Minutes
Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
February 17, 2004
Ballantine Hall 008
3:30 - 5:30 P.M.

Summary of Actions Taken:

1. Approval of Minutes (approximately 5 minutes)
   October 21, 2003
   http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY04/minutes/10-21-03.minutes.htm
   November 4, 2003
   http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY04/minutes/11-04-03.minutes.htm
   November 18, 2003
   http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY04/minutes/11-18-03.minutes.htm

2. Memorial Resolutions (approximately 5 minutes)
(Moya Andrews, Dean of Faculties)
   Professor William B. Cohen
   http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY04/circulars/B36-2004.htm
   Professor Emeritus Alan Paul Bell
   http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY04/circulars/B37-2004.htm

3. Agenda Committee Business (approximately 10 minutes)
(Professor David Daleke)

4. Presiding Officers' Business (approximately 10 minutes)
(Chancellor Ken Gros Louis)

5. Question / Comment Period* (10 minutes)
(Chancellor Ken Gros Louis and Professor David Daleke)

6. Student Code Revisions (First Reading) (45 minutes)
(Librarian Mary Popp, Chair, Student Affairs Committee; Dick McKaig, Dean of Students; Pam Freeman, Associate Dean of Students)

7. Proposed Amendments to the Conflict of Interest Policy (approximately 15 minutes)
(Professor Ann Gellis, Associate Dean for Research Compliance and Professor David Daleke, Chair, Research Affairs Committee)
http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY04/circulars/B35-2004.htm

8. External Relations Committee: Review of Committee Charge (approximately 20 minutes)
(Professor Richard Nash, Chair, External Relations Committee)
http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY04/ERCenabling.htm

9. New Business

ATTENDANCE:

Members Present: Moya Andrews, Ken Gros Louis, John Slattery, Neil Theobald, Bennet Brabson, Simon Brassell, Ann Bristow, Malcolm Brown, Bonnie Brownlee, Erik Bucy, David Daleke, Luis Davila, Paul Elliott, Ann Gellis, Kathleen Gilbert, Laura Ginger, Michael Hamburger, Kevin Hunt, Margaret Intons-Peterson, Elin Jacob, Elizabeth Johnson, Bradley Levinson, Deidre Lynch, Murray McGibbon, Ted Miller, Kelly Mix, Richard Nash, James Patterson, Mary Popp, Eric Rasmusen, Elyce Rotella, Barry Rubin, Dennis Senchuk, James Sherman, Herbert Terry, Thomas Walsh, Mary Wennerstrom, William Wheeler, Andrzej Zieminski, William DeKemper, JoEllen Baldwin, Jesse Nelson, Kimberley James, Carla Thoele, Jen Crompton, Casey Cox, Grant McFann

Members Absent with Alternates: Moira Smith for Celestina Wroth

Members Absent: Jeff Alberts, Joyce Alexander, Patricia Foster, Joss Marsh, Harold Ogren, Sarita Soni, Rex Sprouse, Holly Stocking, Larry Thibos

Visitors: Pam Freeman, Paul Purdom, Richard McKaig, Brian Clifford, Robert Kravchuk, Julie Knost, Barbara Wolf

AGENDA ITEM #1: Approval of Minutes

GROS LOUIS: First item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes. You have three sets of minutes that have been circulated on the web: October 21, November 4, and November 18. Are there any changes, or comments, or corrections, deletions? We can't delete I guess. Any additions?

Can we have a motion to approve the minutes?

BRABSON: Yes.

GROS LOUIS: Second.

PATTERSON: I'll second.

GROS LOUIS: Thank you, any discussion. If not all those in favor indicate by saying AYE [AYE]. Opposed? [none]. Abstain? [none].

AGENDA ITEM #2: Memorial Resolutions
(Moya Andrews, Dean of Faculties)

GROS LOUIS: Next we go to the Memorial Resolutions and I'll call on Moya Andrews.

ANDREWS: Let's celebrate the careers and lives of our colleagues who have served the university in extraordinary ways. Professor of History William B. Cohen, 1941-2002. He joined IUs History Department in 1967 and built an extraordinary reputation as a pioneering historian of Modern France. An unsurpassed teacher who was popular yet demanding and who taught large freshman courses, graduate seminars, and mentored his many doctoral students with enormous skill and enthusiasm. Bill was the heart of the history departments field in modern European history and was a marvelously effective academic administrator. He served as Chair, Director of Graduate Studies, and on scores of university committees. His tragic death robbed the university of a colleague of profound intellectual depth, innate wisdom, and vitality. To his students and colleagues he was the ultimate role model.

Professor Emeritus of Education, Alan Paul Bell, 1932-2002, was a prophetic researcher of human sexuality. A sought after psychotherapist of national stature, a provocative academic, and a champion of life who savored its diversity and shared its riches. He was an ordained Episcopal Priest who subsequently completed a doctoral degree in Counseling Psychology at Columbia University. Soon after he joined the Kinsey Institute at Indiana University. His book, Personality of a Child Molester, was completed in 1971 and he achieved tenure in the School of Education in 1973; full professor in 1975 and he retired from teaching in 1995. Best known as a sex researcher, Alan was a faculty member who loved teaching. He co-founded the Center for Human Growth and was involved with it throughout his career. He exemplified the scientist-practitioner model of counseling and worked tirelessly in the private vineyards of therapeutic acceptance.

Let us stand for a moment as we remember our esteemed colleagues.

GROS LOUIS: Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM #3: Agenda Committee Business
(Professor David Daleke)

GROS LOUIS: Now we'll turn to the Agenda Committee business and I'll turn it over to David.

DALEKE: I have just a few brief comments to make regarding today's agenda and also upcoming agendas and then two other additional items. First of all the elections will be held within the next two weeks so once again I've been reminding everyone that ballots will come in the mail soon and we're getting closer to the time when they will arrive. So keep looking for them in your mail.

Secondly, the Fringe Benefits Committee has prepared a document for, on retiree health care—it's actually a subcommittee of the Fringe Benefits Committee—and this is, the document is entitled Health Care and Retirement: Big Decisions. It's a 27 page document that has plenty of information, analysis, references, and other very useful resources for people who are retired, thinking about retirement, approaching retirement, those of us who wish we were closer to retirement—all having to do with options for health care. And we have posted this document on the BFC website, it's on the opening page. And I encourage all of you to pass this information along or pass the link along to those who you think may be interested. I'd also like to make another comment and that is that the Fringe Benefits Committee puts a tremendous amount of effort each year into preparing these two types of documents. We already saw in the fall the analysis of the health care plan document which is extremely helpful and I would like to applaud Elyce and her committee once again, not only for their efforts, but also for the tremendously useful information for the faculty.

In today's agenda you see that we approved some minutes. I'm very happy about that and we will have more minutes coming, not only from those that were left over from last year, but also the few remaining from this year. And once again I want to thank Bill for doing a tremendous job for bringing us up to date.

Today we are going to have a first look at the revisions to the Student Code. You have that in front of you in a very large document. This is going to be a first reading of this document. And we've decided to approach it in a two-step process where we will take a look at the document and maybe have some discussion today but mostly today's discussion should be focused around giving information as to what has been changed in the document, and not to go into depth about some of the particular details. If you some concerns, however, between now and the next meeting would be a time to voice those concerns either directly to Mary Popp and to the Student Affairs Committee or online through a discussion with the rest of the Bloomington Faculty Council members through our majordomo list. We think this will be very helpful in allowing us to think, at least collect the information about the Code, and think about the changes that have been made, and then hopefully facilitate the process of approving these changes by our next meeting. So at the next meeting, on March 2nd, we will approve the Student Code revisions. Some of them have been needed for some time and some of them are rather urgent and need to be done this year. But in reading the document I hope you all keep in mind that the Student Affairs Committee has spent many, many, many long hours considering these, debating these changes, talking about the document in line-by-line fashion in fact and so we should take great respect to the work that they've put into it and consider that they have also thought quite a bit about it. So in the next couple of weeks if you have questions, please address them to the committee and hopefully we'll get all of those answered so that our discussion at the next meeting will go smoothly.

Also today we will pick up, we will discuss changes to the Conflict of Interest Policy. This is a policy that also was in need of some revision. It's a university-wide policy and so we don't have to vote on it today; it's mostly for our information and discussion. It has come through the Research Affairs Committee; we've already taken a look at it and again made some recommendations for some changes. That's what you see today.

Finally the External Relations Committee has come to us with a request for a discussion on the charge of the committee. This committee has a long history, it actually has gone through at least one mutation and

this is an opportune time for us to reconsider the charge of the committee and the direction that it takes and they are looking for input from the BFC. And so hopefully we can get to that today and have a discussion on where that committee is heading.

On March 2nd, our next meeting, as I mentioned we will address the Student Code revisions again. We will also hear a report from the Library Committee on periodical contracts, which is an issue of great concern because of wide, rising costs of our contracts for periodicals with publishers. And then also we'll hear from the Technology Policies Committee and an update on the peer-to-peer file sharing policy for the university. Just looking ahead to one additional meeting, March 23rd, so far the only thing we have on the agenda is a revision of the Conflict of Commitment policy. This was extracted from the Conflict of Interest Policy and now will be considered separately.

I have a few comments about actions at the University Faculty Council. As you may be aware we discussed the review of the campus IRBs across the university. Part of the result of some of these reviews is the institution of a, or establishment of a training program, and the first of those IRB training programs will occur this weekend. This is again to reflect the need for us to make sure we are in compliance across all of our campuses in proper human subjects use. The UFC also heard a similar report on the percent of non-tenure track faculty that we heard at our last meeting, although that was at the university-wide level. And also they heard the Conflict of Interest policy that Ann will present to us today. There was some initial discussions, although not on the floor of the UFC but in the Agenda Committee, on the multi-campus tenure and promotion document that we discussed last time so I can only report that that document is moving its way through the UFC and I'll report back any changes that occur as it moves. And that's all for the Agenda Committee business.

AGENDA ITEM #4: Presiding Officers' Business
(Chancellor Ken Gros Louis)

GROS LOUIS: Thanks, David. Three quick items. Last Wednesday night I met with Fred Cate's Commitment to Excellence Committee and as I indicated at the last meeting I suggested to the committee that instead of a competition the committee identify areas of strength that were not funded last time and that invitations would be made then to deans and/or departments for proposals—being clear that the invitation itself does not guarantee funding. I left the committee after answering questions and I indicated to Fred that I had assumed, and he said that was true, that the chemistry of the committee formed in a particular way and that my presence there might alter the nature of the conversation. Fred the next day sent a draft of an email that's now gone to all of the deans and I shared that with the President, he had a couple of comments on it. But it has now gone out and just to give you the highlights of it: there is greater flexibility both in the time table and what the group identified as the areas that they believed either to be sustained or to attain recognition. I think in the last round I was not on the campus the whole time, but my sense was that many people believed that what was sought were innovative proposals and as you know a number of them were innovative.

I think that the language that the Trustees approved, and also in Fred's committee reports, the word "sustain" appears a lot—to sustain and attain excellence. Though that's not necessarily a focus, but at least it indicates to deans that this is not necessarily looking for something new and flashy but there may be areas in need of sustenance in order to maintain their excellence.

Each dean is invited then, in four pages, to state frankly what their areas of strength are and here's the three categories: advancing an excellent program to greater national or international reputation, meeting critical needs in an already top-tier program to enhance or broaden its national or international recognition, and the third, connecting already strong existing programs in a manner that would advance them in a strategically significant way or [inaudible] important height of a new program or initiative.

Then Fred goes on to say that they don't need to be comprehensive, they don't need to follow precisely the priorities that were established last year. And he asked that the assessments of the deans get to Fred by March 12, the day before Spring Break starts as you know—four single, spaced pages. Then the committee will make their review of the documents and make recommendations to me as to the areas in which I should invite proposals.

There's no specific date for that. The committee really urged, and I agree, that there should be considerable flexibility. The feeling was that last year, not that things were rushed, but the timetable was such that maybe there was not sufficient time for either the committee to work or the schools to prepare the proposals, etc. So that's where that stands.

Second I want to say that the committee I mentioned before that Neil Theobald's going to chair to look at the financial and operational issues involved in the expansion of the size of Informatics has been formalized and here are the membership: Neil's chairing it as I said before. David Zaret is there representing the college, Jim Buher representing Informatics. Bob Kravchuk who is chair of the Budgetary Affairs Committee. And then from the Law School Pat Baude and Doug Boshkoff. And from the Business School James Pratt and Ash Soni. And the charge of the committee will be to look at those areas that I mentioned, but also to look more broadly at the implications of a school that's expanding very rapidly what the implications might be on the other schools, other campuses, especially the College. And to get information on what exactly was funded, what the level of funding was, but information that, from other campuses, both, maybe a half dozen campuses where there is an Information Science school—what the impact has been as that school has developed on other schools or on other schools enrollments. And then to look at six campuses where there is not an information science program just to see what has happened to those enrollments, in computer science in particular.

I met last Saturday with the majority members, a majority of the members for the College Policy Committee and I know that that committee is preparing a memo to me making some suggestions about next steps. Actually the review that this committee will do will give us a lot of information that will be helpful to get everything clear.

The other thing I wanted to mention was, yes, a week from Thursday afternoon at 4pm will be the first meeting of the Dean of Faculties search committee. And that letter went out today. That committee has—your procedures say that a committee of more than 12 is unwieldy so this committee has 13. [laughter.]. Unwieldy by one! But in order to get, because of the nature of the position, I wanted to get as many schools represented as possible and then we always have 2 students and 2 staff members so…

And finally, most of you know, but in case you don't the last faculty council meeting is April 20 and I will have a reception at my house after that meeting, a cocktail-buffet. So if you write it down, spouses are welcome or significant others, so if you're available to come that night that would be, that would be very nice.

That's all I have.

AGENDA ITEM #5: Question / Comment Period
(Chancellor Ken Gros Louis and Professor David Daleke)

GROS LOUIS: So the floors open now for any questions or comments. Yeah, Ben.

BRABSON: I'd just like to announce one change in my life which has been overwhelming and delightful and that has been the SPAM filter in my life. [Laughter]. I think that is brilliant.

GROS LOUIS: I told David, I felt a little bit hurt, I never receive SPAM. [Laughter.] I don't know why.

GELLIS: You don't use the Internet.

GROS LOUIS: What?

GELLIS: You don't buy things over the Internet.

GROS LOUIS: I have a couple of things, but not a lot.

HAMBURGER: Could I suggest that all the members of the Faculty Council forward you some messages? [Laughter.]

GROS LOUIS: Herb?

TERRY: Since I've been critical of some things that IUSA has proposed lately about alcohol and parking, I think I'd like to say something positive about the readership program that's going on. I think it's astonishing that we have ready student access to the New York Times, Indianapolis Star, and USA Today, and that the students are reading it. There was an IDS story the other day that some are concerned that they're reading it and discarding it—maybe we can address that problem through better recycling or something like that. But I hope that when the review is conducted on this project that the university and IUSA find a way to continue it. I'm not anxious to see us recover the number one party school ranking, but if we had the highest readership outside of New York of the New York Times that would be desirable.

GROS LOUIS: It is interesting. Grant, you'll take that back?

MCFANN: Certainly. Appreciate the recognition, thank you.

GROS LOUIS: It's interesting at the Student Advisory lunch last Friday that Dick holds that I attended—it's the New York Times that's first gone. So students get there by noon or, I don't know the exact time, other papers may be there but all the Times are gone.

Other questions or comments? Yes?

DAVILA: Ken, forgive my ignorance, and the rest of Council also, but what is the status of that construction site north of the Auditorium that for some of us is an eyesore and for maybe others it's just obtrusive or part of the permanent landscape? It seems like there is always a trailer there and there's a hard hat sign and I'm, that's what I hear from a lot of people that go to and from the library and certainly one part of campus is connected. And we have that beautiful rock garden there that is totally overshadowed by a construction site that seems to be there now almost permanently. I'm sure there's a reason, but could you, or someone else?

GROS LOUIS: Does anyone know the answer if not I'll get the answer for our next meeting.

MCGIBBON: I believe that a possible solution would, I don't know what I'm trying to say. The Theatre building hasn't been completed—the second renovation of the theatre building. And I think that the people who are going to be doing that are housed there at the moment.

DAVILA: It seems like it won't, if I understood you correctly, it's not a permanent situation?

MCGIBBON: I don't believe so. The second phase of the Theatre building is on hold at the moment pending funding.

TERRY: That sounds permanent. [Laughter.]

BUCY: I was just going to add that I asked the same question about two years ago. [Laughter.] My question had to do with 7th Street which that apparently is, would ever be reopened as a way to get through the campus and the answer was no at that time.

DAVILA: I understand that and I myself would be for not reopening but I would think there would be better ways to discourage traffic that the way it's set up right now. [Laughter.]

GROS LOUIS: I'll try to get the answer but I think it probably is there pending. As I think the Council members know the universities Repair and Rehabilitation budget was not fully funded and this is not our request. It's a dollar amount that's arrived at by the Commission for Higher Education based on the age of buildings and the condition of things. So it's not something we make up it really is a significant need. But at least in the last year, and maybe before that Neil, the full amount has not been funded. So all that's being done are emergency repairs on all the campuses.

Yeah?

RUBIN: Ken, as you know I'm still concerned about the Strategic Planning process not being comprehensive enough to include potential areas that are not departmental or unit specific. And the way the process is structured now we are specifically looking at really raising the status of existing units or creating new units that might have national prominence. And what that does is focus in on our research mission and our reputation relative to graduate students, hiring faculty, and so on, which is clearly a strategic issue. But it leaves apart anything related to instructional improvement, to university division for example, to programs that really cross-cut the service and the teaching mission that we have and I really am concerned that we don't have anything in place to address those issues. Whereas research is a critical part of the university the element that pays the biggest part of our bills is our instruction and tuition. And from the Strategic Planning perspective we're not really addressing that to any great degree. So given that the current CTE process-Strategic Planning process really does focus on unit-specific programs I think we really need to follow that up in some way with something that cuts across the other elements of our mission. And I don't know what that is but I think right now we're only focusing partly on what's strategic, not the comprehensive perspective.

GROS LOUIS: Your point is taken. As I indicated to the committee last Wednesday there will be an additional 3 to 5 million dollars after the six million dollars is expended. So maybe that's the time to take another look at other areas. Yea?

BROWN: Ken I would like to return to Professor Brabson's statement about the SPAM filter. When are the rest of us likely to have the opportunity? I remember the report about that in the Council but what is the status of that.

GROS LOUIS: Actually as Jim has explained it to us…

PATTERSON: Yeah, the first 5,000 to sign up can sign up for it. It's on the, what's that thing we get the Monitor? Yeah the Monitor, it's on the Monitor. So everybody can sign up for it now presumably 5,000 haven't signed up.

If I can make another point that does remind me there's a new virus loose today, if you haven't heard about that. The first thing you do when you get home tonight is go ahead and run Norton Anti-Virus because it has it programmed. I forget the name, does anybody remember?

The message comes through as Monitor.

HAMBURGER: It's bfc-only is the…

GINGER: It said ID or something.

GROS LOUIS: Yes, it said ID.

GINGER: So you did get SPAM?

GROS LOUIS: Is that SPAM?

RUBIN: It's particularly problematic because it looks like one potential source is the Monitor mailing list itself so it's very dangerous.

GROS LOUIS: Any other comments or questions?

AGENDA ITEM #6: Student Code Revisions (First Reading)
(Librarian Mary Popp, Chair, Student Affairs Committee; Dick McKaig, Dean of Students; Pam Freeman, Associate Dean of Students)

GROS LOUIS: If not then we'll move to the next item on the agenda which as David indicated is the first reading of the Student Code revisions and I'll call on Mary Popp, whose work as David indicated has been very busy they've been having several meetings on Saturdays.

POPP: I'm waiting for my cohort to get up here and we'll be all set. OK, well, yes we've meet meeting nights and weekends—we eat a lot of pizza, or at least we have been. What we're going to do today as David said earlier is to take a look at the Code and to talk about major issues that the Bloomington Student Affairs Committee has tried to incorporate into the Code. And then we're going to talk about issues that you would like to raise and I'm going to raise a few issues that have come in my email in the day since this was released publicly. It is 96 pages long with the appendices; we did include the appendices because this time they are important to some of the things we are talking about.

First of all I do want to thank the committee and our faithful ex-officio members who hung out with us a lot. Casey Cox and Bill DeKemper and Mary Wennerstrom and Tom Walsh from this Council are members. Brian Clifford from the Student Supreme Court; Paul Purdom, Deanna Reising, and Carolyn Walters round out the membership on the committee. Pam Freeman, who is the Associate Dean of Students, and Dick McKaig who is the Dean of Students spent a whole lot of time with us, and they are both here today to help and answer any questions. Dick is going to talk a little bit about the process of dealing with the Code today because the processes are changing and we think that's a really, really good thing so that the next time we won't wait from 1990 to 2004 to do a whole sale revision of the Code. We also had great help from Julie Knost with thorny issues and members of the Educational Policies Committee have helped us out as well. And Kelly Kish keeps us organized so we've had lots and lots of people who have been helping us with all of this and I'm sure there will be more. I know that Beth Cate was to be here as well to help answer some of the legal issue questions as well.

So again Dick is going to start us out by talking about the process of the Code and the kinds of, the ways that we will be dealing with the Code in the future—and that has a real impact I think, on the way we think about this Code this time. So I'm going to shut up and let Dick talk and then I'll come back and we'll talk about some of the issues.

MCKAIG: Thank you, Mary and I think all of the members of the committee would want me to comment that were it not for Mary's leadership, her attention to task, we would never have gotten as far as we have today. The Code that you see in front of you by and large was adopted in 1990. It was the work of a faculty committee for three years starting in about 1987 to make major changes to what then had been the document called Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities. Minor changes were made in 1993 and in 1996 there was a set of changes, almost as significant as the changes being presented to you today, but still the basic Code stays the same. The Code is a document that establishes standards for the university, processes by which those standards are enforced and adjudicated and an educational document to send messages to students about expected behavior. In 2002 it was obvious that the Code again had many items that needed updating or revision—technology had changed, issues about off-campus internships were much more common and problematic in some respects, some behavior off-campus as more than half of our student body began to live off-campus came into question. And so a committee was appointed including Professor Berkvam, Professor Ellen Brantlinger, Dean Lindemann, some students and some staff members who represented the university counsel's office to look at the Code and see what sections needed updating for 2003. Ellen Brantlinger actually had been involved in that process in 1996; apparently loves the pain that's involved in the Code process.

This year—that committee worked for a year to clarify all of the changes that they thought needed to be made to the Code. They drafted the language and submitted it to the Bloomington Faculty Council Student Affairs Committee. This year the Bloomington Faculty Council Student Affairs Committee has been going through the Code, line-by-line, reviewing the Code as well as all the changes recommended by that committee. It also becomes apparent that waiting every 3 to 6 or 7 years to make changes in the Code results in a backlog of changes that become difficult to process. And so the recommendation was made by the Code committee that was looking at it in 2002-2003, that they become a Standing Committee to each year look at the Code, find what changes might need to be made, so that the changes don't come in one large package, but rather small updates throughout the year. And so serving on that committee again this year are Professor Brantlinger and Professor Berkvam and Professor Brownlee, Professor Bichelmeyer, Dean Lindemann, and staff members and representatives of the university counsel. And so while we bring you a package of changes to the Code today, there are some Code changes that are already being discussed and might well be on your agenda next year at this time, but hopefully in smaller segments than what we're presenting at this point in time.

It was decided when the Code committee began its work in 2002 that the effort should be to revise the document at hand—not to go back and start all over again. When we went back and started all over it was about a 3-5 five year process to try to develop a Code. It was also the advice of university counsel that there would be one Code for the university. And so the document you see in front of you, if approved by this Council, would ultimately go on then to the University Faculty Council for consideration. And we know there are efforts underway on the campuses, the other campuses of the university, to also suggest changes in the Code. We've worked with those campuses, most particularly IUPUI, to try to coordinate the changes that are being made so we think in large part many of the changes you see today are the changes that are coming from the other campuses also. And ultimately the document of course must be approved by the Board of Trustees. So we have a process in place today to show you some changes we think are now ready to be approved. We have a process underway to consider additional changes that will have to be made in future years. And we certainly have the opportunity to decide not to make any of the changes that have been proposed at this time and refer them back to the committee—although clearly, as Mary will describe to you, there are some changes that are, that in a sense almost seem cosmetic and yet

they make the Code document more easy to understand or they make the document an instrument more easy to enforce. So Mary, back to you.

POPP: All that is to say that the Code as it's finally approved by the Board of Trustees may look different than what we have here. One of the things that we're hearing from the other campuses, particularly the small campuses is that they would really like to simplify some areas of the Code. And what I anticipate may happen is that they will add some procedures for smaller campuses knowing that Indianapolis and Bloomington have more of the bureaucracy than places like Northwest or Kokomo to do this. So I do think that the Code as you see it will be changing. And I think that the fact that we're going to have this drafting committee that Pam Freeman so ably has chaired, is going to make a huge difference in the way that we think about the Code.

We've got several issues that we'd like to bring to your attention today; things that are major changes or what we think are important changes in the way that we think about the Code, in the way that the Code has been viewed, and things that the Committee, the Student Affairs Committee of the Bloomington Faculty Council thought were important to you. So I'm going to read them to you and then at the end of that we'll talk about things that are important to you. But in general I think as we go if you have something that's really a burning issue and you want us to bring it up so that we don't forget about it I think that you should as we go along.

So the very first issue that the committee looked at that we wanted to bring to your attention is to remind you that since 1996-1997 computers and the Internet and technology are certainly much more ubiquitous than they used to be and there's all this new stuff out there. So we have added to the Code additional information, additional emphasis on technology because of that importance in the lives of our students as well as in the lives of ourselves. You can see that in the Preamble on the very first section, very first page, where we've added an additional section that talks about university resources and facilities but one of the places that this is going to be important to us is that our facilities and our resources include our computer facilities.

Another place that you will see more emphasis on this is in the area on academic misconduct which begins on line 1276; and I'm sorry I can't keep up with all these line numbers. But it is the beginning of section III on Student Misconduct, page 28. And you will see that we have added information about involvement in academic issues, human, hard-copy—and by hard-copy we mean not just text but also other things that might be physical like art and that sort—and electronic resources. We talk about the fact here that there are many kinds of technologies that are important and you will see some of that in the additions, particularly what we have gotten from the Educational Policies Committee, further down on lines 1300 and forward. You will see that there is additional area, or additional material in that area. And as you go through the Code you're going to see this in places all through the Code where there are small revisions that include technology, that include access to computers, and use of computer technology for the good of all of us. And you will see that.

You'll also see things that allow us to develop and send reports via email—because email is such an important process, at least when we don't have a lot of SPAM in it to slow it down. So that's another issue here that we've brought up.

A second area is the area of harassment. And the section on harassment which begins on page 3, line 92.

BROWN: Would you repeat that please?

POPP: Page 3, Line 92. That whole section has been revised by the Drafting Committee and rewritten. There is some additional material that will be coming to us from the Affirmative Action Office and we

will have any additional material that's brought forward from that group at our next meeting to vote on, or ahead of our next meeting to vote on. But essentially the focus here was to bring the issues of harassment all together. We had sections on sexual harassment, on sexual orientation, on race, and those sorts of things were all in separate sections. And the Drafting Committee felt strongly that we needed to bring them all together, put them in one section, and make them more inclusive. There may be some other things that we can do to make those more inclusive. I know that Professor Rasmusen has sent us some suggestions to help us be more inclusive. But this is an area that is important to us and I think that you're going to want to take a pretty good careful look at this section and make sure that we didn't miss anything.

TERRY: Mary, along that line I think it is important and I hope we have this language from Affirmative Action not at the meeting, but well before hand so that we can review it. And if not I think we'll have to defer discussion of this if we get it the day of the meeting.

POPP: Now we do, we want to know that there are people who are knowledgeable in this area who are on the Drafting Committee but they are taking a last look as well. So we will have that information and I know that Julie was sitting in the back and I know she's working on all of these areas, because we sent her a whole bunch of stuff to take a look at. But you're right, we want to be sure that we've done this, and done this right because it's too important to leave it to chance.

A third section is something that Dick had alluded to and I wanted to bring that back to you as well and that is the whole issue of what goes on off-campus. What goes on off-campus has become more and more important as more and more of our students live off-campus, number one. But secondly, it's become important because we have so many programs that involve students who are working off-campus in clinical programs and experience programs, in programs where they provide music or other, sports events, all of those kinds of things where our students represent Indiana University off-campus. And so we have taken a look at those areas—we got a good bit of information from the drafting committee as well as from members of this group who last year sent us information about the Code and this material, a great deal of it has been included here. But I wanted to point out a couple places where they're most important.

On page 28 again, in Academic Misconduct you will see that we have added in the beginning section about policies of academic misconduct apply to course, department, school, and university-related activities, including field trips, conferences, performances, and sports activities off-campus, exams outside of a course structure, theses, master's exams, and doctoral qualifying exams and dissertations, as well as research work. So we're really looking at things outside of coursework, but we're also looking at things that happen off-campus. So that's one area.

Another area begins a little further in on line 1673 in the section of Student Disciplinary Procedures. And you will see that there's a section 5 on the bottom of page 36 where we talk about summary dismissal from programs and this often is going to include off-campus programs and we tried to build some of that in and make some of that area a good bit stronger.

And finally on page 34, just a little before that, at the end of section 2, you will see that there are some additional definitions of personal misconduct, not on university property. And we really focused here on posing a threat and so you will see some additions here that talk about threat issues. And you will notice that there is not one word about excessive noise here although some of our neighbors from the university would have liked to have some of that in here I think. But in general there is information here about off-campus activities.

The one we've heard a great deal about is the, are the changes in the area of academic misconduct. That academic misconduct area that is in part 3 at the beginning, is an area that will be important, is important

to all of us. And we have heard a number of activities, a number of issues that have been presented to us and we've had some email on this, to this effect. And I want to bring up a couple of things here. Again, I mentioned activities outside the standard classroom because that was important. Another thing that we have been asked to add is language that encouraged faculty to bring in their own advisors or attorneys to hearings. One of the reasons for this is that there is a widespread perception that university counsel will not support faculty members in such activities.

And we did check with University Counsel and we learned that they will indeed assist faculty who are facing these kinds of hearings. And as a result of that we did not add additional wording here except to line 2193 when we're talking about appeals. So that faculty members are to be notified when a student is bringing in an attorney so that they can have the additional support if they would like to have it. But this is an issue that I know a number of people, and certainly the EPC has been debating about this. So I wanted to particularly bring it to your attention because we are hoping that because this is the Student Code, and because in most of these activities the student tends to be the one without as much power we wanted to play down the faculty member's advisor but we also don't want to lose the comfort level of the faculty member who doesn't want to go into this and feel that they might be sued or whatever. So we wanted to be very, very sure that university counsel would support all of us and I don't know Pam if you wanted to add anything to that. And Beth is here. And Beth do you want to add anything here?

CATE: I'm happy to answer any questions on that issue or to clarify if people do have questions. I don't know how much has already been made available to the committee by way of the Indemnity, the Board Indemnity and Defense Policy should there be litigation that results from a student getting a failing grade or otherwise [inaudible]. But whatever questions anyone has I'll be happy to try and answer.

POPP: And Beth referred to the Indemnity Policy which is what we are really talking about as supporting the faculty, as I understand it. So there is a policy in the university that does provide that sort of support. Other questions or issues here yet?

JAMES: Yeah I have a question. You're saying that a faculty member can use university, basically university resources to secure counsel, right?

CATE: The University Counsel's office doesn't typically get involved in internal proceedings under the Student Code because we're rarely called on to do that. But we give procedural advice when people ask us about it and I've talked to faculty members about specific cases or what sort of evidence they need to pull together in an academic misconduct case, that kind of thing. So yeah, we can certainly answer those questions. We don't tend to go to hearings or things like that. I mean we just don't. Frankly we don't want to see those proceedings overly lawyered [End of Tape 1, Side A, some words lost here]. We try to answer them as best we can. On rare occasion I've gone to an appeals hearing. For example, in a unit where a student challenged a grade and given advice to the unit review board about, mostly about procedural issues.

JAMES: I guess my concern is just that, it's my understanding that in this sort of proceeding a student wouldn't be able to utilize Student Legal Services so I'm just wondering why the faculty?

CATE: I don't think students can go to Student Legal Services for this sort of thing.

JAMES: Right, I know that's my question. Because if the student is supposed to seek outside counsel, not from Student Legal Services

CATE: Oh, I see what you're saying.

JAMES: But the faculty members are allowed to?

POPP: Ann I think has an answer here to?

GELLIS: I'm making a guess that the University, that what the university is willing to do, from what I hear from Beth, is to advise the faculty on the procedures and so on, but if the faculty—if the student has a lawyer and the faculty feels like the faculty member would likewise want someone you know representing his/her case—the university, I would be very surprised, if it would pay for the faculty member to go out and get outside counsel. My guess is that if you decide that you need a lawyer, a private lawyer, that that's out of your own pocket. Do you mean—does university counsel intend to pay the legal fees of private lawyers for faculty?

CATE: In internal procedures no, I wouldn't expect that. What happens is if a student were to sue, say after all the internal proceedings they still have a failing grade or they still have some kind academic or personal misconduct and they decide to turn around and sue the university and they actually name an individual faculty member, not just the university, then under the Board's Defense and Indemnity Policy assuming that there is nothing to demonstrate that the faculty member has not acted in good faith or within the scope of their duties, then yes, the counsel's office for the university would pay for counsel to defend both the university and the faculty member and it would indemnify against any, in the unlikely event of a judgment.

GROS LOUIS: Ann do you want to follow up?

GELLIS: Yes I want to follow up because I want to make sure as to what this says or whether it needs to be ultimately changed. As far as I can hear Beth, that the university is not going to pay a private attorney's legal fees for representing a faculty member in an internal proceeding based on academic misconduct. And should you not, should you want a private attorney at that level, those would be costs that you will incur yourself. If, what Beth is saying, then if after that proceeding the student feels that he/she has been wronged and files a lawsuit against you personally and the university—at that point you can go, you basically can piggy back onto the university's defense. But I don't think—my understanding is the concern at least initially is when the student brings a lawyer into the internal proceedings and at that point who represents the faculty member? And what I think Beth is saying is that you can get some advice from the university counsel's office, they do not sit in as your attorney at the internal proceeding, and should you want a lawyer to sit with you then that's going to be out of your pocket.

CATE: Yeah I guess the one thing I would add to that

INTONS-PETERSON: Excuse me, could you speak up please?

CATE: Oh sorry. Yeah. Maybe a couple things I would add to that. I mean the first is that we see an increasing trend, or we think we do, of students either talking about or actually bringing lawyers into these internal proceedings but the reality is that no lawyer that you could get if you were to get one as an individual faculty member bringing to these proceedings is going to be as helpful as simply clearly stating what the basis for your action is and stating it to the academic colleagues and in some cases students who are on the boards reviewing this stuff. So I guess you know, everyone sort of worries about having lawyer or legal representation, but in these, when I've talked with faculty or administrators about student complaints and appeals, you know typically what we end up doing is just kind of walking through well, what was the basis for your thinking that there was cheating, or what was the basis for your decision in this case or anything and just, we can talk about what is the evidence that you've got and think through it. And that process is helpful. It's something that our office can certainly help people with. But how much a lawyer is going to do for you at a campus review board or at a unit review board level—I mean I guess

it's ultimately up to you as individuals but I guess I would suggest, I don't, again, I don't know that overly lawyering that process is going to be as beneficial as simply sitting down and saying ok, what's happened here, how would I explain this to someone, how would I come to this decision, is it fair, is it rationale. And go through that process.

GROS LOUIS: John do you have a question?

SLATTERY: I was just going to say that I think, you know the bottom line here, Kimberley, for answering your question, is really that university counsel represents the university, not the faculty member. And the role of the university counsel in this place would really be making sure that due process was followed and the rules were followed.

JAMES: That clears it up. I guess my concern was that sine the student wouldn't be able to go to Student Legal Services and solicit advice in this case, I just wanted to make sure that since this is the Student Code that we're talking about that there isn't language that gives the faculty more power I guess, if it got to court or something.

GROS LOUIS: Dennis?

SENCHUK: Well I guess I did think there was a little lack of clarity in the way some of this was expressed in 2195 where the faculty member should have the option of providing an attorney, are you providing an attorney for the student or something? And there's no indication that it kicks in as a right, I take it, after the other party decides to have one or something like that seems to me ought to be stated. But I do share I guess some of the concern about whether faculty members actually have some particular interest that requires representation by a lawyer at this point. I don't foresee—they're not parties to some kind of a lawsuit, no action is being taken against them, I'm a little puzzle by that and I'm wondering if I could get some further insight into why it might seem even appropriate for a faculty member to have a lawyer.

GROS LOUIS: Malcolm?

BROWN: Well it would seem to me all you would have to say is that if a student chooses to be represented by an attorney this must be made known five days before the hearing and the faculty member may be represented by a private attorney.

SLATTERY: Well the language is just permissive. If somebody feels threatened coming into this you don't want to exclude it and so they have the ability to obtain representation if they choose.

SENCHUK: Well again, but to what end?

SLATTERY: No end other than the faculty member's comfort. If the faculty member feels more comfortable with representation, somebody sitting at your elbow in there, then this simply allows that to take place in the same way that it does for the student. It's difficult I think to exclude counsel from a meeting where an individual might feel threatened.

This is not unusual language for other universities. It's just permissive. It tries to discourage the process from over-lawyering but it doesn't draw the line and say that we will absolutely be exclusionary.

GROS LOUIS: Eric?

RASMUSEN: Suppose a professor has raped a student; that's not in the course of his duties. He can't

expect university counsel to be on his side necessarily and he's in big enough trouble to get a lawyer. But the ordinary cheating case or as things like that you may not want a lawyer.

GROS LOUIS: Yes, Bill?

WHEELER: So I am knowledgeable of one case that involved a faculty member in the mathematics department where the very fine, young faculty member who actually gave a student an incomplete and while he was away there was—making up a final exam—there was an allegation of misconduct. The student involved then alleged that there were issues of race and gender involved in the accusation of misconduct and brought counsel to the hearings to protect her interests. And the faculty member involved then felt that he did have to obtain counsel given the possible threat of a possible lawsuit. And he did in fact retain counsel for two years to represent him during this process. He subsequently left the university in large measure because of this. And went to a better university. One that could retain him.

POPP: So maybe the suggestion here is that there is concern by some that an attorney would be useful; there is a concern by others that there may not be a reason to have an attorney. And the question that we have here is is the statement that we have on 2193 with the friendly amendment that we just got going to be enough for this or do we need to talk a bit more about this outside of this meeting?

GELLIS: I think you can, in order that no one is misunderstanding, I think you ought to say specifically at your own cost or not at the cost of the university.

POPP: So we need to be clearer about at own cost.

GROS LOUIS: You could do it by changing the word providing to hiring.

POPP: Yes.

TERRY: I haven't read the document well enough to know if you have addressed the parent-attorney problem. Has it?

POPP: You mean mom is an attorney? Is that what you're saying?

TERRY: Doesn't get declared as being represented by an attorney, it's just my parent. Certainly my experience with complaining parents is that they are disproportionately legally trained [Laughter.].

POPP: We have not put that in the Code.

TERRY: I think this is an area where we may have to talk about. Personally I would like to know because I don't have, either receive a point in the direction of the Indemnity provisions that the Trustees have adopted, or if it's relatively short have it sent to us. Because I'm not really aware of when the university's willing to step in and protect me based on my actions as a university employee and when I'm on my own.

CATE: Can I just, on that issue, and also to a point made earlier. When a faculty member is issuing a grade or acting kind of in the scope of his university or her university duties in the ordinary course, I mean, basically they are acting as part of the university. And it is in that context I think that faculty and others in the process will call us and say, and run things by us, and we're happy to talk about it in that realm because the one thing, and I'm just kind of reacting at this point and I haven't really thought this through, but the one thing I guess I would ask is what in—if in the ordinary course in the usual garden variety case where there's no reason to suspect that the faculty member has done anything improper and has simply issued a grade the student disagrees with or whatever—if there is a private attorney for the

faculty member directing a case in some way that quite frankly university counsel which may have to defend the university down the road if there is a lawsuit, we don't have any control over that person, we don't have any you know necessary input in that. How do you sort of work through the situation? I need to think that through.

SLATTERY: In the normal course of events the university's interest and faculty's interest are going to coincide—the faculty member acting as an agent of the university. There can be a faculty member who sees a lawyer on the other side and is worried about being sued themselves; they're not sure of the extent to which the university will back them up and they'll simply want their own counsel in there. And this might, and it's just permissive in that regard and it really wouldn't change it. But the hearing officer would have to discipline the respective attorneys and make sure that this process followed the route that it needs to go.

CATE: I think that's actually a very important point because a lot of times, just based on again sort of calls that we get and the concerns that are raised by faculty, they reflect the very aggressive and I think sometimes abusive tone and tenor of counsel for the students. I know one faculty member who called up and said I just got a call from an attorney, he told me they were going to sue me and take away my house and all this kind of stuff. And I think that the better the hearing officer's are, or the bodies who are hearing these appeals, at keeping a reign on the proceedings and not letting anyone, not just attorneys, but advisors of any sort and frankly the parties themselves get out of hand in that the more you can control the situation. And also if attorneys for the other side are calling individual faculty and threatening or calling or asking to talk to them and the faculty don't want to then you know I would say just tell them to call the counsel's office.

SLATTERY: Oh yes. In fact that should be the advice to the faculty member at the onset. If you're contacted by an attorney to go attorney to attorney and that would go through university counsel. But again you come back to that, if the faculty member is worried that their interest diverged from the university at that point they should be free to obtain their own counsel.

GROS LOUIS: Yes, Richard.

NASH: Mary as this conversation moves along I find myself feeling great sympathy to you and the time you spent on the document [Laughter.]. Just focused on this small item I find myself moving between the poles of utter boredom and abject terror [Laughter.].

GELLIS: Where are you?

NASH: So I'm thinking, and I'd just like to give you this to think with before you return to us, whether it needs talking about or not. I'm struck by the five days in this permissive allotment. That's roughly from Friday to Wednesday so if I'm a faculty member and the hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday apparently if the student is going to bring a lawyer he's to notify someone on Friday, and I assume that that would not be me. I don't know when I would hear this. Maybe everyone else has counsel retained already [Laughter.]. Maybe I should [Laughter.]. But the five days is beginning to feel a little tight to me [Laughter.]. So I'm hoping that this conversation is focusing very intently on something that isn't ever going to matter to me but I just wanted to raise the five day concern.

SLATTERY: I guess you just have to trust that practicality and common sense take over. If an individual doesn't have an appropriate period of notification to respond to meet the letter then again the hearing officer is the one who would postpone the hearing if the other individual, the other party in this needed to be notified. I used to do this for several years at another institution and you do have to trust enlightened self-interest and common sense because it does work.

GROS LOUIS: Yes, Kevin.

HUNT: I have a non-lawyer question. I emailed you a little earlier about this issue and I was wondering if there was any text anywhere in this that addresses the issue of the culpability of people that know about instances of cheating but do nothing about it. And I'll say exactly what I mean by that. I had a case just a few years ago where one student allowed another student to copy her exam. And she maintained that she refused to answer questions about the incident and maintained that she was completely innocent because she hadn't benefited from the cheating in any way. So I was wondering if there was any, I couldn't find any, you know I emailed you and suggested some text that's probably inadequate but I would like to see some text in here that addresses that issue that students that are asked about instances of cheating that they know about have to answer forthrightly, have to answer honestly, and tell what they know. And that students that allow cheating, allow copying that sort of thing, are to some extent culpable.

POPP: And Kevin you did provide that. That actually is taking us to the next point so maybe, would you mind if we make sure that the lawyering got done before we do that one?

GROS LOUIS: Any other comments on the lawyering issue?

WALSH: Mary, just about the five days. Everywhere else around this paragraph it says school days. So we must have just missed that one.

TERRY: I have a lawyer question. Does that include Sundays?

GELLIS: No.

TERRY: But it does include Saturdays?

FREEMAN: Yes it includes.

HAMBURGER: It doesn't include Friday though! [Laughter.]

POPP: The school calendar days should, you're right we missed that one and it should be in there. School calendar days were something that we were trying to work on because it includes Fridays, Saturdays, and Sundays but it does not include times when the university is not in session.

TERRY: It does include Saturdays and Sundays?

POPP: It does as we have it written. And that's actually something that has happened. It's part of the Code, it has been part of the Code for many years.

GROS LOUIS: On the lawyering?

HUNT: I have a lawyer question. If a student should bring counsel to one of these sessions is statements made by the instructor in these hearings, are they considered private and confidential or can a lawyer use those later in a private suit against an instructor?

CATE: Generally I believe that in a hearing a transcript is made of the proceedings and so in a sense they would have access to that in the student record, as part of the student record's under FERPA. So the federal law that governs access to student records. So in that sense what goes on in the hearing is going to be available to the student and if down the road they choose to file a lawsuit

HUNT: Which complicates things.

CATE: And they could easily go on to subpoena that record anyway and we would turn it over. I'm not aware of a privilege that would attach to that, but that's true of statements that get made in any university operations

BROWN: Please speak up.

CATE: Sorry.

BROWN: Please speak up.

CATE: Oh I'm sorry. That's true in lots of things that happen in university operations generally—I mean we put things in writing, we say things, etc., it gets transcribed in the ordinary course and then if a lawsuit arises. Unless that stuff has a special privilege that attaches to it documents can be obtained in the litigation. But again, I mean, that's what I would come back to what I said before which is in these proceedings the most important thing is to lay out, you know, as an academic, what your academic reasons are for failing a student or giving a certain sort of penalty, or in a personal misconduct case, than playing it out. Let me say that courts as a rule are very reluctant to step into the shoes of an academic and judge academic matters. They may be more willing to review procedural issues and see whether or not they think that a fair process has been followed. But judges don't want to grade your papers and they don't want to review whether or not something was cheating and so, you know, you can perhaps take some comfort in the fact that it is rare—very, very rare—for a court, to the point of I can't come up with an example, of a court actually wanting to reassess an academic decision at least in the absence of some strongly suggestive evidence of something like racial discrimination, or something like that. I mean and then in the most general to go back to do it again, don't like to redo grades. [some parts inaudible here].

DALEKE: I know that Mary has a number of other issues she wishes to touch on. I think this is a case if you have any additional comments please forward them to Mary and the committee.

POPP: And we will certainly take a look and we have several suggestions for wording in that one area. The second issue, the issue that Kevin brought up is another issue that has come to us. We've had several requests, including the one that Kevin sent, to add language about the need for students who know about academic misconduct to report it even when, often when they are not directly involved—this is not necessarily a piece that you sent. There is some information in this on line 1354 which is where you have sent some additional wording for it. The issue here though is broader than line 1354, the issue really here is a way to think about the philosophy of this Code because when we start to think a little bit about how a Code like this one, when somebody knows about something that is misconduct and going out and telling someone about it, we need to think about how much broader do we want to make this section on 1354. At the present what it says is that "A student must not intentionally or knowingly help or attempt to help another student to commit an act of academic misconduct." That's the wording that we have here. And the wording that you wanted to add—and I have it here somewhere—had to do with adding, "nor allow another student to use his/her work or resources to commit an act of misconduct" to the end of that first sentence. And then an additional sentence had to do with, "Student's who are aware of academic dishonesty must report the violation to the instructor or other academic authority such as department chair or Dean of Students." When we get into that second sentence, and it's not just what you've sent, we start to get into issues that relate to honor codes. We do not at this university have an honor code. Honor codes have been promulgated in many private schools, in some public ones; but a real problem with honor codes is they tend to be really hard to enforce. And so the philosophy over the years has been that we would not do, we would not add language to our Code that would make it an honor code so that people had to talk

about misconduct if they saw it or were aware of it. And we got talking a little bit about this and how this might work. In general we think in a lot of cases, including in the case that you talked about, that number six does it or should have done it.

HUNT: I disagree because I can't remember if it was this exact text or not that the student came up with but her contention was that she didn't help the student in any way with her exam, she just allowed it. And about the honor code I would be happy with text that says that, for instance instead of requiring students to report incidents that they know about, in which case I don't see enforcement as an issue because it only comes up if something like this comes out, where a student, their exam has been copied and they know it was being copied and then you could invoke that part. But I'd be happy with text or language that says that if students are asked about incidents of cheating in which they have some knowledge or were involved in they are required to answer honestly. In this case the student didn't answer honestly even though the truth came out eventually.

MCKAIG: Two things that could be mentioned on the issue of the young woman in that case who said in fact the Code did not apply, most students I deal with who have been accused of violating the Code will imply the Code doesn't apply. And it's the hearing officer that determines whether or not it applies. While I would congratulate her on her creative defense I don't think that should cause anyone to feel they have no opportunity to find her responsible.

On the second point—compelling testimony—the fact of the matter is there are constitutional rights against self-incrimination and I don't think there is anyway that can be written into an institutional code. It certainly in the sense of an academic ideal, one worthy of pursuing but university counsel could probably advise that self-incrimination is generally a protected area that you are not required to self-incriminate. In fact the Code goes on to say that failure to answer can't be interpreted as an admission of guilt. It's a burden in a democratic society that we allow to exist to ensure that innocent people, I guess, aren't necessarily found guilty. I don't know whether it's one we ought to uphold, but I don't know that we have any choice.

HUNT: That's interesting because if you go to the webpage for the athletics program they have language like that and their code requires that if asked, and fortunately it turned out in this specific case this person was an athlete, but it has language that if they are asked they must answer completely and honestly.

MCKAIG: Maybe a structural, I'm unfamiliar with that. A good lawyer would have to answer that question.

CATE: One of the problems that you get into with the Student Code is requiring a student to testify or respond is at least in the personal misconduct cases sometimes there are pending criminal charges against the student at the same time and if they have a lawyer, the lawyer is probably going to say since the proceedings would be subpoenable, for example, by the prosecutor, don't say anything, or don't incriminate yourself. And so in that context certainly we end up with students who may not want to say anything. Now having said that you know if you have a Code that doesn't require them to testify or respond that doesn't mean that you can't, as a decision maker, evaluate the lack of information that exists because the student hasn't provided any, say alternative explanation for what seem to be the facts at hand supporting an act of misconduct.

HUNT: Is it incrimination if you haven't broken the law? If you've just broken the rules of the university?

CATE: Yeah I don't know, I'm not entirely sure that the constitutional right if we were just talking about internal proceedings would, you know the extent to which it would apply so forcefully in just that internal setting. Although like I said a lot of times you've got external proceedings in which there's a clear right

against self-incrimination that would apply. But, you know, again, it's not, even if you don't want to, and I gather we've never required students to actually say anything historically in their defense. But you also can take the lack of information that results from that choice into account in deciding if misconduct occurred.

POPP: And maybe one of the things that we can do at least to begin to rectify this piece of it would be to add those additional words, "nor allow another student to use his/her work or resources to commit an act of misconduct." Because that at least makes it clearer to everybody what's involved and what you have to do and that would be a really important clarification here. The issue of an honor code though is one that we've come up against before and I don't know if other people who have been interested in an honor code, some of whom are sitting in this room, and I don't know if they want to mention something about it or how we might work around it because honor codes are very difficult.

FREEMAN: I might just mention that we do have one academic unit that does have an honor code and that's the School of Business; a pseudo honor code anyway. It works it's way into the Code procedures at some point. But within the School, you know students do sign a statement that they will, they will reveal if other students are seen committing academic misconduct and that they will not commit academic misconduct themselves—that's a gross paraphrasing of what it says. But at some point it does then plug into the central system and the drafting committee did look at this question because it had been brought up. And some of the members of our committee actually visited the School of Business and talked with some people over there who are in charge of administering the honor code and we were strongly advised don't go that direction with the whole Code, with the overall Code. And we thought that was probably a pretty good indicator about how easy it would be to implement on this campus if we went that route.

Another point that was brought up, which may or may not be popular to hear in this room but I'll say it anyway, is that there was a comment made that the bigger problem with non-reporting of academic misconduct is on the part of the faculty. And if you cannot get the faculty to consistently report when they know that academic misconduct is occurring in their classrooms then how can we ever expect the students to report? So, I will offer those two bits of information from our committee.

HUNT: And we've talked a lot. I'm ok with language that insists that faculty report it as well.

FREEMAN: It's in there already.

GROS LOUIS: Dennis?

SENCHUK: I guess I wonder whether it isn't a bit of a red herring to use the resistance to an honor code as the basis for not including this kind of language. It does seem to me that if I find that somebody's been using my car as a get-away car in a bank robbery I ought to tell somebody about it. If somebody happens to be using my test even without my permission to cheat and whatnot it might be that I have some [inaudible] in there as well.

GROS LOUIS: Herb and then Eric.

TERRY: I agree that you ought to be able to ought to tell about it. I think the question is whether you convert the ought into a must or something that is sanctionable.

SENCHUK: Well legally speaking though, wouldn't the case of the use of the car in a robbery be such to make it a legal obligation?

TERRY: We have to leave Beth to answer that. What I would like to say I think is that…

CATE: I wouldn't answer the question here because you don't have the similar obligations here. There may be times when legally when you know something afterward you may be facilitating or an accessory after the fact under criminal law. But here I think you can answer this question purely as a manner of policy and whether the same policies that animate the criminal law are ones that you want to import into here is the question.

TERRY: I'd like to comment on this notion that we shouldn't do the honor code path because it's difficult to implement. I've been around the Student Conduct Code for a long time and I wouldn't call it easy to implement either. I think there's a sort of fundamental choice that we have made. We have chosen to go down an enforcement and sanctions and penalties path rather than an educational and let's inspire them to do good things and behave well, and depend upon them to do it. I don't know that I want to change course at this point and go down the honor code path but the idea that we try to say that there is a moral or an ethical obligation for everybody in this community to participate in the detection and prevention of misconduct. It's not an ideal I want to run away from either. And I'd like to respond to something else that you said at the beginning about the smaller campuses. You said they didn't want to go down this path because they don't have the beauracracy to implement it. I'm not so sure that just because we have the bureaucracy we should make things complex and difficult. And as I look through this whole thing I wonder if efforts to respond to 'school calendar days' have not, among other things, extended rather than shortened the period of time during which these proceedings can drag out. And a bunch of things. So I'm going to be looking at, as we move to our final discussion, the question of whether despite the fact that we have bureaucracy can we find ways to use it less and to make this process more educational and more efficient.

GROS LOUIS: Eric and then Paul.

PURDOM: The danger of putting language in here.

GROS LOUIS: Paul, Paul. Eric first and then Paul.

RASMUSEN: I hate to return us to bureaucracy but I think faculty maybe are the place to start and I wonder if any instructor has ever been sanctioned for failing to report cheating as I believe we're supposed to be? Does anybody know a case ever in history? If we can't do it with faculty I don't think we can do it with students. But we maybe should do it with faculty.

GROS LOUIS: Paul?

PURDOM: The danger of putting language toward an honor code in if it gets too far out of keeping with the beliefs of our students is that it's going to cut off a valuable piece of information. From time to time I've had students come up and tell me, I have a problem with cheating in one of my courses—and that was all they were comfortable in telling me. It was very valuable for me to know this, I was able to take some action to cut down on the problem in the future. But if we had language that made it necessary for them to testify they would not have told me this under the current spirits under which most of them are operating. This is the danger if you do this before it comes out of demands say from the students.

POPP: So we know we're going to have a little bit more about bureaucracy later. But I'm hearing that our path of enforcement right now seems to be an ok way to keep going, right?

GROS LOUIS: Mary?

WENNERSTROM: We could point out that in the Preamble we tried to do what Herb was talking about

and we did put in some general language here which wasn't there about inspiring everybody to be good and ethical and take responsibility and take care of the resources. We thought that was a good, a better beginning at least to the whole thing.

GROS LOUIS: Yes?

JAMES: Talking about, I guess, culpability, we do have a statement on the very first page saying that every student is expected to be familiar with the contents of this Code and I would argue that most are not. And that possibly to maybe cause students to be more aware of the Code if there was language in a professor's syllabus saying "you're expected to act with the full understanding of the Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct Code." So I would offer that because I certainly haven't seen it in any of the language of the courses that I've taken here.

WENNERSTROM: It's in every one of our undergraduate courses.

JAMES: Really?

WENNERSTROM: Yeah it's sends them absolutely to the Code and to the link and to the, used to be printed in the Schedule of Classes, especially the academic misconduct section.

TERRY: As a Director of undergraduate studies in my department I advise all faculty to put a reference to the Code in their syllabus.

JAMES: Yeah.

TERRY: And a link if they're doing it on Oncourse.

WENNERSTROM: It's in a lot of our syllabus.

BRABSON: As a faculty member in physics I must admit I never heard of the Code before.

GROS LOUIS: Because physics only has 1 undergraduate major. [Language]

BRABSON: That's right.

HAMBURGER: And one unifying law.

POPP: Mary has brought us to a couple of other things that I want to say very briefly before the hook comes and we have to go away. One of them is that the drafting committee and the student affairs committee have tried very hard to set out general principles. General principles that can be guidelines for what we expect; and that was what Mary pointed out in the first section. There is another big section of that at the beginning of Part IV that talks about general principles to be followed in disciplinary procedures. The goal in all of these is to make the ground rules clear up front at the beginning—because we know nobody reads this stuff. And we want to be sure that in the general principles where somebody might skim it there is some information there that talks about our philosophy and what we think is important. So you will see those areas.

The other thing that came up, and we've been talking about school calendar days. We tried to make some practical changes to make the Code easier to understand and work with—deadlines and timelines in disciplinary section have been adjusted to make them more realistic because of the time it really does take to do some of these. So you will see many of them that have been expanded from 7 days to 14 for

example, and some things all the way to 21 days. Because again we need to be a bit realistic about what people can do. And we also tried to define terms. Faculty member has always included associate instructor; that definition is any instructional person and we tried to put that up front at the beginning of the section on academic misconduct and misconduct in general. And we also tried really hard to define calendar days and school calendar days are days when classes are in session and that actually is described in section 5. And there are general principles in section 5; we tried to define "school calendar days." And you will note that when we were talking earlier about Saturdays and Sundays—Saturday and Sunday are included. A question has arisen about summer sessions and whether summer sessions are school calendar days? We're going to have to take a little bit closer look at that issue as we go along because it is a valid question to raise.

I wanted to just get through some of the basics because I know that others of you may have other issues that you want to make sure that your colleagues think about before we vote next time. So I think we may need to open the floor for any other additional questions or issues.

GROS LOUIS: Yes, Erik?

BUCY: Two kind of unrelated things. One you mentioned that the noise issues off-campus was just not on the table. What was your reasoning and deliberations about that because I had a tremendous problem a couple years ago with that. And secondly, there's a notice fairly early on about the students' really necessity to receive important information by email—is that new, is that something we really want to strictly enforce? Those two things.

POPP: The noise issue has not been, was not on our list and that was actually somewhat facetious because many people are interested in the noise issue but it is something that, in terms of general conduct, that we would have a really tough time trying to enforce. And what's noise? Define noise. And the city of Bloomington has an ordinance that has defined it and they will probably do a better job than we'll be able to do in the Code. So that was one of the reasons that we tried to stay clear of that issue. And I'd be happy for any member of the committee who would like to add any more to that to it.

Your second issue that had to do with…I lost it.

BUCY: Email.

POPP: Email, yes, email. Email seems to be, is a standard for all of the campuses now. It is a standard that even we in the library have been hearing that everyone is to have an email account and to watch it because that's one of the major ways that we communicate on campus now. But I'm not an administrator so if there's somebody else who would like to add to that I'm happy to stand back and let them do that.

GROS LOUIS: Bill?

WHEELER: I believe that at least the Agenda Committee received a note, a copy of a notice that the appropriate administrative bodies have adopted a university policy that students, that email notifications are official university correspondence and that students must monitor their email for that purpose. That if they do not, if the university sends an official notice to them via email and they don't read their email then they have failed in their responsibility to watch for official notices. So the university has moved from notifying, from sending official notices by mail to sending official notices by email.

BUCY: I guess just to follow up if I could. That's an interesting area for me because it seems to me, unless I'm wrong, there is no similar policy for faculty and that most official notices still come by paper. I

could be wrong. In other words do I have a obligation to check my email. Or can I still teach and do my job without it somehow. I mean officially.

GROS LOUIS: That may vary from school to school and department to department.

RASMUSEN: [End of Tape 1, Side B, some words lost here]. It goes without saying if you don't check your email it's your tough luck.

TERRY: Mary I'd like to ask if you think the procedures you now outline or are proposing are based in all instances on sort of the physical presence of witnesses, students, and everything else in these hearings. Or if we're moving in a direction where some kind of distance or virtual presence is possible. And the reason I raise the question is that we're relying more and more on visitors, adjuncts, and other sorts of faculty who may initiate or be involved in these proceedings at the beginning, but by the time they get to some stage where their presence might be required, they're gone. They may not still be university employees. It may be summer, if this is something that has arisen out of Little 500 week. And I'm wondering if we now have a system where using modern communications technology that it's possible to at least not require everybody to be physically in the same room.

POPP: We probably want to go back to the, and Dick could find it, he found it at 1648. We did add that, I just couldn't find it, I knew it was there, but if 16, around 1648. Line 1648.

WENNERSTROM: 1651.

MCKAIG: 1651 is what mainly covers this.

POPP: Sorry I couldn't quite see it, but we tried to, the Dean of Students or the Dean of Faculties may allow for presence in formal hearings by electronic means—and I found a typo so I'll catch that—when warranted by extenuating circumstances. And the sort of thing that you're talking about what exactly Herb what we were concerned about—adjuncts, people who go away, that sort of thing. But we did have a mechanism for doing that because that does happen.

TERRY: How would the student question somebody informally in that before you got to the formal proceedings how would the informal proceedings be conducted if the person is gone?

POPP: Well informal proceedings are informal so somebody could call on the phone or whatever. We had, that's an issue I think that we didn't even think about here because we do say in line 1619, nope, we do say earlier in the Code that people, that the informal hearing is expected to be an in-person activity.

TERRY: Yeah.

POPP: So we're assuming that extenuating circumstances would follow in other places as well.

RASMUSEN: Let me follow up on that. What if the instructor just doesn't want to show up? What happens then? If there's plenty of evidence against the student, it's all in writing—but he can't be bothered or maybe he's gone off to Idaho to teach there or something? Well, the instructor doesn't care it's not his university maybe anymore. But if the student doesn't appear I guess he, that's not supposed to mean anything. It's ambiguous here as to what happens if the instructor does not vigorously pursue the case against the student. The student, the instructor is being charged with misconduct, maybe that's not so bad. But I know in my own case when I was pursuing cheating I was, one student appealed and I asked do I have to show up for the hearing and the hearing officer said yes. But, and I did I guess, but I wouldn't

really have cared if the student got away with it much. Would he have gotten away with it if I hadn't shown up?

POPP: The hearing officer probably would have taken that into account.

RASMUSEN: Well that's ok if he just takes it into account. But I'm wondering if people might read into this if the professor does not show up and cannot be questioned does the student then win his case?

BROWNLEE: Well the winning of the appeal has to do with the officer's, the faculty and the students. The lack of being there—the effect of the lack of being there would be decided those individuals. It could certainly work against the faculty member.

RASMUSEN: You might want to clarify that. It's not an automatic loss for the faculty member if he doesn't show up.

POPP: If the faculty member doesn't show up it's not automatic.

TERRY: And then let me clarify. I have certainly participated in hearings where basically the data was unequivocal—it's a slam dunk that the student did something. And should the faculty member be disadvantaged if they don't want to take time from other university duties to appear when the record clearly demonstrates their presence won't add anything. So I think I agree with Eric to some extent—you shouldn't automatically be hurt because the faculty member doesn't show up. The faculty member is disadvantaged or loses if the record in other instances is not something the student can refute. There you are.

GROS LOUIS: One might assume if it's that clear Herb that in the informal process someone from Dick's office would say to the student, you really have no case.

TERRY: But that isn't always heard.

HUNT: I chaired a campus review board where the student was found guilty and it wasn't exactly a slam dunk but the instructor did not show up for the hearing and it didn't change things.

NASH: Mary I'm hoping in preparation for the next meeting you might give me a little bit of guidance about places I might look here. I'm wondering, it seems to me that since the last time the Code was revised there have been several new stories about alcohol and substance abuse and about hazing. And I'm wondering if the revisions of this Code have any substantive changes in policy that you could direct me toward to look at, or is this largely unchanged from what has been the policy.

POPP: The…I'm trying to find it, I think it was 1564. We looked at it a little earlier. Dick is better at this than I am, he finds the lines better than I do. That whole section on personal misconduct not on university property, and also there's a section about personal misconduct on university property, we're talking about alcohol, we're talking about alcohol and drug offenses. The key here was trying to make these stronger, trying to make it stand out specifically. Originally the alcohol and drug offenses were not in personal misconduct not on university property; it's been added here. And the key here is posing a threat to self or others. And that was one of the cases that's here.

BRABSON: Mary just one comment about returning to Herb Terry's comment about the educational part of this policy. Ideally students of course would sit down and read the 96 pages, but they won't. So the question then is how do we effectively communicate this information without, beyond the point of just citing a reference in a syllabus. Is it possible that there is a, let me be naïve, a one-page summary for

students that would actually give the essential nature of the beast so that they would, in one-page, be able to extract the essence of the document? I realize that's naïve, but I say it anyway.

POPP: Orientation I know covers it, they do have sessions on it but one page will probably not going to quite do it.

BRABSON: But there is such a session.

POPP: There have been in the past.

GROS LOUIS: Yes, Grant?

MCFANN: I'd actually like to comment on both of the last two previous points. Our Student Rights department actually will be undertaking the task of shrinking this document down into a pamphlet for students so hopefully it will give them a better idea of what's going on and that will be there project over the next 10 years. [Laughter.]

Secondly, regarding line 1565, the first point under that personal misconduct—alcohol and drug offenses was added. And I just wanted to bring up for discussion three points of my concern with that. First is that we have a huge, a difficult time enforcing alcohol and drug offenses on-campus. Nevertheless we've decided to branch out and try and take on the world and literally the world because this document doesn't stop anything. And that actually transfers into my second point—it's a university wide document. And I'm going to fight my urge and present this story about a thirty year old graduate student at Indiana University at Indianapolis who goes out, has three drinks, gets a DUI, and then the university takes it upon themselves to sanction them because he's jeopardizing the, I don't know what the word is, but presenting a threat to himself and in so threatening the academic environment of the university. It seems a little absurd to me.

And thirdly, there's already police enforcement. Every student is a citizen, off-campus is a citizen of the county, pays taxes, subsidizes that police department, and is therefore sanctioned by the police department. It doesn't seem to me that the university is the place, or the responsibility to sanction them as well.

Just for thoughts.

POPP: And Grant you talked about some of these at the Student Affairs Committee and we talked about it and I know that Casey has been concerned about this issue as well because you're right because it is a difficult thing to police the world and we're not out to police the world. In general one of the things that we have said about the things that are on this page is that they tend to be issues that come to us, or that we follow up, because there is a huge additional piece to it. I know Pam had talked a little bit earlier about how often something like this might come up. And it might come up because there was an additional sanction from the police, an additional sanction, and because it is an egregious offense. So the likelihood of this happening to every thirty year old who gets picked up for DWI is probably not there, but we want to be sure that if there is cause for us to do it that we do have some way in order to do it.

MCFANN: With that I would ask possibly if the sponsor would add a friendly amendment to that point making number one "Egregious alcohol and drug offenses."

POPP: Not to mention egregious domestic violence.

MCFANN: That doesn't trouble me either, we do have police for those.

GROS LOUIS: I think if you have further comments, David said before we really need to get to the reading or the Ann's description of the research policy because that will be voted on at the next UFC meeting. So if you have further observations or comments than by all means email Mary.

AGENDA ITEM #7: Proposed Amendments to the Conflict of Interest Policy
(Professor Ann Gellis, Associate Dean for Research Compliance and Professor David Daleke, Chair, Research Affairs Committee)
http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY04/circulars/B35-2004.htm

GROS LOUIS: Ann do you think you can do this in eleven minutes?

GELLIS: I'll try.

GROS LOUIS: OK.

GELLIS: We've done, many of you know and those of you who were at the UFC last week, I apologize with having to bore you with the same story. The existing policy on Conflict of Interest was passed in 2000 by the UFC and by the Board of Trustees. The major crux, difference that that policy brought into play was that it said that all employees of Indiana University were required to report or disclose financial conflicts, certain types of financial conflicts of interest if they reached a threshold, a certain monetary threshold, and if one could, if they reasonable appeared to effect or be effected by ones research, teaching, or service activities at the university. In the past, prior to 2000, the only people who were required to make disclosure of financial conflicts of interest were those people who were getting federal money because the NIH and NSF regulations required having, had provisions for the disclosure of significant financial conflicts of interest.

So the 2000 policy said we think this ought to apply to everyone, not just those who get federal funds. The significant financial interest ought to be disclosed where they might affect your research, teaching, and service activities. We have had the policy in effect, we've implemented it now this is our second year and we have found that there are three problems with the policy that we're seeking to change.

One is that it's too broad in who, in it's scope of who is covered by the policy—it covers all employees, whether they're staff, faculty, graduate students, what have you. But what we're looking at is whether the outside financial interests affect research, teaching, or service. Now those are activities that we associate with the faculty or other academic appointments, and not non-academic appointments. So the one thing we want to do is narrow the scope of the policy. So now it applies to persons who basically are academic appointees only. That's the first change.

The second thing we've discovered is that looking through somewhere around 7,000 forms that to the extent there are financial conflicts of interest that we're concerned about—and let me step back. When I say concerned that is, the federal regulations upon which the 2000 policy is based, which we are most concerned, is that the significant financial outside financial interest will affect the research that is produced at the university. That somehow the outside interest will skew, will bias the research. And it's very important that that obviously not happen and that people perceive that the research that comes out of the university can be trusted for its objectivity and freedom from at least financial biases. And our experience with it is that to the extent to which we find financial conflicts of interest they relate to research rather than to teaching or service. Teaching and service activities, when connected with other outside interests, tend to fall predominantly into the area of Conflicts of Commitment—the faculty member who instead of meeting with his/her classes is busy running a side business like a floral shop,

what have you. But having combined those two things—Financial Conflicts of Interest with Conflicts of Commitment—and sort of bundled it all together, if nothing else, we have a document that's very confusing, people do not know what to disclose, we get the disclosures. Fortunately I suppose we get lots of disclosures that we're not interested in and therefore the second thing we want to do is narrow the scope. So we're asking people who do research whether they have significant financial, outside financial interests, that might affect or be affected by their research.

The third change is to take that portion of the existing policy, it's basically section six, that dealt with Conflicts of Commitment, and remove it from the document and have it stand as its own policy and that the monitoring, enforcement, what have you, of conflicts of commitment would be basically out of the research office. That is, the Vice President for Research really cannot monitor whether a particular faculty member is meeting that faculty member's university obligations of teaching, research, and service. So we are—the three changes are to narrow the people who are covered, narrow the scope to research which is what at least under the policy the Vice President for Research is concerned about is, and to take the Conflicts of Commitment policy, take it out of the document and out of the domain of the Vice President for Research.

GROS LOUIS: Good. Are there any, yes, David?

DALEKE: I just wanted to make a comment to what Ann said and also to let you know the time schedule for this. This was read before the UFC at the last UFC meeting and it will be voted on at the next UFC meeting on March 9th. So whatever discussion we don't get to here feel free to contact Ann or me as Chair of the Research Affairs Committee and we can pass that along to the UFC when they discuss this.

GROS LOUIS: Questions at the moment? Dennis?

SENCHUK: Might there be some pieces of non-academically appointed procurement officers that might have a?

GELLIS: That's a good point. Those things are covered by other policies, the state law—we are also taking out the state law conflict of interest provisions that would relate to procurement. There are other policies that will be referenced in a Conflict of Interest policy but that are not in the domain of the Vice President for Research or the Office of Research.

So it's not that we're…you're right. There are potential non-academic conflicts of interest but they are covered either by the state policy, human resources has adopted its own policy on conflicts of interest for staff, and conflicts of commitment for staff. So I think all told we have the range of polices to deal with most situations.

GROS LOUIS: Mary?

WENNERSTROM: Can you explain the Conflict of Commitment again? I know David said that was going to be on the March 23rd agenda, is that right? Is that in here?

GELLIS: No, we've taken the Conflict of Commitment completely out of the document.

WENNERSTROM: So it's not scratched out in here somewhere?

GELLIS: It's just not there. It's just disappeared into the ether.

WENNERSTROM: Will it reappear on March 23rd in a separate document, is that it?

DALEKE: Right.

GELLIS: Right.

TERRY: But what I assume what you're going to bring to the UFC which will be this on Conflict of Interest, if adopted by the UFC would also say that until a Conflict of Commitment policy is adopted, the Conflict of Interest is still handled by the Vice President of Research and so they wouldn't, by replacing the current document temporarily eliminate a conflict of commitment.

GELLIS: No we wouldn't be eliminating, although I'm not sure. It's basically not being enforced anyway so.

WENNERSTROM: I know.

TERRY: I mean it could be some time before we get back to this and adopt through the UFC and get another Conflict of Commitment policy.

GELLIS: But the Conflict of Commitment policy does not really need any changing except to probably substitute Dean of Faculties for Vice President for Research and I think that could be done rather rapidly through the whole process. That is the only change that I am aware of.

DALEKE: We anticipate that there will only be one meeting difference between the time these are taken up. But we might put some wording in here just temporarily to what you said Herb.

GROS LOUIS: Further comments at this time? If not since we're close to the adjournment time, I suggest that we adjourn.

Adjourned 5:29 pm.

AGENDA ITEM #8: External Relations Committee: Review of Committee Charge
(Professor Richard Nash, Chair, External Relations Committee)
http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY04/ERCenabling.htm