Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
February 4, 2014
IMU – Georgian Room
3:30 P.M. – 5:30 P.M.

Attendance

MEMBERS PRESENT: David Baxter, Lyudmila Bronstein, Carolyn Calloway–Thomas, Mike Conway, Carrie Docherty, Marion Frank–Wilson, Don Gjerdingen, Dennis Groth, Vivian Halloran, Brady Harman, Bradley Heim, Gretchen Horlacher, Jason Baird Jackson, Karma Lochrie, Eugene McGregor, Patricia McManus, Jose Mitjavila, Michael Morrone, Maresa Murray, Jamie Prenkert, Lauren Robel, Jim Sherman, Rebecca Spang, Cassidy Sugimoto, Herb Terry, Kelly Thacker, Peggy Thoits, Johannes Turk, Edward Vasquez, John Walbridge, Rega Wood

MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT: Tom Gieryn (Shannon Martin); Sarita Soni (Ruth Stone)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Joelle Bahloul, Zach Bailey, Abhijit Basu, Gracia Clark, Claude Clegg, Ying Ding, Jake Docking, Nathan Ensmenger, Alyce Fly, Jeffrey Gershman, Krista Glazewski, Jeff Hass, Timothy Hoch, Kao Cheng, Christopher Kauffman, Peter Kloosterman, Dan Knudsen, Bradley Levinson, Michael McRobbie, Sherri Michaels, Joseph Miller, Jeff Nelsen, Deanna Reising, Matt Semadeni, Sandra Shapshay, Dia Sharma, Lisa Sideris, William Swanson, Adam Szczepaniak, Mikel Tiller, Jessica Tooker, Julie Van Voorhis, Nona Watt, James Wimbush

GUESTS: Jon Blau (Herald Times), Scott Borer (VP of Student Body for Congress), Angela Bowman (Army ROTC), Dave Breed (Graduate and Professional Student Rep.), Mark Bruhn (OEVPAA), Mia Carroll (Office of the Registrar), Craig Dethloff (Faculty Council Office), Catherine Dyar (Office of the Provost), Debbi Fletcher (IUEMC), Krystie L. Herdon (Academic Admission, College of Arts and Sciences), Mike Hoadley (Air Force ROTC), Christopher Kauffman (VP IUSA), Bob Kravchuk (SPEA, IUB–BAC co–chair), Ben Krebs (Army ROTC), Diane Mack (PSIA/IUEMC), Mark McConahay (Registrar), Ariadne Rehbein (Faculty Council Office), Kathrine Schultz (IDS), Ralph Vargas (Army ROTC)

Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes
http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/minutes/13–14/01.21.14.pdf

2. Memorial Resolutions for Arnold Milton Jenkins and Lawrence 'Les' Waters

Arnold Milton Jenkins: http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/13–14/B22–2014.pdf

Lawrence 'Les' Waters: http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/13–14/B23–2014.pdf

3. Executive Committee Business (10 minutes)
(Faculty President Herb Terry)

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

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

6. Discussion of Emergency Preparedness (30 minutes)
(Mark Bruhn, Associate Vice President, Public Safety and Institutional Assurance; Diane Mack, University Director of Emergency Management and Continuity; Debbi Fletcher, IU Bloomington Director, Emergency Management and Continuity; Jerry Minger, Director of Public Safety) [DISCUSSION]

7. Request for Priority Registration for ROTC Cadets Comparable to Current Priority Registration for Student Athletes (20 minutes)
(Professor Jim Sherman, Faculty President Elect and Chair of the Educational Policies Committee) [ACTION ITEM]

http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/13–14/B24–2014.pdf
http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/13–14/aux/PriorityReg.pdf

Minutes

AGENDA ITEM 1: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

ROBEL: ...we're still at a bit of an iffy place we're the – for our own campus. May I have a motion for approval of the minutes, please?

MCMANUS: So moved.

ROBEL: Second?

HALLORAN: Second.

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

ROBEL: All in favor? [Aye] Opposed? [Silence] Abstentions? [Silence] Okay, thank you very much. In Tom Gieryn's absence I am calling today on our Associate Vice Provost Shannon Martin to present our memorial resolutions. Shannon?

AGENDA ITEM 2: MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS FOR ARNOLD MILTON JENKINS AND LAWRENCE 'LES' WATERS

MARTIN: Thanks. Arnold Milton (Milt) Jenkins died on August 16, 2012, after a long and distinguished career at multiple universities, primarily Indiana University (1977–1989) and the University of Baltimore (1989–2004). Milt also served as L. J. Buchan Distinguished Professor at Oakland University, Adjunct Professor and later Visiting Professor at the University of Maribor, Kranj, Slovenia, and Visiting Professor at the University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana, Slovenia. Throughout his career, Milt was an excellent teacher and a hard–working, thoughtful researcher, as well as a team player who served on numerous committees and volunteered to teach courses above and beyond the standard teaching load. At Indiana University, we especially remember his extraordinary work in almost single–handedly creating the Management Information Systems major in the Ph.D. program in business and in working with over a score of doctoral students.

Milt was born on June 12, 1938, and he received an Associate of Mechanical Engineering degree from Worcester College in 1961, a Bachelor of Science in Engineering degree from the University of Albuquerque in 1969, an M.B.A. from the University of New Mexico in 1971, and a Ph.D. from the University of Minnesota in 1977. At Indiana University, Milt was an Assistant Professor of Management Information Systems from 1977 to 1981, and then an Associate Professor of Management Information Systems from 1981 to 1989. In addition, Milt was named a Distinguished Research Fellow at the Institute for Research on the Management of Information Systems (IRMIS), Indiana University, in 1985–1986, and then Director of Research at IRMIS in 1986–1989.

At Indiana University, Milt regularly taught the M.B.A.–level Information Systems and Design course, and he did an outstanding job with this difficult–to–teach course. He won the M.B.A. Association Teaching Excellence Award in 1979, and he won the M.B.A.–Career Integrated Program (Indianapolis) Student Advisory Board's Teaching Excellence Award in 1980. His strongest contribution to the Management Information Systems curricula, however, was in creating and initially teaching all four of the required courses for the Management Information Systems (MIS) major in the Ph.D. program in business: Research Design and Methods in MIS, MIS Research Topics in Systems Analysis and Design, MIS Research Topics in Administration and Technology, and Research Seminar in MIS. Creating and teaching these doctoral courses was a labor of love for Milt, and the reading lists for these courses were almost book–length. He then

served on the dissertation committees for many of the students in these courses. From 1982 to 1989 he chaired twelve dissertation committees (including that of the first MIS Ph.D. graduate from Indiana University), and he served as a member of thirteen additional dissertation committees (including that of the current Interim Dean of the Kelley School of Business). The doctoral students recognized his contributions by nominating him for the Doctoral Student Association's Teaching Excellence Award in three different years. He was also nominated for the Doctoral Student Association's Inspiration and Guidance Award in multiple years, and he won this important award in both 1982 and 1983.

Milt's teaching was not limited to a traditional classroom setting. During the 1980s, the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) recognized the severe shortage of properly trained Information Systems faculty members. Milt, in collaboration with the AACSB, developed and directed the AACSB's Advanced MIS Faculty Development Institute, which was held in Bloomington, in the summers of 1985 through 1988. He also developed and taught major segments of the Institute each year.

He also taught seminars and short courses on new or developing Information Systems techniques, such as Prototyping and CASE (computer–assisted software engineering), at sites around the world, including Australia, the Netherlands, Yugoslavia, England, Sweden, and Brazil.

In 1995, Milt was named by the Data Processing Management Association as the winner of the national "Distinguished Information Systems Educator of the Year Award" in recognition of his distinguished service and lifetime achievement in Information Systems education.

Milt had a tremendous impact on research in MIS at Indiana University. He had a good research record at Indiana, which eventually led to his appointment as the Baltimore Gas & Electric Company Chaired Professor of MIS and Eminent Scholar, Merrick School of Business, University of Baltimore, in 1989. But his impact came from more than just his own record: He worked with other faculty members (including the author of this memorial resolution) and doctoral students to make all of us better researchers. Milt insisted on doing research the right way—his research design and methods course was popular for many majors in addition to MIS, and was even required for some other majors in the school. He led the creation of a working paper series, and he regularly brought in outside scholars to stimulate our thinking. As noted earlier, he was named Distinguished Research Fellow at the Institute for Research on the Management of Information Systems (IRMIS) and later Director of Research at IRMIS. He was the research leader of the MIS faculty at Indiana during his years here.

Milt will be missed by the entire Information Systems academic community worldwide, but especially by his colleagues at Indiana University and the University of Baltimore.

This memorial resolution will become part of the minutes of the Bloomington Faculty Council. Copies will be sent to his wife, Sarece Jenkins, and his two children, Arnold and Michelle.

If one word could be used to describe Les Waters, it would probably be "inspiration." Les was many things, but to those who studied under his direction or who worked with him, what he did better than most really good teachers was to inspire his students and colleagues. After inspiration, the next most appropriate word is "encouragement."

Les Waters' prowess as a teacher is evidenced by his always crowded transportation graduate seminar that met at 3:30 on Friday afternoons. Moreover, halfway through the semester, the class would meet again in the evening at the Waters residence for more discussion and student presentation of transportation topics. More than one dissertation found its way into existence based on a presentation in the transportation seminar.

Les' teaching method was formidable preparation in order to tell relevant stories about a given topic. Many examples were used to illustrate a point or explain a complicated situation. His stories were always on target and memorable. His broad scope of knowledge earned him the reputation of one of the best informed faculty members on the Bloomington campus.
Les Waters joined the IU business school faculty in 1948, coming from the University of Kansas. Les served the University of Kansas' School of Business as a Professor of Finance and became Chairman of Finance, as well as Director of the Bureau of Business Research. He was also the Economist for the Archison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company and wrote a fine business history of the railway that was published in 1950.

Dean Arthur Weimer was always scouting for talent, and he charged some of his most trusted top faculty members with the task of looking for talented faculty for the business school. Les Waters was one of the talent scouts, and he was responsible for finding many top–flight faculty, not only in transportation and public utilities, but also in other fields of business. Les was active in various academic organizations and became acquainted with academics and professional practitioners of business in the U.S. and abroad. A major instance of broadening of horizons came in 1954 when he spent a year with British Railways and met with and gained the friendship of many academic and professional transportation and economic thinkers in Britain and Europe.

As a result of his year with British Rail, Les became very active in developing international business studies at IU. He sponsored a series of summer programs in international business

held in Lofer, Austria. He was instrumental in bringing foreign students to study at the IU School of Business long before it became a relatively commonplace practice.

Les was always anchored in the real world and encouraged engagement with reality as well as theory for his own work and that of his students and colleagues. He enjoyed mentoring, and he was practically a one–man employment bureau. He worked wonders in placing students in good positions, thanks to his many contacts in the business and academic spheres.

Les Waters played a key role in creation of the American Society of Traffic and Transportation (now the American Society of Transportation and Logistics) and helped get funds necessary to create *The Transportations Journal*.

Les Waters was a great colleague. He was always ready to talk about matters of interest, which were very broad in his case ranging from transportation and business to history, opera, plays and worthwhile books. And there were no short conversations; the full measure of a topic would be wrung out and completely vented. One could always count on learning something new in any talk with Les. That's why he was inspiring, whether in encouraging a student or a new faculty member. His reputation as one of the best informed faculty at IU was well earned.

ROBEL: Thank you. Please stand. [All stand in silence] Thank you. [All sit] I call now on our President Herb Terry for Executive Committee Business.

AGENDA ITEM 3: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE BUSINESS

TERRY: Thank you, Lauren. I'm happy to report that our colleagues read the agendas because not long after we distributed the agenda Lauren and I received a comment from a faculty member on one of our items today, on the proposed registration change for ROTC members, and we've referred that letter to Jim, and when he presents the item we trust he will summarize it and address some of the concerns and questions that were raised by our colleague. So it's always nice to get comments from our colleagues based on the agenda. Read your agendas.

I'm happy to report that we have named, the Executive Committee has named, two members to a joint University Faculty Council administration taskforce. That taskforce is going to try and develop both guidelines and potential policies for the review system to be used or applied to system wide, IU wide, academic officers – are not – are the people that we've named are I'm happy to report very experienced. Both of them have chaired recently on this committee – on this campus, reviews of deans. Very grateful to Hannah Buxbaum for agreeing to serve. Hannah is on leave after serving as interim dean, and she asked for some time to think about my request that she serve, and she choose to serve, and I'm very grateful that she is going to serve. Another – the other person that we've named is David Reingold from SPEA. David has

also chaired a recent dean's review. So our – our hope here is that we get people on this taskforce which will be coordinated through John Applegate's office by Anne Massey that will recommend some good guidelines and procedures for those reviews. I assured Anne when she asked questions about it that – that this group was free to start from a blank page, that they could look at what they thought would be the ideal principles behind doing reviews of admin – of academic officers and their units, and that they should feel free to recommend to the UFC whatever they wanted to recommend. We currently don't have any policies for the review of system wide academic officers. In fact, we aren't even certain who system wide academic officers are, other than probably John Applegate who is now the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs. You put "academic" in the title, you're probably becoming an academic officer, but there are probably others too and so they – they have a broad slate. We're hopeful that they can actually come back with recommendations to the UFC Executive Committee by the end of semester. I'm also hopeful that what they recommend, particularly if they produce nice little guidelines as to why we do this and what we're trying to get out of it will be something that can lead to a review of these policies at campus levels. I can tell you that Lauren's predecessor, Karen Hanson, and Lauren herself have expressed some reservations that our current policies are not ideal, and hopefully we can use the guidelines that this group devises as a – an exercise next year in reviewing all of the ways in which we review those who guide our academic enterprises.

MaryFrances is scheduled to report at the Trustees' meeting at IUP – IUPUI next week on the parking strategic plan. As you remember, she was challenged by the Trustees to tell them how she would generate an amount of money comparable from parking if we kept it to what it was predicted we would get if we privatized it. I asked John Applegate last time I met with him if he could help me get some information from MaryFrances, and I haven't heard anything from John, but hopefully that will work, and Jack Windsor and I will have some idea what she's going to present so we can talk with the Trustees about it at the meeting. Lauren is also scheduled to give the Trustees an update on new academic directions. I think that might have been postponed from Richmond.

ROBEL: [Comment Indistinct].

TERRY: Yeah. If she – she wants to say anything about what she's going to say she can do that. But she is scheduled and we'll be there to observe that. There was a meeting at IUPUI last week of Public and Governmental Affairs, PAGR, to which they invited university officers and they invited the members of the University Faculty Council's Government and External Relations Committee. Generally, it was just an update on where things stand. It was also advice on how – what to do or what not to do if you want to advance IU's causes in federal and state government. Because this is a short session of the General Assembly it's not likely to

reopen the budget. There was some discussion of how we might be affected by the 2% budget reversion that Governor Pence ordered in December. It's not a cause for panic at the moment. It was a prudent, I think, move by the governor based on one less than anticipated revenue forecast. I hope – I'm hopeful that – that – that going forward the state's revenues may improve, and we may discover that it isn't fully affected, but whatever it is it's probably not a cause for – for huge panic, and I think IU government relations is doing what it can to respond appropriately to it. One thing that was a focus of that meeting was HJR-3 which I assume some of you are following. Let me tell you what I have done with regard to that as well as what the university is doing. University still remains committed to the proposition that the resolution, the constitutional amendment should not go to a – to a public vote. That's the position of Freedom Indiana which we joined, it is the position of Lilly and Cummins, and – and others that are also part of Freedom Indiana, and I believe it is still the position that the university is advancing. The House took the so called second sentence of the amendment out; this is the one that said that the state would not recognize anything as if it were a marriage if it was not also between one man and one woman. That's variously interpreted as to its effects on same sex partner benefits and a bunch of other things. That was stripped from the bill, from the version in the House, and that's what went to the Senate. That creates some confusion because the state constitution does say that amendments require that they be adopted in two consecutive separately separate – separately elected General Assemblies. Some believe that the change in language means it could not go forward to a – a vote in this November, others in the General Assembly argue that it can. The Senate could restore the second sentence, they could end up at loggerheads over whether or not to restore – there are many outcomes. What I can tell you is that the Senate leader, Senator Long, assigned it to a committee that he chairs. That committee will meet Monday following a 1:30 meeting of the Senate. I presume IU will be invited to speak at that, and probably send the same representatives that we did to the House. Our general indications are that the committee will be advised by Senator Long to simply send it out of the committee in the version that it was received from the House. And Senator Long has been quoted as saying that if the second sentence goes back in or does not, that will be decided on the floor of the – of the Senate. On behalf of the UFC I wrote at as timely fashion as possible to the members of the House Committee before they took it up, the members of the Indiana House, both democrats and republicans before they took it up, and I wrote last week to the members of Senator Long's committee. What I basically stressed was that the faculty, the UFC, and the Councils of – all of the IU campuses that report to IU, in other words not IPFW although they also oppose it, join the administration in believing that this should – this could be harmful to the state, harmful to Indiana University, and should not go forward for a – a public vote. I mostly got automated responses saying, you know, 'thank you for your response,' 'I get lots of e-mail, I'll take it into account,' 'I appreciate it,' one of them added 'be blessed.' I did however get three or four responses from folks who obviously read it and were glad to receive

it. They were all from people that are on the record as opposing the amendment, but nonetheless we did what we can. Jack Windsor, John Applegate, and I have discussed whether or not we might want to put out some guidelines for faculty and – and others should this get out of the General Assembly and go to a public vote. What we're talking about is – is advice that makes, you know, a lot of sense, that – that this is individual advocacy for or against the amendment, whatever side a faculty member comes out on, that needs to be done on your own time and not IU's time, that it probably would be a really good idea to make sure that – that what you're saying represents you, and that you don't come across as a representative of Indiana University, although the university officially at the moment does oppose this constitutional amendment, and finally it's probably a good idea to not use university resources to do this. Send it on your own letter head and get yourself an e-mail account from the Gmail account or something of – try not to send it on IU accounts. Not so much I think – because obviously use of university resources for private advocacy is not a great thing, but also because it could come back and hurt your case. We want to be able to indicate that this is the feelings of individuals who happen to be associated with Indiana University.

Work continues on the degree maps. I still am on the taskforce that deals with that. I am sticking to the position that we need to make sure that the whatever system for degree maps we set up maps the curriculum as the faculty have adopted it, and that's going to be hard, and some of the technical problems of doing that are becoming more apparent, but I am taking that position and I – I think we have the support from – I'm trying to do that so we're – we're trying to go that route. I assume Lauren will comment on the progress of the strategic plan, it's still very much a work in progress, the IU strategic plan, sorry, let's distinguish from the IUB strategic plan, is very much a work in progress. It's still supposed to be completed by June and the leaders of the UFC are working hard to try and design some system so there's meaningful faculty input for that plan as it's developed. Lauren, I assume, will say more about her progress on the IUB strategic plan. What I will say is that I anticipate that the next meeting of this council on February 18th will be devoted to a discussion of that plan if it gets out in time for comment, and for the BFC members and committees to look at it. If we need to as I said at the last meeting, we have February 25th, there's not a scheduled BFC meeting. You should kind of try and hold it on your calendar, and if we have to have a special BFC meeting on the 25th devoted to the plan in order to give it time for meaningful thought and comment we'll do that. My comments, thank you.

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

ROBEL: Great! Thank you so much. I'll keep my report quite short. I wanted to let the Council know, and you'll be reading this I also think, I suspect in the newspaper or… the – the Trustees have approved a plan to – to change the summer tuition discount, and for our campus the

summer tuition discount will go away, and it will be replaced with an increase in the credit hours that are covered by the flat fee from seventeen to eighteen. The – at the other campuses the summer tuition discount stays in place, and I think this primarily reflects the differences in our – the situations of our students. For IU Bloomington the summer tuition discount was not something that appeared to influence much behavior over the last two years. We've been absolutely flat. I think we were up maybe 1% and down 0.5% so – in the two years that we did it. So as – as an inducement to students to – to continue to go year round in formal courses and use that as a mechanism for quickly getting through college, that – that didn't seem to work particularly well for the students on our campus. Although, it has worked moderately – more than moderately well for students who were in different circumstances than our students on other campuses. The – the Board of Aeons had recommended after a year study of completion and looking very carefully at completion rates on our campus, and what distinguished students who were able to complete college in four years from those in five, six, or never had recommended increasing the number of credit hours covered by the flat fee. The flat fee was set at seventeen credit hours, and seventeen credit hours if you divide by three does not come out in exactly the way one might hope I suspect if you're a student. Raising it to eighteen permits students in theory to take – to add another three credit hour course, and in the view of the Board that recommended this and the president, and looking at what our peer institutions have done where we have been far – far below actually, frankly, what's covered by the flat fee at other institutions, the president and the Trustees decided to move forward with permitting this change in order to continue to allow many of our students who would like to take an additional three credit hour course and continue to make progress towards their degrees. So that's the – the news from – on that front. I actually don't have anything to say about the presentation to the Trustees on New Academic Directions. It was delayed from December and it was really sort of a crossing the T's and dotting the I's presentation and John Applegate has [comment indistinct] on that. What has – what my focus has been for the Trustees meeting coming up is a presentation by our Dean of Students, Pete Goldsmith, and his team on student health and safety, and in particular on our compliance with Title IX on sexual assault reporting, and the procedures for handling sexual assault and sexual violence on campus. The good news is that the dean of students' office just won a national – the national award for its compliance in this area. It's been working extremely hard on these procedures and on the underlying, broader philosophy of trying to help our students think through and deal with one of the most difficult things that could possibly happen to a student in – in school, and also to – to adjudicate the relationship of students who are accused of being the perpetrators in a sexual violence or assault situation, adjudicate the relationship of that student to the university. We obviously are not adjudicating anything else, that's all we're adjudicating. So there's a report that will be presented by Pete and his team as well as the student services team in Indianapolis to the Trustees at this upcoming meeting.

And on the strategic plan, my goal has always been to get it out by next Monday. I was hoping to beat the – beat that date but I'm not going to. So it will be posted on the website. We've had lots of good discussions of the draft reports with a number of constituencies so far and I'm trying to process that – the comments I've gotten back through that process. Once the report is up it will be open to the entire campus to comment. So sounds like fun over the next couple of weeks. Questions for me? I don't believe any questions were submitted, so I'd like to turn at this point to the next item on our agenda, the discussion of emergency preparedness. We were in the haunting position of meeting communally as an emergency preparedness group on the day after the shooting at Purdue recently. That was for – fortuitous does not seem like the right word for that – it was coincidence that we had set that up. The Executive Committee thought it might be helpful to have the – our emergency response team give some overview of emergency preparedness in this – in this arena and so I'm really happy to introduce three wonderful people. Mark Bruhn is the Associate Vice President for Public Safety and Institutional Assurance, Diane Mack is the University Director of Emergency Management and Continuity, and the intrepid Debbie Fletcher is the Bloomington Director of Emergency Management continuity, and I spend a fair amount of time on the phone with Debbie during any weather event –

FLETCHER: – I always have lots of good news for her, so she loves to talk to me –

ROBEL: – So at this point I'd like to turn it over to Mark and Diane and Debbie.

AGENDA ITEM 6: DISCUSSION OF EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

BRUHN: Very good, thank you for allowing us to come and talk to you today. I was going to spend a little bit of time talking about the organizational changes that have occurred over the last, well, four of five years now, but really sort of with a lot of momentum over the last three years. I'm going to do that very briefly and then I think that will let us get into some of the more substantive comments and questions that you might have. We created in 2010 a new emergency management and continuity planning department for the university. There was some effort, though it was hidden, and there were people struggling to get – to get any traction on some effort for planning for emergency management across the university prior to that, but again, no sort of emphasis on that. In 2010, well,3

a variety of things happened. You could sort of go through the sort of litany of incidents that happened prior to that that sort of added additional momentum. We assumed responsibility for that in late 2009. We started putting an organization together in early 2010. What we decided we would do is we would seek out and hire certified professionals in emergency management as opposed to grabbing somebody from within the university who might have the desire and the will but not necessarily the background and the certification. Our protection has

now arrived. [Jerry Minger enters meeting] [Laughter] Actually, I asked Jerry to come along too because some of your questions may have to do with policing and public safety, so Jerry Minger.

ROBEL: Thanks, Jerry.

BRUHN: The – we hired Diane Mack from the Indiana Department of Homeland Security. She was working emergency management there and so had already been – was already certified, had already been working on the – on the same sorts of things for the state of Indiana, and so we sort of lured her out of there. They're still not overly happy with the number of people we've taken out of that department at this point, but she was the first, and so Diane is responsibility for emergency management and continuity planning across the entire of the university, so she's the one that does the very high level strategy and planning. We then looked for a dedicated person for, I'm not sure what order we did these things in, but actually there was an interim step for Diane, I forgot, sorry. She was at IUPUI for two years – ? three years – ? doing the same job, and so we actually stole her from IUPUI, which stole her from IDHS. So it wasn't directly our fault as far as Diane's concerned. We then looked for someone, a professional, for IU Bloomington and we got Debbie from the Marion County Emergency Management Agency, I think was what that was, and it was interesting because we had been hearing Debbie on the radio and on T.V. doing the public relations stuff around some of the incidents up there and we were, you know, when we started interviewing her we recognized who it was and it was good because she did an excellent job with those so it sort of bore that out. We then of course had to find a replacement for Diane at IUPUI. We hired Carlos Garcia from again from IDHS, I'm getting these right, I think, from IDHS so he's a professional, certified, emergency management planner for IUPUI, and then we wanted to find someone for the third half of the university, so the regional campuses, and we hired at the time Joe Romero, also from IDHS. That's why they were unhappy with us. Joe has since gone back to IDHS, and then we hired somebody else from IDHS to replace him. And so we have Diane over the whole thing, she's the uber director for emergency management, we have Debbie for Bloomington, we have Carlos Garcia for IUPUI, and we have Bill Smith now for the regional campuses collectively. Their initial job, of course, was to assess the state of things across all of those sort of three halves, and just to skip to the sort of the chase to the – to the end credits maybe, they have implemented new campus emergency management plans on all of the campuses over the last couple of years. They have identified essential personnel on all the campuses, those people who would be critical to response really to any sort of an incident. They have done training for all of those people. They have set up emergency operation centers sort of virtually in some places, in some cases, emergency operations centers for every campus. There's incident management teams for every campus. There's an executive policy group for every campus. Provost Robel chairs the one here for IUB. Each campus, the emergency plans that were

established on each campus follows the federal framework, the federal guidelines, the National Incident Management System which was brand new to me before these folks walked in the door, and the incident command system, and so it's based on federal standards. What that means essentially, there's a lot more to it than this, it does mean a lot of training for a lot of people, but what it does fundamentally mean is that any incident response at IU Bloomington, or really any campus, will be completely coordinated with the other responders, the community responders and state responders. They all use the same terminology, they all use the same – the same practices, the same operating procedures, and so if there has to be joint command one from the fire department at Bloomington and one from campus, they know how to speak to each other and – and so all of that is coordinated. The whole framework came, sort of, mostly out of the Katrina response, so you can understand why a framework would have been a really good idea after how that went down. The plans are not specific to individual hazards, to specific hazards. So while we do spend a little bit more time on tornados and have spent a little bit more time over the last year and a half on active shooter, the plans are designed to – to address all hazards, that is they're flexible enough to sort of amoeba-like change. People come and they go depending on the nature of the hazard that we're dealing with, and that's how they're trained, and so someone says what am I supposed to do specifically in a particular situation that may not be in the training. It's something that we train around and then – and then they have to use judgment in that situation. We'll get a bit more to that as it has to do with all of you shortly. Training, again, has been done for all of the sort of people, the essential staff who would be responsible for – for participating in a response. They each have individual training sessions, they all have their own individual checklists and documentation, they have – they go through table top exercises, they go through boots on the ground exercises. Now specifically for active shooter there's a three set – by the way, they're going to, as soon as I say something wrong or incomplete, they're – they're – they're supposed to jump in and correct me, or add to what I'm saying, and so if you see them going like this, [Gesturing] that's what they're about to do. There are sort of three steps in the active shooter training that they've put together. The first one is a workshop. That was held, I think you mentioned, the day after the Purdue event, just coincidental – coincidentally. And then that workshop is for all the people who'd be involved in the response. It's – it's pretty detailed. It goes through all of the eventualities, all the sorts of things that could happen. Then the next step is a table top exercise where they're handed a scenario, an initial scenario, and then the scenario will sort of modify as the discussion goes on. That's a tabletop exercise generally and – and the third then is the larger, very much more involved, boots on the ground exercise. And so you can imagine a campus this size, if we're going to have anything of significance in the exercise of significance, that is something that would test sort of all the moving parts adequately, it has to be a pretty large production. We have to have, you know, theatre and drama students with bottles of ketchup and, you know, whatever there has to be, and it has to be as realistic as we can make it

while people still know that it's going to happen, right? Because you can't really have something on – on the campus like this. Somebody has to know about this, some building has to be accessible to the responders for the exercise, something has to be closed, streets blocked off, stuff like that so – so certainly it's a little more difficult to do those sorts of exercises, the larger ones without people knowing about those. Am I okay thus far?

UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER: Yeah, great.

BRUHN: Good. The – okay so you're going to want to talk about IU Notify. The way that we do all the communications on emergency, or weather closings, or what have you is using a product called RAVE, it's a commercial product that we purchased. It does okay. That's a key point. It does okay. Alright, for what it's supposed to do, it does okay. It's capable of sending messages in a wide variety of modalities, text, you get all these right? Text, phone, e-mails, another phone call on your cell, so it – it has a, you know, it goes to digital signs, it goes to Twitter, so it does all of that stuff in sort of a blast mode. We choose the modalities based on the nature of the incident. If it's a – if it's a fairly significant emergency on campus we're sending that notification to every modality, and everybody who's in the contact list, but if it's a more limited thing, you know, then we'll try to send it to specific people. There's a couple of points related to that. Well, let me make another point, it might help too. We used templates for almost every – there's a defined template for almost every event that we can imagine. That's maybe a bit of an overstatement. But there are canned templates and so what the – the dispatchers at IUBPD will do is for example is that there's a tornado heading, you know, they'll pull out that template, they'll change the date and the time, and they'll send it out. They don't have to do much thinking about what to send. If there's an event, an incident on the campus like what happened with the stabbing incident, you know, they'll pull out – they didn't in this case which caused us some problems, but they would pull out the template, they would change it, and then they would send it out that way. So we try to get those things defined in advance so they don't have to do a lot of thinking, they just pull it out, put the additional, pertinent information in there, and then send it out. It obviously reduces the time to send that out and it keeps them from having to make sort of qualitative decisions about what to say, it's already said. And then the – the sort of rule of thumb is that we try to send updates depending on the circumstance, obviously. We try to send updates every thirty to forty, forty-five minutes. Now a lot of times it's very difficult to do that and sometimes you might get a text based on a – about an emergency that says, you know, stay where you are there isn't any further information. But you know, that's – that's the goal. So there's – there's a few things about this that sort of, if you thought about this, you'd – you'd probably get straight away. First off, we – we really can't know when somebody is sort of on vacation, right? So if you're in Florida and we close the campus for weather, you're likely going to get that message and you're going to roll over and look out the window and it's bright and sunny, and – and you know, you're getting a message

that there's all kinds of ice and snow on the Bloomington campus, and it's closed or delayed or what have you. We can't figure out also where, you know, where you might go. I mean you may be laying in bed in Bloomington and when you get an event notice you're all fine, and then you may have had plans to come to campus. We don't know that. And so it's very hard for us to choose – pick and choose– it's technically, it's nearly technically impossible first, and then it's going to be very hard, sort of socially, culturally, figure out where people are, or where they might be, and so you're going to get notices. Right? So we – we try to use this thing as little as we – as we can. But at the same time, you know, you all need to know, the students need to know the information that they need to know. You know if we had the stabbing incident at –

FLETCHER: – Tulip Tree.

BRUHN: Tulip Tree, you know, we had, we didn't really know in which direction that person went and so, you know, we can't sort of inform a swath of the campus while not informing people in the other half of the campus and so that was a broad notice as well. So there's a lot of things that we can't do as it relates to figuring out whether you should or should not receive notice because we don't know where you are, we don't know where you're going to be, and if you're going to – if you're going to be somewhere that, you know, which will put you in harm's way then certainly you need to know about the incident. Some – I – I know there was a lot of conversation around this and – and of course there was a lot of information that came out of several of our incidents. There was also some conversation about what happened at Purdue around this, so I'm going to pause and see if you have any questions, comments, thoughts, suggestions, ideas, especially those latter things. Yes?

SPANG: I canvased my colleagues about this and I also took the opportunity to talk to some of my undergraduates, and they all realize that unless we monitor them very, very carefully we can't pinpoint which notices they get. Everybody recognizes that. On the other hand, there is definitely a boy who cried wolf phenomenon at work with IU Notify. I spoke to a number of colleagues and some students who have given fake contact details to the system because they're sick and tired of having their phone ring. I've talked to other people who say they're going to do that. I'm concerned that we're in a position where people will not be able to get the notifications they actually, desperately need. Everybody agrees that if they were notified only by text message they would not mind getting multiple messages. But it's having text, e-mail, and phone that is driving people around the bend and making them take this extreme position that's potentially endangering them. So is there were a way in which individuals in the system could say I only want to be notified by text, or if the system only did notify the people by text, I think people would be much, much happier with it. I know that for the students that the notice also goes to their home telephone number, so then their mom calls and says, 'Are you okay?'

BRUHN: – And then mom calls us too, actually. [Laughter]

SPANG: This is just adding to the anxiety and the frustration.

BRUHN: So if we – what we have to consider is how we're going to get to the majority of people, and so it's getting such now, we all know that, you know, that some large percentage are carrying around a smart phone and text would work probably fine. But there's still some number of people who don't, and so we have to take into account – there's two I think right there. Thank you, perfect, perfect example. There are people out there who don't, and so we still have to rely on other sort of modalities. E-mail for many notifications is just useless. It takes so long to get that many e-mails out. It takes a good – I think we were looking at pretty consistently thirty to thirty five minutes after each text reached at least me, that I got the e-mail, so the e-mail is right out. So clearly that leaves phone, it leaves webpage, it leaves Twitter, it leaves Facebook, it leaves the scroller on the bottom of WTIU, and so – and so we have to – we have to add these things up because it has to be layered in order to get the maximum number of people. Now, as things change, as the way people behave and what they carry changes, we might be able to sort of start reducing our reliance on some of those other things, but you know, we have to reach the majority of the people. Now there are going to be some changes to the way that the system works. Do you want to talk a little about that?

MACK: Sure. So the – before we never had a chance, an option in the system, to opt out of any kinds of those, especially the phone number modalities. We are changing that in – in the very near future, where you will be able to opt out of, for example, phone calls.

SPANG: Oh, good.

MACK: So that you will be able to have your correct information in there but yet not receive those. We're also going to make sure and verify, especially with our templates, that – that phone calls are used only when really, really necessary so that we can – we really want to rely on text for the most part because we have evidence there, we – we've done tests on it – and we have evidence that text reach between 75%–90% of the population that we send it to within one minute, which is phenomenal, and that goes for all of our campuses, so we really want to put the hard court press on that one, and – and reduce the reliance of phones without taking them out entirely.

SPANG: Okay.

BRUHN: Anything you want to – ?

ROBEL: Can I ask just because I – I – I wonder if people, our community thinks about this. My guess is that these notifications also exist in a regulatory web so that there – there may well be

Clery Act or other requirements for when we send them out that – that it might be useful for the – for the Council to understand.

BRUHN: Yes, good. Actually, I should have put that in there. I don't know how many people looked at this, but that that's an important point that didn't make it in here. The Clery Act, the Jeanne Clery Protection – Safety Protection Act, or whatever the name of it is – the Clery Act, federal Clery Act provides that we do notifications in certain circumstances, and they use the term "immediate notifications." The act initially had thirty minutes in it, but there was such as outcry about that because it was clearly based on circumstances – various circumstances – but we are required to do immediate notifications on certain things, which means that if, you know, if a student here – well it's been a couple years now, a student was walking by herself under the bridge on Indiana I think it was, and was assaulted. Because of where that was located adjacent to IU property, we are required by federal law to send out immediate notification of that as a threat. There's another thing that they call "timely warning." This gets us into a little bit of trouble because, again, definitionally there's a problem with that, where if something happens on campus that's not sort of an immediate threat, but it's information that people could use to protect themselves, then we're required to send out a timely warning, and as we're sort of working with our federal liaisons trying to get some of this stuff, some of these requirements sort of combined. Now we have the Violence Against Women Act, we have the AGOA provisions that modify both of those, and so there's a lot of, sort of, complicated obligations that we have to adhere to and so we're trying to figure out how to sort of get out from underneath some of the complexity. Clearly the goals are admirable, right? I mean, the fact is that there were some campuses, I don't think IU has ever been in this boat, but there are some campuses who were in fact sort of pushing some of this stuff aside in favor of, you know, protecting the reputation and all that stuff and so – so clearly that's – clearly that was needed. And so, yes, we have an increasingly complex set of requirements around a lot of these things. There were other questions I think about the notification thing – ?

UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER: [Comment Indistinct]

BRUHN: Oh, we're required also to send "all clears" and so we did that for the stabbing incident, for example, and if you think about the robbery at this credit union it – it takes a while to find the individual, if they find that person at all, and so you may get an all clear, you know, a day and a half later if they caught somebody who's still suspected to be around campus, and so we do, we are required to send the "all clear." Yes?

TERRY: My academic field was telecommunications, so I know the difficulties of converting text to speech. I have a suggestion. I think that must be what you're doing with you templates. The templates are text, somebody loads them down, puts in addresses or buildings or changes, and then that get converted to speech. Am I right?

BRUHN: Yep.

TERRY: Okay. It doesn't do well with IU abbreviations.

BRUHN: Right.

TERRY: And – and so I would hope the advice to whomever makes the change is don't put in IU abbreviations that it can't figure out how to pronounce, or even things like it – it abbreviates – it took "Apts.," which you meant I think as apartments and converted it to apps or something like that. It would be clearer and I think you could probably improve your instructions to the people who change the templates to they better match the voice recognition pattern.

BRUHN: The first interesting encounter with that would be when we put in the first IU Notify and IUPUI sent out an alert and had IUPUI in the alert.

TERRY: – Oh, yeah.

BRUHN: It was interesting the way that the thing tried to pronounce that –

TERRY: I remember that.

BRUHN: It wasn't anything we would have expected. But yes, we actually do look at those periodically but we should go back and take a look at some of those things. Should I move ahead?

FLETCHER: The only thing – I would like to say something really quickly.

BRUHN: Yes.

FLETCHER: One of the things to, again I'm the [microphone interference] I'm not sure if I can do this. One of the things to think about to on the emergency notifications specifically, like with the Tulip Tree or the – the robbery, while we try to make sure there are templates for every eventuality, there aren't always. So you've got somebody in dispatch who's getting information from the police who are trying to make the best decision possible. So understood that we – we try to make sure we don't cry wolf, because we understand that completely. We also get, and then thing is, while you may not feel our pain, we get the messages for everybody. So every time anybody does anything on any of the campuses we get it all, even if it's 3 o'clock in the morning, it doesn't matter. So –

BRUHN: It's bad in the winter.

FLETCHER: It gets really bad in the winter, especially this today. But just remember that too when you receive that, and that's probably one of the biggest things is how can we

communicate to people, what the technology limitations are to us and, you know, when we're trying to make decisions, and I know Jerry can speak to law enforcement tries to make a decision in a very quick amount of time and they always will err on the side of caution. So you may get a notification that you really don't care about because you're at home sleeping at 4 o'clock in the morning on a Sunday. I was actually in Florida when the Tulip Tree incident occurred and I was on the phone. Mark's like, "So, are you going in?" Uh, well, not yet. It will be about eighteen hours before I can make it. But I was still up at 4 o'clock too so, you know, and I understand, and we do, we're always trying and striving and developing new ways to try to make this as effective a system as absolutely possible. So…

BRUHN: So the – one of the sort of larger areas that we spend a lot of time working on is active shooter, right? So you clearly, you followed those events not just at universities but in other places around the country and it's – it's a difficult area to work in because it's sort of difficult to figure out how to respond. It's difficult to figure out what to tell people, how – how to tell individuals how to respond. It really does in the very end come down to the individual's choice in a – in a particular circumstance, and so as much as we would like to put, you know, a checklist on the back of every classroom door that says if you hear shots in the hallway this is exactly what you need to do, it just – it just can't happen. First off, it may say something that's completely wrong for that circumstance and makes things that much worse for – for everybody around you or for – for you, and so we're – we're working through this. We do have an active shooter website. Everything's on a website right? We have an active shooter website about the, and I don't want to say it quite this way – one of the best sort of components of that website is the video. There's a run, hide, fight video on that website. It was developed by the Houston Police Department I think with funding from USDHS, or some place, or FEMA. That video is – is – is very good. It's very well done. It sort of hits sort of all the problem areas that we're – we're trying to work through. I mentioned what we're doing sort of to – with the responders on all the campuses, the workshop, the tabletop exercise. The tabletop exercises get very intense. In fact, I think the very first one we did was, and President McRobbie was at that one, was in this very room I think, a couple of years ago. And people get very, very uncomfortable, and that's the point, right? So if a question comes up and you don't really know how you as a responder are going to react, in other words what's your next step, then – then that's what those things are for. Clearly then the campus wide exercise would be highly valuable. Our plan, and we should be – though it's budget construction time about now, we should be getting money each year to have two exercises each year, one on two different campuses, right? That was the plan.

MACK: One for every campus but two major ones.

BRUHN: One for every campus, but two major ones, okay. Good. And so there's an exercise schedule out about five years on – on – for all the campuses. The – the – the other thing that we're doing that relates to this, and I think the other document that you got sort of describes this very well. We started talking about this space a couple years ago and trying to figure out what we were going to do sort of with physical facilities as it relates to this. You all know, and there was a lot of conversation about being able to lock classroom doors. Many, many, many classroom doors do not have locks on the inside. If you think about this sort of very practically there are reasons why you don't want to have locks on the inside of classroom doors. In fact I will just tell you that under this project Ballantine Hall almost all or all the classroom doors in Ballantine Hall now have locks on the inside, and now there are a lot of doors being locked accidently or on purpose with nobody inside, and so somebody has to go run off and find a key. So it's causing key control problems, right? So – so that's, you know, some process, procedure, some sort of logistical issue that that does. Another instance that we had though I think at Southeast, is that when they had and event there someone locked the door from the inside and there was no peephole, and there was no window light, and a police officer banged on the door to tell the people what was going on and to get people out and everything and they wouldn't open the door for the police officer. They couldn't see him or her and – and did not believe that – that they were a police officer, and so that's sort of another kind of problem. If the doors are locked we do need to have a way for people to tell who's outside safely, right? That – facilities – I get this wrong, facility, security and safety master plan is how we're going to sort of work through all of those physical security issues in every building on every campus, and it's going to take a while to do that obviously. Ballantine was sort of a test case as it relates to the locks. That was – that cost – that one building cost on the order of $430,000 to put all those locks in, and so there's some statistics in that document you have that will then – well this says $380,000. Not that much of a difference, but I just want to be accurate. That's a lot of locks, a lot of doors, and a lot of buildings, and so it's going to take a while to do that. But we are going to look at all of those sort of different areas as it relates to those things. Any questions or comments about that aspect of it? I know that was something that a lot of people were talking about, and asking about, and worried about. [Silence] So the other thing that people have been talking about is getting the right information in the hands of the right people and so, you know, teaching faculty are standing in front of a classroom full of, you know, 500 students and there's shots in the hallway. Well, what does that – what does that faculty member do? What does that instructor do? As I said earlier on, we're not going to be able to hand you a checklist it's just – if that's what you're expecting then – well then I just don't know what to say without being negative about it. The – the – the theory is that we should be able to provide you with enough information to make sort of informed, intelligent decisions about what's going to happen next. And every one of you who stand in front of a classroom are sort of going to have think inside yourselves, if this happens what am I personally capable of doing, right? So if you

watch the run, hide, fight – hide, fight video the third part of that is fight. So there are people shown in the video, I think they were throwing things at the – at the person coming in and all of that. Everybody has to think about what it is that they're capable of doing. Am I personally capable, myself, my psychology, my physical being, am I going to be able to run at somebody who's holding a gun, or am I going to be able to start throwing things? Can I lift a table and put it in front a door, or move a coat rack, or whatever it happens to be, or am I going to have to figure something else out? And so we've got the active shooter website, it's got a lot of very good information on it. We really need a way to get – that's very passive, right? We need an active way to get the same and even more information into the hands of faculty. We are not completely sure of how to do that. We have a training delivery system called absorb, e-training we call it, and we have the ability to put all this training into e-training and people can come and take the training. How many people will come and take the training if it's there, if they are told about it, how many people will come – you don't have to raise your hand. How many people will come and take the training on their own proactively? Would it require a mandate? So if you are teaching faculty, if you are in a position where you are standing in front of a large number of students where – and you – and you may encounter a bad situation, should you be mandated to take the training? E-training allows us to track who took the training and when, and we could set the period as to how often that training needs to be taken.

HORLACHER: I was going to say this is something I think that any incoming faculty member ought to be exposed to? I mean that's not going to get the whole population, but I would have loved to have heard that kind of information when I was coming in, and that'd be an easy target to get some of it out right away.

RUHN: Yes.

HORLACHER: There are new faculty orientation events.

BRUHN: Yes, and – and traditionally we need to re – sort of get back into the conversation about the – sort of the three orientations, right? Students get security and safety information during orientation. That likely needs to be beefed up. Parents also get that sort of information at orientation. The staff – the staff orientation as far as I know is very short now, it doesn't contain a lot of material – in person material. It's very hard to get, you know, there's fifty, sixty departments that would like to get information in front of, not just staff, but faculty also and so it's – it's one of those things where we really have to make a choice as to what – what's going to be presented, and what the priority is and – and it would seem the way things are going – I don't want to be an alarmist by any stretch, but it seems like the way things are happening around us at other places that this ought to be a priority and we can have, again have those conversations. We are, as this thing says, absolutely open to any ideas and so we put Debbie's e-mail address on here since she represents the Bloomington campus, and so if you come up

with anything, if you come across any good ideas in your wonderings and your talking with other – other faculty in other places, then absolutely we want to hear those because we do need to effectively get information into your hands. Yes?

HALLORAN: I was teaching at Ballantine Hall the last time the young man jumped and my windows were open, and I heard a lot of screaming. This had been after Virginia Tech so I didn't know what to do and I felt very responsible for my students. There was – it was incredibly disorienting because there was no one telling us what happened or whether it was safe to let our students go, so I ask, right? I put a desk in front of the door and said let's just stay here until somebody tells us. What happens in case of a suicide in a tall building like that? Will there be an alert telling us it's okay to – because we heard screaming so we didn't know.

BRUHN: Well, the – the – going back to the other comment, that's going to be a threat based assessment and so in that case, terrible as it is, there is likely no other threat to other people on campus.

HALLORAN: – Right, well we didn't know –

BRUHN: And so there likely will not be an emergency notification about that, right? So there's, right there is the balance, right? People want to know what's happening but nothing that's happening in that situation, nothing that's happening is really going to hurt them unless they, in that case they couldn't get out the stairwell as I remember but… In any case there wasn't anything that could hurt them. It was a confined incident. So really what we think about is exactly that. We think about the level of threat to the people in that area to the campus, and that's when we decide to either issue the emergency notification or – or not. Or we send something a bit more – casual is the wrong term – but, you know, we may send out an e-mail for people to know what happened but that there was no threat.

FLETCHER: We do have something that – that we'll be beefing up and continuing to work with is every building that has academic classrooms in it, and even other offices, administrative offices, has something called – large enough that there's at least ten people in the building – has something called an emergency control committee or – those are the people who annoy you when there's a fire drill and a severe weather drill and tell you to go out, right? They also are really that conduit. So if, you know, in – in – in basic theory and – and the way we like to see it happen is if they are part of and understand that this has occurred that they can send those emergency control committee members just like they do during a fire drill to down the hall to say, an incident has occurred just please stay where you are. Because if nothing else we want you to stay where you are so you're not in the way of response, right? So that's the plan is to – is to start really building – and in the past they've been, it's been much more passive type of situation. We're really trying to build the partnerships so that those folks are empowered to be

more involved for any kind of an emergency incident that may occur within their building. You know giving them additional training, doing some other things so that they have that capability as well. You know the other piece of it is as technology gets better, you know, we may be able to send a notification just to a building and the people within that building rather than the entire campus, because obviously we wouldn't necessarily want to send it to everybody when something like that happens because everyone's going to try to go there. But, you know, again, technology restrains us in some ways but we can use the personnel that we have there and try to use them more effectively so –

BRUHN: I'm not actually sure if we had a notification – a formal notification system at that time actually, as long ago as that was. Other questions, comments? Yes?

WALBRIDGE: It's very difficult for me to believe that there wouldn't be useful information that could be posted in each classroom. I realize that you can't cover every situation. But it's difficult for me to believe that the alternative to not being able to cover every situation is to give no information at all. I have a class of 110 students and I have absolutely no idea what I would be supposed to do if something happened, you know, whether it's fire or –

FLETCHER: We actually have some good ideas for – for you. A couple of things that I know I went and talked to Lauren about and a couple of other things is participate or providing you like a syllabus insert, because students are the same way, right? We don't touch them very often when it comes to information we give them a pamphlet when they move in, we send them to the website if they ask questions, and that's kind of it. So it'd be really – if we can provide to you one thing would be a hanger on the door that says if it's a fire go this way and some of that information, but if we provide you a syllabus insert to template where, you know, you can read through it, it's going to have the same information, you just – basically it puts the onus on you, though, that for whatever classroom you're teaching in you need to know where you are. Some of the things are standard, right? In severe weather you're going in and down, or in the stairwells, or – or whatever. So we can give some pretty basic information that at least is better than nothing and we can provide that to you, and you can use it, and then the students also receive it because whether – I'm sure they all read every word of your syllabus, because I know I did, but it is something that may be something that can be added that's a little different that – that helps you as well as helps the student. So that's something that we can continue to – to and maybe bring to you all to have you review, if you'd be interested in that.

BRUHN: And again, you – you guys are in the classrooms. You're the ones interacting with the students and so anything like that, anything that you think would be effective, you know, we're looking at that as maybe that's not effective but if you think that's something that would be effective, even a little bit, you know, that's something that we could add to our list of –

WALBRIDGE: We don't always know the buildings we're in either, you know, I have no idea what the safest part of Jordan Hall is and I've got 100 students.

FLETCHER: And something that says on there, just look for the maps, you know, each of the buildings have evacuation maps and – and if all it does is get you to think, oh wait there's a map somewhere I should go look and see where my nearest evacuation point is, or my nearest shelter is. It's just an opportunity to – to sort of touch base, and at the beginning of the year everybody's thinking new, right? And where are we, and trying to – to gather that information. So we can make sure that that's available as well.

ROBEL: The ubiquity of connectivity in our classrooms which we're all familiar with for other reasons means that it's quite possible that something that is simply the web address that can take people quickly from the web address to the information on the web address would be – would be – would be sufficient to post in the classes. At least it might get people interested in going to the web address, but I of course love your views on that.

BRUHN: Again, Debbie's e-mail address is on the bottom of the sheet that I think you all received at least in the e-mail so please jot that down somewhere and again if you have any ideas or comments or questions please send those along.

FLETCHER: And if you do have groups or – or others that you would like us to come and talk about, you know, talk to or something within your schools, please let us know. We're more than happy to do that, you know the more opportunities we have to – to spread the word and – and let people know that we exist and what we do is – is very helpful. Because people understand why we do what we do it – it makes it easier to take when we tell you, you know, get up in the morning and go work or whatever.

ROBEL: Well, thank – thank you so much for your willingness to come in today, it's been really helpful.

BRUHN: Thank you for the time.

ROBEL: Much appreciated. Not to mention all the things you do behind the scenes that nobody sees like evaluate the weather.

FLETCHER: It's going to snow tonight! [Laughter].

TERRY: Lauren, I have one comment. I just asked provost if I could have one comment. This has all been about emergency preparedness and safety. What I want to stress is there's another dimension to all of this that is coming our way as well, and that is the continuity of the university, especially academic continuity. What do we do if something happens and a major building is taken out of use for a long period of time? When do we conclude that something

has happened that makes a semester unsalvageable? These are big issues in many cases. What I can tell you is that in 2010 there was a university wide committee that proposed – it wasn't a report I read until I started preparing for this thing, that – that pointed those out and quite a number of them actually involved the continuity or lack of continuity of faculty adopted policies. What do we do to a tenure and promotion clock should something happen? What do we do if tenure and promotion committees cannot continue to meet? When do we authorize campus officers to take action that normally we wouldn't say they shouldn't do until they consult with the faculty? We're working on this. I don't know when that would come back here but, you know, I wanted you to know the Executive Committee is at least aware of – of this, and we're going to, I think, respond to some of the direct challenges in that report that said faculty governance needs to do something, and we appreciate the heads up on that, that's another dimension of this that's very important to the institutions.

ROBEL: And I should, – Diane or Debbie may want to say something about continuity planning, but it is – business continuity and academic continuity planning are ongoing exercises so they're – they don't happen and then stop happening. They have to be updated regularly but it's… Would you like to say something Diane about this?

MACK: Sure. We – we do have what we call the IU Ready. It's a business continuity planning tool, and we've asked each department on every campus to come up with their own plan and have a plan for their department. The good news is for Bloomington I think we have a 95%, something like that, completion rate so that's great. So any remaining departments we're going to hunt you down. But we want to make sure – we want to get that up to 100%. We want to make sure every department has that capability to resume their operations if all of a sudden their working facility – if you're offices are all completely gone, if you have a building that's completely gone, if you have half of your work force that's out because of pandemic influenza, we need to understand how – how – what your critical functions are, what the tools, personnel, and everything – and space that you need to conduct your operations if something unfortunate were to happen to the university.

ROBEL: Thank you so much. Well, we have a – a request from the Educational Policy Committee to – to provide priority registration for ROTC cadets. I see we also have some ROTC cadets with us today. So I'll turn it over to the chair of the EPC, Jim.

AGENDA ITEM 7: REQUEST FOR PRIORITY REGISTRATION FOR ROTC CADETS COMPARABLE TO CURRENT PRIORITY REGISTRATION FOR STUDENT ATHLETES

SHERMAN: Thanks. I hope we can kind of make this a little brief because it's already snowing and we probably want to get out of here.

UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER: We can't hear you, Jim.

SHERMAN: I'll speak loudly.

ROBEL: It's for recording actually not for speaking, so pretend you're in a big class.

SHERMAN: Okay, so let me give you a brief history of what this resolution was about. Last semester student organizations came to EPC with a request for priority registration for ROTC cadets. During an EPC meeting they presented some material, and we asked them for a couple of things. Number one we wanted a – something – a more specific resolution that was coherent and organized, and second we wanted some data about what the constraints and the – the time issues were with regard to ROTC cadets. They supplied that to us toward the end of last semester. We had a meeting I want to say a week or so ago, and at the meeting Tim Hoch was there, he's the – the commander for the Army ROTC, Scott Borer was there from student government, there were, I believe, four or five cadets there, and Mark McConahay was there to – to answer questions regarding the registrar's office. The EPC members discussed the issue. It was – I believe it was one of those days when it was probably below zero so attendance was not that great. Of the people there I think it's fair to say the – the sentiment was positive, but I sent out all the information to all EPC members and asked them to please send me their sentiments, and in the long run there were eight people who responded from the committee. That is not everyone but I think it's the majority of members. Six were favorable, one abstained, and one was not favorable, and I'll have a little more to say about that later. Given that, we thought that it made sense to bring the resolution before BFC as a whole to get full discussion. In addition, if this is something that is going to be done for registration next semester it has to be done reasonably quickly because I think once March comes we're up against the deadline for registration, and we wanted – if this was going to go forward we wanted it to go forward now.

So let me say a few things about the resolution and some of the reasoning that I think is important. The first thing I want to say is that student athletes already have priority registration. This meeting is not about priority registration for student athletes. But it does raise the point that if there is another group on campus that is desirous of priority registration their credentials if you will, their situation, really should be compared to that of student athletes who have already been okayed to have such priority registration, but I don't think that we want to discuss now priority registration for student athletes. Okay, the – the second thing that I would say is that, and Mark McConahay will be here to answer questions, but it's important to get it out front, the registrar's office can do this easily with very little trouble and with very little impact on other students and their registration on campus. I think that's fair to say and Mark will be able to elaborate on that and answer questions. The next thing I want to – want to say is that in the near future as Herb mentioned during his comments there will be

degree maps. In a sense then, I like to frame it this way, maybe it's wrong, but in a sense every student on campus will have priority registration because we're guaranteeing that they will be able to take the courses that they need when they need to take them, and if they're not able to do that then we're going to give them free courses, and I don't think we want to do that very much. So in some sense we're – we're going to make sure that students have a map to get their degree in the correct time frame. Finally, I'd like to talk about the major counterargument to priority registration and – and we've seen it before it's – it's really the slippery slope argument, that if we go down this slope aren't we going to have to do it for A, B, C, and D? So, as I think Herb mentioned we received a comment from a campus member and I won't read it word for word but this is a faculty person who teaches in a program with a lot of top level applicants, and typically there's little financial aid for students in this area, and most of them work largely at paid jobs around Bloomington up to maybe 29 – I wonder why they've chose that number, 29 hours a week do defray their expenses. [Laughter] And then saying there's no reason why they should also not be entitled to priority registration and thousands of students are trying to stay in school, and afford it, and they work one, two, three, or four jobs, and if we're going to give priority registration because students are busy then it's going to cover a large number of students. And I think there are a couple of answers to this. One appears in the resolution itself, and I think there is some validity to it, and that is the idea that IU has some institutional commitment to student athletes and some institutional commitment to ROTC cadets that I think isn't true in the same way for work study students or for students who major in music, or business, or something else that's time consuming, and I think that idea of institutional commitment is an important distinction. The second point I want to make, I really hesitate to make it with Don and Lauren up there from the law school, and me just a dabbler in law but I'll do it anyway, and if I'm wrong you can tell me, or if it's a specious argument you can tell me and – and that's the analogy I make between this and class action suits in courts where, you know, you may have a big class like Wal-Mart, or you may have, you know, there – there are many cases of class action suits that are brought, and one of the keys things that is necessary for a class action suit is the class has to be coherent in some way, it has to form some category. I guess I would say that more than any class that's come forward, ROTC cadets are a pretty coherent category. They have the same constraints, they have the same limitations, they have, you know, their time is impacted in the same way, probably somewhat more than student athletes were in different sports. Certainly more than work study students, or music majors, or any other category that you might find, so if we draw an analogy between is this a class, I'd say yeah this is a pretty good class and they'd pass my sniff test for a class action kind of move forward, so with that I'll – I'll stop my presentation and let you know you can ask me questions, Mark McConahay is here from the registrar's office, Scott Borer, and Jose Mitjavila are here from student government, and from the ROTC world we have Mike Hoadley who's from Air Force ROTC, we have Ralph Vargas here from – he's a retired lieutenant colonel –

VARGAS: Yes, sir.

SHERMAN: – from Army ROTC, and we have two cadets Ben Krebs and Angela Bowman and they're both senior ROTC army cadets. So if you have any questions for me, for the ROTC people, for the students, or for – for Mark in the registrar's office kind of ask away. Again, this comes with a – a recommendation from EPC which as I told you was not unanimous but was certainly majority.

ROBEL: Thank you so much, Jim. Are there questions or – or discussion that we'd like to – presumably this – this comes as a resolution from the committee so –

SHERMAN: Yes, it's the same –

ROBEL: So it's open now for discussion.

SHERMAN: Yeah.

PRENKERT: I just have a question of clarification about the notion that the roadmaps to graduation will provide sort of de facto priority for all students. That's not entirely true though, right? Because the –

SHERMAN: – I put quotes around it for that reason.

PRENKERT: Yeah, because my understanding would be that all that – the guarantee is that you have access to the courses that you need, right? And so you – if you have access to an 8 AM course but that didn't work for your schedule otherwise, you wouldn't be able to say I didn't have a roadmap that would get me there on time. And this request for priority is really to get around that problem; I'm not available at particular times to take the courses, not that the courses are not available.

SHERMAN: That's correct.

PRENKERT: Okay.

SHERMAN: But it will be less of a problem for other students once the degree maps are formed so, I didn't mean to suggest that everyone will have – although I put quotes around it and said it. It will be more true later than now but not as true as –

ROBEL: Let the record reflect the air quotes. Other questions or discussion from the Council? Yes?

WOOD: I would be interested in hearing what the students think since this is a measure which if we approve it will put other students at a disadvantage.

BORER: Yeah, I can take that one. Actually, having worked on this throughout – it's definitely the case that there will be a few more students who will be getting priority over students like myself who don't have those extra restraints of an ROTC student, however, I think that the important thing to realize that having already looked at athletics which was a larger pool, and that was actually back in 2007 I believe the BFC saw that issue, that having now become a reality we've seen that it's only been a drop in the bucket I guess would be the safest way to put it when it comes to other students getting the classes they need, and studies since then have shown that students are still able to get their classes just because there are so few students receiving priority registration in that group. ROTC compared to student athletes is a much smaller group so the logic follows then that, you know, if athletes didn't cause a problem for other students getting into the classes that they need that adding just a few more students who are well deserving of that right for priority registration also will not have an effect on students getting the classes that they need outside of that group. So I'm very comfortable with it as a student not in that category.

SHERMAN: This came as a recommendation from IUSA, I mean not just from you.

BORER: Yes, sir. Correct.

SHERMAN: Yeah.

ROBEL: Yes?

MCMANUS: I appreciate the response from IUSA, I appreciate the contributions of the students, and Jim you had mentioned at the start of this that you had requested some evidence–

SHERMAN: – Ah, thank you.

MCMANUS: Could you just speak a little bit to the evidence that you collected?

SHERMAN: Yeah, thank you for that. I blocked out. What I asked was for ROTC to provide information on what the constraints were and I believe in one of your handouts, the yellow one, on the back you see the constraints for ROTC students scheduling and above it there are some sample basketball players' schedules and their constraints, and I also on the white handout Kurt Zorn sent me some examples of constraints for student athletes in football, swimming, volleyball, and track and field, and we looked at those and judged them to be quite similar in terms of the hours of constraint, and the times that they were taken up. So that was really the kind of evidence that we wanted. Is it really comparable to the needs of student athletes, and we found that it was reasonably comparable.

ROBEL: Yes?

BAXTER: I'm curious a couple of things directed toward the idea of the slippery slope. In looking at the case made for the student athletes there were additional things such as regulations from the NCAA, and the Big 10 and so forth that factored in, and ideas of the coaches being able to look at students' schedules and work out the – the practice schedules around that, and being able to do things ahead of time led to that. I'd like to know is that – is there anything like that in the case of ROTC and are there other organizations out there that have similar time constraints but not any of the other factors that would make them less likely candidates to get priority registration?

SHERMAN: Yeah, I think that's probably a question for the ROTC folks. I'm not sure there's a lot of flexibility in some of the things that are required, but then again I'm not sure a football coach can organize practices to meet 100 players' needs for whatever they're doing or even a team of 20 or 25, baseball team, softball team, but you could – you could speak some –

VARGAS: We do have limited resources when it comes to faculty members that are credentialed to teach, so that is a constraint in the times that are provided to us by the university, by the registrar's office are more or less set in concrete so everything we do is built around those building blocks there.

SHERMAN: But the – but the ROTC cadets know that, for example there's, you know, Thursday afternoon, they just know that they ain't going to be able to sign up for a course because they've got to be where they've got to be and I – I think they probably look less favorably on cadets missing that class than student athletes missing a practice. I don't know for sure, but it's not something you do, right?

KREBS: Correct, sir.

BORER: I also think that some of the NCAA oversight can be linked in similarity to ROTC by the fact that ROTC students are contractually obligated to the federal government to fulfill their requirements that they've signed in their contract which is also something that while many other students definitely have a lot of hours they put in for other programs, this is on a whole new level because they are signing a contract that they know that if they break – or that they know simply that they cannot break essentially once they've signed it so…

SHERMAN: Yeah, thank you, that's a good point.

CALLOWAY–THOMAS: I just want to know where do we go from here gentlemen, because there's several "whereas" clauses that suggest different kinds of action but there's only one resolution.

SHERMAN: Well, I don't know. My sense was that, you know, the legalese of the whereas' [comment indistinct] like this for me – but, you know that the bottom line for me is if this passes ROTC cadets will have priority registration and Mark will make sure that that's put into effect and I – I think that's what all the whereas' mean.

ROBEL: Okay. Are we ready then to vote? Thank you. All in favor?

WOOD: I have a question about the lieutenant colonel's comment. Are you saying that this block of time, 10 o'clock on Monday morning, is set by the registrar's office?

KREBS: Do you want me to answer that, sir?

VARGAS: Yeah, go ahead.

KREBS: Ma'am, the Thursday block that was eluded to and also where it says 402 lecture, those are actually when we sign up for those classes we have to work our schedules around that, so when we sign up through Onstart, or Onestart for our classes, I usually that's the first thing I add to my box because that is a time set by the registrar that we have to be at so that's on our schedule at a set time that's given to us, excuse me, by the university, and then usually all my other classes are put in around that. So yes, the registrar sets that time and we, I'm not sure how much the leeway the cadre have with choosing that, but the class portion is always signed up on Onestart in that Thursday slot is – I'm a senior and every single semester I've been here it's that – our two hour lab has always been in that Thursday slot and we sign up for that through Onestart. So it is assigned by the registrar.

ROBEL: Mark, would you like to?

MCCONAHEY: Well, only in the sense that I don't have, as Dennis just mentioned, you have to start somewhere. So it's this fixed block, it's a fixed class time – chicken and egg kind of question, you've got fix something. They need that big block of time, it has to be sometime during the academic day, and the placing it somewhere is required, and then you start, and then you work from there.

ROBEL: Alright. So are we ready now to vote? All in favor? Opposed? And Abstentions? Alright, thank you very much. I think that concludes – thank you so much for your work on this, Jim and the EPC, thank you Mr. Borer for your work on this, and thank you to the ROTC folks for coming today for this. I think that concludes our agenda unless I hear any other business I will – and probably even if I do I will entertain a motion to adjourn. [Laughter]

ALL APPROVED SAVE ONE OPPOSED (WOOD); ONE ABSTENTION (MCMANUS)

UNKNOWN MALE SPEAKER: So moved

ROBEL: Alright. Second?

UNKNOWN MALE SPEAKER: Second.

ROBEL: Huzzah!

MEETING ADJOURNED: 5:02 PM