

**Indiana University**  
**BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL**  
**December 6, 2011**  
**IMU Georgian Room**  
**3:30 P.M. – 5:30 P.M.**

**Attendance**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Randy Arnold, Abhijit Basu, Bonnie Brownlee, Carolyn Calloway-Thomas, Shu Cole, Tony Fargo, Pnina Fichman, Jeffrey Gershman, Thomas Gieryn, Karen Hanson, T. Scott Herring, Robert Jacobs, Bruce Jaffee, Edwin Jimenez, Padraic Kenney, Justin Kingsolver, Susan Kovacich, Rebecca Manring, Jane McLeod, Theresa Ochoa, John Paolillo, Mary Popp, Deanna Reising, Patricia Riesenman, Bret Rothstein, John Schilb, Jim Sherman, Grant Simpson, Andrea Singer, Sarita Soni, Sonya Stephens, Herb Terry, Frances Trix, Barbara Vance, Maxine Watson, Tony White

**MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT:** William Swanson (Steve Burns), Jason Turner (James Ferguson), William Wheeler (Roger Levesque)

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Joyce Byrer, LaNita Campbell, Kevin Courtney, Constantine Deliyannis, Gregory Demas, Mark Deuze, David Estell, Matthew Guterl, Lesa Hatley Major, Patricia McManus, Michael McRobbie, Sherri Michaels, Tim Mickleborough, James Perry, Sima Setayeshgar, Marietta Simpson, Bryce Smedley, Geoff Sprinkle, Jerrold Stern, H. Wayne Storey, John Tafoya, Joey Tartell, Pat Thomas, , James Wimbush

**GUESTS:** Amanda Ciccarelli, Craig Dethloff (Faculty Council Office), Rachel Geiger, Pete Goldsmith, Mary Gray, Alex Lichtenstein, Mark McConahay, Maeve Peterson-Miller, Dan Rives, Benjamin Robinson, Steve Veldkamp, Barbara Wallace (Faculty Council Office), Patricia Wheeler

**Agenda**

1. Approval of Minutes  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/minutes/11-12/11.01.11.pdf>
  2. Executive Committee Business (10 minutes)  
(Faculty President Carolyn Calloway-Thomas)
  3. Presiding Officer's Report (10 minutes)  
(Provost Karen Hanson)
  4. Question / Comment Period<sup>1</sup>
-

5. UFC Reform Proposals (20 minutes)  
(Professor Calloway-Thomas, Bloomington Faculty President) [DISCUSSION]  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/circulars/AY12/U4-2012.pdf>
6. Resolution on Extended-X Policy (15 minutes)  
(Professors Padraic Kenney and William Wheeler, Co-Chairs of the Educational Policy Committee) [ACTION ITEM]  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/11-12/B27-2012Rev.pdf>
7. Resolution on Friday Classes (15 minutes)  
(Professors Padraic Kenney and William Wheeler, Co-Chairs of the Educational Policy Committee) [ACTION ITEM]  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/11-12/B28-2012.pdf>
8. Resolution on Research Misconduct (20 minutes)  
(Professor Steve Burns, Chair of the Research Affairs Committee) [ACTION ITEM]  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/11-12/B29-2012.pdf>
9. Resolution on Reporting Benefits to IU Faculty (20 minutes)  
(Professor Mary Gray, Chair of the Benefits Committee) [FIRST READING]  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/11-12/B30-2012.pdf>

## Minutes

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

**HANSON:** I think we have probably almost as many people as we'll have today, so let's begin. First item of business is approval of the minutes from November 1<sup>st</sup>. Anyone care to sally forth with a motion or would you like to defer that until later?

**FARGO:** [comment indistinct] I'll move it.

**HANSON:** Okay, anyone—is there a second to Tony's motion? Second—Basu. All in favor of approving the minutes? [Aye]. Opposed? [Silence]. Minutes are approved. Let's turn to Executive Committee Business and President Calloway-Thomas.

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

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Thank you. In my remarks today, first I want to address for a moment the dynamic interplay between the Occupy Wall Street movement that is sweeping the nation

and issues of free speech at Indiana University, and the “right of the people peaceably to assemble” to quote from the U.S. Constitution. I’m certain that all of you know that IU students expressing support of the Occupy Wall Street movement were arrested on the IU Bloomington campus on November 29<sup>th</sup>. The incident generated, and is still generating, keen reactions, even as I speak. Prior to the incident at the Kelley School of Business, framed by the Occupy Wall Street incidents that occurred in California and elsewhere, Associate Professor Mary L. Gray, with support from other faculty, had sent a resolution to the BFC Executive Committee, calling on President McRobbie to declare all IU campuses safe protest zones. More specifically, the resolution stipulated that: one, President McRobbie commit publicly to making our campus safe locations for peaceful public assembly, and two, that we call on President McRobbie to institute immediately policies that reflect these commitments and to instruct our campus police and security forces that they must abide by these policies.

On November 22, 2011, members of the BFC Executive Committee discussed the resolution, hereafter referred to as “Resolution Number One,” and decided that we needed to search the archives to determine whether there are already current policies in place at IU which address the principles embodied in the resolution. Having some historical knowledge of issues and having some historical knowledge of IU students’ fierce opposition to apartheid South Africa, and their call for the U.S. to divest its holdings there, and having some historical knowledge of the dramatic display of crosses and tents on Dunn Meadow, a free speech area, in the late 1980s, signifying student opposition to black oppression in South Africa, members of the BFC Executive Committee reasoned, surely, IUB should have policies in place which govern issues of free speech and the right of the students peaceably to assemble. And of course we were also mindful of student protests which took place at IUB during the 1960s, as well as student opposition to Dow chemical company, a company that produced Agent Orange, which visited unbearable sufferings upon the Vietnamese people and returning U.S. veterans.

So, in light of past events, and the context they provided, members of the BFC Executive Committee wanted to do due diligence. We wanted to know what are the facts and what remains to be done. For these reasons, we asked Craig, our Chief of Staff, to see what he could find out. We consulted with the dean of students’ office and others, and found a key policy in the Academic Handbook, Policy I-18, Policy for the Use of Indiana University Assembly Ground, which was voted on by the Board of Trustees in 1963. Here I shall quote from the document: one;The Trustees of Indiana University have designated an area on Dunn Meadow, immediately north of the Indiana Memorial Union, as the Indiana University assembly ground, as a public forum for expression on all subjects; two, we believe that the University should not use physical force to enforce these rules, that is rules regarding the use of signs, symbols, structures, and other specific items which, in the interest of time, I will not elaborate on here today. Item C of Policy I-18 also states that “the Bloomington Provost should create a committee to oversee the

implementation of these provisions,” that is, ones previously mentions in the policy document. We have not been able to determine whether such a committee was ever constituted on the IUB campus. However, in light of gathering concerns about free speech issues on the IUB campus, it might behoove us to look in to the possibility of creating such a committee.

In addition to face to face discussions of Resolution Number One, members of the BFC Executive Committee also held virtual online conversations regarding the matter, and consulted with one of the nation’s foremost experts on constitutional law, who is also a member of the BFC Executive Committee. I am, of course, referring to BFC Secretary, Donald Gjerdingen. I am using the Norwegian pronunciation here. [Laughter]

On Friday, December 3, 2011, Provost Hanson and I received an updated, amended resolution, Resolution Number Two, from Professor Gray, which was signed by sixty faculty members. For the record, I shall now quote from Resolution Number Two, taken in to consideration that I am omitting parts of the preamble: “We, therefore, call on the Indiana University Faculty Council to declare all IU campuses safe protest zones, where students’ rights to safely express their free speech and assembly will be protected and defended by university police and where those who practice peaceful, nonviolent civil disobedience, will be treated with respect and not subjected to violence or abuse; two, we call on the Indiana University Faculty Council to commit publicly to making our campuses safe locations for peaceful, public assembly, as an expression of our core commitment to exploring civil debate and civic engagement; third, we call on the Indiana University Faculty Council, in coordination with campus administration, to institute immediately, policies that reflect these commitments, and to instruct our campus police and security forces that they’re charged with protecting and defending these policies to their fullest capacity.”

Although members of the BFC Executive Committee have not had a chance to discuss the new resolution, which I received on Friday, substantively the current resolution accords well with an earlier version, in terms of calling for a statement of university policy as regards to free speech and the right of students to protest. What we don’t know, and are in the process of finding out, is whether free speech policies exist on the regional campuses, and we want to be very systematic about this. Of course ultimately, this will be an issue for the University Faculty Council to consider. So, this is where we stand as regards Resolution Number Two that Professor Hanson and I received on Friday. I know that Karen will also address this topic during the question and answer period, a topic that is of significance to our democracy, and to all of us, students, faculty, staff, and administrators, as well as citizens of Bloomington. As soon as our fact-finding mission has ended, members of the BFC Executive Committee will report back to the Council regarding the status of Resolution Number Two, which supersedes Resolution Number One.

A second item that I want to mention briefly concerns the actions by the Board of Trustees regarding the chancellorship of Ken Gros Louis, and the relocation of his office, from Owen Hall to Woodburn Hall. Recall that the Council addressed this issue on November 15, 2011. Today, many faculty continue to express some discontent with the process and the outcome regarding the reassignment of Ken's office and status. We are baffled, upset, and bewildered about the matter, but this is a topic that we will revisit in the new year.

Third, I am pleased to report that Pnina Shachaf has agreed to co-chair the BFC Faculty Affairs Committee, and we want to thank her for accepting this important assignment.

Finally, I want you to know that the Family Leave Policy will be discussed at a meeting of the Board of Trustees on Thursday or Friday in New Albany. There, University co-Secretary, Jack Windsor, and I, will give the Board and update on UFC reform, the status of the core campus NAD Report ad hoc committee, as well as on the IRB situation. Thank you for listening.

### **AGENDA ITEM 3: PRESIDING OFFICER'S REPORT**

**HANSON:** Thanks, Carolyn. I just have a few things, although some of them are very long. One is I just want to make a slight clarification on the policy for free assembly on the campus. I think the document that Carolyn was referring to is one that is—that comes out of the Academic Guide; the whole of it is not something that's been a resolution of the Board of Trustees, and I think it was—has some of the form it has due to a kind of updating of administrative procedures when we switched from a chancellor to provost system here. So there is—and I don't think it has actually been substantively discussed by this Council at all since then—so if you want to think afresh about how you might constitute a committee or something like that, I actually think it is all wide open to you, because this isn't a Board of Trustees' mandate. The Board of Trustees, though, is responsible for designating the Dunn Meadow as a public forum for expression on all subjects, and that—as Carolyn has talked about—those of us with a longer history, a lot of us came from elsewhere, it seems surprising that you could mandate one area, and tell people that was where they could express themselves freely, but people did it. But, in fact, the policy is somewhat broader than that now, the actual operational policy, and there is, of course, free speech all across the campus. It is—one other thing that might be noted is that the Student Affairs' Office has what they call the "blue cards" which gives, you know, information about demonstrations on campus and explain the ground rules for demonstrations, which basically endorse, you know, First Amendment rights, but also talk about the issues of, you know, not engaging inappropriately with people in ways that will call out the Racial or Religious Bias Incidents Teams or the GLBT Anti-Harassment tTam, and the principles that we have governing free speech on the campus do talk about the issues of disruption to classes and speakers. I noticed that the dean of students is with us here today. Is there anything you want to add to the discussion?

**GOLDSMITH:** I think that in practice, we encourage [comment indistinct] student exchange of ideas, [comment indistinct] on the campus, and so the so-called “blue card” is really how this policy has evolved, and so in our guidelines for working with students who want to demonstrate, and so that we will work with them to do it in an appropriate manner, remind them about issues of disruption or blocking ingress or egress, but we want to encourage a discourse and debate. That’s what we are about.

**HANSON:** Another item I wanted to report on today, which was, you know—is somewhat longer, and that is on allocations from the provost’s fund which continue to be made. As you know, because of the cut backs in state appropriations and the generally fragile economy, one year, much of the provost’s fund was held in reserve. That was for the—for fiscal year ’10, but that was—that begins in the summer of 2009. All continuing commitments were honored out of it, and anything that had been a multi-year commitment, and so on, was honored, but no new allocations were made. So the fund built up a little, and I think it’s a good thing that it did because it still allows for prudent planning, I think, for some expenses that will be coming up. Not on my watch, but coming up. And you should all remember that various kinds of hiring arrangements with the deans encumber the provost’s funds in various ways.

Now, we have had some discussions this Fall with the Budgetary Affairs Committee about a couple of matters that I’d like to draw to the whole Council’s attention so you can kind of be thinking about this together, but let me say a little bit about some of the allocations that have been made this year. Optometry received a substantial cash allocation as recommended by the BAC for the upgrade of instructional equipment, that’s also something that serves the community in a variety of ways, and Optometry had indicated that it was making recruitment of graduate students difficult because the equipment was old and not up to current standards. The School of Education received a substantial cash commitment for two years of continuation of funding for the P-16 center; they had been asking for base funding. The Budgetary Affairs Committee recommended cash, and that is what I did—it’s about a quarter of a million dollars in cash over two years in order to meet certain state needs. I think it is prudent because there is more and more recognition of the appropriateness of the university engaging with K-12 in the state, and that’s part of what that center does. In fact, there are several new initiatives going on—a committee, which I chaired, which involved a number of people, Sonya, and Dean Gonzalez, and John Applegate, and a variety of people who’ve been working on some elements to both demonstrate the K-12 engagement that this campus already has, and perhaps to begin some new programs, including some partnerships with some inner-city schools in Indianapolis.

Informatics received a small amount of seed money for a center, which again will involve campus community outreach, a Serve IT Center, they’re calling it, but I mean it’s Serve IT, and will engage their students in solving IT problems for the community. Part of the idea here was

that the center would also be more likely to enhance the diversity goals of the School of Informatics because of the patterns of engagement of the people who were—who are Informatics students. So it's a—it was a small amount of money. They hope to get grant support, if that's successful, and it seemed like it was hitting a number of campus priorities. The Jacobs School of Music received both some base funding and some cash funding for a new program it has that's sort of aimed at developing audiences for music in the long run, but also for trying to build a different kind of revenue stream for the School. It has a partnership with UITS, with Radio-TV, with the Vice President for Research, and with the Vice President for Engagement. It is going to involve a kind of—and the Kelley School of Business has been advising them on the development. It's an online instructional modality for teaching people who are going from beginner status to, you know, being able to play a song on the guitar or the piano or something like that, but it also is going, you know, the idea is that it will develop interest in music around the country.

Medical Science and Nursing have requested some funds for a joint classroom initiative. They have been asking for this for years, and the Budgetary Affairs Committee knows this, and they have put together money themselves for the renovation of the room, but they also need simulation equipment, and it is the way these things are taught now, and it involves collaboration between Med School and Nursing School students, and you really just cannot be doing state of the art teaching without this, and we need the space, and we need the equipment. So that amount hasn't been nailed down quite yet, but I heard a rumor that there was something of a request—a particular request in my email today, and I am inclined to provide some funding at a three-way split between the schools and the campus.

Another place that's going to involve a multi-unit split, is the renovation of Woodburn Hall Library. As many of you know, that's been vacant for a while. It would be put to use as a kind of front door for social science research and particular searching out grant opportunities and collaborating on grant proposals. The social science departments have been involved in this, and in the College, the College itself has been involved, and then other units that do social science, like Education and HPER and, you know, other schools, are to be involved, too, so that they can jointly decide on how this should be configured, but at any rate, the campus has put in \$200,000 cash to begin that renovation and the College is committed to putting in some money itself, and probably some money will come from facilities.

The Graduate School asked for a small amount of money, which was granted for—to assist its quite successful Getting You into IU program for minority recruitment—recruiting minority graduate students. And the Graduate School, Student Affairs, and the College have jointly asked to sponsor additional staffing in the Career Development Center, both to address ordinary needs there, graduate students, and post-docs, and I gave a little bit of funding to each

of them, so that remains a partnership. Actually, I didn't give anything to the College for that, but the College got a big whopping amount, in any case, for AI stipends on the one hand, that was added early on so that it would be in this year's budget, as the Budgetary Affairs Committee probably remembers, the College was not paying enough to sustain people's visas here. It was really seen as sort of a scandal, and people were having offers that dropped off after the first year, so that they then did not really have enough money unless they could find it from other sources to stay in the country legally, so this was an attempt to address that. In addition, I have given the College some base money for a variety of graduates—undergraduate student needs. The rationale with the, particularly the AI stipends, is that also serves general education on this campus and serves a variety of units because most of our students—our undergraduates, at any rate—take courses in the College at one time or another.

The situation with respect to the Graduate School in the College is a large, and the never ending need, because our funding for graduate students continues to remain low compared to peers, and it makes it difficult, then, to engage in recruitment, so I allocated, as endorsed by the Budgetary Affairs Committee, a substantial amount of money for recruitment scholarship with the College to decide which departments were most in need of it and could benefit, you know, so that it'd be strategically allocated. It's not necessary going to go across the board; that's the College's decision. But a \$100,000 worth of that was designated to assist in minority graduate student top-ups, which would be, again, done in conjunction with the funding from the Graduate School. So that looked like it was a bit of a synergy there.

The other thing that will be rolled out this month by the College comes from funding for dissertation year fellowships. And again, we've talked throughout the semester about the right way to target assistance here. This is—this money is really going to be reserved for the arts, humanities, and humanistic social sciences, because that is where we have substantial problems of time to degree. I mean there it's often eight, nine years to degree because the students are spending a lot of time teaching and what the College plans is an incentive program so that those who reach candidacy by a certain point will be eligible for this, and then will have the support they need to work throughout the year to finish their dissertations in a timely way.

The—if, you know, and again, as I say, that is where the area is—that's where the need is the greatest for support, I think at the moment, in the humanities and the humanistic social sciences. There is a need for science support, obviously, as well, but that—a great deal of science support has been encumbered in the provost fund because of various kinds of hiring agreements, so that there's a recognition that there—we have to build up on the science side as well, but these fellowships are particularly—and graduate students in sciences tend to, you know, more often to be on grant money and so on, so these are targeted in the other direction where there are some other needs and the grant opportunities are much smaller.



There is one place where I allocated some money that the BAC recommended against, and I might as well just admit it, and that was a \$150,000 in cash to DEMA for the Groups Program. The Budgetary Affairs Committee very reasonably noted that DEMA is a UA unit, and so this is an allocation from Bloomington to a UA unit. My rationale for this, though, is that the Groups Program is wholly based on this campus, and it has run into some difficulties with funding in the last year because it lost some—a federal grant, and it needed some money to stabilize it, and to move on. It is a hugely important program for us in terms of recruitment of minority undergraduates and first generation undergraduates. Eventually, some solution has to be made to this issue of UA versus Bloomington, and to the integration of the—of some of these programs with other elements of the Bloomington efforts, but this was not a program we wanted to see fall down, so while I think the Budgetary Affairs Committee made some very good points, I also think that we had to try to keep that afloat.

The Student Affairs will also be—is receiving funding for a staff position in IT. That's an area that had been—Pete is doing a terrific time in kind of rebuilding websites and making more accessible to a generation of students who want to put—get things on their handheld—information that's important to them from the Dean of Students, and he really does need full time help with those student services, so something was allocated there. Both Army and Air Force ROTC got small sums in one case for recruitment, because that's one of the ways of keeping that program alive. If they do not have a certain critical mass that can be pulled from the campus, and they are an important source of scholarship aid for our students. Army ROTC asked for a small sum for a suicide prevention initiative, which I think is important and connects with activities that we have going on elsewhere, and I've asked them to connect with Student Affairs and particular Veteran Affairs and CAPS, which eventually reports to the dean of students in pursuing that initiative.

Oh, here's one other one that I think may have gone slightly against the Budgetary Affairs Committee, but it was just \$20,000, but it's base to the Art Museum, which had asked for a small increment to bring its GA stipends up to the level of the whole school. It may not be a huge priority, but it is something that is important for, basically for support of graduate students and parity among graduate students, but it's—it helps SPEA where their Arts Administration is located, and the College, where some other people who might come in to that program are located. Radio and TV was recommended for a cash infusion, which was—which goes to matching grants that they are trying for from elsewhere. I mean, one was \$50,000 in cash to go to our \$411,000 project for remote production equipment, which again then will be used by the campus, and \$20,000 for a \$100,000 project on a digital transmitter and power increase to the station. OWA was given—the Office of Women's Affairs, was kind of the pass through for \$70,000 for each of two years for women in science residential thematic floor. And the Budgetary Affairs Committee put a stipulation on it that it was very important for that to be

driven by the science departments as well as Women's Affairs, and there is—you should all know there is an advance grant that gone on for the campus as well to try to increase women in the sciences here, and this can be part of it, and I think there is a working group now that can make this a successful initiative to increase women in STEM disciplines.

There are—and I think I did not mention—did I say anything about HPER yet? Okay. We had a sustained discussion about HPER, which is, of course, undergoing a transformation into a School of Public Health, and the—eventually the Budgetary Affairs Committee recommended \$500,000 dollars cash for startups, and GA and AI support. And that's what's been allocated. This is a school that has not in the past had to pay those kind, you know, these large startup fees of the sort that scientists—not fees, startup costs that science labs often require, and so, you know, it had asked for some assistance in that. It also has to begin to have some graduate student support in areas where it needs to build the programs in order to be accredited, and it will have a difficult transition here as it moves away from tuition revenues in some areas to tuition revenues in others, and in operations where there aren't so many tuition revenues as there aren't for a lot of, you know, professional school, you know, graduate programs. Those cost us something, they don't generally produce a lot of revenue. So there are ways in which the school—the Budgetary Affairs Committee wanted the School to help itself, and the School is helping itself and doing some reallocation, but I do think it is probably the case that, in the long run, somebody—we need to revisit the issue of whether or not the campus supply some additional base funding to HPER because I don't think it can make the transformation without a little bit of flexibility and leeway there. But at the moment, we didn't go any farther than the Budgetary Affairs Committee recommended. And I think that's enough for now because with reallocations there's nothing that's holding back their hiring, but again, when those points are reached, I think you may want to have this discussion again with the successor.

There are other big spends coming up—or big bills that are going to be coming due, and so there's a substantial amount of money left in the Provost fund to address these. One of these has to do with the IU Press, which is also probably going to be undergoing a substantial transformation in the way in which it operates. We have—we had an IU Press Committee of faculty in the last year to examine the press and write a set of recommendations, and one of the things it recommended was that somebody be brought in as a business consultant to come up with an analysis of their business operations and their plans, and that's—somebody is—I engaged someone for that and he's working on it right now, but this is a difficult time for scholarly presses, as you all know, and they will—they are trying to find their way into a new world and maintain something that the faculty have endorsed the importance of a recognized excellent press at this university. They also have the misfortune of having to get out of their current location in—by the end of this year. That's been sold to a developer, and so we have to

find another space for them, and it's unclear—I mean there's no other source of funding they have for this, but basically the campus, so that's going to have to happen.

The transformations that may come about because of the NAD Report are also things that probably are going to need to look to the provost fund for some help, and exactly what those will be will depend on what the faculty decide, but there will have to be seed money there for a variety of initiatives.

A few other issues about the spending from the campus that I want to draw to your attention before I depart, and that is that campus infrastructure needs are currently being laid at the door of the provost more and more often, and that is not how we've funded things in the past. That is not what the provost fund has been used for in the past. Things that are needed to maintain the physical plant, for example, or some of our IT infrastructure. You know, there are a lot of things like that, and some of these, you know, as the Budgetary Affairs Committee has said over the years, are things that help the whole campus, like the IT infrastructure, they do. And so sometimes, I mean last year the Budgetary Affairs Committee was in favor of making an allocation to UITS on those grounds, and that allocation was made. This year, the Budgetary Affairs Committee was not in favor of that, but we really have to—or you really have to sit down and think how do we want to fund this and how do we want to be clearer about how we're funding it. Some of these things are not some, you know, it depends on what you mean by enhancements, but some of these things are maintenance, frankly, not enhancements, and some of these things are just things that have to be done, so you need to think where that those funds are coming from and how you want to parcel them up to make sure that the transfers that are being made are clear and appropriate.

The other thing that—and this may be something that comes out as people discuss the RCM review—one of the things that this campus needs to think about a little bit is whether or not some of the things that are part of the physical plant are being paid for by Bloomington, when they are, after all, again UA operations. They're UA operations or they're in UA—the building is, you know, kind of wholly devoted to UA, but they're Bloomington campus things, and the—our schools are assessed to pay some of those bills, whether or not a different division there would make sense and would be helpful to this campus is something, I think, the Budgetary Affairs Committee needs to kind of keep its eye on. So that is a—that's the report on that. It's not quite done, but if you have any questions, I'd be happy to take them.

Okay. One other—well then, this is really on the same topic. I just want to draw to the attention of the Council the Shared Services Initiative, which is taking place, again, at the—this is something that I know a number of people here are involved in, but the effects of the Shared Services Initiative for the campus need to be looked at closely by a body of this sort because there are issues about how you maintain some of the functions that this campus has expressed

its desire to maintain, and really need to maintain in order to improve certain things on the campus, and one of those, of course, is the assessment project that comes out of the Gen Ed initiative. The question is, kind of, where are those things going to be taking place. Some of them right now are supported by things that are a part of the registrar's office, for example, and it's important that those functions be maintained on this campus. So kind of keep your eye on that, be involved in it when comments are requested when the Shared Services Initiative report comes out, which is likely to be January. Okay. Other questions or comments? Okay, these reports were longer than they usually are.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 4: QUESTION / COMMENT PERIOD**

**TERRY:** Did you intend to open the Question/Comment Period or were you asking—

**HANSON:** Yeah. No, no. That was the Question/Comment Period.

**TERRY:** At your desk, you'll find a little memo that I don't think I need to read it to you. This is what I was going to raise it at the last meeting, and then the time ran over. Basically it's a suggestion that the Council and its Executive Committee take a look at a Trustees policy that requires the retirement from an administrative post not from the faculty if they're tenured faculty, but retiring from an administrative post, but certain high level administrators once their age reaches age sixty-five. I ask that this be looked at because a variety of recent developments that I think suggest it has outlived whatever usefulness it may have once had. And they are summarized in this memo. I would add that at another meeting of a campus group a while ago, Dean Goldsmith behind us here confirmed another dysfunction of this policy, when we set out to recruit him to become our dean of students, and I am very happy with his service as dean of students, he declined to be appointed as a vice provost because if he had been appointed as a vice provost, this policy would have come in to effect, and he wouldn't have been able to serve us for very long. So between the example cited here, and Dean Goldsmith in the back, I would hope that the Executive Committee would ask this Council or some body or acting on its own consider whether this is a positive policy or not, and if it considers that it's not a good policy, it could either bring it to the Council for discussion, or I think on its own take it to the UFC, since it's a university policy, and ultimately ask the Trustees to reconsider it.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** I would just like to say thank you, and this is a policy whose—an idea has come, I suppose, because for some time now, some of us have been very concerned about the fact that some really deserving faculty members have to leave the university very early because of this retirement issue, so you can count on the BFC Executive Committee to consider it.

**TERRY:** Thank you very much.

**KINGSOLVER:** Yeah, I have a comment that will eventually end in a question, I think. So, regarding, I think it was Resolution Two, that—

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** —Is that the resolution regarding the protest, free speech?

**KINGSOLVER:** Yes. My eventual question will be what is—like if you could give me a good definition of what like a—by saying that IU’s campus is a “safe protest zone,” I’d be interested to know what that means because while these guys have, and every other protest movement, has a right to be heard, I, as a student, also have a right to learn, and I have a right to, you know, be engaged with career professionals. I know a lot of people that were in that room who heard offhanded comments from the J.P. Morgan people that we won’t be coming back. And I think that, you know, students at this campus, especially in the business school, come to this campus, yes to learn, but also because they think that there is a likelihood [comment indistinct] and disruptive protests, whether it’s in a classroom or a particular activity like that, I think we need to—and I would be strongly in favor of creating this committee to examine that. We need to draw a really fine line there. Because from all ends of the political spectrum, we have people that want to get their voices heard, but we also have a mission of this institution to learn and to provide well-suited, I guess, individuals for the workforce. So, my question to you is how sensitive would that be? Would that be saying that every academic building is a safe protest zone where they—people cannot be forcibly moved by the police if they are protesting during a class or [comment indistinct].

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** I really do not know, but I do know that this is a very delicate issue because it does raise the question of individual rights against the collective rights, and so I don’t know what we need to do with regard to that, but I will say that we will keep studying the issue, because you’ve indicated that it is very critical for students to have an opportunity to go into the classroom and to learn and to not be disrupted, but at the same time, it is the obligation and duty of other students to protest. So how does one draw that distinction and where does one draw that distinction? These are really complicated issues, and because they are so complicated, I’m going to ask constitutional lawyer, Donald Gjerdingen, to make a comment because he really did, I thought, put some really precious perspectives on the issue of free speech. Donald, do you mind speaking?

**GJERDINGEN:** I will give you the two minute version of the U.S. Constitution, First Amendment. These are basically the default rules the Constitution applies, and here’s a couple of initial points. There’s a big difference between speech and conduct. You can say about anything you want but once you start to do things, that’s different. There is a fundamental difference between restrictions of content, what you can say, and time, place, and manner, that’s how, where, and under what circumstances. And the limits on content are virtually open; time, place, and manner is very, very different. You can’t have a protest in a residential

neighborhood at three o'clock in the morning, waking people up. That's a [comment indistinct] right there. A third factor is where it can be done, and it has to do with the notion of public forums. There are certain traditional public forums. My office is not. Neither is my home. What IU basically did in this assembly provision is declare Dunn Meadow to be a public forum, and basically went beyond anything that is required under the Constitution to do that. So there's actually more First Amendment protection in that zone than—IU created it—more than anything else. Those three big distinctions are what's going to govern this, but the default rules, and there is a policy basically in place, and that's the—whatever the United States Constitution says. The school can implement this in particular ways, but it's not inconsistent with the First Amendment to enforce reasonable time, place, and manner constraints, and that things also not in public forums. Now there are a lot of other things, but those are the starting points.

**TERRY:** [comment indistinct] a long historical comment. I believe that at the time the Trustees adopted that policy, they were responding, not only to the United States Constitution, but the constitution of the state of Indiana because there is long dispute in this state about whether the protection of freedom of expression under the state constitution is actually stronger than the protection of freedom of expression under the U.S. Constitution. It is differently worded, and so I hope this group, being that we operate in the state of Indiana, looks not only at U.S. constitutional law, but at the protection of freedom of expression in the Indiana constitution.

**HANSON:** Other questions or comments?

**KENNEY:** Just a quick question for a clarification. Do I understand right, and this is again on the various resolutions concerning free speech, that the plan is to have this looked at in the context of all of the campuses at the level of the University Faculty Council?

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Yes. Mary is here. Mary, do you wish to address that question? It is my understanding that the answer is yes, but I will allow Mary to speak to that.

**GRAY:** Hi everybody. I'm going to be [comment indistinct] resolution, so please don't get the impression that I love resolutions, because I really don't. The goal would be to create symmetry across all of the campuses, and this is coming out of the express concern by faculty at IUPUI because it is not clear that there is a written policy or conversation around how to deal with protests, and I think particularly for campuses that have—that are in more urban settings where there needs to be some clarity about what does it mean to be a public university that, in theory, is owned by the public, even though we know we don't get a lot of money from it, that—what is it, what are the expectations to providing the proper time, space, and forum for expressions of civil rights around speech, assembly. And also I think the bigger issue for the these campuses is being expressed by the faculty at those campuses, is that there's really a goal that Bloomington doesn't become somehow privileged in this conversation as this is—this

really is an IU-wide concern about how to protect students' rights to protest. And to the point around civil disobedience specifically, and I definitely hear Representative Kingsolver's concerns here, the goal would be to create—to create an environment where if students choose to participate in civil disobedience that's non-violent, and not threatening to themselves or others that campuses have really thought out and had public conversations about how—what is the proper response that is respectful and that will actually will be a productive response rather than potentially a destructive response. And all this comes to you as a 1992 alumna of UC-Davis, where I can honestly say I never thought I would see my campus, my alma-mater in the news that could have easily gone the route of Kent State. It's the last place I would have expected that to happen. The other last place I would expect that to happen is IU. And so my concern and I think the concern of faculty is that we really have a robust conversation about what does it look like to not only support the rights of free speech and assembly, but how to productively respond to students' decision to do civil disobedience in a non-violent and peaceful way, which may include a disruption of a class proceeding or a recruiting session. As a historian of this sort of social movement, usually difficult issues call for disruption that's not so polite, and I hope that we're going to be able to give students our support in what that looks like. I think—I absolutely feel galvanized and heartened by hearing that the goal is to really pursue what we have, but the reasoning was a UF—presented as a UFC discussion precisely because there is inconsistency—there isn't clarity about whether there's consistency across [comment indistinct] IU campuses.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Mary, could you speak to whether there have been disruptions on other campuses? In other words, what are some animating reasons for some of the regional campuses participating in this resolution? I'd like clarification, please.

**GRAY:** I think—I definitely heard from IUPUI faculty and from faculty at IU Fort Wayne, and their concern is really a matter of how do we fully get ahead of the situation, instead of being put in a reactive position, as UC-Davis and UC-Berkeley have been. So UC President Mark Yudof's statement that he was going to actually actively engage all of the presidents and provosts and his chancellors, we call chancellors in the UC system, that he was going to actively engage those chancellors and come up with what is our unified plan was I think the moment in which those faculty contacted me and said, 'What are we doing that's proactive and specifically putting something in place, rather than responding to a disruption or a horrible incident?' I think the fear is that we will be responding to something really awful, and I feel like our campus has a really great history. I'm thinking of Provost Hanson's wonderful response to last year's violence around hate speech, that we didn't just kind of wait to have a forum and conversation about how to facilitate students in [comment indistinct] we were very active in structuring that, and in this case, I think, certainly in the Occupy movements, Duke University, a number of other private universities, have precisely done this move of coming up with specific fora and policy

around how do we encourage our students to protest in productive ways. So those faculty were not responding to specific incidents, they were responding to a fear that we're going to wait for an incident to do something.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Thank you.

**HANSON:** Yeah?

**PETERSON-MILLER:** Hi, I'm really glad that you guys are already talking about this, but I wanted to be my own voice and ask a question.

**HANSON:** Could you identify yourself, please?

**PETERSON-MILLER:** Yes, I have a little—a little statement. My name is Maeve Peterson-Miller. I am a citizen of the United States of America and an undergraduate student at Indiana University Bloomington. On November 29<sup>th</sup> I joined fellow citizens and students in a non-violent demonstration against J.P. Morgan at the Kelley School of Business. I intentionally denied the representatives of J.P. Morgan access to a classroom in order to demonstrate political and intellectual dissent against the unjust use of public resources for private profit at the expense of the American public good. This incident of civil disobedience was a statement of unity with all students and citizens frustrated by the dubious collusion between public government and private corporations. I sat grounded in solidarity with national and global protest movements attempting to reclaim civil power and human rights in the face of institutionalized corruption, oppression, and violence.

Now I sit before you, the intellectual leaders of Indiana University, frustrated by the refusal, or inability, of university administration, faculty, and staff across the country to protect students as we stand up, sit down, or speak out to protect the integrity of our academic environment. The precedent of police aggression against peaceful, albeit disruptive IU students on campus echoes a national trend of illegitimate brutality against non-violent student protest. Although IUPD's actions against students at the J.P. Morgan event were mild compared to the violence employed by police at UC-Davis and UC-Berkeley, it should give us all pause to reevaluate the legitimacy of IU policy that enables police force against student protesters. Furthermore, I urge you to reconsider the university's policy regarding students who feel they have been wronged by the IUPD.

In the wake of the J.P. Morgan event, I have been told by the dean of students that my only recourse as a student within the university is to submit my complaint (against two high-ranking IUPD officers, including Detective Greg McClure) to the IUPD. First, this process contradicts the IU Code of Rights that says that a student whose rights have been violated may file a request with the Dean of Students for an investigation and appropriate action. Secondly, it sets up a dangerous conflict of interest and threatens my right to petition my government for a redress of grievances without fear of reprisal. I request an exploration by the BFC of an alternative process for students to file complaint against IUPD officers.



In these times of political and economic unrest, future protests on the IUB campus must be expected. And in the words of John F. Kennedy, when peaceful protest is made impossible, violent protest is made inevitable.

So this is my question to the Bloomington Faculty Council:

Will you be leaders in progressive policy to maintain a humane academic environment , or will you fall prey to the conservative fear of political evolution that has historically enabled institutionalized violence against students and citizens standing up for their civil rights?  
[Applause]

**HANSON:** Other questions or comments?

**TERRY:** If I may make one comment to the question of why this might well be designed to be a university committee, and it's a response to your comment as well. To some extent we have consolidated the police services. Each campus has its own police department, that's true. But they all report to John Applegate. And so having some review of what should be the appropriate police response to [comment indistinct] disobedience or to some of the protests that don't amount to civil disobedience, would seem to me to be something that would be useful to discuss for all of the campuses, and I hope that we involve John and members of the IUPD in this discussion. And, frankly, I'm glad to see you here. I am a child not of UC-Davis in the nineties, I am a graduate of Stanford University in 1970, we shut down the university for my senior last quarter. This is where I came in, we were debating about social equality and socioeconomic equality, the civil rights movement, the Viet Nam movement, and is encouraging to me to see that we have students here who are willing to stand up and argue for justice. Some of that had disappeared the years I've been at the university. It's nice to see it back.

**HANSON:** Anything else? [comment indistinct]. Okay, let's move to—I think we're going to need to shorten some of the discussion, but it is important that we move to the UFC Reform proposals, and that is you, Carolyn.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 5: UFC REFORM PROPOSALS**

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Yes. I'm going to make this very short, because we only have about maybe ten minutes to discuss this, and I'll just give you an opening comment or two. And I just want to say that over the past several years, the UFC simply has not functioned in robust and significant ways, creating a situation that quite frankly threatens to undermine faculty governance at Indiana University, as well as at regional campuses. In a word, the UFC has been dysfunctional because attendance is very poor, it is difficult to sustain a quorum, and accomplish our goals at the university level, which include consulting with administrators, negotiating, deliberating, formulating policy, and being the voice of the faculty. As a matter of

fact, one of the most dramatic examples of our almost inability to sustain a quorum happened on the very day that we were discussing whether the UFC document should come before the body, and President McRobbie kept saying to Craig—poor Craig—“Craig, do we have a quorum?” And at least three or four times, we were very, very unsure as to whether we’d be able to sustain a quorum. So that is one of the fundamental reasons why we need UFC reform. We simply cannot sustain a quorum, and if we cannot sustain a quorum, we cannot do the business of the UFC. So I will just say that, and I know that most of you, if not all of you, have read very carefully the UFC reform document that is before you, so I will just accept questions and listen to your comments because what we want to do is listen to your comments and then take those comments back to the University Council for their discussion and deliberation, and I believe all of the campuses have responded to the document, with the exception of IUB, and you know that this was on the agenda, the November 15<sup>th</sup> agenda, but we simply did not have time to get to it, so we want to make sure that you have an opportunity today to voice your concerns and interest.

**HANSON:** Any comments from members?

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** While we’re waiting—

**HANSON:** --John? John had a comment.

**PAOLILLO:** So, I unfortunately left my copy [comment indistinct], the one thing I remember thinking about as I was reading it was a question about the numbers and not being able to really tell how that might change the representation across the different campuses. Do you have any comment that we could think about—about the numbers of representatives and how the representation will change?

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Well if you look on page four, everybody has the document in front of them, on page four—we’re asking that we reduce the voting faculty from two hundred to one hundred, so that’s one key change. We’re also asking that the Council consists of thirty members that would be: Bloomington would have eight representatives, Indianapolis would have six representatives, regional campuses would have one representative per campus, then you would have the eight presidents of the Council remain on that Council, and in addition to that we will have two student representatives, an undergraduate student and a graduate student, and those representatives would be determined by the university-wide student body that is charged with determining who should sit on the Council, and so that’s the representation that would be part of it. And one of the few reasons why we did this was that people simply had abdicated their responsibility. There were people who had committed themselves on paper to becoming a member of the UFC. They never showed up, or if they

showed up, they showed up sporadically and imperiled the ability of the body to conduct its business.

**TERRY:** If I may note the principle people who get disenfranchised in this are the administrative members of the UFC. And frankly, they were the ones that most often didn't show up.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** That's right.

**TERRY:** The second group that most often didn't show up were the student representatives, but mainly this doesn't change the numeric balance, if you like that, between IUPUI, Bloomington, and the regionals all that much.

**HANSON:** It does increase the prevalence of the regionals though. I mean it increases their voting power.

**TERRY:** It depends on what you define by "all that much." It does increase the voting power, yes.

**KINGSOLVER:** My only question would be about the student representative selection process because the All University Student Association is only the undergraduate student body presidents from all of the campuses and the student Trustee, so I just ask that you [comment indistinct], there is not really a graduate mechanism there [comment indistinct]. I don't know what the solution would be; maybe the solution is still within AUSA, but maybe considering an alliance between the GPSO's of all of the campuses to select that.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** We grappled with that very issue, and concluded that it is then up to the student representatives to come up with a structure that will help them to determine who is going to be their duly constituted representatives to the UFC.

**HANSON:** Bruce?

**JAFFEE:** This is a question—I mean, I have nothing against the restructuring, but I guess I would like you to address the question of the issue of the relevance of the UFC. If people are not showing up for lack of a commitment, but lack of a feeling of the power and influence of the UFC, maybe given the structure of the university, maybe weakens—this may be, we, you know, making it more efficient and rearranging the deck chairs, but on page two, you have the list of the role of faculty governance at the university level, and I just question whether many people in the UFC, past or present, might be thinking that [comment indistinct] authority maybe rests at the campus level or is centralized in the office of the president or the Trustees.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** I don't sense the matter that is that power is centralized in the Board of Trustees, although it might very well be. I don't sense that it is centralized in the office of the

president. But I do sense that there have not been enough compelling issues to address the attention of the members of the UFC. In other words, what difference does it make for one to attend a UFC meeting when there's no compelling issue, and when people don't see a need for them to be there, and so we thought that by reducing the number to a manageable, energetic, robust—we hope—thirty-member group, that we might circumvent the very issues that you are raising. We might be able to galvanize more sufficiently the interest of individuals. That's the—

**JAFFEE:** --Let me interrupt. I mean, this group—twenty years ago this group was probably half the size it is today.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Absolutely, Absolutely.

**JAFFEE:** And arguably that hasn't affected the issues or the enthusiasm of this group. Why do you think the more substantive issues will come up with a group of thirty rather than sixty?

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Well, for one reason—well there are probably many reasons, but one important reason from my perspective is that it is easier for a few individuals to discuss and make policy than it is for, you know, fifty or sixty to do it, and I think that's one reason. The second reason, I think, is because these individuals are going to be meeting face to face, as opposed to meeting virtually, and so I think those are two key reasons. And then another reason, I think, is that we have committed ourselves to better communication, and I think that's one of the things that's really lacking here is that people have not been communicating effectively and efficiently with members of the various constituencies, so much so that it was not unusual, from what I understand, for people simply not to know what was going to be on the agenda. So if you don't know what's going to be on the agenda, you probably won't be attending. We will try to be a little more robust and diligent about sending out the agendas on time, so I think those are probably some reasons, although I will also add that I was at a meeting of the Big Ten faculty presidents in late October; this issue also surfaced there. In other words, nationwide, this is a problem. And then my final point will be that, I think on this campus we have invited assistant professors to do the business of research, and I think that they're not being shepherded in the direction of faculty governance. I mean, look around, how many do you see?

**MCLEOD:** I have a question about the decision to abolish all the standing committees. I'm curious about the rationale for that decision, whether you can give us some sense of what those committees are and what their purview is [comment indistinct]. Are they all equally—?

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** —We have abolished or we're calling for the abolition of all the committees with the exception of the Honorary Committee, primarily because the committees simply were not functioning. They were nominal committees, they were name only. So that's the key reason why we decided not to keep them. Why keep committees on paper just for the

sake of having them on paper? We reasoned that committees ought to do something substantively and vibrantly, and this simply has not been the case. The only committee that does something systematically and regularly and routinely has been the Honorary Committee. So that's the main reason, but I will say that I received an email from Eno—Bob Eno, and I'd like to call your attention to the Finances and Facilities Committee because he raised the question of whether we should abolish that committee and I will take that back to the body, to the UFC body, because I think he raises a very, very important question. And I'll just read to you from the constitution and bylaws, with regard to the Finance and Facilities Committee. It says here that this is the responsibility: "Periodic budgets and other financial affairs; consultation on tuition charges policies and procedures; new buildings, modifications to existing structures, safety and security, machinery and other accommodations as they affect the delivery of academic programs; liaison with Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, and Vice President for Administration (on facilities matters), liaison with the Indiana University Foundation." So, I think I will take this back to the body and ask the body to reconsider the abolition of all of the committees with exception of the Honorary Degrees Committee.

**G. SIMPSON:** [comment indistinct] Council really has to involve other state [comment indistinct] and this year, you know, adding an observatory [comment indistinct], and I'm wondering if that is something [comment indistinct] for the UFC as well.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Will you repeat your comment because I was easily distracted momentarily? [Laughter]

**G. SIMPSON:** Anyway, I was saying that I respected this body's willingness to include non-faculty members [comment indistinct] students, staff [comment indistinct] and I was wondering if that's something that we could possibly model the UFC because there is currently no staff representation. A lot of staff members feel like there is no way that they have [comment indistinct] advisory fashion.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** I like that proposal, and I will recommend it. Thank you.

**BURNS:** Steve Burns. I'm on the UFC and I've come to reluctantly sort of support this, because I think the UFC is stuck in a chicken and egg situation is because there's never a quorum, there's a big tendency not to bring things to it because they can't make a decision, and there's also a tendency, excuse me for those who would disagree, but to run things by because a decision can't be made at times for the appearance of it. And so somehow getting to a body that can act is needed. I'm not sure I would have chosen this one, but it's the one on the table that makes sense. So I just—I've been on it for a couple of years, and that would be my perception.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** As you recall, at our last meeting, we had a terrifying moment because we thought we would not be able to sustain a quorum.

**BURNS:** Yes.

**HANSON:** Any additional—Herb?

**TERRY:** I co-chaired an earlier UFC review body, and this is not terribly dissimilar to what we represented. I think it's a sound recommendation. In response to Bruce's observation, one thing I think that's contemplated in here, is that the UFC as a whole will not gather nearly as often as the UFC as a whole has tried to gather in the past. It can on special circumstances be called in to an additional session, but enough business ought to accumulate each semester to make the UFC meetings worth attending, and I think that's the hope at reducing the frequency of the UFC meetings. It does not abolish committees, it abolishes the existence of standing committees, but certainly leaves it open to this new executive body to create additional committees, and, frankly, I think the Facilities and Finance Committee, for example, may not be an optimal way of studying budgetary facilities matters, so that I think this is an opportunity to reconsider what committees you might need, which would be useful. I would call attention to page seven—the bottom of page seven. The last sentence there. It's the one thing that I was able to lobby [comment indistinct] two times it was considered by the UFC. In my experience in faculty governance, one problem with getting faculty involved as it's been pointed out by Carolyn we essentially tell the junior faculty concentrate on your research or at the regional campuses concentrate on your teaching, and don't let service get in the way, then we turn to people and suddenly we expect them to be socialized and care about the institution and this sort of thing, and that doesn't work especially well. But another thing is the general tendency on this campus and many of the others to not reward service for those who do it, and I managed to get into this document the last sentence, it's only in the best practice [comment indistinct] as this goes forward we can continue at least to stress its importance. The sentence says, "Meaningful service in faculty governance merits recognition when decisions are made on promotion and tenure or on merit raises." We have units on this campus that have numerical formulas that give no weight to service at all, and this, at least, is intended to say it's a tripartite system. We've [comment indistinct] teaching, research, and service, and I at least in my occasional roles in leadership of this Council and the UFC have often [comment indistinct] doesn't think that is a good use of my time, and I'll either not get any credit for it or I'll actually lose [comment indistinct]. But somehow or another we have to attack that problem [comment indistinct] new blood in here in active service.

**JACOBS:** I think you are getting at the root cause of the problem is that even with the senior faculty, there is a [comment indistinct] no recognition whatsoever [comment indistinct], and I think that some way we should address this because I think it's extremely important and you're really pushing an uphill battle, unless in some way all faculty are given some incentive of some sort to do this type of service.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** And may I repeat, in the presence of the provost who will be leaving us, that at the October meeting at Purdue University of the presidents of the faculty senates of the Big Ten, I think about eight of the ten campuses represented there, had some compensation package, Karen, for the presidents and even for members who sat on committees.

**HANSON:** Umm—[Laughter] I will just note that the presidents of the Faculty Council have had some compensation in the sense of support for their—whatever their enterprise is—either, you know, some graduate student support or some other kinds of support to keep some of their other enterprises running. I will also note that Minnesota has a very robust system of faculty governance, and I've been getting daily, almost daily emails, with minutes of their various committees. It's huge, it's baroque, but it's robust. I don't know that they give any other additional stipend, but I actually think you need to think seriously about whether or not that makes sense because it sounds like what you'd risk doing is actually creating more administrators. I mean if people are paid for this kind of administrative work it's, you know—I'm not so sure, but, you know, again, I could say anything now and you could hate me—

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** —Karen, I'm beginning. [Laughter]

**HANSON:** —I think you really need to think about what faculty governance means, why people want to participate in it, whether or not they feel it's effective, whether or not there are other ways of engendering a sense that decisions are made together about things that matter to peoples' lives. So I'll just leave it at that. And again I'm not making those decisions—

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** And I will just say quickly that that very issue was raised at the meeting in—at Purdue University, and many of the members of councils who had really hefty packages thought that it made no difference, that people who were willing to serve, served. Those who were not, did not.

**HANSON:** QED.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** I can't remember that.

**HANSON:** 'That which was to be proved.' We, would really, I think given how long things are stretching—and I don't think we really have time for a break, but if you want to go get something, get something and come back. I think that would make the most sense. Let's move to item number six, the resolution for Extended-X policy. We have at least one of the co-chairs of the EPC, Padraic?

#### **AGENDA ITEM 6: RESOLUTION ON EXTENDED-X POLICY**

**KENNEY:** Yes, well I will try to make this very, very quick because you all saw this a month ago and it is essentially there weren't any substantive comments at the time. There haven't been any in the meantime. The one change from then was that the resolution held in front of you at that time has the slightly different language that would be now put into the policy the language now is "prior to graduation." I think the language you saw in the previous one said, "at the time of degree application." The registrar's office asked us or suggested that "prior to graduation" would work very well. So since there were no comments then there have been no comments since I will be curious to hear if there are any comments now.

**HANSON:** Any comments?

**KENNEY:** An action item—I think—

**HANSON:** --bring this for a vote?

**KENNEY:** Yes!

**HANSON:** Should I let people—?

**ARNOLD:** I'll motion to approve.

**HANSON:** Okay, well, I think it comes—it's been seconded. So, all in favor? [Aye]. Opposed? [Silence]. Abstentions? [Silence]. Motion carries, thank you. Very efficient. The resolution on Friday Classes. Don't leave the podium. [Laughter]

#### **AGENDA ITEM 7: RESOLUTION ON FRIDAY CLASSES**

**KENNEY:** This will be just as quick I assure. So you'll recall at the last meeting we brought forth a larger, longer document which we reflected this came out of the meeting of members of the BAC, FAC, and the EPC, to discuss the question of Friday classes. And at that time, the document that you saw at the last meeting essentially said, well, the statistics don't convince us that there needs to be a set of targets set up to somehow mandate schools or departments to increase to some specific amount the amount of instruction that's going on on Fridays. Instead, we wanted to take—be aware of the fact that there must be other things going on—we heard this a great deal from other schools that there is a great deal going on around campus on Fridays, so the document that we presented to you a month ago essentially said we would like the vice provost for undergraduate education to begin a process to find out what is all of this amazing stuff that is happening on Fridays, and to publicize that so we could maybe reflect on it better. And that, I understand, is already going on, at least I've gotten some emails, and I think some of you have gotten emails asking departments, okay, what are you doing on Fridays, please tell us about it. So I'm glad that that is happening. But at the last meeting, you will recall that Vice Provost Tom Gieryn said okay, this is fine, but it would be really helpful if the



BFC, in some way, affirmed its understanding that we are a campus that is working all five days of the week in various ways, fine, but in some way this should be affirmed; and, in addition, it would be useful if the BFC formally asked for data to be collected on some ongoing basis. The short document you have in front of you is a result or is a response to that request. I think that's all the introduction that's needed, I'll be happy to answer questions.

**HANSON:** Any questions or [comment indistinct]?

**POPP:** I have a question as I read this document. I'm almost to the point of saying, so what is the point? I think the question really at the end of this is we collect the data, what do we do with it? What happens to it next? Is something going to happen to it?

**KENNEY:** I would hope that it would. [Laughter]. Look, the, you know, it's one thing a month ago to have said, get some data on what's happening on Fridays. What this does is say, let's continue to do that, let's continue to reflect on whether things really are happening on Fridays, whether it's instructional or otherwise, classically instructional or otherwise, and that would allow us to respond if it seems as if a lot less is going on on Fridays than is claimed, or if it actually declines over time.

**HANSON:** Tom?

**GIERYN:** This is most definitely a step in the right direction. I am happy for the work done by the EPC. I was hoping for a second step. The second step, which Padraic already described, would have been a set of targets, for example, the percentage of students who have at least one Friday class, which we could monitor and see whether or not, in fact, it is going up and down, and a target date by which we might reach an agreed upon goal. It wouldn't really be a mandate to the schools, nor did we ever envision anything quite so heavy handed, but rather allowing me, with a BFC policy that took that second step, to be able to work more closely with the academic associate deans and getting them to think about ways they might be able to use Fridays in creative ways. But in terms of your question, what will this lead to, at least two things that are very real: one is we will continue to monitor Friday activities in our office which will include both registrar classes, as well as other educational activities; and secondly, we have already begun, I've heard from four of the academic associate deans, we've asked them all to provide a list of activities involving students in serious educational activities that occur mainly on Fridays, and it is a growing and increasingly robust list of activities, you'd be happy to know. So I think this is a lovely example of shared governance. The administration presented a possibility; the Bloomington Faculty Council considered it. We have one step, not two.

**HANSON:** Herb?

**TERRY:** I'd like to build on the comment for a moment. You said you heard back from four of the associate academic deans. Would it be helpful if this policy had [comment indistinct], and in the last paragraph said at the Bloomington Faculty Council addressed appropriate campus level administrative offices in conjunction with IUB schools and the College to monitor [comment indistinct]? Would it be helpful if this Council would say to the deans that you have to provide this data, and you should provide this data, or not?

**GIERYN:** No, Herb. I think this is sufficient, but I said I have only heard back from four, that is because I only asked them last week when we had our meeting of academic associate deans.

**TERRY:** Do you expect to hear it from the others?

**GIERYN:** I have no indication they'll resist. It is just taking them time to get the information.

**TERRY:** Okay.

**HANSON:** Justin?

**KINGSOLVER:** I have two points. The first, I would hope that you would rely on sources other than just the academic deans, especially, I guess Dean Goldsmith just left, but I know that the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences is not [comment indistinct] because he doesn't have enough time, he is not aware of all the extracurricular activities that are also going on. So it's not just that academic activities that are going on on Fridays. Significant extracurricular activities are. And then second, and this is a serious question, although it might not sound like it at the beginning, I spoke with several alums, and if they were being truthful with me, they were—they told me that when they were here in the late sixties, I believe one of the alums was Dean Goldsmith—it might not have been—that he had dreaded Saturday morning classes. So, I was wondering why this discussion is hinging solely on Friday classes, and not on Saturday classes?

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Good question!

**STEPHENS:** In fact, I think Dean Goldsmith did raise the question of Saturday classes when the conversation first came up.

**KINGSOLVER:** Yeah, so I mean is there a reason why it's not being—

**GIERYN:** —That might be a third step. [Laughter].

**STEPHENS:** We already have activities going on on Saturdays, and in some cases on Sundays, including examinations because they cannot be accommodated in the week, okay? So, if we fill the week, and we've heard from some of the schools that, in fact, you know, essential maintenance has to be carried out at some point on the classrooms and on the technology in

the classrooms during the semester. And so there are times when we do need to be able to get into the classrooms to do things as well. So we have to keep in mind the full balance of things that need to be done on the campus, but it's a valid point, and it was one that we certainly raised.

**GIERYN:** Your first point is well taken. I have noted it, we will consult broadly with the deans in the schools who are responsible for more extracurricular activities, and other deans.

**KINGSOLVER:** Maybe dean [comment indistinct] as well.

**GIERYN:** Pete has been working with us closely on this, so we are going to go back to Pete.

**HANSON:** Other questions or comments? This is then an action item, and it comes moved and seconded. Is there any other discussion?

**GIERYN:** This says EPC recommendation. What—is this intended to be a resolution or a policy? And what would be the next step if we voted yes on this?

**KENNEY:** Yes, it is intended to be a resolution. I think that the recommendation is on there because that just sort of stayed on from the previous—I don't know, I not sure about that. And yes, I would think it would need to be voted on. Whether it's an action item, I'm not quite sure of the rules on this because we did present something at the last meeting. This could be regarded as an [comment indistinct] not the same text at all, it could be regarded as a further part of that, and so if that makes it possible to be an action item at this time, then there is—yes, we would want a vote, given the way it is [comment indistinct].

**HANSON:** Okay, any further discussion? Alright then, moved and seconded. All in favor? [Aye]. Opposed? [Silence]. Abstentions? [Silence]. Thank you, the motion passes. We have two more items, actually. You may not notice this goes to the next page, despite the fact that there's a little arrow there. The next item is the resolution on research misconduct, and Steve will open it up.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 8: RESOLUTION ON RESEARCH MISCONDUCT**

**BURNS:** This comes to you from the Research Affairs Committee. John Bauman of REEP brought to our attention sort of an unusual feature of the current definitions of research misconduct. So what you've got in front of you is the entire pamphlet, but the most relevant part is on page—bottom of page two and the top of page three, where we have the definition of research misconduct. Item one is the classical definition of research misconduct that holds not only on most of Indiana University, but most research universities, and it includes items that are required sort of by federal funding agencies and other funding agencies, and it defines research misconduct as the types of things we all sort of understand, plagiarism, falsification,

things like that, and you can read the details. Then there's this unusual item two that is in the university's definition, which says "On all campuses, except IUPUI, Research Misconduct also includes (in addition to those acts specified in paragraph one above):" basically items that are related to compliance, compliance with rules, compliance with federal regulations, and this is rather an unusual thing because compliance can be almost anything, and what was happening is, for instance, I'll give a trivial example, though there could be more serious ones. But the trivial one is somebody does their paperwork wrong on an animal protocol, or somebody in their lab didn't get—handled an animal or a human without the proper training. That's a compliance violation, not what most of us would consider research misconduct.

Many of these cases can be dealt with—they're still serious, I mean they've got to be dealt with, but there's a whole procedure for dealing with compliance issues. Minor ones will be dealt with by education of the right people or extra education, you know, examination of the protocols, things like that. But what happens because of this clause is they also have to be handled not just as a compliance violation, but as a potential case of research misconduct. And in some of these less important ones, it could mean that people are being informed in the federal government that so and so is under investigation for research misconduct because we've defined it that way. And it's sort of a double whammy because if there are serious compliance violations, there are plenty of mechanisms within our administrative structure to deal with them, including shutting down the lab or efforts until everything is back into compliance with the regulations, but they're still a long way from what most of—or at least I think—you can decide for yourself, but what I think of is the ethical intentions of this research misconduct thing, and IUPUI, at the time this was being made, said hey, well this doesn't make sense, we don't want compliance mixed in with research misconduct. On this campus, apparently when this was formulated, there was a belief that, gee, our compliance officers aren't up to snuff, let's put it—let's put the guns in here. I don't know that—that's apocryphal. Though I've heard people say yeah. I wasn't aware of it at the time, but the point is this was brought to us as a very unusual item. It isn't present on most campuses, and most universities, Misconduct is intended for serious, ethical, intellectual misconduct, and so the Research Affairs at John Bauman's request considered this, and agreed we should take this out. There's one other area—actually two other slight areas that get affected on page eight and nine. You will see two other cross outs. Those are mostly about referring to the appropriate committee, but now that we don't have this compliance issue, we don't have to coordinate with a compliance procedure, and so it doesn't really change the procedures for what I believe are true research misconduct. It is just trying to separate compliance into compliance and research misconduct into research misconduct. And so that was approved by the Research Affairs, it will be brought to the UFC if you approve it here. It primarily affects Bloomington as the major research campus that isn't included in this.

**HANSON:** Thank you, Steve. Jim?

**SHERMAN:** So, has this paragraph that you've deleted appear in a compliance document?

**BURNS:** It probably does not. I did not check—

**SHERMAN:** --Well this is—

**BURNS:** —This is the definition of—I mean, all the compliance documents require procedures and review processes. And there are whole books of procedures, so the animals will have a compliance procedure, so there are separate procedures. There is a reporting official for compliance that has to monitor that process. There is a grievance process through the compliance as well. Is that what you mean?

**SHERMAN:** Well, what I mean is that the things that are listed under there, although they may not constitute research misconduct—

**BURNS:** Oh, they are definitely—yes, those are definitely covered.

**SHERMAN:** They are probably more important to the university [comment indistinct] research misconduct. The whole research university can be shut down if people improperly don't get human subjects approval, don't—

**BURNS:** Absolutely, those are covered under the compliance requirements.

**SHERMAN:** Okay, well as long as they are not minimized or hidden somewhere.

**BURNS:** And, in fact, you have to get your training before you can be approved by the appropriate committees, be it human, animal, biological safety, radiation, all of those, so there are processes for each of those.

**HANSON:** Herb?

**TERRY:** I was involved a little bit in this in 2006, I think, and I think your recollection is sort of right. Much of the objection came from the School of Medicine as well as IUPUI in general, and it was—we cover this elsewhere. My experiences are compliance regimes are more vigorous now than they were in 2007. I think this change will be okay. I assume you also intend to strike the footnote on the bottom of page three, since it refers to the struck language.

**BURNS:** Yes, yes. Thank you.

**HANSON:** Any other comments?

**GIERYN:** It might be good to follow up on Jim's question to figure out whether or not the documents pertaining to compliance also include some kind of a discussion of sanctions and how those would be handled and who would make the decisions about appropriate sanctions. This document really is—it puts faculty and their representatives in control, and that's why it's an effective policy. If we put it into the world of compliance, and turn that responsibility over either to outsiders or simply administration, then I'm not sure that we're getting the same kind of oversight that this policy provides. Could you check on that? I don't want to hold that up, but what we need to do is to see whether or not the outcomes of noncompliance would mesh well enough with the array of sanctions and the procedures for meeting those out.

**BURNS:** I will look in to it. I'm quite sure they do since there are faculty led committees in charge of each of those areas that are involved in it.

**HANSON:** Anybody?

**TRIX:** When this discussion is over, could I—I—just post-script to the IRB that doesn't have to do with this, but has to do with their misconduct.

**HANSON:** Um, okay, but we [comment indistinct] schedule. Any other questions or comments? Okay, this—

**TRIX:** I mean, we're going to vote on this, aren't we? Yeah, I don't want to derail it.

**HANSON:** Okay, are we ready to vote then? Alright, all in favor of keeping these changes? Anyone opposed? [Silence]. Any abstentions? [Silence]. It carries. Thank you. So...

**TRIX:** John Bauman is the interim director of the IRB, is that—?

**BURNS:** Is he what?

**TRIX:** Is he interim director?

**BURNS:** He's the interim director of the IRB.

**TRIX:** Okay, he and I have been having words this week.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Lovely words, I'm sure.

**TRIX:** Oh, sweet, mellifluous words, as you might imagine. I don't know if anybody else here has had the pleasure of taking this CITI test. I made the dreadful mistake of taking the wrong CITI test. I will not go into—they're not very well labeled. I took social and behavioral responsible conduct of research basic course. It took me five hours. I should have taken social and behavioral researchers stage one. Doesn't that sound the same? [Laughter]. So I have a

student overseas doing research and I was told he can't collect his data. Why? Because you didn't take the appropriate test. So, that's why John Bauman and I had words, but he didn't return my call, so I had words with a very nice man named Steve Martin. Do you know who he is? He returned my call. John Bauman did not. So now, Steve Martin did return my call, and I asked for the test to be labeled so it would be clear which test to take. Many people have taken the wrong test. They are tedious beyond belief, and we're giving money to the University of Miami with these awful tests. So I would ask other faculty, it turns out other faculty have taken the wrong test, I said, couldn't you take the wrong test off the site? You know, why should you have a test that wastes four to five hours of faculty time? Well it's a CITI site, we can't take it off. I said, well could you label it so it says, "Human Subjects" so we know which one to take? So John Bauman has said he will do that, and I would like us to make sure he does that. So, I—and when we talk about misconduct, I think Steve, you made the point of faculty time. I don't know who decided we needed to take a new test. All of us faculty had taken a test before of what was something for human subjects. Whoever decided we needed to take this new test, if you figure four hundred faculty taking four hours of their time for these questionable tests, and then some of us had the pleasure to spend eight to ten hours because we took the wrong test. So the least they can do is label them clearly, so I am asking this group to please make sure that Mr. Bauman does indeed follow through and label, and if you know of other people who have taken the wrong test, I would like to know about it because I think it's very vague.

**HANSON:** Jim?

**SHERMAN:** I agree with you 100%. I would add that that's the least of our worries with regard to IRB.

**TRIX:** Okay, because misconduct—

**BURNS:** —And the reason—

**TRIX:** —is also toward how they treat us as faculty and how they regard our time. Please.

**HANSON:** There will be an update, by the way, on the IRB issue at the Trustee meeting this Thursday and Friday, and I think—I'm not exactly certain of the content, but it's also something to be watched. But I—unless there are more discussions of this, and we have a couple of visitors here who want to bring forward the last item on the agenda. Is there anything else we need—

**BURNS:** --As Chair of the Research Affairs Committee, we want feedback on these issues. We will discuss them. If this Committee—Council wants, we can bring feedback later.

**HANSON:** Everybody got that? Alright. Let's move to item nine then, the resolution on reporting benefits to the IU faculty. Mary Gray, who chairs the Benefits Committee, is here.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 9: RESOLUTION ON REPORTING BENEFITS TO IU FACULTY**

**GRAY:** Hi, everybody. I wanted to correct the record. I co-chair the Benefits Committee with BFC member Brian Horne, and he is not—he wasn't able to attend this afternoon. You have before you a resolution coming to you—let me switch documents here. Sorry. And maybe just to expedite matters, I apologize. I'm going—I'm just going to read at you in bad lecture form. You have a resolution coming to you that is—Hey there! Oh, this is Dan Rives. He is going to help me out. Oh, actually, first I want to thank the Benefits Committee, and I just want to also have that on the record, thanking the Benefits Committee for composing this resolution, and for the robust conversation we had around it, and I want to thank President Calloway-Thomas and Provost Hanson for putting it on the agenda—a very full agenda. My understanding of the procedures, is this resolution comes to the BFC as a motion of the Benefits Committee with the hope that it will pass by the—be passed by the BFC and move to the UFC for its consideration, as benefits affect all employees at the IU system or in the IU system. This is its first reading of the Benefits Committee—or the BFC, if I understand it correctly, has the latitude to second this resolution and pass it at any point, if a member calls to question for an up or down vote of the resolution as it comes to you moved by the Benefits Committee.

I wanted to give you brief background on this resolution. First, I want to emphasize, this resolution reflects our belief, much as the proposed revisions to the UFC's structures, perhaps expressed, if you think back to that document that we were just reviewing. That faculty governance is not meeting its obligation to represent the faculty's interests and be available to the administration to communicate faculty concerns, particularly where our workplace benefits are concerned. This resolution should in no way be read as a critique or statement of lack of faith in IU's fiscal officers or Human Resources, and particularly I want to give a shout out to Dan Rives. This is, in short, not responding to anything that Dan Rives has not provided to us. To the contrary, faculty are not pulling their weight in responsibilities to shared governance. That would be my argument. And we hope this resolution addresses our concerns and the need to muster faculty governance to be engaged in a conversation about our benefits. The specificity of the timelines of communication structures in the resolution are directed at the faculty so that we have a clear sense of when we need to step up and be available to engage with the administration. So I wanted to underscore the specifics are not meant as a directive to the administration, as much as they are a directive to all of us. And you'll have to forgive my—I'll call it "youthful exuberance" that when we were composing the specifics, I was thinking that that was clear and towards the goal of transparency, and several of my more senior and—people like Jim—[Laughter] reminded me that it sounds—really since he's here—remind me



that it sounds kind of rude to be telling the administration a specific deadline. But I would say that it was composed with really you as the audience, and our broader faculty is the audience.

With that emphasis, I think considering, for example, the proposed changes to IU's Family Medical Leave Policy to be discussed by the Trustees in two or three days, which I just found out at this meeting today, which suggest reducing faculty family leave benefits as a cost cutting measure, is moving forward through an ad hoc committee of faculty appointed by the IU administration, rather than the faculty appointed and elected representative that could represent the voice of the IU system's faculty body. At the moment, there is no clear course of action or opportunity for faculty to directly address the ad hoc committee or even the administration other than direct appeal to the Trustees at the New Albany meeting advocating for the value of the benefit as it stands. That seems to perpetuate a cycle of informing faculty of substantive changes to their benefits in public meetings with the Trustees or through the Herald-Times coverage of those meetings, rather than through direct communication with IU employees.

The second bit of background I wanted to offer you is to consider that we drafted this resolution and a majority of the Benefits Committee endorsed it because faculty asked us for four things in response to changes in health benefits from this year. First, they asked us to respond to faculty requests for more clarity and transparency around the process that established this year's premiums. Second, faculty at the UC—UFC level, have, until very recent past, been a part of the conversations about the substance of changes to benefits we receive. In short, this resolution seeks to return to a robust discussion particularly in light of the very real possibility that the UFC's standing committee on faculty benefits will be eliminated, that we should be there to discuss the benefits available to faculty, and communicate what's available to faculty who are seeking directions on what benefits might best fit their and their family's needs.

The third impetus for writing this resolution was to create a clearer schedule about when faculty would be notified about changes to benefits to allow budgeting for changes earlier in the fiscal year than in the end of October or November.

The fourth impetus is to create structures of reporting and a timeline for reporting that would create more continuity in reporting and communicating with faculty from year to year, regardless of the faculty leadership in place on the IU Benefits Committee or in place or available to the UFC. So, in many ways, it is to rectify the issue that, depending on who is co-chairing the Benefits Committee at the Bloomington campus and the IUPUI campus, faculty may or may not be hearing about changes that are coming down the pipe. And for the other regional campuses, and I want to note for the record that IU South Bend has just passed a resolution at its Faculty Senate, specifically calling for a similar reporting structure and some

sort of accountability on the part of the faculty and the administration in a conversation around benefits. So I think our regional campuses who have even less access to Dan Rives and to the administration around benefits, are feeling even more distressed and cut out of the conversation about what do benefits look like, what are we paying for, and how to be part of a conversation of what it is that we receive as benefits. So with that, I am happy to field any questions or concerns about the resolution. And I actually hadn't asked Dan to represent anything, and I don't know, if in the interest of time, if—

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** We asked him to be present. Dan, do you want to make any comments?

**RIVES:** I didn't come with any prepared comments.

**HANSON:** [comment indistinct] only have five minutes. [Laughter]

**RIVES:** I am not going to make up any either, but in terms of the resolution that's been proposed, I think there are many favorable things in here that we would look forward to. I'll give you an example, too, we being, those of us who are constructing and working with vendors to come up with solutions for benefits, during the summer months, asked—first it was Erika, I believe, and then Carolyn second, and then Jack, who's the co-chair of the UFC up at IUPUI, if we could have some UFC Benefits Committee twice during the summer so we could then begin sharing what was going to be happening in the fall, and there was no response. Now I understand why, because there wasn't really a committee or an active process to have a committee that we could provide information to. But anyway, so this resolution that has been drafted, I think, is very favorable in the sense that it lays out some structure for the UFC, either standing or ad hoc, having a committee for which we could work with and get feedback, provide advance information. The only item I'd ask that we need to work on, if that's possible, would be the timeline. We don't actually construct—we don't get all the data to do the renewal for the upcoming January until July, and then we do the renewal process with vendors, which is growing in numbers, by the way, in August, so we get to late August, early September is when we actually even know what things are going to look like for the coming January. So we probably need to work on some of that timeline.

**GRAY:** May I ask a question of clarification? Because I think there was some—we weren't really sure when that material was available when we were discussing the timeline, and I didn't have a chance to check with you, but we were going off of your comment during one of our Benefits Committee meetings, that you receive your budget, what money you are working with, from CFO Neil Theobald in February/March. So it sounds like you have the budget you're working with, but you're saying you don't necessarily have what the benefits are that you would be working with.

**RIVES:** That's correct. So, I think—I think absolutely having the UFC—if I'm saying it correctly, a BFC Benefits and Budgetary Affairs Committee meeting, and a February timeline would be excellent. It would give us an opportunity to share what's on the horizon. We prepare the benefits budget so we can give to the operating units to prepare their budget for the July 1 process, so we have to have a good understanding of what the university is going to allocate toward retirement, healthcare, life, and so forth in that February timeline so that the budget office can prepare the budget construction material that goes out to the units—I'm not going to say this exactly right, but I believe in April, so all the schools can prepare their budgets and everything get done by—so the Trustees can approve it, in June, I believe. And, so yeah, absolutely. That part would be—would very much be available.

**HANSON:** Questions or comments? Herb?

**TERRY:** This is a first reading. I would suggest that you look at this policy to see if you can create a way for this group to meet—to expect to meet when required with the vice president and CFO, and not just that the vice president and CFO will work, but that you will work cooperatively with Dan. I mean what we now face, where changes in benefits in part driven by a Trustee decision to cap the total amount of money that we spend on benefits, on health, and I think Dan had some influence on that, but not much. The Trustees decided to do that. The VP and CFO should have more impact on that, but that, well—. Similarly, what we now face, as a back story, is really quite political. The governor requested and received a report on the cost of healthcare in public universities and high schools in this state, and that report said those plans are very rich, very expensive, and the state would save a lot of money if it would just force all of those employees off [comment indistinct] health plan. Part of what had to be done was to formulate a response to the legislature and to others, that would indicate to them that they were going a different course, but responding to that report. It would be difficult to be transparent about things like that that are political, so I think paragraph two, some way or another, should try to say that this Committee should meet with the VP and CFO. To some extent, if there's frustration about these changes, I bear some of that responsibility, because I met with Neil Theobald, I shared what I could of some of those discussions about what was coming and why they were coming. Paragraph two might expand that to say that Neil should meet, or his successor should meet similarly with this group. And that, I think, would help you get some influence, not just once it sort of gets to HR, here's the money you got, now the question is how do you allocate it, but to have some impact earlier on on other forces that affect dramatically the healthcare plans we offer.

**GRAY:** May I respond to that?

**HANSON:** Yeah, we've got thirty seconds. Was there another comment in here? Yes?

**G. SIMPSON:** [comment indistinct] the Professional Council has recently passed a resolution essentially advising creation of a committee just like this. We're very much in support of this and would be happy to help. One thing that, or a couple of things, it's not clear what "peer" is doing in front of peer staff councils. I'm not quite sure what that means there. It says Committee— "Budgetary Affairs Committee and peer staff council representatives." I just don't know what "peer" is doing there.

**GRAY:** To your question, I think we weren't sure exactly what structures were in place for our staff, and we're always in this pickle of wanting to coordinate with other employees at IU, but because we're designated as the Benefits Committee for the Bloomington Faculty Council—

**G.SIMPSON:** Right.

**GRAY:**—We're always trying to kind of keep it proscribed to our purview, which is to speak to faculty representation. So the confusion of the language is that we weren't sure what would be the proper language for our—for the staff equivalent of us.

**G. SIMPSON:** And then the other point is you're calling for the creation of a commission, and I think my understanding is that commissions are temporary. Is that the idea or do you want a committee?

**GRAY:** In the past, we've actually had a commission, and Jim can speak to this. What we were harkening to was about no less than four years ago there was this kind of body that was a standing commission that had a range of representation that specifically was engaged with HR and with fiscal officers around what are the benefits that are going to be available—what is it that we're interested in our faculty receiving. And that has gone to the wayside.

**HANSON:** Jim can't respond unless there is unanimous consent.

**SHERMAN:** I just have five sec—I just want a quick question for Dan. Do you have any intent of reestablishing something like the healthcare commission? You had talked about it.

**RIVES:** Well, I think that is why I was looking at this in a very favorable way, so the UFC is developing a committee, standing or otherwise, that would be—that we could meet with on a regular basis, including during the summer where a lot of the planning takes place.

**HANSON:** Thank you, guys. We are adjourned. Thank you.

**MEETING ADJOURNED: 5:32PM**