nationally recognized legal research facility. The collection grew in size and strength, and she brought together, and retained, a highly qualified staff. Colleen believed that the most important thing was for a library to provide topnotch service, and she often stated that she was most proud of the many services offered by the Library's outstanding staff.

The Library's space problems were addressed when funding was received to build an addition to the Law School, which was completed in 1986. Colleen was an integral part of the planning for the addition and renovation project. It was during this time that her talent for space planning first became evident. From that time until her retirement in 2011, every building or renovation project in the Law School benefitted from Colleen's good sense, careful eye, and excellent taste.

Colleen's research was primarily focused on the Maurer School of Law, and she wrote numerous articles on its history. She was keenly committed to preserving this history, conducting oral history sessions with faculty, staff, and graduates, and building an archive for the Law School within the Library. She became the "go to" person for any question dealing with the School's past.

Colleen's influence extended beyond the walls of the Law School. Recognizing the need to mentor the next generation of law librarians, Colleen established a course, "Legal Bibliography

and Law Library Administration”, through the School of Library and Information Science. This course has been taught annually for more than thirty years, helping to start the careers of many law librarians. She also served as an inspector on numerous American Bar Association site Inspection Teams, lending her advice and expertise to other law librarians in the country. Colleen also used her space planning expertise in serving as the head of the building committee that planned and executed a major renovation at her church.

Shortly before her death Colleen was inducted into the Academy of Law Alumni Fellows, which is the highest honor the Law School bestows on its graduates. This award recognized her many years of dedicated service to the School.

Beyond her professional accomplishments, Colleen was always most proud of her family. She leaves behind her husband, Gerry, a retired attorney and accomplished actor. She is also survived by her children, Erin, who is currently completing her Ph.D. in Art History at Indiana University, and Matt, who works in the health care industry in Bloomington.

For her entire career, Colleen was a tireless advocate for the Law Library. Her impact is apparent everywhere you look, both in the Law Library and the Law School, and her loss is deeply felt by all who knew her.

AGENDA ITEM 3: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE BUSINESS

SHERMAN: Rise for a moment. [All rise] Okay, thank you. [All sit] Okay, I have a couple of announcements. As I think most of you know the – the Executive Committee meets every other Tuesday and one of its – one of its important roles is to set the agenda and discuss possibilities for an agenda. So, you know, what you end up seeing on the agenda has gone through lots of discussion. There are items that we think are going to go on and then they – we decide they’re not quite ready. And other items that we want to put forward quickly, so if anyone has any problems with the agenda they should get in touch with the Executive Committee because it’s – it’s done as a group. And typically at Executive Committee meetings the first hour is spent with members of the Executive Committee talking about the agenda, the possibilities, and – and other issues and then the second hour typically Lauren joins us so that we can integrate with her, talk about the agenda and get her input and feedback – right on cue!

ROBEL: I’m sorry.

SHERMAN: I – I had a feeling that maybe you were in the Georgian room waiting.

ROBEL: Well, it’s even worse, I was on the phone with a trustee and thought we were meeting in the Georgian room, so... I miscalculated.

SHERMAN: Well, you're not late because we're just at my presentation of the Executive Committee, so...

ROBEL: Thank you very much [comment indistinct]

SHERMAN: So I actually have two announcements. If you recall in the December meeting of the BFC we – we passed a resolution supporting a student resolution regarding fossil fuel divestment, and as a continuing part of that movement by the students – both graduate students and – and undergraduate students – they have put together a panel of experts. The panel will take place on February 20th, a Friday, from 12 noon – 1:30 in the Maurer School of Law in the Moot Court Room. The panel consists of four faculty members. I'm sure many of you know many of the panel members. There's Ben Brabson from the department of Physics, David Haberman from Religious Studies, Dan Cole from the Law School, and John Maxwell from the Kelley School of Business. So it's a pretty expert and wise panel, and I bring this to your attention. Their – their goal is to do a couple of things, to increase awareness of the fossil fuel issue both locally and globally and to advance the conversation about ways to deal with global warming and fossil fuel use. So I'm sure you will see announcements of it throughout campus between now and February 20th, and if you have any questions about it, Brady Harman, who's the GPSO representative is here and there and everywhere.

So that – that's one announcement. The second announcement, I want to bring to your attention again the fact that we are required to put forward a university-wide consistent policy on sexual misconduct that will meet the requirements of the Office of Civil Rights, the Department of Education, Title IX, and will also meet our own aspirations as a university for protecting victims of sexual assault, making it easy for them to express what happened to them in a safe way, and at the same time protecting the rights of anyone who's accused. And I've told you before that Emily Springston and Jenny Kincaid have been the leaders of – of putting forward this policy and they've been helped by a university-wide committee, and after several meetings there is a policy that has now been posted that you can find online, and they are right now, for this last week or so traveling around to all campuses. And they will be here in Bloomington Friday, three days from now, the 6th of February from 2-4 PM at Whittenberger. I sent them an e-mail late yesterday I believe, asking whether they were going to make some announcements of this throughout campus, and – and indeed they are. I think it will probably come later today. So this will go to students, faculty, staff, all are invited, and I hope there will be a good turnout. After – Bloomington by the way, is the last of their meetings, their town hall meetings, and I think I told you on February 17th, this body will have a final discussion of the policy with any feedback, additional requests, or whatever, and Jenny and Emily have agreed to be here on February 17th. And then on 24th of February, there's a UFC meeting in Indianapolis, and the policy will be on the agenda for – for vote, because we are required to have this policy

in place by now. They agreed to an extension. So that will be done. Any input, any feedback, any suggestions, we have about probably until the 17th, so we have a week and a half. And I think that concludes my reports.

ROBEL: Thank you so much, Jim. And before we move forward would you like to make your request?

INTERN: Yes. I am an intern with the media team at the Office of the Provost, and we're doing a story with Cassidy Sugimoto and – don't be embarrassed – and so we were hoping to get some film of the BFC meeting without audio. So if anybody is uncomfortable with me filming them, just let me know and I'll make sure to avoid you. Thank you. [Laughter]

AGENDA ITEMS 4 AND 5: PRESIDING OFFICER'S REPORT AND QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

ROBEL: [To Cassidy] Except you. In my yoga class we typically do that by saying just signal with your hand and we'll have a look around. So please just signal if you're uncomfortable and don't want to be on – on video. There is no audio.

INTERN: No audio.

ROBEL: So – although I suppose someone could sync up our verbatim transcript in some form. I just wanted to – [multiple indistinct side comments].

Well, hello everybody. I – I'm so glad to see you and – and very sorry to have had to miss the last meeting. I agreed to serve on the – the board of the National – the NSSE, National Survey of Student Engagement, and silly me, I thought that would probably be in Bloomington since it's in Bloomington. But no, the national meeting was not in Bloomington it was in Washington on the very day of our last meeting. So let me give you just a few updates on some things around the campus that the Council has discussed in the past or will be discussing in the future. First, I wanted to update everyone about where we were with the Education review. John Applegate and I met with the policy committee at the School of Education. I guess it's about a week and half, two weeks ago maybe. Before that we had solicited from them any additions or changes they would like to make to the – to the charge – to the Blue Ribbon Commission that is coming in in order to make it fit the needs of the School of Education. The policy committee met with the school and came back with a revised charge and we just accepted all of their suggestions. The other issue that was pending with the School of Education were the members of the Blue Ribbon Commission. We had solicited names at a faculty meeting with the school. We had gotten a lot of names. At that point we had gone through kind of some background work on figuring out who was there. We then met with the School Policy Committee and had asked them ahead of time if they might solicit names and evaluate them – vet them for us – so that we could put together a Blue Ribbon Commission that was actually responsive to the charge

that they had helped us craft. They did that. They submitted a set of names in each of the categories they thought were important and all of whom they thought would be acceptable, and we're in the process of trying to recruit the last members of the Blue Ribbon Commission for that particular initiative.

The – the other initiative that is kind of in process right now is around engineering. There's been a group of faculty members who had been meeting to produce something that could be shared with, again, a group of experts from outside. These are the – the composition of that group was announced in, I think, November. The team that's coming in will come in at the end of February. I want to say around then, somewhere the 23rd – maybe of February 23rd and 24th, but don't hold me to that. Jim Duderstadt is heading up that group and it – it looks like it will be a fantastic group. The work product from the faculty group will be shared with that group and then will go out to the campus after that, once we've gotten their reactions to it and any changes the faculty is interested in – in making.

I am happy to report that we will be announcing later today that Rick Van Kooten has accepted the position of vice provost for research, and I'm absolutely thrilled about that. Rick is a – a phenomenal faculty member in the Physics department. He is – he's just great and will be, I think, a lot of fun to work with. I'm also happy to let you know that Ed Comentale has accepted the position of associate vice provost for research in the humanities, and my attention turns now to the position of the associate vice provost in social science, and so if you have thoughts about people I should be considering it would be really helpful if you would just e-mail me.

And I think the final thing I'd just like to mention is we – the Dean of Students' Office working with the Student Government Association has – is piloting right now an initiative called CAPS-Now. CAPS is Counseling and Psychological Services. The hope was to be able to make a commitment to the campus that if a student presented with a psychological – with psychological concerns or mental health concerns we could get someone into a counselor within 48 hours understanding that we – we would triage those calls so that if somebody was in the kind of distress that warranted, you know, immediate – getting them in immediately we would do that. I'm – I am happy to say that we added some staff and that we – we've been able consistently to meet that commitment this semester. The – the statistics on usage are up point on point over last year by something like 80%, so it's obviously a – a need for the campus, and I'm in continuing conversations with – with Dean Goldsmith about, you know, what we need in terms of ongoing support for Counseling and Psychological Services. It's a big issue for all of us. And I also want to give a shout out to IUSA, which has been a wonderful partner in this initiative, and to the students who volunteer for Crimson Corps you probably know a lot about Crimson Corps already, but if you don't it's a group of student volunteers who go through training to be available as peer counselors in places where students frequently are, they are –

they wear particular kinds of t-shirts so that they're easily identified. They're in the residence halls and lots of other places. And they're not intended to be replacements in any way, shape, or form for mental health counselors, they're intended to be approachable peers who are trained to recognize and encourage reaching out to – to CAPS in appropriate circumstances. So with that I think that's all I have to say at this point. Are there questions from the Council? Oh, great.

SHERMAN: So, that's to keep on time their –

ROBEL: Terrific.

SHERMAN: – because their time is valuable.

ROBEL: Well, we're in the bi – there – you know – we're in the biennium with the state legislature where we're – we're – looking at budgetary issues, and so yes, I am sure their time is valuable for all of us. Alright. So at this point the next thing on our agenda is a resolution on the AAUP centennial declaration, and for this I recognize Professor Ben Robinson for a first reading.

AGENDA ITEM 6: BFC RESOLUTION ON AAUP CENTENNIAL DECLARATION

ROBINSON: Well, that went fast. Okay, I actually have – thank you, Lauren and thank you – thank you, Jim. I don't know the procedure. I have a sort of PowerPoint thing. Should I just go up and do that and then – and Steve, as parliamentarian amend – read? What is the first reading? I read the whole thing? [Laughter]

ROBEL: I – I say hold back.

SPANG: [comment indistinct]

SANDERS: I think the chair can – you can request that we dispense with the literal reading.

ROBINSON: [comment indistinct] Reading. But I will read the “whereas” and then –

SPANG: You can read dramatically.

ROBINSON: What's that?

SPANG: Well, we could stage it.

ROBEL: Within the bounds of knowing that at 4:30 we're going to connect electronically with our Governmental Relations people, so use the time as you think best.

ROBINSON: Okay. That's good. That's helpful. Alright, so let me begin before I read just a little bit of background, and the – let me just give the sense of the background in the sense of what's – of what motivates the resolution.

It is as the title makes clear its AAUP's centennial. It's their 100th anniversary since they issued their 1915 *Declaration of Principles on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure*, and the 100th anniversary declaration as you see has some very – and this has come up in the discussion. I've heard it in feedback. It has some very pointed language, and so in presenting it I want – I want us to be aware of the language. I want to give us the sense of why the AAUP might feel that it needs to use that language, but I also want to make clear that it's not language directed at our administration or at our faculty or our institution *per se*. It's language that has developed in order to have institutions and shared governance bodies think about the situation that we're all collectively facing, so trends – national trends – indeed global trends in higher education, and to get us to think about it holistically. And I think when – one of the ideas that the president and the committees of the AAUP are trying to foster is that when we deal with aspects of what they call austerity frameworks, corporate budgets, and in general the trends away from understanding education as a public good. When we deal with these issues in a piecemeal fashion, sometimes we don't see the big picture of the stakes, and the stake is precisely that. That we – that education becomes less and less – public higher education, in particular – becomes less and less a public good and more and more a private benefit, and the – so the sense of the PowerPoint is just to give a little bit of context for it. Actually, this first slide [comment indistinct], but I did pull up [comment indistinct] figures. I was hoping I could link to that, but I – it's not a live link, but this is from the *Chronicle of Higher Education* and it's a wonderful interactive graphic for – you can – you can choose universities by highly active research university, geographical, and you can see very clearly that this isn't a trend just in Indiana, it's a trend all over the place. But I pulled out the statistics from Indiana, and I think we're all familiar with them, but it just seems in this context it's worth having them in front of our eyes again. So the share of state revenue 'til 2012 – the share of state revenue over that period has gone down almost 25%, so from 46.4% to 21.8% is the share of state appropriations in the revenue of IU, and in that same time period the share of revenue from tuition has gone from 19% in 20 – to 19% – no – what do I have? In '07 it was 19% and in 2012 it's 45%. So those changes, they're not necessarily something that we address [comment indistinct] in the strategic plan, the bicentennial strategic plan or the campus plan. But they're in the background and it's important to know, recognize I think, as we make policy and we think about the direction of the campus, the way that those overall trends frame the context in which we make our decisions. So this line is called efficiency and austerity, and Tom Reilly, a trustee, famously convened an efficiency committee in terms of the IU budget and that was discussed last in the AAUP town hall. Those, you know, there are a lot of recommendations, which are valuable. I do not want to make any blanket judgments. The AAUP actually issued its report

specifically on that in which it embraced some of the findings and was critical of others, but the overall framework, again, is what I want to make clear. That forty-eight states are spending less per student FTE on higher education than before the recession, so we haven't recovered. Tuition increases have not made up for the difference in the loss of direct state appropriations, and universities have had to make do with budget cuts while enrollments have increased. So I think in the presentation we had earlier last semester, we have a record class here, class size here at IUB. So an austerity budget, and I actually put this generously, doing more with less. The question is whether we actually do more with less, or whether there are indeed tradeoffs to think about. So then signs of this austerity framework – and I want to be careful with this slide, because I don't mean this, you know, these are signs, right? And – and the signs, they can be taken in all sorts of ways, but I think it's useful to put them in this context. So one sign is more fees, and under the word fees tuition, room and board, mandatory building rehabilitation, whatever the category is, fees going up. More adjunct professors and I – I think new faculty majorities are major organization which – which the title of the organization points to that transformation overall. It's affected our campus less than other campuses in our system, and maybe – and maybe our system less than other – other systems, but the point is it's a massive national trend. More technology. I think we all feel that very directly in our learning management softwares. We had the present – presentation on Unizin, and we had questions about how that would be run and the sort of fashion – the oversight involved with such technology. More management. It's been a large discussion, the issue of administrative bloat. There was a very detailed study at Michigan recently that has surfaced of everything from our administrative secretaries and fiscal officers, and generally how management has been moving up and there's increasing budget going toward that. More standardization and centralization, and those – actually that maybe moves into this question of metrics, learning how to measure. Actually one that I do not have here, but in terms of our later discussion of the replacement for the FAR, citational metrics, aggregate student growth metrics, this is a big issue currently at Purdue. Competency versus credit hours, this was a recent Carnegie – just a few days ago the report from the Carnegie Foundation and issues about how we grade and alternatives to grades based on certificates such as badges. All of these changes are indicating a large framework of shift to, I think, standardization, centralization and a sort of management style that's focused above all, the way it poses the question, on efficiency.

Then finally here are some warning signs and – and that – the corporate management models are affecting universities nationally. And again, warning signs, maybe that's too tendentious a way of putting it, but then a heads up, I could say. It's a heads up, we won't judge it differently. There are different necessities at play but – but – heightened emphasis on faculty productivity is something, I think, we all recognize related perhaps to citational metrics and course evaluations with an increased focus on pay-for-performance, intensified dependence on student evaluations, unilateral changes in curriculum and policy by administration, the famous

case recently at CUNY of the Pathways curriculum. Focus on students as contractual partners or customers. So certain universities such as Penn State writing in their policy guidelines that a syllabus is to be viewed as a contract. Market justifications, I mean market share whether in the frame of a responsibility centered management system or some other rhetoric or system for inequality among schools and faculty. Encouragement of entrepreneurial centers in teaching units, emphasis on job skills, deliverables in curriculum. Oh yeah, this doesn't mean we don't want to – our students to have practical skills. It's a large part of the land grant tradition as well as broader traditions, but the sharp focus on that is, I think, a clear sign. So that is a very quick outline of, I think, some of the trends that we are facing, and I think that's the context in which the AAUP declaration for their centennial – that's the context in which it's intervening. The context it's trying to address. So let me actually go ahead – and I urge you to read the declaration. Craig built it in, I think, so you can read the declaration within the link, too, within the resolution is a link to the actual AAUP site and I think it's important that we as BFC members also take this back to our representatives – to our constituents and ask them to, yeah – ask them their impressions. Have them reflect on it, perhaps even bring it up in the context of a faculty meeting.

So,

“Whereas the AAUP's 1915 *Declaration of Principles on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure* helped establish the basis for the success of the U.S. system of higher education;

Whereas the AAUP celebrates this year a century of shaping, defending and promoting free, open, and vigorous colleges and universities;

Whereas on the occasion of its centennial, the AAUP has issued a declaration affirming that institutions of higher education are conducted for the common good and cautioning against contemporary trends pushing institutions in a direction contrary to the spirit of public endeavor;

Whereas Indiana University Bloomington is nearing its bicentennial, and cherishes its legacy of public education, research, and engagement;

Whereas the Bloomington Faculty Council is the chief shared governance body of Indiana University Bloomington, and is concerned to advance Indiana University's legacy, while fostering robust shared governance in the tradition of the AAUP;

Resolved:

- 1) The Bloomington Faculty Council endorses the AAUP's Centennial Declaration which is reproduced below and accessible online at <http://www.aaupdeclaration.org>;
- 2) The President of the Bloomington Faculty Council shall sign the Centennial Declaration on behalf of the Council."

And it – it follows the Declaration itself, which I won't read unless people would like me to.
[Laughter]

ROBEL: So let me just put this in the context of procedurally where we are. It's a first reading. So the Council has not seen this before. It's not up for a vote today. It came from the Executive Committee for the reaction, advice of the Council, and will go back to the Executive Committee after hearing your advice and discussion. I think then we'll see where it goes from here.

I also, just because I have the opportunity to do it, want to say that I've been working with the AAUP to try to see if we can do a 100 year – a forum of the 100th year of the *Declaration of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure*. We are moving forward with that this semester. I'm very excited about it. I got to see Steve Sanders moderate a wonderful panel on just that at the Association of American Law Schools where in an *Annie Hall* moment like I've never seen before, a discussion of Stanley Fish's thoughts on academic freedom led to Stanley Fish showing up at the microphone and essentially saying, 'Well, I am Stanley Fish. I disagree completely with the way you've read my work.' I never thought I'd see that in real life! [Laughter] So with that I'll just open it to the floor for thoughts, discussion, you know, things you'd like the Executive Committee to think about. Yes, Mmhmm?

PEARL: So, a resolution like this, what bearing would it have for IU if we were to adopt it? You know, is it more philosophical? Or, does it have some sort of teeth or weight that would sort of cause us to have to do certain things if we were to adopt it?

ROBINSON: Should I... ? I – I can speak to that, if you would... I – I do think one of the issues that has come up in the – that the – the Shared Governance Subcommittee, and come up informally as discussions, is where does initiative in the faculty come from? And I think that there is a sense that often the faculty is in a quite responsive mode. And it's not to impugn a lot of initiative that people do take, it's actually to affirm that and say it is. But I think one of the reasons, one of the hypotheses that we're in such a responsive mode is the – we – we haven't taken all the opportunities we could take to think synthetically about the challenges that we're facing as a faculty, and in that sense I think it – it is philosophical, of course. It's a large centennial declaration, but I think the implication would be to give the faculty some warrant for examining the particular issues that are laid out in the ten points of the *Declaration* and hopefully one of the effects could be – one of the practical effects would be – and let me just speak of a specific committee like the Education Policies committee when – when in the

declaration it says something like, “The main aims of teaching are the dissemination of knowledge and the fostering of creativity; learning is not just about developing job skills.” To me that helps a committee form, you know, orient itself toward a policy agenda even though that doesn’t specify *per se* any policy.

ROBEL: Yes?

GLOMM: I’m always very nervous when I hear statements like, ‘this is for the common good.’ Often when people use the term, “the common good,” there are all kinds of distributional aspects that hide behind this. I think one always has to be conscious at most universities, even public universities, so like students from the top end of the distribution – or the socioeconomic distribution. In that context, for me, it is very, very difficult to think of the language of the “common good.” The research that they disseminate often – not uniformly, but often – is appreciated by people at the top end of the socioeconomic distribution. It is not accessible and perhaps they don’t make enough effort to make it accessible at the very bottom – bottom end of the distribution. So for all these kinds of reasons it is very, very difficult for me to accept without qualifications, or at least worth the thought, language in the document like this called, “the common good” or “communal good.”

ROBEL: Yes?

SIMONS: Yes. I mean, I’d agree. This is largely a – a – a document that’s about philosophy and it’s about principle. And I think precisely that principle of – of a university being a place where notions of a public good and common good can be worked out is essential. There are not many spaces left in – in the current world where those things can happen – or do happen – precisely because as this document speaks there is a remorseless social, political and economic logic that seeks to reduce all institutions, including public institutions, to those that serve private interests on the – on the basis or assumption that by doing so that in some way or another is what’s best for the public interest but not in the sense of the common, collective public, but just in terms of everyone’s individual best interest, and to have a document that enables us to think critically about that, enables us to reframe pretty much everyth – everything that we do, but not [comment indistinct] as reframe it, kind of put it back into the frame in which these public institutions were set up is – is, I think, vital. And I think this – this key point about whether to speak to that point about whether the language, “the common good” is about helping those in the upper socioeconomic echelons. I think it would be foolish to – to regard that as false or untrue because [comment indistinct] But I’d like to think in terms of, kind of, what students are doing here. As not – not being only about pursuing their individual best interests, but about inculcating some sort of notion that what would be in everyone’s best interest is – is absolutely essential [comment indistinct] mission of this university.

LEVINSON: [comment indistinct] is quoting from the 1940 *Declaration* [comment indistinct]

BASU: The way I [comment indistinct] can mean in this context whatever sustains our citizens, like taking – like getting– accepting vaccinations for measles. [Laughter]

GLOMM: [comment indistinct]

BASU: [comment indistinct] That was written literally carved in stone of education – whatever sustained our [comment indistinct] that society has found important for sustaining the [comment indistinct].

GLOMM: Well, I do not want to go too far with this, but one in the set of all actions – the set of all actions that sustain our species is very, very large, I guess –

BASU: That's right

GLOMM: – it's probably not the universal thing, but I guess it's very large. And it's not clear that it isn't much of a guidance of picking from a very large set. And the other thing that I think, at least from the early 1960's, social science research has documented that unless I'm willing to restrict – to accept restrictions on people's preferences, it is impossible to define [comment indistinct] that's the work of [comment indistinct]. So I think you have to really – it's nice to use that language, but I think it's hiding certain things that, you know, vibrant, adverse culture. There are many aspects there in that language [comment indistinct]. But you have to be aware of it.

ROBEL: I know that for many of you this is the first time that you're seeing this language so...

SPANG: Yeah, maybe I'll just raise a point which we talked a bit about in the Executive Committee. I certainly very much applaud and support the first sentence, or in some cases, the first clause of each one of these items, but I do find the way that the declaration is stated a bit – it almost sounds immature. The “not” clauses following each affirmation of principle. I'm all for affirming principles. “The main aims of teaching are the dissemination of knowledge and the fostering of creativity...” Great. I would be happy with a full stop there. The, “learning is not just about developing ‘job skills...’” seems gratuitous to me. Similarly, “The main aim of research is to create new knowledge, and academic freedom is essential for the free search for truth and its free expression.” Fine. “Research is not just about enhancing the profit margins of corporations.” Does that really need to be there? So it's each one of those “not” clauses that makes me find this a somewhat less satisfactory resolution, though I would have liked to have seen the AAUP right on this important occasion.

ROBEL: Okay.

SANDERS: I'm speaking now not for the Executive Committee, but for my constituents in the Law School whom I have actually had conversations about this with. I've also had conversations with some stalwarts, longtime stalwarts at the AAUP, David Rabban at Texas who's a former chair of Committee A, Bob O'Neill, a former chancellor of this campus who's a former general counsel at the AAUP. I guess I very much like the way Ben and John framed this, and that is, if – if I vote in favor of this on behalf of my constituents, I see it as a starting point for discussion not an ending point that's intended to sort of end the discussion. I would have written this differently. I think it makes assertions not arguments. I somewhat agree with Rebecca's points, that the tone is sometimes needlessly confrontational throwing around words like "authoritarian" and putting "job skills" in scare quotes I think is not necessary, but – but I like Ben's point. This is not an indictment of our institution. This does point up issues that concern many of us and that need to be discussed about the state of American higher education. Many institutions have it much worse than – than we do at this institution and so anyway, I like the idea that this provides necessary grist and maybe a little provocation for thinking about these issues, talking about these issues in ways we might not otherwise do, and that it's not intended to say we have now decided what is wrong and what the appropriate answer is, and this is it.

GIERYN: Could you drop the other shoe, Steve, and acknowledge that discussions of these very important issues – and I'm glad Ben – that we have very important issues brought before the Faculty Council. That discussion of these issues going forward is not dependent on a positive vote on this particular resolution.

SANDERS: And when I say – and I wasn't actually necessarily speaking about the BFC. I'm talking about all of us on this campus, everyone who's a part of higher education and concerned about our mission both this campus and more generally, hopefully, will take notice of this and it will start conversations that might not have otherwise happened.

ROBEL: Yeah, David?

DALEKE: Just want to make one – couple of points of observation, perhaps. One is that the AAUP represents institutions that have a wide variety of different types of faculty governance, and I think that when we look at the wording of the document, I think you can see some of that in there. So it is highly likely we will find things in here that we don't like, and things that we do like. So I guess that's not too surprising. The other thing I just wanted to point out is I looked at the site and they had posted the – the statement on the website. And you can sign up and endorse this individually. So regardless of what we decide to do as a body, if you feel strongly about it you have the option, of course, of putting your name down and signing it as well.

ROBEL: Other discussion? Yes?

GLOMM: Just – at the seventh point, “Students... are not just the bearers of collateral for unsustainable debt loads.” [comment indistinct] just two numbers to put things in perspective. The average student debt currently for a student who graduates with a four year degree is \$30,000 approximately. The college premium, which is the difference between college wages or college salaries relative to a – college student relative to a high school student on average is \$800,000. It is not clear if a \$30,000 cost that gives us access to a premium of \$800,000 is unsustainable. The issue is not the average. The issue is tail end of that distribution [comment indistinct] in perspective I think it’s useful before we use terms like “unsustainable.”

ROBEL: Okay, maybe this could be our last and then we can – Jim can tee us up for our next.

ROBINSON: Thank you, Lauren. So I – I do want to say – and to Gerhard’s point too, you know, some of it – there’s obviously a lot of economics involved with this, and there are a lot of perspectives on it. I mean, even someone like Mitch Daniels at Purdue would argue that yes, we are, you know – there’s – he’s worried that you’re not getting the value. And it won’t come out – you know, there’s not consensus on the economics and an intricate debate. So – so I think it’s important that we – that we concede that. But I think what I tried to do with the PowerPoint presentation and – and what I wanted to bring before the Council is that we are in a shared situation whether we call it a public good or not, and I do want to repeat what I said that is from the 1940 *Declaration* that you – the idea of a common good. And at that point that was of course during World War II, and the AAUP was – played a very important role in bringing about the – the GI Bill, which did expand it to different socio and economic groups. But I don’t think a declaration like this or the implication of the language of the common good does anything automatically. Right? It isn’t – in that sense it is just – it could be just reduced to smoke and mirrors. But that’s why I want to put a final point on the question of whether we could sign it by ourselves. We certainly can as – as the website points out, and we can certainly as – as both Rebecca and Steve mentioned, we can certainly feel if we were on the committee that drafted this that we would use different language, but the intent of the declaration is solidarity. It is to create a public good. It is to make a shared declaration. The very act of declaration, I think, gives orientation and strength and common purpose. It creates exactly that, which Gerhard says is something that we have to – which isn’t always there, isn’t to be assumed, but is a matter of deliberation and will, and the act of declaration as we know it, and from the foundation of the country is a very fundamental moment in that. Again, it doesn’t imply that we’re on the committee and that we would fully agree with the wording. It implies that we want to act collaboratively with universities across the country and identify ourselves as – as a shared governance body that feels that the overall tenor of making the public good or the spirit of public endeavor, giving it priority in a time period of budget frameworks which seem to point to the privatization of the benefits of higher education that we want to join together and support that – that perspective. And I think it matters whether we do this singly

or to collectively by reference to a declaration. So I would just conclude by saying that the very act of declaration is something that I hope can play a role in our deliberations and not the individual wording of it, which of course we will, rightfully, as we would expect all have different attitudes towards.

ROBEL: Thank you so much, and I would encourage Council members to read it carefully and of course talk with your various constituencies about it, and provide some feedback to the Executive Committee members about your thoughts about going forward. At this point I'd like to turn it back over to Jim to give a little context for our next visitors.

AGENDA ITEM 7: UPDATE ON GOVERNMENT RELATIONS

SHERMAN: The next visitors, but also the – the agenda item as a whole. Government Relations, really important to all of us. To administrators, to faculty, to students, to staff, and I think we're fortunate enough that we will be joined by two Government Relations people who work for Indiana University in this regard. Mike Sample and Jeff Linder, they're very good at what they do. They look out for all of us, I believe. So they're going to make a presentation from their point of view and they're – they're more intimate with the state legislators than anyone. After they make their presentation, I – I thought it would be a really good thing if we could get Matt Pierce here who is our representative in State Legislature, but they're in session now. But I met Matt for a long time on Friday, and I'll report to you a lot of Matt's views of government relations and what state legislature is doing and wanting to do. And then Herb Terry was last Friday at – at a meeting, a discussion of government relations at Indiana University, and Herb is having his second eye cataracted today.

ROBEL: You could say de-cataracted. [Laughter]

SHERMAN: De-cataracted. And so he can't be here, but I also have some notes from Herb, so I will be the mouthpiece for both Matt and Herb.

ROBEL: Great.

SHERMAN: Here's Mike and I don't... They're both there. Great.

[Multiple indistinct comments]

ROBEL: Thank you so much, and Jeff if you could maybe move just a little bit to Mike so – there we go. Thank you so much. I am – I am really delighted to be able to welcome Mike Sample and Jeff Linder to the Bloomington Faculty Council today. I was – I was able to be at a fair amount of the Government Relations seminar. Herb also attended earlier –

SHERMAN: Was it Friday?

ROBEL: I guess it was Friday. And I – I want to just echo Jim’s statement. These – these two individuals do so much for our university to assure that we are in the – not in the cohort that Ben – Ben’s data will point you to that is at the bottom of state support, but really in a place where the university makes its very best case for support to our state legislature and other governmental officials. So with that I think I’ll turn it over to Mike and Jeff to speak a little bit about whatever seems sensible.

SAMPLE: Okay, thank you Provost. Let’s begin with a test. You can hear us okay? Or hear me okay?

ROBEL: We can. Yay!

SAMPLE: Great. Wonderful. Well, we’ll see if that’s a good thing when the meeting’s over. So anyway, thank you very much for the opportunity to – to speak to you about the ongoing, as we speak, legislative session. Just a reminder this is the budget session, the so called long session of the General Assembly. Every other year the biennial budget is set, and that’s the primary focus of the long session. We’re about a quarter of the way through so we know what bills have been filed. We’re sort of through that – that process, and although the budget is always the main focus of the long session typically, unsurprisingly, there are bizarre proposals that often get made. Sometimes they directly affect the university; sometimes they indirectly affect the university. Sometimes we weigh in on those, sometimes we try to influence them or kill them – to be frank about it – behind the scenes. There are a variety of ways that you can play this rather strange game that we’re involved in at the General Assembly, and we’re really very lucky to have Jeff working with us along with his team of really good, bright people that work with us. Becca Polcz is young lawyer who had been an intern with IU out of this office and has worked on the professional staff for several years now. John Grew as some of you probably remember from when he worked with Judy Palmer in the financial side of the university administration, and John joined about I’d say seven years ago. Came in to work directly in Government Affairs, but still with a focus on the – on the money matters and the budgetary issues. Constructing the budget according to the Commission for Higher Education process is a bit of an arcane skill. John is – is great. We’re happy to have him continue to work with us. We just hired a young guy names Brad Boswell to replace an individual who left to go work – lobby for another organization. And Brad is – this’ll be his first session, and he’s so far shown himself to be a very solid contributor as well. Speaking of the budget, the recommendations from the Commission for Higher Education, which go to the legislature based on submissions by the universities and the performance measures that they established a few years ago. In that process Indiana University and all of our campuses come out very well. This reflects the performance, the really outstanding performance of all of you and it really, you know, makes us look good on that part of the – of the advocacy for the university to be able to say that we’re

meeting those targets. And the funding recommendations from the Commission indicate that we're doing what we've been asked to do as a public university, and the funding reflects that. So – so we're very, very pleased about that. Now, the General Assembly does not have to accept what is recommended by the Commission. It'll go through the procedures of all legislation, but we've had very good initial meetings with the leadership of both houses, the committee chairman for finance in the senate, ways and means in the house, as well as the president pro tem of the senate, the speaker of the house, President McRobbie's met with them, Jeff and I've met with them and – and, you know, I would just say so far so good. It looks as though everything is on track, but as Jeff always reminds me this game is not over and nothing is done until they go home and adjourn, *sine die*. So, in addition to the budget, there are, you know, some, you know, weird, bizarre, very bad ideas that bubble up and find their way into legislative proposals that get filed. Jeff can talk more about those individually. I would just say that some of the worst ones, like the proposal to allow guns on campus, for example, those have been bottled up in committee and are not even getting a hearing. So that is – that is very good news, and a lot of that reflects the work that we do with the committee chairmen and the leadership, Jeff and his team, to express our – our views sort of quietly behind the scenes, so that these bills do not even get a hearing. Again, it doesn't mean there's no way that they can come up as the session goes – goes along but again, just like the budget, so far so good.

So I think as an overview, I'll stop right there. Obviously, we'll be happy to answer whatever questions you might have and hear whatever comments you want us to hear after Jeff finishes, but I think for a little – maybe a little more granularity on some of the things that I outlined in general, I'll turn it over to Jeff to go into a little more detail.

LINDER: Thanks Mike, and as Mike said, that the key feature in this session is this is where the biennial budget is put together, and as he pointed out the performance funding measures that were adopted a couple years ago and now fully implemented, our campuses, in particular IU Bloomington do very well. Those were put together under the Daniels administration after he decided he was going to Purdue, and so their STEM or high impact degrees were designed to help Purdue and not help IU by not including health related and medical related degrees, and so – but actually, despite that, Bloomington does great and West Lafayette does not do very well this time. They did well two years ago because the governor, or the president then was the governor and he had it structured for them to do well. The – the real issue for us is even though the performance funding measures will have our campuses in general, and IU Bloomington in particular, be funded at a better rate than other campuses around the state, the overall funding that the state puts in is what's going to make a big difference. The Commission had recommended a 3% increase in year one and an additional 1% in year two. The governor's budget moved that down to 1% in year one and 1% in year two. So the

Commission is continuing to help us try and get the additional funds. What happens in this is they have a number of proposals out there as to what should be done but in mid-April – they adjourn at the end of April – but in mid-April there'll be a revenue report that comes in and a forecast that they'll use for setting the final spending amounts. And so, it's kind of a key to us that revenue forecasts look good because the better they look, the better chance we have of getting adequate funding going ahead.

Some of the key issues that we're going to be dealing with – they've got a lot of ethics issues and concerns. I'm sure a lot of you've noticed those in the paper, even through last year, and the university's trying to make sure that anything we do there's no issue about the ethics of anything that we're doing or any of our personnel or anything, and I think that's going very well. There are a number of issues that we do have to play the defense on. One that started out that was going to be a real problem but has improved is the domestic violence issues, sexual abuse issues, and our concern had been going to something like California had where it's really an attack on college campuses. And weren't looking at general, sexual assaults, they were looking at what was going on in college campuses and really putting the faculty in difficult positions if students wanted to confide in somebody. It was almost like dealing with a middle schooler. You were going to have to report it, even if this was an adult who asked you not to. At this point, there's nothing university specific filed or moving and as Mike said we hope to keep it that way. Things can always come back, but that's kind of a key thing, and we work closely with Lauren and her team as well as John Applegate and our General Counsel, Jackie Simmons, in trying to work this through. There are domestic violence issues – issues about criminal background checks on taxi drivers or the Uber drivers, those kind of things where we're supportive of all that. We just didn't want the university singled out, and at this moment that's good. We've got – the annual bill is being filed on bringing firearms onto campus. Ed wants to do away with all firearm licensing, so anybody can carry guns. The sawed off shot gun bill did pass the senate today by a vote of like 44 to 6. We need those sawed off shot guns. And I say this – we have a bunch of knife bills, you know, last year they had their switchblade bill. I mean, it – it – it's hard to find a weapon they don't want to make sure everybody has access to. [Laughter] So, another thing we're working on is where they can make a difference for the finances of the university is IU and then other universities followed us, moved a lot of our staff positions from being defined benefit programs to defined contribution programs to try and control expenses going forward and to not have the university finances' subject to fluctuations in the market. That's worked out well for the university, but the state has not made that conversion and there was a shortfall in some of these accounts, and they were wanting to try and get some of us who pulled out to pay some of that shortfall, which we're willing to pay what's fair, but we don't want to be subsidizing the state. So working on that, hope to get to a fair conclusion on that. But this is tens of millions of dollars, so it's something that's really very important for us.

There were some bills involving proprietary education. Not that we care about it, but it was to change proprietary ed to be allowed – the core profit schools to be – their students to receive a higher level of funding for the state student assistance grants. You know, right now Harrison College is the one who pushed for this, they're – they do qualify for student assistance grants for their students, but they're paid like their kids are going to Ivy Tech and they want to be paid like they're going to Wabash or Notre Dame and that was kind of unreasonable. They have backed down on the bills. They were planning on getting accredited and apparently accreditation fell through and they let their government relations staff go and their bills are dropping off. The reason why that's important to us, not that we care necessarily what they're going to be paid, except there's a – a finite amount of money that is appropriated for financial assistance from the state for higher ed students, and – and Indiana's really pretty good with that. For next year it's going to be about \$320 million dollars a year they're going to give in grants, but that's a finite amount, and if they decide with these for profit schools they're going to double or triple what they give to their students then that eats into what's available for our students as far as ones who qualify or the amount of their awards, and so it's important for us not to have a lot of new people eating out of that trough.

Electronic transcripts, there was a bill filed on that, which I know from talking to John Applegate – we talk to John Applegate all the time – was a real problem. But at this point I think that bill has been held up and even the Commission who was wanting this originally has agreed to ask them to kill that bill.

And just a few other things about tax credits that we get for college giving. There's always a push to try and do away with that, which would be harmful to universities. On that we partnered with the nonprofit universities to secure their support, too, because it's a big deal for them, but there's an annual push to try and do away with that tax credit, which I don't really get, but it's – it's a good way for universities to get people used to giving to them, and it's a 50% credit if you give a couple hundred dollars to university, you get a \$100 tax credit from the state, and that's just a way of kind of priming that pump to get people reconnected to their college and university and giving, and that's something that's important for us to hang on to. We are working on trying to further streamline and deregulate higher ed as far as, anything from mergers to some of the online offerings. Our General Counsel's office feels it's important that some of those be for profit as we do these in overseas markets, they're not used to dealing with nonprofit entities and the state has been open to trying to give us the ability as the university to own for profit entities for the delivery of online or distance education in other states, in other countries. And just, a number of things working on student success initiatives, and people are receptive to that. It's just, I don't know if they're going to be willing to put the kind of money into it that we would like. They have recommended both in the governor's

budget and the Commission budget, for \$48.5 million dollars for the renovation of the old quad area, so to kind of keep the old quad -

SAMPLE: The Old Crescent.

LINDER: Old crescent – old crescent. And that will, you know, add another couple buildings to getting completed. So hopefully one of these days we'll get all that finished up, but everybody seems supported of that and that's to be a cash project, so that's a good thing. It's not something we have to worry about paying off over the next twenty years. Right now they're looking at doing that all with cash on hand. So there are a number of bills, and I sent to Jim kind of an update as of today on where a lot of these are. If anyone has any questions on any bills I'll be happy to – or Mike will even be happy to try and answer them the best we can.

SHERMAN: I handed them – I handed them [comment indistinct]. So everyone has a copy, and if they don't ask about them now, they can always get in touch with you folks. Jeff, could I – could I ask you and Mike a question that people ask me a lot? Is there something the faculty should or should not do in terms of improving government relations and trying to get what I think we all want to get? So what advice do you have for faculty other than not to irritate the legislature?

LINDER: Actually, I think the number one thing that can be done and is being done is run a successful operation, and that's why we're in a good position for funding this time around because our campus is very successful. And when we've had issues like, you know, with the sexual abuse or domestic violence, Indiana University has been the leader, and IU Bloomington is kind of the think tank hub for supporting the regionals, because the regionals don't have the wherewithal to really dig into this to the extent that, you know, our talent pool at Bloomington allows. And so on – when there have been problems or issues our campus has not been shirking back and saying, well, we don't want to deal with this, or can we let it go? You know, we've had, and Lauren's sitting there, I see her. She's kind of at the forefront of making sure that we go after it, people know we care, we're going to address it in a thoughtful way, and that's really important. If members would like to weigh in on a topic that they know about that's just fine as well. If you're going to testify, we always kind of like to know. We don't necessarily – especially when you're going to testify as an individual – we are happy for you to say whatever, but sometimes we know some background on a topic about who's mad about it or what issues they've raised to kind of make sure you're aware of some of the moving parts so you don't get up and find out that what you're pitching is – you know, that somebody has undercut you ahead of time. So if you're going to do that we need to know, you know, it would be helpful if we know that, but I think just the best thing you can do is do your, you know, a great job like you're doing now.

SHERMAN: Thanks.

ROBEL: Questions from the Council? I suspect it might be helpful because Council members come from all parts of the campus, if you could just talk a tiny bit about the performance funding measures that – that lead to funding for us, you know, and the structure we’ve been working in for the last several years?

LINDER: Okay, yeah.

SAMPLE: You want to... ?

LINDER: Yeah. There are very – there are different measures depending on what kind of campus you are. So if – IU Bloomington obviously is a research intensive campus so they are in one category, regionals are in a different category and the community colleges are in a separate category, and so for the part that impact the performance funding for IU Bloomington, on time graduation, which is four year graduate rate, is a big deal. What they call “high impact,” which are the STEM degrees give you funding, and that’s at a rate of like \$22,000 per STEM graduate. Then 21st Century Scholar graduates –

SAMPLE: And these are STEM graduates who are from Indiana.

LINDER: Yes.

SAMPLE: And this is one of the reasons why Purdue has seen their funding decline at West Lafayette under this plan because they have taken really significantly more on a percentage basis out of state students, frankly, to make for the tuition freeze. It’s another way to make up the money from their tuition freeze, but then, of course, now they’re seeing the – the other side of that coin as they are producing fewer Indiana STEM graduates.

LINDER: Yep. And so – then, in other words the 21st Century Scholars who are graduating, which – and in all of these categories Bloomington did very well –

SAMPLE: Yeah.

LINDER: – and the number of 21st Century Scholars who are going to Bloomington is increasing and I think part of that is due to – with the recession we had some pretty good students in families that were doing pretty well, in the recession they lost their jobs and so some of our 21st Century Scholars kids are really at a talented level where they can come to Bloomington and succeed, so on all those categories, Bloomington finished way ahead of the pack. I mean, like, our STEM degree additions, I think, were maybe 350 in this cohort as compared to West Lafayette at 85, so our 21st Century graduates IU Bloomington did better than anyone else at adding those. And even though IU Bloomington has by far the best graduation rate in the state,

it increased significantly again. One of the things we're looking at for the future, because they were talking about redoing their formulas on performance funding, and one of the sensitivities on this is some of these campuses have 6% on time graduation rates. And so they have lots of room for improvement, but in IU Bloomington's situation, it's about 60% now and you kind of get to the point where there's not a lot of gap there. And all these performance funding measures are not based on what you're doing, it's how much you have improved over these three year rolling averages, and so we are starting to talk to them to kind of prepare for the future that, you know, it – you can't expect continuous improvement at these levels. I mean, you got to give us some credit for what we're doing already.

SAMPLE: Yeah, the – the performance measures have evolved from their early proposals which were really, really quite flawed. They're still not perfect. For – and Jeff – what Jeff mentioned is – is one example of that. It – there has – I mean essentially in an – in an unintended consequence kind of way, or maybe it's not quite so unintended, it – it disproportionately rewards people who are really at the bottom and doing very badly because the low hanging fruit is more available to them. The easy stuff in Bloomington, for example, has already been done, and so we start from a pretty successful base right now, which makes that improvement harder to get and that's really not fair. And so when they go back and look at the performance funding plan going forward after this cycle, and we had to be careful not to change it during this cycle because we do pretty well, but going forward we're going to have some suggestions as to how that can be more rational and incentivize the right behaviors and reward the right behaviors. The right outcomes – not behaviors – the right outcomes.

ROBEL: Steve?

SANDERS: Mike and Jeff, hi. Steve Sanders. I am really grateful you've done this. I've worked with you guys for years in some issues of common interest, have the highest regard for your savvy. Sometimes people here, I think, get impatient about what they think are show and tell presentations. I think of this as absolutely essential transparency because we're all so concerned about maintaining as much of a position as we can financially for the university so thank you. I want to ask you about something I didn't see on your bill list, and I wonder if you're following or have thoughts. There have been a couple of bills introduced in the senate regarding religious liberty and essentially, as I read them, these bills would require state government, state agencies, local government to put forth a higher level of legal justification, what's called "compelling interest," when someone believes their religious freedom is burdened by those rules. It's commonly thought this has provoked by same sex marriage, but I can actually fairly easily think a lot of it – I think of a lot of implications for Indiana University about this. A student who's required to attend a diversity presentation that they don't like could say that it impinges on their religious liberty. As student who is required in a theatre

workshop to act out a portion of a David Mamet play could say, “Uttering those words is against my religious freedom. I require a pass from that scene. You can’t make me do that.” Somebody who’s required to read something they don’t want to have to read for a class. I don’t think it requires too much of an imagination to – to think about potential implications all over the university’s disciplinary and curricula concerns about [recording garbled, comment indistinct]. Am I imagining worries that I shouldn’t? Are you – is this a bill you’re following and thinking about?

SAMPLE: Yeah.

LINDER: Yeah.

SAMPLE: Yeah. Thank – thank you, Steve. We – we really appreciate the work that you have done in the past with us as well. It’s a great example, I think, of, you know, how, you know we can bring in a pinch hitter like you to help on – on occasion or strategize with you to get – to get an outcome that – that we’re all trying to get done. And – and I think that, you know, for your colleagues you – you’ve brought a real – a really sophisticated approach to – to the process, so we really appreciate that.

Yeah, we’re aware of these – of these bills – maybe not in every permutation of how – how it could – could impact, so appreciate your – your sort of legal expertise and – and comments here. I’ll let Jeff comment more specifically. These things are moving and changing every day, and Jeff’s over there every day so I’ll – I’ll let Jeff comment on – on all this.

LINDER: Yeah, so the one that did pass this afternoon is Senate Bill 127, and on the list we gave you this – like there was about twelve hundred bills filed.

SAMPLE: Yeah.

LINDER: And we try and give a cross section of what’s out there and we’ll be narrowing stuff down and adding things on as we figure out what’s going away and what’s heating up. So this is – that’s this morning’s printout. These are changing targets depending on what’s out there. But Senate Bill 127 is actually for Indiana Wesleyan University because they want to get state and government contracts, but they don’t want to have to follow the rules as far as hiring practices. They want to hire on religious basis and the thing that’s tough, and – and on all these, and Steve knows since we’ve worked on a number of issues together. I get lots of calls from our friends on these, Steve, as we try and figure out how to approach these. That one’s hard to stop right now. In fact, it passed this afternoon by a – a vote of 39 to 11. So even Democrats are supporting that out of – I don’t know – out of fear or whatever. So we always try to on those issues do things quietly as much as we can behind the scenes and only put the president and the general counsel’s neck out on the table if we’re pretty sure that it’ll make a

difference. We don't do it on issue after issue because you lose your effectiveness, and so this one is not going to be stopped in the senate obviously, it passed easily –

SANDERS: Jeff, the bills I was – I was referring to I think are SB 101 and SB 568, which are much –

LINDER: Yeah.

SANDERS: – more broadly about “religious freedom restoration.”

LINDER: Yes, and that's – in fact, 568 is set for a committee hearing next Monday and that one is, I think, maybe the worst of the group. But 101, the problem with that is, I don't know if you noticed who the author of that bill is, that's the president pro tem of the senate, so among bills that are hard to work with leadership to do much about, when the pro tem, who is the leader of the senate has that bill, that makes it difficult. Although 101 is much less onerous at this point than Senator Schneider's 568, and on that one it basically, as Steve points out, anything you feel like limits your religious – ability to do what your religion tells you to do, you're basically granted authority to anything from file a suit to bring any kind of a cause of action on this, and it – it goes way too far. Now, of course, the religious people don't want to be discriminated against, but they're happy to discriminate against others, which is kind of what's coming up with this, too. They don't want to serve, you know, people who they don't like their lifestyles, but since they're religious and therefore by definition “right,” you would always have to do what they want and so – but, you know, I tell you in the crowd over there, these are tough issues because on floor votes, like I say, we even lose Democrats on a bill that's not nearly as strong, and we'll see what happens if we can even keep the – and the Democrats can't stop anything – they've only got thirteen members. But like on the shotgun bill, we only had six votes against getting sawed off shotguns out and about in the public. So, we're working on those. We are hopeful that we'll have a little more success in the house because a lot of the new house members are more business oriented, and that's kind of been helpful. Like, say [comment indistinct] the president pro tem of the senate, who's the author of 101 is pushing that concept, you can't really go to leadership and kill his bill because he's the leader. So we're working on it. We will do what we can, and we have a number of allies even though on some of these even – our – the business community is not fighting as strongly as they have before. But we're hoping – the big – the first big test will be next Monday on 568 and 10 – or 101, and we'll see who we can get lined up to kind of work on that. At this point, I don't anticipate we'll testify, but that's something that we'll have to see what shakes out as we put together a team.

ROBEL: Any questions? I think we've got two? Ben?

ROBINSON: I'm – I'm curious about something you mentioned and I think you – Ben Robinson, and thank you both for the very informative presentation. But you mentioned something that

isn't, I guess, a bill yet, and it's working – that – that just struck me and I just wonder if you could tell me more about it, and that was where you said that there's not even legislation, but you're working on – on policy or legislation to streamline and deregulate higher education for offering online courses delivering them especially in distance education. What – what – what struck me about that is would that legally open up, for example, I mean I know it's not yet legislation, but would that open up markets for other private providers of these courses so potentially our General Education courses could be open to a market of for profit online alternatives, or would it be strictly overseas online offerings – how would legislation work and make that distinction? Because I'm worried about the fact – the potential of opening up inter-transferable Gen Ed courses also to a private deregulated market.

SAMPLE: Yeah. On – on the deregulated thing, just to clarify then I'm let Jeff talk about the online sort of implications. The – the – just to clarify there are – there are on some of the gateways and other things that are being done overseas, the – the – the things that – that Jackie Simmons at General Counsel has to get through foreign governments to get approvals to open those. They don't – it's not that they don't just – don't understand not for profits. The – their law doesn't have any way to – to deal with it. You're either this or you're that. And so the goal really was just to allow for that purpose and related purposes, the university to – to have an entity that would be a – a for profit entity so that it could streamline, reduce our legal costs to get all of that – those approvals – done in countries that just have no – no legal basis to deal with us. So other universities have had to deal with the same thing. Jeff then expanded that a little on – on online in the same sort of discussion. So I'll let – let you pick up on that.

LINDER: Yeah. It's not like we're opening up gates for anyone else because, see, private entities whether they're for profit or nonprofits don't have to mess with state regulations on this. They are – they're not controlled like we are. Since we're a public university and a creature of the state, if the state limits what we can do because of our status, and what we want is the ability to basically own these for profit entities, which has been a problem before for public universities. So this would free us up and really would kind of allow us to compete on a more level playing field against those who can already do it, because what happens a lot of people in these other countries do want IU degrees, and so this would allow us to reach out to those markets.

ROBEL: This is – this is a legal problem that we're facing in India and China primarily, where they – they cannot – they can't – there are – there's regulations around the kinds of educational programming that they permit in the country from outside the country and the kinds of entities they permit to [recording garbled, comment indistinct]. So that – it's not intended to, you know, open a for profit branch of Indiana University to set up online Gen Ed or

anything like that. It's really intended to deal with a specific legal issue in a couple of places where we would like to be able to offer our educational programs to people.

SAMPLE: And – and we've had some success – I'm sorry. Is there a question? Yeah, go ahead.

TRIX: Yes, I'm – I'm just curious. It's a general question, how you encourage the legislature to give us more money? [Laughter]

LINDER: I couldn't hear.

SAMPLE: How – how – okay, I think I heard you, how do we encourage them to give us more money? Is that right?

ROBEL: Yeah.

SAMPLE: Well, you know, we're – first of all – first of all, Jeff and I are very charming. I mean it starts with that. [Laughter]

TRIX: It's not [recording garbled, comment indistinct] as it sounds, because I'm worried about the governor of Wisconsin right now with his, you know, what he said today about funding the University of Wisconsin at 14%. Those kinds of things really make me nervous, and what you said at the beginning where the commission wanted a 2%, and the governor wanted to cut it to 1% and it may come up to 2%. I mean, how do you encourage the legislature to be more generous? I guess is what I'm saying.

SAMPLE: Well, you know, in a – what might seem counterintuitive. The first thing we do is we acknowledge the problem that they have, that the state cannot print money like the federal government can. The state has tremendous demands on the limited resources that they have. The economy has not come back, and the revenues for the state have not come back. But the needs and, in some cases, the unfunded mandates that come from Washington, the Medicaid demands and such, that they have no choice but to spend, leave them with a lot of requests and very few, well – limited – resources, I'll say. So to the extent that we don't just go with our hand out, but we go expressing an understanding of the difficult job that they have in doing this, we get a little better hearing, you know, from – from them having acknowledged the situation they're in. Having done that we then reinforce with them the importance of this from the standpoint, and a little bit of this is who you're talking to, but with a – with a strongly, overwhelmingly, majority Republican legislature – supermajorities – we tend to talk to them about the return on investment. You know, we speak a language that they understand. The importance of higher ed and the return for the state. We've got a really good set of facts that we talk to them about. They – and they – they understand and are generally supportive and they want to work with us for the most part, and I'm talking about the – the leaders who – the

thought leaders in the legislature who tend to be in control of the – of the funding committees. The – we’re – we’re very lucky – I want to be careful, choose my words carefully, but within the citizens’ legislature, as Abraham Lincoln said one time, “You can’t dip clear water from a muddy stream.” And so we’ve – we’ve sort of dipped from a muddy stream, and so a lot of times you’re dealing with people who it is kind of hard to convince, and it is kind of hard to – to connect with. But we’re very lucky that within the legislature we have Tim Brown who is a doctor – very smart guy, very reasonable guy – who understands higher ed pretty well. He understands what the AAU is. So he may be the only one who does in the legislature. He’s – he’s chairman of ways and means. Luke Kenley, who can be a thorn in your side or he can be your best friend is a, you know, Harvard lawyer, educated, and he at least is a smart guy that you can – you can talk to him about the complexities of an issue. He understands what you’re talking about. He’s chairman of the senate finance committee. So in dealing with those people we first start with trying to get on – on common ground with them, and once we get on common ground with them then we try to make the case for – for the funding levels that will give the state what they expect from a higher ed investment, and I think we – we actually in – in the economic downturn we had some hard times but we – we did pretty well. We were very disappointed when the governor had the 2% rescission last year. I don’t think that was necessary, but you know what was interesting is Luke Kenley was the first one to say when we went in to meet with him, when we took President McRobbie into meet with him, he said, “I think the governor made a big mistake in doing that, and I am to do what I can if we have the money, you know, to help restore that.” And – and we didn’t ask for that. He – he had sort of gotten to that point, and I think that he was there because he saw that we understood the challenges and we were responsive to his concerns, and he felt the governor went too far in the rescissions. So, Jeff may want to add something to that dealing with them more on a day to day basis.

LINDER: Yeah, part of it’s we develop close relationships with them and try to be more allies. Like I say, that’s why I compliment you on what kind of product you’re putting out because what they look at us and if we’re successful, and we’re delivering – then you look at the performance measures, they’re measuring outcomes and IU Bloomington has excellent outcomes. But as Mike said, they – the state of Indiana has some serious systematic issues that make it very difficult for them, and then we – and because of that we have to show that we’re the answer and not the problem –

SAMPLE: Yeah.

LINDER: Indiana’s per capita income is only about 83% of the national average per capita income, therefore it’s harder for people at that level to send their kids to college, to pay tuition. They’re also not going to pay as much in taxes. So how do you support your public entities and

yet then more people on Medicaid. How do you take care of them? All of a sudden you've got poorer people, more health issues, less income, and that's – that's a real issue for our university, and –

SAMPLE: But –but having said that, Jeff, just to add to that point – that, having acknowledged that problem we also then hold ourselves out, as Jeff said, as the solution to that problem. I mean if you have 83% of the national average in terms of income levels in the state do you think you can improve that without college degrees for a greater number of your citizens? And so, you know, that's a great example of how having gotten on common ground with them you can then show how you're the solution. How it is a good investment in higher ed in order to hit the goals that they have and that we share. So... yeah.

ROBEL: Thank you so much for taking the time –

SHERMAN: Thank you, guys.

ROBEL: I know where you are at this point in the legislative session, and I just really appreciate it –

SAMPLE: Well, you know, you do – you do all kinds of things, you know? We don't have – we don't have a political action committee like some organizations do. You know, we don't do anything like that, but we do have a basketball team and they better help us out because we have an event that Jeff and I have to go to over at the Columbia Club. We're going to get a big screen and have legislators come over and watch the game tonight and that – that's another way that we can kind of develop good relationships with [comment indistinct].

SHERMAN: You picked a bad game. [Laughter]

LINDER: We're afraid you are right.

SAMPLE: You are exactly right. [Applause]

ROBEL: Thank you.

SHERMAN: I'd – I'd like to take just a little while to try to emphasize what – what I learned from Herb and Matt Pierce and, of course, it fits in very well with what Jeff and Mike talked about. So let me quickly just talk about a couple of issues that I got from both Herb and – and Matt. One of them involves the Indiana Commission for Higher Education, and John Applegate had a lot to say about that Commission and how, you know, they're becoming an arm of the legislature in – in some sense, and one of the things that the Commission is looking for is what they call "ever better metrics" to measure student success. Now some of this is in the funding formula and that seems like graduation rate, and four year graduation. Fine, but I think they're

– they – they’re kind of mov – Matt – Matt Pierce was most worried about them moving toward other metrics and measures that were much more like what we now do for K-12. We have tests. We, you know, we see whether students are living up to them, and there – there’s, according to Matt, Purdue is moving toward these tests for – in a number of areas, especially for critical thinking. So, when students come to college you measure their critical thinking. When they leave you measure their critical thinking –

ROBINSON: Is Howard Zinn on the test?

SHERMAN: It’s what? [Laughter]. That’s a good question. This kind of make it likes the K-12 testing – standardized skill set tests. As Matt understands it, McGraw-Hill is going to manage those kinds of tests [Groans] and it’ll allow comparison among universities – who’s doing it better? And the reasoning is it makes faculty accountable to teach in important ways, that we teach our students what we’re supposed to be teaching them, and how else can you do it without these measures? So I, you know, I think that was the – the thing that bothered Matt most about the direction in which higher education may be heading and, you know, if it’s starting at Purdue, is it something we want to do?

ROBEL: No. Are you asking? [Laughter]

SHERMAN: Yeah.

ROBEL: God, no. The –

SHERMAN: “God, no,” is the answer. But it’s a – it’s a – it’s a problem. When – when the legislators look at it they want to know whether you’re successful in teaching students what we ought to be teaching them.

ROBEL: And can I just interject there for – for a moment. I, you know, I do sort of often have a course. I’m a faculty member, and I wouldn’t [comment indistinct]

[Audio Recording Cuts Out]

– the – where we’re having to deal with that kind of interference in what – in our curricula, in our teaching, and in everything else, I hope you can see from the kinds of challenges that our state legislative folks are dealing with on a regular basis, that it’s not as easy as simply saying we hate this, you know? That there is a – there – there is a – we are a public institution. Our funding does come in significant amount from the state of Indiana, and the state of Indiana has goals for us that shift with the politics of the, you know, of the legislature, and the politics of the statehouse, and the politics of the Indiana Commission on Higher Education, which is appointed by primarily the governor, right? So we’re – we – we – we can have the feelings we have about all of this and we can resist the things that we think are bad and wrong or

misguided, and we do it as effectively as we're able to do it within the context of the politic – the political hand we're dealt. And that's the – and that's the reality on the ground, you know? So when Mike and – and Jeff talk about performance funding, that was the system that was not at all favorable to Indiana University when it was put in as he – as I think, Mike mentioned. It was designed by the now-president of Purdue University. Those folks have worked very carefully as have a number of offices on the campus to try to do the best we can for our faculty and our students within that context and, so it's a, you know, you – that's the pragmatic gap, and that's the one that we have to kind of keep our eyes on as we move forward if that makes sense.

SHERMAN: So talking about the performance standards, I thought Matt Pierce had an interesting view of it. He agrees that we're doing very well by current standards, much better than Purdue.

ROBEL: Much better than predicted.

SHERMAN: Much better than predicted, and – and better than other universities. But Matt has a somewhat cynical – maybe it's an accurate view of what the legislature does with regard to performance standards – and that is, they kind of give universities what they think universities need, which may not be what we think we need. Then they take some away, and then they'll give it back if you meet the performance standards, so you end up at best, you know, not better than they want you to be. So it – he agrees that performance standard will help us but only so much.

The – the other thing that I wanted to say was something that I think is really important from the point of view of faculty members. Now we sit here and I'm sure we all have our stereotype views of what the Indiana state legislatures are like – legislators – are like, and I think the first thing that we have to do is get rid of those. Jeff Linder is a former state legislator. A Republican, okay? He is the best. So get rid of your stereotypic views of who they are, and what they are, and what they do, and what they think. On the flip side, you know, Matt tells me what – not – not unanimous, not universal view of state legislatures are of faculty and administration, and it's not a good picture. The – the words that Matt used are professors are snooty. We teach two classes and that's all we do all week. We get the summer off. We got big salaries. We aren't unaccountable to anyone because we have tenure. We have "the life of Riley" and in addition we're pretty much extreme liberals without any concern for balanced budgets or economy or the business world. And that's a view that I think we have to change just – just as we shouldn't accept the stereotypic views of all these legislators, you know, you – you have to do what Mike and Jeff do in terms of providing a picture that's more accurate about what we do and why we do it, and how effective we are, and how our jobs are full many hours a week and we do important things. Their view of the administration is no better. From –

from Matt's words again, Indiana University is ripping off students. They send students out with huge debts, basically because we don't care how much they have to kick into the system. IU is fat and happy and one thing that they focus on, but they may be changing that now, is that when it comes to construction costs, IU's or other universities as well, have bloated construction costs. Well, maybe that's it – at IU Bloomington is because, you know, when we build a building we want it to fit in with the architecture of the university. It's – it's one of the great things that we have here. Do you want to put up a, you know, a – a kind of a wooden building that doesn't fit in with the campus? And last week or two weeks ago, we had Tom Morrison here, and he talked about meeting the LEED standards. Well, that costs money. If we want to meet sustainability objectives, it's going to cost more. So, you know, their view is we're ripping them off, but I think we have to do a better job of explaining what it is we're trying to achieve in – in terms of our goals. So, you know that I – I think I couldn't have done a better job – never – than – than Mike and Jeff do both in what they do and presenting what they do. They're really good folks and they share our values. So don't look at them as, you know, 'Oh God they're probably in bed with the legislators and, you know, making deals.' And it's not true, I mean, I think you heard their words. So, that's all I have.

ROBEL: Comments or questions?

SHERMAN: Oh, by – by the way, if you want to – if you want to communicate with – with Matt Pierce he'd be delighted to hear from you. His e-mail address is H61@in.gov.

LEVINSON: Well, I'm going to have to [comment indistinct] final comments, Jim, I wonder what – whether there is something that we could even do as a Council to foster better channels of communication? I – I would relish the opportunity to sort of adopt a legislator for the day and let them look at my Outlook calendar for a typical week, and then even look at my summer and give them a peek into the reality, and conversely, I would want to do the same. So I wonder whether we could think of innovative ways to really – to – to get to know each other a little bit more while –

SHERMAN: It – it – it's a – it's a – it's a – I'm glad you said that, because some of us may remember when there was a Trustee, an elected Trustee, Ray Richardson?

ROBEL: I do.

SHERMAN: You do. Well, Ray Richardson was a – pretty much a lone voice in the Trustees. They – they were all pretty good people, but Ray Richardson had this view of faculty that was very much like Matt depicted and every time – and I was President of the Faculty Council back then in the '90's – and he would say things and every time I saw him and we were in meeting I said, "Ray, I want you to come with me. Just spend a day with me or two days, and just see

what I do. I'll do my normal stuff and you tell me whether I'm wasting your money or I'm not earning my salary," and he never took me up on it. So...

ROBEL: And we have – and we have done that –

LEVINSON: Can we have body cams for a day. [Laughter]

ROBEL: Yes, I think that might be a bit at war with the AAUP statements on the surveillance. The – and we do try to bring legislators to the campus on a regular basis and get them in to see what faculty are doing because it's important. I – I do want to not lose sight though of the Realpolitik on the ground. At the end of the day, the – the state legislature numbers that – that I think it was Jeff who mentioned – there are thirteen Democrats. The rest are Republicans, you know? So they're – they are working within a construct and trying to maximize the position of the university in a way that requires that they move things forward with incredible amounts of pragmatism. That's – that's my observation about them, and they do it as – absolutely as – as brilliantly as I've ever seen it.

I want to mention one – one other thing that I – I'm not sure you all know. Does everybody in the room know what the 21st Century Scholars program is? [Yes] Okay. Because it – it – it's a program that the state and universities in the state cooperate on to provide, in essence, full funding plus living expenses for low income Indiana residents, and it's an absolutely critical program for – for economic and social mobility for people, and that performance metric is one that we can improve and I am focused a lot on improving it because, you know, our students' lives might hang in the balance. If they come for a year or two and they don't finish, or if they come for, you know, five or six or seven years they run out of funding after four right?

SPANG: Yeah.

ROBEL: And so, we – that's one where I really do think it's all hands on deck around that cohort of students. Other – is there anybody – I'm – I always am so aware that there's a back – thing in back of us here – when we're in this room.

SIMONS: Just a – a – a quick comment?

ROBEL: Yeah.

SIMONS: I can – I think there are a couple of things. First of all, it's very important to see things – these things – not on a state level, they're not just on a national level, but on a global level. All these issues about accountability of all public bodies are exactly part of the same logics and processes that we mentioned before and that's all the more reason to think that these AAUP principles are extremely important for us to have in mind as we move forward because they

give us a logical basis, a rationale, in which to engage with – with our public representatives to – in order to explain to them why it's so important we do what we do.

ROBEL: Yes?

LEMON: And I'll just put a pitch in – the Government Relations team every week on Friday sends out an electronic newsletter about what's happened in the state house so if you want to subscribe to that just go to the Government Relations website and you subscribe. It's a really great way to just to keep your pulse on exactly what's happening, you know, see – I don't know if you're aware of that, but it's – it's extremely helpful.

ROBEL: Yes?

HASS: Oh, I just wanted to get your opinion on whether you thought our state representatives would be thinking about this AAUP declaration because I have a 180 degree whiplash going from this to that.

ROBEL: I think you can make that judgment. [Laughter] I would encourage you to have that conversation with your colleagues.

HASS: Okay.

ROBEL: Thank you all so much.

SHERMAN: Right on time.

MEETING ADJOURNED: 5:30PM