

**Agenda**  
**Indiana University**  
**BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL**  
**November 16, 2010**  
**IMU Georgian Room**  
**3:30 P.M. - 5:30 P.M.**

**Attendance**

**MEMBERS:** Randy Arnold, Robert Arnové, Jack Bielasiak, Elizabeth Boling, Geoffrey Brown, Maria Bucur-Deckard, Jennifer Chaffin, Gregory Demas, Erika Dowell, Tony Fargo, Tom Gieryn, Donald Gjerdingen, Matthew Guterl, Karen Hanson, Diane Henshel, Brian Horne, Edwin Jimenez, Neil Kelty, Patrice Madura, Rebecca Manring, Jane McLeod, Sherri Michaels, Robert Noel, Michael Ogden, Mary Popp, Diane Reilly, Patricia Riesenman, Eric Sandweiss, Debora Shaw, Geoff Sprinkle, Sonya Stephens, Herbert Terry, Maxine Watson, Sue Whiston, Tony White, James Wimbush

**MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT:**

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Arthur Bradley, Joyce Byrer, Carolyn Calloway-Thomas, Andrea Ciccarelli, Angela Courtney, Nick D'Amico, Mark Deuze, Frank Di Silvestro, Janice Duchene, Lucas Fields, Lessie Jo Frazier, Laura Ginger, Mary Gray, Padraic Kenney, Susan Kovacich, Eugene McGregor, Elizabeth Raff, John Raglin, Ranu Samantrai, Sima Setayeshgar, Richard Shockley, Sarita Soni, H. Wayne Storey, Adam Szczepaniak, Joey Tartell, Neil Theobald

**GUESTS:** Craig Dethloff (Faculty Council Office), Jocelyn Karlan (Faculty Council Office)

**Agenda**

1. Approval of Minutes

November 2, 2010: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/minutes/10-11/11.02.10.pdf>

2. Memorial Resolutions for Robert Quirk and Judith Serebnick

Robert Quirk: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/10-11/B20-2011.pdf>

Judith Serebnick: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/10-11/B21-2011.pdf>

3. Agenda Committee Business (10 minutes)

(President pro Tempore Erika Dowell)

4. Presiding Officer's Report (10 minutes)  
(Provost Karen Hanson)

5. Question / Comment Period\* (10 minutes)

6. Report on Capital Projects on the Indiana University Bloomington Campus (45 minutes)  
(Tom Morrison, Vice President for Capital Projects and Facilities) [DISCUSSION]

7. Constitution and Rules Committee Recommendations on Proposed Bloomington Faculty Council Reform (45 minutes)

(Professors Mathew Guterl and Jane McLeod, Members of the Constitution and Rules Committee) [FIRST READING]

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/10-11/auxiliary/CRCproposals2.pdf>

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/10-11/auxiliary/BylawsMarkup2.pdf>

## Minutes

### **AGENDA ITEM 1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**HANSON:** Even though people are still arriving or celebrating the rain or something, we thought we would get started. First item of business is approval of the minutes from the November 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting.

**SHAW:** Motion.

**HANSON:** Is there a second?

**MCLEOD:** Second.

**HANSON:** Okay, moved and seconded. All in favor? [Aye] Opposed? Abstentions? Thank you, and we have today two memorial resolutions so we will turn to Tom Gieryn.

### **AGENDA ITEM 2: MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS FOR ROBERT QUIRK AND JUDITH SEREBNICK**

**GIERYN:** Professor of History, Claude Clegg, writes: I first met Robert (“Bob”) Quirk in 1998, having recently been hired by the Indiana University Department of History. Tall and slender, he routinely sauntered the seventh floor hallways of Ballantine Hall, his forward lean giving him the appearance of purpose and attentiveness. Bob had retired in 1983, but was very much attuned to the happenings of the History department and the larger profession. If my office door was open, Bob was often ready to chat. He was a man of another time, with quick recall of events that had occurred decades ago. The last time we spoke, he mentioned that he had been working on publishing a collection of correspondence between him and his wife, Marianne, during World War II. Of all of his past and present book projects, he seemed especially anxious to talk about this one, which in many ways was the crowning achievement of an illustrious career.

Robert Emmett Quirk was born in Akron, Ohio, on September 22, 1918. He served as an infantryman in the U.S. Army during the Second World War, managing to enroll in courses at the University of Utah in 1943-1944. He earned a bachelor’s degree two years later from Wayne (State) University. Quirk completed M.A. and PhD degrees in history at Harvard University in 1948 and 1951, during which time he received the Woodbury Lowery Traveling Fellowship to facilitate his research on the Mexican Revolution.

Quirk taught briefly as an instructor at both Wayne State in 1946-1947 and Mexico City College in 1950. His employment at Indiana University began in 1950, when he was appointed as an instructor of history. He rose through the professorial ranks quickly, with an appointment as assistant professor (1955-1960) and then as an associate professor (1960-1963). Just twelve years beyond his graduate training at Harvard, he was promoted to full professor in 1963. Over the course of his career, Quirk would serve in a number of other professional capacities, including Visiting Associate Professor History at the University of Texas (1960), Visiting Professor History at Columbia University (1965), and Visiting Professor of History at Hamburg University (1974-1975). Additionally, he took on prestigious administrative roles, including chairship of the IU Latin American Studies program (1963-65, 1977-1980), the managing editorship of the *Hispanic American Historical Review* (1965-1970), and the interim editorship of the *American Historical Review* (1976).

Quirk’s interest in Latin American history was best articulated through his books and articles. His first monograph in the field, *The Mexican Revolution, 1914-1915*, was published in 1960, with a Spanish language edition published two years later. *An Affair of Honor: Woodrow Wilson and the Occupation of Veracruz* appeared in 1962, winning the Frederick Jackson Turner Prize of the Organization of American Historians and concretizing Quirk’s reputation as a leader in the area Latin American Studies. IN 1973, he published *The Mexican Revolution and the Catholic Church* with Indiana University Press, which won the John G. Shea Prize of the Catholic Historical Association. Quirk also published a number of articles in venues such as the *Hispanic American Historical Review* and *Historia Mexicana*. Complementing his scholarly productivity, he received several high distinctions, such as Social Science Research Grants (1952, 1961-1962),

a Guggenheim Fellowship (1965-1966), and a Fulbright Grant (1974-1975). Furthermore, Quirk was a regular participant in professional conferences and presented papers before members of the American Historical Association, the Southern Historical Association, and the Society of Historians of American Foreign Relations.

Beyond the walls of academia, Quirk cultivated interests in gardening, fine music and wines, and basketball. However, if there was one constant in his life, it was his wife, Marianne, with whom he enjoyed sixty-five years of marriage. His last book, *When You Come Home: A Wartime Courtship in Letters, 1941-1945*, is a testament to their enduring relationship, which had weathered a war, several relocations, and the steady march of time. On May 23, 2009, Robert Emmett Quirk died at the age of ninety in Bloomington. He is survived by his wife, Marianne; their children, Anne Chafee (Jody) and Tom Quirk; and grandchildren, Henry Chafee and Tabitha Quirk.

Professor Debora Shaw from the School of Library and Information Science writes:

Judith Serebnick, professor emerita of the Indiana University School of Library and Information Science, died November 30, 2009, in Bloomington. The intellectual energy and compassion for students, colleagues, and staff she committed to the school have had a lasting impact on its program, faculty, and alumni.

Judy received her PhD degree in library and information science from Rutgers University in 1978. Her previous education included a B. A. in English literature from City College of New York and an M. A. in English literature and theater from Pennsylvania State University. She joined the Indiana University Graduate Library School (now School of Library and Information Science) faculty in 1977, bringing substantial professional experience in libraries and publishing, including reference information work at the Brooklyn Public Library and the University of California at Los Angeles, experience at Northwestern University and Princeton University, and service as book editor and assistant editor with the *Library Journal*.

Judy was the architect who redesigned the school's collection development course. Under her influence it became more than the technical acquisitions course that had been the standard in education for librarianship since the late nineteenth century. Her commitment to intellectual freedom was the core of her academic interest. She was devoted to understanding how librarians develop and maintain collections that present a range of perspectives on controversial issues. She pioneered the popular intellectual freedom seminar, which greatly extended the treatment of censorship prevalent in the 1960s and 70s. In her hands the seminar became a strong, research-oriented examination of the literature on censorship in libraries and beyond. As a student remarked in the course evaluation, "I only wish that all students could experience the stimulating discussions and the wisdom provided by Dr. Serebnick."

She was a productive researcher, but Judy felt that her primary task was teaching well. Her former students, in both the Master of Library Science and doctoral programs, remember with

pleasure her conscientious and insightful teaching and her infectious enthusiasm. She was a ready and careful advisor to master's students and especially to doctoral students on whose committees she served. She shared her enthusiasm with students. Alumni Louise Schlesinger and Ralph Gaebler remembered "Judy's classroom as a place where you wanted to come prepared... so that you could contribute to the critical examination of the issues... Judy uniquely combines a zest for teaching with a seriousness of purpose." Another former student, JoAnn Balinglit, wrote, "Her uniqueness as an educator begins with her warm, outgoing personality and the constant concern she shows for her students' progress, interests and needs. The sheer joy with which she welcomes the demands of teaching ... impresses me. I have never met a teacher so devoted to her students and so willing to shower every last drop of energy upon them. Her effervescence is continual, contagious and downright magical."

In 1991 she was awarded an Indiana University President's Award for distinguished teaching. In his nomination Dean Herbert S. White wrote, "The devotion of her students, both master's and doctoral students, is well documented in the materials that follow. What cannot be documented is the affection with which former students greet her at conferences and at alumni reunions. Of course they respect her for her knowledge, and for her effectiveness as a teacher. However, the operative word here is love."

Judy Serebnick's research interests related to her teaching: intellectual freedom, information policy in public libraries, collection development in libraries, and ethics in scholarly journal editing. Her concern with the effects of censorship on access to information was demonstrated in her dissertation on the "Relationship between Book Reviews and the Inclusion of Potentially Controversial Books in Public Libraries." She also published on the theory and practice of library collection building and ethical practices in journal publishing. In 1994 she and former doctoral student Frank Quinn received the American Library Association's Jesse H. Shera Award for Research in Library and Information Science for their article "Measuring Diversity of Opinion in Public Library Collections," which was soon published in *The Library Quarterly*.

Judy's professional service included extensive activity in the American Library Association and in the Association for Library and Information Science Education. Through all of this activity she gave liberally of herself. She retired from Indiana University in 1994.

A native New Yorker, Judy adjusted to life in the Midwest and relearned to drive at age fifty-eight, after a lapse of ten years. In retirement she had more time to regale her friends with stories of her adventures, enjoy her flowers, and explore southern Indiana -- from local restaurants and the Bloomington Farmers Market to small towns where she could find just the right piece of pottery. Judy loved life and enriched the lives of friends and colleagues. She will be remembered fondly for her devotion to friends, her bubbly laughter that was so hard to resist, and her enthusiasm for about just about everything (especially gardening, IU basketball, baking, cats, and ANYTHING her friends were involved in doing).

**HANSON:** Thank you, Tom. May I ask you stand for a moment of silence? Thank you. Next is Agenda Committee business.

### **AGENDA ITEM 3: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

**DOWELL:** Thank you. I want to apologize to everyone about our last meeting in which we had a number of hurried presentations at the end and no time for discussion. We're working on getting Fred Glass and the Athletics Committee back for some question and answer time. Herb has just passed out something related to that, but I haven't really had a chance to digest it. Brad Wheeler's presentation, I think, was informative and we talked about it in Agenda Committee and we didn't think we needed him back right away, but I do want to point out the website [etexts.iu.edu](http://etexts.iu.edu) which you may have noticed highlighted on the Oncourse homepage recently. Its FAQ includes some indications of where policies need to be developed and I think we're going to take that up at the committee level when it comes to the policies. It also states that, "IU is making this option," – the option of an eTexts fee – "available for faculty to choose beginning in Summer 2011." So I don't know that that got mentioned specifically during his presentation, but I'll just highlight that again. And as for David Daleke's visit to talk about the NRC Graduate Program Rankings, we're talking to him to see if he is interested in just having some sort of separate meeting where people who are intensely interested in it can get together and talk over the data. Maybe something co-sponsored by BFC but didn't feel it necessarily that it needed to come back to the Council for questions. Let me know if you disagree with that or if you have a problem with any of those avenues of further kind of talk about those issues. In health care news, the ad hoc committee on the Health Engagement Program is working on its final report, they expect to have it to BFC after Thanksgiving. Also Dan Rives has asked for appointments to an Employee Health Care Program Advisory Committee. This is to have representation from all campuses as well as from different faculty, staff, and professional level employees. So the BFC and the Agenda Committee and the Nominations Committee are putting forward names, we are just discussing exactly who right now, and we'll most likely propose to have two people from the current ad hoc committee move on to serve in that capacity. Hopefully a lot of the work done in our ad hoc committee will actually inform what happens in that advisory committee. But I think its formation is something that is also necessary from the administrative perspective. And thanks to everybody who responded to the call for nominations for BFC. The Nominations Committee will be meeting soon to look over the list and resolve any tie votes and then the process of asking those nominated if they are willing to run will begin. That's it, that's what I got.

### **AGENDA ITEM 4: PRESIDING OFFICER'S REPORT**

**HANSON:** Thanks, Erika. I don't have a lengthy report to give to you today, but I really want to reiterate the call for you to give your comments to the New Academic Directions Committee. We still have not received many faculty comments and I would urge you to email in your comments or talk to a member of the committee, talk to me or any of the listed committee members or just in a spare moment email your thoughts. Again, you don't have to have something well composed just any thoughts that bear on these organizational issues. We would be grateful for that. That committee has a very short timeline, and we really only have a couple of meetings remaining. I know that all the Faculty Council standing committees are also working on this issue and I urge you to bring to completion whatever you might want to be providing the other committee because it does only have only a couple of meetings left. So thank you for whatever efforts you've been putting into that and again, do feel free to come forward with your suggestions. We had no questions or comments conveyed to us except one that we promptly conveyed to Vice President Morrison, so unless there are questions – are there any questions from the floor today? We have none? And yes.

**TERRY:** I'd just like to comment. I handed out something to the members so I can summarize it very quickly. Last meeting's agenda you were given links to a question that I sent to Provost Hanson and response from Vice President Glass on the matter of IU joining many other universities in extending verbal financial aid offers to very young student athletes. At IU they've been as young as fourteen and those at other universities have been as young as thirteen. Part of the context of my concern is that the NCAA is actually considering what they would call legislation, regulations, on the matter. And they will consider that legislation in the meeting in San Antonio in early January. So if we want to say anything about it, we need to say it expeditiously. What this memo proposes is that I hope the Agenda Committee will find a way to bring this matter to us at our next meeting as a result of some discussion or examination of the issue by a group that the Agenda committee could choose. It could be the Athletics Committee. I hope it would be a faculty committee as the Athletics Committee is a mixture of faculty and alums and others. I don't know what committee to recommend, maybe the Agenda Committee itself. What I have discovered from doing some more research is that a number of distinguished coaches take the risk of appearing hypocritical. They engage in this practice and they none the less express the opinion that they don't like it very much and they kind of hope this legislation be adopted. And Fred Glass in his memo defended the practice but admitted that this legislation was pending and subsequently Coach Crean was quoted in Indiana papers as saying if it got adopted he'd adapt like everybody else. I, personally, think the practice is a bad one, I don't think that thirteen year olds are quite in the position to decide what college they should go to. Everyone has pointed out that these verbal commitments don't mean much. The athlete can change his or her mind; the university has many ways to decide not to admit somebody, that it can change its mind. Which is one of the reasons why I think it would be a good idea if we joined other institutions that are supporting – if not necessarily the exact language of the current NCAA legislation –at least the review that the matter will get at the NCAA in January. So

I hope that the Agenda Committee will take this letter seriously and find a way to bring this to us at the December meeting so that if we have anything to say we can get it said before the NCAA meets in January.

**HANSON:** Any other questions or comments? Okay, well then we will turn to the Report on Capital Projects of the Campus. And we have joining us today Tom Morrison, Vice President for Capital Projects and Facilities. Thanks, Tom.

## **AGENDA ITEM 6: REPORT ON CAPITAL PROJECTS ON THE INDIANA UNIVERSITY BLOOMINGTON CAMPUS**

**MORRISON:** Thank you, Provost Hanson. If it is okay, I'm going to try to speak from over here if everybody can hear me, because I'm going to use a lot of pictures, a lot of images, things like that to talk about capital development here on the Bloomington Campus. I'm going to do a couple of things. I'm going to actually run you through the same report that I give to the Board of Trustees about the major capital projects that are ongoing and have been just completed here on the Bloomington Campus. Then I am going to talk about the status of some projects that are in planning. Then I'm going to walk you through – if we have a little bit of time to walk you through – some of the components of the master plan.

So let me move ahead and so first things first, let me talk about the Bloomington Capital Projects Update. These are projects that were completed in the summer or fall of this past year. The first one – and I hope you've had the opportunity to see some of these – this is the former Ashton Complex, now we're calling it the Union Street Center. Seven new residence hall buildings and this project was completed this summer in time for the students to move in. It was right up to the deadline and of course the weather did not cooperate in our landscaping plan and so we delayed that until October and fortunately that has turned green at this time as well. So we're pleased with that. This project was estimated to come in at, as you see on the screen, about \$80 million. It came in just over \$70 million so we're very pleased with that. That is the benefit of the economic climate, we're seeing bids for projects come in much lower and this was the first one we did after the economy went south and we benefited from that. This complex does also include some academic classroom space – that are very nice classroom spaces – and I know will probably be very, very popular. The student units, the housing units, are very popular as well and very different from when we all went to college. If you haven't seen a residence hall room designed to the new standard I would encourage you to do so and you'll probably be a little bit shocked but students find it very appealing. These are just a couple more images. And again this is the facility that does house some of the classroom space and I encourage you take a look at it.



1319 East 10<sup>th</sup> this is the house beside the Wells House and it is adjacent to SPEA. It was in very bad condition and we fully renovated this house and did a small addition to it for the benefit of the Kelley School of Business. This was completed this summer as well. Very practical space, very beneficial and at the same time this project again was estimated at about \$1.5 million dollars and probably came in the \$800,000-\$900,000 thousand range. So we benefited on this one, too.

The Informatics Addition, if you can imagine the Informatics Complex on the corner of 10<sup>th</sup> and Woodlawn – two old Greek houses, fraternity and sorority houses, very different architectural styles. This project joined the two together to the rear with a little bit of a courtyard, very effective space, adding new classroom space and some new offices. This project came in on time for the start of the semester and again, very nice classroom spaces.

This project is the Chambers of Judge Hamilton of the U.S. District Court. This was one that we were pledged to secrecy for a long time, because it was a project that was funded by the federal government – Judge Hamilton electing to move his chambers from Chicago to Bloomington and to be housed at the Maurer School of Law. And so we did serious renovation to the space on the second floor of the Maurer School and really it is a very nice space. It obviously is to specifications of the federal government and all the security there unto, but we're very pleased with this project and it is now open and available for Judge Hamilton.

The Athletics Academic Center: this space was one that once the North End Zone Project was complete it vacated space on the east side where locker rooms used to be and so this became an academic development center, tutoring space, classroom space – and those are again general purpose classrooms that can be scheduled and making the most out of what was very much a dungeinous space underneath the stadium, it is now an academic space. This project, again, estimated at about \$3 million probably came in at about \$2.4 or \$2.5 million and is now open for business.

Assembly Hall Roof Replacement: these are some of the less glamorous projects that we get to do a lot that most people don't see, but if you have been to a basketball game in Assembly Hall previously, in fact, I am looking forward to going to the game tonight to see if it worked. [laughter] Because I can tell you that I was one of those spectators, within the last year, that was getting dripped on from above and it was pervasive. We had a situation where we were concerned about potential danger of the ceiling getting wet and coming down, and so after the season was over last season we replaced the roof and put a new skin on the roof. Again every indication is that we're all dry again and safe again. You can see in this image here, if you look right there, you can't tell...but that's daylight. So when they peeled back some of the skin you could see straight up. And that's what happens to roofs over time. After thirty, forty years of use they rust, they deteriorate. Happens in every building no matter what building you're in, the same thing happens.

This project, the Cinema Theatre Project, here in Bloomington right behind the Auditorium: this project was just completed. In fact, we did our first events there last week. You may have read about it in the paper. Really, that was kind of the dry run to make sure that everything worked. The real opening of this facility will happen in January – the dedication will happen in January. So when you get a chance, if you haven't been in there – many of you got a chance last week – when you get a chance to go in I think you will find it quite stunning. To bring that facility back to its original appearance, the murals have been restored; we took great care in the historic preservation of the facility. That's the cinema side of this. The theatre side of this was an R&R project that we did to put in new classroom space and new practice space for the Theatre program and I know that faculty have already moved into that space. So this really has been a very good restoration project and an R&R project that we're very pleased with.

The Morton C. Bradley Center, Education Center, this was a project – again a bit of historic preservation – moving an old barn from western Monroe County piece by piece here to the campus and then re-erecting it as an education center. This project is now complete, and I'm very excited.

Now let me talk about projects that are under construction right now. The last one is actually – you can call it the Morton Bradley Center – it's the Wylie House for those of you who know.

Cyberinfrastructure Building: if you drive by 10<sup>th</sup> and the Bypass you've seen this project coming out of the ground and the images I show here are about a month old and we've made quite a bit of progress in the last month. This project has benefited from one, a very good bid climate, but also very good weather. While it's been very dry, and most of us are concerned about that, this is one of the good parts of it as it doesn't slow down construction. In fact this one has sped up and we anticipate this building will be closed in before the New Year – before January 1<sup>st</sup>. Once that happens it really starts to fly. So we anticipate this project will be done in May or June of next year there at 10<sup>th</sup> and the Bypass. Now to help you to answer the one question that Provost Hanson did forward to me, one of the questions that I get quite a bit is, what about the Bypass project? And as you know the Bypass reconstruction is not a university project, but we are very much concerned bystanders because we are constantly trying to make sure that that project doesn't negatively impact our property because we are the property holders on much of both sides of that project. The project has been going fairly well again because of the weather. Now it was quite stunning to all of us, myself included, when they tore down all those trees back during the summer when all of them went in one fell swoop. That's rather shocking to the system. I was telling somebody earlier that by and large they were tearing down their own trees. They weren't our trees. They were cutting down trees that were in the right-of-way. It was within INDOT's right-of-way and they probably should have been doing that over time anyway and they grew up over time. So it's been a little bit shocking but they are very purposeful in their work and that's one – I'm going to try to say this as positively as possible – they are purposeful in their work because now that this project has been on the books for thirty years and it's finally moving forward they – they the state – don't want anything to slow them

up. So even when we might tell them there is a tree that we think is on our property, they'll come out and say, 'nope drawing says it's here' and the next day it's gone. So they are very purposeful in their work. It's not that they are negative. They're just blinders on going forward. We are trying to work with them on certain ingress and egress points that we have. The design of this was done quite some time ago and we had input on the design that affects us, particularly there at 10<sup>th</sup> and the Bypass. And again nothing negative, we're working with them, but they are very purposeful in what they do. And I would be happy to answer any questions about any of these projects including this one but I want to make sure that I covered that.

Briscoe Quad Renovation, the Briscoe Complex, If you've been by there at the corner of 17<sup>th</sup> and Fee on the southwest corner there are two high-rise buildings as part of this complex. One of those is vacant right now being gutted and being renovated, again back to a new housing style that is more suite driven as opposed to the old double bunking quarters and, you know, two to a room. Putting in suites, so once this tower is done – that's the one that's under construction right now – then they will move into this tower the following year. So that project is on-going right now.

The HPER Courtyard Project: this project, some of you may not know, in the inside of the HPER Building there was a little courtyard. I often, don't take this the wrong way, describe it as a prison yard and it was totally enclosed, very nonfunctional space and so we are filling that in to add in more classroom space which is a dire need in many buildings on campus. That's what this project is. It is ongoing. It is under budget as well and is probably going to come in a little above \$5 million.

Let me update you first, before I talk about the master plan, on some other projects that are in the works. What I showed you are the major construction projects on the Bloomington Campus. We also have at any given time many, many R&R projects going on, Renovation and Rehabilitation projects. That range everything from replacing roofs to drainage to plumbing to electrical and things like that, steam works and tunnels. When I talk about R&R in our world I worry about, and this is what we have to do so that you don't have to, we worry about the things you don't see. We worry about all the things that exist in tunnels. We worry about making sure that electricity works every day. We worry about heating and cooling and ventilation. When we went through the long periods this summer of 90° day after day after day that created a strain on the system, and so that then becomes evident of some work that we need to do. So those are R&R projects that you see going on around the campus and maybe in some of your buildings or digging up sidewalks and things like that. Yes, they are inconvenient but they are necessity to keep this place going. The other thing that I would tell you is when we see that type of work it means that it's being funded and when it's being funded we have been beneficiaries of – even though the state cut R&R funding down to zero in this past biennium – we were fortunate enough to have it replaced with federal stimulus money. So we have been the beneficiaries of stimulus money and that is what we are using for many of those R&R projects. But I would tell you on a campus like Bloomington R&R is a need that never goes

away. When I talk about the things you can't see, you probably worry also about the things you can see – paint that needs to be done, and wall fixtures and things like that, pulled ceilings. Those are all part of those things, too. Vice President Theobald and I have been working on, for the past several months, on financial plans to try to set aside funds, as best we can, to address the future R&R needs because we're anticipating that, in the state budget at least, that those R&R funds will be scarce if at all and we know those projects keep coming. And then on top of it we don't see another federal stimulus program coming. So we are trying to make sure that we are adequately funded over the next several years until the state gets back on its feet and can fund out R&R formula the way we need it to. That's R&R, the other thing in terms of major capital projects, a couple of projects that are in planning, the International Studies Building is designed and we are awaiting funding and fundraising on that project. To move forward that will be a critical one for the master plan. The Kelley School of Business Expansion is also designed and that one is working on fundraising as well. So those are two major capital projects that are underway and then I'll talk to you about some master plan projects that we see coming down the road as I work through the master plan presentation. We also probably are looking at another residence hall complex coming on line in the planning phase. We haven't started the planning phase yet, but much like the Ashton Complex with the Union Street Center you'll probably see another coming out later as well as we start to try to replace our housing stock. So let me – any questions about capital projects before I get into master planning? Yes?

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** I'm very interested in hearing what the "new standard" means in terms of the Union Street Project and, in particular, I was very surprised to see that each apartment has cable TV and washer driers. Are these washer driers operated with coins?

**MORRISON:** That's a good question. I honestly don't know.

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** They're not, I don't think so. I'm very concerned about that. [multiple indistinct comments] Well, but you know, this semester is dedicated to sustainability, and it's very nice to get nice grades in the paper that we are trying doing this and that and recycle, but that's a major issue if each apartment has its own... I mean, you know, who sets up the standard? I actually looked through all the floor plans of all the other apartment buildings, not one of them has those standards. So is this something that's going to continue to happen in this way and is there any discussion about whether these are reasonable standards? Or maybe not? I personally don't find them reasonable. That's what I want to say.

**MORRISON:** Let me talk about how the design process works and they are very much student centered. They work with student groups and their student governance system to identify those things that students look for in housing complexes. I know that probably came out of that process. So that's where it comes from and then they will go through on the next one going through the same thing as to what the standard is. Now, I would also share that there is a level, and I'm not justifying it by any means, but there is a level of taste that is even higher than that,

that our Board of Trustees said, 'Don't go there.' There are other universities that are doing single rooms with washer and dryer, you know, and...

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** Were these details shared with our Board of Trustees?

**MORRISON:** Yes, but it was really student driven.

**ARNOVE:** With regard to the residence halls. Do you know the number of students who are now residing in dormitories on campus? And how that number compares with five years ago? Is it greater, equal to, or less than the number of students [indistinct comment].

**MORRISON:** I believe, again, probably a better housing question than me but I... the total number, I believe, is around 12,000. I believe it's been static.

**ARNOVE:** More students, but not more dormitory space?

**MORRISON:** Correct. Correct, and so one of our goals is to ever so slightly increase that housing stock, but for the most part start to replace some of what we have. The Union Street Center are the first new housing facilities we've built here in forty years. So that's an effort to replace some and we see the projection has us growing it by ever so slightly. It also speaks to that enrollment here is probably not going to grow a lot, we are up a little bit now in this latest bubble but our plan is not to grow enrollment.

**ARNOVE:** Are there classroom spaces in all the dormitories plus new facilities?

**MORRISON:** There are in Collins, and I'm trying to think...

**ARNOVE:** The new ones?

**MORRISON:** The new...there are in the new ones in Union Street as I was talking about, and we have not designed the next one yet. [indistinct discussion] Let me grab this one here.

**TERRY:** It's a comment, as well as a question I guess, about R&R. You know I'm well aware that we've delayed R&R for decades. I know we have real needs. We have asked the General Assembly for R&R money instead of for a new capital project, at least, unless we change in the next two days. We've asked them for that, but given the outcome of the election, the state's finances, and other sorts of things I share you pessimism that we're going to get much. At the last Trustees meeting Vice President Theobald announced that the central administration was going to sequester half of the unbudgeted tuition income. He said after the expense of the units, and covering the cost of the unbudgeted students have been taken out. That seems to have come to a surprise to some of the campus deans, and some of them are arguing that they are going to have to make academic cuts, because they didn't get the unbudgeted tuition income, which rightly or wrongly they have sort of received in the past and thought they would get again. My comment is I hope you and Neil are very creative at finding the means internally

of addressing our R&R needs that are developed in consultation with the academic units so that the deans certainly know what is coming and have input to the plan to generate R&R funds that we simply have to have. If you have a reaction, that's fine.

**MORRISON:** No, I agree with you and I think Neil does as well. Our intent would be, understanding that R&R funding is going to be scare if at all, is to utilize whatever state monies we get or anything we get through savings to invest that in infrastructure – those things you don't see. Because we know those things fail and we have to replace things like cooling towers and things like that. But in any funding that might be generated from the academic units, from the schools, one of the things that I've recommended is that we focus those recourses on classrooms, because one of the things that we certainly hear is that we need classroom spaces to be improved and we need additional classroom spaces as well. And so those are the things that fall out, unfortunately, when you don't have enough state funded R&R, because you fund the emergencies and you don't fund the restoration. Those are the things, I think to your point, of working with the schools and college to identify what are those critical classrooms things that we would have.

**TERRY:** I just hope you take into account when they say 'we can't afford it without making academic cuts' that those are difficult choices. I hate to see further deferral of painting maintenance but while we may have to continue to defer that we have to maintain essential infrastructure we can't let that by.

**MORRISON:** Right.

**TERRY:** I realize that things may get a little shabbier –

**MORRISON:** Right.

**TERRY:** – but that's the cost of the current economic situation.

**MORRISON:** And we understand that.

**HENSHEL:** The first question is actually an add-on to the question about the washers and dryers and then I have a question that I really had. But given that you are putting the washers and dryers without, first of all, without coin payment or anything like that, how are you compensating for the cost of the water and how are you encouraging appropriate use of water and third how are you adjusting to the fact that there are going to be overflows and therefore damage from water, because they don't necessarily always know what they are doing? So that's the first question, is how are you dealing with that issue. The second is related to the 10<sup>th</sup> and the Bypass which is an issue which keeps coming up and if they're on their way to doing 10<sup>th</sup> and the Bypass what are they going to do about pedestrians because we have more and more students on the other side and we going to get another kid killed.

**MORRISON:** Let me first start with your first question, and again I have to preface that I'm not the housing folks.

**HENSHEL:** I understand.

**MORRISON:** And so I'm not dealing with student's every day and their behaviors. My assessment is you're absolutely right and that we're going to have those issues. In terms of the costs, the costs of that in terms of both, all the utilities are born by the residents of that space so that figures into the rate. So water, electricity, all those things figure into that rate. I would say that the housing staff does a very good job of educating students on the benefits of sustainability, and so that helps. Now, I wouldn't stand here today and say that every eighteen to nineteen year old is going to, you know, make the right choices about how they use water and then overflows and things like that. I will tell you the story that after the complex opened one of the most immediate problems we had is those units have kitchens and stoves – small ones – we had, I want to say six, fires within the first two weeks. Small ones, thankfully, and you know, popcorn and things like that. And there literally were those issues of students cooking for the first time. So that is something that the housing staff is taking as an immediate challenge, I'm happy to report that has died off.

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** You mean they're not cooking anymore! [laughter]

**MORRISON:** So the housing staff has been going through the education phase because someone like me is saying to them, we can't keep having fire trucks come. I understand your point. On the pedestrian safety issue at 10<sup>th</sup> and the Bypass, that is something that we hammered on quite a bit with INDOT about their design. One of the things that they did agree to in the end was two pedestrian paths going vertically along both sides of the Bypass – bike paths, pedestrian paths on either side. That is one of the reasons you are going to see it as wide as it is, is because we asked for it – those paths. In terms of crossing at 10<sup>th</sup> and the Bypass the remedy was the underground bypass that will be south of the intersection, so there'll be an underground pass just south of the railroad tracks that will come underneath right there for students coming from the other side.

**HENSHEL:** But there are going to be students that won't take that tunnel.

**MORRISON:** I understand. I completely understand.

**HENSHEL:** So, I mean, an island of safety in the middle would be helpful. Anything that helps prevent death, you know.

**MORRISON:** Right, agreed.

**BROWN:** Do you have any sense of cost for students in the new space? Because I think we're...I know there is pressure to have more luxurious accommodations for students, but I am actually

quite concerned that we are on a path of mutually assured destruction as colleges get too expensive for most students.

**MORRISON:** Right, that is something that the Trustees, as I was mentioning before, have been very strong about. Saying we don't want to create, I'm paraphrasing from the Trustees, a culture of the haves and the have-nots. Meaning the haves can afford the really nice spaces and then, you know, everybody else can be in these spaces over here and that we want to shorten the gap between those two things. Again I couldn't tell you what housing costs are because that's not what we do, but I will tell you I know that feeling from the Trustees because I was there during those debates. That when – I'll give the example – Purdue went with an all singles high-end residence hall where I think the yearly cost to the student was around \$15,000 a year and we said absolutely not.

**BROWN:** But you really haven't answered my question at all how this affects the cost, the average cost of the housing for IU students. Did it drive it up? Is it neutral? I don't think it's neutral

**MORRISON:** No, it's not. No, I know that the housing cost to the student goes up just like tuition goes up. Just because of inflation.

**BROWN:** I didn't really mean by inflation, I meant because of the improvement to the standard.

**MORRISON:** Well let me answer that question. Curiously housing on a college campus is not funded in the immediate, it's funded over time. So students for the last thirty years, part of their money has been going to the debt to pay off post bond issues and to pay off going forward. So everybody is paying a little bit on...so that if we build a dorm today we're not skyrocketing that on just those students who will only live in that for four years.

**BROWN:** But you're still driving...

**BIELASIAK:** I have a follow-up question to this actually. Do you happen to know what the occupancy rate is at the Union [Street] new housing?

**MORRISON:** I think it's 100%.

**BIELASIAK:** Because I've heard from some students that they were being priced out from, you know, they could not afford that particular price tag. They were looking for dorm space but were being offered dorm space in that complex and there was a shortage of affordable housing for them someplace else. I don't know how true that is. That's my concern are students sort of being priced out by [indistinct comment] luxurious accommodations.

**MORRISON:** I think what I am going to recommend is that you –



**DOWELL:** Yeah?

**HANSON:** It's not true. I mean some people may have been priced out of what they wanted, and there are big disparities in the costs. You know Mason right across the way from the 10<sup>th</sup> building, the new one, costs, you know, almost half of the Union Street one.

**KELTY:** Yes, I just checked!

**HANSON:** But Union Street filled up quickly.

**JIMENEZ:** I don't have a question. I might be able to help on some of the housing stuff.

**MORRISON:** Good!

**KELTY:** I was an RA last year in McNutt. I think it's important to point out that the Union Street is primarily an upperclassman dorm so it's not like we throw freshman right into there. I think there might be some freshman space but I'm not sure on that. But it is primarily upperclassman. I think it's important from a student perspective to offer these kinds of amenities on campus. I guess a rhetorical question, but I heard two concerns about washers and dryers. I don't know how many of you have coin washers and dryers in your own personal homes, so I think offering –

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** I did for four years as an undergraduate.

**KELTY:** – I think, I mean, in my off campus apartment I have a washer and dryer without a coin. That's what students are going to expect these days and if we want them to continue to live on campus in that environment we're going to have to offer that kind of competitive amenities. I think Union Street is somewhere around \$900 a month depending on whether you go with four, three, two, or one.

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** It's \$8,700 for one of the larger apartments per semester. [multiple comments "per semester?"] Per year. [multiple "yeah"] I'm sorry. Just ignore it. Apologies.

**REILLY:** I just have an opinion on this which is, I remember both being willing to pay a dollar in order to wash one pair of jeans when I was an undergraduate, because I needed them the next day. [laughter] So having a coin operated laundries isn't necessarily going to make people more responsible. [laughter] But I really like the idea that upperclassman who are over the drinking age will still be living on campus and may actually walk to their entertainment rather than driving. I like the idea of increasing the range of students of all years who are living on campus. I think that's the responsible thing for us to do. And if we have to give them free laundry – but put meters on their apartments so we know how much they're using – but if we have to give them free laundry in order to encourage that I think that is a good idea.

**JIMENEZ:** Yes, the Union Street apartments filled up immediately because I'm a grad student and those were the options, there and Willkie. And so I know that the demographic of the population in the new Union apartments is similar to what you expect from Willkie. So you might have more experience from your expectations from the student body that lives in Willkie. As for the machines, she made a very good point that there are big industrial sized machines in Willkie that will run for however much it costs to do one or two things the machines in the Union Street apartments are smaller so as far as water waste goes it's a smaller amount. Also the apartments there have more than one bedroom so you generally have a few people who do their things together as opposed to in a singular situation where they'll just do it on their own. And you make a very good point also – as a grad student and considering that Willkie and Union were the only options for on campus living for grad students –it was very appealing to us. So that's why most of us said we want to go into Union immediately and it got full and so I ended up at Willkie. They also have the students, like the Q's and things like that, also educate the population on sustainability issues and stuff like that. And there aren't freshmen there, so you run into less of those, oh-this-is-my-first-time-using-a-washing-machine issues. But as a student I can say that it's very appealing and it's something that I think can certainly be done in a very sustainable way and in a measured way like you said by maybe attaching meters and things like that. But I know it wouldn't be a good idea to try and take it away because it's become so appealing that lots of people want to go in there and I know for a fact that lots of students who are living off campus now are considering coming back when there's more available space in Union Street.

**DOWELL:** I want to change the topic to...

**MORRISON:** Great! [Laughter]

**DOWELL:** Probably another favorite thing parking. You said there's fundraising going on for the International Studies Building and certainly for those of us in that vicinity there has been talk of a new garage kind of yoked to that.

**MORRISON:** I know you'd be surprised to hear that parking is an issue and, yes, we know that if we build the International Studies Building that is one of the busiest, if not the busiest, surface lots on the campus. Therefore we're going to have to look at an alternative to that space. The question is, and assuming we would have to build a garage, to try to go vertical. The question is location. The master plan has called for a garage that would be east of the Health Center potentially in that surface lot there and going vertical. That is one location. And then there is another location in the master plan long-term for a garage somewhere in the housing area that's bounded by 3<sup>rd</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> where the Education Building is, all in that space there. So we are right now doing some planning discussion, I have a meeting later this week with our master planner to try to flush this out a little bit more as to where we go because we know that again to take that surface lot away particularly as busy as it is for the library and for the arts district; it

is one of the busiest surface lots that we have so we know we are going to have to replace it somehow.

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** The issue with the library is that people carry heavy things to and from that building so distance to the building by foot...

**MORRISON:** Right, and also still having to maintain some degree of disability access as well.

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** Oh that's...yeah, right.

**MORRISON:** That's all part of the mix. The International Studies Building gets built, as I think you know, fronting the Arboretum and so we'll deal with what we deal with in that space behind there. But that is one of the things we've been talking about as part of the master plan. Good question.

**TERRY:** One other thing that has been discussed most of the years I've been here is what to do with the old library building, Franklin Hall.

**MORRISON:** Yes!

**TERRY:** You haven't mentioned that.

**MORRISON:** I'm ready to, thank you for your prompt!

**TERRY:** In response to Maria's thing, can I ask a theoretical question. I mean in some communities, municipalities, who follow the principle of concurrency planning. They don't build the buildings until they also know they how they are going to build the infrastructure, the parking ramps and this sort of thing; we don't quite do that here. We've build structures and then discover we have to expand chilled water plants and other such –

**MORRISON:** Well, that is absolutely my goal to do it exactly the way that you say. It's the reason why we're having those discussions now about that parking ramp because of knowing that, if we go and do that we're doing it backwards.

**TERRY:** Okay.

**MORRISON:** So that's one issue now let me also deal with the question of, I'm going to back into your Franklin Hall question, the issue of utilities and of chilled water and steam and things like that. We know that we're going to have to continue to ramp up our service in that area. We've got an older system—number one—and we need more capacity—number two. And so one of the things that came out of the legislative request process and the task forces that worked on that, that include faculty, is our number one project going forth to the General Assembly in this session is the renovation of several buildings on the Old Crescent, Franklin being one of them. But included in that is also utility upgrades. Knowing that – and again, this past summer this was one of the fortunate things about doing some planning during the summer is that,

again, it was 90° day after day – it was right on people’s minds that our air conditioning is right on that cusp. So that is part of the money that we’re requesting from the General Assembly is to upgrade our utilities at the same time we do that project. So that answered that. Franklin, one of the things I was going to talk about in terms of the master plan, is the master plan talks about reinvigorating the academic core, which means the Old Crescent. We are looking at – there’s an Old Crescent Taskforce that’s meeting now –and we are looking at emptying the administrative functions out of Franklin. I can’t tell you today who might move back in there, but the goal is to reinvigorate that space with foot traffic that is all day and all night long as opposed to 8 - 5 which is more administrative. So you can imagine classroom space, you can imagine something that has student foot traffic to it. Because one of the things that the master planners were very concerned about is that we have this beautiful academic core and it really becomes nonexistent after 5 o’clock. So to reinvigorate that core you’ve got to drive student foot traffic. And Franklin is one of the first buildings that we are looking at. We’ve already emptied what the President calls the Great Hall, the big old library space that’s in there. So that space is just about empty. We know that UITS will be moving out of that once the Cyberinfrastructure Building opens up. Research is moving out of there. We’re making some gains in emptying that building and so that will be the first focus for renovation money should the state, hopefully, grant that project. Let me...Tom?

**GIERYN:** The university and the city have worked together to provide some more safe crossings of major streets. I’m thinking primarily of 10<sup>th</sup> Street there in front of Kelley and SPEA. There is another spot on the east side of campus, Jordan by the Admissions Office and Neil Marshall. That happens to be the pedestrian path that goes from Union Street, if you follow the beautiful new path and follow the Jordan River you end up crossing Jordan at that particular point on your way into the central campus, so we can expect even more traffic. Are there plans in the works to beef up...?

**MORRISON:** Yes.

**GIERYN:** Good.

**MORRISON:** Actually, part of our goal. The new Music Building is going to be built; you will see ground broken for that probably sometime in the spring, will go on the corner of 3<sup>rd</sup> and Jordan where there’s an apartment building now. So part of our plan for that was a landscaping plan that makes a boulevard out of Jordan from 3<sup>rd</sup> Street all the way up to 7<sup>th</sup> – the bridge gets in the way – but when I say boulevard, divided median, so that students and faculty and visitors have a place to land in the middle of the street. Someone made the same comment. I mean, that is something that we can work with the city on and they are very supportive, and so that’s one of the things that, as I moved to this community, noticing the haphazard way that people cross streets and not everybody – I know you are going to be shocked – not all students cross at the crosswalks. And they have their earbuds in and so we are trying to find ways to have them land, and those two crosswalks that you mentioned were the first two kind of experimental

ways to do that and I have seen it work in other places and so we've done that one on 10<sup>th</sup> and we did the other one on Fee, and so we would like to take that further but on Jordan, like I said, we would like to go from 7<sup>th</sup> all the way back to 3<sup>rd</sup> Street. It's because of the foot traffic for everything that goes in there, but that would be a joint city project if we can get funded.

**TERRY:** A very quick-follow up. Did the Trustees approve the tunnel connecting the new music building and the current buildings?

**MORRISON:** They did not.

**TERRY:** They did not.

**ARNOVE:** How do you go about articulating the Physical Plant planning with what area called academic needs planning? You mentioned that old campus for example and the need for more classrooms there, we've heard about the need for more science labs, but with whom are you talking to know what the academic needs are?

**MORRISON:** There are various committees beyond the normal communication that I have with the Provost and all of the academic leadership and the Deans, it happens in very formal ways with different committees, whether it's the Classroom Committee or – and you are going to catch me in all of the names of the committees that we deal with – but we get input from them because I don't ever want to be in the position of trying to determine, without the input of faculty, what the academic needs are. You know, our job is to build space, renovate space, but it's not our group or our architects who determine what effective pedagogy is or, you know, what classrooms ought to look like and how they ought to be designed. So that is something that we do see a lot of input on. When the master planners were doing their work they went through that exercise with the academic leadership and doing lots of interviews to find out what the needs were and both on the research side and on the classroom side. We're working on now an ongoing list of: what are the classrooms that really need renovation throughout the campus, and what are the lab spaces?

**BROWN:** Related to the pedestrian question, is there anything in the master plan to make this a little more of a bicycle-friendly campus? It's a pretty unfriendly campus with respect to the bicyclists.

**MORRISON:** It is, it's not the most bicycle-unfriendly place I have ever seen, but it's got some issues. And yes, the master plan does speak about bike paths and making it more, not only a bike-friendly but a pedestrian-friendly campus, a walkable campus. One of the debates we're having internally now is, in terms of redesign, is do you do those bike paths on the streets if the streets already aren't wide enough? So that even if you mark a bike path on the street, if there isn't enough room for two cars to go like that [holds both his hands out flat and side by side] are we creating a more dangerous situation for the bicyclists than we had before? So we are talking about do we on some – we are looking at 10<sup>th</sup> street to tell you the truth – do we put in

a double sidewalk there? You know, one that's a bike path and one that's a pedestrian path so that we don't create a situation – because we are not sure that 10<sup>th</sup> street is wide enough.

**BROWN:** But what about the north-south? There actually isn't a way for a bicycle to cross campus north-south that's legal.

**MORRISON:** Same thing. We need to look at all of those bike paths. Also as part of 10<sup>th</sup> we are looking at Woodlawn, too –a long streetscaping. So the answer is yes, and that is a concern of ours, because, by and large, we know that people want to drive their cars. We know that we need parking garages. But if we don't do something to reduce the number of – it's almost impossible to reduce the number of cars we would like to – but something to decrease the volume of vehicular traffic, and bicycles are one of the ways that you do that.

**HENSHEL:** Would you consider not allowing freshman or even freshman and sophomores not to have cars on campus? That they could park at the stadium or something, and be able to keep them there even during the games? There are many other schools that do that. We are actually unusual in letting our students drive as freshmen and sophomores.

**MORRISON:** I'll be clear that that decision is not something that's in our purview, however, the master plan does speak to that, the master plan does speak to the potential of taking more advantage of storage parking so that you take advantage of the big lots that you have.

**HENSHEL:** Well, especially for freshman and sophomores where you want to encourage them to be on campus and stay on campus.

**MORRISON:** Right.

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** Is Ballantine Hall on anybody's horizon in terms of...? [laughter]

**MORRISON:** You have no idea!

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** I mean speaking of sustainability and all those window units that are killing us!

**MORRISON:** Yes, Ballantine is mentioned quite a bit in the master plan. It's probably... Yes, all of the air conditioning units...

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** ...and many other things.

**MORRISON:** And many other things. I told the Provost just other day that my Ballantine list is a really long list.

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** It's 50° degrees on one side and 90° on the other side. Any day.

**MORRISON:** Every once in a while I have this dream of just tearing down Ballantine [murmurs] but in terms of re-use, so the master plan has contemplated an addition to Ballantine and again assuming that we can work through – there is a set of dominoes that needs to happen before we get to Ballantine in total – International Studies is one of those.

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** And that would move a lot of things outside of Ballantine...

**MORRISON:** Right, it creates the domino effect that we need to do, so that's a critical building for us.

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** I'm not selling my window unit yet...

**REILLY:** I'm sorry we haven't been able to talk more about the master plan because I was at the original presentation and I thought it was a really compelling vision for what could happen with the campus, and I'm wondering how far away in the future the reorganization of the central space, including the Union Parking Lot, so that more attractive destinations for on-campus students are created. How far away is that?

**MORRISON:** It's one of the things that as I go out and talk about the master plan, that when we talk to donors and alums, that part of the master plan gets as many head nods in agreement as do – and people with interest of potential donor opportunities – just about anything else I talk about. Creating those special spaces, the landscape... One of the things I talk about often in the master plan is that we want to grow the tree canopy from 20% to 40%. people love that, the Jordan River coming through that area, all of those things. And so, in terms of time horizon, I can't give you because it's all going to have to be privately funded and fundraised. But I can tell you that the response on it is very good, and so now when we make presentations about physical infrastructure, that's one of the main things that we talk about. I'll turn it over to you.

**HANSON:** Well, thank you very much, Vice President Morrison. Well I guess we have time for a very short break, and we'll get to the reorganization issues.

## **BRIEF RECESS**

## **AGENDA ITEM 7: CONSTITUTION AND RULES COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS ON PROPOSED BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL REFORM**

**HANSON:** ...reconvene [taps gavel] And coming up to the microphone are Professors Matt Guterl and Jane McLeod, members of the Constitution and Rules Committee and they're bringing to us recommendations on Bloomington Faculty Council reform.

**MCLEOD:** Thank you. Well, we are very pleased to be here as representatives of the Constitution and Rules Committee. We have other committee members who are here with us today. Jack is over there and Bob back there. Mary Gray was not able to be here, or Jack Raglin. Our presence here is just one step in a process that the Faculty Council initiated last spring, when it called for the appointment of a committee for the re-envisioning of faculty governance. That committee presented its report to this Council on September 7<sup>th</sup>. The Constitution and Rules Committee was charged by the Council with addressing five main concerns that were voiced that day. And we bring recommendations that we'll review one at a time. We'll say very little about them by way of introduction so we can leave as much time for discussion as possible. But we will begin with a brief introduction to our approach and our guiding principles, which Matt will offer.

**GUTERL:** I want to say that we met a number of times in the BFC building and that Craig was an excellent component of this. I was really glad for his presence. We tried to balance what seemed to be an interest in nimbleness and what seemed to be a concern about the ability of the BFC to move quickly in times of stress, and by focusing on that we attempted to privilege experience and knowledge in some of the reforms that we've suggested alongside workability, what we thought would be a fairly commonsensical arrangement of things that wouldn't involve too many working parts. I don't know exactly how else to describe it. So those would be the three basic things: nimbleness, workability, and privileging of experience and knowledge. The first issue, the nomination of the President-elect, we encouraged the BFC to allow a President-elect who is nominated among the current serving and elected members of the BFC, along with a number of other sort of soft and hard breaks to ensure that there were not fifty people running, necessarily, for the position—or one. And we tried to find a way to get faculty to run on the basis of peer support and to encourage people to both self-nominate as many people as they thought were qualified for the position. In the end, it's hard to imagine more than six people might want to run for a position like this, but we thought it was good to plan for the moment at which this was a really wonderful position. There were, I should say, a number of perks that we tried to add to the position, but Craig really stopped us from doing that. [Laughter] Number two? [to Jane].

**MCLEOD:** Do you want to invite...? Should we have discussion..?

**GUTERL:** We are at a loss as to how to proceed, I guess. Should...

**MCLEOD:** Should we have discussion on that item first?

**DOWELL:** I don't think...I think you should just hit them all briefly.

**MCLEOD:** Hit them all briefly. Oh, okay. The second item we were asked to consider was the issue of term limits for the Executive Committee. I think an item that was referred to us, based on some concern that we would want to make sure that multiple voices are represented on a regular basis and that no single group dominates faculty governance. We therefore offered



several recommendations with that endpoint in mind. The first recommendation is really already present in the Bylaws and Constitution, which would ensure that no one could serve consecutive terms as President, then we put in place some procedures for filling that vacancy, for ensuring that the President and President-elect would not hold other committee chair positions, although we thought the Past-President might be an appropriate chair for the Nominations Committee, this being a recommendation that had come forward from the re-envisioning committee. And put in place a limit on the term of anyone on the Executive Committee of three years maximum, after which you would have to take at least one year away from the Executive Committee before you could return, reasoning that anyone who really, really, really wanted to be on the Executive Committee again could then be patient and be re-elected to the BFC and take their place.

The third item has to do with the issue of consultative and legislative authority, an issue that the Re-Envisioning Committee had brought forward by introducing a distinction between those two types of authority, and the Constitution and Rules Committee was pleased with that division and upheld it, we also noted that in order to offer the Executive Committee a more robust legislative role, that we would recommend that any legislative action undertaken by that committee would require the approval of a majority of the members of that committee, including at least the President and the President-elect, to ensure some accountability of legislative action.

And finally, the fourth item rather, from the Re-Envisioning Committee had recommended that the Executive Committee would meet once a week and our recommendation, I think, ended up being slightly different from that; that the Executive Committee would meet in the weeks preceding the BFC meetings at a fixed time and location with the Provost and then would certainly have the option to schedule additional meetings as necessary to conduct its business. And finally... [to Matt]

**GUTERL:** Finally, the last question asked of this committee was whether the proposed composition suggested over the summer was too narrow or too large. We suggested, should others be added, we were asked should committee representation have some flexibility built into it? We understood that it was a kind of tradition of the Agenda Committee to invite the chairs of whatever committees might be important, so we encouraged the continuation of that tradition. And we defined an Executive Committee that would include both, or all of, the Presidents serving at the time: the President-elect, the President, and Past President, along with the Secretary and the Parliamentarian, and the chairs of the Budgetary Affairs Committee, the Faculty Affairs Committee, the Educational Policies Committee, and the Long Range Planning Committee. And again the idea here was really to have a body of knowledge present in the case of some major decision needing to be made in the absence of the full BFC and to have a kind of workable committee that wasn't 35 people large, but was a fairly nimble group.

**MCLEOD:** Now I guess I'll ask whether there are questions or comments. I think Herb was up first.

**TERRY:** There may be something in the original document to the committee that covers this but I'm wondering if, in its current form, if your changes are adopted there is something in the document explaining what happens in the event of somebody not completing their term. If they are Past President I assume that office just disappears. If the President is unable to complete that one year, I assume that President-elect moves up, that's why you have one; then I assume there would have to be some decision about having some of special election to fill the office of President-elect, but that's not in there. It seems to me that it seems it would be useful to have something to have. We did not have, quite frankly, the most perfect of procedures when Lisa Pratt decided she could not complete her term. We improvised a bit and it would be a good idea to not improvise.

**MCLEOD:** I don't think we considered that particular issue. There's some sort of provision in the Bylaws for that, is there not? But it may not be perfect.

**TERRY:** See if it works with this construction.

**DOWELL:** I mean I think we can look at it—my recollection is that this came up over the summer with past of course looking at the issue and that we sort of thought that improvising wasn't so bad. That rather than trying to plan for the unexpected in every possible permutation that... But it's worth, perhaps, taking a look and seeing if we can make that explicit that the Agenda Committee—or that the Executive Committee – is to improvise [laughter] in the case if someone needing to step down.

**BIELASIAK:** Is not point H in the Bylaws, sort of refer to some [remark indistinct], maybe adding some language, a position to solve that issue?

**DOWELL:** Could you? What section was that?

**BIELASIAK:** That's the Bylaws; it's the new section H.

**UNKNOWN SPEAKER:** Page 4.

**DOWELL:** Page 4, thanks.

**HANSON:** I think there is a question back there?

**ARNOLD:** It's my understanding that currently some of the BFC committees are co-chaired. And so if the chair is designated as serving on the Executive Committee, do they decide is it this person who will serve on the Executive Committee? In running the committees sometimes it's okay to switch out who chairs a particular meeting, but it seems like it would be important to be consistent with the person who serves on the Executive Committee. Is there any thought as

to how, I mean, or just can we specify that one co-chair or if there are co-chairs – there aren't always co-chairs – just to clarify that you just want one person from each committee and you don't end up with thirteen people on the Executive Committee because there are co-chairs.

**MCLEOD:** Yeah, that's a good point.

**HANSON:** Maxine?

**WATSON:** I had a question really relevant to point three and that's why the majority on the Executive Committee has to include the President and the President-elect, because that essentially gives these two people veto power and so I was just curious about why it's built in that way and what the advantage is.

**GUTERL:** I think our interest, we did have a lot of Tom Clancy scenarios that we posited for, you know, people storming the BFC, and I think our concern, if I remember that conversation correctly was that we wanted to ensure there was not discord between the President-elect and the President and our concern was about the perpetuation of authority and leadership in a moment of crisis, that in other words both the incoming President and the current seated President should be on same page about whatever decisive action was being taken.

**WATSON:** What if the faculty wants a change in direction?

**GUTERL:** There is a Black-Ops scenario where the BFC can revisit a decision made by the Executive Committee in private immediately following the decision. So there's a place for any elected BFC member – I think it's an elected BFC member – to express concern about the actions of the Executive Committee taken outside of this larger group and to ask for a re-visitation of that.

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** Isn't there an assumption though that basically the President—or President-elect for that matter—would be executing whatever the majority... in other words that he or she has the capacity to in fact, go with what the majority has decided. I think that's your concern, right? That he or she doesn't have to vote in favor of that, and to execute, to put into—

**WATSON:** Well, my concern is just I don't see why two people should be more equal than anybody else on that decision making group. I think this is a big issue.

**GIERYN:** Since we're dealing with foundational governance documents we need to be very careful about the wording and there are many changes proposed in both the Bylaws and the Constitution. I caught some typos which I'll spare you. But one issue in the Bylaws: Point number five is a substantive issue and the problem stems from the fact that when the rewriting began on the Bylaws, the committee was working with the version that's on the BFC website as opposed to the Academic Guide. The Academic Guide version reflected the changes in nomenclature of the offices and it turns out that number five has deleted two offices from the list of voting members of the Council, and it's not clear to me whether or not you intended to

delete them or whether they simply got left out by mistake. I pulled up the version that's in the Academic Guide now. We're looking at point number five in the bylaws?

**DETHLOFF:** Mmhmm.

**GIERYN:** As it reads: "Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs, the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, Dean of the University Graduate School, the Vice Provost for Research in Bloomington" and then something that really doesn't exist, "the Vice President and Chief Financial Officer for the Bloomington campus shall be voting members of the council." That's what is in the Guide now and we have to fix that anyway. A question for you guys, and I will say this, when we made the nomenclature changes last year, the Dean of the Faculties had voting membership in this body, and we simply decided to give it to both my office and Sonya's. I assume that's an oversight?

**COLLECTIVE:** Yes.

**GUTERL:** But not the Budgetary Officer.

**GIERYN:** The other one then we need to at least consider this. At one point there was a chief financial officer for the Bloomington campus, and that person, in the old Bylaws had voting membership on the Bloomington Faculty Council. That's what we tried to capture with this translation but it doesn't really translate very well. So you considered that and decided not to include any financial officers in the BFC as voting members? That's fine, but we'll get Sonya added to the list.

**GUTERL and MCLEOD:** Yes.

**ARNOVE:** Having the four committee chairs sitting on the Executive Committee, the idea was to increase the representation of faculty interest. Having the Long Range Planning Committee was, for example, when we saw the master plan for the Physical Plant, they have a long range vision that would articulate our academic needs with these others. And so, we're trying to increase the representation, the continuity, the expertise, and with regard to whether the president, vice president, have a more weight than the others probably, yes, because in any governance structure you have a president and a vice president who have more authority and responsibility than the members of a cabinet and the idea was accountability, continuity, responsibility, and that's why we have it as it is.

**HORNE:** I have a question just about a different point, and I've may just be ill-informed about this, but you said facetiously earlier that you tried to add in perks [laughter]. Maybe for amusement, again facetiously, I don't know –

**GUTERL:** – special robes –

**HORNE:** – you know, what kind of perks would be involved, but my impression is there's nothing other than, 'Hey, thanks.'

**GUTERL:** If that.

**HORNE:** I really think that – exactly – if we want our best and brightest to be part of this then we have to have some – I'm not talking about financially, but at least, you know, some kind of course or workload reduction.

**GUTERL:** – we had lots of great ideas for props –

**HORNE:** But we we're talking about that in a sarcastic kind of way. I think it's unrealistic that somebody would step up to do this for a three year commitment with the current situation. If we want our best and brightest to be involved in this, hopefully people would want to do it out of a sense of loyalty and of a sense that faculty governance is important, but if we're doing this, and having this whole project, because we feel the BFC has become somewhat weaker in recent years then I believe that we should want to address that in a serious way, to do something. I mean not pay, but some kind of workload reduction or something.

**HANSON:** That does happen.

**HORNE:** That's that the first thing I said, well I might be ill-informed, but I wasn't aware.

**MCLEOD:** But those are individual ad hoc arrangements, is that correct? Is there a general understanding of what a president should receive?

**HANSON:** I am not dead certain, but because we sort of, you know, fell into something where there was a practice, and then the practice has been continued, but it is an understanding that there be something exactly like that, like course reduction, but I think what's happened over time depends a little bit on what the nature of the faculty's responsibilities is, you know, whether or not somebody has a lab they have to keep running or whether or not they need a course reduction and don't have a lab, you know, those kinds of questions I think play a role. Herb?

**TERRY:** I would think that it would be useful to discuss it. I don't know if you could in the end write it down, but when Lisa stepped down and I talked with a number of former BFC chairs to try and find out what their units had done for them. The College was always pretty good about providing a course reduction, but it didn't believe it ever got money from the campus, to be made...

**HANSON:** It did. I can guarantee you...

**TERRY:** It didn't get to the department!

**HANSON:** What?

**TERRY:** It didn't get from there to the department in some instances. David Daleke, when he served, encountered the fact that the medical school didn't want to provide a course release for him I think that actually some money was provided in some way to keep his lab going, so Karen's absolutely right. The specifics vary. I'm sure there were different circumstances when we elect a librarian than when we elect a faculty member, so... But it would be useful, for the reasons that Brian noted, I think, to indicate that we do recognize that this is a time and personal – and to some extent, to some minor extent – an out-of-pocket expenditure, here and there, for BFC Presidents, and that we consider making it clear that the idea is to make these people whole, to keep them keep their research agendas going if that's what they need, in Lisa's case she got a post-doc out of the thing. Which, for her year–

**GUTERL:** I don't think there is any—I mean the Committee–

**DOWELL:** Yeah.

**GUTERL:** –understood, though seriously, that we turned it into a joke, because it was beyond our purview. We weren't authorized to really write that into the document.

**TERRY:** At some point we've got to say something when we expect this –

**BIELASIAK:** I think there's got to be a sense of the body that I don't see that how we can write such provisions into the dialogues. I think that's not our problem–

**DOWELL:** Yeah.

**BIELASIAK:** So we can, perhaps, have a sense of the body that there should be some special compensations, a reserved parking spot would be good. [laughter]

**DOWELL:** I think I've actually had some people ask me, newly elected members ask me, for what's sort of the job description of a BFC member, and I think we could think about a document that could incorporate some of these things and actually write down, at least, the fact that these are the possible things that past Presidents have done and here's who you take it up with, you know.

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** But not part of the Bylaws, more –

**DOWELL:** – Not part of the Bylaws but as a supporting kind of document, and anyway, Bob?

**ARNOVE:** Well I would like to draw a parallel between running for, for example, Vice President for the BFC, and running for office in a professional association. Because generally in a professional association you have three or even up to four years as Vice President Elect, Vice President, President, Past President, with different responsibilities at each step. In professional organizations it's often the Vice President who often has the biggest load in terms of preparing the professional congress, the question is whether or not an academic unit then, whether in the

annual review or promotion and tenure cases, takes into account this is a major service contribution to the university. But people who run for office in professional organizations know they're going to give up a big chunk of their time without necessarily having a release of their academic load. And that's because it's something to which the committer engaged.

**HANSON:** That actually raises another question but at least I know we've discussed a little that today since system seems to be breaking down. This is the raise your hand in the air, the fallow period idea, but the actual people being elected to these posts who are already sitting members of the Council, I, too, thought of professional organizations where you don't necessarily come out of the group that's already on the board to become chair of the board or President or something like that. Do you want to say a little bit about your thinking on whether or not the people should be elected at large for those two posts, or elected out of the Council? Because again it may, for many people, be—

**DOWELL:** That is a major difference in what the summer group proposed and what you guys have sort of refined. So?

**MCLEOD:** Yes, the current recommendation was that the President-elect would be elected from the standing members of the BFC, and I think there was actually some difference of opinion about this issue on the committee, but some concern that allowing someone who perhaps didn't have background or experience on the BFC to run for that office might put that person in a difficult position in terms of leadership. But I think, Bob, you might have something you want to add?

**ARNOVE:** Well, Matt, for example, kept on stressing experience and expertise, which is if you want to have a consequential Executive Committee, you want people who are knowledgeable about working on the BFC, and that demonstrate some commitment to it. So I think there was consensus – although we floated an idea that a person could be elected at-large from one. No, that it would be preferable to have someone who experienced on the Council. I mean someone – let's say, not on the Council – may have a political, ideological agenda they want to promote and therefore would put himself or herself up, which is a possibility. But we want people who are already familiar with the workings of the Council.

**GUTERL:** And again, this all flows from the idea that this Executive Committee, will, you know, in a worst case scenario, have some kind of function outside of this chamber, right? That there could be a circumstance where the Executive Committee might be called to act and in that circumstance when there are only nine people, or seven or eight – depending on the weather or whatever – that you have, you know, the best and most experienced people sitting there and making that decision.

**ARNOVE:** You know in the analogy with the professional association is that you pick someone in, who is going to be nominated or elected, who is known by the membership, and respected

by the membership, rather than someone who has just become a member and therefore wants the position.

**HANSON:** I guess the other issue though is that the membership here is of faculty, so part of the issue was whether or not you are bringing more of the faculty, there's that issue, and then the time commitment again –

**ARNOVE:** The idea is that the whole faculty elects me, *elects*, and that the candidates would have [indistinct] a platform or vision statement that they would provide so that the faculty at large would know what that person stands for.

**BIELASIAK:** If I can just add also, I think I don't recall our deliberation, but I think originally I tended to think that they needed to have a wider [indistinct], I guess I was persuaded that we can think of this as a two-step strategy, so if someone from the faculty is interested in leadership and governance they can certainly become a candidate for the BFC, and from that position then become part, you know, of the Presidency, and I thought that made sense because it balances sort of the expertise issue and familiarity with the ability of the larger faculty to get involved with faculty governance.

**HANSON:** Geoffrey?

**BROWN:** This may have been said, and I might have missed it, one of recommendations is no individual elected or appointed can hold a seat on the Executive Committee for more than three consecutive years but if you are on the Executive Committee, and then are elected President, this can't be met because the President-elect, the President, and the Past President; that's three years, is there an exception for that, or is that meant? I mean, I'm not quite clear on that recommendation.

**ARNOVE:** It's almost metaphysical problems [laughter], quite honestly. What was the wording that was decided yesterday?

**MCLEOD:** I think the wording that's here is the wording that we decided. We did discuss that issue in various configurations of positions and so on that might complicate that but I think ultimately decided that the three year limit made sense, that if you were sitting on Executive Committee in another capacity, you would never the less have to leave for at least one year before you would be eligible then to return.

**BROWN:** I guess, this didn't answer my question.

**MCLEOD:** And so you wouldn't be able to run for president at that time.

**BROWN:** Okay, so the net effect is that somebody on the Executive Committee cannot be elected President. Is that what we want? I don't think that's what I want.



**WATSON:** It seems we have another problem that you can only serve two consecutive terms, right, on the Council. So, I mean, you're getting boxed in by a bunch of time constraints so that you would have on the Council one year or you couldn't run for President, but if you've served two years then you can't.

**MCLEOD:** Well, there is a provision that allows someone's term to be extended to allow them to fulfill their term as President, if they're elected at the end of their term on the BFC. So that one, we have taken care of.

**GUTERL:** And we didn't assume, I think, at any step, that the candidate for President would necessarily be a member of the Executive Committee. I think the presumption of the group was that the experience we were seeking was experience in the BFC, not necessarily experience on the Executive Committee or experience on the Agenda Committee, and we are here obviously to entertain thoughts and ideas and reactions.

**ARNOVE:** Generally the person that you're suggesting would be the chair of a standing committee. That would be the person who has expertise and might be desirable as a candidate for Vice President-elect. And we really weren't able to quite resolve that issue, that's a good point to make.

**TERRY:** I guess I'd point out that the President will always have one year of experience on the Executive Committee as President-elect, and I think that's probably adequate. I think that says the council will elect somebody, not somebody currently on the Executive Committee, as their President-elect. For one year that President-elect would be in training, would join the Executive Committee, would learn what's going on, would move up the next year. I think that would work.

**BROWN:** I guess I'm saying I think that eliminates candidates who would be good presidents. I just don't think that's a particularly good idea.

**SHAW:** Or alternatively, it encourages people to chair those important committees because they know they are safe from being nominated. [laughter]

**BIELASIAK:** Yes, that was actually the intent. [laughter]

**ARNOVE:** I mean, we were concerned about it being too onerous, yeah.

**GUTERL:** We weren't able to imagine someone who would so enthusiastically embrace the work of the Executive Committee that they would ask for more, so that might be a limit to our imagination, that we weren't able to conceive of somebody who wanted that much work. Randy?

**ARNOLD:** I think Geoff's point is a good one about preventing people who are currently on the Executive Committee from being nominated to run for President because of the limit. Could we

make that rule that the three-year limit on the Executive Committee – except for someone being nominated to then serve as President, right? So in that case somebody could serve on the Executive Committee as a chair of one of the standing committees for maybe two years and then that person—so they may end up five years on the Executive Committee but it would only be because they got elected President and then the term limit would still apply to everyone who doesn't go through the presidency, right?

**ARNOVE:** Yeah, that makes sense.

**ARNOLD:** I mean it keeps both things...

**TERRY:** It keeps both open.

**DOWELL:** Yeah, I think I would support that, because, you know, I share Geoff's concern that sometimes – I mean in my own experience, you know – being on the Executive Committee or being on the current Agenda Committee is where you really get a sense of what's involved in being President and that might, you know, spark an interest and you wouldn't want to kind of cut out some of your top chairs who might be interested in taking on the top spot. Yeah?

**ARNOVE:** Do you have the wording that was recommended by [indistinct]? Do you have wording?

**DOWELL:** Randy?

**ARNOLD:** I don't know if I quite have wording. But I think that I think that, and I don't know if I'm looking at the document – the correct document, to say it – but I think the term limits, “unless one is being nominated for President,” some phrase along that line.

**MCLEOD:** Yes, I did make note of that, thank you.

**HANSON:** Other questions or comments? This is a first reading of the recommendations.

**SHAW:** Can you explain what happens after the first reading, what will be the next step to this?

**DOWELL:** Sure. Shall I? Well, our hope is that we will bring this back on the December 7<sup>th</sup> meeting, and vote on it. At that point, I believe it opens up a fifteen day remonstrance period at which a faculty – Do you have this in the report, I'm trying to remember, do you have this?

**DETHLOFF:** Yes, it's at the very the beginning.

**DOWELL:** It's at the very beginning. Right. So if a proposed amendment—so we would be approving proposed amendments. If it's been approved by the Faculty Council and considered by a meeting of the faculty and if fifteen days have elapsed after the Council approval without a call for a faculty meeting, then we are supposed to circulate a ballot to the faculty. So I think that there is, essentially, the way I interpret it is that there's a waiting period of fifteen days

after our approval which would then be the opportunity for someone to call a faculty meeting to say it's a terrible idea and that we shouldn't put it forward to a vote of the whole faculty. But if not then we compile a ballot that has to be accompanied by the arguments for and against each point. And that would obviously incorporate, probably, bits and pieces of the document that we looked at, at the very beginning of the semester and this document that you're kind of following up on refining those recommendations. And then that would go out to all faculty in the spring semester. I think we agreed that that would follow the paragraph here that outlines the changes.

**TERRY:** I would read it as saying that you only have to summarize the arguments if a general faculty meeting has been called.

**DOWELL:** I don't know, it says, "the paper or electronic ballot shall be accompanied by a summary of arguments."

**TERRY:** Keep going. Presented during any general faculty meeting at which the amendment was considered. We haven't had that.

**DOWELL:** I'm sorry. We haven't had what?

**TERRY:** A general faculty meeting and I think it's probably intent in the middle of that paragraph.

**GIERYN:** The general arguments were presented during that faculty meeting, if you didn't have the faculty meeting there wouldn't be any general arguments—

**TERRY:** I think I was around when we adopted this paragraph and that was the idea that we we'd have this general faculty meeting, pros and cons would be presented, it wouldn't vote. But then the idea—

**DOWELL:** But then the ballot goes out—

**TERRY:** But then the arguments would go out to the faculty as part of the ballot.

**DOWELL:** Okay.

**HANSON:** Still, it's not precluded that some—

**TERRY:** No, it's not.

**HANSON:** —a count of what you're voting on.

**GIERYN:** This procedure would change both the Bylaws and the Constitution, so it would be done in one fell swoop.

**DOWELL:** Yes, that's the intention.

**HANSON:** Any other questions or comments? Thank you very much then we are adjourned.

**MCLEOD:** Thank you. I just want to express our gratitude again to Craig without whom all would be lost. So we very much appreciate his assistance.

**MEETING ADJOURNED: 5:22PM**

