

Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
April 16, 2013
IMU Georgian Room
3:30 P.M. - 5:30 P.M.

Attendance

MEMBERS PRESENT: Abhijit Basu, Bonnie Brownlee, Gracia Clark, Marion Frank-Wilson, Thomas Gieryn, Jason Baird Jackson, Jennifer Laherty, Lesa Hatley Major, Eugene McGregor, Sherri Michaels, Michael Morrone, Maresa Murray, Michael Ogden, John Paolillo, James Perry, Edwin Ramos, Deanna Reising, Matt Semadeni, Sandra Shapshay, Jim Sherman, Grant Simpson, Sarita Soni, Rebecca Spang, Sonya Stephens, Herb Terry, Peggy Thoits, Julie Van Voorhis, Barbara Vance, Edward Vasquez, John Walbridge, William Wheeler

MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT: William Swanson (Steve Burns)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Dana Anderson, Lyudmila Bronstein, Carolyn Calloway-Thomas, LaNita Campbell, Mike Conway, Gregory Demas, Pnina Fichman, Jeffrey Gershman, Donald Gjerdingen, Cassandra Guarino, Vivian Halloran, T. Scott Herring, Robert Jacobs, Bruce Jaffee, Lynn Jamieson, Peter Kloosterman, Dan Knudsen, Patricia McManus, Michael MCRobbie, Jeff Nelsen, Dot Porter, Elizabeth Raff, Lauren Robel, Bret Rothstein, Augustin Ruta, Lisa Sideris, Marietta Simpson, J. Kyle Straub, Adam Szczepaniak, John Tafoya, Pat Thomas, Frances Trix, James Wimbush

GUESTS: Mark Bruhn (OVPIT), Craig Dethloff (Faculty Council Office), Stacy Konkiel (Libraries), Dan Rives (AVP-HR), Craig Stewart (OVPIT), Munirpallam Venkataramanan (VPSI), Carl Weinberg (COAS)

Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/agendas/12-13/04.02.13.pdf>

2. Memorial Resolutions for Lloyd Vann Seawell and Ellen Anderson Brantlinger

Lloyd Vann Seawell: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/12-13/B26-2013.pdf>

Ellen Anderson Brantlinger: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/12-13/B27-2013.pdf>

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

4. Presiding Officer's Report (10 minutes)

(Provost Lauren Robel)

5. Question / Comment Period¹

6. CWA Membership (20 minutes)

(Professor Don Gjerdingen, Chair of the Constitution and Rules Committee) [ACTION ITEM]

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/12-13/B28-2013.pdf>

7. Online Course Questionnaire Update (10 minutes)

(Professor Bill Wheeler, Chair of the Educational Policies Committee; Tom Gieryn, VPFAA; Sonya Stephens, VPUE) [DISCUSSION]

8. IT-28: Provisioning of Information Technology Services (30 minutes)

(Professor Brad Wheeler, Vice President for Information Technology) [DISCUSSION]

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/12-13/aux/IT-28Revised.pdf>

9. Health Care Update (30 minutes)

(Dan Rives, Associate Vice President, University Human Resources) [DISCUSSION]

Minutes

AGENDA ITEM 1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

ROBEL: Welcome, everybody. At this point, I will call for a motion to approve the minutes.

UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER: So moved.

ROBEL: Okay, great.

UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER: Second.

ROBEL: All in favor? [Aye] Okay. Opposed? [Silence] Terrific. At this moment, I will recognize Tom Gieryn.

AGENDA ITEM 2: MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS FOR LLOYD VANN SEAWELL AND ELLEN ANDERSON BRATLINGER

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

GIERYN: Ellen Brantlinger was born in Mahtomedi, Minnesota to Arnold Anderson and Rose Nott Anderson, both children of Norwegian immigrants. She was the youngest of three children, the oldest being her sister, Wilda Anderson Obey, who now resides on a farm in Hinkley, Minnesota, and her brother, Burton Anderson, who lives in Italy. She was raised in Minnesota. After graduation from Mahtomedi High School in Minnesota as one of forty members of the Class of 1958, Ellen moved to Yellow Springs, Ohio, where she earned a Bachelor's Degree in Secondary Education/Social Studies from Antioch College. While attending Antioch, a five-year program, Ellen had a number of work-study experiences that foreshadowed what would become her lifetime dedication to community advocacy and working with those with special needs, including working for the Central Institute for the Deaf in St. Louis, an orphanage in Stuttgart, Germany, and on an Ojibway Indian Reservation in Orr, Minnesota. It was while in college at Antioch that she met her husband, Patrick Brantlinger. Ellen and Pat were engaged for two years before they married in 1963.

Ellen worked as a school teacher in Dayton, Ohio until 1964, at which time she and Pat moved to Cambridge, Massachusetts in order for Pat to attend graduate school at Harvard University. Ellen taught special education classes in a school in Cambridge before transferring to a school in Stoneham, Massachusetts, working there for three years with students who were, at the time, labeled, "educable mentally retarded," ranging from preschool through junior high school age. While teaching, she completed a Master's Degree in Special Education at Boston University, graduating in 1966. In 1968, Pat completed his Ph.D. and they moved to Bloomington, Indiana, where Ellen enrolled in a doctoral program in special education at Indiana University's School of Education and completed her Ed.D., with Dr. Sam Guskin as her dissertation director.

During her doctoral studies and early career, first as a visiting lecturer and then as a visiting professor in the School of Education, Ellen was also raising her children, Andrew, Susan, and Jeremy. During the six years that Ellen spent as a visiting professor in the School of Education, she had a number of responsibilities in the special education program. In addition to teaching, she was responsible for the supervision of undergraduate special education student teachers in classrooms with "severely handicapped" children throughout south-central Indiana and became an important contributor to the development of many courses in the special education program.

In 1986 Ellen was appointed as Assistant Professor of Special Education, earning tenure and promotion to the associate level in 1990. In 1992, she became the chair of Special Education and helped the program transition into its current academic home in the Department of Curriculum & Instruction. Ellen was promoted to professor in 1996, after which time she coordinated the doctoral program in Curriculum Studies several times before retirement.

Ellen was a prolific and exceptional writer, a rigorous and highly ethical scholar, and an exemplary editor and methodologist; she was also highly effective in translating these skills to teaching and perhaps more importantly, to mentoring students and junior colleagues. The dozens of doctoral students with whom she worked, along with her colleagues, admired her as an exemplary model of a successful woman who was a mother, wife, and scholar who knew how to navigate the complexities inherent in life in the academy, and to do so successfully and with integrity. Ellen was, without a doubt, a singular woman who was a highly valued presence at Indiana University Bloomington, one sorely missed on this campus, and on the many campuses which her former students now call their faculty homes.

Among her many published works are five books, highly regarded by scholars in special education and social justice. Ellen also authored twenty-eight peer-reviewed articles and six book chapters, along with nine other training manuals and curriculum resource publications. But numbers of publications do not reveal the value of her contribution. Ellen was said by the colleagues and friends who contributed to a booklet provided to her family upon her death, *Thoughts of Ellen*, to be a “great” and “brilliant researcher” and “incredible scholar,” someone who was “warm” and had the “perfect combination of seriousness and good humor.” These attributes made her contributions to the field theoretically profound and significant in their meanings for real-life practice with children, families, and teacher educators.

Ellen was widely recognized for her activism in the areas of education reform, particularly in regard to diversity and the influence of social class on school structures. She was also known for her extensive community involvement. Following is a sample of her many accomplishments. She provided extensive information to *The Herald-Times* of Bloomington, IN for a five-part series on school redistricting in the fall of 1996. She provided approximately fifty workshops and presentations on sexuality and disability issues or on the Americans with Disabilities Act between 1976 and 1998. She served on the Monroe County School Community Corporation (MCCSC) Adult Basic Education Advisory Board, the Planned Parenthood Public Affairs Committee, the Indiana Family Health Council, and as a surrogate parent for annual case conferences for several MCCSC students living in group homes between 1992 and 1995.

Retirement was a very active time for Ellen, one in which she became freer to spend time with the family whom she loved, to cook, quilt, sew, garden, and read, and to follow her passion for community service. After retiring, Ellen became a Monroe County Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA) and volunteered in the library of Fairview Elementary School.

Ellen was very proud of her three children and was an actively involved grandparent of two grandchildren, Leroy and Jayla Robinson. Her oldest son, Andrew, who is currently teaching at the University of Maryland, College Park, also chose the education field, earning a doctorate in Mathematics Education at Northwestern University. Her daughter, Susan, is a social worker,

earning her Master's degree from Indiana University. Her son Jeremy is a musician in St. Louis, Missouri. Ellen and her husband Pat, recently retired emeritus professor of English from Indiana University, were married for forty-eight years.

Professor Lloyd Vann Seawell II was born on February 9, 1930 in Fayetteville, North Carolina, and he passed away on January 1, 2012 in Bloomington, Indiana. Vann (as he was affectionately called by his colleagues) received his BS degree from Wake Forest University where he was a quarterback on the football team. He received his MBA and DBA degrees from Indiana University in 1955 and 1958.

Vann joined the Department of Accounting faculty as an assistant professor in 1958 and retired in 1994. He was repeatedly recognized for teaching excellence, winning over a dozen awards for his efforts in the Undergraduate and MBA Programs. He won awards from the MBA Association, Delta Sigma Pi, the Senior Class Council, Student Alumni Council, and others. In addition to being admired for his superb teaching, he was a leader in hospital accounting and consequently was an invited guest speaker at numerous hospital seminars throughout his career. As a long-time member of the Healthcare Financial Management Association (HFMA), he worked with that organization to create books and publications to help healthcare finance and accounting professionals. HFMA recognizes Vann's contributions to healthcare finance publishing with the annual "Helen Yerger/ L. Vann Seawell Best Article Award" for outstanding editorial achievement in healthcare financial management.

For many years Indiana University partnered with the HFMA to present a week-long Hospital Financial Management program. The program consisted of several educational class tracks to meet the varied needs of course participants. The mainstay of the long-running program was Professor Seawell's course on Hospital Accounting. Participants came from all over the country to attend this program.

Besides publishing articles in professional and academic journals, Vann Seawell's expertise in healthcare finance was efficiently and insightfully delineated in four textbooks:

Principles of Hospital Accounting, (Chicago: The Physicians' Record Company, 1960);

Hospital Accounting and Financial Management, (Chicago: The Physicians' Record Company, 1964);

Hospital Financial Accounting – Theory and Practice, (Chicago: Hospital Financial Management Association, 1975, 1987);

Introduction to Hospital Accounting, (Chicago: Hospital Financial Management Association, 1977, 1988, 1991).

He also coauthored three other texts:

Accounting Theory and Practice – Advanced, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1961), with Robert Milroy and Robert Walden;

Introductory Accounting – A Management Approach, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968), with Robert Walden;

Introductory Accounting, (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1973), with Gerald Searfoss.

“In the preface to *Hospital Accounting and Financial Management* (1964), I wrote that the financial management problems of hospitals were becoming increasingly numerous and complex! I pointed to the need for continued improvement in hospital accounting practices and for greater utilization of accounting data as a basis for effective planning and control of the financial affairs of hospital enterprises.

These remarks hardly surprised anyone in the hospital business at that time, but, looking back, I am struck with the sheer magnitude of understatement in those observations.”

L. Vann Seawell,

Hospital Financial Accounting Theory and Practice, 1975

When not in class or writing books, Vann had a deep love for the game of golf. He was reluctantly coerced back into the game of golf in the early 1970s by a fellow faculty member and he continued to play the rest of his life. In the summers and after retirement he often played five times a week. It was during these many golf outings that Vann would share his wisdom about professional success and about life in general. He had a wonderful outlook on life and it was always a pleasure to golf with him. He used his love of the game to develop strong professional contacts and relationships with public accounting firms and with others in the business community. He was famous for his ability to organize golf outings that greatly strengthened the ties between IU accounting faculty and the business community.

Vann is deeply missed by his family, colleagues, and friends. His office door was always open to conversation about sports (golf in particular), politics, and intellectual pursuits. Lloyd Vann Seawell II, truly was a special person. Warm, kind, pensive, and thoughtful are all words that aptly describe him. He was an outstanding teacher, an extraordinary mentor, an insightful writer, a devoted family man, and a genuine human being.

ROBEL: [indistinct comment] include those people who were lost in Boston in our thoughts. [All rise] [Silence] Thank you. I now recognize our president.

AGENDA ITEM 3: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE BUSINESS

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Thank you. A compelling, most resonant thing happened precisely five days ago. In a timely anticipation of my last comments before this Council in my role as president of the BFC, and it is with that event that I wish to begin my comments today. On April 11, 2013, I received a document from Dr. Gary Engstrand, Secretary of the Faculty at University of Minnesota, where our former Provost, Karen Hanson, is a matter of human interest today, only because she happens to be there. The narrative that is relevant for us today is that Professor Sally Gregory Kohlstedt, Chair of University of Minnesota's Faculty Consultative Committee circulated a statement to senate and council leaders of the Committee on Institutional Cooperation, CIC, titled "Reflections on Governance Service: A Statement by the Faculty Consultative Committee to the Faculty," which was adopted unanimously at Minnesota in March, 2013.

Professor Kohlstedt thought that all senate and faculty leaders at CIC institutions, as she noted, would find it of interest. And, of course, I did so eagerly. Although all of the statements in the document truly resonated with me, I will quote only two passages from the document because they have the keenest implications for what we have done at IU over the past two years, as well as implications for what we must continue to do at IU over the next several years.

First, the Governance Committee at University of Minnesota reported in a mission-driven fashion that, "one of the obligations of a faculty member in an institution like ours is to participate in its governance. It is part of the definition of a faculty member that he or she has a role in governance. There are intrinsic rewards to participation beyond the financial, including having a voice in determining actions taken, and outside the department, the almost-invariably rewarding experience of meeting colleagues from other departments and colleges."

Second, the Governance Committee of University of Minnesota underline that quote, "We are also concerned that the practice of sheltering probationary members from almost all service responsibilities can be a mistake. Doing so can give them a distorted view of what it means to be a full-fledged member of the community of scholars, with this attendant obligations. While we concur that probationary faculty members should not be expected to perform significant levels of service," the statement continued, "we believe they should be involved at a level that will not harm their prospects of achieving tenure but that will provide them an understanding of what it means to be a citizen of a major research university." By now, I think you see where my narrative is going, and how ready-made the Minnesota statement is for our purposes. Clearly, the challenges that we face at IU in the area of shared faculty governance are universal

and not occasional, but rather typical of what is happening throughout the CIC, as well as nationwide.

One of the major efforts on the part of the BFC Executive Committee over the past two years has been to understand the constraints to a more engaged faculty. And toward that end, this year I visited with the School of Education, the School of Health, the Library School, the College of Arts and Sciences, the Jacobs School of Music, and the School of Business councils. And on behalf of the BFC, I listened intently to faculty voices and took away from my dialogues with Council members, the importance of strengthening and valuing service at IU. Today, I am happy to report that Provost Robel also listened to faculty concerns about the role of service at the university. In keeping with our purposes, she has included the twin functions of governance and service at Indiana University Bloomington as key components of her strategic goals for the campus in the immediate years to come. This is lovely and promising news because as a consequence of our efforts, we have embarked upon a work of reformation as a way of changing minds on this significant lynchpin issue. Truly, a mission of service cannot succeed without the collective efforts of all.

Colleagues of the Council, let us be especially proud of this achievement because it means everything from bolstering faculty participation and shared governance to reinforcing alignments among school councils to intensifying decision-making at all levels of the university. Such an achievement invites us to band together beautifully, and look for solutions that beset the postmodern university. I stress this point vigorously precisely because Provost Robel's support has changed the meaning of things pertaining to the significance of shared governance at IUB. And specifics that will be forthcoming from the provost, as well as from members of the BFC, will add systemic, performative dimensions to this well-meaning and well-being of the university in this regard.

I am a great believer in that old fashioned idea that no human being should abdicate his or her responsibility for civic engagement. Like Aristotle, I believe that it is what we do with the life of the mind that makes education and solutions to myriad human problems possible. But, in addition to this important achievement, we also walked upon other main traveled roads and can highlight other accomplishments of the Council over the past two years, including our substantial role in returning the centrality of budgetary affairs business back to the campus level at IUB. Prior to the action of this Council last year, matters of budgetary affairs flowed universally and not locally in many instances. Now, a budgetary person will report to the provost. Members of this Council, we made this happen, providing us with a more direct voice in what monies are spent and how. In October 2011, we also urged, with great effect, that Vice President José make every effort to eliminate IRB approval backlogs, which were, at the time, unacceptably high, and which were intruding upon the research and scholarly work of faculty

and graduate students. This was a huge issue that we confronted in October 2011. Here today, I am pleased to report that over the past two years, Vice President José and members of the Council working through a committee structure, in conjunction with the UFC, have reduced backlogs considerably. In October 2011, full board approval of IRBs took a mean of seventy-nine days for completion. Today, full board approval from submission to review by full IRB is twenty-nine days. This means that IU's turnaround times are significantly better than the forty-five days gold standard turnaround times published by the Association for the Accreditation of Human Research Protection Programs, AHRPP. That was a big acronym. Truly, our voices made a difference in this matter.

There is more edifying news. This year, surveys by Vice President José's office indicate that almost ninety percent of faculty surveyed before that process began are effective, compared with approximately twenty percent who were surveyed in fiscal year 2012. This important topic was mentioned briefly at the meeting of the Board of Trustees on April 11th this past Thursday in conjunction with discussions about the potential impact of sequestration on research at Indiana University. Right now, according to Vice President José, we know that sequestration will have some effects on the flow of grants and research funding at IU, but we don't know precisely how and with what effect. So, I think that we should thank Vice President José and his staff for their excellent work on our behalf. Well, there are more things that I could mention, such as revisiting the policy and procedures on research misconduct regarding deliberative or mediation procedures, as well as our helping to sculpt the process of getting the General Education campus report to its current status. The action of this Council should make it possible for IUB to meet the state's deadline of May 15th for implementing the statewide core. We're very mindful, of course, that some particulars still need to be ironed out. This helps explain the assertive course of action at this body took on April 7th, recall our Nelson Mandela moment, and our vigorous but respectful efforts to reconcile the actions and constitutional provisions of the BFC with the report of the General Education Committee.

In underlining the aforementioned items, I just wanted to address some things from a broader perspective, ever-mindful that other specifics will follow in Fall 2013 when a summary of actions report is issued. Now, I would like to update you on where we stand with regard to the Search and Screen Committee for Neil Theobald's replacement. Are you still thinking about that one? Before I report on a few informational items from the April 11th meeting of the Board of Trustees, with regard to Neil Theobald's replacement, President McRobbie will appoint an internal Search and Screen Committee this Spring, and it is still Spring so let us remain hopeful. On March 21st, members of the BFC Executive Committee selected four names of individuals for membership on the Search and Screen Committee. Craig sent the names to President McRobbie. When President McRobbie and I discussed the matter briefly at the March 26th meeting of the UFC in Indianapolis, the President indicated that he had not received names

from IUPUI. President McRobbie is very aware of our serious stance on the matter especially since Jack and I have raised the issue unceasingly at every face to face meeting that we have had with the president, thus, as a representative of both the BFC and the UFC, I have been both faithful and persistent, and so has Jack in his role as co-Secretary of the UFC and president of the Senate at IUPUI. So let the word go forth.

Now, a few items from the April 11th meeting of the Board of Trustees. First, at the meeting, IU Treasurer and Interim CEO Mrs. MaryFrances McCourt, reported appealingly that IUB has one of the lowest rates of tuition in the Big Ten and at comparable brother [cellphone rings in background]—who’s calling? Basu! — and at comparable brother institutions, IU’s tuition rate is the lowest at around \$10,000, and Penn State’s is the highest at around \$20,000. Since this is such good news, it behooves us to talk of such findings to our colleagues and students as widely as possible.

Second, Trustee Reilly and others stressed the crucial matter of finding more parking spaces at IUB as a way of relieving pressure on faculty, students, and staff when the new school for global studies is constructed. We also know that Provost Robel is finding new ways of doing this very thing, which she reported on a few Council meetings ago in response to librarians’ concerns, which were also brought to this Council. Trustee Reilly, the most outspoken member of the Board of Trustees, also called for more work in the field of cyber security and for IU to become more involved in this area. In his own words, Reilly said, and I quote, “we should see if we can function to the maximum in this important piece of work that is going on.”

This ends my commentary on the official business of the Council, but on this day, at this moment, I must end with expressions of heartfelt gratitude. Publicly, I want to thank Provost Robel for her openness to the faculty, for taking seriously the work and the voice of the Council, for her humanity, for her wide angle of vision, and for her especially rich mind, which, through her fresh initiatives, is giving us new ways of fortifying this great university. I must also express my gratitude to all of you on this Council for your enduring and devoted work on behalf of the faculty. Words cannot express my gratitude to you, this special band of people who continually extend engaged boundaries of our university. You are a visible, public model of citizenship. I’m also deeply indebted to Dr. Craig Dethloff and his beautiful staff for their steadfast dedication to the BFC. Craig is most attentive to details, concerned, and has provided exquisite persistence and expertise on behalf of the BFC and the faculty at large. I’m also hugely indebted to the six men who made my role as president of the BFC and chair of the BFC Executive Committee both productive and exhilarating. Unbeknownst to them, silently to myself, I dubbed them as the “Big Six,” and I mean this in a numerical, intellectual, decision-making, and plain goodwill sense. We all argued robustly, but always with one central overarching goal in mind: what is in the best interest of the faculty and the university? And we did so with deeply ingrained good habits

of sensibility and kindness. I hope I get an “amen” here. [Laughter] I am, of course, referring to Herb Terry, president-elect, Peter Kloosterman, who could not be here today, secretary, Donald Gjerdingen, parliamentarian, Bill Wheeler, chair of the Education Policies Committee, Roger Levesque, co-chair of the Budgetary Affairs Committee, and last but not least, Bruce Jaffee, co-chair of the Long Range Planning Committee. One of my favorite writers, classicist Martha Nussbaum, author of several books that I adore, including *The Therapy of Desire: Theory and Practice in Hellenistic Ethics*, and *Cultivating Humanity*, said movingly that, “to be a good human being is to have a kind of openness to the world. Being human means accepting promises from other people and trusting that other people will be good to you.” Member of the Council, you have been good to me. Thank you. [Applause]

ROBEL: Well, I’d like recognize at this time our incoming President, Herb Terry, for a resolution. Herb?

TERRY: And [indistinct comment] resolution was [indistinct comment]. I’m here as a representative of the “Big Six,” but on behalf of the Executive Committee, it’s somewhat traditional that the Executive Committee express its appreciation for the leadership of the outgoing president, and even though it’s traditional, it’s also heartfelt. Carolyn, we’ve benefited much from your leadership. The six of us have enjoyed interacting with the one of you, in the future we hope to have more balanced gender equity [laughter]. And you should by now have received a resolution, which I have predetermined from the parliamentarian will not be ruled out of order, which you have before you. It’s [indistinct comment] Calloway-Thomas. It’s shorter than your closing remarks, but containing many of the same elements.

Whereas Professor Carolyn Calloway-Thomas has served as president of the Bloomington Faculty Council since July 1, 2011, and

Whereas the Council is extremely grateful for her leadership, accomplishments, tenacity, and civility, and

Whereas her term will end June 30, 2013,

The Bloomington Faculty Council thanks Professor Carolyn Calloway-Thomas for her devotion to the Council, to the campus, to the university, and wishes her well in all her future endeavors.

And I would hope that we could unanimously and by a voice vote claim this a resolution of the Council. If you approve, would you please say “aye”? [Aye] Good. We won’t even ask for disapproval. [Laughter] It’s approved unanimously.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: For fear that you might get it? [Laughter]

TERRY: Civility. It's also somewhat traditional that the Council—the Executive Committee, I should say, using its own resources, like a twelve-step program we are self-supporting through our own contributions, presents a gift to the president. We try to make it something that's lasting, and something that matches the person's interest. I learned that Carolyn, like my wife, is a master gardener, and so we're giving you a gift certificate from Mays Greenhouse.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Oooh! [Laughter]

TERRY: Hopefully, you will not use it to cover several years of annual plants, but it should help you buy a nice tree or bushes or something like that that you can put in your garden, use as they grow up and serve to remind you of the Council and its affection for you.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Thank you so much! [Applause]

AGENDA ITEM 4: PRESIDING OFFICER'S REPORT

ROBEL: Well, I need to add my thanks. I don't need to, but I will because they are heartfelt. I think our president this year has been an enormously principled and eloquent speaker on behalf of the faculty and the university and our campus. She has kept the faculty's responsibility for governance and the shape of our—the educational experience that we—we knit together, all of us, for our students front and center. She has been a—well, I just keep coming back to how—how beautifully she expresses these principles, time after time after time, to every audience she addresses, including our Board of Trustees, and I think on—and, from my—from my perspective as well as provost, I could not have asked for somebody who is more accessible and more—more beautifully expressed the underlying humanity of a university community than Carolyn Calloway-Thomas, so I—I very much appreciate the opportunity to work with you in this role, Carolyn, and look forward to working with you in other roles in the future.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Thank you. I appreciate that.

ROBEL: I have very few things to report at this meeting, mostly because I can't see much, [Laughter] but I—I think I—I am required to let you know that there are two comprehensive five year reviews that are scheduled for next year, and that is of the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs, and the Vice Provost for Student Affairs and Dean of Students, and this would have been the year as well to also do a review of the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, but Sonya has—Sonya—Sonya has mooted that, so we will—which is—which is, given the agenda otherwise on reviews, just as well, I suppose, on that front, even though it's deeply, deeply distressing on every other front I can imagine, so. I will, of course, be in touch with the BFC Executive Committee for—and the Nominations Committee for the membership of review committees for these important offices.

I want to express my—my gratitude for the—the deep commitment to—to civility and—and robust conversation and collegiality that we saw in the last week. I think that the—the campus had been engaged in a wide-ranging set of conversations about very important issues, and I think that the members of the community certainly members of the faculty and—and students did so in a way that we feel is exactly right in a university community. Ideas and the expression of ideas and the expression of disagreement around those ideas in a—in a way that allows us entry into each other’s thinking is a deeply held commitment for us. It’s fundamental. It’s bedrock, and so it was—it was wonderful to watch our community respond last week with that commitment in mind, and—I—I want also to report that I have been having all year I think productive and really useful conversations with the—the group of students who have been leading discussions on issues of diversity on the campus. I met with them again yesterday, and I think we’ve got a number of great initiatives that will be coming out in the next few weeks.

AGENDA ITEM 5: QUESTION / COMMENT PERIOD

With that, I think it’s question and answer time. And Craig, do you have questions for me, or otherwise I’ll open it up to the—to the Council.

DETHLOFF: Just the Friends of Art thing.

ROBEL: I got a question about the future of the Friends of Art Book—Bookstore. Unfortunately, I got it very—I got it in the morning, and I—the day has been consumed with other things, most of which have precluded me from being able to read anything, so I—I have been in conversations with a number of people, but I think that—that I need a—just a little more time to be able to answer that one with any assurance about what actually is going on, so if I—if you don’t mind, I will report back at our next meeting or maybe even before once I’ve had conversations with the principles. Are there other questions from the Council? Yes?

G. SIMPSON: Regarding the CFO search and screen, and the two reviews that you mentioned, are there plans for staff representation on either of those? Well, I guess there are three, so either doesn’t work. All of those?

ROBEL: Yes, certainly on the—the reviews that I’m responsible for, and I—I actually haven’t been in a conversation with the President about the CFO search. Carolyn, you may have a—a better sense of—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —It’s my understanding that there will be representation from staff, but I have no seen the makeup of the search and screen committee.

G. SIMPSON: Thank you.

ROBEL: Thank you, Greg. Yes, Professor Wheeler?

WHEELER: A matter for the provost. Do you have any initial reaction to the disturbing Senate Enrolled Act 182 that was adopted last week, and its implications for our campus?

ROBEL: I do not. I need—I need time to really understand it and study it and to talk to the state relations people who understand what's—what the background is from the university's perspective about how they're approaching it, and what other things are kind of sitting on the table, so again, I just need a little time. Last week was busy!

WHEELER: Yes.

CALLOWAY: It was.

ROBEL: Professor Walbridge?

WALBRIDGE: I received the—your invitation to the reception for retiring faculty. I read through it to see if I had any friends, and one of the things I noticed, was that—or enemies—was that it's roughly three to two men to women. I think there were twenty-nine men and nineteen women. Of the men, all but two of them were full professors, and one of the remaining two was, well, was an associate professor, the other was a senior scientist. Of the women, I think nine or ten were non-tenured, and of the tenured, I think about four or five of the nine were associate professors, which with some of the differences obviously due to the changes that were taking place in the seventies and eighties, but the fact that people who were retiring at the associate professor level are disproportionately women seems to indicate that for some reason women are progressing more slowly in their careers [indistinct comment] or what we might do.

ROBEL: One of the issues that we're taking up as part of the strategic planning exercise is how to really work on providing support for faculty members in the period after tenure towards promotion to full professor. I think that there are—for understandable reasons, we—we focus a lot of energy on assuring that the faculty members who are in the pre-tenure period have all the support the university can muster around—around their development, and we have a little less of a structural response to the period after—after tenure, and that's one thing that the vice provost is looking at very carefully, that the strategic planning process that is focusing on very carefully, and I think that it's important to continue to focus very carefully on whether we are achieving promotion with equity, and that—I take your point to be an extremely important one.

WALBRIDGE: Thank you.

SHAPSHAY: I just wanted to stress that a number of—of colleagues have told me that they're very concerned about the Friends of Art Bookstore—bookshop, and they were also alarmed that the date on which that was supposed to close is August 1st, and so I just wanted to—to go

on record that a number of faculty are—are really concerned that—that this bookstore—bookshop that’s been around for forty-five years is—is a real treasure for the School of Art and funds a number of scholarship endeavors, and it would be very sad if—if it were to close on the basis of a—of a contractual arrangement with Barnes & Noble that maybe couldn’t be amended, so I just would urge the—the Council to take this very seriously.

ROBEL: Thank you, and I learned about this actually this morning, so I am spending—I will understand during the next couple of days a little better what has gone into this, but I take—thank you for that point. I understand that this is a little treasure that many people do treasure, and that we need to understand exactly what the implications are, and I need to understand better what the—what the process was to reach this decision, so...

VAN VOORHIS: And as a follow up to that, as a member of the Art History department and a faculty member, and as a card carrying Friends of Art member, the faculty in Studio Art, Art History, and all of the associated community members who are involved, we just learned about this, too, and we have not yet met in order to consider what options might be available. We have not had an opportunity to work or talk to any members of the administration, either in the College or in the provost’s office, and we look forward in the coming weeks to a series of engaged talks to explore what kinds of options might be available.

ROBEL: I agree, and I think the other party here that we have to keep in mind is the Foundation, which is apparently the—the—it is the Foundation, I believe, that is the—the party that sits in back of this operation, and so—so I’ll understand it a little better in another day or so, but I—I do understand that faculty members and graduate students and students and community members have a lot of interest in this topic, and need to be engaged in a way that assures everybody that they—that there’s some transparency around what’s going on.

VAN VOORHIS: Thank you.

ROBEL: Yep, Jim?

SHERMAN: I have a simple question and then a comment. The simple question is what happened to the light tower?

GIERYN: It’s being repaired.

SHERMAN: Oh.

ROBEL: It’s being repaired, yeah.

SHERMAN: Thank you.

ROBEL: I'm not sure, though, whether it's being repaired and will go back up. It had—do you know? Is it?

GIERYN: Not for sure. It was my understanding it was going back up.

ROBEL: Well, I—I know that it had a structural—there was a structural problem with it and it had to be taken down, and I don't know for certain whether it can be repaired and put back up. The last time I saw the—the discussions of this by email, it was—there's a, you know—there's a safety issue with it at this point, and we've got to explore what's—what needs to be done to fix it. Does anybody—yeah, I'll find out.

SHERMAN: Okay, my—my comment is only because I feel compelled to make it because it's been the only thing on my mind for the last twenty-four hours. I don't know what to do about it, but I was in Boston yesterday for the marathon, and my daughter crossed the finish line minutes before the first blast. And we're a bunch of smart, effective people here, and it's okay to talk about General Education and about promotion and tenure, but there are bigger things out there. This will all be meaningless. I don't know what to do, you know? It may be that it's my generation and the generation below me that's responsible, so maybe I should speak to the students because this is what's happening.

ROBEL: I'm—I'm so glad your daughter is safe. I know we're all—we're all aching for—for the people who were affected by this.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: I would like to remind members of the Council that you have at your seat a ballot. This will be out second balloting, so if you will fill out this ballot and make certain that Craig gets it at the end of the Council, we'd be so pleased.

WALBRIDGE: How many people are we supposed to vote for?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Please vote for three individuals. Three individuals. Thank you.

THOITS: What are we voting for? [Laughter]

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: This is a technique or procedure that we're using to get members of the BFC Council to run for president-elect of the Council, so those individuals whose names percolate up in bountiful ways, we will approach them and ask them whether they would consider running for president of the BFC, so this is the reason for the balloting.

THOITS: [indistinct comment]

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Yes, but we're still sorting and sifting.

THOITS: I see. Okay.

GIERYN: How many time—? We did this at the last meeting.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Yes, I said we're still sorting and sifting. So we are just trying to make certain that—

STEPHENS: So we shouldn't do it again?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Oh yes, indeed. Do it again. That's what I'm asking you to do.

GIERYN: Vote early, vote often!

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: This is a new role of democracy here.

UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER: There are fewer names on this last than there were on the last one, right? They're percolating up?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Yes.

ROBEL: Is that accurate?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Well, some are, and some are not.

UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER: Right. This is a very long short list.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Yes, [indistinct comment]. Are there individuals who are present and do not wish to be voted on, please feel free to speak up, otherwise we'll assume that you are interested, concerned and will be dutiful about running for president-elect, should your name be called.

ROBEL: At this time, I'd like to recognize Don Gjerdingen for—well, I can't see what I'm recognizing Don for. Don?

AGENDA ITEM 6: CWA MEMBERSHIP

GJERDINGEN: Yes, well, one of the jobs of parliamentarian is to chair the Rules Committee, and the Constitution and Rules Committee was asked by the BFC Executive Committee to draft a proposed change to the BFC Constitution, so it could be put before you. The background is this, over the last several years, a representative of the CWA has been allowed to sit in on BFC meetings. Earlier BFC membership promised them that after a trial period, proposal would be considered to add a representative as a permanent voting member of the BFC. You have in front of you a handout, and that is the—to explain this—it gives the—the full text of the—of the text of Article V of the Constitution. I thought it was important that you see the—the entire background, and what you will see in Section 5.5 is listing the various memberships, and in addition to the usual and expected faculty, student, administrator groups. Towards the end of

that list, we have an “I,” it lists the President of the Professional Council. The proposal here would add the Communication Workers of America Local 4730 as a voting member, so it would be on par with that. The—should this change be approved by the BFC today, it’s also important to understand that it must be approved by the general faculty before it’d be effective, and that would require a majority vote of the general faculty either through a general faculty meeting called for that occasion or a ballot circulated by the BFC president for that purpose, and I hope that gives the necessary background.

I also want to mention that a representative of the CWA, Edward Vasquez is here, present today to answer any questions about the organization.

ROBEL: I’ll recognize Mr. Vasquez, is there anything—do you have anything you’d like to add?

VASQUEZ: Yes, I’d just like to thank the BFC President Calloway-Thomas and the provost and the executive board for allowing us the opportunity to sit on—sit in on these as an ex officio member. I think that—it’s—I mean, it allows us to, you know—more allow me for the past year and half basically to understand the workings of the university here, how things are run here, and to understand exactly what goes on. I think that—I mean, we—just to explain why we—why we’ve been here. The Communication Workers of America was organized about twenty years ago. We’ve been here for twenty years. We represent pretty much all 1,800 support staff on the campus, basically, whether they pay their dues or not. If somebody gets in trouble or there’s a disciplinary action or we had to answer something, we have to—we have to help them out. We always—we always listen to support staff whether they’re members or not about concerns, you know, in the university, and we believe that—that to have a vote at the BFC basically would kind of empower support staff to participate in university governance. Also, one other thing I’d like to do, sorry if I’m jumping around all the place. We’ve been on the PA Council for many years basically participating there. We—we—we enjoy that participation there as well. So that’s the extent of it. I can answer questions. I don’t know, I’m not very good with speeches unfortunately, but I can answer questions if you have them, please.

ROBEL: Alright, and so if I understand where we are procedurally with this, this comes from the Executive Committee, and it’s—it’s coming to the Council for discussion today and a vote—that’s your—

GJERDINGEN: —Yeah.

ROBEL: I’ll open it up for discussion.

G. SIMPSON: I just want to echo what Ed said. The Professional Council has had CWA as ex officio seat for several years. We’ve really enjoyed the working relationship. We feel like we

make assumptions about staff that get continually corrected by Ed for support staff versus professional staff differences, so I highly support giving them a voting seat.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Yes?

BURNS: So, I just have a quick question. I think it's a fine idea, so this isn't against it, but I don't fully understand staff structure in the sense of if we're including the group represented by you, is there another group we should also be including? In other words, are we properly balancing. I think it's good to have staff representation here, but is—should we be doing a more balanced approach or is this fine? Are we covering everybody so that we get representation of everybody?

ROBEL: Well, I think I just saw Dan Rives come in, and I—I thought I—I understood as well that there—there are—there's more than one union that has a contract with IU so I just—I want to—I don't understand the answer to that question either. Is that accurate?

RIVES: We have—on this campus, we have four staff unions. There is a union called CWA, and I think that's what Ed was referencing a moment ago for support employees. Not all support employees. Some support employees are in administrative units that CWA does not represent, legal, finance, HR, provost office and so forth, so that could be even another group, let's just stay with the unions. There's a union for the service employees, skill crafts, custodians, food service, et cetera. There is a union for police, and—some of these unions are multiple campus. They're not just Bloomington. CWA, in fact, represents support employees at Bloomington and Northwest. The service employees are three campuses, Bloomington, Indianapolis and South Bend. The police are the same three campuses, Bloomington, Indianapolis and South Bend. Then there's IATSE, which is the stage hands, and so we have a group that are a combination of a couple PA, a couple service, and hourly employees that are the stage hands. That's our longest relationship. I think Herman B. Wells, brought one—that relationship to us, many, many years ago. So, and then there's the Professional Council, and of those—I think that would fairly categorize the staff groups on campus. I would say there's—there's—if I may, there's Bloomington, so employees under Bloomington, then there's employees under UA, so you have this other dimension on this physical location, even within support, there's category of employees under the provost portfolio, if you will, and then there's all the vice presidents, and they have support staff as well.

ROBEL: Thank you. Did that answer your question?

BURNS: Yeah, it answers my question. I guess I'm just saying that it's also possible to set up representative voting within those groups. It doesn't have to be by individual unions per se, but it could be representative—I just think it'd be nice to make sure we have all the information coming in from the different groups so that as we make decisions, we could see what the

implications are. We've seen a failure of process just on not knowing that they're closing the bookstore we were talking about, so the more we can bring information in the better, I would say.

ROBEL: Thank you.

PAOLILLO: Well, this is a question for Don and/or members of the Executive Committee or people who know, what is the situation with respect to union and/or staff membership on the University Faculty Council?

GJERDINGEN: I don't—my sense is that they're—they're—they are not represented there. I am not positive, but I—I think there's a difference, in other words, between the BFC, which does have a representative, and the UFC.

TERRY: I have a question. This is a proposal to change the Constitution of the faculty?

GJERDINGEN: Yes.

TERRY: And so, it has to go to a vote of the faculty.

GJERDINGEN: That's correct.

TERRY: And so, all we would be doing is making a recommendation to the faculty that it move on this change [indistinct comment]—

GJERDINGEN: —Right, it would require a majority vote by the general faculty. I think that's the key thing.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: And our vote will simply allow it to go forward, yes.

ROBEL: How—could I ask how the Executive Committee is imagining structuring the discussion so that faculty members are able to have full discussion with each other of this—of this change to the structure of the—of the Council?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: I think we had envisioned having some statements attached, pro and con statements. That's usually the way such actions go, and have those pro and con statements attached to the ballot so that individuals who are voting will have an informed sense of what they are supposed to do, and how they are supposed to vote, and the arguments for and against.

ROBEL: Is the only, then, discussion that will actually occur in person among the faculty what is happening in this room today?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: That's correct.

GJERDINGEN: Unless there could be a general faculty meeting called for that purpose.

ROBEL: Okay.

GJERDINGEN: But it may not be, and it may just be a ballot.

ROBEL: Okay. Let's see. Professor Wheeler?

WHEELER: So, given Vice President Rives explanation of these groups, so I'm wondering what is, you know, I'm following up on—on your question here. So—so the thing—the CWA includes the support staff in the academic units. Is that it? Whereas the service employees are primarily Physical Plant? Is that right? And what were those other groups? Can you clarify that just a little bit more because, you know, because it does raise a question, I think, about this. So—so the CWA—what do you mean by support staff?

VASQUEZ: Do you have a definition, Dan?

WHEELER: Because I think we would need to be able to tell the faculty this—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —Dan—

WHEELER: —before we send something out—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —Grab a microphone, Dan, please.

RIVES: Changing my name to "Reserved." So, at the university, for staff employees, we have three broad categories. Professional staff exempt—most of them are exempt, salaried. We have support staff, which consists of administrative support, clerical, office type positions. Some technical positions like IT work and doing—setting up computers and websites and things, support. That's a second category. The third category is service. That would consist of skilled crafts, custodians, food service workers, and so forth, drivers. So those are the three broad categories. On this physical location, Bloomington, the support staff are represented by CWA. Those support staff are in all kinds of units, academic units, administrative academic units, and university administration units, payroll, research, IT, information technology, but all of them are represented by a body, which is called Communication Workers of America, or CWA. In addition to the Bloomington campus, that same union for support staff represents those same employees at the Gary campus, as a single unit for representation. So, when you go look at the policies, there's a number of University-wide personnel policies, but then there's some very specific policies that have been negotiated with CWA, covering the support staff employees who work on this physical location, whether they're under the provost portfolio or Vice President Wheeler or Vice President McCourt, as an example, as well as the Gary campus. That help?

VASQUEZ: [indistinct comment] clerical.

RIVES: We don't use the word, "clerical," anymore.

WHEELER: But it's also the IT classifications as well.

VASQUEZ: It's somebody sitting in front of a computer.

RIVES: Well, they're—they're non-exempt.

WHEELER: [indistinct comment]—

RIVES: —mostly—think of it as non-exempt office type work. And that's really gotten varied anymore. You know, we don't really have clerks anymore. We don't really have secretaries anymore. Those are very antiquated references. Support staff to a whole wide range of administrative support work to help and support a unit.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: So Bill—

WHEELER: —So I—I gather the rationale then for this is that—that—that this group of employees is at least—at least a significant part of the academic enterprise of the campus, and that that's the reason for including them in the Council as opposed to the—the service employees and the police. You mentioned they—they had a separate union, and—

RIVES: You have service employees in your academic units, too. If you have a lab, you may have a service employee building labs and setting up lab equipment, and doing things [indistinct comment].

WHEELER: So there's an issue there.

RIVES: I'm just saying that they also support academic units as well. Yeah, so I would—I never would want to say to any staff employee—I think they all support—I'm staff. We support the academic mission.

WHEELER: But I—

ROBEL: —I wouldn't go far, Dan. [Laughter]

RIVES: That seat was getting hot.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Is the underlying question, Bill, whether if we pass the recommendation today that other members might wish to have representation on the Council in the future?

WHEELER: I think that is the question that was raised, and I—I think it is a pertinent question. You know, I don't think it should interfere with our action today, but it may say that there is

something for the Constitution and Rules Committee and the Executive Committee to consider next year.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Simpson?

G. SIMPSON: I personally support as much staff representation as you're willing to give. However, I think one of the distinctions is CWA had approached the Faculty Council about this a couple years ago, and I mean, I think that's crucial. They took the initiative to say that we want to be at the table. Whereas the others, I don't think have made those overtures yet, and I think that's significant.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: That is a compelling piece of the argument. Thank you.

ROBEL: Let's see, I think, Jim?

PERRY: I'm wondering if maybe if our CWA representative could comment if we were to make this more inclusive. I think the issue is are we trying to add somebody to—to include all the bargaining units on campus aside from the sort of the units that are represented in the current Constitution or the Professional Council. If that were the case, then we'd have—probably have to bring in these other units, but—but I'm sort of curious what your reaction would be if we were to broaden this language. Would that be troublesome?

VASQUEZ: You mean bring in the other unions?

PERRY: To bring in the—yeah, unions—we're using that word loosely—but yes.

VASQUEZ: No, I mean, I'll be alright if you brought in other unions, people that represent, because, I mean, generally whenever the provost needs to—a search and screen committee, she approaches the unions for this because that is in the policy manual that was negotiated with the Trustees, so we have representation on those, so—I mean, predominately, I mean, you guys—I mean, the Bloomington Faculty Council needs to deal with faculty issues, but I mean it's good that if you have our input as well basically on certain issues like parking or even, you know, what's going with the state and the university, that relationship. We would like to put in our input into that to the faculty, you know, just to—just get our word out basically [indistinct comment].

ROBEL: Thank you.

TERRY: I have a question I think for Don. Does this resolution that we adopted a few years ago inviting CWA to send a representative to the Council, which I think mentioned the year? Does it mean that absent a faculty vote to change the Constitution they will lose their presence here next year or do we actually have a little space if we wanted it to take a look at how best to

represent the staff who are not members of the Professional Staff Council without *de facto* kicking them out this year?

GJERDINGEN: Well, I think as presently structured, the Constitution provides for voting, and then non-voting membership that could be changed by the Bylaws. As it presently is now, they are not mentioned in the Bylaws at all. I wouldn't see any difficulty with what you're asking if the BFC by resolution wanted to extend that invitation for additional time without—but I think it's also important to note that there is no formal status yet on this, but if they—if that's what they wanted to do, of course we could—they thought there'd be more time, but this is—that could easily be done.

ROBEL: Okay, other discussion? Well this—can you sharpen this for us a little bit exactly what you'd like us to vote on and then—

GJERDINGEN: —Well, I guess—

ROBEL: —I'll call the question—

GJERDINGEN: —what—what is—what—the starting point is the—is the text of the—of the circular we have before you, which as it stands would add in one representative of the Communication Workers of America, CWA Local 4730, designated by that organization shall be a voting member of the Council. That's what we have before us right now.

ROBEL: Okay.

GJERDINGEN: If something else were to be amended or changed, then we'd have to work from this.

ROBEL: Okay. Professor Wheeler?

WHEELER: I just—I would like to move to return this to the Constitution and Rules Committee in light of the discussion we've had here today. When we talked about it on the Exec Committee, my recollection is that we didn't have a clear sense of—you know, that there were these other groups, and I think that—so, I think—so I'd like to move to return it and ask the Constitution and Rules Committee to consider this question of the other staff groups, and return to the Council in the Fall with—with its resolution.

ROBEL: Alright, we have a motion. Is there a second on that motion?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Walbridge, were you about to second?

WALBRIDGE: No, no—I had a comment, or a question actually.

TERRY: So it can be discussed, I'll second it.

ROBEL: Okay, and then John can you—?

WALBRIDGE: Okay, am I correct in understanding that the vast majority of the non-professional staff in the academic and research units on campus are represented by CWA?

UNKNOWN SPEAKERS: [indistinct comment]

RIVES: Can you repeat the question?

ROBEL: The question is whether the vast majority of the support staff in the academic units are represented by the CWA.

RIVES: Affirmative. That's true.

ROBEL: And could I ask, does the CWA, here—I am trying to parse your answer a minute ago, is the bargaining unit here just this campus or is it—does it include staff on—on other campuses?

RIVES: It includes, in one bargaining group, one set of agreements, the support staff at the Gary campus.

ROBEL: That's what I thought you said. So the CWA here is also Gary. Alright. Further discussion on the motion? I believe that...

RAMOS: On the newest motion or the one here?

ROBEL: I think that Dr. Wheeler's motion, which is what's on the floor right now.

RAMOS: I would just add to that what I think that I'm hearing is that this should be reconsidered so that the language can possibly include these other organizations that may have representation. I'll just add that from the student perspective, I know that there is language here which allows for student representation but since I tend to be the only student representative a lot of the time, it tends to feel like an invitation, if you would. So we can place those representatives there, but as you know, organizations may or may not choose to send as many people as the Bylaws will allow, so I think if they did consider added language that would serve as an invitation for those other groups to possibly send people. If they choose not to send anyone, then that's up to them, but if they choose to send someone, then there's language to support that opportunity. That's what I think I'm hearing.

ROBEL: Is this—is this [indistinct comment]

GJERDINGEN: Just to clarify, I think—we're happy to do whatever the Council would like to do. I would just add there's a couple things there. There are different options in here. Certainly one

option is that the Constitution allows to add other campus constituencies, that's the term, as non-voting members. That takes just a Bylaw—that's one option. There could be a second option that is a voting member. You know, we're happy to consider whatever arrangements people think, if there's—if there's a sense of the Council, and I just wanted to—those are among the options. I suppose another one would just even an informal resolution to allow people to sit in without necessarily having [indistinct comment]. Those are at least three options that I would see. Whatever people would like to do with those three options, that's fine, but I—those are the procedural options that we have, but that—that's my only role is to point those out.

ROBEL: Okay. And does anyone want to speak to the motion that's on the floor before we move on? Greg?

G. SIMPSON: I understand the impulse to want to be more inclusive and I'm behind that, but I think what we're talking about here is solidifying an existing relationship. There was a year trial. It's worked. We've benefited from Ed's work for the Council. If we were to ask others, I kind of would like to see the same sort of provisional, you know, see whether there's a fit working with those groups before—before that, just for parity's sake.

ROBEL: Further...? Professor Wheeler, you're speaking to your motion?

WHEELER: Yes, I am, in response to this, you know, because the—at least I hope I'm speaking to my motion. [Laughter] It's certainly a consideration there is that, you know, is that this has to go to a vote of the entire faculty, you know, so that's a non-trivial consideration, is, you know, and that's the sense that if you're going to send something to the vote of the entire faculty, you would like to have some real finality to it, and—and so—so while I realize yes, that this is confirming a—would be confirming an existing relationship that has—that has been a positive thing for the last year and half, I myself am reluctant to send something for a campus-wide faculty vote on the Constitution if we're likely to come back early in the Fall, and think, well, maybe we should do something more.

TERRY: A question I think for Don. If this resolution—Bill's amendment—passes, would the existing ways in which Ed and his successors have participated this year in the BFC continue next year? If Bill's resolution passes, if we do nothing today except ask the Executive Committee to study the matter further toward more inclusive representation of staff, if that passes, would representation that CWA has enjoyed here the last year or so continue into next year's BFC?

GJERDINGEN: My understanding is that is an invitation that was offered by the BFC—

TERRY: —with no time limit—

GJERDINGEN: —that there isn't a—in other words, that there isn't an up or out kind of in here.

TERRY: All we did was promise them that within a year we'd look at that—

GJERDINGEN: —that's—that's correct. That's my understanding.

ROBEL: Jim?

SHERMAN: I don't see it here. In terms of representation on the Faculty Council, is there some minimum percentage of membership to be faculty and still be Faculty Council? So could it come to the point where faculty, in fact, were a minority in terms of total membership? I mean, I think it's a reasonable question in terms of representation on a Faculty Council. Do you know the answer?

GJERDINGEN: Well, it's whatever—you know, that is, whatever the Constitution says.

SHERMAN: But I don't see it here.

GJERDINGEN: There's not an overriding number anywhere presently existing if it was limited.

SHERMAN: So there is no—

GJERDINGEN: No. Last word is really whatever the BFC wants to do. There's nothing in the—presently in the document that would give any limits on that.

ROBEL: Thank you. John?

PAOLILLO: So I—I think there are two principles that I'm having a lot of difficulty resolving in this particular question. One of those principles is that—is the principle of faculty responsibility as is outlined in our university Constitution, and the university Constitution very clearly charges university faculty to oversee the academic mission of the university, and that charge percolates down to faculties in campuses, and faculties in schools, and faculties in the units that they participate in. The other principle is the principle of—of cooperation and of sharing in decision making. I think that's a very, very important one, and it's a lot of what when we participate as—in the processes of faculty governance, what we are trying to promote is goodwill, trust, sharing and the like. And so I see these two things as being—both being very important, but to some degree in conflict, and I'm feeling the need for clarification as to how to precisely resolve that, and for that reason, I—I tend to feel that—that this particular motion may need further study. I'd also point out that, you know, we do have policy on—on things like what we've discussed here this Spring on things like the non-tenure-track faculty so we make distinctions within the faculty as regards responsibility and, of course, that all is very clear until you actually sit down and try to write a Constitution and Bylaws that take that into account, and so—so these are

really, I think, very serious parts of our responsibility that I think we should like to study more carefully.

WHEELER: Can I call the question please?

ROBEL: Alright. The question has been called. All in favor of the motion on the floor which is to recommit the resolution to the Executive Committee for further study, please vote “aye.” [Aye] Opposed? And Craig, are you all over this?

DETHLOFF: It looks like the “aye”’s have it.

ROBEL: Thank you. So we—we commit then to the—to the—to the EC. Thank you so much. I’m wondering if it would be possible just since we have Dan here to have him do his brief piece on healthcare before we get to the discussion items, and then I think we’ll go next to OLQ if that’s okay. Dan, would that be alright?

AGENDA ITEM 9: HEALTHCARE UPDATE

RIVES: Absolutely. My time is your time. Is it proper to hand out more? I would have brought a PowerPoint, but I understood that was not the right protocol. I’m teasing.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Thank you.

RIVES: For not bringing PowerPoint? [Laughter] So I am passing around some slides. This is actually from my presentation to the Board of Trustees late last week, and what I’m going to focus on is the impact of the Affordable Care Act on Indiana University. And you could look at this as universities and colleges in general, but I have some very specific numbers for IU, and I—I was addressing questions from several Trustees. One Trustee wanted to know what we were thinking of in terms of adjuncts, in terms of being eligible for healthcare going forward, and another group of Trustees wanted to know what the financial impact would be on the university, and if there—if there—if I didn’t bring enough copies, maybe those of you—hopefully those can go around. So, the Affordable Care Act is primarily about affording thirty million U.S. citizens’ healthcare coverage, and there’s lots of piece of this—lot of pieces of this act and elements, which I’m not even going to begin to get into today, such as the individual mandate, such as setting up exchanges on a statewide basis, such as subsidies and taxes—tax subsidies and tax help for individuals below certain income levels. I’m not going to go there. I’m going to primarily talk about one section of the Act that deals with employers, and it’s called “shared responsibility.”

But before I get there, the Act’s been around for a couple of years. This is—it may be that a lot of us were waiting to see what the Supreme Court was going to do late last year, and as you know the Supreme Court affirmed that this Act could go forward. There was one element

dealing with—with one of federal government programs, but that's not where I'm going, and then we were all waiting—I say we—the industry, employers, were waiting to see what was going to happen, the federal elections, if that was going to deter this act, and as you know, all those things resulted in the Act going forward, and there's a lot of catch up that we're doing. Also, the Health and Human Serv—HHS—put together the basic rules of the Act, and now HHS turns to the IRS to tell employers how to do their part, and the IRS has great—has great experience with retirement plans as an example. Am I talked loud enough or too loud? So—so, we still—we still are waiting for the IRS to give us a lot of regulations, too, from the employer perspective. But some of the Act has been around for a couple years. Page—slide two. I'll give you slide numbers, not page numbers. Slide number two is just a summary of those things that were effective 2011, 2013, and I begin to approach '14. That's where I'm going to go to a little bit more in a moment.

And I mentioned earlier, Affordable Care, more individuals covered by healthcare, but right away, you saw that in the first year out. Children who—most of those would limit to age 24, now we cover children to age 26. More individuals covered by healthcare. 2014 is—is a really big year for the large employer. In this case, a large employer is everybody who has fifty employees or more, I mean not really large employees, so the Act says well, who's responsible for shared responsibility, and that cutoff is fifty employees or more. And—and—again, I was addressing my original presentation to the Trustees who wanted to know what the financial impact was or would be, and I put something on here about clinical trials, and lot of times clinical trials today are picked up by NIH. And they're approved and participants are approved, but going forward, those trials and the costs will be picked up by medical plans or insurance plans, so that will move some dollars to us. Automatic enrollment's interesting, and this is an area we're waiting for the IRS to give us a real clear definition, but starting 2014, we will automatically enroll eligible employees, so sort of like we've been doing for retirement plans. I find that interesting. It's a lot more work, but, you know, it's—it's—so—when your peers start working at IU, we will say you're automatically enrolled in this medical plan, and you have thirty days to elect out of it or to move to a different plan, and so that's—that's a new—something new for us as an employer going forward.

Page three, and this is where you begin to look at some impact of new fees. These are only two fees that impact self-funded, large employers. There are other fees that will impact insurance companies, and I—and I don't really go there to—I'm not well versed on them, but they're not fees that will impact us, so that's why I'm not as versed on them, but these two fees will. And—and the first fee is, not to make light of it, but when you have a program with expenditures over \$225 million, when you put a new fee in there for a patient-centered research institute, it's not going to impact the bottom line that much. So I won't spend much time there.

The second fee, it's called a transitional reinsurance program, and I guess I do need to give you a little bit of information about the state programs. So every state's going to build an electronic mechanism, electronic place like Google or Amazon to go buy insurance in the future. And insurance companies, you know, the Aetnas and the Antheims and Cignas will put their products out there, and it should be more apples to apples in terms of comparing their products, and there's going to be some uniform definitions, uniform coverages, but the insurance companies cannot deny coverage going forward, and some of these are going to take a lot more risk than they do today. They're going—they're going to be covering individuals that couldn't get coverage today, and to help offset that cost on the insurance companies, the mechanism that HHS came up with was for the insured lives to be able to contribute something. So we have this transitional reinsurance program fee—"transitional" meaning that should go away in the future. It's billions of dollars being collected and will be parceled out to insurance companies taking these high risk lives. It's about \$63 per life, so in my business, I don't think employees all the time. I'm thinking covered individuals. So employee plus spouse plus children, and we have over 40,000 lives, and—and that's around \$2.6 million. So now we're getting to some real money, and that \$2.6 million will be added to the premiums, so we don't calculate premiums until we get to August, and we'll calculate premiums starting January. Well, here's basically 80,000 will be added to it, but the big deal is the \$2.6 million, and that will be spread across the medical plans.

The—everybody okay with that? You'll let me know if you have questions, I know. Slide four, this is where you get to what's called the employer shared responsibility. Most—besides the federal government, most healthcare in the United States is provided through employers, and this Act was to ensure that employers continue that, and so the first page is, you know, if you fail to do certain things, you're penalized, and—and—and there's a heavy penalty here, and so large employers should be providing full-time employees, in parentheses, I'll need to come back and define what's a full-time employee. But it needs to be affordable so can't be premium-wise any more than 9.5% of your household income, yes, I said it the way I meant it. I don't know your household income, and I'm not sure I want to know your household income, so the safe harbor will be probably 9.5% of your salary or wages. And it has to have some minimum values, so copays and deductibles. It has to—can't go over some threshold. You can't create a medical plan and have a low premium, but pass it all on to the member by high copays and deductibles. So it has to—it has to cover essential benefits, too. And—and so it has to cover essential benefits, be provided to full-time employees, be affordable, and have minimum value and if not, you're penalized. And the penalty is, like I said, pretty extreme, though if you read in the *Wall Street Journal* and some other newspapers, there's some discussion in the cloud about should employers just pay the penalty, but if you don't meet this threshold, then you have a penalty for your whole employee base, and it's basically, I think, \$2,000 times our number of

employees, and so 2,000 times 17,000 employees, you're getting, again, \$330 plus million dollars. You're getting some real money. But we're spending \$225 million or \$212 million so...

Let me be very clear here. We are—this is a—this is a—a—a real basic program to recruit and retain faculty, and—and as an employer, at least from my office, none of the senior leadership that I have talked to, are there any ideas to do anything other than what we're moving forward with. This is—this gives us competitive edge. This is how we recruit faculty coming from other institutions is to have very high quality medical and dental plans, well at least the medical plan.

So let me move forward and talk about page five or slide five. And the first we come up with, who are the employees that we need to provide medical benefits to? Today, at Indiana University, our definition of full-time is forty hours a week are 100% FTE. You know, it's easy to—when you have positions that work by the hour to look at forty hours. But we have a lot of positions that don't work by hours, you work by like a salary. So faculty get paid a salary, not by hours. Professional staff, for the most part, get paid a salary, not by the hours, so it gets a little more complicated as you start drilling down, but the new definition for medical plans only, starting January 1, is now thirty hours a week being eligible for medical coverage. Our definition today is forty hours a week. So keep that in mind. And you can see my challenges to the university again, the definition of forty versus thirty. We—we have a lot of—a lot of employees with sort of variable hours. We have over ten thousand hourly employees, so capital H, temporary and seasonal. When I'm talking to a Trustee and I say hourly, they think non-exempt. I don't mean that. You know, we have academic employees, you've got staff employees. We went through the various categories of staff. You know the categories of academic. We have a third, broad categories of employees called hourly, seasonal, temporary. They may work a couple hours in athletics, but they may work many hours in residence halls or many hours—many hours in student services and so forth. College work study students, as an example. They're our employees, but they have student status. Well, so that's just something that we'll have to work through.

And the last item here is when we do our payroll tax, and I mean I'll show you the payroll tax in a moment for the year coming up. We include the employees which are academic and staff. We do not include adjuncts. We do not include hourly employees. We don't include those—those variable individuals, and so that's sort of a dilemma in how you can fund those things. And—and—and then we have a lot of contracts—federal contracts and so there's rules about even how you charge things to federal contracts.

I may be taking more time than you anticipated. I'll speed up just a little bit.

ROBEL: [indistinct comment] I know people are interested.

RIVES: Slide six. Thank you, I'm glad you are because I have to spend a lot of time doing it, and I look forward to sharing more of the information. I didn't say "pain," I said "information." This—this—you can't imagine—just saying "auto enrollment" and "tracking hours," you get a sense of sort of the new and administrative systems that will have to go in place to get this done. So, that—slide six is a current policy, and it—this will relate directly to adjunct faculty, and this is an existing policy today that appointments for adjuncts are limited. And if you look at the limitations and Tom Gieryn and his office and others can actually describe this a whole lot better than I can, but this limitation has been in effect for ten plus years, and it basically says if it's an adjunct with a ten month appointment, it can't be any—it can't—it has to be less than .7 FTE, now thirty hours is 75% FTE. So, in essence, adjuncts today would not qualify for medical if the rule had been in place today. And then if they're appointed for a twelve month, it has to be less than .5. Again, it never gets to seven—it never gets to .75. It never gets to the equivalency of thirty hours a week. That's important, as we peel back, well, the very next slide.

So, slide seven is the university's current thinking endorsed by many and beginning to be distributed in terms of information and—and status as we go forward as to what's the impact of that thirty hour rule on various groups of employees. Now let me, before I got into this, you have to understand that we're talking about something that becomes effective January 1, but to get to January 1, you have to look at the hours they worked in the prior period. It's like July 1 of this year, so the July 1 of this year to the end of December, as an example, could be a period time you look at to decide if someone is eligible for the next period. That's a measurement period, is what we're looking at for the first six months, and a stability period you look at when they get coverage. I'm not even mentioning the administrative period of sixty days in between. But, here we have various individuals, employee groups, and we have around 17,000—university-wide, by the way, all of these numbers are—17,500 full-time, forty hours a week, 100% FTE equivalencies, and—today—academic and staff, and they all continue with medical coverage going forward. Nothing changes.

Here is a new group that we will be providing coverage to, so for medical, we're lowering the threshold from forty to thirty, or 100% to 75%. There are appointed academic AC1s or academics, and—and, I didn't say tenured. They—maybe they could be. I don't know how that works, but they're academic and staff, and they have these appointments, and they're ongoing appointments, but they range between 50% FTE and 99% FTE. There are around sixty—six zero—individuals, which are 75% FTE and more. They will be eligible for healthcare starting January 1, 2014. In fact, they will be automatically enrolled come January 1, 2014. That's a new group that we're picking up to provide medical coverage to. And that number is in the budget, when I show you a budget number in a moment. Everybody okay with that? So—so there are, in your offices, university-wide, there aren't many, sixty individuals, academic and staff, so even

fewer than that, just academic and—and—and there's a new group of individuals that will get healthcare at IU starting January 2014.

The adjunct faculty, the decision is to continue the existing limits, and if you continue the existing limits, adjunct faculty never get to 75% FTE, and adjuncts don't qualify for healthcare or medical. The hourly employees, these temporary seasonal employees we have, we already have some limits on the number of hours they work, but we're going to have to put new limits on the hours they work. And so that they—they can work no more than twenty nine hours a week, so they don't get to the thirty hour threshold either.

SHERMAN: Dan? This is a question I've wrestled with myself, and I don't know the answer that I'd give myself, and that is whether in good conscience I can be opposed to Wal-Mart cutting its employees to under thirty hours a week so that they don't have to provide healthcare, but being in favor of IU doing it for hourly employees who now work let's say thirty-five hours a week. I understand the bottom line and I'm not—I'm saying I can't convince myself one way or the other, but I know if we weren't in the position and someone told me Wal-Mart is doing it, I would—I would rise up, and—

RIVES: —right, right—

SHERMAN: —and so, I—I don't know the answer. I understand the bottom line, but it's not a simple question, I think.

ROBEL: Can I ask just—I know that you've raised—you're—you're really raising the big issues today, Jim, but in the interest of time, has this discussion happened at the Benefits Committee?

SHERMAN: No.

ROBEL: Then—then could I maybe ask that would this framework that Dan has given us today—the Benefits Committee continue it so that we have the opportunity to talk about the OL—the online questionnaires and also I know Brad Wheeler is—is coming in to talk about IT policy, and we've got so little time left.

SHERMAN: I think the policy will be in place before the Benefits Committee could meet and come with a recommendation. I mean, that's the—that's the truth. It's the way it is.

ROBEL: We're under a time constraint.

RIVES: May I hit the next—the last slide. May I hit it in one minute?

ROBEL: One minute.

RIVES: So, slide eight is really what the Trustees wanted, what's happening with the dollars. The little chart to the left, 212.7, that's the budget for this coming fiscal year. That's a 7.5% increase, probably more than the Trustees expected. They were probably looking at something close to six, but the other one and half percent's to cover these new fees, and the other sixty employees, and you get a sense of the dollars, and I would also say that one other piece—this chart does not include administrative overhead, so I haven't really put on—on—on an analysis on my worksheet that says well here's the new position, I may need to get this done, but that's what that chart represents. This is what the Trustees really wanted to see. So I worked up to it. I did that in less than a minute.

ROBEL: Thank you.

TERRY: On that last chart, you did send that to the Trustees, my understanding was that you affirmed to the Trustees that they would only have to increase their contributions to the healthcare by 6%, so would the additional 1.5% be charged back to—

RIVES: —No, if you don't mind. I affirmed to the Trustees that the budget's the two hundred and twelve, and the Trustees know because I've spoken to them offline, they know quite readily that that's 7.5.

TERRY: Do you expect them to cover the 7.5 if that's—

RIVES: —It's already in the budget. It's already out there getting distributed in the budget, and so that's—that, from—I think should be good news.

TERRY: Yes.

THOITS: You said before there's 40,000 lives. Does that include family?

RIVES: Yes it does.

THOITS: Okay.

RIVES: So, that includes our children and our spouses. I didn't include the residents. So if you add the residents, probably another 2,000, maybe 2,400 lives with the residents—medical residents.

THOITS: Okay. I just—it just didn't add up in terms of if we looked at slide seven, there's like nineteen thousand lives.

RIVES: Yeah, yeah. No, that's just employees.

THOITS: Okay. Thank you.

ROBEL: How about one more question, and then we can—we'll move on to the other agenda items.

MICHAELS: So for the temporary seasonal—the student hourly, is that the average, so if somebody works full-time over the summer, but only five hours a week during the semester. Is that...?

RIVES: Well, good question. Real quickly, first of all, we hope—we hope eventually the IRS will exclude students. There's lots of—the IRS asked for comments, and there's over a hundred and forty different institutions that have given them comments, and one of them—one group would be to exclude students from this right now. If they don't, no, that's still a problem because the IRS has recognized that educational institutions have the summer break, and you can't count zero during those months. You have to—you either have to not count them in your average or do something else.

ROBEL: Thank you, Dan. Professor Wheeler and the vice provost?

AGENDA ITEM 7: ONLINE COURSE QUESTIONNAIRE UPDATE

WHEELER: So, let me say that the vice provost and I were drafted to give this report, and so with the vice provost's permission, I will try and summarize for all three of us in no more than two minutes. Okay...

ROBEL: Go!

WHEELER: The main I'm supposed to say is that on October 3rd of last Fall, on behalf of the Executive Committee, and the Educational Policies Committee, I submitted to University Counsel a legal memorandum prepared by our parliamentarian that raised several issues concerning the interrelationship between the policy we adopted last Spring on online course evaluations—online course questionnaires, the university's policy on access to faculty records, and the state law on public records. In particular, it raised a question as to whether or not, if we release the data for student return questions, whether or not the employees involved in that would be exposed to prosecution for criminal misdemeanors under state law. There were also some other issues, and so we asked University Counsel for a ruling on this. We submitted this to University Counsel on October 3rd. Six months later, we have not—we have heard nothing, and this is in spite of our—the provost has—has spoken with University Counsel, Don has had contact with them, we still have not heard anything and so, as a result, that's why we have, although under the provisions of the policy we passed last Spring, this Council is supposed to approve the student return questions, we haven't brought those to you because until we have a ruling from University Counsel, we cannot proceed on that.

ROBEL: Bill, when was the last time you talked to somebody in the University Counsel's office, because I have seen a response to this.

WHEELER: Really?

ROBEL: Yeah, I've seen a draft of the response.

WHEELER: Well, I have not seen a draft, and I have not received anything—

ROBEL: —and I thought it had been sent to Don—

GJERDINGEN: —I haven't seen anything.

ROBEL: Okay, well—

WHEELER: —so at some time in the fall, we may hear something about this, but this is why you have not heard anything from us this Spring. Turning quickly to a further update on this, the primary committees have been working hard on this, that is to say the Software Committee and the Items Committee have been working hard, Dennis Groth, chair of the Software Committee. They've heard, as I understand it, presentations from at least four vendors who might provide the software, and they hope to reach a decision soon if they haven't in the last couple of weeks on a software company to do it. The target implementation date is Fall of 2014. The Items Questions Committee, chaired by Judith Ouimet, has also been proceeding with pilot testing. The Spring's pilot test started yesterday, and will run for another two weeks, and then the data will be analyzed. So that's where things stand. Thank you.

ROBEL AND CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Thank you.

ROBEL: How do we get to Brad Wheeler?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Craig, how do we get there?

ROBEL: Hi, Brad!

AGENDA ITEM 8: IT-28: PROVISIONING OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SERVICES

B. WHEELER: Greetings, [indistinct comment] ready when you are!

ROBEL: We're ready.

B. WHEELER: Okay, thank you. Sorry I could not be with you today. And I appreciate the BFC enabling me to attend this way [indistinct comment] works out with other universities, and then later this week in Bloomington we will announce the university has awarded \$20 million [indistinct comment] by not doing any PeopleSoft financials, but [indistinct comment] open-

sourced product used by other universities, so I hope you'll find that to be good news. And later next week, we will have a dedication for Big Red 2, replacing our seven-year old old Big Red for—it's much faster and upgraded cousin that researchers will make a lot of use of. Joining with me today are Craig Stewart, Associate Dean for Research Technologies, and Mark Bruhn, Associate Vice President for Public Safety and Institutional Assurance.

I'll make a couple quick comments, try to lead into this, and I realize that time is quite short. The purpose today is to give some background on IT-28, mitigating cyber risk, and some things we're doing at the university. Many of you have seen the policy. We've been out visiting with schools and departments talking about it. The motivations are essentially that the [Indistinct comment] much more dangerous place in terms of cyber security. You saw the coverage of the *Wall Street Journal*, *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, Bloomberg all hacked. Much of that actual government political activities, some of them originating out of China. One of the things that we have [indistinct comment] challenge around cyber security is when Mark Bruhn there in security talks about motive, means, and opportunity. The motives have gone up for organized criminal activity and political activity in terms of hacking. The means become more and more pervasive and increasingly sophisticated, but I want you to all stay very vigilant what with your virus protection software and such. The game has changed such that it's hard to detect many of these risks even in advance until [indistinct comment] start doing something. And the third piece being opportunity. We can't change people's motives, and we have limited means of ongoing fighting in terms of the mean. But one thing we can do is reduce their opportunity, and so the better the university is at mitigating cyber risks by being as secure as we can with what we do, the better we can reduce the probability that we're going to have a very substantial incident.

As Provost Robel knows, the Trustees are very much all over this and have been for quite some time. The [indistinct comment] moving this policy forward, and it is in the review phase. The challenges [indistinct comment] enterprises, so many things have become [indistinct comment], twenty-four seven by three sixty five, so it's really not something that the university can leave to chance any longer.

So, IT policy 28 essentially says that we need to account for the cyber risks that are at the university, and ensure that we're doing our very best to stay on top of [indistinct comment]. Those risks include also physical risks, like a tornado that ripped up by Spencer some years ago, as you guys recall. Had that been closer to what was the Wrubel data center at the time, we could have been knocked out in a pretty serious capacity. With our new concrete reinforced data center, we hope we don't ever test it, but if your research data are there, there's a pretty good chance, you're not going to see anything disruption or loss of the data in that secure facility.

So IT-28 says that we're going to account for the cyber risks that are at the university and there are just two means of addressing those. To the extent that the unit, the administrator or academic unit can put its servers or make use of our virtualized servers, the staff would then be provided by UITS, that is the best way to mitigate these risks. We have people who are on this twenty-four seven, three sixty five. They're in the flow of information coming out of the FBI and other places that are going on. We're constantly monitoring the network. The things are behind firewalls, and that is the best means to mitigate those risks.

A second means, is because some faculty in research endeavors are doing unique things, and the computer scientists [indistinct comment] development, or some of our other researchers in the College, so to the extent that a unit wants to run its own IT around those things because there really is an academic need that's just not practicable to do it in another way, then, through the reviews that we'll be doing with the school IT staff and others, deans will say, yes, okay, we will—we're going to keep this in the School of Business or School of Informatics or the College, and we are going to warrant that we'll put sufficient resources around it, so somebody can stay on top of those risks and scanning server logs and patching and doing all of those things. And again, being mindful of time, with that brief and quick introduction, the policy's posted. I believe it's been passed out there for you today. I will move to your questions.

ROBEL: Terrific. Thank you so much, Brad. Questions from the Council?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: The woman in the back, yes?

CLARK: Is there anything concrete that faculty in the College can do about it given that we don't have administrative rights on our own office computers?

B. WHEELER: Yeah. That's a question [indistinct comment]. Those are low level decisions in how they approach who has administrative rights in terms of what your IT service providers and departmental folks set up. The best practice there is that a user can have administrative rights on his or her machine under a separate account. So, you login intentionally as an administrator to do something on that machine, to install some software or make a change, and then log out of that administrator account, and then login to your normal day account when you're just doing your—your daily work, and that ensures that if something you came across was a bad thing, it wouldn't be able to do something under administrator rights. We use the same policy with our IT technicians and others that they login intentionally as an administrator to do something. So that existing policy already covers that.

PAOLILLO: Brad, I want to thank you on behalf of our faculty in the School of Informatics and Computing for having arranged a meeting on very short notice, and also for being responsive in the revisions of this policy. We have a policy now, which is, I think, much more to the faculty's liking according to comments that I've gotten. I did just want to mention that I have some very

specific comments which I think I will have to share with you by email, and so I hope that there's still time for that, that there might be further consideration [indistinct comment].

B. WHEELER: Yes, thank you, John. Thank you for arranging that meeting in Informatics and yes, we're still receiving feedback to improve the final wording of it.

ROBEL: Herb?

TERRY: I have just a comment that arose from the Trustees meeting. I would hope treating the Trustees appropriately that we nonetheless could talk them out of making this policy a Trustees' level policy, which some of them suggested at the meeting they wanted to do. The reason for that is that it is difficult to get on the Trustees' agenda and to change a policy once they have adopted it. And I hope we've got this right for the short term. This is a very dynamic area, and we may need to revisit it soon, and I would hope we would try to prevail upon the Trustees that we will keep them informed and all of this sort of thing, but try to prevent it from becoming a Trustee adopted policy.

B. WHEELER: Thank you, Herb. So—so noted, and you noticed I shared and tried to slow that down just a little bit myself. I think the spirit will be that they just endorse this direction, but not screw it in as a Trustee policy per se.

TERRY: That would be fine.

BURNS: I haven't had time to fully study this. I'm just filling in for somebody today, but it is—is it safe to interpret that what you're setting up is a rule of this is what we should do by default, if you do something different we can work with you to make it as safe as possible? I'm thinking in terms of research systems, hardware controls. I deal with multi-terabytes of data, things like that, which won't fit under standard policies, but if we can work with your group to ensure them, then they can work, and I sort of interpret that's what you're trying to say. Is that correct?

B. WHEELER: Yeah, that very much it. We're saying there's a set of services that we know we are doing our best in a game that changes by the day, you know, knock on wood, nothing bad has happened at IU recently. We've invested pretty heavily around this. So you're right, that is the default approach, and to the extent that faculty and research projects can make use of those facilities, then that's the best [indistinct comment]. And to the extent that if something is not practicable in carrying out our academic mission, we just want to work with the administrative or organizational unit to ensure that what is going on can be—have enough staff and resources and training around it to make sure that it's not imposing risk to other researchers.

BURNS: Thank you.

ROBEL: Well, thank you so much, Brad, for coming in in this way and further questions to Brad when he's—I know he welcomes them, and I think at this point, we party. And please turn in your ballots. Thank you so much.

MEETING ADJOURNED: 5:30PM