

**Indiana University**  
**BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL**  
**April 5, 2011**  
**IMU Georgian Room**  
**3:30 P.M. - 5:30 P.M.**

**Attendance**

**MEMBERS:** Randy Arnold, Robert Arnové, Elizabeth Boling, Maria Bucur-Deckard, Carolyn Calloway-Thomas, Jennifer Chaffin, Angela Courtney, Nick D’Amico, Gregory Demas, Carrie Docherty, Erika Dowell, David Estell, Tony Fargo, Lessie Jo Frazier, Tom Gieryn, Laura Ginger, Don Gjerdingen, Karen Hanson, Diane Henshel, Brian Horne, Edwin Jimenez, Peter Kaczmarczyk, Padraic Kenney, Susan Kovacich, Patrice Madura, Rebecca Manring, Eugene McGregor, Sherri Michaels, Robert Noel, Michael Ogden, Mary Popp, Paul Purdom, Patricia Riesenman, Eric Sandweiss, Marla Sandys, Sarita Soni, Geoff Sprinkle, Herb Terry, Maxine Watson, Tony White

**MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT:**

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Jack Bielasiak, Arthur Bradley, Joyce Byrer, Andrea Ciccarelli, Michael Coleman, Frank Di Silvestro, Janice Duchene, Luke Fields, Matt Guterl, Neil Kelty, Jane McLeod, Elizabeth Raff, Diane Reilly, Ranu Samantrai, Sima Setayeshgar, Pnina Fichman, Richard Shockley, Sonya Stephens, H. Wayne Storey, Adam Szczepaniak, Joey Tartell, Neil Theobald, Sue Whiston, James Wimbush

**GUESTS:** LaNita Campbell (GPSO President-Elect), John Carini, Amanda Ciccarelli, Craig Dethloff, Katie Dawson (IDS), Michael Evans, David Johnson, Jocelyn Karlan, Shannon Martin, Bill Wheeler

**Agenda**

1. Memorial Resolutions for Harvey Phillips and Robert D. Bent  
Harvey Phillips: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/10-11/B33-2011.pdf>  
Robert D. Bent: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/10-11/B34-2011.pdf>
2. Agenda Committee Business (10 minutes)  
(President pro Tempore Erika Dowell)
3. Presiding Officer’s Report (10 minutes)  
(Provost Karen Hanson)

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

5. Update on Math Credit for Admissions Implementation (30 minutes)

(Dr. David Johnson, Vice Provost, Office of Enrollment Management) [DISCUSSION]

6. Merger, Reorganization and Elimination Policy Reform (30 minutes)

(Professor Tom Gieryn, Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs) [DISCUSSION]

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/10-11/B35-2011.pdf>

### **Minutes**

**HANSON:** We now have a quorum, so let's call the meeting to order and the first order of business is Tom, Vice Provost Gieryn, who has memorial resolutions for Harvey Phillips and Robert Bent.

**DOWELL:** And we apologize that they have been left out of the packets this week. So you don't have your own copy.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 1: MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS FOR HARVEY PHILLIPS AND ROBERT D. BENT**

**GIERYN:** Indiana University Distinguished Professor Emeritus Harvey Phillips was born on December 2, 1929, in Aurora, Missouri, and died at his home in Bloomington, Indiana on October 20, 2010. IU President Michael A. McRobbie awarded him the President's Medal for Excellence in 2008. Perhaps no individual better represents "the freedom of thought and spirit that is a hallmark of IU's community of scholars," McRobbie said. Phillips was a member of the IU Jacobs School of Music from 1971 to 1994 and lived on the Tuba Ranch in Monroe County.

Phillips performed as tuba soloist throughout the world. His music career began as a teenager with the Ringling Bros. and Barnum & Bailey Circus Band. He attended the Juilliard School of Music and the Manhattan School of Music, and he was a member of the United States Army Field Band. From 1950-71 he maintained an enviable freelance career in New York City, performing, recording and broadcasting with famous artists, conductors, bands and orchestras. In 1954, he was a founding member of the New York Brass Quintet. He served as personnel manager for Symphony of the Air, and for Leopold Stokowski, Igor Stravinsky, and Gunther Schuller. He was the New England Conservatory Vice President for Financial Affairs (1967-71). In 1971, he was appointed to the Indiana University faculty.

His honors include Principal Tuba, Circus Hall of Fame Band (selected by Merle Evans); Kappa Kappa Psi Distinguished Service to Music Medal (1979); Association of Concert Bands "first" Mentor Ideal Award (1994); Sousa Foundation Sudler Medal of the Order of Merit award (1995); National Band Association Academy of Wind and Percussion Arts Award (1995); United Musical Instruments Lifetime Achievement Award (1996); American Bandmasters Association Edwin Franco Goldman Award (1996); Rafael Mendez Brass Institute Lifetime Achievement Award (1997); Colonial Euphonium-Tuba Institute Development of Musical Artistry & Opportunities Award (1997); Phi Mu Alpha Orpheus Award (1997); and others. Harvey Phillips Day has been celebrated by the New England Conservatory (1971) and by his home town in a Bi-Centennial Celebration, Marionville, Missouri (1976). In 1985 the Governor of Missouri declared a Harvey Phillips Weekend. He received an Honorary Doctor of Music (1971) from the New England Conservatory, and an Honorary Doctor of Humanities (1987) from the University of Missouri. In 2008, he became the first brass player ever inducted into the American Classical Music Hall of Fame.

Phillips was the founder and president of the Harvey Phillips Foundation, Inc. which administers OCTUBAFEST, TUBACHRISTMAS, TUBASANTAS, TUBACOMPANY, TUBAJAZZ, etc. For ten years (1986-96) he served as Executive Editor of *The Instrumentalist* magazine. He transformed the repertoire for the instrument by commissioning more than 200 works for tuba and inspiring composers to write serious music for solo tuba. A biography of Harvey Phillips is to be published by the Indiana University Press in the very near future. In May, 1994 he retired from Indiana University with the title of Distinguished Professor Emeritus.

On October 21, 2010, NPR's Robert Siegel and Melissa Block had this remembrance of Harvey Phillips:

Siegel: "The man known as the "Paganini of the Tuba" has died. Harvey Phillips was eighty years old. You're hearing Phillips with a small ensemble playing the Hoagy Carmichael classic 'Georgia on My Mind.'"

Block: "Harvey Phillips tuba virtuoso started his career somewhere you might not expect - with the Ringling Brothers Barnum and Bailey Circus Band. Then he ran away from the circus to study at the Juilliard School of Music."

Siegel: "In 2008, Harvey Phillips became the first wind instrument player inducted into the American Classical Music Hall of Fame. Phillips became a tuba ambassador, performing classical jazz and pop tunes. He created tuba concerts, one called Octubafest."

Block: "In 1975, a *New Yorker* profile said of him: 'The ongoing elevation of the tuba, from the laughingstock of musical instruments to one of its kings, is mainly the doing of Harvey Phillips.'

"Harvey Phillips had Parkinson's disease. He died yesterday at his home in Bloomington, Indiana."

[Soundbite of song, "Georgia on My Mind"]

Charles Webb, dean emeritus of the Jacobs School of Music stated in the *Bloomington Herald-Times*, "He was one of the greatest living players of the instrument and one of the greatest teachers of the instrument as well. His students went on to occupy major positions in symphony orchestras and bands across the world. Wherever the tuba was played, you'd find students of Harvey's." Phillips is survived by his wife, Carol, sons Jessie, Harvey Jr., and Thomas.

Robert D. Bent, Professor Emeritus of Physics, was born on December 22, 1928 in Cambridge, Massachusetts, and died in Indianapolis, Indiana on January 2, 2011 at age 82. When he was eight years old, he and his family moved to Columbia, Missouri, where his father was a professor of chemistry and dean of the Graduate School at the University of Missouri. Bob began playing the cello in second grade and later on he took up basketball and tennis.

Bob received an AB degree in physics from Oberlin College in 1950 and then went on to study physics at Rice University (then the Rice Institute), receiving the PhD degree in 1954.

He remained at Rice as a post-doctoral student in nuclear physics for one year. During his last year in Houston, Bob met Mary Alice Keating, a 1954 Rice graduate, through their shared interest in music (piano and cello). They were married in 1956. Bob spent three years doing post-doctoral work at Columbia University from 1955-1958.

In 1958 Bob joined the physics department at Indiana University as an assistant professor to teach and to do research in experimental nuclear physics at the old cyclotron located in the basement of the original physics building, Swain Hall West. He and his students made measurements of the lifetimes of unstable nuclei, and he continued his analysis of these measurements at Oxford University in 1962-63 with a Guggenheim fellowship. In 1962 Bob was elected a Fellow of the American Physical Society, an honor awarded to about ten percent of the membership.

In the 1960s plans were developed to build a new cyclotron at Indiana University on the north side of the Bloomington campus. Bob helped plan the experimental program, and after the cyclotron was completed in 1975, he carried out important experiments at the new Indiana University Cyclotron Facility (IUCF). One of his specialties was to use the high energy proton

beam at the cyclotron to collide with targets of various nuclei to produce “pions” (pi mesons), unstable particles that decay in a tiny fraction of a second. He and his co-workers published more than 60 research articles in refereed physics journals.

Bob was promoted to associate professor in 1962 and to full professor in 1966. He retired in 1996. In 1983-84 he was associate director of the Indiana University Cyclotron Facility. After his retirement, he was the Roger Newton Professor at the Indiana University Institute for Advanced Study for three years.

Bob was an innovative teacher and especially enjoyed teaching students who did not major in physics. He helped develop a course in sound at the request of the dean of the School of Music. He also taught several courses related to environmental issues connected with our use of energy. His teaching on the environment led to his developing a research interest in this subject. He continued this effort at the IU Institute for Advanced Studies, where he developed the materials for a book (eventually published in 2002) with co-editors Lloyd Orr (Economics) and Randall Baker (SPEA) entitled *Energy: Science, Policy, and the Pursuit of Sustainability*. For several years, he also served on the Sustainability Commission of the City of Bloomington.

Bob had a lifelong interest in music and tennis. He continued to play the cello and to engage in competitive tennis for many years. A cellist from childhood, he played in string quartets, small ensembles, and large orchestras, including the Bloomington Symphony Orchestra (playing cello in both the first and fortieth concert seasons). He played tennis on his high school team, on the varsity team of Oberlin College, and in a large number of local Bloomington age-group tournaments

During his early college years, Bob and his family and a few friends built a traditional, Scandinavian-style log cabin in the north woods of Minnesota. He and his family used this location for relaxation and renewal for more than sixty years. After his retirement, Bob recorded this adventure in a book created from letters, pictures and family memoirs.

Bob is survived by his wife Mary (Keating) Bent of Bloomington, a daughter, Lisa Scott (and husband, Perry Scott) of Indianapolis, two sons, Jason (and wife, Erica Duke) of Anchorage, Alaska, and Alan (and wife, Amanda) of Fairbanks, Alaska, and his brother, Henry A. Bent (and wife, Anne) of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

In memory of Bob Bent's creative work in nuclear and environmental physics, be it resolved that this memorial resolution become part of the minutes of the Indiana University Faculty Council and that copies of it be sent to members of Bob's family.

**HANSON:** May I ask you to stand and observe a moment of silence for our colleagues.

[Observed]

Thank you. Agenda Committee Business?

## **AGENDA ITEM 2: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

**DOWELL:** Thanks, Karen. Alright, we have a variety of things to mention today. Gosh, a few weeks ago the CWA, Communication Workers of America, union contacted us about possibly getting representation on the Council in the same way that other affiliated kind of groups of staff and students have representation. We talked this over with the Agenda Committee and have agreed with CWA to the following plan: I'm reading it – I shouldn't say reading it to you, it's not that formal – but I'm announcing it here so that if there are objections they can be raised at this point and if not, we'll proceed with that. At this point what we plan to do is that we will invite a representative of CWA to the Council, give them full discussion, sort of, rights so they're able to participate in the discussion of the issues here at BFC but not vote on anything at the moment. And then at the end of two years, with that kind of trial participation, we might – we, collectively – we might have the wherewithal to address revising the bylaws of the organization to add them officially as a seat on the Council. And I don't mean that in a bad way, I just mean that we just revised the constitution and bylaws and so we weren't really ready to address anything right now, but in two years the intention would be to make the representation of CWA on the Council official. And are there any comments or objections? Okay. Alright, Herb?

**TERRY:** Is it a two-year trial with this non-voting right –

**DOWELL:** MmHm.

**TERRY:** – that would be assessed at the end of two years or is it whether they should be given voting privileges or something like that at the end of two years?

**DOWELL:** Well, I think it would all be kind of up for discussion at the end of two years.

**TERRY:** So the intent at the end of two years is to review the whole question.

**DOWELL:** Right, but I think if we've gone this far I think the intent would be to formalize the situation. So I don't think at the end of two years we're going to say, 'No, we've decided not to do this.'

**TERRY:** But we might formalize it by saying they have a permanent non-voting seat –

**DOWELL:** Right.

**TERRY:** – or by saying they have a permanent voting seat.

**DOWELL:** Yes, I think that's fair.

**TERRY:** Okay.

**DOWELL:** Looking at how the other seats of a similar kind work. Alright, great, because we've already invited the CWA representative to be here today. [laughter] And welcome, Peter, he's sitting over there next to Tom, so... You should have seen your election ballots for next year's BFC. They're supposed to be in by Friday, although I'm told if you mail them Friday, you know, they'll still count them on Tuesday or Wednesday or whenever they come in. We had originally had on the agenda today the School of Nursing request for an exemption from General Education Requirements. There is some more work going on with the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education regarding that, and so it's not coming up today after all, just to let you know. But maybe something will be coming on the 19<sup>th</sup>, our final meeting. I've been asked to comment on the status of the paid family leave policy, this is a university-level policy that had a sunset provision in it which brings it to a close at the end of this fiscal year, so June 30<sup>th</sup>. And I had hoped to have more to report today. Maria and I, on behalf of the UFC, have been working with John Applegate and others to see what possible revisions of the policy would be acceptable to the Trustees. They have a concern about the level of financial exposure that the university faces with the policy as it stands. And we had hoped – we had a meeting a couple of days ago that was supposed to be with John Applegate and with Vice President Theobald, because of course, he being the money person would be key to having his support of whatever revision we come up with. His support would be key to having the Trustees approve a new policy. And Neil was sick, so we didn't get our meeting with Neil at that point, but we hope to reschedule soon and to have something hammered out soon, because I know people are very concerned about planning for next year and not knowing what kind of paid family leave policy is in place makes that difficult, and we hope that we can know something about perhaps a temporary extension of the existing policy very soon or details of a new – and/or, I should say – details of a revision of the policy which would come before UFC next month or this month – later this month. And that's what I've got for Agenda Committee Business, unless, yes?

**ARNOVE:** I have an issue for the Agenda Committee.

**DOWELL:** Yes?

**ARNOVE:** As my two-year tenure ends this spring with BFC and I won't be here for the last meeting I would like to bring up for consideration of the BFC next year the issue of privatization and outsourcing of significant sectors and services of IU. The BFC addressed one significant component of the issue when we brought up the issue of the outsourcing of the IU Bookstore to Barnes & Noble, and what this implied for providing information to the government and

students about course textbooks, their costs, and their availability. But I mentioned to Maria and to Erika and the Agenda Committee the need to examine the cost of benefits of outsourcing agreements, and they've rightly pointed out that this is a big issue that's difficult to get a handle on. So we agreed that one issue that could be addressed is the exclusive agreements reached with Coca-Cola with regard to what beverages are sold in IU vending machines, and exhibit A to my right [indicating the soft drinks in the room – *Editor's note*], exhibit B over there. [laughter]. Okay, just as IU is not willing to place its logo on goods produced by sweatshops around the world, why has it provided monopoly rights to Coca-Cola, a multinational corporation that is associated with union-busting, environmental destruction in countries ranging from Colombia, South America, to India. Over the past several years there have been student protests across the country as well as in England and Canada to end the agreements. The largely IU student organization, No Sweat!, has taken the lead in protesting the agreement including a die-in before a Trustee meeting at IUPUI which is part of a national campaign against "Killer Cola," and for the reasons that I am going to read to you from the Vassar "Kick Coke" campaign mission statement. "We, the Vassar community, demand an end to Vassar's relationship to Coca-Cola because of the documented human rights atrocities that Coca-Cola has committed. In the interest of the health, safety and welfare of people here and abroad, Vassar needs to participate in the international efforts to put an end to Coca-Cola's exploitative practices." Members of the Vassar "Kick Cola" campaign created a Coca-Cola monster with nine arms, each with the name of a union leader killed in Coca-Cola's Colombian bottling plants. So, you will be told that Coca-Cola's sweetheart deal brings in tons of money at IU, but what does this say about what values IU as a higher education institution is going to represent and effect, I wanted that in the public record.

**HANSON:** Okay, any other questions or comments, about either Erika's... or Maria's...?

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** Well, I wanted to add maybe a couple of details. One is that the issue of family leave will be coming before the Trustees at the June meeting. That's what John told –

**DOWELL:** He believed.

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** – us... we believe. Well, that's the last meeting and the May one apparently is crowded already. So that brings up a couple of issues, one is that most of us will not be around, including me. So if there are thoughts you want to share about your concerns I think now is the time. The other issue is that we have been asked to consider ways of limiting this exposure in so far as length between times that one can take the leave, possibly a cap on how much one can take as a total amount rather than percentage – possibly percentage, possibly number of weeks – so you know some of these things –

**DOWELL:** Right.

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** – are on the table as well as qualifying events.

**DOWELL:** We've also discussed triggers in the policy that would – we don't want a sunset provision – but we have discussed triggers in the policy that would bring it back up for possible revision if a certain threshold of expense or usage was reached.

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** And it would be important to have feedback from the faculty on things that they are willing to entertain as a compromise in this situation. I hope that we'll have something more concrete soon, but I'd just like to go on record to say that I am not in favor of limiting the qualifying events. This is a very restrictive policy as it is, and I don't think that we want to put young faculty at loggerheads with senior faculty in terms of who can take these benefits if you catch my drift.

**HANSON:** Any other comments? Questions?

**TERRY:** I would just offer one comment. You know if you go to the Trustees' meetings a lot lately, you discover that they're very interested in benchmarking. They're interested in making sure that we're efficient, that we don't cost more than peer institutions, and that sort of thing. And that's important, but at the same time I would hope the Trustees once in a while would support us as being a leading institution in the way we treat faculty. I would point out that unlike staff, faculty don't accumulate vacation time or other paid time off that they can apply to some of these events and so there is some justification, I think, for this being simply a faculty benefit. I know in my department it's been very important to building morale. We've had several instances where faculty have taken advantage of this, they haven't been especially costly to us, because we have found relatively inexpensive ways to cover the teaching obligations of those faculty. And I think it has been very valuable to us in holding the loyalty and support of those faculty to this institution and we've lately had a faculty member thinking of going elsewhere while simultaneously trying to plan for some health issues in the family, and that faculty member will be rather displeased if this thing sunsets – at this late date at least – in his own planning. It's not, by every evidence I've seen over all the years I've been involved in this issue, it's not a costly policy and it is hard to pin down its exact cost. It is also hard to pin down its exact benefits. But this is something on which we're a leading institution, benchmarking will get rid of this kind of policy, but this is a thing on which we should lead despite the financial situation of the university right now, it's just not that costly.

**HENSHEL:** Maria, you've done some analysis of this, could you give some preview of it? Is that possible?

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** Sure, wherever the heck it is. I've memorized some of this stuff already. So, the highest number of persons that have taken this benefit was this year, was forty-four people.

**DOWELL:** Out of the university.

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** Out of the whole university. Out of five thousand eight hundred and something, almost six thousand. The cost has gone up in the last three years, partly because more people are taking the leave, and partly I would say, disproportionately because people who paid \$100,000 or more in salary are taking it. Because this is, you know, a percentage of your salary, it's, you know, twelve weeks of your salary, of your ten or twelve month salary. And so even though the proportion of persons out of the total population taking that leave this past year was under 20%, the percentage of the total amount that they accounted for, those ten people, was about 40%. So what we're talking about is, you know, a clear indication that this is where the growth is coming from overwhelmingly. The other thing that's not surprising about it is that, and I've said this in other circumstances, that this is a policy that women use disproportionately in relation to the percentage that they are as part of the eligible population. And anyone here that we've followed, they are between 50% and 100% of the persons taking the policy, right? So it's always more than half the people taking the policy, and women represent at most 40% of the eligible population, right? They also represent only about a tiny fraction of those people that are really costly, at the very top. So I think that there's issues there in terms of, you know, what we are doing for our female employees with this; how do we attract them, how do we keep a diverse population in terms of gender equity. And I think that the issue's also not just what's going on now but if we do away, or if we reduce some of these benefits, that it is going to hurt women more than men, disproportionately. And I hope that this university doesn't want to go on record for gender discrimination at this point in our increasingly progressive way of treating women, you know, at the top...so... [laughter]. Well, we should hope so! Thanks for that question.

**HANSON:** Any other questions or comments? Okay, I just have one main item I wanted to make sure I reported to you, particularly because it relates to an agenda item. The New Academic Directions Committee did deliver its final report to the president on Monday – well, a little bit before, but it became final on Monday – and the president will presumably give that to the Trustees for the next meeting. I think it's up to him about when he releases it, I have the sense that he is going to release it to a broader community before the Trustees meeting, but I'm not dead certain. But so that people can begin to think about it and then there are, you know, all of the next steps that will have to be taken, you know, because I'm not in a position to release it now, I can't say a lot in detail. Maria was on the committee, too, and she can't say a lot [laughter] either, but you know it offers some criteria for investment, and it offers some criteria for cutting budgets. It offers some specific suggestions about areas in which we might want to pursue, the areas where we have strengths and could augment those strengths and position them differently and things like that. It also makes a number of comments about administrative issues and issues about policy tangles in the university. But again, it should be out to everybody

I would think within the next couple of weeks – probably within the next week. So be on the lookout. And be prepared then to take up the tasks that faculty governance bodies will have to take up. Any...? That was my main item of business, but any other questions about that or any...? I do have a couple of questions that came before the meeting but is there anything about New Academic Directions you want to discuss right now? Okay.

One question, really, and then an augmentation of that question. This came from Ted Miller, who said, “I understand that changes have been made to the timing of the VPFAA’s notification to promotion and tenure candidates regarding the final campus recommendation sent forward to the level of executive review. I’d appreciate your describing these changes and explaining why they were made.” I don’t think there were any changes made by the VPFAA, and so there’s just a slight – kind of an oblique – misunderstanding here. There is a slight change, a delay, in the timeline, which is of course very anxiety producing to P & T candidates and to the interested parties, their departments and so on just because there’s a bit of a delay. These are intended to go forward to the Trustees at their meeting on the 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup>, so next week, and they have moved expeditiously through all of the layers of review and I sent the Bloomington ones forward and – you know they keep aggregating – and I sent the Bloomington ones forward on the 21<sup>st</sup> of March, but of course all of the other campuses are going forward to the president at that point, too, and the president has been involved in things at the state legislature, working on the budget. It was a very ambitious schedule this year and it’s proven not quite feasible from the level of the president to get them done by the 6<sup>th</sup> which was the date that we think originally published – right? – that the notifications would go out from Tom. I hope they’re done soon. Normally, of course, they would have been done in May and have gone forward then, so it is still earlier this year. Now that brings up a question that – the augmentation of the question by Herb – who was wondering about whether or not there was an issue of compression of time in which people who might want to try to rebut something that happened at a given level before the things were finally going on to the Trustees. I think that’s not actually the case, and this is the slight misunderstanding I think. Tom, as has been the practice in his office and was the practice before, I believe, by the Dean of Faculties, has always gotten in touch with candidates and departments if someone is up for early tenure and things have not gone well at some level so that they think about and have the opportunity to pull their case back, because you have as they always unfortunately say, “one bite at the apple.” In other cases, the notification has always gone out of the recommendation that will be made to the Board of Trustees. There has never from this campus been a recommendation that’s gone out from the level of, previously the Dean of Faculties, now the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs. So that is as always. Tom?

**GIERYN:** Since 1986. So Herb and Ted may well have memories long enough to recall, Anya Royce was the last dean of the faculties to send out the letters at that time.

**HANSON:** So in terms of the substantive worry that Herb voiced about that, about whether or not people will have an opportunity to rebut things if there is a negative decision somewhere along the line right at the end, they have that opportunity anyway, and if they are not recommended for promotion and tenure at the upcoming Trustees meeting and they learn about that then they have the next months to try to ask for reconsideration or to mount a grievance with the Faculty Board of Review or whatever that would have been done in the past, so basically that hasn't changed.

**TERRY:** And at that time they would know what the campus committee recommendation and the VPFAA was?

**HANSON:** They have full access to their dossier which has a check sheet which shows what every level has done, including separating the role of the provost and the president. So, anything else to be said about that?

**GIERYN:** I simply want to go on record as thanking all of those many people who worked very hard to prepare the promotion and tenure dossiers including the candidates themselves meeting a new schedule; the deans and the chairs who reviewed them, the school-level and department-level committees, faculty members who serve on the campus-level promotion and tenure advisory committees. All of these people made the deadlines in a very difficult and accelerated schedule and I want to thank all them publicly for their work. The concern about compression of time between the campus decision and that of the executive level, the executive level doesn't prepare any written response on tenure and promotion cases. The last written response is prepared by me with the recommendation in hand from the promotion – campus-level promotion – and tenure committees. If a candidate chooses to grieve using BFC mechanisms, that can begin immediately, and it could extend into the next academic year. The same is true with the consideration. If there is new material that comes to fore, a candidate has the right to request reconsideration at whatever negative point, whatever venue that had a negative vote. Neither of those, the grievance or the reconsideration, would add time to a tenure clock. It would simply be allowed to take place during that next year. So, it's not as if we've squeezed the time between when I reach my decision and the executive decision is given to the Board. That was never really a timeframe for a grievance open to consideration. There wouldn't – there never has been enough time.

**HANSON:** And then in fact in terms of what options are left to candidates who have had an unfavorable decision, this accelerated time clock, difficult as it has been, and even though the final stage has not, you know, quite met that date I think it's got to meet it within a week and it will still be giving the candidates more time to respond than they would have had last year or the year before when we moved forward in the middle of May.

**TERRY:** I might show that I am – let me explain, Ted asked this as head of the AAUP, and I'm on the AAUP committee – executive committee – I think I'm the only member of that committee here, so... It's still the case then that the candidate has no written explanation for the decision at the level of executive review?

**GIERYN:** It's always been the case. The president and provost base their decision on the full set of recommendations that come forward from the candidate's own dossier to every level of review at the department, school, and campus level. Their decision is based on all of those recommendations which are made to them.

**HANSON:** And I don't know if this term was ever in use before, this idea of "executive review," but essentially that process is the same even before there was a provost, when there was a chancellor, the chancellor didn't write a rec –

**TERRY:** – No, this came up when I was President of the BFC and UFC and I confirmed that from Ken Gros Louis and Myles Brand, actually, so I know that that's been the practice. As you understand the appeal process, after executive review and presumably the actions of the Trustees, one would go, if one wanted to, to the Board of Review which would make a recommendation to the provost?

**HANSON:** There are a couple of options. And again what happens is that, you know, the cases that are being recommended for promotion and tenure are the ones that go forward to the Trustees, they don't make any negative decisions or anything about the ones that haven't gone forward. So depending upon given cases, you know, Tom has mentioned things that, you know, people might have new things come in, they suddenly get a gazillion dollar grant, or their book is awarded the Goncourt prize or, you know, something. And they could come back and simply ask for a reconsideration within this period, or they can file a – and they can do that at the level of first negative turndown – and then they can ask for a reconsideration at the level of the – well, basically at any level – and they can take things of a procedural sort to the Faculty Board of Review.

**TERRY:** Okay, I will summarize this for Ken.

**HANSON:** Okay. Any other questions about it? Okay, any other questions on anything else? Or comments? Okay, well then we'll turn to David Johnson who has an update on the math credit for admissions.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 5: UPDATE ON MATH CREDIT FOR ADMISSIONS IMPLEMENTATION**

**JOHNSON:** Thank you Provost Hanson and President Dowell, pleasure to be here this afternoon with you. I wanted to bring an update after working on this analysis over the last several

months with our staff and admissions and enrollment management. And these are just a set of recommendations, I think, that we would want to consider.

We first examined the policy which you can see on the handout was voted on by this body in 2006 and approved by the Board of Trustees and that particular policy related to the seven credits of mathematics to include pre-calculus, trigonometry, and calculus. And in August of last year it became apparent, or at least it became a concern, that a period of review for this standard was needed and therefore for the fall 2011 math requirement we rephrased the prescriptive language at some guidance from the provost and the leadership from this group and the Educational Policies Committee. So that was changed or rephrased to read, "...and one credit of additional college preparatory math," so we could have some time to review these standards as set moving forward and the data, which we'll walk through in a moment, was a considerable project to load all those high school curriculum units, which normally are not captured. A transcript is reviewed, but not normally captured and put into the system but we did that so we can analyze this data. And we did two preliminary reports to the Educational Policies Committee and I want to thank Padraic and his committee for very lively conversations and well thought out discussion. We had a meeting on January 24<sup>th</sup> and then again recently on March the 7<sup>th</sup> and the findings related to admitted beginners with their curriculum listed here, seven units plus, that would include trig, pre-calc, and calc, you can see the numbers represent 93% from the domestic students. If you go over toward the end of that group of data you can see 830, [throat clearing] excuse me, or 99 Chinese students. And the reason we mentioned, or just referenced Chinese students is because the data – or the curriculum and the data – from that curriculum is very diverse with our international students as you can imagine and not as homogeneous as it would be with our domestic students. And so we began this large project in the fall with the domestic students primarily and we added in Chinese students because they represent the largest group of international students on campus. And then you can see looking further through that data there is a split on resident and non-resident and mean SAT's and the median GPA as well. Then it goes across, it goes down to talk about 7+ units of any math and "any" means different types of titles that may in fact reference trig or pre-calc, but those are different titles and they are listed on lots of appended pages in this data analysis but that represents 6% of the domestic students and 1% for Chinese students. And then fewer than 7 units was listed as well, with 1%, 268 students. And you can see the split between resident and non-resident. The story – the compelling story – is for those who don't meet the prescribed trig, pre-calc, or calc 7+ plus any units, that would largely be non-resident, because these standards are – as those of who were here when this was voted on would know – were written primarily toward the Indiana high school requirements and so they follow that very well and those students who were coming here from out of state may not have the exact curriculum. But you can see even with our non-resident students a large, large percentage meet the standards, there are a few that have 7 units of any and then fewer than 7 units is also represented. After

the discussion with the Educational Policies Committee and through further discussion on campus and enrollment management we believe that it's important to return to the policy as prescribed by this group, to the approved language of 7 credits, which would be including the pre-calculus, trigonometry or calculus. We have a few other notes or recommendations here that undergraduate admissions would continue to use professional judgment and discretion in admitting promising students who are an exception to this policy. And for students from which we request additional information, such as the seventh semester grades or new test scores, that we would also request that they provide us with a statement indicating extenuating circumstances as to why they may not have met the academic standings/credentials that are required here. We think that that will help us when we are looking at individual cases and that was a point brought up through the committee discussions and I think that's important as the Director of Admissions, Mary Ellen Anderson, has pointed out and she's traveling today or she would be here as well, that we do receive from a number of students their personal statements about their personal situations but not all are required to send that so we think that would be a compelling point for the students for which we are going to be requesting additional information. And then last, the Office of Enrollment Management will study this cohort. We feel that that's important to look at their academic performance and persistence over time because I can imagine as you look at this data and you look at these SATs you may ask, well, what about these students with 7 units of any, will they fare well here? Will they do well at IU? And so those are questions that we would want to follow up on with the cohort.

**HANSON:** Thank you. Any questions?

**ARNOVE:** There appears to be an anomaly with the students, the 1% fewer than 7 units because they have actually higher SAT/converted ACT scores and a median GPA that's almost as high as the 7 units plus all the rest, so what can you tell us about that group?

**JOHNSON:** Right, and I appreciate you bringing that up because it really does speak to their – if we use the test score and GPA as quality indicators which are measures of their ability and quality – it does speak to that but there may be extenuating circumstances around those 268 students for a variety of majors or programs that they may be in and we would have all of that data within the summary of the data.

**ARNOVE:** Well, I mean, one possibility is that they're at high schools that don't offer these courses?

**JOHNSON:** Absolutely, yes.

**ARNOVE:** Or that they're doing some homeschooling is another possibility?

**JOHNSON:** Yes. Right. And when we're talking about thousands and thousands of students and then you have these nuances in the curriculum you look at that to see, do they have the course that's required? Maybe that course has a different title and that's a difficult discernment, student by student, and as you can see it's a very small number.

**ARNOVE:** But interesting.

**DOWELL:** Padraic?

**KENNEY:** I just wanted to quickly say from the EPC that we've dealt with this all year and I do want to thank Vice Provost Johnson for putting up with all of our questions and demands for more data. Just two things I'll say, is that we were pretty cautious in coming back to the original language, and I think and there maybe there was some on the committee who wanted to go back immediately, some weren't sure and maybe we should stick for a longer time with this temporary language. But I was actually pretty impressed with how the discussion went and in the end we're all quite comfortable with the language that had been approved by the EPC and the BFC five years earlier. Secondly I just wanted to say that this also put generally admissions guidelines on the EPC radar and it's something we're going to be thinking about over the next year not, you know, that they need to be tinkered with or something like that but it was interesting to have this opportunity five years on to look at how admissions is working and now that there's going to be an opportunity to review data, I think we're going to be interested in seeing how it all works out. I don't know if we're going to be bringing anything here but we'll certainly be paying attention to it.

**HANSON:** Herb?

**TERRY:** My question's probably based on that comment for both Padraic and David. Presumably the shift away from the original language to additional college preparatory math was based on a concern that some people might not apply?

**JOHNSON:** Right.

**TERRY:** Okay.

**JOHNSON:** With these new requirements it could, potentially, have an impact and so this was an opportunity to not walk away or step away from the requirements as written but just to modify them to have a bit more discretion.

**TERRY:** The data here shows that the students who don't have courses that you can clearly identify as pre-calculus, trigonometry, and calculus are overwhelmingly non-residential students. And now I'm going to sound like somebody from the Budgetary Affairs Committee,

we need their revenue. We need them. So what convinces you that the chilling effect that you feared when you proposed changing the language has gone away?

**JOHNSON:** Well, I think if the chilling effect would have been since they were new requirements would students meet those requirements? Well, they were advertised for a number of years so one, on one side of the fence, could assume that they would, on the other side of the fence would be since they were new requirements there may be cause for some analysis and study of that and that analysis of the real students coming through the pipeline for this class, because looking at 10 would not have helped us, because that's not the group that was required to meet this standard, so looking at the real first class that needed to meet this standard proved helpful in that regard and we are able to say that overwhelmingly the data show the students have met the standard and that's why I think with confidence it's easy for me to recommend to this body and to the provost that we return to that language.

**DOWELL:** Right, and just to clarify, that's returning to the admissions language that was passed in 2005 and that went into effect for this year. So he's not proposing new language, he's proposing full implementation of what was approved and what we, just briefly, drew back on for a little bit for this year.

**HANSON:** Any other questions or comments? Well we thank both the EPC and David Johnson and admissions for working hard to gather the data and it'll be interesting to follow-up on it as well. I don't know that this really requires an action. I mean I think the sense is we wanted to bring this back to see whether or not, once we gathered the data, that was recommended before looked safe. The recommendation is that is does, so we'll move forward.

**DOWELL:** Yeah, wonderful news.

**HANSON:** Yeah. Okay, we have a big item for discussion and possible voting. Do you want to take a short break and then...or not a break? It's your pleasure. Five minute break and then reconvene.

#### **BRIEF RECESS**

**HANSON:** I believe that was a five-minute break so let's reconvene and I will turn again to Vice Provost Tom Gieryn to present, for a second time, issues about the policy on merger, reorganization, and elimination reform.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 6: MERGER, REORGANIZATION AND ELIMINATION POLICY REFORM**

**GIERYN:** Thank you. This is a second reading of an attempt to take a policy that would greatly streamline what happens to faculty rights and interests as the university reorganizes its administrative structures. The existing policy created a committee and a fairly cumbersome

review process that last year when we considered the proposal for a new School of Public Health proved almost completely unworkable in practice. As a result of that, in working with John and Elizabeth and the MRE Committee as well as the leadership of the BFC, we decided that a useful strategy was to extract some of the principles behind the long and unwieldy existing policy, principles that said exactly what was at stake for faculty as the university merged units, reorganized departments and schools, eliminated them, renamed them and so forth. What was really at stake is a fairly simple list of rights as well as responsibilities on both sides and that's what we've tried to do in this policy. I can repeat how this is different from the previous policy, but what I'd like to do is bring you up to date. We discussed it last time, we took those comments, Erika received other comments from additional members of the BFC and others, and we had a meeting, two meetings, to discuss how we were going to change the policy. Let me propose to just cover those very few changes really.

In the policy you have before you, the first paragraph remains unchanged. It replaces the preamble of the old policy. The second paragraph is completely different. Basically we wanted a more forceful wording to indicate that what follows is a set of principles that we expect will be implemented in cases of reorganization but we also wanted to say, as we do, "Consistent with our commitment to shared faculty and administrative governance," is a re-wording rather than a change in substance. Secondly, in response to a comment at the last hearing, we changed all of the words "should" into "shall." It is, again, a more forceful statement. "Shall" implies that we expect this to happen. "Should" is a more normative, it's a weaker statement. It's like an expression of hope. [laughter] This one is an expression of sincere desire of expectation. Third, on point number two, we changed the tail-end of that to read now as you see: "these concerns will be collated, summarized and presented to the relevant Deans, Provost, and President before any changes are finalized." There was some lack of clarity as to when faculty feedback would get into the process, now I think it's a little more clear before the final changes are made. The next change – we're almost done – the next change is on point six, suggestion that, among the other compensation and benefits that might be at risk, would be negotiated agreements. It could be a promise of research money. It could be a title, and so forth. We wanted to expand the protection to include negotiated agreements between faculty and some administrative office. Point number seven is new. We heard from representatives both of NTTs – non-tenure track faculty – and graduate students. This is perhaps the shortest but in many ways one of the more consequential points that we could have added and I'll read it, because it's important. "*Contracts*. Contractual rights and obligations of non-tenure track faculty and graduate students shall be honored." It makes no comments about subsequent reappointments, but it does say if there is a contract for a period of time that contract shall be honored. Those are all the changes. I'd be happy to answer any questions you might have.

**HANSON:** Thank you, Tom.

**GIERYN:** Or comments.

**HANSON:** Maxine?

**WATSON:** One thing I'm a little concerned about is in point two, the faculty response, you say in "a reasonable period of time," do you want to give any dimensions to that, because what may be reasonable for one party might be very unreasonable for another.

**GIERYN:** I'll tell you what unreasonable would be and that is if final action is taken prior to the opportunity to provide the response, anything else – I think that John just reminded me, John Carini who co-chaired the MRE Committee – reminded me that the problem with the policy is there is no "one size fits all" on these. They are varying degrees and levels of reorganization, some of them massive in terms of closing or merging schools, others relatively small. I think we felt that we didn't want to lock into a period of time.

**WATSON:** Would it be possible, perhaps, to have the group of negotiators lock-in a time so that there's some collaborative decision about in any particular – I don't know how to say that briefly – but it seems to me it would be nice to have some agreed upon time rather than, I don't mean in each case, an agreed upon time...

**GIERYN:** Maxine, I can understand your point very well and I'll tell you in the couple of years I've been in this job it's been really tough with policies that have 30-day or 45-day... because timing of when you start that, whether it's sufficient... We face these kinds of demands even in our very basic policies on grievance procedures about time tables, really difficult to stick to them.

**WATSON:** No, I mean I'm not asking you to put a time in here, but it seems to me that parties should collaboratively decide at the beginning, some notion of what that time should be. Otherwise when it's totally unspecified it would be really easy to block something by stretching your idea of reasonable to a limit. I mean I just think at least you should both know. So I'm not trying to lock you down to any time.

**GIERYN:** Yeah...

**WATSON:** But some agreement on time. Thanks.

**GIERYN:** Yeah?

**SONI:** How about adding something like, "the period of time which is well publicized?"

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** I think Maxine is leaning towards to be determined by consultation with the BFC is what we're talking about here. So the faculty governance body rather than just a matter of PR.

**GIERYN:** I think that's... I think that's the point. I think that the reasonableness would be decided by the Executive Committee of the BFC who's going to receive the comments and I think that since that is a BFC action, I think we can assume that the president and the Executive Committee will set a reasonable period whether it's – you know, and probably would at that time, work with the provost or the president if necessary to figure out exactly the timetable for implementation.

**DOWELL:** I think that's true and I think in our discussions we were trying to view this document as a set of principles that would trigger and then guide what would be essentially an ad hoc process in each case and the most important people guiding this process would be the Executive Committee of the BFC working in concert with the provost.

**GJERDINGEN:** Just to restate, is it fair to say that with the time – and I agree that a reasonable time makes sense – that as part of the consultation in this process and I think that's what basically she was saying that, among other things, that the prominent role of planning for that change, that one of the things that's talked about is maybe some general agreement at that time so people know in advance whatever it happens to be, and I think that's in essence what she was saying not to have – just to have that as a consideration in item number one rather than...

**GIERYN:** That makes great sense.

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** And we do have the, you know, the grievance process, I don't know if you want to add something having to do with if you're aggrieved not just personally in terms of your appointment but I guess personal consequences could also be, you know, not being consulted in a timely manner with regard to the change, I mean would that fall under... ? Would that be covered by the grievance process, right? If, I don't know how personal that gets. If you're out of the country for the month that you have and – I don't know.

**DOWELL:** I think we viewed those kind of more collective remonstrances or collective concerns perhaps about consultation or lack of it as something that would be brought to the Executive Committee of the BFC or any kind of ad hoc group that might be formed to guide the process.

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** Okay.

**HENSHEL:** Well, Herb is actually next, but I just wanted to add a comment on this so I don't know if it is any different than your comment.

**TERRY:** No, go ahead.

**HENSHEL:** So could we then just add the phrase that Maxine is asking for which would be something like what Maria said. So, “have a reasonable period of time as determined in consultation with the BFC Executive Committee.” And then we can vote on it knowing that phrase is going to be in there. Tom, is that okay?

**GIERYN:** You know, I’m gonna have to ask you to repeat where you want to stick it and the words again [laughter]

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** First line of the second –

**GIERYN:** I got it, “shall have a responsible period of time...”

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** Comma.

**HENSHEL:** “– to determine in consultation with the BFC...

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** – Executive Committee.”

**HENSHEL:** Executive committee, comma.

**GIERYN:** Got it.

**HANSON:** Herb?

**TERRY:** I had a comment in the last meeting that didn’t get incorporated and I’m sort of wondering if there’s a reason. I suggested a change in the first paragraph. It noted that as well as university campus and school administrators recommending a reorganization that faculty might decide to do that and I thought that you were going to stick that in there. “University, campus, and school administrators, and faculty may occasionally decide that reorganization...”

**DOWELL:** We must have missed that one.

**TERRY:** We certainly might propose a reorganization at some point. Also in that first paragraph in the light of the-

**GIERYN:** – I’m adding it. –

**TERRY:** – in light of the upcoming report of the New Academic Directions Committee I think it’d be useful if it indicated that a reorganization could include campuses, departments, schools, and degree programs. Certainly once we’ve created the core school idea we opened the door to reorganizations that might involve multiple campuses.

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** Do faculty individually have the power to decide? They have the power to propose.

**TERRY:** To propose. Oh, to decide...

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** So that verb there...

**TERRY:** Yeah, okay.

**GIERYN:** That is a BFC document.

**TERRY:** I wondered about point four. This is a point that was brought to me by one of my colleagues. We've covered expectations of probationary tenure-track faculty. We haven't covered promotional standards for people who are associates and find themselves as fulls in some new thing. Did your group think about that problem and what do you do or decide?

**DOWELL:** We did think about that problem and because of the sort of open-endedness of when someone might go up for full we decided it was not appropriate to stipulate that they needed to be reviewed under the original criteria. If it was a fifteen year gap between the reorganization and when you sought that final step in promotion, we felt that that was probably unreasonable to expect that we would unearth – that we would let that original criteria live for so long. We understand the difficulties that it would present in other instances, though. If you want to, Tom, did you want to expand?

**GIERYN:** Again because the decision to go up for promotion for full professor is never obligatory with the immediate consequences of a negative decision, the other would be in the event of somebody finding a new academic home there could be, if there were issues surrounding when and how the promotion consideration would be made, you could draw up an MOU or a MOA with signatures from the chairs and the appropriate deans in my office and the candidate and do it that way. Which is how it's happening now so I didn't, yeah.

**TERRY:** Also on that point, again something that we did discuss at the last meeting. I thought point four was going to give the probationary tenure-track faculty member a choice between the criteria and standards of the original home and the criteria and standards of their new unit.

**GIERYN:** Yeah, I remember.

**TERRY:** You could imagine a faculty member feeling more comfortable with some newly created unit.

**GIERYN:** Yeah.

**TERRY:** So I don't know.

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** Part of the impetus for having the change.

**TERRY:** Yeah exactly. Some of these sometimes this comes from junior faculty who want to reorganize the world. So I think it would be okay to give the faculty member that choice.

**GIERYN:** So you'd like to propose that instead of "shall be reviewed," "may choose to be reviewed?"

**TERRY:** Or you could just add it at the end, "or if they so choose under the criteria and standards of their new unit."

**GIERYN:** Yeah, I think it might be easier this way, Herb.

**DOWELL:** Yeah.

**GIERYN:** If they choose to be reviewed for tenure under the criteria of the original home unit at the time they were first appointed or under those of the new...

**TERRY:** Yeah. Okay.

**HANSON:** Geoff?

**SPRINKLE:** Two quick questions. One on point five, the last sentence, "the selection of a new home unit must be approved..." and so on. What if no one wants you?

**GIERYN:** Yeah, we've come to refer to this as the homeless problem. [laughter]

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** We need a shelter!

**GIERYN:** We must admit that there is no easy resolution because two fundamental principles are kind of in a clash. One the one hand, the right of a faculty member to have an academic home, the other is the autonomous right of faculty to decide who their colleagues will be and they butt heads right there. What we know is this, that tenure is a campus phenomenon so that, you know, no one is going to be denied or lose tenure by virtue of not having an academic home. So in that sense there's that baseline protection. Otherwise, what we felt is that it would have to be in some cases and sadly, a protracted set of negotiations between the individual faculty member and possibly a number of units until something is reached. Because tenure is a campus-level phenomenon it might involve the provost's office working with the candidate and with deans and chairs to try to find a home. It seems to me that that's something that I'd be

lucky to put in the policy but I think as a practical matter I suspect that's how it would have to come down.

**SPRINKLE:** My second question was on item three, the negotiated termination. For whatever reason it struck me as a little bit odd, perhaps a little bit heavy-handed almost, and it doesn't indicate that the faculty member is a part of that negotiation. So, I don't know if it's necessary or if we could just negotiate a termination that is acceptable to the faculty member or for whatever reason the negotiated termination term just – it really struck me as a bit odd, if you will.

**GIERYN:** It – I can see that – and I know what I was thinking of in proposing it initially that sometimes negotiated terminations deal with a period of time –

**SPRINKLE:** – Sure. –

**GIERYN:** – not an immediate decision. So one could say that if the unit is being dissolved or something that I would agree, this is typically for our senior colleagues who are at the edge of their careers and they're choosing to retire within the next couple of years. You could have a negotiated termination, an agreement to retire after some time. We could take it out if you think it's so peculiar that it raises problems.

**SPRINKLE:** I don't know. I didn't know if that would fall under the umbrella of voluntary attrition that was over a period of time?

**GIERYN:** I guess it might. So let's take it out.

**SPRINKLE:** So I would just go with voluntary attrition or reassignment.

**GIERYN:** I'm game.

**SPRINKLE:** ...but that's... okay.

**HANSON:** I'm sorry, can I get a clarification on the other thing that Geoff raised on number 5 on the homeless problem. When it says shall not be involuntarily assigned to a new home unit I quite take the point you make about people continuing to work to find something that everybody's satisfied with but in the meantime people would have to keep teaching or doing some things like that...

**GIERYN:** Doing something

**HANSON:** ...so are we getting ourselves into a bind here of looking like we can't do something that we would have to do?

**GIERYN:** I think that's a question for the Faculty Council [laughter].

**ARNOVE:** Related to that was the grievance procedure.

**DOWELL:** Yeah.

**ARNOVE:** I mean this was brought up last time. So the individual can bring up a grievance to the Faculty Board of Review. Now, the question is then negotiations involving the timing though, what role does that Faculty Board of Review have and what authority does it have.

**GIERYN:** I mean, I have-

**PURDOM:** Yeah, I'm not sure whether or not there's any effective wording that can be used to improve the situation but when my unit was, you know, reorganized I think there was lack of clarity as to whether or not we were voting to consider reorganizing versus actually voting to reorganize. So anyway, those are obviously important differences and clarity of wording in these procedures is of the utmost importance.

**GIERYN:** Yeah. I know. The case in point from last year, that is the reorganization of HPER raised some issues about the extent to which faculty have the right to resist an involuntary reassignment and I think that in discussing this with the committee we felt that that was an important right to protect. It does raise the problems of the fact that, you know, in the middle of this reorganization faculty continue to need to have a home for the purposes of teaching assignments if nothing else as well as service and research expectations. So I don't know. One would hope that this policy requires the kind of consultation and faculty response so that it would eventually work out, okay? That if there were faculty who could not be located, who resisted location, again, I want to fall back on the word "reasonable people," but I get into trouble with the word "reasonable." One would hope that we could find a home, that we could work that out and in a certain sense that the finalization of the proposed changes would be contingent on making sure that faculty all ended up in places that they were more or less content.

**SPRINKLE:** Tom, just to make a follow up on that. Is the last sentence in item five even necessary? Seems like we could strike that because when we say faculty are "allowed to pursue residence..." and then the "mutual fit" and so I just worry with that last sentence that you could take my department or any other department that draws the line in the sand and when you – you know when it's not necessary – when you can just go with when you say "mutual fit" that implies that there's multiple sides to that.

**GIERYN:** Yeah.

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** That's process, that's process, and I think that's what you've drawn the attention to.

**GIERYN:** This is a time-honored principle so that, you know, we see it not just in cases of people who voluntarily want to move or reassign their FTE, we see it also in dual career hires where, yeah, the trailing spouse or partner is – they go to the chair and say to the faculty, do we want to receive this person as a member of the faculty on such and such conditions? Do we need to restate it? I think it's a matter of principle that's well established but I state there because we don't want to go the other way and infringe on the rights of departments to their own self-determination of faculty. Whether "mutual" captures it all, yeah, maybe it's a little redundancy that maybe we can I guess...

**HANSON:** Padraic?

**KENNEY:** I sorry this is a really stupid question, but I'm struck looking at this document that everything is about faculty and there's not a word about students. And, I mean, students are here temporarily but shouldn't... For example, that "all students in a program are permitted to receive the degree for which they enrolled," or something like that?

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** I mean students are not in departments, right?

**HANSON:** But they're in schools.

**DOWELL:** Right.

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** Oh, so you're talking about...oh yeah, duh. Yeah, okay. Obvious.

**KENNEY:** Exactly.

**DOWELL:** Right.

**KENNEY:** Whether it's an undergraduate or graduate student I mean there are people who come into a program and expect to get a degree. We certainly have the right to reorganize it out from under them but presumably they deserve at least the same expectations of something for the duration of their degree.

**DOWELL:** Right, we did discuss this in our discussions [laughter]. And we – it just gets very sticky the closer we came to trying to cover everything I think and – who else is here? – John, you can jump in if you like to explain what we were thinking here. I think in the end we were looking at the typical student progress that one, a reorganization was probably not going to take place rapidly. It would take the process of at least a year or two to be fully developed and that the faculty, the units involved, whether they're schools or departments would figure something out to accommodate everybody so that they could graduate in the programs they started out with,

or in some semblance. Now, if we need to figure out a way to add a point and say that in a sentence in a very general way, then we can take that back.

**KENNEY:** You know I kind of feel like it's necessary but only because it's just very strange that we're talking about so important and here are faculty talking only about ourselves.

**DOWELL:** Mmhmm.

**KENNEY:** And we ourselves are very important to ourselves. But we are here to teach students, and we can imagine a situation where a student enrolls in, let's take the longest version, enrolls in a doctoral program, say an eight-year doctoral program, and all of a sudden that, you know that [slight laughter] – well, in the languages that's typical – and a few years in that program and the entire place where it's located is gone.

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** Like the Russian Literature at SUNY.

**KENNEY:** Exactly! Yes, where they had to make – at SUNY Albany – where they had to make specific promises to the students that they would be able to get their PhD's in Latin or Italian or Russian, all of the various ones that were cancelled. I think it would really behoove us as faculty to say that, and not just in a kind of general way, say it really explicitly. They are owed as much protection as we are.

**DOCHERTY:** As a faculty member in HPER, this was a major concern as we've been going through this and, you know, we immediately think of the doctoral students. But even sophomore undergraduate students that still have three more years in their program were really concerned. So I would – I know that.

**HANSON:** Maxine?

**WATSON:** My concern, I'm embarrassed that I didn't bring up graduate students, I feel like I should have focused on that and didn't, so I'm glad you did. I think that we need some reality, though. If we dissolve a department, can it still create the curriculum that's associated with the degree? And I think that if it's not a good degree that's an issue, too. So I'm sort of going with the same sense that there are some cases where we'll be able to continue to deliver a curriculum and some cases where we probably won't and that there seems to be – as in so many things Tom points out – we need to be careful of that orchestrating things that we can't deliver. The other thing I'd like to do is to say is that for graduate students, at any rate, I think that people who have been admitted to candidacy and have finished taking their courses and are now doing research deserve some guarantee, because they've reached a point in their development where they're functioning more as independent people and where they're committed to a precise question, they can deal with faculty more flexibly, but again as with

undergraduates, or a pre-admission student who's still taking coursework and has not got a thesis project, if the department – what's left – can no longer deliver we're not doing them any favors by presenting something that looks okay but isn't. So I'm just leery, you know, of putting it into too solid a language.

**GIERYN:** The other issue that came up in our discussion was, sort of, and I think Maxine cut to it on the graduate side, but if you just go over to the undergraduate side, at what point does an undergraduate student make a commitment such that we need to honor it? They come to IU, okay? They arrive as a freshman with the intent to major in X, and we close the department. Well, maybe they hadn't declared the major, but they had taken some courses consistent with the major, they wanted to, they came here for that reason. It opens a lot of really tough decisions about what the obligation really is to students, which is why we ended up fastening on point seven on the contractual obligations to cover multi-year [comment indistinct due to coughing in background] would be covered, teaching assignments over a period of time, but again I think that the key point is major reorganizations can't possibly happen overnight. They're going to take time. They're going to be phased in. Students are going to have opportunities to respond, and I – again we could work out wording that could protect students. It might be easier in the case of graduate students at a certain point in their career than to open it up to all students, that I think would be difficult to, in some way, limit the obligations of the institution to provide basically what we have at time one in perpetuity for a student in any situation who faces a change.

**HANSON:** Thank you.

**KENNEY:** I think that that makes sense. I can see the difficulties of getting [comment indistinct] into this, but I think it may be one thing we could keep in mind is one key disadvantage that students have is lack of information. I mean, faculty already know about a possible merger and so on [background noise remark indistinct] that might happen someday goes around a department or school. Students are less likely to be informed, and so at the very least one could imagine, you know, adding something about consultation explicitly so that students are consulted at an early stage, so that would take care, I think, of the obligation. So perhaps in point one in addition to "Faculty governance bodies..." I'm not sure – "student" – some kind of student representation could be recommended.

**DOWELL:** Yes?

**JIMENEZ:** I mentioned at the last meeting, and I'm sure that there were relevant challenges discussing your discussions, but at the last meeting I mentioned that if this a revision, the original document did mention students in, I think it's like basically point one and point two, in that consultation process. The original document did mention students in the sense that they

were part of the consultation process and could be part of the ad-hoc remonstrance committees and things like that and the new one doesn't at all. And that was my comment at the last meeting because I'm sure that it is challenging, but if the old one mentions students at least at some point, then – and correct me if I'm wrong – if this is the only policy document or one of few policy documents, students should be at least mentioned because then it would remove all capacity for student feedback if it's not at least somewhere in here.

**GIERYN:** Could the line in question is, in the original policy, the rationale is it's the position of the BFC one, that it is best interest of the administration, faculty, and students, that adequate consultation take place between all the relevant parties in pending matters of merger and reorganization and so forth. It's not bad language.

**DOWELL:** There's also Nick in the back.

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** Nick?

**D'AMICO:** Sorry, I just wanted to echo a few comments that have already been made by both Maxine and Padraic about, you know, I can understand that it's very difficult to come up with every single situation possible to ensure graduate students can continue which is why I think that point seven that was created about contractual obligations actually is probably the closest we can get and I think Maxine makes very good comments about the fact that I'm leery about promising graduate students something that we can't really deliver on, especially if you have, you know, faculty who might decide, 'Ah well, I don't really want to go on to this new department, maybe I'll seek a job somewhere else,' and maybe that's your advisor. So it creates lots of situations that I think could be difficult to articulate. It's why I think it's probably acceptable to just leave it as the contractual obligations, but at the same time I think that consultation really is something that could be very helpful, especially for younger students. Like you said, this is something that will happen over a number of years, and to get students you know, involved over that whole time and let the graduate students know at least, can at least help them get an idea of whether, you know, what expectations are, what the new program will look like, do they want to continue in that new program, should they start putting in applications to different schools with better programs. So I think the combination of the current wording plus some explicit consultation is something that could really alleviate this problem.

**HENSHEL:** Given that this is the at least second time we've heard this, and it seems like this needs to be passed by our body before this new document is made public, because it seems to me like this is something that's important for the faculty to have. I wonder whether we could consider letting, passing this, either as is or with the sentence we put in again, and then have the group go back and revisit to either do an addendum that addresses students explicitly next year? Just I would like to see the faculty document passed, or at least considered, you know put

up for a vote, only because I'm concerned about what's going to be coming down the pipe very soon.

**HANSON:** It does seem to me that we could do something in the spirit of it but then also, I don't think actually anything will come down the pike so quickly that it–

**HENSHEL:** Okay.

**DOWELL:** Yeah, I mean–

**HANSON:** I mean, it will come down the pike, but it's [laughter] not as if in two weeks something or other will have to have been done, I understand.

**HENSHEL:** I understand that.

**DOWELL:** Yeah. If you give an update to the Trustees next Friday, or maybe it's Thursday, I forget, we would meet the following Tuesday, and I don't when this will – even if this went public, you know, next Monday, it's still less than a week and we're in the middle of the policy process. So I understand the desire, and we did come in here today thinking 'Well, if there weren't a lot of comments we could consider voting on this today,' but I don't know. I think maybe we've reached the threshold where there's quite a few comments and we have a number of wordsmithing changes that have come forward. So, I mean, I take my advice from Karen who knows most about maybe what would happen, you know, following the release of the New Academic Directions report, but at this point we're not even sure it'll be public before our next meeting. We think it will –

**HANSON:** Oh, I'm sure.

**DOWELL:** You're sure it will?

**HANSON:** I'm moderately sure.

**DOWELL:** You're moderately sure.

**HANSON:** But I do think one, you may have a sense that, you know, if you don't have this in place by the time that comes out somehow this couldn't govern that, but it can.

**HENSHEL:** No, it's not so much that. It's just that I think that the students' concerns are a lot more than just a couple of sentences in here.

**DOWELL:** Yeah.

**HENSHEL:** I think actually they probably warrant a full page on their own because I think there's going to be a lot of complications associated with it and just having one half hour discussion

doesn't really, to me, feel like it's addressing the issues. And so I feel like it's a – it's a piece that needs to be addressed by itself and that this is a piece that maybe with some additional, you know, language in there, is okay to stand by itself and then address the student issues next fall or even starting now if they're willing to back and start working on it.

**HANSON:** Well, and also may I just add something on the student things? It seems to me that when Padraic raised this initially there were really two concerns, one is the consultation concern, but the other concern is the disposition of their educational careers and, you know, those might go in different places and something, you know, generally hortatory but that makes the point that you attend to those students who are in train in various programs is important you don't maybe have to spell it all out but it makes it, these are supposed to be principles and that may be something to add in besides the contractual things.

**TERRY:** And in line with that, I mean that's what reasonable efforts shall be made for the completion of degree programs affected by reorganizations.

**HANSON:** Mmhmm.

**TERRY:** That's what the College of Arts and Sciences now does when it makes a major change in a degree program or combines departments or something like that. You ad hoc your way through it, but you are sensitive to the basic principle that these students started under one set of expectations and you would do the best you can to carry that forward as long as you can until eventually the key faculty member dies, retires, or whatever. You can't do it any longer.

**HANSON:** Did you need to respond to that, Tom?

**GIERYN:** I just, because it goes back to the point you made, Karen, about the timing of this, I think that we haven't seen the report, several of you have, if there – I think I'd be completely satisfied in putting off a vote until the 19<sup>th</sup> if we have some assurance that there's nothing in the New Academic Directions that is fundamentally inconsistent with the spirit of this document. That is, if it were to get at the level of detail that recommended implementation, a time table of implementation and so forth, then if there's nothing in there that's inconsistent with the spirit of this document then I think we can certainly wait so that three days, four days after the Trustees get it we have a chance to vote on this policy. That's fine and I'm persuaded that the issues require more than just a quick wordsmithing.

**DOWELL:** So Carolyn, and then, yes?

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** There is something concerning about number two, "*Faculty response.*" In particular where it says, "these concerns will be collated, summarized and presented to the relevant deans, Provost, etc..." That clause behaves as if it shall be, you know? That all that is

going to be required is collating, summarizing, and presenting, and I'm not certain that is going to be the case but that's the way it reads from my perspective.

**WATSON:** That they needn't pay any attention to it.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Pardon?

**WATSON:** That they needn't pay any attention to it.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Absolutely!

**WATSON:** I mean, I agree

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Yes, before changes are finalized, you know, we just want to collect, you know, concerns, and then once these concerns are collected, we'll make a final decision.

**DOWELL:** Well...

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** And that's implicit.

**DOWELL:** Well, I think that reflects reality, in some respects. I mean, before it said, "before changes are implemented," which made the faculty comment seem totally by the by, you know? That you couldn't actually implement until you received the faculty comment. But I understand where you're coming from, I understand that the idea is that those concerns be put forward and then, you know, further negotiating would happen. But...

**WATSON:** [Remark indistinct] say "will be formally considered by," so that they're not just put in.

**BOLING:** They can still blow you off but they have to say so.

**WATSON:** Right, they have to say so.

**DOWELL:** David, would you like to go ahead?

**ESTELL:** Yeah, I was just going to say in regard to the student things, I mean obviously it seems like there's a lot of other issues that have been raised,

**UNKNOWN MALE SPEAKER:** Could you speak up please? Thanks.

**ESTELL:** Sorry, I was going to say in regard to the student concerns obviously there's going to be a lot of issues with regard to specifically finishing degrees but I do think in point one, if you literally just put "and student" after every time we say faculty because point one is just, we're going to talk to you, we're going to listen to you, but it spells out nothing in terms of kind of rights, and so, I mean, you can put that in pretty easily and say, 'Look we're going to consult

with students, plan for change with students, keep them informed,' but in nowhere in there does it say the students actually have like a voting right in whether these changes move forward, and so I think at least in that one in terms at least of the consulting, that one would be a relatively quick fix, if just "faculty and student government", "faculty and student representatives." And then yeah, what are their rights in terms of degree programs is a whole other concern but it seemed like one of the major things just making sure that they know early on enough that if the bottom line if you're going to have to go to another institution at least you know that's coming down the pike rather than, you know, you're continuing to move forward on your dissertation and then whoops, you're going to have to switch institutions or something like that. So I mean I think at least in terms of consultation, that one could be a relatively quick fix even if everything else is a much, much more difficult ball of wax. So...

**WATSON:** I know that this was developed specifically in order to address merger, reorganization, and elimination. But it strikes me because we've been dealing with a department this year who's had, I don't know what to call it, a major upheaval, but the issues are all these same issues, and it would be nice to somehow get that encapsulated under these same principles, and I don't know whether it's too awkward, but the issues really are strikingly the same. And it would have been helpful to have some formal or express – but I don't whether there was a way to do it without becoming too cumbersome.

**GJERNDINGEN:** I'd like to go back quickly to the "homeless," and just an informational question. The big exception always is financial exigency. I'm assuming from your earlier remarks for these people, financial exigency basically means Indiana University at large, correct? So that just a kind of, I wouldn't want that to come up as a future argument, because that's always the exception. And that that would be IU in general and not just those departments because if you say it's those departments that's just, that's a huge hole in all of that and I think that's consistent with what you've said before that is given by IU and if that that be the understanding if that what it is.

**GIERYN:** That's my understanding.

**HANSON:** Well, but isn't that, that isn't buffered a little bit by our budgeting system, so that if a particular school finds itself unable to operate, it's not so obvious where the funds comes from in order to make it operate, because they are dispersed.

**GIERYN:** Tenure is a campus-specific right, and therefore if a school declares bankruptcy –

**HANSON:** Well, tenure is, but this business about the assignment to a new academic home, suppose one academic home is unable to operate now, and that's the sort of concern I have, whereas another one is flush. I guess I'm a little uneasy. I hadn't had this concern until a number of you raised this, but about five, whether or not it's asking for things that we can't do

which would be very bad for a principle. I mean we don't want to have principles that we end up ignoring, so it does need to be shaped in some way, that it's doable. I mean, I was just thinking of – sorry, this is the counterfactual philosophy training, you know – if faculty members are in an academic home that's renamed they shouldn't be involuntarily assigned to it. I mean I suppose somebody gets a naming gift but a faculty member doesn't like the person for whom it's been named, and then says, 'I'm not sitting in this thing.' [laughter] And then what do we do with it? I'm just a little uneasy about how we deal with this. I mean I think what Tom describes is exactly what we want. We want to work through the individual research and teaching career of that person to understand where the best fit is and to find something that's mutually satisfying on both sides, but we also can't have somebody who's not doing a job for a salary for a while, so this is a difficult thing to rephrase. So other...?

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** I would say that because this New Directions Committee Report is so compelling from my perspective, it seems to me that it would be unwise for us to approve this document before we see what's in that report, which probably will have a huge bearing on what's before us.

**HANSON:** It may well. But I also want to underscore the works that Tom and Erika and the Agenda Committee and others have done on this, that part of what produced a very policy in the past was a specific reaction to deal with something or other, I think you really need to think what principles do you want to govern these processes? And put those in forward so that that shapes then everything that's done in that vein.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** I understand that but this strikes me that I might come up with some newfound and newfangled principles as a consequence of what is in that report.

**HANSON:** Yeah. Herb?

**TERRY:** In response to your – maybe the principle is that you have a right to be reassigned to the best fit that all of these people can, in good faith, negotiate.

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** But isn't that what mutual fit represents?

**TERRY:** Well, but it does say that you can't be involuntarily reassigned. You know the current thing says that you can just keep saying no. And maybe the only principle is that you have a right for all of these parties to work together in good faith and come up with the best fit they can given the changes that have been required or decided upon through the mechanisms that decide on reorganization.

**DOWELL:** Well, we can take that to our discussion.

**TERRY:** In other words, positive thing. You have a right to this rather than a right to never be reassigned involuntarily.

**DOWELL:** MmHm. Yeah.

**GIERYN:** It's hard to put down...

**CARINI:** '...hall not be summarily reassigned.' [laughter]

**BUCUR-DECKARD:** I think the grievance process takes care of the person who feels like their issue is summarily...

**HANSON:** Okay. Other questions or comments or suggestions? I'm taking it that the consensus is that you want to polish a little and then come back to this at the meeting on the 19<sup>th</sup>?

**TERRY:** I'd like to make a request to the Agenda Committee, could we get within about a week, the next version of this?

**DOWELL:** Yeah, we have a meeting scheduled tomorrow at ten.

**TERRY:** Well, that may be too soon. [laughter]. Instead of it coming the day before the next meeting, could we –

**DOWELL:** Yeah.

**TERRY:** Get it within a week or so so that we can look at it and come really prepared?

**GIERYN:** Sure. Herb, a point you made last week, there is one section of the existing policy that deals with a set of separate issues dealing very specifically financial difficulties, and you were concerned. What I'd like to propose is that we retain section 3 of existing policy D16, put it after this, this would become the new D16 when we finish with the wordsmithing and the changes we've proposed. This would be, in a sense, the first part of it, the second part would be existing section 3, which is not touched. I think it needs work but that would take a great deal more time than we have. Is that okay?

**TERRY:** MmHm.

**GIERYN:** Okay, thank you.

**HANSON:** Okay. Other questions or comments or suggestions? Again, I think that, I would be looking for that report to be released, you know, sometime mid next week, I'm just guessing. So you be looking for it, too.

**DOWELL:** Oh yeah.

**HANSON:** Anything else, any other items? Well then we stand adjourned.

**MEETING ADJOURNED: 5:16PM**