

Indiana University  
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL  
March 5, 2013

## Kelley School of Business – CG 1034

3:30 P.M. - 5:30 P.M.

### Attendance

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Abhijit Basu, Bonnie Brownlee, Carolyn Calloway-Thomas, Pnina Fichman, Marion Frank-Wilson, Thomas Gieryn, Donald Gjerdingen, Jason Baird Jackson, Robert Jacobs, Peter Kloosterman, Jennifer Laherty, Eugene McGregor, Michael Morrone, Maresa Murray, John Paolillo, James Perry, Deanna Reising, Lauren Robel, Bret Rothstein, Matt Semadeni, Jim Sherman, Rebecca Spang, William Swanson, John Tafoya, Herbert Terry, Peggy Thoits, Barbara Vance, Edward Vasquez, John Walbridge, William Wheeler

**MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT:** Sarita Soni (Ruth Stone)

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Dana Anderson, Lyudmila Bronstein, LaNita Campbell, Gracia Clark, Mike Conway, Gregory Demas, Jeffrey Gershman, Cassandra Guarino, Vivian Halloran, T. Scott Herring, Bruce Jaffee, Lynn Jamieson, Dan Knudsen, Lesa Hatley Major, Patricia McManus, Michael McRobbie, Sherri Michaels, Jeff Nelsen, Michael Ogden, Dot Porter, Elizabeth Raff, Edwin Ramos, Augustin Ruta, Sandra Shapshay, Lisa Sideris, Grant Simpson, Marietta Simpson, Sonya Stephens, J. Kyle Straub, Adam Szczepaniak, Pat Thomas, Frances Trix, Julie Van Voorhis, James Wimbush

**GUESTS:** Alan Bender (Biology), Mike Leonard (Herald Times), Roger Levesque (BAC), Trevor Loney (Sociology), Laura Ridenour (Faculty Council Office)

### Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/minutes/12-13/02.05.13.pdf>

2. Memorial Resolutions for Roy J. Gardner and George Ewing

Roy J. Gardner: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/12-13/B18-2013.pdf>

George Ewing: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/12-13/B19-2013.pdf>

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

4. Presiding Officer's Report (10 minutes)  
(Provost Lauren Robel)

5. Question / Comment Period<sup>1</sup>

<http://www.indiana.edu/~provost/about/speeches.shtml>

<http://newsinfo.iu.edu/news/page/normal/23855.html>

6. Report of the Long-Range Planning Committee  
(Professor Joel Stager, Chair of the Long-Range Planning Committee)

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/12-13/aux/LRPC1.pdf>

7. Bloomington Campus Policies for Non-Tenure-Track Instructional Appointments  
(Professor Herb Terry, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee) [SECOND READING]

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/12-13/B15-2013Rev.pdf>

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

8. Old Business/New Business

### **Minutes**

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

**ROBEL:** ...last week before spring break, right? So, and is the Faculty Council also leaving early for Spring Break? Welcome, and I will entertain a motion for approval of the minutes.

**UNKNOWN MALE SPEAKER:** So moved.

**ROBEL:** Okay. Second?

**UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER:** Second.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 2: MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS FOR ROY J. GARDNER AND GEORGE EWING**

**ROBEL:** Thank you. Okay, all in favor? [Aye] I turn now to Vice Provost Tom Gieryn to present the memorial resolutions.

**GIERYN:** Can you all hear me? Lecturing for many years helps.

---

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

In January of 2011, the Department of Economics lost one its most imaginative, productive, and generous colleagues, Professor Roy Gardner. Roy passed away unexpectedly at his residence in Bloomington. He was sixty-three years old. He left his wife of forty-two years, Carla Gardner (Reardon), their son James C. Gardner of Seattle, and their daughter Sara A. Gardner of Bloomington.

Born on May 21, 1947 in Peoria, Illinois, Roy was valedictorian of his high school class of 1965 at Limestone High, Peoria, as well as the state Latin champion. He graduated summa cum laude from Bradley University in 1968. Following graduation, he served as an artillery officer in the US Army-Vietnam and won the Bronze Star for his service. Roy earned his Ph.D. in economics from Cornell University in 1975.

Roy arrived at Indiana University in 1983. Prior to coming to Indiana, he was on the faculties of Iowa State University and Northwestern University. Roy held the titles of Chancellor's Professor of Economics (since 1996) and Henry H. H. Remak Professor of West European Studies (since 2004). His research productivity was extensive, and included co-authoring with three Nobel Prize laureates (Robert Engle, Reinhardt Selten, and Elinor Ostrom). Although Roy specialized in the theory of games and economic behavior, the span of his research was much broader. Over his career, he applied his game theory expertise to such diverse topics as decision making in planned economies, voting models, class struggle, spoils systems, draft resistance, alliance formation, monetary union, and corruption. He published in the most prestigious journals in economics, as well as in a wide assortment of journals beyond economics, including *American Political Science Review*, *Animal Behavior*, *The Journal of Theoretical Biology*, and *The American Anthropologist*.

Roy was a regular participant in colloquia and mini-conferences in the Vincent and Elinor Ostrom Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis. In the late 1980s he began collaboration with his colleagues Lin Ostrom and Jimmy Walker, investigating issues of cooperation and institutional design in the context of collective action and self-governance involving common-pool resources. This twenty-year collaboration led to numerous journal articles in prestigious economics and political science journals, and the widely cited book, *Rules, Games, and Common Pool Resources*. This research program gained the support of several grants from the National Science Foundation and importantly, was acknowledged by the Nobel Prize committee in economics as being a significant component of Lin's research program leading to her receiving the Nobel Prize in Economics.

Suggestive of the breadth of his interests is the fact that he was a member of a large multidisciplinary NSF grant, "Mathematics across the Curriculum," (Indiana University), a large German Science Foundation grant (University of Mannheim), and two large Trans-Atlantic

Cooperation grants from the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation (University of Bonn and Humboldt University Berlin). He also served as the Academic Director of the MA program in Economics at the Ukrainian National University “Kyiv-Mohyla Academy” since 2002.

Roy was promoted to a Chancellor’s Professor on the basis of his outstanding contributions to the teaching of game theory both at home and abroad. Roy’s text book for undergraduate courses in game theory, *Games for Business and Economics*, published in 1995, was innovative. He wrote in ways easily demonstrating how the complex concepts of game theory could be made accessible to undergraduates through well-designed applications focusing on a wide array of applications in economics. He popularized the use of “arrow diagrams” to find Nash equilibria in the most elementary games. This visual aid for locating equilibrium points has been widely adopted in more recent game theory textbooks. His text was one of the outcomes of a grant from the National Science Foundation made to IU in order to enhance the teaching and learning of mathematics across the curriculum. Yet, it was also the case that the pedagogical approach developed for the book was shaped over many years in game theory classes he developed for undergraduates and graduate students, as well as teaching his son and daughter the finer points of poker.

Two examples illustrate Roy’s approach to teaching game theory with clever applications. The first game, “Liar’s Poker,” took its name from Michael Lewis’s book of the same title. Roy’s approach was to simplify the game and reduce it to its barest essentials. Indeed, there are just two cards in the deck Roy creates for this story: Aces and Kings. In this case, the big point was to model bluffing, the very core of any poker game, so why not radically simplify the number of possible hands that could be dealt? By doing so, Roy gets to the core problem of whether or not a player bluffs. Roy’s approach yields an easy calculation to find how likely each player bluffs when players follow their Nash equilibrium strategies. Getting just the right amount of bluffing is the most difficult step in any poker model. Roy’s model is the best simplified way of capturing how important bluffing plays out in poker strategy. Indeed, his work on this point is original and is better at getting the essence of bluffing in poker models than in the earlier models developed by the great founders of modern game theory, Emile Borel, John von Neumann, and John F. Nash.

The second example is the notorious “Every Day Low Pricing” strategy employed by Sears in the 1980s. This strategy failed Sears. Roy explains why in a simplified model. Here he borrows from a model of sales first published by Hal Varian. Roy’s contribution is to strip the model to its essentials and present it in a manner that beginning game theory students can readily digest. They learn a good managerial lesson in doing so! Both of these examples from Roy’s book employ the notion of a mixed strategy. His Chapter 4, on that topic is overall the outstanding chapter in the book and remains one of the most original and well-thought out presentations of

that subject, which happens to be one of the most notoriously difficult topics in basic game theory.

Roy was always filled with creating ideas and concern for the learning and development of his students. He was known by all as someone with a warm heart, unbelievable memory, and mentor to a host of undergraduate and graduate students. Roy's loss was felt worldwide by his numerous friends, students, and colleagues. He is sorely missed by his colleagues and students.

In memory of Roy's contributions to Indiana University and beyond, be it resolved that this memorial resolution become part of the minutes of the Bloomington Faculty Council and that copies be sent to members of Roy's family.

George Edward Ewing was born November 28, 1933, in Charlotte, North Carolina to Allen Conover Ewing and Margaret M. Ewing. He was married to Louise S. Ewing of Williamsport, Pennsylvania. He graduated high school from the Phillips Exeter Academy in 1952, completed his undergraduate work at Yale University in 1956 (where he most enjoyed being a member of the Mountaineering Club), and received his Ph.D. from the University of California, Berkeley. Upon graduation, he worked for Jet Propulsion Laboratories in Pasadena, California and then at Bell Laboratories in Murray Hill, New Jersey, before joining the faculty at Indiana University in 1963. George believed his most valuable education came from his parents, family, teachers and friends. Side-stepping mention of his elite schools was a manifestation of George's vigorous allergy to pretentiousness.

George was one of the last to be stuck with the tradition of beginning a tenure-track appointment as an Instructor. Within only eight years, he became a full professor. George retired in 1998 as a Chancellor's Professor of Chemistry and a Professor of Public and Environmental Affairs. Over the years, he and his students studied the chemical and physical properties of molecular complexes, liquids, surfaces, atmospheric particles and ice, resulting in over one hundred papers. Thousands of students have studied with him, ranging from undergraduate non-majors to chemistry Ph.D. candidates.

George's academic career was a tight integration of teaching and research; he excelled at both. A formal recognition of George's innovative teaching is given by his Chancellor's Professorship. His teaching spanned courses ranging from our most elementary offering for first year non-science majors to graduate quantum mechanics and spectroscopy. A student from the junior-senior physical chemistry course wrote:

*"We called him the P-Chem Guru based on the rather wild look of his hair after he walked into the classroom and pulled his sweater off over his head. He would generally have his notes rolled up in a pocket. He would remove them from the*

*pocket and never look at them. On one particularly memorable occasion, after introducing his main ideas of the wavefunction and quantum theory to us, he turned to the class and said, 'And now there will be an embarrassing silence until someone asks a question.' And he waited for the question – something not many professors were inclined to do. My decision to pursue physical chemistry as a career was cemented in his class."*

Formal recognition of his research is found in his election as a Fellow of the American Physical Society, Directeur des Recherches (École Polytechnique, France), his Guggenheim Fellowship (Oxford, England) and his visiting sabbatical appointments at top research institutions worldwide: Bell Telephone Labs, École Polytechnique (France), Oxford University (England), (Indiana University); Chapman Lecturer (University of Alaska) and Quatercentenary Visiting Fellowship (Cambridge, England), and the Technion (Israel). His last sabbatical was as the Chapman Lecturer at the University of Alaska in pursuit of his research interest on ice.

George directed more than thirty Ph.D. students and almost an equal number of postdocs. They organized a Festschrift for George at the time of his retirement and returned to Bloomington from as far away as Europe.

The accomplishments of his lab, the "quantum garage," were as familiar to those overseas as in the US. He would first choose a topic little studied by others (thus he didn't have to read the literature, so he said), and when it became crowded, he moved on.

One can trace the evolution of his research through at least five distinct areas. His initial IU work involved weakly bound molecules, so-called van der Waals molecules, such as the dimer formed from two ordinary oxygen molecules. He started when there was skepticism even about their existence. With a unique cryogenic apparatus (-200°C) created to maximize the small concentration expected of such fragile complexes, he published in 1971 the first IR study of the dimer, confirming not only its existence but reporting its bond strength and geometry.

Soon this field became hot, and he moved to the different world of energy transfer in liquids. At the time, a central issue was the time scale for vibrational energy loss from a molecule such as molecular nitrogen that was undergoing a trillion collisions per second in its liquid nitrogen environment. The time scale for loss of a vibrational quantum in this collisional mayhem was commonly thought to be on the order of a billionth of a second. Using state of the art laser technology in 1975, he discovered the time scale to be a little longer. It was about one second! George's paper revolutionized concepts of liquid state energy transfer.

George revisited van der Waals complexes as a theorist. The issue was again one of time scales, but now the process was the breaking of the weak bond after one of the chemically bound

molecules became vibrationally energized. He developed in 1979 “the momentum gap” methodology for prediction of the time scales that still remains in common use for several types of energy transfer processes.

His developments next lead George to predictions concerning molecules weakly bound to surfaces. The surface of the NaCl crystal, an insulator, was a useful model. Once again, this was a nearly virgin field since little attention had been paid to insulator surfaces. The work eventually lead to another of George’s papers now considered a classic.

This experience led George to studies of small atmospheric particles, mostly sea salt suspended in air. He developed a unique method to gain access to these aerosols via IR spectroscopy that has been adopted by other labs for diverse atmospheric research. This experience also led to George’s service on The Indiana Air Pollution Control Board. It also stimulated George’s interest in the thin films of water that cover most surfaces under ambient conditions and his fascination with properties of ice that he pursued during a winter sabbatical in Fairbanks, Alaska.

Most recently George became deeply involved with Professor Martin Jarrold concerning the mechanism of electric charge build up in the atmosphere. That problem has been with us for a long time, say, several hundred years, so that it violates George’s propensity to go after problems with a minimal literature. Still, significant issues remain unresolved. Obviously, George was intellectually restless.

George loved the city of Bloomington and especially the woodlands and countryside of southern Indiana. He had a passion for walking and spent much time in Brown County’s Yellowwood State Forest and on Pate Hollow Trail in Hoosier National Forest. He was a regular at his favorite local haunts including Soma, the Runcible Spoon, Laughing Planet, Uptown Cafe, the Monroe County Public Library and the late Ladyman’s Cafe. He appreciated Bloomington’s many cultural offerings such as the Art Museum and enjoyed evening strolls to musical and theatrical events. He volunteered as a cook in the Hunger Relief Program at the Shalom Community Center, was concerned about environmental quality and served on the Air Pollution Control Board for the State of Indiana, was a member of the Bloomington Coalition for Death Penalty Issues and a longtime member of the Religious Society of Friends (Quakers). Always an active man, he became a yoga enthusiast in his later years.

George Edward Ewing, 77, of Bloomington, passed away on Tuesday, August 23, 2011, at home with his loving family after a long illness. George was a devoted family man and will be missed by his wife, Louise; four daughters, Alice Ewing of San Diego, California, Chrisstina Hamilton of Ann Arbor, Michigan, Tamara S. Ewing and husband of Nantes, France, and Sasha MacKenzie and husband of Naples, New York; two sons, James Ewing and wife of Brooklyn, New York, and

Ross Ewing of Bloomington; four grandchildren, Luther and Josephine Hamilton, Tea and Emile Hazebrouck. He is preceded in death by his mother and father, and survived by his two sisters Susan Fisher and Katherine Ewing.

In recognition of Professor Emeritus George Ewing's many contributions to the scientific and scholarly life of the Department of Chemistry, the community and to the university at large, be it resolved that this memorial resolution become part of the permanent records of the proceedings of the Bloomington Faculty Council.

**ROBEL:** Please stand. [Silence]. Those are such wonderful resolutions, Tom. Thank you. I don't know whose colleagues—which colleagues wrote those, or did you write these?

**GIERYN:** Uh—

**ROBEL:** —They're at the end.

**GIERYN:** You probably should give credit where credit is due because these people take time to write these memorial resolutions. In the case of Roy's, it was a collaborative effort, Bob Becker, Jimmy Walker. And for George, it was Kate Reck. So we do owe them a debt of gratitude. Those were both wonderful resolutions.

**ROBEL:** They really were terrific resolutions. Thank you so much. I turn to our president.

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

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** I want to say good afternoon to everyone on this beautiful day. [Laughter] I want to begin my comments today by congratulating Provost Robel on a very successful inaugural State of Campus Address. Eagerly, we look forward to your second State of the Campus Address next year. The inaugural speech was thought-provoking, vigorous, and visionary. It reminded us of where we've been, where we are, and what remains to be done. And all of us will strive collectively to extend the reach of this great institution in a fiercely competitive global era. So thank you, Provost Robel, for helping us honor our BFC constitutional, civic, and academic commitments to the faculty.

Today, members of the BFC Executive Committee are pleased to announce that we will be working closely with Provost Robel to implement some very important initiatives, and in an open and facilitative way. We will meet with Provost Robel on March 7<sup>th</sup>, which is Thursday, to discuss the way forward. And we will be calling on you, as well as others, to help us advance our common mission. One of our crucial missions, which is clearly articulated in Article II of the BFC Constitution under the heading "Faculty Authority" is that we have jurisdiction over curriculum, student academic performance, and standards and procedures of academic units. As you may know, I commented on this intrusion of state legislators into our academic business at the



February 14<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Board of Trustees. There, it was most gratifying to hear a chorus of positive, reinforcing responses from members of the Board of Trustees and President McRobbie. While the lively affirmations and testimonies were going on, a colleague sent me the following message: “Carolyn, for a moment, I thought you, Jack,” my co-Secretary, “members of the Board of Trustees, and the president were going to hold hands.” And I almost chimed in, “...and singing ‘Kumbayah.’” But thankfully, I recovered quickly in time for me to realize that I was not down South in my hometown of Bernice, Louisiana, where we sing Kumbayah enthusiastically. In any case, the article that appeared in the *Herald-Times* has travelled to all of the regional campuses, and their faculties have begun a resolution campaign to dramatize their support of our efforts to forestall legislators’ usurpation of our rights. Professor Christopher Darr, President of the IU Kokomo Senate, and the IU Kokomo faculty, were first starters in initiating the campaign, and I have asked president-elect Herb Terry and his committee to assist our campaign efforts here at IUB, and I see that such a document awaits our attention later on this afternoon.

Further, on February 19, the UFC Executive Committee created a Vigilance Committee, which will be working with Jeff Linder under the auspices of the IU Government Relations representatives and others, so that we can determine, as best we can, when particular pieces of encroaching legislation are imminent, and stop them if need be. Of course, as we move forward, we will ensure that our thoughts and actions concerning such matters will meet the tests of sagacity and good will. I love that word “sagacity.” A lovely word. Professor Donald Gjerdingen, our very methodical and effective parliamentarian of both the UFC and the BFC, has crafted a beautiful ethics document, which will be presented on March 26<sup>th</sup> at the meeting of the UFC in Indianapolis. Please recall that the purpose of the document is to create a list of strong, compelling, ethical principles to govern the actions of Trustees, administrators, faculty, staff and students. The ethics document is not a replacement document. This means that the Student Handbook, the Faculty Handbook, and other extant legislative materials will not be disturbed by the ethics document, but rather enhance and elevate it. We have not tinkered, in any way with such documents, and I will report later, after the March 26<sup>th</sup> meeting.

On another front, I continued my ambassadorial meetings with school councils, and it has been a great pleasure to visit with groups of superb teachers and scholars from many different disciplines who are shaping the university. On Monday, February 25<sup>th</sup>, I met with the Kelley Academic Council on the very day that departmental and faculty accomplishments were being discussed. And I was very impressed by the progressive agenda of the Kelley School—do we have anyone from the Kelley School?—their passionate devotion to their mission, as well as the stellar achievements of the faculty. As an interesting aside, I observed that their publications are categorized according to whether articles appear in A or A minus journals. No B plus journals were highlighted at the meeting. I mention this because the designation told me a

great deal about what is emphasized, stressed, and reinforced there. Kelley School faculty members are also concerned about the perception of a one-size-fits-all mentality that appears to permeate policies governing non-tenure-track instructional appointments. It was also good to learn that that council also receives updates from their BFC faculty representatives, and as a part of the regular agenda. So, a shout out to Matt for doing due diligence.

Only one of the five councils that I have visited has omitted regular BFC updates from its agenda, and the member of the Council promise fatefully to join the current practice. On Thursday, February 28<sup>th</sup>, at 8AM, I met with members of the Jacobs School of Music Council, a very cheerful place. Rainbow colors of red, purple and green greeted me from the moment I entered the bright, spacious elevator on route to the Parsifal room where the meeting was held. Again, I was just pleased to learn about the new and marvelous things that are happening in that outstanding school, as well as things about what makes the university hum. Faculty voted on proposed changes in the Jazz Studies degrees to incorporate majors in vocal jazz and on proposed changes in musicology course prerequisites. Music faculty expressed concern about the declining significance of service on the IUB campus.

Since I have had a chance to visit with three councils, enough time to see some trends, I would like briefly to summarize two of my observations for the benefit of this body and the campus as a whole. First, there is a reservoir, a huge reservoir, of good will on campus that we need exploit collectively. What a congenial, exhilarating group of faculty we have at IUB. That goodwill warmed my heart, and I think it can serve as a wonderful human relations basis for fostering greater cooperation among existing councils. As you know, we must develop more effective ways of communicating from council to council and from councils to the BFC and back. In such a spirit, today I invite all of you to invite your colleagues to become more involved in the work of the BFC and the campus. Although members of the BFC Executive Committee have not formalized matters in terms of the structures that we will use to help facilitate Provost Robel's initiatives, we have declared that representatives from all councils should be at the table. Otherwise, we fear, if I may be permitted to borrow from bioethicist, Willard Gaylin of the Hastings Center, we will behave like one celled amoebas instead of like exquisite interconnected corals. We cannot survive without each other.

Second, we must think of more significant ways of rewarding faculty for their civic engagement and contributions to the campus. Provost Robel and members of the BFC, as a consequence of my meetings with five councils, I sense that one of the most important issues we face today and an issue that was raised again and again and again is the diminishing significance of service on the campus. I will not take the time to interrogate this non-numerical finding because I realize that there are many factors at work with regard to the issue, but as some faculty argue, we must find ways of balancing the three areas that guide faculty productivity and well-being:

research, teaching, and service. May I add quickly, however, that in my discussions of this timely issue with Council members, not one person said that we should deemphasize research, rather faculty are searching for a both/and solution as opposed to an either/or solution to the problem. Faculty members clearly recognize that the increased demands for research and publication are part of a larger trend to a national and global competition. But let us save the larger discussion of this for what I hope will be another day as we seek remedies.

In terms of parking privatization, that perennial issue, the committee should be meeting one last time this semester to issue recommendations to President McRobbie and members of the Board of Trustees, and of course I will keep you informed and updated. Thank you for your attention.

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

**ROBEL:** Thank you so much, Carolyn. As our president mentioned, I did give a State of the Campus Address, and I will not repeat it today. It's up on the website if you would be interested in looking at it, and thank you to those of you who were able to carve some time out of your schedules to come. The—the—the address did outline my hope that the campus can engage in its own strategic planning process over the next year, and really look at, with some care, where we are as a campus, and where are the places the campus can, coming together, make some collective decisions that can help all of the parts of the campus. And there are many, many, many examples of—of this, but one of the easiest and most obvious to grasp, I think, for everyone is just to think about the recruitment of students to our campus, and how—how the needs of the—of the entire campus have to be met and honored and thought through collectively if we're going to do a good job with that. So, as—as the president mentioned, I'm in the process right now of trying to break each of the areas that I've identified down into manageable chunks, and to think about some leadership for each of these groups. The only one that I have really gotten put together right now is in the area of science, technology, informatics and mathematics, STIM. And the reason that that one has come together so quickly is that group needs to respond relatively quickly to a request from the AAU for a proposal to—for a grant. So the rest of them I will add to my agenda, and that one as well, with the BFC Executive Committee later this week?

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** On Thursday.

**ROBEL:** On Thursday—

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** —5:30.

**ROBEL:** I talked a great deal about diversity in the address. In particular, the need to provide greater support for the recruitment of a diverse student body, and the campus' commitment of

\$1.9 million to do exactly that with the Hudson Holland program, which did, in fact, grow quite significantly this past year. I'm modeling a number of possibilities with the Groups program, but this will also be a part of—of a more comprehensive planning process. I talked about the New Academic Directions initiatives, and announced that the—that the committee's report from Journalism, Telecommunications, and Communications and Culture, which had been commented on by faculty members across the campus, I thought presented a pretty compelling vision for moving forward with those areas, and doing so in a school. The—I had a great meeting yesterday with the leadership of the School of Journalism and the College, and I think we've got most of it focused on next steps, which will include the putting together of an MOU that will help the School of Journalism resolve basic issues about its, you know, some of the things that are fairly easy to resolve like students being grandfathered into degrees, and lines staying stable for a period of time, and P & T processes not changing for people who are on the ground already, so I feel very positive about that. The next steps there will include a group to do program planning for Franklin Hall, and if you have not been into Franklin Hall in the last couple of weeks, boy do I encourage you to go over there! It is just—the area that used to be—well, the bursar? The registrar? Oh my goodness, it is just stunning! You know, it is so beautiful, and it will be such a great place. I hope we will be meeting there at some point so that we can actually have a conversation, and then I won't be turning around like this. [Laughter] And also, to—we talked—I talked with the leadership yesterday of the—of the College and the School of Journalism about careful next steps for the faculty to take hold of the report and begin to shape it and the various faculties to begin to come together. So, that—I feel quite excited about where that is going.

I went to India and back in eighty hours. So I may well be incoherent still, but I—we opened a—a gateway facility in India outside of Delhi and Gurgaon. It is a partnership with the American Indian Institute of Education (AIIE), which has been involved in Indian—in working with US institutions of higher education on—on higher education programming in India for a little over fifty years, and I see Ruth Stone is here. I met your colleague at AIIE. I could not have asked for a more lovely welcome from AIIE. It was almost as if we were getting married. There were marigold garlands, and mandalas made out of flowers, but more importantly, it was the fact that our alumni and our educational partners all came for this opening, and helped us usher in what will I think be a very exciting set of opportunities for our faculty and our students. The—the gateway facility is one floor. It's a—it's a small, pretty traditional facility, but it has a classroom that will hold about forty people. It's got a few offices that faculty members can use, and it's got a nice outdoor space that can be used as we did for an alumni reception. So I'm hoping you all at some point have an opportunity to visit it, but in the meantime, as we think through ways in which so many of our schools and the College are working internationally, this is an exciting experience, and we'll see how it goes.

I received reports from the two working groups that were commissioned at the end of last semester—or during last semester, both of them working through the facilitation of wonderful faculty members here at the Kelley School of Business. One on thoughts about how we might begin to get our online programs in place at each of the schools, what the schools might be thinking about doing educationally in the masters—professional masters, and certificate arena, how the campus can be helpful in that process, and heard presentations from all of the schools just a few weeks ago. All of these programs are in various stages of development. They are all going, of course, they're being developed by faculty members and they're going through proper faculty processes. Some are further along than others, but they're all quite fascinating. And four of them are focused on the possibility of students in India. So I can see a lot of alignment between the gateway facility and the recommendations of many of the faculty members.

The other group that—that presented to me and then to the deans was a group—the group that had been brought together to think about career advising. That—that group was really propelled forward by a \$150,000 planning grant from the Lilly Endowment, and we have been invited to put a grant forward to Lilly for about \$5 million, and we're in the process of putting that together. I asked all of the deans for their advice and response to the report and they're—they're coming back in their budget presentations with their thoughts about how they might—how they might move forward. The other big report that came forward, of course, was the students' VOICE report, which was released in the last week or so. Everything actually seems like it was in the last week or so, but I think it was that—that quick trip to India. And I would urge all of you to take a look at it. It does have some significant results with respect to the students' perception of the—of their advising environment. It also—and I—I really want to give a lot of credit to the students and IUSA for this—focuses in on student safety issues. IUSA has been really wonderful in pushing forward the idea of a culture of care on our campus and the need for peer intervention and peer involvement in—in safety, and it—the voice report takes that whole concept to the next level I think. So I—I really recommend it to you all.

We have begun budget conferences. We—thank you very much to the Budgetary Affairs Committee for the beginning of what we all know is a rather—it's a sprint through all of these conferences, but those should be done actually very quickly. We're focusing on the academic units this year. I realized after going through last year and spending a great deal of time during the month of March and late February in budget conferences that many of them were with parts of the campus over which I really don't have any budgetary authority. And while I'm, you know, I'm deeply interested in—in what's happening in those parts of the campus, it didn't—I really, in the—in the grand scheme of things, think I could save them the time and the Budgetary Affairs Committee the time as well by releasing them from the obligation to come and report—report on their activities. And similarly, the offices that report most directly to me, the Vice Provosts' offices, I am in such constant communication with the Vice Provosts' offices

that it—it again seemed a little unnecessary to require them to go through a formal process of making a presentation, and so, I talked to Roger sometime back. Roger, where are you? And asked his advice, and asked him please to consult with BFC's Executive Committee about whether it would be okay to really focus in on the academic units because as provost I feel that's my charge, you know, the excellence of the academic units.

So, finally, this week I should have back from Parking Operations a fairly comprehensive plan for dealing with the library parking situation. I plan to release that to the campus for comments, and receive those comments, and then see if we can't make some progress to assure people that they—you know, there's a way for the people to get back and forth to the library, and it will involve a fair number of elements, including bus transportation and shuttles and remote parking and changing the classifications of a lot of parking spaces near the library, but that's—what are you going to do? You can't park where there's going to be a building so...

And I guess finally, I had the opportunity last night to be back in the classroom at the law school, and it was so much fun that I'll see if I do that second State of the Campus Address. [Laughter] And with that, I guess we'll turn to questions and comments.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 5: QUESTION / COMMENT PERIOD**

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Oh yes, Spang.

**SPANG:** Excuse me, I had to miss the State of the Campus Address because I was out of state, giving a lecture, and I was just skimming through the text, and you mention an integrated program in the humanities?

**ROBEL:** Yes.

**SPANG:** Please, can you tell me more about that?

**ROBEL:** Sure. John Lucaites and Matt Auer are—are heading up a group that's looking at a proposal that was put together by a student over a year ago. Yeah, do you know what this is? And the student proposal was an interesting proposal, and it was an interesting starting point, but it is something that would need a fair amount of programmatic thought by faculty members before it could possibly be implemented, and so there's a faculty members who are looking at that.

**SPANG:** Okay.

**TERRY:** And I want to thank you for the upcoming written plan for parking. That arose in part, I think, because after the last Faculty Council meeting I was asked by people in Telecommunications and Radio-TV Services and even Fine Arts what I'd learned from Doug

Porter about the plans for dealing with this, and the answer is that we expected there to be a cultural change, and not much else had been discussed specifically, it wasn't very satisfying to them. And I started a process of helping people who might be affected by this know that other people might be affected by it, and the provost stepped in rather quickly and said there we'll get a written plan, and it sounds like that's progressing, and, yeah, you can't park where there's going to be a building, but you can have some plan for where you are going to park—

**ROBEL:** —Oh, absolutely!—

**TERRY:** —some indication that the university is looking at the problem systematically, and I'm glad that that's being done.

**ROBEL:** Other—other questions or comments?

**WALBRIDGE:** I just want to second the sort of concern about faculty being disconnected from issues of service and governance. There's something of a generational difference in that. I mean, there are not a lot of people who are involved in it, and it's a little alarming that when I sort of approach a committee or something, things are far more likely to happen than seems natural to me, which is fine from my point of view, but obviously [indistinct comment] involving themselves, but I think some of it just simply goes back to socialization at the earliest sort of pre-tenure stage. I mean the—service is something that's sort of put off and not seriously considered in tenure. I know of a tenure case with someone who is notorious for not wanting to do anything that was not of personal benefit, and I mean we, you know, we bitched about it, and then basically said, well, you can't do anything about it because we don't count service seriously for tenure, and so there'll be a faculty member who drifts through a career without any sense of obligation to the collectivity. But I think it's something that needs to be addressed in the course of socializing faculty at the pre-tenure stage because what they learn now is that they'd better do research because they might get tenure and nothing else they do here, if they don't count—if they don't get tenure, will help them get another job, and that includes certainly contributing to the common good, so that doesn't make a resolution, but I think it's something we should all be worried about.

**ROBEL:** Yeah, I agree.

**TERRY:** I'd add one other comment on that, arising from the last Trustees meeting. At the last Trustees meeting, Dan Smith, who is now the head of the IU Foundation, spoke to the Trustees about the Foundation. He indicated he was putting together a sort of a skunkworks project to try to find ways to help get faculty more engaged with the Foundation. Not so much that he expects us to give them large amounts of money, but that we can be helpful when he tries to get large amounts of money from former students and this sort of thing. I haven't done it yet, but my intent was to write to Dan, and say, well, you know, here you're talking about a problem

that we face in faculty governance, and that is the lack of the engagement with the faculty with the institution and with the campus, so I hope that if you have a chance to work with Dan and that sort of thing that this becomes not just engagement in service, but engagement of the faculty not just with their discipline and not just with their department, but with the campus. And I sense generally that Provost Robel is trying to in developing a campus strategic plan get the campus units to think more about each other than in the past, and I think that's a good move, but all that will be at odds with the notion of faculty that their obligation is just to give their research time to satisfy their department for purposes of tenure and promotion and annual review, and all of that goes hand in hand with changing the culture. We may need a cultural change about parking, but we also need a cultural change about service.

**ROBEL:** Okay. Thank you. I think now I will call on Professor Joel Stager, the chair of the Long-Range Planning Committee, for the report [indistinct comment].

#### **AGENDA ITEM 6: REPORT OF THE LONG-RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**STAGER:** This is my first visit to the BFC. I thought [indistinct comment] well let's hope it's not my last, but it could be. Alright, I want to thank the BFC Executive Committee and President Calloway-Thomas for scheduling the release of the report. Everybody should have a copy of that report, and it also was on our URL from an email yesterday I believe. The committee was convened in 2011-2012. I want to thank them for their leadership and their efforts, Matt Guterl led the chair, and Jim Capshew, Deb Cohn, LaMonda Horton-Stallings, and Pat McManus, and of course BFC Chief of Staff, Craig Dethloff. Now, as a result of departures and sabbaticals, we replaced three of those people, Wendy Gamber in History, Walter Gantz from Telecom, and Bruce Jaffee from Business, sat on the committee this year.

You actually have three documents. The first one is a report generated from responses from the faculty and administrative staff, solicitations and interviews and email requests for input. The document represents the assimilation of this input, and its attempt to translate the input into a coherent view of the issues introduced by the faculty and the staff.

The second document you have that's stapled to the first is a list of recommendations composed by the Long-Range Planning Committee and it's based upon again this initial report. The third is actually a timeline and a statement of procedures and the rationale used to prepare the initial report. So, what does the Long-Range Planning Committee want to occur? That might be the initial question. Well, the first answer would be for the BFC members to read it and think about it. This doesn't necessarily reflect the committee's perspective. It represents the faculty's concerns. The second thing we would hope would happen was that the BFC would translate and communicate the document directly to their prospective faculty, and if not asking too much to get additional feedback. And third, the Long-Range Planning Committee would like to



have some tangible effect from this particular report. Some of you, I'm looking around the room, some of you are probably here on February, if I've got the date right, February 23, 1985. What's important about that particular date?

**SHERMAN:** It's my wife's birthday.

**STAGER:** Coach Knight threw a chair across the court. The question is, why did he do that? Right? We've been asking that question for years. But a little response, a little feedback. Obviously what he did is he did it get a reaction and a response, potentially from the officials. He certainly got a response. Potentially from the team, and potentially from his coaching staff, and possibly even the people in audience, right? So the Long-Range Planning Committee would respectively like to throw a chair across the court, and we're asking for some kind of a response, right? It's taken us a year and a half to get the thing together to present to you, and with any luck at all, there will be some kind of feedback coming back the other way, so read it, think about it, and respond. Thank you.

**ROBEL:** Thank you. I wonder if you read the interview in the *New York Times* this past weekend with Bob Knight on his new book, *The Power of Negative Thinking*, and his dislike of the word, "hope." Alright, thank you. How should—what would you like to do at this point?

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** I think we should follow his suggestions, and if individuals have comments that they would like to make, they can send them to Joel, and I'm sure his committee would be happy to receive them.

**STAGER:** That's exactly right.

**ROBEL:** Great, thank you so much, Joel. Comments or questions at this point? Can I turn to Professor Terry then, chair of FAC?

#### **AGENDA ITEM 7: BLOOMINGTON CAMPUS POLICIES FOR NON-TENURE-TRACK INSTRUCTIONAL APPOINTMENTS**

**TERRY:** I guess I'm going to follow Joel's model, I think, and stand—

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** —no, you're too persuasive already in this chamber!

**TERRY:** It's a better room for this. What you have before you is very slightly modified version of what you saw at an earlier Council meeting in first reading. It's circular B15-2013. We have, in this case, modified the prior circular so you can see the ways in which it changes on first or second readings. There aren't very many substantial changes to be blunt. You also have a cover memo, and I won't read the cover memo to you. I will point out that in part, it's responsive to—a partial response—to one of the things the Long-Range Planning Committee identified, and

that is the need to take a look at our non-tenure-track faculty members, what they do, what the titles are and that sort of thing. But it's only the start of that process for reasons that I'll explain in a moment.

The main thing that we did after the first reading was carefully look at all of the comments that members of the Council made, and that we received occasionally from some others who read our minutes or read accounts somewhere about the Council meeting. Many of the comments that we received, both in the last BFC meeting and then subsequent to that were not so much about these specific proposals. They were about the general issues of NTT faculty. The one comment that we followed up on at some length was Tom Gieryn's observation that the school—the Kelley School of Business—had some difficulty with the proposals to reconcile the campus policies on NTT instructional appointments with system policies. We invited the dean of the Kelley School of Business to come and talk to the Faculty Affairs Committee. She was not able to attend. She sent a representative. We devoted almost an entire meeting of the FAC to meeting with an associate dean of Kelley.

What we sought to understand was more of the difficulties that they perceived they would have if these changes were made, and also to understand what they were doing as current practice. What we've learned, I think, is that the Kelley School here is an outlier in the way it appoints non-tenure-track instructional faculty, and what it has and does—do. To summarize briefly, for the most part, their non-tenure-track faculty who teach in their graduate program are clinical professors, and typically have whatever would be the typical terminal degree in that part of Business. Their non-tenure-track instructional faculty who teach undergraduates are primarily lecturers, and they may or may not have the terminal degree, typical of that part of business. We were told that the—one of the primary—two primary reasons why they were doing this was in part, to be quite honest with this Council as they were honest with us, cost, that it is very expensive to hire tenure-track faculty in business, and that non-tenure-track faculty were more affordable.

And second, competitive forces. Essentially, they said that the schools with which they competed did this, that they had lots of clinical faculty, clinical professors, and that they couldn't hire people unless they can dangle before them a clinical title. We asked specifically what schools do they compete with, and they gave us a list. Our research indicated that we couldn't support their claim. That we couldn't find large numbers of clinical faculty at the very schools that they said that they were competing with. Now this could be a temporary problem. We certainly discovered some business schools that, in terms of their hiring patterns, look like Kelley, two to three. Those may be recent developments. It may be the case that schools around the country now are—business schools around the country, are trying to hire clinical

faculty. But at the moment most of the schools that they said that were their competitors, didn't have large numbers of clinical professors at all. That's what we found.

**JACOBS:** Not true, though.

**TERRY:** Well, we can get back to that in a moment.

**JACOBS:** When you get done with your statement.

**TERRY:** Yeah, we'll get back to that. But what we did was we took the list we had, we farmed it out among the members of the Faculty Affairs Committee, and they checked the websites of those schools. So what we're asking the Council to do is to still modify the campus policies so they are not inconsistent with the system policies. Clearly, the system policies require, the Trustees therefore require, the UFC therefore has required, that clinical professors do instruction in a clinical setting. That's what the policy says, and Carolyn mentioned earlier that the idea that some in the School of Business with whom she has met object to one-size-fits-all policies. This may be exactly an example of that.

What I think has emerged from this is it would be wise for this Council next year to work with the schools and to work with the campus administration, and take a comprehensive look at our NTT faculty system. The policies that we have were all adopted before that was a large part of the faculty here. Now it is a large part, as the provost noted in her State of the Campus Address, there's not much growth in the tenure-track faculty in recent years, nor I think much reason for anticipating large growth in the future. There's been a dramatic growth in NTT faculty. And, I would add, one of the things we've discovered is that non-tenure-track scientists aren't entirely at ease with the current system either. In a budget conference this morning, we discovered that one of the initiatives that the provost is pushing for, and I agree with, better advising and career advising, is leading one of the schools here to think that they're advisors should teach courses. Well, we may not have the greatest instructional rank system for that either. So I think it is time to—to take a comprehensive look at that.

One of the things that was intended, I think, when this president-elect role was created was that the president-elect would have time to learn how the campus worked, and come up to speed, and be ready to go the following year. For a variety of reasons, I don't need to do a lot of that, but the other thing that I think was—

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** —Thank you, Herb!— [Laughter]

**TERRY:** —you could identify issues that you wanted to address, and I hope that regardless of the outcome on this vote today, that you will support me in taking a look next year, actually beginning this year because we've got to start gathering a lot of data on NTT life. But so that we

can hit the ground running with that next year. Now, you could say that that's an argument for not voting for this proposal. I just think it's a bad thing for everybody when you have appointments clashes, inconsistencies between a system policy that has gone through the faculty governance system, that this campus wants approved and that the UFC has approved and that the Trustees have approved, and then when you have a system at the campus level that it can be argued is either inconsistent with that, or has resulted in appointments that are inconsistent with it. So I would urge you to vote for this today, but I would acknowledge that it's not something that our colleagues at the School of Business would favor, and would welcome hearing from them.

**JACOBS:** Well, I—number one, I can understand your concern, honest. As a tenured faculty member and there's tremendous interest in academic integrity of the university, research focus for the university, and I recognize that. But I picked up on your comment here that you could not confirm the claim that the business school had made. Actually I was reviewing this about an hour before the meeting, and I found it quite interesting, and I got up—the first two websites that came up was NYU Stern and the University of Chicago Booth, because they're two major business schools that we—we compete with. And I simply went through the business school faculty and counted the number of clinicals versus total, you know, of faculty NYU Stern has forty out of three hundred and sixty. At University of Chicago Booth, it's eighteen out of two hundred. Business school, it's about twenty-seven out of two forty. Anyway, so these run between ten and fifteen percent and, I mean, if you would like more data, I'm sure it would be very easy to do the same thing that I did, and we could confirm that this is very common practice in the major business schools, including Harvard and everywhere else to use clinical faculty. The clinical term, and I think this is part of the problem, the clinical term, you know, for a faculty appointment of someone with a degree in, you know, you've got some extra data, some data—I think we—we also—

**SEMADENI:** —well it's, you know, it—this is being framed as a Kelley versus the rest of the campus but, you know, Kelley is far from—in percentage terms—there are others. Well, obviously Optometry has a high number of appointments—there's no surprise there. But SPEA, Public Health all have percentages that are higher than Kelley, and so—but I echo Bob's sentiments here. One of the things is the way that the clinicals are being used within the Kelley School is very novel. This is a very progressive, and across many different curriculums—the provost referenced the online—and we—we have a very diverse set of students. We have a diverse set of needs, and this allows us a lot of flexibility in terms of our ability to deliver the value we need to to our students, particularly in the graduate degree area. And so, to—to put us in a box here, to put a stricture like this on the Kelley School would affect our ability to deliver.

**JACOBS:** And it would affect SPEA and some of these other schools—

**PERRY:** —I—don't speak—don't speak for SPEA—

**JACOBS:** —You don't agree with that?

**PERRY:** Yeah, thanks.

**JACOBS:** Okay, okay. Anyway—but it would, it would restrict us.

**TERRY:** I would add one thing. I don't think the NYU school is one we were given as a competitor. University of Chicago was, and it was one of two schools where we could find a large number of clinical [indistinct comment].

**SEMADENI:** Again, this is a progressive thing. Increasingly—

**TERRY:** —It may be—

**SEMADENI:** —we're seeing that—

**JACOBS:** —This is the future. I mean—

**TERRY:** —It may be—

**JACOBS:** —this is where schools are going. The major business schools are—this is not, you know, [indistinct comment].

**UNKNOWN MALE SPEAKER:** By the way, I mean, just a suggestion. I mean, I—I do think that this clinical thing, I mean I would suggest that some kind of definition of clinical to mean settings that focus on specific career preparation, emphasis on real world applications. These are the kind of things we're using clinicals for. I mean, I think are congruent with the things that are in the medical profession, and the other places. I mean, and that possibly that's the way to resolve this dilemma, you know, is that we be a little more open in our definition of clinical, you know, and not so restrictive [indistinct comment], because I think that's kind of the issue here is that, you know, very applied type of stuff, very career oriented school—very specific career oriented school. Because I think that's—that's the way we're trying—we're not trying [indistinct comment] a broad research oriented [indistinct comment].

**ROBEL:** Thank you, Jim?

**PERRY:** I have one question and then a comment on SPEA, but I'm not—it's not clear to me why the professor of practice would not sort of fit the need that the business school has, and that professor of practice is at least as attractive a title, I would think, as clinical professor.

**JACOBS:** We simply use clinical already and that's what everybody else is using, you know, in the country.

**TERRY:** Let me make a comment on that, too. The professor of practice is a relatively recent creation. The clinical rank has been around for some years. The professor of practice is only a single level appointment. You have to be a full professor of practice, and as it's written, you know, it's written for practitioners who have already had an exceedingly distinguished career and are now coming back into academia. And I think actually Kelley has been reluctant to some extent. You have professors of practice in SPEA I think at a greater level than they do in Kelley. One of the things that might be done in a review of system-wide policies would be asking whether, you know, you should modify the professor of practice things that you might have an assistant professor of practice. We did find professors of practice at other business schools.

**ROBEL:** John?

**PAOLILLO:** So I think I have a general understanding of what the issue is from the Kelley perspective, but I would like to have a better understanding of what the specific problems are that you have with the recommendations. Could you explain? Is it—is it something about the—the six-year up-or-out or is it about the use of the label of the clinical? What exactly is the problem from [indistinct comment]—

**JACOBS:** —we have no problem with the rest of the—of up-or-out type, you know, we have no problem with that whatsoever, that I know of. Right?

**SEMADENI:** I think the basic concern—

**JACOBS:** —I have no problem it—

**SEMADENI:** —with—with the, you know, that clinical term being—the way it's framed right now, it could be taken very narrowly, and I believe in our prior meeting, it came out that this is an interpretation that the dean of faculties wishes to [indistinct comment], that that policy would be interpreted by the individual in your position.

**GIERYN:** All ranks are subject to interpretation. That is, all applications of the different titles that we use. Honestly, I don't see anything in the emended text that would compel me to change my practices in terms of approving or not requests from the schools for use of a particular rank like clinical.

**SEMADENI:** So, this language...

**GIERYN:** It's within the bounds of the meaning of clinical that may correspond to what you were just speaking of in terms of, you know, preparing students for particular types of applied

work and so forth. I—I don't see the policy as necessarily as having the consequence of restricting the use of the clinical rank.

**SEMADENI:** I guess then the concern would be—

**JACOBS:** —Our concern is this, if it were someone else, other than you, looking at this [indistinct comment], they would see the client service disciplines, the client service disciplines in this, and they might be interpreted differently. If the client service—I mean, that to me sounds like Optometry or something where you have clients coming in and you're servicing them. Clearly, we don't have that.

**SEMADENI:** But [indistinct comment] clinical setting—

**ROBEL:** —Point of clarification. Herb, I thought I was hearing you basically say you—you—you were disagreeing with the way Kelley and presumably Tom had been interpreting the clinical rank [indistinct comment]—

**TERRY:** —I think on that there is a split within the Faculty Affairs Committee. Some on the Faculty Affairs Committee would say, well, the system policy says a clinical setting. The history of this was that it came about primarily at the urging of the School of Medicine who wanted a title for their clinical professors, that the law school primarily uses clinical faculty in their clinics, that Optometry primarily uses clinical faculty in their clinics. That Business might have some clinics—I think you do—you have someone in the community who bring you business problems, and you set your students on them, and you help solve them, you know, but that the clinical setting language had a meaning like that in the Schools of Optometry and the Speech and Hearing Sciences and Law and elsewhere where there were either clients or where you were teaching students how to interact, take their knowledge that they have from some other setting, and put it to the service of a client.

**ROBEL:** So can I ask—

**TERRY:** Others in the Faculty Affairs Committee are perfectly content with Tom's statement, and I'm content with Tom's statement being in here in the legislative history such as it is saying that there isn't any intent to—

**JACOBS:** Yeah, I think we need to be more specific on the—oh, I'm sorry—

**ROBEL:** —I was just going to ask. I just need to understand the position a little better myself. The—so, as you pointed out in your end of preface to this—to this discussion, we're about to embark on a long study of the use of NTT faculty on the campus, and you know where we are at this point, and what NTT faculty are doing, and you know, how our policies are affecting the missions of various schools, and so I'm wondering what is the immediate problem that the

resolution is designed to solve? You know, what is the harm that it's—that it's intending to remedy at this moment?

**TERRY:** Among the faculty in the Faculty Affairs Committee who believe that the university's definition of a clinical faculty member should prevail, there is a hope that prospectively, not retrospectively, future appointments will be more constrained. Among others, there is simply a hope that—that the policies will be sufficiently consistent that faculty members in these ranks won't look at the school policy and look at the system policy and say, 'Hmm, what am I supposed to do here? Am I supposed to do what the system says or am I supposed to do what the campus says?'

**ROBEL:** And has this been a problem that FAC has identified in conversations with these faculty?

**TERRY:** I believe it was identified last year. I was not on the Faculty Affairs Committee. Ted was so, I mean, what evidence did the Faculty Affairs Committee have last year that this was a problem?

**MILLER:** Well this, you know, this was recognized as a problem ten years ago by the Faculty Affairs Committee. You know, the historical context of this is that, you know, prior to 2002, Indiana University had virtually no non-tenure-track appointment categories for faculty, but the clinical category did exist prior to 2002. And, for various reasons, the dean of faculties in Bloomington, prior to 2002, given requests from various schools, Kelley in particular, who wanted to appoint non-tenure-track faculty, the dean of faculties agreed that they could use the clinical category to do that. Now, that fact brought about the creation of the 2002 appointment—appointment policy. That's the policy in which the lecturer category was created, and it was certainly the intent of the faculty in creating the lecturer category, it was the intent of the faculty that that category would be used for appointing instructional faculty, non-tenure-track instructional faculty. That the clinical—that the clinical appointment category which had a well understood use in the university, would no longer be used—that we would retreat from that, and we would switch to the lecturer category. Now for reasons that I do not understand, the campus administration simply did not follow through on that, and so here we are today with many—with many clinical faculty in—in the School of Public Health and SPEA and Business, and—now I'm not saying that all of them are inappropriate appointments under the university policy—but certainly many of them are. They simply don't meet the—you know, the appointment policy says, you know, here's an appointment category. This is what such a person is supposed to do. These are the responsibilities, and many of the clinical faculty we have today are not doing the duties that the—that the university policy says they're supposed to be doing.



**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** And so—so, Ted, these individuals come to you and articulated the grievances that you just described?

**MILLER:** Which individuals?

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** That is that—

**MILLER:** —in the Business faculty?

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Because the language doesn't seem to be consonant what with the duties of the faculty.

**MILLER:** Well, I mean, if you—

**GIERYN:** —are clinical professors complaining to you? I don't think so.

**MILLER:** Well, the dean of the optometry school—well, you know, this is getting—this is a historical thing, I mean, I've been involved in this for over ten years now. But the dean of the optometry school certainly, you know, five years ago, let's say, maybe it was seven, when we were—we were talking, you know, about trying to do something about this, and he certainly encouraged the faculty to go forward and try to change it because he felt that his clinical faculty were really somehow being devalued by the use of this, you know, by the use of this appointment category in places where you know—so, nobody—nobody even—nobody knows now what a clinical faculty appointment is.

**ROBEL:** Could I then make the observation, if this is an issue that has been kind of simmering for ten years, and if it's not an issue of—where faculty members are being harmed right now that you know of by it, but is instead an issue about clarifying campus policies, and if there has been an inordinate amount of change as there has been in that ten year in the lay of the land and the number of faculty members involved, might it—might it then argue against the urgency of taking a vote today to change the policy, and rather argue in favor of having a fairly thorough understanding of where the campus is at this point, which is the commitment that I think I made in the State of the Campus Address on this issue. In other words, if it's not a—if it's not urgent for the protection of the faculty members at this moment, might we put this off so that we understand a little bit better what is actually happening on our campus?

**SHERMAN:** Yeah, I would agree with that. Let me make another observation. I'll try to be rational. [Laughter]

**ROBEL:** You're always rational.

**SHERMAN:** Number one, I think we would all agree that the people who do this clinical faculty work at the business school are important and necessary to your mission. Number two, we

have a clinical faculty by some ambiguous definition. Other business schools happen to call this appointment, “clinical faculty.” It seems irrational to me that we should force our business school to have them call it something else that doesn’t fit with the general definition in business schools. So it seems that the logical solution is to extend the term clinical faculty to fit what the people in the business school do and we want them to do. We don’t want to change what they do. I don’t care if you call them blechha eccha or anything else. They’ll do the same thing. [Laughter]

**ROBEL:** Okay, you fell off the rational. [Laughter]

**SHERMAN:** The fact is that we want them to do what they do, and if other places call it clinical faculty, maybe your whole discipline has a problem, but I don’t think we should fly in the face of what’s common practice. Just my view.

**ROBEL:** I’m sorry, Professor McGregor had a hand up, and I—

**MCGREGOR:** Just an observation, and I think it’s important, perhaps a little more study with the thought that I wonder if the issue on the table is not the general question of how professional schools get on with their business. Part of what they do is to prepare people for jobs for which there are clear standards of practice for which people who have not confronted that world, they’re simply not able to do it. It doesn’t devalue the roles of research professor, it just says that people who are in the business of dealing with other professors, in generating knowledge, knowing, appreciating and understanding, are not in the same game as the professional schools of which there are several, and the trick will be, I think, to come up with a—a set of—a codification for describing what people do.

One option is to simply say, well, maybe the role of practice could entertain an associate professor practice, so you don’t have to be a musical Josh Bell, who would then return that they’re very competent people who could actually do the work. I think an assistant professor of practice would be an oxymoron, but at least you could imagine a couple of ranks that will allow schools to create people into the business of taking on cases, for example. To explain what a real world problem actually—actually looks like. So that might be a way to go. But I think that might argue for looking at this. You certainly face the problem in the issue of what to do with the School of Journalism where all of—virtually all of the competitors at Columbia, Annenberg, Newhouse, are all professional schools, and they—they’re a club that pretty much knows what they’re doing. They establish the standards to imagine then how that school would be developed in a College of Arts and Sciences is really a stretch, so someone will have to sort that out. But I think this is a much larger problem in the School of Business. I think it embraces several schools, and it might also be useful for the College of Arts and Sciences to imagine how it is that they would cuddle up closer to the world of practice, and you get into the business of

career advising. In any event, I think this is an issue that is—just goes beyond dictionary definitions of what is clinical and not clinical. It's a rather large issue, I think.

**ROBEL:** Thank you.

**TERRY:** I agree that it's a rather large issue—

**ROBEL:** —I'm sorry, I keep—there's a—

**TERRY:** —I'm sorry—

**ROBEL:** —[indistinct comment] sitting right in back of you.

**REISING:** I come from a clinical discipline, which is nursing, and I would just like to point out that just because it is a clinical discipline doesn't mean all of our clinical-track faculty are practicing according to the definition that we would traditionally think is clinical. And our interpretation of a clinical-track faculty would be one that is connected to practice. Okay? So that does not mean that you have to see clients, but that you have a direct contribution to se—I think that's why the service component is in there. That service does not always mean that you are delivering direct care to a patient. And I wouldn't assume that just because one discipline like optometry might feel devalued by some other discipline using the term, nursing would not. We would not be offended by the School of Business using the term, "clinical faculty." The other issue that we had noted is we have moved away from lecturers as well, which we used to use is that we had a clearer promotion to exemplar track, or clinical track, than what is available for [indistinct comment] lecturers. So I would just like to speak in support of the Kelley School of Business and their use of clinical track, and offer that we do expand and make the definition more inclusive in that it links to practice.

**ROBEL:** Who's—?

**SWANSON:** Just for the record—

**ROBEL:** —Swanson and then—

**SWANSON:** I want to comment here. So there are several questions [indistinct comment]. I'm a PhD, not an OD. I can't work in clinic. The—every time I bring back to the faculty this discussion of non-tenure-track, there is a great concern about how it's used in Optometry as different than it's used in other places and the consequences. It's not about the term being devalued, but that the policy as it's written seems to be written for different—that it may be written for different groups of people, and it may not be consistent. So I've been looking through the history of how clinical rank came to the Bloomington campus. In the 1990s, Sarita Soni had noted that our—that those faculty who taught in the clinic in Optometry typically left after several years

because they found they would not be able to get tenure. And so she proposed that we have a clinical rank, who only teach in the clinic, so that those who taught in the clinic who were tenure-track, would be able to have a reduced number of clinic hours, and hence be able to pursue research, and that was the original motivation that she provided for why we wanted it.

Today, everyone who teaches in the clinic is clinical rank, and so we're in a position that if you take our clinical rank plus our lecturer, and you add those to the tenure-track, you find that tenure-track are 54%—now is 51% for two years, 50%. We haven't been at 60% tenure-track, so we've been non-compliant with the document since at least 2006 in terms of our percentage of tenure-track versus non-tenure-track. When I presented to the clinical rank that we could decrease their voting so they have a less than one vote per person, it they become become very upset with that. [Laughter] The argument is that clinical rank in Optometry does have an intellectual freedom because when somebody has—has completed the promotion to—to the—renewed their contract after six years, they have a commitment as long as that clinic remains open. Now we've only closed the one clinic. That was the one [indistinct comment] faculty member is at risk. So their concern is that clinical rank, as it's practiced in Optometry, does have an intellectual freedom that should allow them to be a large percentage of voice, and that's why, although technically non-compliant, we feel we are. So, it's not that the term's been devalued, but it has different meanings. I cannot teach in the clinic. I have a PhD. I can teach the doctors about a lot of things, but I can't do that. So we have to have a certain number of people who teach in the clinic. It's very difficult, in most places, for somebody who teaches in the clinic to receive tenure because they don't—can't teach enough to do research. So, that's— that's our position, not that it's devalued, but that given the amount of time that students are in the clinic, and the amount of faculty that's needed, our approach has been try to give them a security that provides intellectual freedom, and that that's the distinction between non-tenure-track and tenure-track. So I just wanted to make that comment—clarification of my understanding of the position of Optometry.

**ROBEL:** Okay, Professor Wheeler?

**WHEELER:** Herb, I thought the starting point for this was the discrepancy between the campus definitions and the system definitions, and this instance—and so [indistinct comment] we do not have the authority to use a system definitions. Can you give us any insight as to how the system definition came to be as they are and is this reflecting a situation in Indianapolis, where with the Medical School, there's an entirely different balance on the campus between clinical faculty and non-clinical faculty than we have here in Bloomington?

**TERRY:** My recollection of when these policies were adopted was that yes, the Medical School was a powerful driver for the revision of system policies defining clinical professors. And so, the statement there that these folks must teach in a clinical setting almost unquestionably comes

about from the—the influence of the School of Medicine there. I don't honestly know how many full-time clinical faculty they have now. They have a lot of part-time clinical faculty, and volunteer clinical faculty and this sort of thing, and the motivation there, which one of the Trustees made very important at the Trustee meeting was you couldn't get these hundreds of people to volunteer to be clinical professors for free unless they could call themselves professor. And that that may have been the case back in the early 2000s when this policy was adopted as well.

So my recollection was that, well several things were going on. One, we wanted some system where you could have non-tenure-track, but semi-permanent, long-term contract teaching faculty. And the first of those that we created was this clinical professor rank. Then we came along, in a later stage, and created the lecturer rank. I would agree with Ted that the expectation of most schools here was that once the lecturer was available, those—that's the title they would give the people who were non-tenure-track teaching faculty, but didn't teach in a clinical setting. My department, Telecommunications, did that when that change was made. We had a couple of clinical professors because that was the only title we could give somebody to give them long-term contracts. Lecturers, prior to that point, were limited in term and couldn't be renewed. As soon as this was created, we never appointed another clinical faculty member. We appointed lecturers, and in that sense we thought we were being consistent with the system and the campus policies. I'd add one other twist to this. There's some on the Faculty Affairs Committee, and I would agree with this, who argue that—that—that the change is, to some extent, necessary to preserve the integrity of faculty governance, that that this system, the UFC and others, produced a definition of clinical professor. It might have been good for its time. It may be badly out of date now, but that once we identify what appear to be discrepancies between the way this campus is doing things and the way the system policy reads, adherence to the principle of faculty governance should say, well, you try and fix that as best you can, but most importantly, I think, these are policies that are ripe for review, and—and change. The problem is it will probably take two years to get something through all nine units, if you want to count the Medical School separately of Indiana University to get back and change the system policies. And you might adopt a [indistinct comment]. I don't know whether there was any pressure from the Trustees, for example, whose policy it ultimately is to have one pretty firm policy that define these jobs, or you could just say there are these titles, and exactly what they do might vary by campus and mission. I don't know. You could try and go that way this time.

**WALBRIDGE:** I'm beginning to think this whole business is somewhat misconceived. I mean, we're a research university, and the model that we follow with faculty is that there's research, there's teaching, there's service. So I did research on Friday, teaching yesterday, and service today. It's all very neat, but what's, you know, what's clear is that while that might fit most of

the faculty on campus, it certainly doesn't fit all of the faculty. I mean the language department about two thirds of us are sort of the three-pot kind of professors, but we've got two language pedagogists, one who's tenure-track, one who's a senior lecturer, one lecturer who just wants to teach. The Business School has its—clearly has needs for different kinds of professors. It isn't clear to me why this shouldn't be addressed by simply facing the fact that certain kinds of units will need certain kinds of faculty who don't fit the neat 50% research, 30% teaching, 20% service model and just, you know, say, okay, some people are professors. They—their duties are defined somewhat differently, depending on the needs of the units, especially but not only, the professional schools, and that these people should have fac—should have tenure, they should have regular professor titles, and they should have a—a normal role in—in departmental and campus governance.

**ROBEL:** I'm watching the time just to try to—I'm trying to think how we—I can call—

**JACOBS:** I think we should just table this. I think—let me just, what you are saying, the impact that this has had on the Business School has been positive relative to the research productivity of the tenured faculty in a dramatic way in that it has given the Business School the flexibility of reduced teaching loads and things, and there are all kinds of rules in place, you can't reduce teaching loads, you can't teach overloads, you can't do all these other things. Yet, on the other hand, allowed us to hire terminal degree people who are people that are very close to industry and tremendous teachers to the—I mean, they wouldn't be hired otherwise. These are not faculty that didn't make it as researchers. You know, these are faculty that are involved in working with companies and—and love teaching, and all these things. So this is actually, if you look at the research productivity of the Business School since 2003 or 4, whenever this really got going, and the teaching evaluations of the faculty over that same period, you'll see they both went up. A lot of it is because this type of switch allowed [indistinct comment]. So let me just leave it at that.

**WALBRIDGE:** Is there a reason not to get these people you know, faculty status, tenure and so forth?

**JACOBS:** They don't do research. They have no research obligations. They have no—it's just pure service and teaching is what they do. And we need this because it takes that load, to a large extent, off of tenure-track faculty, especially the un-tenured, tenure-track faculty to do—

**SEMADENI:** —And they fill—they fill some very specific roles—

**WALBRIDGE:** —that I [indistinct comment]—

**SEMADENI:** —for example, we have within the MBA program, we have academies. And so these individuals that run these academies, they are faced with businesses, bringing in executives—

**JACOBS:** —[indistinct comment]—

**SEMADENI:** —reach out to alumni, help the—help the students get internships, as well as—so it's—it is a very much this—this integrative-type role, but they do not have any—any research.

**JACOBS:** Any research. It would be very difficult for un-tenured faculty, you know, assistant professors, to do these types of things, [indistinct comment] types of responsibilities.

**ROBEL:** Professor Spang and then [indistinct comment].

**SPANG:** I'm perfectly willing to imagine that—that the Business School does have clinical needs, specialist sort of expertise from people in the business community, as well as [indistinct comment] but I'm a bit disturbed by what I've just heard which seems to be the creation of a two-tiered system, where you have some people doing research, other people doing teaching, and no wonder it's so hard to find people on this campus committed to research, teaching, and service if the model that's being promoted is one in which we buy our researchers out of teaching so they can do more research. That's—that's how it sounded to me.

**JACOBS:** I can understand [indistinct comment].

**PAOLILLO:** I want to echo your statements in the—but frame it a slightly different way. What I heard you say effectively was that we managed to promote—we managed to promote the research agendas and the research profiles of our tenure-track faculty by discounting the teaching mission of the schools—

**JACOBS:** —this is not [indistinct comment]—

**PAOLILLO:** —by essentially discounting—

**JACOBS:** —open up Business Week. We have the number one teaching and faculty in—in our—

**PAOLILLO:** —but they don't, they are not—

**UNKNOWN MALE SPEAKER:** —[indistinct comment] number one in the country—

**PAOLILLO:** —tenure-track. They don't earn tenure.

**JACOBS:** We are ranked—our tenure-track faculty—

**ROBEL:** —I think we are getting way off-track here because we already have a policy that—for lecturers and clinical faculty members that provides clarity around their mission and long-term contracts. So it—we’re not really having a debate about whether or not we should have non-tenured ranks. I mean, that’s not what the debate is. I think the real question that we’re—we’re facing right now is whether we need to—there’s some reason to change the policy right this minute to make it consistent or whether we need to take the variety of experiences that we’ve heard expressed in this room, and really try to understand how we’re using instructional faculty, people in non-tenure ranks, and—and then make a decision about where we sit in 2013, not where we were in 1999 or—or where we were in 2002, but where are we now, and what are the effects—the actual effects on our teaching mission, our research mission, our service mission, and the—and the academic freedom and job security of our faculty members. I—I would be dismayed to—to see us take a vote today that the Kelley School of Business would feel is, you know, is antithetical to their mission, without having a better understanding of the variety I just heard expressed in this room.

**SHERMAN:** Can I move to table? I can.

**GIERYN:** Procedural question first. The draft, Herb you can correct me if I’m wrong, but I think the draft that is circular B15, the one distributed today, marks the most recent changes that we discussed in fact, but incorporates as unmarked the series of earlier changes to our policy A3. So, if we table, we are missing an opportunity to change a policy, in I think some very progressive ways, and it would not elicit the kind of discussion we’re having here, which are much broader, and probably deserve more time. I’m—last time this came up, we talked about some of those changes, and they include the point that was briefly mentioned, which is to get both clinicals and lecturers onto an up-or-out decision after the probationary period. I think that’s a good change to make, so I would rather we pass this policy so that we can get those changes in place, otherwise, a lot of very hard work is just going to go unrewarded.

**SHERMAN:** As long as it has no implications for the current designations.

**GIERYN:** I don’t believe it does.

**ROBEL:** You would know. So there’s a—do you want to try your motion, or do you...?

**SHERMAN:** It wasn’t seconded.

**ROBEL:** Would—are we calling—are you calling the question?

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** I am.

**ROBEL:** We have on the table a policy that—a draft policy A3, brought to us by the Faculty Affairs Committee and all in favor? Did you get it?



**RIDENOUR:** People keep moving their hands.

**ROBEL:** Okay, all opposed? Alright, and abstentions? Alright, the policy passes. Thank you so much. Is there any—we—we will still, nonetheless, be doing a review this year, and I think I heard Vice Provost Gieryn say that he wasn't planning to have this affect anybody's appointment status right now, so... Do we have any new business for the Council? Herb?

#### **AGENDA ITEM 8: OLD BUSINESS/NEW BUSINESS**

**TERRY:** Hopefully it's not as divisive. As Carolyn indicated in her opening comments, some of the regional campuses, and I think IUPUI now, have followed up on a most remarkable event at the last Trustees meeting. At that Trustees meeting, the co-secretaries of the UFC get to give a faculty report to the Trustees, which usually elicits no reaction whatsoever from the Trustees. And we get thanked for our report sometimes, and often it's just on to the student report. At that—at the last Trustees meeting, speaking for the UFC and for the co-secretaries of the UFC, Carolyn commented that there was concern about actions in the General Assembly that deal with matters of curriculum and minimal credit hours and the state-wide General Education cores, and all this stuff that we see coming our way, that impinged on the authority of the faculty over curriculum and academic matters, and the constitution of the faculty. I thought I had mastered the Michael McRobbie presidential scowl because I could see him, and he scowled a little as she made her remarks. I thought he was not happy to have this raised at a general public meeting. I have not mastered the presidential scowl because before very long, two of the Trustees on opposite ends of the political spectrum on the Board of Trustees chimed in and they were grateful that Carolyn had made these observations, and they added that of course they saw the moves of the General Assembly as compromising their authority as Trustees as well. And then, much to my surprise, President McRobbie chimed in and said well, we might disagree about exactly what's under faculty authority and what isn't, but certainly many academic matters are, and I agree with you, Carolyn, and you Trustees, that there's legislative encroachment, and that surprised me when he said that, but he did, as Mike reported in the *Herald-Times*.

Several of our colleagues at the other regional campuses have debated resolutions expressing support for what Carolyn and the Trustees who spoke out and President McRobbie said about legislative encroachment on the duties of the faculty over curriculum and on the authority of Trustees under Indiana code. What you have before you as circular B20-2013 is a very slightly modified version of a resolution that's been adopted by the Faculty Senate at IU Kokomo. The modifications are, number one, to insert IUB where it said IUK, and number two, to modify it a bit in the closing paragraph, which the committee did in part in response to remarks by Trustee Riley at the Trustees meeting. Trustee Riley commented that, you know, that General Assembly is encroaching on our authority and the faculty authority, but you guys on the faculty should be

proactive, too. You kind of can't be the constant complainers that the General Assembly is, you know, taking over your duties, you have to indicate a willingness to deal with what the General Assembly fears are—thinks are problems, such things time to graduation, cost, inter-transferability, and this sort of thing. So compared to the IU Kokomo resolution, the last paragraph of this resolution talks a bit about urging cooperation and consultation among faculty, administration, Trustees, and the legislature over the matters that are under the authority of the faculty. The intent of that change is to—to have the resolution say, sure, you know, we—we are interested in listening to the General Assembly and their concerns and working together, but probably that will produce the best outcomes in these areas. If you want one great example of one-size-fits-all policy problems, it's what comes to the General Assembly telling every publicly assisted university and college in the state to do the same things. So what we're asking you to support is a resolution that will support what Carolyn and Trustee Riley and Trustee Shoulders and President McRobbie have already commented upon, that some legislative actions are encroaching upon the Trustees and encroaching upon the faculty, and a better approach would be to consult and cooperatively address those questions, especially those [indistinct comment] recognizing authority of the faculty over some of them.

**ROBEL:** Discussion? Are you calling for a vote of the faculty?

**TERRY:** We'd like support for the resolution. This comes after email discussion by the Faculty Affairs Committee. It only started last Thursday, I think. We're trying to be nimble.

**ROBEL:** So it comes as a—an action item from the—

**TERRY:** —Faculty Affairs Committee.

**ROBEL:** Faculty Affairs Committee. Okay. Alright. Comments? Ready for a vote? Call the question. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Alright. [the motion passes] Thank you very much. Is there any other new—new business? Hearing none, we're adjourned.

**MEETING ADJOURNED AT 5:10PM**