

**Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
February 2, 2010
Indiana Memorial Union – Georgian Room
3:30 P.M. - 5:00 P.M.**

Attendance

MEMBERS: Randy Arnold, Robert Arnové, Rob Aspy, Arthur Bradley, Geoffrey Brown, Bruce Burgun, Carolyn Calloway-Thomas, James Capshew, Angela Courtney, Gregory Demas, Jon Dilts, Carrie Donovan, Erika Dowell, Thomas Gieryn, Laura Ginger, Mary Gray, Karen Hanson, Patrick Harbison, Robert Hatten, Patricia Henderson, Brian Horne, F. Robert Jacobs, Padraic Kenney, Valerie Markley, Jack McCarthy, Patricia McManus, Jennifer Miller, Jenna Morrison, Robert Noel, John Raglin, Debora Shaw, Richard Shockley, Joey Tartell, Herbert Terry, Maxine Watson, William Wheeler, Sue Whiston

MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATIVES PRESENT: Sarita Soni (Geoffrey Conrad), Richard Stryker (David MacKay)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Eric Arnold, Jack Bielasiak, Elizabeth Boling, Purnima Bose, Andrea Ciccarelli, Nicholas Clark, Lucas Fields, Julia Fox, Lessie Jo Frazier, Valerie Grim, Michael Jolly, Paul Losensky, Eugene McGregor, Michael Morrone, Elizabeth Raff, Michael Rushton, Ranu Samantrai, Eric Sandweiss, Peter SerVaas, Sonya Stephens, Adam Szczepaniak, Alex Tanford, Neil Theobald, Vasti Torres, James Wimbush

GUESTS: Jason Baird Jackson, Greg Buse (Provost's Office), Amanda Ciccarelli (Provost's Office), Jim Gieser, David Hardy, Autumn Harrell, Gretchen Harris, Jennifer Laherty, Cynthia Landis, Sydney Rueher, Gabriel Ramon Serna

Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/minutes/09-10/01.19.10.pdf>
2. Memorial Resolutions for Warner O. Chapman and Paul A. Pietsch
Warner O. Chapman: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/09-10/B14-2010.pdf>
Paul A. Pietsch: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/09-10/B15-2010.pdf>
3. Agenda Committee Business (10 minutes)
(President Erika Dowell)

4. Presiding Officer's Business (10 minutes)
(Provost Karen Hanson)
5. Question/Comment Period (10 minutes)*
6. Report from the Library Committee on Open Access Issues (20 minutes)
(Professor Jason Baird Jackson, Chair of the Library Committee) [DISCUSSION]
7. Resolution on Shared Governance (30 minutes)
(Erika Dowell, President of the Bloomington Faculty Council) [SECOND READING]
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/09-10/B12-2010Rev.pdf>

*Faculty who are not members of the Faculty Council and who wish to address questions to Provost Hanson or President Dowell 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

Minutes

AGENDA ITEM 1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

DOWELL: And I think we're still passing out one item for a later agenda item, but let's go ahead and get started. We have approval of the minutes from our meeting on January 19th, first on the agenda and I know that we have Mary Gray. We recognize her. She has a suggested amendment of the memorial resolution that was part of that meeting.

GRAY: Hi everybody. In reading the minutes I noticed – and I noticed when it was presented – that Don Belton's memorial excludes his cause of death, and it just really struck me at the time that that might be an omission from the historical record that particularly for lesbian, gay, bi, and trans identifying students and staff and faculty might be misread as not wanting to speak the truth of how he died. I didn't recognize or didn't know at the time whether there was any consistency about whether the cause of death was stated or not, but it struck me because the cause of death for Professor Odland's passing was very much present and I thought that was important that the statement said he died of colon cancer. That's, I mean, I think that's very important. So what I wanted to propose, wanted to—how do I put that?—propose as an amendment to the minutes was the inclusion of Don Belton's cause of death and rather than suggest specific language, be able to ask you all to consider that motion and if we could come back to specific language at another meeting rather than trying to figure out language here.

DOWELL: Tom?

GIERYN: There is no consistent pattern. Sometimes the cause of death is noted, sometimes it's not. I think in this case it would be altogether appropriate and I'd be happy to work out some appropriate wording to indicate the cause of Don's death.

SHAW: Do we need an approval of the minutes with the amendments?

DOWELL: So moved. Do we have a second? [Second is made] All in favor? [Aye] Thank you. Are you ready to step in and take over? Ready to step in and preside? We are at memorial resolutions.

AGENDA ITEM 2: MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS FOR WARNER O. CHAPMAN AND PAUL PIETSCH

HANSON: Okay, have you talked about that? Well, there are two memorial resolutions that Tom will bring to us.

GIERYN: As is the practice, I will read an abbreviated version. The full version will be entered in the record and we'll have a moment of silence at the conclusion.

Warner Oliver Chapman died June 11, 2008, in Virginia Beach, Va., at the age of eighty-nine. He was born in Norfolk, Virginia, where he graduated from Maury High School in 1937. He then entered the University of Virginia and in 1941 earned his undergraduate degree in government, with honors.

When the U.S. entered World War II, Chapman joined the military and was assigned to Marine fighter squadrons VMF 221 and VMF 224. For his combat service in the Solomon Islands and aboard the carrier U.S.S. Franklin, Warner Chapman was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross with four stars, the Air Medal with fifteen stars and the Purple Heart with two stars. He subsequently served in the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve until 1976, rising to the rank of Colonel.

After the war, Chapman returned to the University of Virginia and earned his Ph.D. in political science. In 1950 he joined the Bloomington faculty of Indiana University, where he taught constitutional law in the Department of Political Science until his retirement 1984. An extraordinary teacher, Chapman was revered by many students. One of them, Lawrence H. Lee, was so impressed that he endowed the Warner O. Chapman Professorship in IUB's Department of Political Science in 1996.

Until his retirement Chapman was IU's single greatest champion of honors-level education at Indiana University. In 1955-1956, a campus committee charged with improving instruction recommended "a lively and attractive program of honors work for its superior students." Warner Chapman responded by creating an honors course for political science students – the first of several honors courses he developed in the

Department of Government, which returned to its original name, the Department of Political Science, in 1969.

In the mid-1960s, Chapman persuaded the Bloomington faculty and the Indiana University Board of Trustees to establish an “Honors Division.” Officially the division reported directly to the chancellor, but its home was literally in Warner’s office at Kirkwood Hall 113. He served for twenty years as the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Development, overseeing the Honors Division, which admitted more than 400 new students each year prior to becoming the Honors College (and later still, the Hutton Honors College).

For his many contributions to the state of Indiana Warner Chapman was named a Sagamore of the Wabash by Indiana Governor Evan Bayh in 1991. A modest man, Chapman seldom spoke of this award, and never volunteered information about his military decorations. His only boast was that in 1980 Chapman and his son Dave won the 1980 Mobjack National Championship. Chapman was sixty-one at the time, but he was an avid, and highly competitive, sailor for several years after that.

Warner Chapman was preceded in death by his first wife, Sarah Mills (Tillie) Chapman, and his sister Agnes Wells. He is survived by his wife, Grace Kelley Chapman, and his children and their families: Susan Hersberger and Rod, Bakersfield, Calif.; Nancy Anderson and Brian, San Diego, Calif.; Warner Davies (Dave) and Cyndy, Charlottesville, Va.; and Virginia Rosenberg and Sam, West Palm Beach, Fla. Grandchildren are Mark Hersberger and Kate Hersberger Greenberg, Sarah and Grace Anderson, and Reuben Chapman. He is also survived by his wife’s children and their families: Ann Short and Carter, Charlottesville, Va.; Jean Horne and Ken, Bedford, Va.; and Tom Kelley, Virginia Beach, Va.; and Chapman’s brother Semmes Chapman and Helen, Virginia Beach.

Paul A. Pietsch passed away on November 26, 2009 in Bloomington, Indiana at the age of eighty. Dr. Pietsch was a native of depression-era New York City, the first of four children. His father died when he was six, and Paul dropped out of school when he was in the 10th grade. He joined the army in 1946, serving until 1949 in the post-war occupation of Japan and again in 1951, and he always credited the G.I. Bill for providing him with the means to an education. While in the army his love of teaching emerged, and he taught English to Japanese students and was a writer on military subjects. While in the army he earned a GED, and after his discharge he continued his education, earning a bachelor’s degree in biology from Syracuse University in 1954 and a PhD in anatomy from the University of Pennsylvania in 1960.

Dr. Pietsch worked as an instructor in anatomy at the Bowman Gray School of Medicine, Wake Forest University; as an assistant professor of anatomy at the State University of New York at Buffalo; and as a research scientist at Dow Chemical Company, where he

was the author of nine patents. He came to Indiana University in 1970 as an associate professor of optometry. He was promoted to professor in 1978. Dr. Pietsch taught optometry students and medical students while pursuing his primary research interests in regeneration and in the relationship between the brain and the mind. He developed coursework to teach anatomy to blind students. He shared his research with the scientific world through publication in professional journals, but he also believed that scientists have the obligation to share knowledge with the non-scientific public. His article "Shuffle Brain," about brain transplants in amphibians as a test of the language of the brain and of memory, was originally published in the May, 1972 issue of *Harper's Magazine* and later won the 1972 Medical Journalism Award of the American Medical Association. Popular interest in his research continued to grow, and it culminated in August, 1973, when Dr. Pietsch was interviewed and discussed his research on the television show *60 Minutes*. He also was the subject of a series of Canadian national radio broadcasts, and was interviewed on *Television Francais*.

Over the years Dr. Pietsch was a beloved mentor to thousands of students, was the author of nearly 100 publications, and he won numerous awards, including twelve awards for outstanding teaching. He taught many courses, including neuro-anatomy, microscopic anatomy, gross anatomy, cell biology, molecular biology, embryology, ocular anatomy, comparative anatomy, and physiology. A demanding but enthusiastic teacher and a rigorous and exacting scientist, Dr. Pietsch was also an intellectual in the broadest sense of the word, with interests ranging from Civil War history to the space program. Although he retired from classroom teaching in 1994, he continued to come into the office every day until illness made it impossible. In his retirement he devoted himself to helping others and to the authorship of more than ten fiction and non-fiction books.

His passion in retirement was an extension of his belief that science should be available not just to scientists. This passion resulted in his award-winning website, [Shufflebrain](http://www.indiana.edu/~pietsch/) (<http://www.indiana.edu/~pietsch/>) "A polycultural collection on the biology of memory, perception and a few other items." This site has experienced an astonishing 29.5 million hits since July, 1995, which is an enormous testament to the fact that the world is hungry for palatable scientific information. Ironically, in retirement, Dr. Pietsch influenced millions of people using this new technology, while during a lifetime of teaching, his students numbered "only" in the thousands.

Touching testimony to the international influence of Dr. Pietsch's website is evident in the pleas of people afflicted with rare neurological conditions, or, even

more touchingly, from the parents of children suffering from these conditions. He was in constant communication with people around the world who needed help interpreting the language of science as it applied to them in the most personal of ways. Such conditions as agenesis of the corpus callosum (a rare condition in which the patient lacks the bundle of nerve fibers that connect the two hemispheres of the brain) and Acute Zonal Occult Outer Retinopathy (another rare condition resulting in temporary or permanent vision loss) are two of the many subjects that he researched and translated into comprehensible lay language for sufferers worldwide, referring them to nearby specialists for treatment.

Despite the enormous popularity of his website, Dr. Pietsch was uncomfortable with recognition, and he did little to call it to the attention of his IU colleagues. Many people at IU remain unaware of it despite the priceless goodwill that it has brought to the university over the years. He modestly resisted all attempts to publicize it among university administrators, preferring to work quietly and tirelessly for the benefit of others.

Could we now rise for a moment of silence?

HANSON: Thank you. Erika?

AGENDA ITEM 3: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS

DOWELL: Alright, I have some items to discuss under Agenda Committee business. The first item is that our next meeting, February 16th is cancelled. Lin Ostrom will be presenting again her Nobel speech opposite our normal meeting time at 4PM in the IU Auditorium and we've made the decision that it would be a good idea for us to attend. So I invite you all to be at the auditorium at four. There will be a press release going out tomorrow about this I understand with more detail.

Let's see, we have a proposal from the CWA, the Communication Workers of America that was forwarded to the Agenda Committee just about a day ago entitled "Compassionate Cost Sharing," that I wanted to let you know about that we'll be considering at the Agenda Committee. It proposes that faculty and administrators agree to pay more for parking permits so that support staff can pay less. And the proposal describes this measure as a one year temporary concrete show of support for the lowest paid university staff members. This proposal was discussed at the Transportation Policy Advisory Committee but not endorsed by them at this point. Doug Porter, Director of Parking Operations, is looking at cost implications and, sort of, details of how something like this might be implemented. And at this point the Agenda Committee has responded

to this CWA saying that we're interested in learning more and so you may or may not see this proposal coming back to the Council on a future agenda.

Let's see, the Agenda Committee also received today from the Budgetary Affairs Committee a memo requesting that the Agenda Committee convene an ad hoc committee to examine several issues related to campus and school budgeting and faculty involvement in it with the goal of recommending modifications to budgeting institution systems and procedures both of the administration and of the Council itself including the Budgetary Affairs Committee. The Agenda Committee hasn't been able to discuss this yet but we will do so at our meeting on Tuesday and in the meantime you have a copy of the memo that's on one of the white sheets in the pile of paper in front of you and I think we can get it posted on the BFC website also to point colleagues to if you have comments relating to it.

I'd also just like to say a couple of things about some of the discussion from last week's or – I'm sorry – last meeting's, consideration of the resolution on shared governance. Obviously we'll be discussing it again today as an action item. But I would just say a couple of words about things that have happened since then which aren't necessarily super dramatic but I think that our discussion last week generated what I think is a productive conversation about what is wrong with faculty governance at IU right now. And I believe that many of us have a pretty good idea of what the problems are. They tend to—you know we're reactive instead of active, tactical instead of strategic, our processes move too slowly, our discussions can lack substance, the Council is viewed by some as a waste of time, there's little incentive to serve for many people. That's painting the picture pretty black but that's what the problems revolve around. And the Agenda Committee has certainly seen less consensus on how the problems should be addressed or what potential solutions might be. Provost Hanson has very generously issued a pretty open invitation to help in any way she can and of the ideas so far for fixing faculty governance, the one comment element seems to be that we need some sort of group to step back and look at where we are, where we want to be, and talk about what we need to do differently or how we need to change structures or processes or the people or the kinds of people who are involved in order to get to the place we want to be. It's been suggested that a small ad hoc committee of well respected senior faculty would be a good type of group to take this kind of look or make this kind of report. The Agenda Committee hasn't really discussed it at any length yet. Just over email and there's been sort of a general sense of that seems like a good thing to do, a good way to address it. If you'd like to comment, obviously we'll be talking about the resolution later, and if we veer off into this territory again, you're welcome to comment there or to talk to someone, any of us, on the Agenda Committee after the meeting or before next Tuesday would be ideal. We've also had the suggestion that we should devote a whole meeting later in the semester, or a substantial portion of a meeting, to questions relating to this issue which could be useful depending on how we structure it, I think, and I'd also love to hear what you think about that. In the near term, we're going to try to speed up items in front of the Council by abandoning the sort of strict

first reading, second reading, action item sequence and try to just make sure that people get things in time to read them, in time to discuss them, and to try to take at least one or two steps out of that process and in conclusion I guess I just want to say that we are taking this seriously and we're interested in doing something that is productive and moves us forward on these issues and I'm interested in the comments of all faculty and especially those of you on the Council as to how we might do this. That's all I have.

HANSON: Questions or comments for either Erika or the Agenda Committee? Okay then we will move on to, I guess, my business.

AGENDA ITEM 4: PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS

HANSON: First of all, I want to apologize for being late. I was in Indianapolis for Higher Education Day at the Statehouse and I left the minute I could, drove down here slightly too fast, and I could only get here now. But I should tell you that we had very nice support there from Representative Peggy Welch and State Senator Vi Simpson and there was a very nice tribute to Trustee Sue Talbot who founded Hoosiers for Higher Education. So Sue isn't here today as she often is, because she's up there lobbying for the university. But again, I apologize for being late. I got here as quickly as I could. I do have just a few bits of housekeeping news to relay.

Three more decanal reviews are underway. The review of the Dean of the Kelley School of Business is being chaired by Lauren Robel, the Dean of the Maurer School. The review of the Dean of Journalism, Brad Hamm, is being chaired by James Wimbush. And the review of the Dean of the School of Library and Information Science is being chaired by Patricia McDougall who has been Executive Associate Dean of the School of Business. As you probably recall – if you memorize all the policy documents – the dean reviews are generally chaired by somebody outside of the school and then are made up predominantly of faculty in the school and that's how these committees were formed. And these were quite a challenge to form actually, because they are all core schools and we don't really quite yet have a policy for that. And the minute they were announced something blew back from Indy despite a lot of consultation with the head of the Faculty Council there. And I haven't quite—I've got to admit I was looking at that on the road too – and I haven't quite responded. I responded initially, but there's some more consideration there. So I don't know whether the committee will take yet another shape, but it's a very complicated policy and we're just trying to do what we think is basically fair to have proportional representation from the faculty in Indianapolis and in Bloomington and we'll proceed with that.

The other thing that I wanted to announce that's somewhat more complicated is the formation of a quick task force to address an issue raised last fall by the Board of Trustees. I believe I've mentioned this to this body before but if I haven't, then this will be an announcement. But the trustees asked us to look at the structure of the units

connected with communication studies. They were having a report on the School of Journalism by the dean and they said, 'Well, whatever happened to things like RadioTV, and so on. Why are these all in different units now?' And so I had a meeting with the dean of the School of Journalism, the dean of Arts and Sciences, the chair of Communication and Culture and the chair of Telecommunications which seemed to be immediately relevant units and asked them to talk with their faculty about how they saw the future of – kind of broadly speaking – communication studies on this campus. And each of them produced a small – really just a one page outline of kind of bullet points. Nothing formal, so that I could bring that back to the trustees and basically we ended up at the last trustees' meeting telling them we were still looking at this and we would address it in some way.

Right now, I don't think there's anything more to come out of that initial conversation we had without getting into more detail. So I let those units know that I was going to be forming – and the Agenda Committee – and I talked this over actually with the Agenda Committee antecedently, that I was going to form a small taskforce made up of people from none of those units; people who were uninvolved with this, but with some liaison to the BFC Merger/Elimination/Reorganization Committee. That task force has been formed. Fred Cate is chairing it, and he's the one who's the liaison and the other members of the committee are from the School of Education and the Office of Admissions and the Kelley School. I wanted some people who had some sense both of how things were operating for students who were applying to Indiana University with interests in these areas, hence the office of admissions, and some other people who were sort of specialists in the organizational structure and who didn't have a dog in the fight. So they're to work on a short timeline to bring back some kind of recommendations or evaluations about whether the structure we have now is ideal, whether there'd be some other structure that might be better, how we're serving the students, how the faculty feel about the various alignments and how these things pertain to the reputation and the profile of work in this area for the campus and for the units involved. When they do that, it's understood that the recommendation will be presented—and I told all the units this—that the recommendation would be presented back to the units for their comments, their reactions and they may accept it, reject it, start off on something else...and I'll have a reaction to it, too. If there is a recommendation for reorganization that either the units and/or I find attractive, we will present it to the Merger/Reorganization/Elimination Committee for further vetting. And that's when I think the normal processes that are in the BFC policies would kick in. I'd already talked to the Merger/Reorganization/Elimination Committee about this, too and that this does look like the only way to work this. You kind of have to have something on the table before that committee begins to look at something. So this is also a way of getting something on the table if a reorganization is indeed recommended. So that's where that is. Any questions?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Yes, could you speak to the—and you talked about the protocols that are going to be followed, but in terms of the end product – the major decision that

is to be made with regard to what is going to happen to these two units? Who will make that final decision? Will you make that decision even if the units say, 'We don't want to do this?' Will you follow that decision making or...?

HANSON: Actually the truth is, it's been so complicated to get to this stage Carolyn, I haven't looked at what happens after the MRE report's out.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Oh.

HANSON: I mean, that would be the next step. The MRE would report something out. But I suspect – I shouldn't go on record on this when I really haven't looked further than that – but that that is an administrative decision in the end about the organization, the academic organization.

TERRY: You said a short timeline and your memo was quickly distributed in my department. Do you have an idea when this task force should report to you?

HANSON: I asked them if they could do something basically within a month. Because, you know, in some sense it's so much the beginning of this stage. I want a kind of quick take on it, because the detailed working through with the units involved and with the other units on campus will take a lot of time so there's not a lot of point in their getting deep into the details. They should have some kind of broad outline in place for the other units to work with. And the chair said he thought he could do that.

TERRY: Okay.

GRAY: Is there precedent, or can you give me some precedent for some past moment where IU Trustees have saw something that they'd like to see changed in the academic mission of a particular set of units and that that's been implemented in this way?

HANSON: It isn't a change in the academic mission, and let's be clear about that. It would be an organizational change about how we organize communication studies on the campus. And yes, there have been a lot of academic reorganizations over the course of the history of IU. I don't know how many have been initiated by a straight comment from the trustees and how many have come about in other ways.

GRAY: A quick follow up to that. Does this body have a way of distinguishing organization from academic mission? Because I'd say that different units that are in the constellation of fairly complementary different ways of thinking about communication – this is as somebody who bridges to those different units – so if they were put together that seems like it would change the academic mission in integral ways and I can see one way to read it as organizational but for me, if I was in a different unit that was an amalgamation of all of these – I'm in Communication and Culture, disclosure – I would

feel like my academic mission might shift, or it seems like that would be a shift in what I think I'm doing right now.

HANSON: I think that's not at all obvious. If you think about the organization of something like the arts and sciences on this campus, many of our peers organize the liberal arts in a slightly different way. They might have a unit that's the natural sciences, another the social sciences, or the natural and social sciences and then the arts and humanities. If they at a certain point, you know, if they've been divided in that way and at a certain point they decide, 'We're going to remove some administrative layers and put all these layers under one dean,' say, it's not at all obvious that philosophy begins to sound a lot more like biology. I mean, you see, the units might still persist with a great deal of the same integrity and wholeness they had before or they might not. I mean I don't think there's any way of prejudging this. But it isn't obvious that something like an academic reorganization changes the mission of studies of any of the faculty who are involved. And that's one of the things obviously that has to be worked through, and it's one of the reasons that they've all been told that what they have to do is sort of see what the faculty do, what students are studying and figure out whether or not any other kinds of alignments make sense. And one other thing that I wanted to say so that everybody takes an interest in this here, and besides the people who are directly involved, (laughter) is that such a reorganization is as Hegel said the 'flower in the crannied wall.' It will often end up touching a lot of other things. And that's why there is the wisdom of the MRE committee which brings in representation from every unit. There were some obvious ways in which another school on this campus had some issues of overlap with one of the units involved in this constellation and I actually left off representation from that school in part because they already had some issues, but certain kinds of recommendations could have implications elsewhere on the campus. So it is an all-campus issue.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: But Carolyn – Karen, I'm calling you...

HANSON: You're Carolyn! (laughter)

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: It seems to me that it is likely that issues of content and substance will come up. Absolutely, I agree. But to what extent have you included people on the committee who really know something about what we do, how we do it, and under what circumstances we do what we do in terms of Communication and Culture, in terms of Journalism? I would think that we would be interested in individuals who really know a great deal about our mission.

HANSON: I have to admit it's a deliberate decision not to include people who are deep into the affected areas. And the check and balance against this is nothing about what this committee comes back with is dispositive. I mean they will talk to people and we can assume they're good colleagues who will listen to their colleagues who are deeply affected by any prospect of a reorganization, but they're not to do a huge canvassing or

get deep into the issue of where these studies are going. That's something for the faculty and, frankly, the students to think about. They're to talk about organizational matters. To get something on the table essentially for the larger, more detailed discussion. So the short answer is, no, they are not people who are deeply involved in the work of these units. And that's a deliberate decision. Yeah?

BROWN: I'm sorry I missed this, but you said you had one pagers from the dean of journalism and the head of Telecom, but did you say what their response was or what their position was on this?

HANSON: No, I didn't. And I don't have them in front of me so I probably shouldn't summarize them. I could say roughly that Communication and Culture thought some other kinds of organizations might be okay, but without a lot of detail and Telecommunications did not think that there was any reorganization that would be appropriate for its unit, but it did want a name change for its unit, (laughter) and the – this is probably not fair, I don't have them in front of me, there's more detail – (laughter)

BROWN: The name change is separate.

HANSON: Pardon me?

BROWN: The name change, I mean, is a separate issue.

HANSON: Oh. And the School of Journalism mainly presented details about comparable efforts on other peer campuses.

BROWN: What about value judgment?

HANSON: Not an overt value judgment.

BROWN: So if you were to say there's support or there's not support, where are you on that? (laughter)

HANSON: I don't think it's time to make a judgment about that. I think it very much depends upon where we end up once everybody's looked at this in detail. I don't think there's... are you really asking are the trustees asking for something that faculty don't want to do?

BROWN: Yes!

HANSON: No, I don't think that's the case. I think there are certainly some faculty who would welcome a reorganization.

TERRY: Disclosure: Telecommunications. Does your charge to this committee say limit your attention to Journalism, Communication and Culture and Telecommunications or can they look more broadly at other units on the Bloomington campus that might also be involved in communication study and trying to figure out if they're appropriately structured?

HANSON: Would you like me to read you the charge?

TERRY: Yeah.

HANSON: It's actually not a charge. It's just a memo, but I think in some sense again to cut to the chase of what your question is is one of the reasons I said any change here might well affect other units. I'm not asking them to do a survey of the entire campus or to think about reorganization campus wide, but that these things could bear on it. Here's the memo to the committee members – or the people I've asked to be committee members:

“Questions have been raised by the Board of Trustees about the organization of communication studies on the Bloomington campus. To respond to that question the deans of Journalism, and the College of Arts and Sciences and the chairs of the departments of Telecommunications and Communication and Culture have met with me to discuss their views of the current organization of their units and their perspectives on the future of communication studies. I requested that telecommunications, Communication and Culture, and journalism engage in faculty discussion about these matters. By copy of this memo, I invite you to serve on a campus task force to address these issues as well. Fred Cate has kindly agreed to serve as chair. More specifically, I would like you to consider whether the current academic organization of these units best serves our students, faculty and campus. You should consider the teaching missions of each as well as the research interests and professional alignments of the involved faculty. Is the current organization the most effective use of school and university resources? The internal and external profiles of each unit should also be considered. Does the current organization help or hinder the activities, the visibility, and the status of the various degree programs, schools and departments? I would appreciate your evaluations and recommendations. If you recommend any substantial changes, those recommendations will be brought to the affected units and to the appropriate faculty governance bodies.”

At least you know I said the same thing to them that I said to you. (laughter) Any additional questions or discussion? This, presumably, will be circulated to the faculty of the affected units as well. Okay, I think that's it for that business unless there are other questions.

AGENDA ITEM 5: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

HANSON: Did you have any questions or comments coming in?

DOWELL: We had the Labor Day...

HANSON: Oh, you had the question about it?

DOWELL: We had a question from someone about progress....

DETHLOFF: ...the Calendar Committee.

HANSON: We had a question about the Calendar Committee. Tom Gieryn chairs the Calendar Committee. I checked with him after, indeed, Craig relayed this question to me earlier. I momentarily forgot that. And Tom told me that they had met, that they'd had productive meetings and he gave me a little sketch of what they are likely to bring back to the Faculty Council very soon. I think it's a very imaginative response. As you recall (laughter) – I mean that in the best possible sense – they are going to recommend a Labor Day holiday. They worked off of the (applause, followed by laughter)...but they went beyond that to recommend something that I think is a very good idea for a variety of other reasons about summer sessions. As you recall, there were a lot of desiderata that you all listed and a committee a couple of years ago said, 'You can't satisfy all of those,' so what you asked them to do was to go back and think if we removed one or the other of these is there some other constellation of results we could achieve that would satisfy a lot of the things you want. And I think they did that – almost got symmetry, they have the Labor Day holiday, they are – well, I shouldn't...

DOWELL: ...shouldn't just give it away.

HANSON: Yes, give it away, but I think it's a very interesting recommendation. And you'll be bringing it back when...?

GIERYN: We're polishing the wording. With Karen's approval we're going ahead and circulating it among a variety of people in administrative positions to see what feedback we get and then we'll bring it to the Council for full review by the faculty. The changes, really very quickly: Labor Day holiday, a Fall break, an addition of three days at the front end of the Fall semester and a reorganization of the summer session. This would really not be the time to open a discussion of those possibilities but we encourage you to get involved after we've put the final dots on all the i's and crossed the t's which will be very soon.

HANSON: That was a warning not to ask questions. (laughter) Does anyone have a short question or have a question about anything else?

MARKLEY: How soon? How soon that would take effect?

HANSON: It depends really on how quickly the people respond. They have a very clear proposal ready and they need to circulate it among the deans, the physical plant, the registrar, all the sort of units that get involved about the things that matter on the calendar when we can get the buildings cleaned up, the dorms switched, the calendars for performances, and so on. But soon.

GIERYN: 2011 would be the earliest we could hope for. And it's our goal at this point, Fall of 2011.

HANSON: So they do hope to bring it back to one of the remaining meetings of this term. Anything else? Any other questions from the floor now?

AGENDA ITEM 6: REPORT FROM THE LIBRARY COMMITTEE ON OPEN ACCESS ISSUES

HANSON: Alright, then we have a report from the Library Committee on open access issues. Professor Jackson?

JACKSON: Good afternoon. My name is Jason Jackson. I'm the chair of the Department of Folklore and Ethnomusicology and for today's purposes I'm also the chair of the Bloomington Faculty Council Library Committee. But I'm obviously not a member of the Bloomington Faculty Council. I'm one of those idiosyncratic committee chairs. But we have a great committee, some very talented folks. A number of them are in the room and they are in many ways more knowledgeable on the issues that I'll be touching on today than I am so that when we get to the questions there may be others amongst us who can field better answers than I can. I am very excited though, to be involved in the Library Committee. For many years now I've been involved in a number of initiatives at the library so that service on the committee has been a wonderful opportunity for me over the last two years. This is my first year serving as committee chair. We've been involved in – by way of a kind of report – we've been involved in supporting the work of the library at large in a number of domains. We've been a go-to resource, a way to access faculty input on a number of activities that have been happening in the last couple of years at the library. It's been a very dynamic time at the library. And for those that are following campus news it's a very good time for the library. The Bloomington libraries were recognized in a national way as the best libraries in the country. And the Library Committee certainly congratulates our librarian colleagues. We're grateful for their work and the amazing accomplishments that we've seen in the last couple years.

In particular today, my focus is open access questions. The Council has put before the committee a charge to explore this domain. We've been doing that informally over the last several years, but in a focused way this year, and then to bring forward at an appropriate time recommendations to the Council relating to open access. So my remarks today, which will be brief, will break into three parts. I'll begin with a bit of an

introduction that aims to complexify the topic. That won't last long though. Then I'll move to simplifying it a bit. And then in a final phase I'll just point to where we stand at the committee level and articulate our current work with what we hope will be a satisfactory timetable and a set of outputs that can come before the Council as a whole.

So first let me introduce the topic and complexify it a bit. Open access is one of those topics on which there's a tremendous level of divergence in understanding and expertise in the professoriate and on university campuses. There are early adopters, there are highly knowledgeable folks whose research programs have themselves turned to questions of scholarly communication. There are folks who are innovating in a whole host of ways, but then there are other colleagues of course who have been busy doing their regular day-to-day research work and haven't yet taken up their own investigations about what open access is all about. So as a committee we recognize the tremendous diversity of experiences and background that exists on the campus level. I mean this is a domain in which we support the work of the libraries, the leadership role that the libraries have been taking, promoting education on these questions because we can't have a campus-wide discussion as a faculty until we've pursued the educational work. And that's been going on, we anticipate that the committee will support a kind of more robust set of educational activities in the next year or so to help educate faculty on a whole array of issues which arise whether or not the Council takes up any kind of formal proposals so that issues of author rights, the nature of projects like IU Scholarworks, faculty education on those kinds of things is a valuable matter whether or not there's a particular policy that comes before the Faculty Council.

So here's a bit of introduction. Open access is a piece of a larger constellation of matters. It entangles people, institutions, projects, an array of social/practical problems, and it opens up a whole series of really exciting prospects so that open access as a kind of area of engagement both addresses growing problems but also cultivates new opportunities. So it's a part of a wider set of issues that universities have to align themselves toward, make decisions regarding, make structural choices. Open access has organizational, social, financial, ethical, moral, practical, cultural, technological, and biographical dimensions and surely there are other aspects as well. Open access has a number of neighboring domains about which you may be more engaged or have more knowledge. Some of those would include technological innovation, open and community source software, open and interoperable research data, textbooks and teaching resources, the future of libraries and of scholarly societies, questions of author rights, of copyright and copyright reform, intellectual property, new media, tenure and promotion standards, and the university's public service mission. That's too much to talk about today, but the committee and the wider community of stakeholders on campus is aware of all that complexity and we're trying to keep it all in our heads as we formulate practical strategies and also begin contemplating a kind of policy recommendation. So that's the complex part.

Now for some basics and some simplification. I have two handouts that you can carry away with you on this. The first has to do with the fact that open access relates to a whole, almost infinite, array of kinds of scholarly communications activities but if you need a starting place for the core of open access discussions, they center around the scholarly article, particularly the peer reviewed article. So if you need a starting place, that's where it almost certainly is. Everything else can be seen in a way through the lens provided by the core discussion relating to the scholarly journal literature. What is open access? I've offered to you a kind of medium length definition by Peter Suber who's a leading scholar in this domain, also a kind of activist. Open access literature is digital, online, free of charge and free of most copyright and licensing restrictions. What makes it possible is the internet and the consent of the author or copyright holder. In that simple beginning we see a number of elements that converge around questions of open access. It's a technological matter. It's a scholarly communications matter. It's a legal matter in the context of intellectual property law in such things as copyrights which we sometimes hold, which journal owners sometimes hold and which sometimes we negotiate ourselves out of through new legal tools like the creative commons, science commons, and other reworkings of the copyright system. So open access at its basic level is about finding strategies by which to make the scholarly literature more accessible. And this is a crucial matter for our students. It's a crucial matter for the communities that we serve. It certainly relates to a whole host of issues that matter to universities as a whole including the reputation of faculties and the accessibility of the work that faculties do. It entails a tremendous number of other matters as I tried to suggest at the beginning. There's a couple points though that I would like to offer now and there will be opportunities for not only questions, but for further refinements I hope in later discussions as the work of the committee advances. A key thing to know though at this stage would be that open access in general takes one of two forms. And here again, it's easiest to think about the scholarly literature. In one form, what are known as repositories provide a digital, openly available – to anyone who can get on the internet, that is – home for work that is vetted by and fundamentally published by the existing journal system. In other words, it's a way of, for instance, making widely available pre-prints or post-prints or some form of the journal article in an alternative framework separate from the journal itself, whether that journal is print-only or available behind what we call toll-walls, that is, in a fee for access way. IU Scholarworks' repository is our own institutional repository. It's a place where you or I can place manuscripts and peer reviewed articles and other works of scholarship and make them, not only widely available, but durably available. We in essence charge our librarian colleagues to ensure access over the long haul. The other way that open access scholarly journal articles are made available are through what are known as gold open-access journals. I mean these are journals in which the entire content of the journal is made freely available through a number of business models so that the IU Scholarworks Journals project which now presently publishes three journals, one of which I edit is an example of a gold journal initiative. These kinds of journals are best known for the biomedical sciences where they entail author side fees, but the vast majority of the gold open access literature at this stage, doesn't charge author fees and that's just a key kind

of basic fact. Some of you will go explore this domain after today, perhaps. So the key thing to keep in mind about all of these approaches is that they involve various kinds of restructurings of the technological and economic frameworks in which our scholarly communication work unfolds but that there's no single way in which the norms in forms of scholarly communication are being rewritten. This is a period of experimentation, but that experimentation has progressed far enough that I think we can see the trends and we can identify what had become some norms.

The key thing that I want to bring up now and this by the way a kind of final substantive point is that what's at issue in the discussions now going on inside the Library Committee concerns what's known as an institutional mandate. We're weighing the potential usefulness of proposing an institutional mandate regarding open access. There are two main types of mandates in this domain in the world. One is a funder mandate and the other is an institutional mandate. Institutional mandates, though, can take a number of forms. Quickly a funder mandate is when a granting agency or some other funder of basic or applied research insists as a condition of having received research funds from that agency that the results of that research are made openly accessible in a number of forms. So that we have private funders now who insist now upon this. We have public funders in a number of domains and places insisting upon open access. So that if an IU colleague receives funding from a funder who insists upon open access, then there's already a mandate in place relevant to the work of that colleague. More essential to the conversation that we're having in an IU context is the question of entertaining institutional mandates. And the thing that I would like to point out at this stage is that institutional mandates can unfold at a whole host of levels. So if you look at the kind of table in one of the two handouts that I gave you, that's an enumeration of the institutional and other kinds of mandates that exist in the world of letters today. The source here is a database which is tracking the ever growing variety and number of institutional and funder mandates that exist in the world. So there's a diversity of kinds. There are things, theses and dissertation mandates. There are department level mandates. A particular unit on a campus as the faculty of that unit adopting a policy related to open access. Generally these things have been unfolding above the level of a small department. They've been happening at the school level or the campus level. The most famous school level mandate would be the decision, the unanimous decision of the arts and sciences faculty at Harvard to adopt a mandate. Probably the most widely known institution or university-wide mandate was that established by the faculty at MIT. To see what that would look like I have provided you with the text of the adopted MIT mandate. This does not mean that any future mandate that might be considered by the faculty in Bloomington or in the IU system would look exactly like or even have anything in common with the MIT mandate but having said that, as mandates have been adopted, particularly at the university level around the world, many of them do look very much like the MIT mandates. So if you're wondering, well, what would this be like in a Bloomington context, one reasonable starting place is just to imagine yourself on the faculty at MIT and I've provided you with that document for your consideration. How does it work in a nutshell? Well, what it

means is that generally, scholars on a campus in whatever the affected unit is, whether that's a small department or an entire university, is called upon to make its scholarship available generally through an open access strategy that's implemented by the institution. Something like our own IU Scholarworks, repositories of that sort, are now common in most institutions. And any institution that adopts a mandate builds an infrastructure like IU Scholarworks to receive that work. Those of you who have used or explored IU Scholarworks know that right now it's a kind of voluntary undertaking. But in a campus context in which there's an active mandate, all of that scholarly output, the default setting becomes all of the scholarly output of the faculty is headed to a repository like IU Scholarworks or to a funder mandate, funder related repository, so that there are some funders who gather up all the work that they have funded. There's a whole list of issues that arise here. Our relationship with publishers and scholarly societies are certainly on the minds of many. There's also the question of how easy or hard is it for any faculty member to opt out when the circumstances warrant. So there's all kinds of questions that arise and they're being worked through by our colleagues elsewhere. The final point then, the trend line is that more and more institutions in the world at various levels are adopting these kinds of mandates. When they're adopted, they're almost always adopted unanimously by faculty through the mechanisms of faculty governance. But that happens generally in a context in which there's been plenty of time for exploration and discussion and the policies that reach the faculty have been really vetted and discussed and contemplated and there's some considerable educational effort that's gone into making everyone comfortable with what on the surface to many observers seem like pretty radical changes in how we do our work as scholars. So I'll just end by saying that the work of the committee right now is focused on , in essence, workshopping this kind of proposal at the level of the committee, asking ourselves based on the diversity of knowledge we possess, not only about activity in this area but of our colleagues in various departments and corners of the campus, what seems possible? What areas of education or engagement would be most necessary? What kinds of concerns are most likely to arise and would need to be addressed if a proposal came forward. We don't propose to bring a proposal this season. What we're doing now is basically the background work but if that work proceeds in a way that seems fruitful and gathers momentum, it's likely that the Library Committee in its next year would bring forward a set of firm recommendations for the consideration of the Council. If there's time for questions, I'd be happy to take them.

ARNOVE: I'd like to talk about the possible incompatibility between an institutional mandate to make articles freely accessible and the emphasis of the university on partnerships with business and certain research and the proprietary rights of those partnerships would be in direct conflict with the open access. And even here with the MIT policy, there are certain provisos that put a limit on making it available.

JACKSON: Yes, and we have begun discussions on those issues at a number of levels. One is just recognizing the diversity of questions that can arise. The other is exploring the ways in which other universities have tackled the specific issue that you raise. Legal

counsel offices for instance on universities vary quite considerably in the ways in which they read these matters. And then there's the IP policies and the technology development policies and frankly the economic interests that universities have in, let's call it, proprietary knowledges. The good news is that in places that are not that different from us, suitable workarounds that have proven in implementation to be workable and agreeable to a large number of faculty and to university administrators have been found. The benefits of working through these issues are considerable just as, obviously, the challenges and the questions that arise. IP issues and proprietary—well proprietary research – are certainly matters that have arisen elsewhere, and we're trying to gather all the information we can on that.

TERRY: Do we have any of the lists – maybe Tom has the answer to this – of journals published/edited by faculty members on this campus that are published by commercial publishers?

JACKSON: This is a huge question. The IU Scholarworks office I know has been in dialogue with other units on campus regarding this. There was for a time a kind of a list of this sort that was accessible from the old dean of faculties' website. Tom might be able to update us on this. But your question is one that is of considerable interest to the committee and I think should be of interest to deans and others who support editorial offices.

GIERYN: We've taken information about editorial offices on the Bloomington campus from the faculty summary reports. And now that that's gone online we can produce that list very quickly from FAR [Faculty Annual Report – Editor's Note].

JACKSON: The information will be extremely valuable. I think as we've been discovering in other contexts related to, well, budgetary questions, my sense is that there's a tremendous unevenness to the kinds of support that the institution at various levels has been providing to journal editors but there are a huge number of editors on campus operating in a whole really wide range of business models. Mary?

GRAY: I just wondered if – I'm not sure what body would need to do this – but is there a way to link IU Scholarworks to the faculty summary report. Because if I saw that there when I was uploading my stuff this year, I would have thought, 'Oh, I would love to put that in the repository.' At least that would give you kind of a track record for how many people volunteered so that there...

JACKSON: There's two ways in which that plays out. Everyone's getting accustomed to the new FAR system. But the... (laughter) Tom, there's...

GRAY: I love it!

JACKSON: I love it, too. And there's already a mechanism by which, as you enter publication information in it, there's already a mechanism by which you can set off basically a little bell at the library. Now that's the simplest mechanism we can devise and still call it a mechanism so that if you enter a new publication into your report if you check the Scholarworks box, that sends a notice to the Scholarworks team at the library that you're someone that is interested in being in touch with them. But we're still talking about a handcrafted process. Real people are contacting you because of an email or some alert in a box. In institutions that have adopted mandates it's important to realize that that kind of handwork with every published item or every about to be published item can't happen in that kind of human, person to person way. It becomes automated and tools can be devised to do that, so that we can imagine a future in a mandate context where we could be a mandate school. We can imagine the FAR system changing in ways which accommodate the automation of the process.

GRAY: I just mean between now and when we might go to a mandate I meant to have that as an easy gateway to doing that so I don't have to bug somebody at the library. I don't know.

JACKSON: There are technical questions that...

GIERYN: There are technical questions. One of which is what you're entering on FAR is in effect a citation rather than the text itself. Jason asked us to look forward. One could imagine a circumstance where FAR would simply have you pop in a PDF of an article and at that point it would be automatically sent to an open access system at IU Scholarworks. Technically, it's not that difficult. It would require, obviously, a rethinking of Scholarworks and its connections to FAR.

JACKSON: In the intermediate step that the committee has been talking about in connection with the reporting, Faculty Annual Report, is if one of the motivations that causes universities to move in these directions is greater awareness of faculty research. Even if we're not making – even if we never make – the full fruits of our labor openly accessible, making the existence of that work more widely known is something that we can work on and the Faculty Annual Report provides new tools by which, in essence, union lists, for instance, of scholarly output can be devised and made more widely available so that there are other ways that these questions can be approached. And the Faculty Annual Report is a humongously crucial tool to a number of them.

JACOBS: I have an obvious question but the—I know our top journals, the A journals that I publish in, I have sign off to give them copyright to the article as a condition of submitting the article for publication. How does Harvard and MIT, how are they getting around this?

JACKSON: There's two crucial things to note. Let's imagine that a mandate never comes before this group. The world is still changing around us with regard to these

issues. A majority of journals in the country are just mainly at this stage driven by funder mandates more than institutional mandates although the institutional mandates matter. Most journals have already, most publishers, even the most vicious commercial partnerships (laughter) have made some peace with these questions. One issue here relates to terms of art in the world of scholarly communication. In that a pre-print, a post-print, a final published version are understood in this domain to be different things so that a significant, although not universal, number of publishers allow for the circulation of pre-prints and post-prints even if they don't allow for free circulation of the final typescript or XML or HTML document. So, there are tools that any scholar can use to investigate the underlying copyright issues that are built into the author agreements that are arranged for all, for virtually every journal. Certainly any major journal in a substantive research field will appear in a thing called SHERPA/RoMEO which is a database you can go to and look up the journals of interest to you to see what the general criteria are for open-access relative to them. No journal is willing, with perhaps a few exceptions, almost no journal is willing to not publish a Harvard author and few are willing to forsake publishing work funded by the Wellcome Trust or from various other kinds of funders so that that doesn't mean that the final published typescript can be made available, but generally some form of the article can be made available. There are these color codes which if you get into this you'll discover that journals have been coded in a variety of ways. Gold and green are the two most commonly discussed color codes, but there's an array of variations. In some fields, publishers don't want pre-early manuscripts circulating. They want those taken out of circulation once the final work is published. We can imagine research in crucial medical contexts in which anything but the final version is just unacceptable to the world and in other situations, having the pre-rough redraft or the post-draft redraft in circulation in parallel to the final published version is acceptable. And again, there's tremendous disciplinary variation here. High energy physics represents one end of the continuum and Bob and others can speak to this, and then there are other fields in which large chunks of the scholarly literature isn't even digital yet so that there's just a lot of variation. These matters are political. There is tremendous resistance to open access from a number of quarters most obviously the commercial publishing interests who, you know – these matters are out of alignment with their concerns. Scholarly societies are a little more mixed on this point, although they're worried about how they're going to pay their bills. From the point of view of a wide range of the public, open access is a no-brainer, right? So there's tremendous variation.

HANSON: And again, it's political in other senses too. I mean as you know there's an NIH mandate which, you know, has obviously been very successful with the rationale that the government funded the research that led to certain things. The public ought to have access to it. You should know that I wrote on behalf of the institution in support of shortening that time period for results to be open and right now there's another bill circulating with respect to eleven other agencies that fund research asking for essentially the same conditions to be a mandate for anything coming out of it. And what is it? I just looked it up on my thing, it's called the Federal Research Public Access

Act and I received a letter from the provost at Harvard asking whether or not our institution would support it. It's been signed – letters in support of it have been signed. I did send a letter in support of it. The CIC members, that is to say the CIC, the provosts of the, you know, the Big 10, have conferred about these matters and in the first instance we wrote a joint letter and in this one we wrote individual letters but, and I'm not certain that all of the CIC institutions supported it, but Steve Hyman of Harvard has pointed out that the presidents or the provosts of Harvard, Stanford, Princeton, and Rutgers were early on this. I think now among our CIC peers, I wrote a letter, Penn State did, Ohio State did, and perhaps others did as well.

NOEL: I just wanted to get back to this very first comment that was made. And this is a question for everybody. I'm just wondering what kind of intellectual property is generated on this campus that really shouldn't go in a repository and be open? What are specific examples of things that might go in an institutional repository, but that would be bad for the author or bad for the institution?

SHAW: Bad research...? (laughter)

JACOBS: But the problem here is that, you know, if you take this out, you know, in the future, we're going to end up having—I had a student just this last week who in term of employment, he's got to sign something that basically gives the university copyright to anything he develops, you know, on campus. And, you know, maybe we're not saying this here, you know, but that's where this kind of thinking goes, you know, eventually. And that means that as an author, I can't write a textbook and publish it, you know, without going through all kinds of institutional stuff for doing it. So I don't like that. I mean, I have problems with that. So, you know, just my opinion, but some things the university, I mean, you know, I don't know. Does the university own everything we do?

HANSON: That question was not what this is about. It's not what's involved in the open access mandates that have come from the government.

BROWN: You mentioned scholarly articles, but there's another part of our mission that is educational. I wonder if you can comment on the fact that the university seems to have chosen a software system that makes open access to our course materials very difficult to allow a lot of the...it's extremely hard to link to Oncourse and it's extremely hard to make things visible in Oncourse.

JACKSON: There's certainly questions about the potential limitations of Oncourse as a part of the digital ecology of what we use and do. In a more favorable—and I'm not an expert in Oncourse—but what I would note would be that in addition to the DSpace driven repository that we've developed and the open journal systems-based journal framework that the library has developed, there's another piece of the puzzle that the university is now very involved in and this relates again to collaborative work between UITS and the libraries and that is we're becoming a major partner in a project that's

centered at Rice University called Connexions. Connexions is another set of digital tools and its main focus is to make it very easy and very fruitful to engage in the creation of open textbooks and open teaching tools in general. A group from Rice was here last year and a group from here went to the Connexions meeting I think recently. I've experimented myself with using Connexions as a publishing platform. It's certainly the folks at IU who are involved with Oncourse are also now involved in Connexions which is a tool built differently than Oncourse to help us produce open teaching materials in particular. And I know that David Lewis and other administrators on campus are extremely eager to see us where possible move into that domain of creating open course materials and in a way that's not bounded in the way that an Oncourse site would be.

HANSON: Do we have questions or comments? I think we're still supposed to have a break. A very short five minutes.

BREAK

AGENDA ITEM 7: RESOLUTION ON SHARED GOVERNANCE

HANSON: Oh, good. Alright, the next item of business is the resolution on shared governance second reading. Erika Dowell?

DOWELL: Well, I think back in Agenda Committee business I gave you sort of the long introduction to this and just to point out changes since you last saw it; principally there are a few things changed for clarification. We specified the types of decisions under notification "3) Notification" announcements of "significant policy" decisions was added and we added another element here now described as number "2) Representation" which is an all new clause suggested from comments after our previous meeting that addresses, I'll just read it. It says, "2) Representation: administrators seeking consultation with faculty should use the existing communities of the Bloomington Faculty Council," and consult with its officers and if administrators choose to form separate consultative groups we ask that they include members of the Faculty Council also. And we have this listed as a second reading, but I'm perfectly happy to have action on the item today, too. So, I'll open it up for discussion.

HANSON: Questions or comments?

BROWN: I have a question actually about the representation, because there are committees formed all the time for recruiting, I was on a committee panel last year. Do you really intend that she has to ask the Bloomington Faculty Council for representatives on those committees or is that...?

DOWELL: Well again, I guess this speaks to sort of the lack of specificity in certain terms that we use. I don't think it's meant to consider every committee. But that certainly could be something that we clarify.

HANSON: For example, would it include promotion and tenure committees...?

DOWELL: No, I think it's meant to indicate wherever is an existing committee that might provide general advisory kind of input to an administrator that they not decide to form their own committee instead.

HORNE: I have a quick comment since you looked at me. And this came up in the Agenda Committee and it's not something to do with this resolution it is just to do with the overall issue and that was that we had a meeting on this two weeks ago and, you know, talked about this and the response from the administration came out in the paper instead of to any—there was no response to any of the Agenda Committee to anybody to my knowledge in this body. It was just printed in the paper which is I think one of the issues that we sought to address by raising the resolution to begin with.

GRAY: So what kind of procedure or teeth does this have? I mean, I would fully support this and I would love to see this kind of consultation happen and be expected and institutionalized, but what way do we have to make sure it's done, and are we just making a statement that we want it done or if this is passed does it become how we operate? How do we make that happen?

DOWELL: I would say that this resolution does not have teeth. It would be a statement of goals for the Faculty Council to try to work on and press in other interactions with the university administrators.

GIERYN: The contrast between this resolution and the memo that was circulated just today by the vote of the Budgetary Affairs Committee is interesting in one way. And that is that the BAC memo at least acknowledges that there are many layers of administrative work going on in the Bloomington campus whereas the resolution is rather coarse in its identification of the administration, at times saying that it applies to campus and university level. The question is, in your discussions in the Agenda Committee, when you use the word administration, are you thinking of the many layers? Is this, for example, a resolution that would be incumbent upon individual schools in their setup of a whole variety of committees that schools set up for a whole variety of purposes? Were you thinking of that level or were you restricting it to some campus level, university-wide or campus-specific administrative units?

DOWELL: My sense of our discussions at the Agenda Committee was that we were restricting it to, particularly, university level administrators. But you're right. It is written rather coarsely because frankly, I think there are gaps in communications that exist at multiple levels. Anyone else on the Agenda Committee like to comment?

TERRY: Just wanted to – I think we were intending it for campus level administrators which would include the president since he’s the chief executive officer of the campus. But being the Bloomington Faculty Council, we can’t mandate what the University Faculty Council should do in terms of consultation. And I think since I also participated in writing this memo on the Budgetary Affairs Committee we’re very cognizant of the fact that we’re a campus committee, but we felt we had to include those other units partly because of the nature of responsibility center management. It was a deliberate – as you pointed out – deliberate effort in this memo to say, ‘It won’t do any good to address this problem just to the campus level, we have got to get deans and others also consulting with faculty over budgetary matters.’ I think as a member of the Agenda Committee, my sense of the resolution on shared governance was targeted at campus level officers. I would hope that the policy committees and others of the schools would look at similar sorts of things and go to their deans and say, ‘You should consult with us too.’

DOWELL: Steve?

BURNS: In terms of the issue of teeth, I wonder if you’ve considered what’s probably not very strong teeth, but the issue of if a result of such a process that didn’t receive BFC input came to the BFC ultimately that you’d have to reexamine it. In other words, if they got input from the start from BFC or BFC designated members, the BFC could consider it immediately, but if not it would require BFC consideration with a subcommittee. Did you consider that?

DOWELL: I don’t think we talked about that at all. Mostly because my sense of it is that the object of what we’re talking about are things that aren’t coming to the Council, period.

BURNS: I suspected it might. As I said, it wouldn’t be very good teeth, but still the principle ought to be that nothing comes through without that.

JACOBS: I would say that this is addressing some problem, but the other thing that’s obvious about this is that it’s so general. It’s so virtually impossible for administrators to apply. There’s so much judgment associated with this in terms of, is this a significant issue? Is this not a significant issue? It could create a problem. And I think at least the expression that we want something and I think you know the faculty want it to be involved in significant, strategic initiatives changes problems in a major way. But you know, we don’t want to sit in Neil Theobald’s office all day helping him figure out how to allocate. If you can solve the problem, you know – help me understand. I’m trying to be constructive here.

DOWELL: I think you are being constructive.

JACOBS: I think that that's what we want is a statement that we want to be involved strategically. We want our committees to be (inaudible). But it is a very difficult thing to do, to put in words.

HANSON: Padraic?

KENNEY: Well, that was actually very constructive precisely because it speaks generally in ways some are calling vague. I mean one of the difficult things in a situation like this is the ability to name something and to name it relatively quickly. It seems to me that the problem that the Faculty Council has had over the last few years is kind of a, 'well, we think we've been neglected, but we can't quite say how.' And if as a result of this document, the BFC would now be able to say, 'You know, we have specifically asked for representation in matters when administrators are seeking consultation with faculty,' which by the way strikes me as a very specific term which clearly excludes promotion committees, because it's about seeking consultation with faculty and task forces and things like that. So the BFC might be able to say, 'We specifically asked for representation on these types of things and that has been violated.' I think that's a huge step forward in a very specific and constructive way. You know, my field of work is opposition to authoritarian regimes. And it often turns out that (laughter) oppositions are much more effective when they're able to speak specifically rather than generally, 'we don't like what happens, but this has been violated, that has been violated,' or something else entirely. And so in that general sense, and you know I'm using analogy wisely – or advisedly (laughter) – anyway I think that it is precisely the ability to name things that, you know, gives this actually some teeth.

BROWN: I agree it's too broad. I think if we can focus on a narrow problem, that actually might be addressed like we don't want to read about this stuff in the newspaper. We really would like the Bloomington Faculty Council as representatives to be notified in a timely fashion before policy decisions are released publicly. That's a very simple statement. It doesn't have any more teeth than this does, but this doesn't have any teeth, so you might as well just say what you really want.

HORNE: Essentially – I'm sorry – but point number three, the announcements of significant policies decisions should be made to faculty before their release to the press.

BROWN: Yeah, but it's really buried. Why don't you just crisply say it? You know, we're not happy with the way we've been informed of things. We would like to be involved in the communication before the press.

R. ARNOLD: Does it help if we also somehow quantitate things a little bit? And I think this is along the lines of being more descriptive. And I think we're talking about issues on campus that affect more than one school or department so there's really campus wide issues. And I don't think we make that point anywhere in here necessarily so that leads to a certain ambiguity as to what level does the faculty want to be involved? Well,

we want to be involved when there are decisions made that affect the, you know, many of us across campus and maybe don't affect just one school or one department or some other stratification that's less than the campus wide. I think it's those campus wide issues where we want to have input where we're being sort of ignored right now. And if there's maybe a way to craft that into the language that might make it more specific and easier for an administrator to grasp what it is we're talking about.

HANSON: I'm afraid that puzzled one administrator a little bit. I mean why would you think that the decisions made at the, say the school level, aren't just as important to you, especially in an RCM system as campus wide?

R. ARNOLD: I think they will be, but I think that the main gist of our angst at this point is really related to those bigger decisions – maybe not. Maybe it's at all those levels, but maybe we have to say that a little more clearly.

ARNOVE: There is a clause here about decisions that affect the pedagogical and academic environment. So there you may have something specific in mind or a little bit more specific and then what I'm hearing about significant (inaudible), I'd recommend that significant policy decisions in point 3. There you could put a clause in concerning the mission of the university, the allocation of resources and maybe a couple of other things that would be critical. A little bit more specific but they also reflect that concern about the way resources are allocated and this affects the governance and mission of the university for our campus.

TERRY: I would not like to see us focus just on point 3. I guess I don't care whether the authoritarian notifies us of decisions first or through the media. I mean, it's sort of equally...

JACOBS: ...administrative emails is what's going to happen.

TERRY: Yeah, I'm much more interested in the idea that we have the ability to know what is going on that might affect the interests, and to which we can make positive contributions before it's decided. And while it's important to some extent how you find out, sometimes the media is a more effective way to notify people of things than others. I'd also, I might drop 3, but the other things are important to people that have brought the issue of faculty governance and its fate to me.

GRAY: Mine was a suggestion for maybe an addition, I'm just not quite sure where to put it. But I'm perfectly comfortable, right now it says, "All the BFC," and I'm perfectly comfortable having our representative Faculty Council officers, I'm not sure what they're called, be the ones who are in direct consultation. So, for example, under "Representation" if administrators choose to form separate consulting groups, that you'll be notified. I mean, you would have the opportunity to request representation. So something that directs administrators to you would be useful to me. And then for

me, this— you know, I'll make it kind of concrete—the reason I really appreciate number 1 and number 2 particularly is that – and this is no slight to the task force that's been created to look at the issue of consolidating or examining different units' doing communication work on campus – but we have a BFC committee that's going to deal with the MRE, that's supposed to be dealing with what would it mean to consolidate or eliminate or do restructuring of our units. So I would really prefer that rather than there be a separate task force in MRE that the BFC is charged with doing that work in consultation with you. And you know I can understand the value of a separate task force but for me it sets up an antagonistic relationship with a separate task force as opposed to having the chance to talk clearly with my peers and have them perhaps consult our department about are we feeling really happy about the possibility of a merger or do we feel like it's an offer we can't refuse? Like I feel like I could have that conversation differently with the BFC.

HANSON: Well, if I may respond to that, I think you need to look at the charge to the MRE and the establishment charge to the MRE. It couldn't possibly do that. It has to have some proposal on the table. I consulted with the MRE and the Agenda Committee before deciding to move in this direction in order to produce something that could use the policies that the BFC has established. So while you may prefer that, that isn't really an option according to governance principles.

GRAY: But would representation on that task force from the BFC be an option?

HANSON: Well there is representation on that task force from someone, as I say, who is on the MRE as it moves, and I believe he's chairing it and going to serve as something of a liaison. But I think, if we can actually take this as a useful example here of some of the ways in which the policies of the BFC may need some close attention to see whether or not they can deal with some of the issues that are in front of us now, particularly when we have budgets being cut and when we have the emergence of these things called the core schools. I mean each of these has been very, very clunky to address with goodwill on all sides and attempts to use the policies that are in place. I must say, though, and this is just a separate point, so if you want to respond to that, I'll give you a second, but this is a separate point. I think the philosopher in me would ask for some kind of justification of the idea that any consultative group had to include non-administrative members of the BFC. What is the justification for that? I realize that it's come out of an expectation that at least these are people who have been elected as opposed to simply being chosen by an administrator, but I think we really need to think hard if you want to build that into the rules about how we proceed in the future. And to do that you have to look closely at how many people on the Bloomington faculty are involved in faculty governance mechanisms right now to think whether or not this is truly representative and whether or not it actually is going to be the most useful thing for solving problems that are facing us collectively because sometimes it will be members who, of our faculty, who are not involved in this group who have the right expertise to participate in things. And again, that wouldn't preclude consultation with, for example, the Agenda

Committee about whether or not, this is the right move to make. If you stipulate that, that is considerably more restrictive. And in a way that I think you need to think seriously about whether or not you could justify. Richard?

SHOCKLEY: Yeah, I personally don't think this is the right view. The right view of this is that it's sort of putting the burden on someone else to find a way to get the faculty involved. I really think that, you know, Bob brought up the point last time that what are we going to do?

UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER: Could you speak up? We couldn't hear very well.

SHOCKLEY: Yeah, in our last meeting Bob, you know, asked the question, what are we going to do? Why don't we get out in front of things? And I think that the more appropriate way to go about this is actually to step back and figure out what is it we want to do? Is it just notification? Is it consultation? Or is it some decision, right? Where is it that we actually have some expectation and where is it we can actually provide some value in those different areas and then you know, really design sort of an institution that can be a positive player in these kind of activities rather than simply sitting back and putting the burden on an administrator to find a way to use the faculty. So I'm going to vote against this, because I think that we should be more active and proactive in figuring out how we want to be partners in these things.

WHISTON: I was not here at the last meeting, and so what I'm going to say may be redundant and already discussed and then originally I was going to suggest you know editorial changes to this, but I think instead I'll make a different suggestion which is kind of related to what I was going to do. Is, and God I never thought I would ever say this in a public meeting, bylaws. It's a terrible term, but don't we have bylaws for the Bloomington Faculty Council that really describe what we should be doing? And it seems that maybe we're not doing what's been done in the past. I'm not sure on that, because I've only been here for about ten years. And the second thing, is what I hear is that historically, the Bloomington Faculty Council has had a very, very active role. And that in recent years there is the perception or maybe it's accurate that we don't have as active a role in the governance of the university. So my question now is, is this redundant to something that we really should already have? And should we be saying to the appropriate administrators, 'I think you've skipped a step here.' And the second thing is, if we are going with this, shouldn't there be more of a focus on historically the services that the Bloomington Faculty Council has provided?

HANSON: Tom?

GIERYN: Redundant or not, it may be worth sending the signal once again. If you look at the Academic Handbook which is university wide, you don't need to go into bylaws but in the Academic Handbook under the section 2 that outlines responsibilities of the administration, the faculty, and who has the authority to do what, it's very clear. The

trustees and the administration should consult the faculty concerning and then there's a list that includes planning about physical resources, budgets, faculty compensation and benefits, and administrative offices. And then it ends with this line, which again suggests that there may be redundancy but a useful redundancy in the resolution. "Consultation of the faculty shall be through representatives authorized by faculty governance institutions. Consultation should occur sufficiently in advance of action to permit faculty deliberation." The resolution is really not a radical document (laughter), but should I say is a restatement of the policies that this Council and the University Faculty Council passed many years ago to work through the relationship between administrative decisions and faculty governance. It is shared governance and it's there in the Academic Handbook.

WHISTON: What I would say to Tom is, isn't it a stronger resolution to say, 'It is in the handbook and we feel that it's not being implemented?'

ARNOVE: Well, it is a statement concerned of it's perceived as an increasingly autocratic tendency on the part of the central administration with regard to budgetary decision making on important matters. The last faculty meeting was covered in the HT, Mike Leonard's piece, that made it very clear that we are concerned about these things. They quoted Herb, that if the faculty expected to be nimble, they have to be asked to be nimble. So my feeling is that this concern is already out there in the media and what we're simply doing is reiterating it with this resolution.

HORNE: If I may, that was the point of raising any kind of resolution. It was not necessarily having any teeth, at least, you know, in my little portion of the Agenda Committee, to me it was just we have this perception and it's possible that the trustees, that the president, that other various administrators may not even know because they're doing – I mean, I personally believe, I can only speak for me – that every person we've addressed or to whom we might even have referred are doing their best job in good faith to do what they are supposed to do and what is for the benefit of the students and the faculty and the legacy of the institution. However, we feel that they're not being properly consultative, that they're not informing us in the way that they should and we wanted some method of saying that other than just an email to them. So I personally wouldn't want any kind of teeth, so to speak, in it because it's just supposed to be a communication device. That, at least, in my portion of that.

ARNOVE: So how do we proceed?

DOWELL: Well, how do we proceed?

SHAW: Full disclosure: there's no communication anywhere in my title, but (laughter) it seems to me that it may have been effective in communicating enough with the document and the discussions that we have had here that we don't need actually to vote on it. We can table the proposal and keeping in mind the point that Tom raised

about the underlying responsibilities of everybody to be doing this and be more mindful without having to actually vote on something.

GRAY: Just another question: what's the downside of actually moving on this and having a public statement of our conversation? Well, genuinely, I'm relatively young here. What's the downside of making this an official, entered into the record, statement?

DOWELL: Well, I think the downside would be if it's defeated. You know, on the basis that it's not that we don't share the core sentiments of it, but that various among us have problems with specificity, have trouble with the fact that it seems to be demanding of administrators rather than demanding of ourselves to change the way we operate and use things that we use some control over to push forward. I think that would be the downside of a vote is if it was defeated. And people don't necessarily understand that it's not because we're down on faculty governance it's because that it was a flawed motion or a flawed resolution. Pat?

HARBISON: Might it be wise to re-write this yet again to include a whereas citing what Tom's just read to us from the Handbook and considering what we're saying in the terms that are already in existence and citing that we are not feeling comfortable with the realization of those terms?

DOWELL: I think that is one option open to us definitely. Diane?

REILLY: I think to make that even briefer, it might just be effective to say, 'we'd like to call people's attention to what's already in the Academic Handbook.' And rather than list all of our complaints with things that have happened lately, which I think have already been well covered, just say something that we can all agree in agree on, which is, that's what's in the Academic Handbook. I don't know if we should have a problem voting for that. (laughter)

HANSON: Any other questions or comments?

JACOBS: You know the other thing, I think we are all concerned about the budgetary conditions on this campus over the next two years. It's going to get worse before it gets better and that, you know, basically we could state that, you know, we want to be involved and we would like to be strategically involved in the decisions that are made to get us through what's going to be a terrible few years. And that if we could just put that in a statement, I would feel very comfortable, you know, agreeing to something like that. Because we do want to be, and we know there's going to be all kinds of implications to teaching and everything else, you know, for what the decisions are going to have to be made as far as the funding situations and stuff.

HORNE: If I may, I'm sorry, I feel like I might have said too much on the subject already, but my concern about that would be that if we make our desire for cooperation with the

administration or a desire for consultation with the administration contingent on rough financial times then after two years then this resolution would then pass out of effect? We think the history of the university demands this.

JACOBS: It started with those...

DOWELL: Yeah, it started with “These are core principles that are in our faculty handbook.” Okay, so do I get a sense that a dramatic rewrite to create a more succinct resolution that references the Handbook is in order? Yes?

GIERYN: I realize that Neil was invited to speak on a set of issues and was not fully prepared to articulate what he said with this resolution. So that’s a preface to what I’m about to say. But I think as we move this resolution forward, it might be useful for the Agenda Committee to re-read the minutes of the last meeting. Because part of the problem may be a perception of what consultation consists of and it may well be the case that Neil felt, and some members of this Council may have felt, that there was proper consultation. And that other members of this Council may believe that that’s not satisfactory in terms of our sense of the word consultation so that I do think there is something that would be useful by way of specifying the Academic Handbook language. I don’t think it’s enough to simply say, “We’ve got the Handbook. Take it seriously.” I think there’s something more to be said in terms of what is meant by the language in the Academic Handbook. So I think there is reason to start there but move on.

HANSON: Are there other comments, questions, or suggestions? So is that a general consensus that the Agenda Committee, or Erika, would...?

TERRY: Any support for the proposition that we might find an electronic way to approve our next resolution? We have just canceled our next meeting. We are getting good at proving we’re not nimble. (laughter) I wonder if there’s a way we could...

DOWELL: No, I think that’s an excellent suggestion. We have to have this out so that we can all read it and discuss it in another way next week or sometime. I don’t know that we can approve it or not, but...

TERRY: I would hope the group might approve the Agenda Committee working on this and getting it back out to the group electronically in some form at least.

DOWELL: Well before the next meeting.

TERRY: We have quite a gap before our next meeting.

HANSON: Do the bylaws allow for electronic voting?

HORNE: I don't know. I personally would not be in favor. Absolutely distribution of a new revised version, but I personally wouldn't be in favor of an electronic vote.

DOWELL: Well, we can see what the possibilities are for both and I don't think we'll have something in the interim to report about our more proactive kind of efforts to examine the way we operate and see what maybe we need to be doing in the future. Yes, send us your good ideas. Talk to us on the phone about your good ideas if you don't want to write them down.

HANSON: Okay, are there ...? People are putting on their coats, so I guess we're adjourned.

MEETING ADJOURNED: 5:34PM