

Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
April 29, 2014
IMU State Room East
3:30 P.M. – 5:30 P.M.

Attendance

MEMBERS PRESENT: Abhijit Basu, Carolyn Calloway–Thomas, Claude Clegg, Carrie Docherty, Nathan Ensmenger, Marion Frank–Wilson, Jeffrey Gershman, Donald Gjerdingen, Dennis Groth, Vivian Halloran, Brady Harman, Bradley Heim, Timothy Hoch, Gretchen Horlacher, Jason Baird Jackson, Christopher Kauffman, Bradley Levinson, Eugene McGregor, Patricia McManus, Sherri Michaels, Jose Mitjavila, Maresa Murray, Jamie Prenkert, Deanna Reising, Jim Sherman, Sarita Soni, Rebecca Spang, Cassidy Sugimoto, William Swanson, Herbert Terry, Peggy Thoits, Johannes Turk, Edward Vasquez, John Walbridge

MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT: Tom Gieryn (Shannon Martin); Timothy Hoch (Capt. Mike Hoadley)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Joelle Bahloul, Zach Bailey, David Baxter, Lyudmila Bronstein, Gracia Clark, Mike Conway, Ying Ding, Jake Docking, Alyce Fly, Thomas Gieryn, Krista Glazewski, Jeff Hass, Cheng Kao, Peter Kloosterman, Dan Knudsen, Karma Lochrie, Michael McRobbie, Joseph Miller, Michael Morrone, Jeff Nelsen, Lauren Robel, Matt Semadeni, Sandra Shapshay, Dia Sharma, Lisa Sideris Adam Szczepaniak, Kelly Thacker, Mikel Tiller, Jessica Tooker, Julie Van Voorhis, Nona Watt, James Wimbush, Rega Wood

GUESTS: Alan Bender (Biology); Andrew Braden (IUSA President Elect); Craig Dethloff (Faculty Council Office), Bari Goldman (IDS); Bob Kravchuk (BAC co-chair, SPEA), Mark McConahay (Registrar); Bob Noel (Libraries); Ariadne Rehbein (Faculty Council Office), Diane Reilly (History of Art); Kathrine Schultz (IDS); MJ Slaby (Herald-Times)

Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/minutes/13-14/03.04.14.pdf>

2. Memorial Resolutions for Robert Mackenzie and Robert W. Hattery

Robert Mackenzie: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/13-14/B32-2014.pdf>

Robert W. Hattery: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/13-14/B33-2014.pdf>

3. Executive Committee Business and Presiding Officer's Report (20 minutes)
(Faculty President Herb Terry)

4. Question/Comment Period¹ (10 minutes)

5. EPC Proposed Motion on the Common Calendar and Online Course Questionnaire (20 minutes)

(Professors Jim Sherman and Cassidy Sugimoto) [ACTION ITEMS]

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/13-14/B34-2014.pdf>

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/13-14/B35-2014.pdf>

http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/13-14/aux/BFC_OCQ_Policy.pdf

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/13-14/aux/CampusCoreItems.pdf>

6. Review of Library Committee Activities Regarding Open Access (20 minutes)

(Professor Jason Baird Jackson, Chair of the Library Committee) [DISCUSSION]

<http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/2013/11/oa-policy-quick-video/>

<http://legacy.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/brief.htm>

<https://osc.hul.harvard.edu/modelpolicy>

7. Overview of Faculty Governance Summer Study (30 minutes)

(Faculty President Herb Terry) [DISCUSSION]

Text will be provided to members and participants in the meeting

Minutes

AGENDA ITEM 1: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

TERRY: Good afternoon. The reason for our delay is that the – our parliamentarian and Craig and I have been having a discussion about whether or not – there’s another one – whether or not we actually have a quorum here at the moment, and can conduct business. We were five members short. Craig will continue to check on that. Let me know, Craig if we have a quorum. Since we don’t as far as we know at the moment we can’t approve the minutes of the last meeting. We can certainly continue to have a discussion of the items that are scheduled. There is a provision in the constitution that permits the Executive Committee to act on items in the summer in the name of the BFC. If one member of the BFC asks for reconsideration of the Executive Committee’s action than that rolls over to the next meeting in the fall. So, it might be likely if somebody doesn’t want the Executive Committee to act that they could object to that.

¹ Faculty who are not members of the Faculty Council and who wish to address questions to President Terry 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: bfcff@indiana.edu

We have in other words some procedures for going forward if we must, but at the moment we don't appear to have a – a quorum unless Craig tells me that's changed. Carolyn?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: I'm just hoping that there's a sign on the door where we normally have the meeting to ensure that –

SPANG: People know we're upstairs?

GJERDINGEN: They're giving blood in there.

TERRY: We're close but we are apparently short. Craig is there a sign down there?

DETHLOFF: No, but the doors are wide open so...

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Oh, so if people...

SPANG: But if people get there and –

TERRY: Where they going to go?

SPANG: Right, they're like, oh can't find the meeting, oh well. Got to go home. Do you have a staff member here who can go down and put a sign on the door? Yeah, okay thank you.

TERRY: So we can't – we'll leave approval of the minutes for later should we get quorum. Let's proceed, Tom Gieryn is not here today so Shannon Martin from his office will read the memorial resolutions.

AGENDA ITEM 2: MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS FOR ROBERT MACKENZIE AND ROBERT W. HATTERY

MARTIN: Thank you. Robert Mackenzie was born in Los Angeles on March 17, 1920. After studying physics as an undergraduate at Cal Tech (B.S. 1942), he worked as a physicist during World War II at the Naval Ordnance Laboratory in Washington D.C. Following that, he began graduate study in mathematics at Indiana University and later moved to Princeton University where he received his doctorate in 1950, working with Emil Artin, one of the outstanding algebraists of the twentieth century. He then came to Indiana which became his academic home until his retirement in 1990.

During his time at Indiana, Bob was a key player in the department. His work included being the assistant chair at a time when this meant being both the director of undergraduate studies and graduate director. He also served as the managing editor of the Indiana University Mathematics Journal between 1971 and 1977.

Bob was a team player in the best sense of the word. He was always ready to do the extra things that needed to be done, quietly and with no expectation of recognition. He was a model mentor, especially helpful to young faculty members in explaining how the department and university really worked. On a visit to IU many years ago, Serge Lang, among the most influential researchers and expositors in algebra, related that he had been an undergraduate philosophy major and when he made the switch to graduate study in mathematics at Princeton, Bob was the one who helped him fill in the gaps in his knowledge.

Bob's research contributions came in two phases. Early on he wrote a series of research papers which appeared in such prestigious journals as the American Journal of Mathematics and the Duke Mathematics Journal. These papers attracted reviews from some of the luminaries of mathematics at the time, including Kobayashi, Tate, Clifford, and above all Chevalley, who described Bob's work as "very ingenious."

Bob's later work was more expository. His publication record in this realm includes a paper in the prestigious American Mathematical Monthly and his textbook "Introduction to Differentiable Manifolds," written with Louis Auslander. This book first appeared in 1963 and was reissued as recently as 2009.

Bob was a cherished member of the department. One could always count on his calm insight into teaching and the department. Beyond that, he was a master gardener and expert musician, with a special interest in early music. It is difficult to think of Bob without also remembering his wife, Mildred, whose delightful presence at social gatherings always made them memorable events.

Robert Wilbur Hattery was born January 5, 1925 in Chicago and died October 21, 2012 in Grand Marais, Minnesota. He is survived by his wife of twenty-seven years, Eleanor; children, David, Lor Reddoch, and John; step-sons, Jeff, Allan, and Mark; and a sister, Suzanne Hattery. A celebration of Bob's life convened in late October at the Johnson Heritage Post Art Gallery in Grand Marais.

A U.S. Army infantryman, Bob was wounded in the campaign to recapture the Philippine Islands and was awarded a Purple Heart. After the war he attended the University of Chicago, graduating in 1948. He subsequently earned M.S. and Ph.D. degrees from the same institution. His 1961 Ph.D. thesis, entitled "The World Affairs Activities of Wisconsin Statewide Voluntary Activities," was the basis for a report on that subject published by the University of Wisconsin's extension service.

Bob joined the faculty at Indiana University Bloomington in 1962, after a brief teaching stint at the University of Wisconsin. American foreign policy was the focus of his research and teaching; Bob was particularly interested in the role of public opinion in shaping American policies and interactions with other nations. His earliest work explored the impact of racial and ethnic prejudice on American policy. Later he became interested in raising Americans' awareness of international issues, with a goal of improving the policies chosen by their representatives.

Such practical concerns were reflected in Bob's dual appointment at IUB. He was an adjunct member of the Department of Government, which was later renamed the Department of Political Science. Bob's principal responsibilities, however, were in the Bureau of Public Discussion, which was in the Division of University Extension, and then became part of the Division of Continuing Studies.

Founded in 1914, the Bureau of Public Discussion functioned as a lending library for the entire state, until this type of service was developed through the Indiana State Library. The Bureau collected materials and lent package libraries consisting of materials from recent books, pamphlets, reports, official documents, and magazine and newspaper articles on topics of current interest. Besides materials on current affairs, files on biography, fine arts, geography, travel and science were also kept up to date with new publications. Aiming to stimulate intelligent discussion of current political, economic and social questions, the Bureau assisted civic discussion clubs, debating societies, and literary clubs with recommendations regarding organizational procedures and suitable questions for debate and topics for study, and with bibliographies on current issues.

From the time of his arrival in 1962 until his retirement in 1987 Bob Hattery was Director of the Bureau of Public Discussion. Operating within in the Division of Continuing Education after 1968, the Bureau maintained an extensive library of about a half-million publications of predominantly non-book reading materials focusing on contemporary public affairs. At the time this was one of the largest collections of materials on current affairs in the United States. The Bureau also regularly convened conferences, seminars, workshops, and non-credit short courses on topics of current interest. Furthermore, for those individuals or groups unable to attend meetings away from home, the Bureau developed a number of home-study programs which included guided readings, structured group discussions, and analytical writing exercises.

For his accomplishments Bob was promoted to associate professor 1966. He retired in 1987 as associate professor of Continuing Studies and adjunct associate professor emeritus of Political Science. He was President of the IUB Men's Faculty Club in 1988, continuing his participation in

faculty affairs and faculty governance on campus. As late as 1985 Bob served on the External Relations Committee of the Bloomington Faculty Council.

Bob and Eleanor moved to Grand Marais on the North Shore of Lake Superior in 1988. There they continued the work of enlightening public opinion, founding the North Shore Public Discussion Opportunities Program. Their home was on the Gunflint Trail, surrounded by the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. In 1934 Bob took his first canoe trip in the area and developed a life-long passion for portaging and paddling the “voyageurs highway,” the central artery of the French, British, and American fur trade. Bob was able to indulge his passion for the woods during retirement, without abandoning his belief in the power of public discussion to improve our social affairs.

AGENDA ITEM 3: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE BUSINESS AND PRESIDING OFFICER’S REPORT

TERRY: I’m going to ask the members of the Council and guests to please stand for a few moments in honor of our colleagues. [All stand in silence]. Thank you. [All sit]. As I explained at the last Faculty Council meeting, when we had to add this one because of adjustments made to accommodate the strategic plan, I knew that Provost Robel would be needed at the law school where they are right now dedicating the reading room to the former head of the School of Law Library, Coleen Powell, so Lauren is there. Afterwards she will preside over the celebration for retiring faculty for this year. We will try to adjourn in time for those of you who have indicated you want to go to that to get over there. So I end up as the presiding officer. She did not give me any business to report to you on her behalf so I will report on the behalf of the Executive Committee and – and myself. The UFC Executive Committee met by telephone last week and we decided that we are going to proceed with the discussion of a topic that we will have a presentation on from Jason in a few minutes. The UFC Executive Committee does wish to create a task force to look at a university-wide level at whether or not IU should follow and do what some other institutions have done, adopt some kind of a green or other colored open access policy. That’ll make more sense to you after Jason’s presentation. But it is a very important matter, and it’s not non-controversial. As Jason will report, the way that the Bloomington Library Committee evaluated this issue differs from the way the IUPUI Library Committee reviewed it. And the Executive Committee has decided that since this is a – a national trend we should one way or another continue discussion of it so that we’re engaged with – with that trend. So there will be more about access next year. I assume that whatever the UFC recommends will come back for discussion to the BFC and to the IFC and to the councils of the other IU campuses. At last – the last BFC meeting we had a presentation on the IU strategic planning process, and I must say I was a little bit surprised at a direction that that discussion took, although it was not at all an unreasonable direction. As some of you may

remember there was substantial discussion about, well if there's going to be an IU strategic plan on top of the Bloomington strategic plan why did we bother to develop a Bloomington strategic plan and are the plans of the campuses just going to be overridden by the overall IU plan. As it turned out my colleague Jack Windsor at IUPUI and I and Jim Sherman had a meeting scheduled with President McRobbie and Vice President Applegate not too long after that meeting, and we raised with them the concerns of this Council, that it would not exactly be efficient or a good idea if the university strategic plan preempted or overran the – the plans created by the campuses. We were certainly assured by the president and by – by Vice President Applegate that that certainly was not the idea, and was probably quite unlikely. I think it has to be conceded that it's possible that some campus plan might come up with something that is at odds with some grand objective of Indiana University, but – but both John, the president and I really, you know, didn't think that likely. It was very useful that that issue was raised with the people who are developing the plan. They're certainly now much more aware of that, and it reinforces what we've been trying at the UFC to accomplish here for some months, which is to take that off of the very fast track that it had, that would have created the plan during the summer, and make it something where there will be I hope a meaningful opportunity for discussion of it by the campuses during the early part of the fall semester so the – the concerns of the Council were conveyed directly to the president and hopefully we won't find ourselves in a situation where anything in the Bloomington strategic plan is – is adversely affected by the university's strategic plan.

On other matters, about two weeks ago the Trustees of Ball State University announced that – that they were going to implement by fall of 2014 a more detailed system of post-tenure review of their faculty. What they essentially said was that they were going to identify faculty who were unproductive for two consecutive years or for two out of a five-year period, develop remediation plans one way or another for them, and if those plans fail, if there wasn't changes in productivity, find ways to terminate those faculty. Obviously, once one public institution in a state makes such an announcement that gets a lot of attention from the Trustees and – and the administration of other state-assisted universities, and certainly this has come to the attention of the Trustees at Indiana University, the higher education commission, and – and others. The UFC discussed this last week. Jack and – and Jim and I discussed it with the president, and Vice President Applegate when we met. Where the UFC is going is that we are gathering all of the post-tenure review policies of all of the IU campuses. We have one. It's tucked under what is called faculty misconduct, was adopted by this Council a number of years ago. It basically calls for the creation of a special committee to review the performance of tenured faculty – among – among them tenured faculty should the dean determine that – that a faculty member is consistently underperforming, and that committee conducts a [comment indistinct], at least it can, makes recommendations back to the dean. The dean may, nonetheless, act in whatever fashion the dean chooses to act after those recommendations are made, but hopefully they'll

follow them. We have in other words a post-tenure review system. In addition, we have a requirement that every faculty member be annually reviewed, although we know that – that there are instances on this campus where certain faculty – sometimes full professors – are not annually reviewed. So we will be taking a look at our campus procedures next year. IUPUI has a system that is actually very similar to what Ball State has announced. They have ways of annually ranking faculty and if – if people turn out to be unproductive or unsatisfactory in multiple years that triggers a review. Most of the Big 10 institutions have post-tenure review systems of some kind. The principal difference between them – them is that some require annual review or periodic review of performance of every tenured faculty member, and hopefully lead to remediation plans or improvement plans of any that are discovered to be unproductive or less than ideally productive. Others have tripwires and – and it's crossing the tripwire that leads to a post-tenure review system. I can't tell you for sure where this will go, but what I can tell you is that the UFC working with the administration is trying to gather the information so that we can at least report to the Trustees in June what systems for the review of tenured faculty we have, how we identify unproductive faculty, how their performance is remediated if that's called for, and what happens if it's not on the various campuses. My personal hope is that we will not try to develop some standardized IU across all campuses mechanism or system for doing this. We have different cultures, we have different resources, we have different abilities to – to deal with this. So I, at least personally, will be urging the Trustees to be patient and let us conduct this review and – and report to them, and work with the administration and – and gather a good picture of how this is done across the Indiana University system before they proceed, and I'm con – I'm hopeful we can convince them of that. We certainly do have a couple of Trustees that are intrigued by Ball State's plan, but I hope we can demonstrate to them that – that we have many of those systems already in place, and that we're taking a look at them. I'm almost certain that next year's Faculty Affairs Committee nonetheless will be charged with conducting a review of our policy, which I think is due and – and bringing recommendations to next year's Council.

I'll have some closing remarks if this should be my last BFC meeting at the end of the meeting today, and I'll save those for then. Are there questions or comments from the group?

AGENDA ITEM 4: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

WALBRIDGE: Do we have any idea how often this Bloomington post-tenure policy is used or probably more often threatened to be used?

TERRY: Actually, I appreciate the way you put the question because I've been trying to gather that data. I think a few years ago it came close to being used, and something happened that resulted – I don't know what happened. I think something happened that resulted in it not going to hearings sort of thing. I was planning on asking the Faculty Affairs Committee to take a

look at this policy this year. I did not do so because at the beginning of the year it became clear that we were likely to have a case under it this year, and since the school involved and the faculty member involved had relied on the current policy and it was the policy, I thought we should follow that and see where it led, and what it taught us about our post-tenure review system. We've had that proceeding. It has not come to a conclusion yet, but that's at least one example of it being actually put to use to the point leading to a review hearing. I don't know what the answer is to your other question – does the mere existence of the policy and the fact that deans know it exists have an effect on faculty performance and – and – and lead to changes that don't require hearings. It could lead to faculty going elsewhere. It could lead to them changing their performance. I do not know the answer to that. I raised that concern with John and the president when we had this discussion, you know, that the measurement of whether or not these policies are effective is not limited to the number of people we dismiss under them. The announcement that Ball State, which came I think from their provost, indicated that they thought the number of faculty members involved on this would be relatively small, but their faculty senate president there was quoted as saying that – that people believe the faculty there supported it because those small number of faculty members were not carrying their weight and increased the workload on everybody else. I have not been in touch with that president to find out if he was accurately quoted in the – the – the *Muncie Star*. The answer is we have not had very many instances of them actually going to fruition. I believe the same is true at IUPUI, they haven't had very many either. They are actually currently engaged in an active review of their system, even though they didn't have very many cases under it they weren't convinced that it was working very well for them either. So they're – they're in the process of reviewing theirs. Theirs is, as I said, one that – that results in annual review, largely at the – if I remember right, the department level, trying to identify folks. Remember that these policies can obviously be viewed as punitive. They can be viewed as ways of getting rid of unproductive faculty, but I think if you look at them nationally one of the other things that they can do is that they can actually contribute to faculty productivity if the university will identify why people may not be as productive as – as in many instances as they would like to be, and then commit whatever resources are required to some kind of a remediation plan. On paper those at universities around the country that strike me as best are the ones that do indeed stress that this isn't just a matter of identifying unproductive faculty, it's a matter of trying to figure out why that has occurred assuming that you did a good job when you hired or promoted them in the first place, and if the reasons for those have to do with institutional support or other sorts of things trying to address that. I'll be honest with you, I started out favoring tripwires and thinking that that was probably the best way to be, and I'm not so sure anymore. At universities where I see this working the advantage of periodic review is that if somebody is having difficulties you identify it early and you can fix it. Often if you wait until somebody falls over a tripwire it's too late. But these are all discussions that I – I want as much as we can do to

preserve for the faculty to have next year, and so what we're hoping for at the moment is that by the meeting of the Board of Trustees we can make a report to them and say, yes, IU already has various systems that identify unproductive faculty and ways to try to ameliorate it. We're going to be taking a look at those, and we'll especially take a look at them in the fall when our various faculties on the various campuses are assembled and can participate. Yes?

SPANG: Can I ask that when you say that the Trustees, you specify that productivity does not mean pages published. I'm very concerned that this could contribute to a culture in which all that matters is how many pages you've published in some obscure journal that nobody's ever going to read, and the time it takes to write a book that's going to be read by oh, let's say 50,000 people is longer. Moreover, I think there are sorts of faculty productivity that are extraordinarily important for this campus, such as serving on the BFC, such as directing centers, such as being willing to be a vice provost, such as willing to be a chair, such as teaching good courses, and if none of those things count as productivity then I don't know what the Trustees are imagining a university is.

TERRY: Speaking personally I agree with everything you just said. I – I think one of the things that – that the Trustees need to understand is that meas – effective measures of productivity will be varied. They will vary with department. They will vary with stage. I did like one thing that – that the provost at Ball State was quoted as saying, he said, “there's a big difference between a bad year and a bad career,” – okay? – and that they were not after the people who had one or two bad years. They were after people whose – whose productivity was –

SPANG: But what about a thoughtful decade?

TERRY: That may be, maybe. My main goal at the moment is to prevent the Trustees from just acting and following the Ball State model and say we're going to get this done. I think we have plenty of evidence to present to them that we already have systems in place. We – we may have to tweak them. I mean it does bother me that we have a policy that says that – that every faculty member shall be evaluated on an annual basis and it appears to me we have faculty who are not. But that evaluation if done – presumably by departmental colleagues – ought to be sensitive to most of the things you've – you've indicated so that – that – that I hope that we can have the time to adopt something like that, and that – that will be what the – publically we do make comments of the Board of Trustees meaning – but behind the scenes I will be urging the Trustees to give us time to take a hard look at. But I appreciate the admonition to do that. Other questions? Yes?

THOITS: Every year we will out FAR reports, right?

TERRY: You're supposed to. We have faculty who don't.

THOITS: Is that what you were – were referring to?

TERRY: That's part of it. We don't have any mechanism to force somebody to fill out a FAR.

THOITS: I see. Okay.

TERRY: I don't have – I do not know how units that don't evaluate their faculty decide on merit increases or whatever, but – but I – I think the anecdotal evidence is substantial that – that what happens under those policies and with that form is varied, and maybe it should be or maybe it shouldn't be but – but – but, by the way, I think that one of the things that is going to emerge out of the strategic plan is revisions in FAR to perhaps make it easier to use, who knows what. I won't ask for current comment on that, but I'm pretty sure that that is in the works but – that – that – it might become – useful. I didn't mean "useful," but more useful. Yes?

SWANSON: In – in terms of the yearly reviews our unit has done that for some time and we just changed our policies so that if – if full professors will be reviewed every three years because it was such a burden. So we're – we're an instance which everybody fills out their FAR and we've had these reviews, and it seemed that it wasn't a useful mechanism to require a yearly review of all the full professors –

TERRY: And I think if we get the time to study this issue that that will be important to know and consider, you know, [comment indistinct] authorizing. It may be that – that for some fields some window other than a year would be more appropriate. It may be that when people are at certain stages in their academic career, emeritus, something else may be appropriate, but we'll – we'll hopefully be able to engage in a discussion of all of that and learn in a more systematic way what happens across campus. Dennis were you just – ?

GROTH: I was just going to say that – and – and I know there are programs that differ and they look, even though they collect information yearly and review yearly, their window of evaluation is over a longer window, right? Because to take in – to take into consideration the differing publishing and creativity norms you don't do a book every year, and if you could do a book every year kudos, you know, but – but to – to do a fantastic book might take more than a year to do and so that helps to sort of normalize things. So you're sort of looking –

TERRY: And – and I would also add that obviously I think what is regarded as satisfactory performance will vary from campus to campus. IUPUI and IU Bloomington are research intensive institutions. God knows what the Medical School but it's something research intensive, sort of, too. There are reasons for that comment, but anyway – and yet the regional campuses are primarily focused on undergraduate education, but faculty there are also expected to be productive in research as are all faculty – all tenured and tenure-track faculty at

IU. So there's a lot of reason to – for difference related to departmental differences, to field differences which aren't necessarily the same. We have interdisciplinary departments where some people write books and some people do articles, and that sort of thing. We need a system that will accommodate all of – all of that, and –and that will be what I'm urging the Trustees to allow us to take the time to create, okay? But when – when the headline in the Muncie *Star* is "Ball State to weed out" unproductive faculty, you – you – you kind of have to find a way to get back from that sort of to a more reasonable approach to the problem, okay? Any other questions or comments? How are we doing with quorum?

DETHLOFF: One shy.

TERRY: One shy. No, we can't [comment indistinct]. Okay, we'll keep working toward the quorum. Alright, we have a couple people I know who need to leave which will affect the quorum. When do you need to leave?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: I was just going to [comment indistinct] a little note.

TERRY: A note?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: [comment indistinct] for the parliamentarian.

TERRY: Okay, and the parliamentarian will research proxy votes for – or something. Okay, go to it. And let's see who else was going to have to leave? Basu.

DETHLOFF: Basu left, yeah.

TERRY: Basu left. Dennis?

GROTH: I have to leave, too.

TERRY: When do you leave?

GROTH: Probably after the first, but after that, item five.

TERRY: Alright, let's proceed with five and see if we can get a quorum during that time period. Cassidy? Oh, before we conclude there's one other comment. Craig, can you update the election – BFC election?

DETHLOFF: Oh, yes. The election is now open as of this afternoon. You should have all have received an e-mail with the link that will take you to the CAS, and you log in, and you just progress your way through it. We'd encourage you to please vote in every race you possibly can. Don't get bored or tired with it. Fill it out all the way. That helps us to get the information we need about how many people are actually participating. We don't count the half ballots we

count the full ballots, so keep plowing ahead. Schedule some time, get a glass a wine and just [comment indistinct]. Also, on our website there is another link to the application where you can just go to our website, our homepage. If you want to go in and vote that way, you can do it. If you lose it in the e-mail just go to our webpage, and also on the homepage of the BFC you'll find a committee preference sheet. If you haven't filled out a committee preference sheet that we sent around earlier with the nominations there you'll find it in PDF format, you can just print it up, put whatever committees you're interested in serving on next year, and send it into us at the office. If you don't, we'll just send out another e-mail to all the faculty and it will be your fault, and we'll ask them please what committees would you like to serve on for the BFC so there are – it's pretty much 1,400 other faculty members that you have to take into consideration. Please go ahead and volunteer for your committees.

TERRY: And I would add that what Tom Gieryn's office hosted a meeting a week or so ago on campus leadership, he sent out a cattle call to faculty inviting people that were interested in learning about leadership to come and participate. Eighty people showed up, we had a lively discussion in the Frangipani room. Only fifty or so of them were the usual suspects, so lots of new people who showed up. Tom diligently collected their contact information and I can assure you we will invite them to serve on BFC committees. But it was very – it was an interesting and useful way I think of stimulating faculty interest not only in faculty governance, leadership – I was on the panel, but in departmental leadership and other sorts of things. So an interesting experience. I don't think we've done that before and there were a number of you in this room who were present, hopefully you can also report that it was a good thing. So, with that, Cassidy.

AGENDA ITEM 5: EPC PROPOSED MOTION ON THE COMMON CALENDAR AND ONLINE COURSE QUESTIONNAIRE

SUGIMOTO: Alright, thank you President Terry. So the EPC has a number of proposals that we're going to bring forward today. I'm going to go over the five that are related to the calendar, and then Jim's going to present those related to the online course questionnaires. I'm going to read through all five and then we can do questions on any of them because they're interrelated. So we'll just try to go through them quickly and then come to your questions. The first is about policy H-28 which is on Early Assessment and this states that, "all instructors of courses in which there are freshmen or University Division sophomores enrolled, as well as instructors of all students enrolled in General Education Common Ground courses, shall receive a request for a letter grade evaluation of those students in the fourth week of the regular semester, with a submission deadline of Monday of the sixth week." And we're proposing that we change that to "...the submission deadline of Sunday after the sixth week," to extend it one week. This was motivated by concerns from faculty that it was too early to evaluate or assess

their students. They hadn't given them any midterms. They hadn't received any homework back from the students, and so they wanted an extra week. This will also align it with other things as you'll see later.

The next is Policy H-33 which is about enrollment verification. We currently have a policy that recommends that IUB require faculty to participate in the registrar's enrollment audit now conducted in the fifth to seventh week of each regular semester, and we're proposing moving that forward to Sunday after the sixth week, which would align it with those things. So when you're doing reporting you're going to be doing all of your reporting at the same time. So if you have to early assessment you'll be doing it at the same time as you'll be doing the enrollment verification audit. It's assumed that you should know if students are coming to your class by the end of the sixth week.

The third one sort of puts all of these things together, and it's our proposal that we consolidate everything into a single system. So there was many faculty concerns that you're getting a request to do early enrollment, and then assessment, and then the FLAGS thing, and you're getting them at different times, and you think you've already done it so you delete that e-mail and you're not going through that. So we present the three things. We have the student performance roster which does two different actions, and then the early evaluation grade rosters as part of the FLAGS system. We're proposing that these all be consolidated into a single system that will do all of the instructor actions, and that all of these actions will take place at the same time. Now, in full disclosure, this functionality does not exist yet. So there's concern that we're putting the cart before the horse here. So we'd like to either end – add an explicit friendly amendment to this that it's contingent upon full functionality and we'd ask the registrar's office to contact us once that functionality is required, but it was considered that we might be motivating that functionality by passing something in the BFC saying that that's something that we would like as faculty that would benefit both us and the students when they're receiving these reports.

The fourth item is to collect grades for the first eight-week sessions within 72 hours. So at present if you have an eight-week session those grades are not technically due until the end of that full semester. So you're in spring semester, you take an eight-week course, and it's not due until the end of the semester. There are many business school classes right now which have an eight-week course followed by an eight-week course for which the first eight-week course is a pre-req, but students don't necessarily have their grades back from that first course in a timely manner. So this proposal is that just like the – the full semester classes grades be due within 72 hours so that students can make choices about the next eight-week sessions that they're going to take.

The final one here is Policy H-32 which is our Drop/Add policy, which currently says that you can drop and add, and those drop and adds do not become a matter of permanent record and transcript during the Drop/Add period. The grade of “W” is automatically assigned for drops of undergraduate courses taken for undergraduate credit as late as the Wednesday of the ninth week. We are presenting that is Sunday after the ninth week which aligns it with the current Indiana University common calendar.

So I’ll take any questions on those. You’ll see you have pages full of appendices to read to your hearts’ content about these issues. Jim?

SHERMAN: I think we have to vote on the friendly amendment or just accept it as a friendly amendment –

TERRY: It’s a friendly amendment from the committee if they wish to –

SHERMAN: Someone has to say it’s okay, I guess.

TERRY: Are you saying it’s okay?

SUGIMOTO: MmHmm.

SHERMAN: Is it okay with everyone else?

TERRY: I think it’s what they – the committee, has chosen to present. It’s a friendly amendment to their own motion so it’s incorporated. Mark do you have anything to say about functionality and what can be done, and what can’t be done, and when?

MCCONAHAY: Well, right now the functionality associated with early evaluation, which is the collection of grades for those who are in University Division, Gen Ed classes, or are freshmen only – that functionality only lives in a separate roster. That is exactly what we’re trying to place inside of a student performance roster in order to enable one tool to perform all of this midterm work.

TERRY: Would the Council adopting this resolution be helpful in stimulating the administration to spend the money to do that?

GROTH: Yes.

TERRY: Yes. Thank you, Dennis.

SUGIMOTO: Yes?

HALLORAN: I have a question. I was going to switch over and use Canvas for my courses in the fall so will the rosters magically show up there the way that they have been on Oncourse?

SUGIMOTO: I don't know the answer to that question, but I think Mark probably does.

MCCONAHAY: Can you repeat the question for me?

TERRY: Will the switch to Canvas mean that the grade rosters and that sort of thing from Canvas can be uploaded to the performance rosters?

MCCONAHAY: Correct. You know, I – I can't answer that directly. I would assume so because they want to replicate all of the existing functionality inside of Oncourse with the new learning management system.

TERRY: For – for those of you who haven't been paying detailed attention to some of your e-mails, Oncourse is in the process of being phased out and replaced by a successor system known as Canvas. There's a two-year window I think in which both will exist and – and I will also convey to UITS and others the importance of – that whatever we make Oncourse do with other systems, Canvas must also do. Mark?

MCCONAHAY: Just one other thing to say, the first two amendments lining up the due dates to be the Sunday of the sixth week also correspond to the common calendar initiative, and it's just so that not only will all the deadlines then align within the semester, but they correspond to the common calendar across the system.

TERRY: I'd like to ask a question. Is there any teeth behind the 72 hour grade reporting system?

SUGIMOTO: That's a great question and I think the answer is no, but that could be something that we consider as a Council, what sort of incentives we could make for people to turn those in. Dennis?

GROTH: You know, one of the things we talked about in the meeting is actually, and I – this is just to signal that I don't think – I think in the end the BFC will need to look at this again because eight weeks is just really kind of a – a surrogate for nonstandard class offerings. I think we can expect more flexible class offerings across the board for our classes that start and end on the same weekend, and it – and, you know – I don't know, but the most pressing one was this eight – eight-week section, and I know I – Mark could probably give more detail but the recorders get access to information at the end of each term and who's done their grades and who's not, and it provides them information to the – to the chairs and the deans to actually go back and say, hey, you have to get your – your grades in so the teeth comes at the – at the program level not at the campus level.

TERRY: And – and I would build on Rebecca's observation, this is actually, again, one of these that – that varies a lot across the campus. My colleagues in the School of Law often do not get grades in within 72 days. They have thirty days, it could be a long time, and so I think we have

to take a look at that at some future time. We have to – this is not the time to do that now. Any other questions for Cassidy on that? I – yes?

LEVINSON: Well, I guess I'm just – I'm not inclined – are we in fact going to take a vote on whether to adopt all of these amendments? Is that the – ?

SUGIMOTO: So our proposal was to vote on them individually in case there was any disagreement not as set of things, but do we have a quorum to take a vote?

GJERDINGEN: Craig?

DETHLOFF: Don?

GJERDINGEN: Here's what – here's what's going to happen. So under our bylaws a – a presence of a majority of the members shall constitute quorum, and that means the voting members. And the green sheet that we have here that Craig keeps I – there were – I have sixty-five – is that correct? – on this list. And the majority is more than half, so we'd need thirty-three. And we could just have – I think the easiest way – just a show of hands of the voting members in the room. If we lose a quorum, then we lose the power to vote. So it is –

DETHLOFF: We'd get quorum right now.

GJERDINGEN: Satisfy the lawyer gene in me and – and have a hand count of the people in the room who are voting members just to make sure that...

DETHLOFF: Sarita, you vote. [Laughter]

SONI: [comment indistinct].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Anybody else?

DETHLOFF: Okay, alright.

TERRY: What'd you get?

DETHLOFF: I think we've got it.

TERRY: I think we do, too.

GJERDINGEN: So how many do we have?

DETHLOFF: You'll – you'll have to vote to tell. Everybody who can vote will have to vote, or abstain or, you know, what have you, if we want it to pass.

TERRY: Okay.

DETHLOFF: We have – yeah, we’ve got a quorum.

TERRY: We’ve got a quorum, alright.

LEVINSON: So, are – are we taking in still – taking individual comment on – ?

SUGIMOTO: Please, yes. On any of them.

LEVINSON: So, I’m – I’m inclined not to vote in favor of this 72 hour limit on the eight-week sessions because first of all it seems like it’s prompted by one unit and – and neither the fact that we’ve observed that there are in fact no teeth at the campus level for enforcing this, that it would fall to the unit in fact to enforce whatever timeline they want to. I can also imagine situations in which one is teaching an AP course concurrently with a couple of regular semester load of courses and therefore, unlike the end of the typical semester where one only gets supposedly 72 hours, in the case of an eight-week course one is still continuing to have an ongoing burden of meeting classes and so forth. So mandating this for the entire campus – I can see it possibly, you know, agreeing upon a one-week time period, or something different from the 72 hours, but if what the business school wants and needs is 72 hours I would say, well just kind of leave things the way they are and it’s just up to them to kind of lean on their faculty to get those grades reported quickly. So I would – I would not want to mandate a 72 hour across the board reporting for AP courses, and also in light of what Dennis said for all kinds of other courses that are likely going to attempt – we’re going to attempt to sort of grandfather in under this policy.

SUGIMOTO: Valid point. Dennis?

GROTH: I was just going to say, Mark correct me if I’m totally wrong. Actually, what happens today is the grade roster doesn’t appear until the end of the semester –

LEVINSON: Oh, I see.

GROTH: – for you, and so actually in order to make this actionable the grade roster needs to appear at the end of the – the scheduled time of the class, and then I think could be very well that a program could actually locally manage this, so two – there’s really an implementation detail to be –

LEVINSON: It’s sort of the – the – the implied intent there of this amendment to get those – to get those grade rosters –

GROTH: Approx – approximately at the end of class, yes.

LEVINSON: Okay, alright. So I guess the question is would the committee accept – it's the business school that specified the 72 hours as being important for – it's not entirely clear to me by the way how – when they talked about – I don't know if someone is here from business could explain this how –

MCCONAHAY: Well, the 72 hours though, didn't come from the business school. It is basically 3 o'clock on the third day following the final which is the standard –

LEVINSON: Sure, sure.

MCCONAHAY: – time, and we just applied that to first eight weeks.

LEVINSON: Right, but it says here that – that like a taking second eight-week course is contingent on the performance during – in the first eight-week course, but in fact as we know these courses overlap by a week typically, right? In early March in the spring?

SUGIMOTO: No.

MCCONAHAY: No.

LEVINSON: No, they don't. Okay. So, it would be –

MCCONAHAY: They do in the summer, that's probably your confusion.

TERRY: And it's not your intention here to address summer sessions.

MCCONAHAY: No.

SUGIMOTO: No.

MCCONAHAY: But we do – we do collect much like – and the purpose of this proposal is to formalize the idea that we wish to collect at the end of each session, formalized session. We do that in the summer. We do collect at the end of each session. It seemed appropriate to do that also for the first and second eight-week sessions as well. Second eight-week would take care of itself, but first eight-week was the outlier. Does that make sense?

LEVINSON: Yeah.

TERRY: And the 72 hour rule was a Faculty Council policy if I remember right of some years ago. So this just extends that policy to shorter sessions and intends to motivate the production of electronic rosters for those shorter sessions so that that can be done. It has no greater force than the current policy in assuring that it will be done. Are there other questions about the proposals from the committee? Was your proposal that we vote separately?

SUGIMOTO: We vote separately.

TERRY: I think these are unrelated to the questions of online course evaluations –

SUGIMOTO: Right.

TERRY: So let's – let's proceed. We'll start with the motion to amend Policy H-28. Remind me where your friendly amendment comes in.

SUGIMOTO: In changing the submission deadline of Monday of the sixth week to a submission deadline of Sunday after the sixth week.

TERRY: That's not the friendly amendment.

SUGIMOTO: No, that's come down on number three.

TERRY: Okay. So would all those in favor of adopting the proposal from the Educational Policies Committee to amend Policy H-28 as described in circular B34-2014 please say, "aye?" [Aye] Those opposed? [Silence] Any abstentions? [Silence] Passes unanimously. The next proposal is to amend Policy H-33 as described on circular B34-2014. Would all those in favor of that amendment please indicate by saying, "aye?" [Aye] Opposed? [Silence] Abstentions? [Silence] Passes unanimously. There's a proposal to amend – processes to adopt amendments – to adopt language governing processes in consolidating them described as item three under circular B34-2014. Remind the group of the friendly amendment?

SUGIMOTO: That the friendly amendment – that passing this is contingent upon full functionality of the system and the registrars' office will communicate to the EPC when this functionality has been achieved.

TERRY: You understand the friendly amendment? Are – would – if you please indicate those who are in favor of the proposal including the friendly amendment please indicate your support by saying, "aye." [Aye] Opposed, same sign? [Silence] Abstentions? None. Passes unanimously. There's a proposal which we've just discussed at some length to collect grades for the first eight-week sessions within 72 hours, the intent of the discussion is to indicate that the primary thing this will do is motivate the production of grade rosters so that grades can be reported within 72 hours for first eight-week courses during regular semesters. Would all those in favor of that amendment please indicate so by saying, "aye." [Aye] Opposed? [Silence] Abstentions? [Silence] It passes unanimously. And finally there's a proposal to amend Policy H-32 regarding automatic withdrawals in part to conform to the new university calendar. Would all those in favor of the amendment proposed for Policy H-32 please indicate so by saying, "aye?" [Aye] Opposed? [Silence]. Abstentions? [Silence]. It passes. Thank you all. Jim?

SHERMAN: Okay the – the second part of – for consideration and – and vote from the EPC involves the online course questionnaire, and let me just say a couple of words about what this isn't and – and – and what it is. This is not a discussion of whether we will have, or should have, or might have an online course questionnaire. That issue has already been decided. We will. We are. It's coming. It's here, and we voted on that at the – at the BFC last year. It is not a meeting to talk about the – the tenure and promotion items which are listed on a handout that you have, or on the open-ended items although there may be a question about them that's – about their use that would probably be appropriate at this time, but it's not whether to – to have them or not have them, or use them for tenure and promotion, et cetera... The only purpose of what we're doing is to consider the student return access items, that is the bottom five items on your yellow sheet. And the reason for this is that we voted last year to have a student return access set of questions but that set of questions would have to be endorsed by the Faculty Council before they could go into play, and so we're at the point of seeing what these items are. There is a – there – we asked for a rationale for the items, and these also appear on the handout that you have, and these are items generated by students, that students want to have and use, and will be available for observation by folks. So that's our purpose for being here, and, yeah, the items are there the rationales are there and I think that the – the thing we should do next is hear from students in terms of the items and their support for them and the rationales or to answer any questions about them. So you want to have a microphone?

MITJAVILA: No, I'm fine.

SHERMAN: Well, a lot of us are older and can't hear as well, [laughter] but go ahead and do your best.

MITJAVILA: Well, I – I do believe I can project to the rest of this room, however if anybody can't hear me, please let me know and I'll be glad to raise my voice. I – I'm also a little bit raspy, so I apologize for that today. My name is Jose Mitjavila, I'm currently – we'll, I'm actually the outgoing IUSA president so this is my last BFC meeting as well, and the reason that we would like these – these questions to be made available to students is primarily so that students can make an informed assessment qualitatively of – of an instructor's teaching performance. As of right now we only have the grade distribution database, so the way that students – hypothetically – primarily select classes – how many A's does a teacher give out, you know? Obviously, not the best policy. I can attest to the fact that that, you know, doesn't help me in a class that I really want to learn about, so I think that the real benefit to students of these – these questions which we're asking is to really assess how many – how much time a student's going to be spending in a given class so that they can better accommodate other classes in their schedule so that in the big picture they don't end up shooting themselves in the foot and performing poorly because they've, you know, overcommitted to classes. Additionally, I think it

– it will inform students about a professor’s teaching style. There are teaching styles which I’m – I’m just not good with and there are – and those – those professors whose classes I’ve had, they’re not bad professors just because of their teaching style, and I know that, but it’s just not the way that I learn. I prefer – I prefer visual learning. I prefer, you know, more one on one interaction with – with the teacher and with groups as opposed to the teacher saying here’s the – here’s the material go learn it by yourself, so none of this is malicious. I know that previously the – when the question of well is this going to be something like, you know, Rate My Professor, isn’t this just going to be the exact same thing? And I really think from what I’ve, you know, heard from Dennis Groth is that that’s not – that’s not going to be the case. You know, Rate My Professor is a – is a completely, you know, outlaw system where students can get on there they can – they can rate professors very quickly on a 1 to 5 – 1 to 5 basis more or less and they can, you know, leave any – any kind of comment that they want about that professor. So the differences there are that, you know, we don’t want to – we don’t even want to see student’s general comments, like just what they write, their opinions about the teacher. That’s not useful information in my opinion. We just want to see, you know, answers to the qualitative questions. In addition, I think that the – the quick and dirty rating system of Rate My Professor isn’t very accurate and doesn’t tell you a whole lot. It just tells you that a student didn’t like that professor, and I’ve had professors who I’ve learned an immense amount from, I’ve absolutely adored, they’ve given me rec letters, still great friends with them, and other students completely dislike the way their course was taught. So I think that there’s a lot of subjectivity in students selecting classes, and our goal is really to be able to give students a qualitative metric to select professors as opposed to just the quantitative which is the online course distribution grade – or grade database. Thank you.

TERRY: Thank you, Jose. Are there other questions or comments? Dennis?

GROTH: This – this may sound a little crazy but of course I’m not a fan of Rate My Professor, yet no matter as many times as I feel like I’m not a fan it doesn’t mean students don’t use it. So the fact of the matter is students have used that information, even as flawed as it is. There’s even a new system called Draw Your Professor, actually so you can check that out, and actually students can submit – yeah, I’m serious – sketches of their – of their professor, and – and it’s purported to be something again similar you know to – you know – it’s completely, you know, tasteless, but – but it’s a wild internet out there and I just wanted to point out that there’s information that’s out there already and to a certain extent that these questions are there. They’ve been helpful – seen as helpful to the students. They have been piloted so there is, you know, information that has been collected that looks to – that looks as if it doesn’t, you know, provide anything more than actual useful information to students, and also to faculty to see. And it, actually, it’s quite interesting to see what students are saying about how much time that they’re actually putting into classes, and – and I’ve found some of that information very helpful

from a – from a teacher standpoint, even though it's not used for anything other than this return to students, but it's [comment indistinct] to look at.

TERRY: I would point out to the Council if you haven't quite realized it that what we are doing today is implementing point 5 in the online course questionnaire policy adopted in 2012. When that was adopted among other things, there was substantial discussion in this Council about how it might affect graduate students assigned to teach classes maybe for the first time in their lives, and this sort of thing, and so I – I note that at the end of point 5 there's something that came out of that Faculty Council meeting, that data for any instructor are released only beginning with the third semester of instruction. So while this will generally apply to most of the courses here, there will be courses for which this data will not be released. It may be gathered, I guess, but it will not be released until the third semester of instruction by that person, whether that's a new faculty member or a graduate instructor, or whatever. Does this then come within the endor – the – do these questions come with the endorsement of your office?

GROTH: Yes.

TERRY: As it says in here.

GROTH: Yes.

TERRY: Do you know if Tom's office endorses these?

MARTIN: He did not – he did not indicate that to me.

TERRY: Because the proposal is [comment indistinct] the questions that are being proposed by the OVPUE and the OVPFAA. Do you know if –

GROTH: Yes.

TERRY: – Tom's office was involved?

GROTH: Yes, absolutely. We met just two weeks ago about this.

TERRY: Okay. Jim?

SHERMAN: I have a question I guess is for Dennis or Mark. The – the last item, "How much time do you devote..." – will the answers to that be reported simply as the mean or will there be the distribution of hours that students in the class indicate? Because I teach a course now with about twenty-five students and I would say that the average, that the – that the mean would probably be five or six hours but it's a totally bimodal distribution. There's a lot – some of the class that puts zero hours. We have discussion and I ask questions, and there's another part

that I know do all the reading, come ready, have thought about it, so five to six hours reflects probably no one in the course.

GROTH: We– we – because we actually have a little bit of a runway here because of that three-year – three-year window, even though we collected some information, if faculty want to start releasing then we can release, but our approach is to – is to show aggregate information but also distributions so – so that basically you can – you can see, because I agree with you in the – everything can sort of start looking grey in the average, right? So...

SHERMAN: Okay, thanks.

GJERDINGEN: Just a couple of questions. On the forms themselves, and I know this isn't the form, but for the comment that says, "Not applicable," what – what – what would be the – what – what would be the circumstance that it would be not applicable? Would that go after online or what – and – and – and then on – on – on one of the forms it says on – on the white sheet it says, not – for the availability of the instructor – it says, "Not applicable," and that's not on our – there's an inconsistency between the forms is all I'm saying. And I – I don't – I would – why – why would a – why would that not be applicable about providing help or something, I'm just curious.

SHERMAN: I – I can't answer that.

GROTH: What – which – which question?

GJERDINGEN: On the core, I know that's not in front of us today, but I just – it said, "Not applicable," and I just was curious. My understanding is we don't – these will be – these will – this is the – these will not be approved by the BFC. Now I'm just curious more than anything else.

GROTH: Why...?

GJERDINGEN: Why it would be – we have not applicable for two, three, four? I – I just didn't know. I just –

BAIRD JACKSON: I don't know what the use case was in deciding these, but in my department, for instance, we have practicum courses where there's a lot of course infrastructure but there isn't the standard framework of, let's say, assignments.

GROTH: That – I think what – what we're looking at here is – is in some – in some cases what was available during the pilot as we were experimenting with these, and in other cases where a decision was made to basically get off the fence, right? Say something here.

TERRY: I assume Dennis that – that while the goal here is to construct longitudinal data and not willy-nilly change these things in future years, if you get surprising results that don't make base sense the first time you start collecting this you'll go back and look at whether you have the right response categories or –

GROTH: And certainly I think we need to look at these in – in – in practical terms and say that this could never be anything that this could never be anything that is so – so fixed.

GJERDINGEN: And just on the yellow form it does not have [comment indistinct] for but it does on the – on the white form.

SHERMAN: Yeah.

GJERDINGEN: But I – I assume that it's been [comment indistinct]. A couple of other kind of minor things, the – the student return questions some are – the question number, well I guess at the time we get five options other times there are four is there any – I don't know. Is that – some has to be parallel? Another thing, I – I understand that – that the rationale for this which is certainly I agree with is to give students options, to be able to choose. One of the issues that came up before and that there is – is that there may be situations where there isn't a choice, where students are – are not only assigned the course but the instructor and the time, in which case there's no choice whatsoever to be made for the students and what – so in that case what – ?

GROTH: What's the use of the data then when it's a mandatory course?

GJERDINGEN: Well, and in other words that there isn't a choice at all for the students to make if they are assigned. If they come in and say here's your course list, here's your instructor, and here's when you're going to take it, which happens at the law school that's why I – that – that –

GROTH: Well, it actually happens all the time.

GJERDINGEN: – that whole first year.

GROTH: If there's a major course that's required for a particular – satisfy the requirements of a – of a particular degree and the program schedules one faculty member to teach one section that semester, then that's it. So the utility of it may only be maximized under where choice is involved. On the other hand, we actually have no way of knowing all of the ways that classes may be required or – or not. Some students in the class it's required, other students are taking it because it's –

GJERDINGEN: But if we knew in advance that every student would be assigned the course and instructor and time what do we do?

GROTH: I don't know if we do anything differently than what we're – what we're proposing.

GJERDINGEN: I – I think that – that's the first year at the law school. It's unusual, but every student – when they come in they get their – their – their schedule and that's exactly what we do to them so they – they have no choice in the matter.

GROTH: Right.

TERRY: Jose did you have something to add or Swanson?

MITJAVILA: Yeah, I don't believe that, you know, I see now that you're talking more about, you know, medical school classes and law school classes, but the complaint came to me classes, for example organic chemistry lab. I didn't have the opportunity to choose between any professors, so I was – I was basically faced with a decision you take organic chemistry lab or do you not take organic chemistry lab? In one instance where this could be beneficial even though I'm required to take this course, there are no other options, would be to look at the amount of time that's spent on such a course. For those of you who don't know organic chemistry lab is a very intensive course and I opted to not take it the same semester that I took organic chemistry lecture. So not all the questions would be relevant, you know, admittedly but that would be one where I could see some use.

SWANSON: Just to – in – in relation to the law school and Optometry under point two the last sentence is allows the opportunity to [comments indistinct]. So in other words you and we could ask the VPFA to opt out because we know the required courses. It doesn't extend to people beyond our units.

TERRY: Point two on the 2012 policy?

SWANSON: On the online – yeah on the policy that was the point we had put into the – in these cases like the law school and Optometry where – where there's a fixed curriculum and you don't get to change it. That last sentence under point two was put in to allow the unit the ability to ask for an exemption.

GJERDINGEN: And my concern was there is literally no choice on the part of the student whatsoever. There isn't a choice. Everything is assigned to them.

SWANSON: Right, and – and – and –

GJERDINGEN: What's the utility of the information?

SWANSON: And what I'm saying is that in those cases of – of the law school and Optometry we have put in – we've got that option. As for other people, nobody asked for it.

TERRY: And I would point out that point two is key to national accreditation standards whether it's an accreditation issue exactly in the law school or not I don't know, but that – that was also I remember one of the discussions of this in 2012, an important reason for putting that exception in there.

GJERDINGEN: Well, that's a different issue.

TERRY: It would have to be an accreditation reason for deviation from this. Yes?

MITJAVILA: I would just say from a student perspective even in a vacuum with no other options there would still be utility in the availability of this information in the sense that it would help a student manage expectations for their semester to sort of allocate their time – their portfolio of time in advance to different classes.

TERRY: And building on the conversation that's already occurred I would add that – that it is even easier if it doesn't produce useful data to change these questions than it is to change the core questions. These, as is noted in five, cannot be used in promotion, tenure, and merit decisions. They are to provide information to the students. I assume faculty will ask whether they produce useful information to students and students will volunteer whether or not they think they're providing useful information to students and this can return – the questions can be changed I think under this policy by the BFC anytime of the VPUE and the VPFAA come to us and say we'd like to make changes. And they could be urged to do that by student groups I assume, or by faculty in a school that didn't think it was working very well for them. Jason?

BAIRD JACKSON: It was just in addition to a point that [indistinct] made. In these cases they were asking about where there's a kind of lock on required courses. In my experience those can often be electives for students that you don't necessarily know. I mean for instance, we could be working with a legal anthropology doctoral student who may be interested in coming over to the law school and taking a course, I – I presume that that's possible, but that they would then have access to this data in the same way that another undergraduate weighing an elective even though for the core constituency for a course it's [comment indistinct] –

TERRY: And I would add that for a variety of reasons it's likely that professional schools including the law school where – will in coming years be more interested than they currently are in attracting students and their credit hours from outside of the school.

GJERDINGEN: Some of the differences is that second and third year are electives and that's when the – you get the students – that would apply to anything where it's elective. The core – if it goes back to the core of the first year not – not about these others.

TERRY: Which non-law students sometimes take. They take courses like legal writing, they do other such things.

GJERDINGEN: The point being if you had one or two every once in a while who actually get to choose by the permission of the instructor does that mandate that everybody, the other hundred students, in that class have to have data, I guess. The electives that's easy, second and third year – that's easy.

TERRY: Are there other questions or comments?

SPANG: I do think that it would help students to manage their expectations to know that everybody who's ever done that course says that it takes more than fifteen hours. I had a minor point and it might even – I don't know if it can be a friendly amendment. Number 9 asked, "How concerned was the instructor...?" Now, it's quite possible that the instructor could be so concerned that he or she would be paralyzed in front of the students and so the students might say not at all concerned whereas the instructor him or herself really is very concerned. So would a better wording be, "How concerned did the instructor appear...," or "How much concern did the instructor demonstrate...?" Something that would really put it – turn the question into one about what the student saw and not what the faculty member was feeling.

TERRY: Is there a comment from the committee or Dennis, or the students?

GROTH: I guess I'm looking to the students I think –

MITJAVILA: Yeah, I think that that's one of the reasons that we don't want to use these for tenure because we understand the gravity of these questions on – when assessing tenure, and they're not perfect questions. I, you know, that's a great point that you make. I don't know exactly how that question would be asked. However, you know, these are just the items that we brought forth –

SPANG: Would you mind if that one was rewritten as, "How much concern did the instructor demonstrate...?"

MITJAVILA: I don't – I don't see why not, although –

KAUFFMAN: Or "...reasonably believed to..."

GROTH: It's a perception – it's a perception thing, but I know exactly what you're saying, Rebecca. You know, I actually – I – I would agree with you it really is about – I could be very concerned, really care about you, but you know if I never actually looked at you or called you by name or something actually feel like it. But it – it is trying to get inside the mind of a professor

and I actually – I don't – I don't feel like this particular change would change the spirit of what's trying to be captured here.

SPANG: No.

TERRY: So Rebecca do you have a specific amendment to promote?

SPANG: "How much concern did the instructor demonstrate..." – or no, because those can't be answered with those words.

TERRY: "How concerned did the instructor appear about student learning and development?"

SPANG: That would be okay with me.

TURK: Yes, that sounds good.

TERRY: The students?

MITJAVILA: That's – that's all fine.

GJERDINGEN: But do you want concern or the appearance of concern?

SPANG: We want both!

GJERDINGEN: The – the main question said, "concerned" which I think is – is more definite. You don't care whether they – it's whether it's there not the appearance of it. That's how I read the question.

TERRY: John?

WALBRIDGE: I don't see how this would differ very significantly from question 8 to the appeal for additional information, because I was looking at it trying to get the glaze out of my eyes. I thought perhaps what you actually needed was a question about the – whether the difficulty of the course was appropriate for its level.

SPANG: Oh.

WALBRIDGE: Which would actually give different information.

SPANG: Right.

MCGREGOR: Oh, here we go.

TERRY: I know.

MCGREGOR: Draftsmanship by committee, but one – one more – another try perhaps. “How much emphasis did the instructor place on student learning and development?”

SPANG: Hmm.

MCGREGOR: You get out of the business of judging faculty concern –

SPANG: Yeah.

MCGREGOR: – in the normal concept probably even by close colleagues, certainly by students. That would make it a different question from the motivation to do your best work.

SPANG: MmHhm.

SUGIMOTO: What would you propose that the response say?

TERRY: Can you repeat your proposal?

MCGREGOR: Yes, so how much – “How much emphasis did the instructor place on student learning and development?”

SUGIMOTO: What would the categories be?

SWANSON: So it would be the same as 8?

GROTH: Very much, quite a bit, somewhat, not at all.

MCGREGOR: Yeah. Or – or, “To what extent did the instructor emphasize student learning and development?”

SPANG: Yeah.

MCGREGOR: “To what extent...?”

SPANG: Mmhmm.

MCGREGOR: Can – can we get away with that?

SPANG: Yeah, and then very much, quite a bit, somewhat – those are, yeah.

MCGREGOR: Will you sit still for that? Okay, so very much, quite a bit, so on, not at all. Would that – would that work?

SPANG: Mmhmm.

TERRY: Is that a nod from the students over there?

MITJAVILA: Correct.

TERRY: That's okay?

MITJAVILA: Yes.

TERRY: And then using the categories of the same as 8? Very much. How much – Don?

GJERDINGEN: One last thing and this is more of an informational item. I don't think the answer to this should stand in the way of – of voting on this, and I know there's been a lot of work by everybody. And one of the issues that came up two years ago on question 5 was the availability of this. We talked about – it talks about a – a password protected, and I think one concern that doesn't have to be resolved today – I think we can vote on this, but basically what it asks to me is two things, one is if the – the *Herald-Times* asks for the information do they get in which case everything is on the internet, or alternatively if anybody in the IU community, could be student, could be faculty member, takes this and publishes, what's the position of Indiana University going to be? In other words I – are we going to assume that – that this – well I just don't know what it is, what the answer is, and I don't, again, I don't think that should affect the vote here, and I think that we should vote on this today, but I – I mean updates. This – this held it up for about a year because we were concerned about whether this – this – this one response question is going to be looked as possibly a part of the – the personnel file. The easy answer there, finally, was no. So that – that – that's very, very clear, but I think some people have had concerns about that even though with the good intent of this to have the IU community it may practically mean that everything's on the internet. A year from now you put your name in and the answers to those come up and I – I just raise that to leave it there.

TERRY: Are there any other questions or comments? [Silence] Alright, then we are voting on a recommendation from the Educational Policies Committee, essentially circular B35-2014, and specifically to approve the student-return/access items on that circular. There has been one change to item 9 which would read, "To what extent did the instructor emphasize to you learning and development?" With response categories the same as in question 8. All of those in favor of adopting B35-2014 with that amendment please indicate so by saying yes. [Yes] Are there objections? [Silence] Abstentions? [Silence] That passes. Alright, thank you all and thank you to the Educational Policies Committee and the students, and to Mark and his office on the other matters proposed by the EPC.

Alright, we now turn to a presentation by Jason Jackson Baird. Let me preface this a little bit. This ended up in the hands of the Library Committee this year because I – I charged them with taking a look at open access, and I'm very grateful to Jason and to the members of his committee. I attended their committee meetings. They came up with a recommendation that was very cautious about this, but it was a very well-reasoned, thoughtful recommendation.

While the Executive Committee has recommended, and the UFC has agreed to go forward, I hope that isn't taken as an indication by those committee members that – that we were not grateful for their analysis of the issue, and especially for Jason's work on it. This is a topic that should matter to all of us. We all care about how our scholarship gets published and distributed. It is as indicated a part of a national trend. We are fortunate to have Jason here because he has studied this at some length, and I hope this is the start of a discussion that will continue next year, and ultimately result in some university-wide action.

AGENDA ITEM 6: REVIEW OF LIBRARY COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES REGARDING OPEN ACCESS

BAIRD JACKSON: Thank you. Thank you everyone. The Library Committee has experienced a busy year and I wish to begin by expressing appreciation to the members of the committee, to those who advised it in its work, and to the BFC leadership for the extra attention that it paid to our efforts. Now, President Terry has taken a – has been extremely supportive of our efforts throughout the year and we want to thank him specifically. The Library Committee began the year with two special charges delivered to us personally and eloquently by President Terry on behalf of the Executive Committee. These charges were to be pursued in addition to our standing obligation to act as a liaison between the Bloomington faculty and the libraries, and to provide a sounding board for the dean of the libraries for her planning and policy development work. While the general report on the state of the libraries is not my focus today, I can note parenthetically that now is an exciting time with many worthy initiatives underway. We did our best to track and support those undertakings which include such developments as the scholars commons and the media digitization and preservation initiative. Our two special charges from the Executive Committee are related. They both involve faculty leadership in forming and implementing scholarly communications policies on our campus. As I noted at the beginning of our work, and as President Terry has also stressed, scholarly communications policy is, if viewed nationally and internationally, a real bright spot in the contemporary shared governance landscape. It's an area in which college and university faculty have developed decisive and significant policies on the issue – on an issue that's at the heart of what it means to be an academic, and that relate to the overall well-being of both the scholarly enterprise and the communities that we aspire to serve. Particularly with respect to the open access policies that I'll discuss in a moment, this is an area in which faculties are either unambiguously in the lead or there's no forward movement. It's a rather striking difference with many other realms of shared governance activity.

Beginning here with the easier of the two special tasks, the Library Committee was asked to contemplate an expanded or changed committee charge. In particular, we were asked to weigh broadening the committee's purview to include campus scholarly communications, activities, and policies, inclusive of scholarly publishing. I'll provide a bit of context for this in a moment.

Our second special charge, as our second charge, we were asked to investigate and weigh the adoption of what I'll call for now an active campus open access policy. Later, if there's interest, I can discuss our current more passive policy adopted by the Council in 2004. We might or might not have recommended such an active policy to the Council after our year of deliberation. I'll flesh out what this was all about in a moment. My core task today is to report on our work addressing these two charges. I'll attempt to do so in a manner that will lay the ground for the Council's future work and I'll welcome questions after an account of our findings. It's important to note that my reporting here represents an effort at characterizing the work of the committee. As an individual, I'm on record advocating for various scholarly publishing reforms, and I'm personally in favor of the kinds of open access policies that have been adopted at peer campuses in recent years. As frequently happens in these situations, there's a gap between my individual hopes and the collective stance of the committee whose work I have to represent. A range of factors prompted the Executive Committee to ask us to reconsider the library's charge since at least the time the Council adopted its initial resolution on open access, B39-2004, the libraries have become more and more active in support of campus-based scholarly publishing work as well as in the promotion and facilitation of open access strategies in general. These factors were relevant to the provost's establishment of the Office of Scholarly Publishing in 2012, and to the ways that the OSP initiative is bringing the IU Press and IU Libraries into closer partnership around publishing. The changing and increasingly complex nature of scholarly publishing, and of scholarly communications more broadly, pointed I think to the appropriateness of a reassessment of how the BFC will track and engage and lead on these issues. The need to assign a committee to pursue our second charge on open access was illustrative of the concern that the first charge raised. The Executive Committee's other charge was more complex, weighing it occupied the greatest amount of the committee's attention this year. Inspired by the adoption of campus open access policies at many peer institutions including most recently last summer the University of California system, we were charged with assessing such policies and with making a recommendation to or not to pursue such a policy for our campus. As President Terry noted in remarks at the most recent BFC meeting, our work ran in parallel with the duplicative deliberations of the Library Committee at IUPUI. I'll happily answer questions about open access practices in general and campus open access policies in particular after my report. For now I just want to say a few of the most basic things before explaining why the committee came down. Open access refers to human practices, supported by digital technologies and legal arrangements for making scholarly works such as articles accessible to readers on the internet without recourse to subscriptions or other financial barriers to the user. This can be done through open access journals such as the one that I edit now with support from the IU Libraries. Such journals represent the so called "gold path" to achieving open access, but they were not the focus of our discussions or the focus of the kinds of policies that we were asked to weigh. Our concern instead was open access that's

achieved through the deposit of scholarly articles and manuscripts into a repository such as IU Scholar Works. This form of open access which runs in parallel to the present day journal system is known as “green open access.” At IUB presently, green open access practices are a purely voluntary affair. I or you can pursue them with library help if we wish, but we’re not under any obligation to do so. On campuses like Harvard – Harvard, Oberlin, Kansas, Berkeley and many others, faculty councils like ours have established policies and put into place associated intellectual property frameworks and technical resources to make such open accesses – open access practices the default expectation. We can discuss the details if you’d like, but we and our IUPUI peers have just contemplated putting such campus open access policy into place – or at least recommending it to the full Councils on each campus. Such campus policies run in parallel to the growing number of open access mandates that have been established by research funders including the federal government. I’ll report on the committee mandate question shortly, but let me cut to the chase on the campus open access policy question, and Herb’s given away a bit of the story already. Whereas the IUPUI policy committee has recommended vigorously a policy to the Indianapolis Faculty Council, my colleagues on the BFC Library Committee have not done so. In detailed written reporting to the Executive Committee, I’ve tried to account for – for my colleagues reservations about the pursuit of such a policy. I can answer questions about this, but if asked to reduce them, these concerns, to a sentence I’d report – I’d resort to citing a concern over the law of unexpected consequences as a key factor in the thinking of some of my fellow committee members. As an individual advocate for such policies, I failed to convince my most vocal and active committee colleagues to join me in my views. The committee is not of one mind as to what to do next regarding OA policy formation for Bloomington. The decisiveness of the IUPUI view, in the hope – in – in – in Indianapolis, that we’ve now heard about, that the matter can be pursued at the UFC level means that it will be back on the Executive Committee’s plate even though some of my committee colleagues would probably just like to see the matter go away. President Terry and President-elect Sherman can speak further about their next steps. It’s my hope that the labors of the committee will be useful in future BFC and UFC work on open access.

On the question of expanding the Library Committee’s mandate to embrace scholarly communication policy, my colleagues on the committee recommended not doing so. Their reasoning is multifaceted and has been shared in detail with the Executive Committee. I can address questions on this point too, but in brief summary I would say that the current Library Committee questions its own ability to adequately address its existing mandate and thus is doubtful of its ability to tackle an expanded one, particularly one that involves expertise rather distinct from that cultivated in the service of the inherited charge. In a recommendation that speaks broad – more broadly to the complex matters of faculty governance reform now before the Council, the Library Committee recommended instead that the Executive Committee enter into an agreement with the provost, such that it begins to nominate faculty members to serve

on the Faculty Advisory Committee of the Office of Scholarly Publishing, thereby achieving the goal of ensuring some BFC involvement in campus scholarly publishing policy formation. Some members of the committee recognize this as an awkward suggestion. It's likely that the Council's deliberations on shared governance reform may clarify how to proceed in situations like this one wherein administratively appointed faculty committees exist in parallel to those established through the representative governance mechanisms of the BFC.

If I may venture a personal view in conclusion I'd like to argue one last time that the issues that the Library Committee addressed are important in a great many ways. We can choose to sit them out but they will be resolved by our peers with or without us. IU Bloomington is a – is in unusual circumstances. As a campus we've demonstrated incredible leadership on a wide range of issues relating to scholarly publishing reform, including our work promoting new technologies and updating our tenure, promotion, and evaluation policies. Our campus leaders, particularly Provost Hansen and now Provost Robel have been outspoken on the pursuit of innovation in the name of the common good and in service of advancing our university. The Office of Scholarly Publishing is one illustration of this commitment. Work being done by our librarian colleagues is another. We also have incredible faculty strength in the underlying research issues at play in open access and scholarly communications debates. These factors in turn foster external puzzlement that we are when it comes to faculty based open access policy development pretty far from the leading edge. I hope that the members of the Council will take up the work of educating themselves in preparation for the wider discussion that I believe the Executive Committee has in mind. Thank you for your attention and I welcome time – or questions if we have time. I'll just note something implied I think in my narrative that this a year in which I experienced what the sociologists call considerable role strain, or role conflict, working to represent my colleagues but also being committed to the issues myself.

TERRY: And as I said previously, Jason carried that off with great distinction, and I actually think that the members of his committee would agree that he did that very effectively. I would add one thing about the IUPUI resolution. While they believed that the IUPUI campus should move forward with – with open access as a policy they also firmly stated that they didn't think the faculty at IUPUI understood the issues well enough to move forward at this time. That – that what they really thought was required there as well was a lot of education. This – sometimes if you haven't been involved in it seems rather threatening to your traditional forms of scholarly publications or to the professional societies of which you are a part, or journals that are your favorites. When many people learn how this actually works it turns out to be quite as threatening as they initially thought it was, but that means that we have to have – if we go forward at all we have to have a lot of education about how this would – would play out. It took, I think, four years for the University of California not only to adopt their policy, but to also educate their faculty about it. We hopefully can build on some of the things that – that Cal and

others have done in terms of what makes a good policy, but I'm not sure we could dramatically shorten the – the educational process that has to accompany any change like this and how we conduct our – our scholarly – our scholarly publications and work. So are there questions?

HORLACHER: I – I'm – I'm really very, very new to this but –

TERRY: That's why we need education.

HORLACHER: Yeah. Is the idea that – that there is a mandate that things that are produced by faculty on this campus become open access?

BAIRD JACKSON: Yeah, I mean –

HORLACHER: And if so, let me come up with a problem case just so – so – to stress the idea out a little bit. I'm from the School of Music and so a lot of what we do is – is – is – a recording is made and is charged for and – so how would that work?

BAIRD JACKSON: Yeah, it's a great case to think with. The central genre at issue in these policies is relatively familiar to most of us, but what happens at the edges is an ever changing dynamic.

HORLACHER: Yeah.

BAIRD JACKSON: So the central genre is the classic scholarly journal article. We know that the forms that article takes – articles take is changing, and there's a proliferation of genres that – of scholarly communication that our colleagues are taking up. These policies though – first I would say that the classic article is the focal genre not books, not films, not musical compositions, or paintings or any of the many other things that we do in the realms of scholarship and creative activity, so that would be the first point I would make. The policies that have been adopted by peer institutions, it's also important to note, first off they don't presume to take in everything, and the second aspect of them is that they – they have variously strong waiver mechanisms by which – in an instance in which complying with the default expectations of your faculty colleagues in this matter is not workable for a whole host of reasons which you don't have to in most policies explain, you simply ask for a waiver, and as an automatic consequence of asking for the waiver are granted it. This in turn opens up other questions like, well, what kinds of teeth would a policy have, and there's some variation around that issue. There's also research on how to encourage compliance with these policies which are still new even at the early – amongst the early adopters. But the thing to – the easiest way to think through it, and it's all about – is to start with the scholarly journal article of the sort that we don't author for pay, and that we usually don't peer review for pay and for journals where

few of us edit for pay, but instead the kind of – the basic unit in many but not all scholarly disciplines is what's at issue. Yeah?

TERRY: John.

WALBRIDGE: I – I looked at this. It seems to me that the basic thing this does is move the cost of producing – move the responsibility for paying for the distribution and I guess in some sense production of the material from the consumer, i.e. the person who subscribes to the journal to presumably the university or the producer. Now, I've looked at the California video and underneath it there was a button that basically said what to do if you're contacted by Elsevier, basically if they're threatening to sue you. So obviously the journal producers are concerned about this. How, you know, this is a very fundamental change in terms of financial structure – article production.

BAIRD JACKSON: There's a lot – a lot of important issues hiding in your question. The – the – one of the reasons why I'm – I'm – an issue that I didn't take up and it's probably obvious to all of you in my report on behalf of the committee, is the various motivations that draw people into supporting these policies. The – the thing that I would note here is that the motivations that underpin these policies are quite variable, and that you can have colleagues who agree on the desirability of a policy but who are adamantly opposed to one another's individual motivations for being in that place. I mean it might be helpful in this regard to just suggest a few of what those motivations are but then come back to your question. If you were to look at the Council's policy of 2004 on open access, which was adopted I think unanimously with – on first reading, because I think it's the last time, ten years ago, that the Library Committee actually brought something forward. It's instructive to know what was on the minds of the Library Committee then. At that point a key motivating factor for many, and for some this is still true, a key motivating factor for the promotion of open access activity and the policy we have on the books that I think very few of us know about, is simply a recommendation to all faculty to learn about this issue and to pursue open access strategies whenever they can. The motivation though that underpinned the Library Committee's position then was one concerned with what we now call the serials crisis, basically the collapse of the ability for even major research libraries to provide anything like the journal literature to their faculty and students, as well as the ways in which the rising costs of journals, particularly bundled journals which is the main way we lease, not buy journals. We don't buy journals to put on the shelf. We lease access, usually temporary access to bundles of journal content. That's the nature of the journal landscape right now, and for those of us who work in book fields we know that the – the growth of expenditures on the journal side, paying more and more for less and less, has basically pushed the books out of the library and thus we have a collapsing book market produced by this, what's known as the serials crisis. Now that was what was on the Library

Committee's mind ten years ago. If you had asked people, well what would motivate you to be involved in open access now, some open access advocates don't even recognize that as an issue they've got other concerns. Whether those are ethical, or the patients' rights, or a whole range of other motivations for making scholarship accessible to those who can't afford to get access to it through a major research library which we're, you know, we're in the lucky 1% of the world's population that can access the literature that we do have access to.

The key thing that I wanted to finish with, besides saying that there's a lot of motivations at play here is that the shifting of costs is not what's present in the day to day work of these policies right now in that what they envision and what they actually are realizing is a kind of parallel distribution process in which for the time being and for the foreseeable future, the journals that we know continue to exist, and what they published are finely copyedited, beautifully typeset we hope, well-marked up, oftentimes digital rights management protected files, and those are the things that the library is paying for on our behalf directly to publishers or aggregators and providing to us. What the library-based repositories on peer campuses are doing is generally providing not that final, published version, but instead the last clean manuscript that you created before you submitted it for type setting, copy editing, and all those things, so you're in essence sharing the final author's version which in technical terms is known as a post-print. That differentiates it from a published version and it differentiates it from a preprint, which is the version that has not yet experienced any editorial interventions, right? Your raw conference paper, your first draft, all those things are preprints. What we're talking about here is the – the final author's version, that's the normative central version, there are exceptions around the edges but when these campuses have policies what they're asking you to do is as a default to make available your last clean author's version for the use of students, the general public, and faculty and others who can't get access to the final published version.

TERRY: In the back?

NELSON: So, in – in an attempt to kind of ground this in a specific case, I look at the three journals that are important in my field and – and found three different policies, and – and trying to think about what a – the university policy might mean. So one of them is already green open access, so that means there's a year embargo after which I can share, and that's a University of Chicago Press, so it's a – it's a big press, so presumably that would comply with any encouragement to participate. One of the journals doesn't have any – any policy at all, so presumably I could get a waiver simply by saying this journal doesn't allow for open access.

BAIRD JACKSON: You could – do you want me to – ?

NELSON: Let me do the third one and then respond. The third one seems to be the emerging norm, which is a hybrid, so either I can publish it as a normally would, or I could pay to make it

open access. For me as a humanist that's about \$1,500. For my science – science colleagues it's about \$3,000 but they can write it into a grant, as a humanist not so much, and so that really, I think, for me brings it down to the ground. Okay, so where does that \$1,500 come from?

BAIRD JACKSON: A lot of very useful stuff in that question. Let's work our way through the list. The first journal that you mentioned you identified it as a journal which has what are known as green – green friendly author policies, which means it is pre-adapted to the environment that I'm describing. You don't have to talk to anybody about anything and you do – you follow the rules with your journal, and you follow the rules with your campus policy and everything's good. The majority of journals in most, in almost every field are in that zone now such that what was very controversial seven or eight years ago is less controversial, and it's – it's a combination of campus policies of the sort that we're evoking here and funder policies which are causing more and more journals just to make their policies compliant so that there doesn't need to be any transactional costs. In the second journal that you describe there's no policy at all and – and that's a shrinking community of journals that fall into that zone, but they exist. There are databases you can use to look up all of your favorite journals in one-stop shopping, it's – SHERPA/RoMEO is the main database that you can find for this, but in a case like this you may want to ask your publisher at the time you would otherwise sign your author agreement to have – to reserve yourself the rights to comply with a policy should you work on a campus that has one. The – the key thing that policy advocates would note here is that by acting collectively as a faculty we strengthen your hand, you're able to say, look I'm an IUB faculty member, or I'm a Harvard faculty member and my colleagues expect me to share my post-print so what's the deal here? It smoothes the transaction. There's another side to this, which is that there are tools that any of you could use today to – to amend your author agreements to reserve various kinds of rights, and the worst thing that can happen to you, and it doesn't happen as often as you might think, is that your publisher says no I don't want to give you those extra rights. I need to take all of your rights away from you in exchange for publishing this piece. So, there's that. And then your final example is a really good to think with because it's the – it's a case which more and more of us are encountering in which the publishing community is, including the large commercial publishers like Springer, Elsevier, Wiley, and Sage, increasingly want in on this new expectation of open access, and – but they'd also like to preserve their business models, and if possible they'd like to do even better than they're doing now. This leads to separate conversations about double dipping in which, you know, your library paid for the subscription, but you paid to make it open access and they have in essence have doubled – increased the amount of revenue. That's a sort of separate case, but everyone would want to know this question of hybrid journals that's a – a subscription journal where you at the article level pay to give open access. As you've suggested humanists find this and one other thing very worrisome. You've described hybrid open access. Keep in mind that these are processes by which it's open

access at the journal, not on a repository entry institution, and that's another way to make your work available, and if you've got the grant funds to do it that's worth considering, but it's not the way that we're talking about here. This is a lot like open access journals in general, and the difference being that you've described what's called a hybrid journal where it's closed except when you pay for your article to be open. The alternative here are open access journals, the majority of which don't charge author fees which is a relief to many humanists, but there are many that – particularly in the sciences that do, such that author processing charges have become the – one of the ways in which larger, fully open access journals make their work – make the business model work, and so that is also of a concern to social scientists and humanists and others who don't operate in big lab, research grant driven fields where those funds could be baked into a grant. The question to ask though about your hybrid journal would be do you still retain the rights to share the post-print, and, you know, more and more journals would allow you to do it, but not all, you know. This is an environment in which it's possible to find a journal that where you want to publish and you can't get everything you want out of the publisher those are the cases in which you ask for a waiver.

THOITS: As I understand it, my publishing in certain journals, my post-print is – when I sign my copyright agreement I no longer have copyright, and so I would never be able to give copyright access or permission, the journal has to give copyright permission for a reproduction or distribution.

BAIRD JACKSON: You've asked the question at the heart of this. What these policies do is – pretend that we were all of one mind, which we're not, and we all fully understood these issues, which we don't, but if we were to today agree to such a policy unanimously, what we would be saying as a faculty to you and to each of us as individual faculty members is that we, as the Bloomington faculty, have an expectation that faculty members will not just sign away their rights, all of their rights in their work, but will retain non-exclusive rights in their work to allow them to do things in the public interest. So, if you were working with the American Journal of Sociology, they would – you – but you were teaching at a school that had such a policy you would be seeking to retain your rights – if you can to enable – you to work within your campus policy. Now, most of the journals that you're working with I believe my intuition is, are already compliant here. In fields for instance where NIH or NSF funding, for instance, are at play, it's rare to find a journal that doesn't let you be compliant with the campus policy, and what you're doing here is in the default setting you're – you're – you are, because you're operating within a campus policy you're not signing over all of your rights, you're retaining some, your colleagues are asking you to retain some to enable you to do various things in the public interest. But you can sign away many of your rights in order to get the thing you want out of your publisher which is the finally produced publication, but it's about retaining some of

your rights which most of us have grown accustomed to just signing away all of our rights in an instance of publishing and so that's what it's about.

TERRY: Other questions? Yes?

SPANG: I'm sorry to speak again, but this is something I care about quite a lot. Like Jason, I've worked with the library to start an open access journal so I support this initiative. I mean, I think open access journals are a good thing. I am not ethically opposed to them. However, I do worry that this whole discussion misses an absolutely crucial difference which is that between commercial publishers and nonprofit university presses, and in my experience those colleagues who generally publish in journals published by university presses, or edit such a journal, are skeptical about open access, whereas those who publish in commercial presses are enthusiastic about it because they see the sorts of ridiculous situation created by the prices demanded by Elsevier. So Jason referred to the possibility of collective action as a faculty. How about we rethink that and the collective action is we say, as a system, IU will not pay more than \$500 a year for a subscription. Yes, okay, we have to cancel the subscription to *Science* or *Nature* for a year, but if we took collective action across lots of different universities to do this, it would be like, say the NHS in Britain putting a limit on what the big pharmaceutical companies can charge for drugs because the main market just refuses to pay for it. So it's just a suggestion of a completely different way to address that serials crisis.

BAIRD JACKSON: Thank you for the extra time. An outstanding set of remarks; they do a couple of things to help my task. One is that they channel some of the concerns of my committee colleagues. I would share many of them. I'm chairing the search of the next IU Press Director right now, and certainly those concerns are very much in the mix. The collective action issue, and of edited journals published by university presses too, the – the collective action question I think is a really important one where I think the Library Committee should do additional work in future years. The trick for all of us to understand is that it's no longer possible to find out what a journal costs. It's just not, and the keyword you need to know here is the term – well there's two. One is the big deal, and the big deal is the aggregation of hundreds of thousands of journals into conglomerations such that we – we don't transact business at the journal level anymore, and the second is nondisclosure agreements such that what – in – in the mathematician – is it Timothy Gowers? – has done some new work around this, probing using freedom of information requests in Britain to find out – the amount that universities pay for any bundle of titles from any one publisher is vastly different for the same quantity of content, but in order to get what you think is the best deal at an institutional level, you've got to sign away your rights to tell anyone how much you're paying for that big bundle of journals such that there's there are – there's tremendous interest amongst our library colleagues in battling this problem, but in order – because we demand of them that they provide as much as possible

as painlessly for us as possible, they're torn between two different problems, right? And some of my library colleagues can speak to this more effectively than I can, but we're talking about in general very large contracts with thousands of journals, hundreds of thousands of articles bundled together in very opaque commercial arrangements such that the efforts that have been made to try to do this thing have had some modest success, but mainly as public awareness campaigns more than effective, you know, dismantling of the current regime.

TERRY: Cassidy?

SUGIMOTO: I just wanted to make a quick note that Bergstrom has done in the U.S. what Gowers did in Great Britain, and if you go to itemfactor.org, you can see a lot of those nondisclosure agreements that have been broken, but I would just make a quick note that the earliest OA institutional policies were situated as we've talked about around a genre, right? That of the journal article, and they're on a platform, and we've implied throughout this conversation the notion that these would go into institutional repositories. I would argue that we could be a lot more innovative than that, and that these can be really damaging. There have been low compliance rates with these policies overall because there's no incentive to put it into an institutional repository. People don't search in institutional repositories, they search for subjects, they search for topics, and there's been a lot of interesting things that are going on not only with archives and SSRN, and other institutional – other subject repositories that you might know, but places like ResearchGate which search RoMEO and SHERPA, like he said, and say, hey, you know, that you can put this up, just press upload here and they've made it quite easy. I think that we're not in this landscape that we were five years for thinking about open access, and thinking about open access policies that look like those that look like those that were under construction five years ago is a really detrimental way to go. I think we are innovative in scholarly publishing and we need to think way beyond what Harvard – Harvard's policy looked like which came out of a very different landscape than the one in which we live right now. So I would ask us to think beyond, sort of, what all policies exist out there right now, but what might the next generation of policies for open access look like.

TERRY: Alright, in order for us to adjourn in about three minutes, I'd like to end this, and again, as you've seen, Jason has immersed himself in this and I'm grateful for that. I would also invite you to contact me if you would like to serve on the UFC group that will be studying this issue because we can do that, and it will be my intent to – to create that group including both faculty and librarians, both academic librarians and professional librarians so we have a group that takes a look at this and – and does so realistically and comes back with – with a combination I anticipate of a plan for education and – and a plan for development – for the development of a policy.

The final item is something that – that we did not necessarily have to discuss. I want your feedback. A memo has been distributed, the bottom part which is a draft charge to the Research Committee. What I'm planning on doing is creating a small committee immediately, as soon as the semester ends, to gather background research for a larger group that we will create in the fall that will study how to review shared governance on the Bloomington campus as recommended in the strategic plan. I've got some members who've sort of agreed to serve on that committee. I'm waiting a bit. Once the elections for the BFC president are done, I will invite the President-elect to serve on this, I want to make sure that we have some people from team faculty, I've got somebody here in Higher Ed here at the School of Education who would serve, I had some other volunteers. I don't think the committee this summer should make decisions or recommendations. What they need to do is gather a lot of information that will make the study of shared governance in the fall by the other group more useful, and I've given you things that have occurred to me that we would want this committee to gather. Please take a look at this. If something seems inappropriate or wrong let me know. If I've forgotten something that you think it would be useful for this group to gather let me know, and – and we'll be able to revise this.

Finally, if I may be allowed just a few closing comments. This is probably my last meeting as the president of the Bloomington Faculty Council, I don't think we have a need for an emergency between now and July 1. So my term on the Council will end. Jim Sherman will become president July 1. As Jim has mentioned a couple of times he's got some back problems that have come back a little bit. They may affect how much of the job, or how he approaches the job in coming months. Jim and I have been in – in discussion, basically what I've agreed to do is that as soon to be President-emeritus, I will step in and help Jim do what has to be done and – and so we'll – we'll get the work of the Council done working collaboratively over whatever period of time is required in the coming year, and I look forward to that. I've known Jim for a long time. We can work together very effectively. A review of faculty governance may be taken by some of a criticism of your work and the work of the Council, I hope it isn't. You've worked hard this semester, this year, and I want to express my gratitude to you, to the other members of our committees who are not members of this Council, as I said last time to Provost Robel for her working with the Council. We don't have an ideal system for shared governance, but we have one that – that we can – we have one that we can improve, but we have one that is also not truly failing. It – it occasionally works reasonably well, and it works reasonably well because of – of the energy of the faculty who at present choose to be engaged in it. So I wanted to thank you all for your work for the Council this year, and wish you a happy, productive summer, and I will see some of you on the Council next year because the President-emeritus remains a member of the Council next year. With that I think we're adjourned. [applause]

MEETING ADJOURNED: 5:30PM