

Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
September 18, 2012
Indiana Memorial Union – State Room East
3:30 P.M. - 5:30 P.M.

Attendance

MEMBERS PRESENT: Abhijit Basu, Lyudmila Bronstein, Bonnie Brownlee, Carolyn Calloway-Thomas, LaNita Campbell, Gracia Clark, Shu Cole, Marion Frank-Wilson, Jeffrey Gershman, Thomas Gieryn, Donald Gjerdingen, Cassandra Guarino, Vivian Halloran, Jason Baird Jackson, Bruce Jaffee, Peter Kloosterman, Eugene McGregor, Michael Morrone, Maresa Murray, Jeff Nelsen, John Paolillo, Dot Porter, Deanna Reising, Augustin Ruta, Matt Semadeni, Sandra Shapshay, Jim Sherman, Grant Simpson, Marietta Simpson, Sarita Soni, Rebecca Spang, Sonya Stephens, J. Kyle Straub, William Swanson, Herbert Terry, Peggy Thoits, Pat Thomas, Julie Van Voorhis, Barbara Vance, Edward Vasquez, John Walbridge, William Wheeler, James Wimbush

MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT: Sherri Michaels (Stacy Konkiel), James Perry (Ted Miller)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mike Conway, Gregory Demas, Pnina Fichman, T. Scott Herring, Robert Jacobs, Dan Knudsen, Jennifer Laherty, Lesa Hatley Major, Patricia McManus, Michael McRobbie, Michael Ogden, Elizabeth Raff, Edwin Ramos, Lauren Robel, Bret Rothstein, Lisa Sideris, Adam Szczepaniak, John Tafoya, Frances Trix

GUESTS: Alan Bender, Craig Dethloff (Faculty Council Office), Jamie Feldman (Faculty Council Office), Roger Levesque, Judith Ouimet, Laura Ridenour (Faculty Council Office), Michelle Sokol

Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/minutes/12-13/09.04.12.pdf>

2. Memorial Resolution for Peter Lindenbaum:

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/12-13/B5-2013.pdf>

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

4. Question / Comment Period¹ (10 minutes)

5. Healthcare Update (20 minutes)

(Dan Rives, Associate Vice President for Human Resources) [DISCUSSION]

6. Update on Online Course Questionnaires (30 minutes)

(Presenters: Professors Bill Wheeler, Alan Bender, Ted Miller and IUSA Representative Jarad Winget; Respondents: Vice Provost Tom Gieryn, Assistant Vice Provost Judith Ouimet, IUSA President J. Kyle Straub, Vice Provost Sonya Stephens) [DISCUSSION]

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/policies/OCQ.pdf>

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

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/12-13/aux/TableX1.Items.OCQ.pdf>

Minutes

AGENDA ITEM 1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Good afternoon. We delayed the opening of the meeting for a few minutes in order to allow individuals to find this room because we just found out that we had been switched, so that explains why we're starting at 3:32PM. Provost Robel will not be here today, so I have the honor of using this gavel, feeling the gavel today. So the first item of business is for the approval of the minutes. Could we get a motion to approve the minutes?

UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER: So moved.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Thank you. All those in—

COLE: —Second.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Thank you. All those in favor of approving the minutes, please signify by saying "aye." [Aye] Those opposed, please say "nay." [Silence] The minutes have been approved. First—second item is the memorial resolution for Professor Peter Lindenbaum. Tom?

AGENDA ITEM 2: MEMORIAL RESOLUTION FOR PETER LINDENBAUM

GIERYN: Peter Lindenbaum's final publication appeared in December 2010, the year in which he died, as the lead essay in *The Library*, a prominent journal in the study of the history of the book. In "Publishers' Lists in Seventeenth-Century London," an essay which Peter thought was

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

the best he ever wrote, he shows how the printed lists with which publishers advertised their books can serve as guides to communities of political and religious affiliation whose members patronized the publications of certain booksellers and met in their shops. Peter had much more to contribute to this rich and expanding realm of literary and historical scholarship. His book on how Milton helped to change the profession of authorship by moving from a tradition of patronage to a market system in which writers and publishers negotiated contracts will remain unfinished. But his last essay properly stands as a fitting culmination to his long and steady study of literary forms and traditions and of the book as both an index and an agent of social connection and change.

Peter Lindenbaum earned bachelor's degrees at Harvard (1960) and Cambridge (1962) before entering study for the doctorate in English at Berkeley. He completed that degree in 1970, but he had already come to Bloomington as a lecturer in 1967. In these first decades of his work he wrote essays about how important writers used important literary genres and forms: Sidney and the pastoral, Shakespeare and the romance, Milton and his Puritan practice of the epic. Peter's book on Sidney and the status and meanings of the pastoral – *Changing Landscapes: Anti-Pastoral Sentiment in the English Renaissance* -- -- was published in 1986, an exercise in "sane, serious, and humane scholarship," in the judgment of the readers who recommended the book to its publisher, which exhibits "the values of hard, active, engaged work."

At the beginning of the next decade Peter opened a new topic in his study with two essays whose titles suggest the ground onto which he had moved: "John Milton and the Republican Mode of Literary Production," and "Milton's Contract," the latter essay published in a law journal. (Peter was very pleased by that placement.) He continued to lecture and write on the formal aspects of the writing of Sidney, Milton, and Shakespeare, and several of his earlier essays on these topics were reprinted in collections of literary commentary. But in the years before and after his retirement in 2003 his heart and first energy were given to studies in the history of publishing in late 17th and early 18th century England, not just the publication of writings by Milton, but also the publication of music and of sectarian religious tracts and commentary. He lectured frequently on these topics, in the United Kingdom, Canada, and Italy as well as in the United States. And he continued patiently and methodically to dig into books, pamphlets, and historical records to find and organize information about how English writers and publishers did business, and what their business had to do with the literary, intellectual, and religious cultures of their time.

The meticulous habits of his scholarship mark all of Peter's professional work. His management of a departmental committee awarding fellowships and teaching assistantships to graduate students, for example, has been described by one of his colleagues as "the stuff of legend." He became a master of putting together packages of financial aid, and he diligently pursued

promising candidates by letter and telephone. (Had e-mail been available in those years, his screen would never have been dark.) Year after year during Peter's conduct of the committee, about half of the applicants whom his colleagues thought to be most promising came to Indiana, and even those who did not went away impressed by the persistence and particularity of Peter's attention: "You are a very persuasive man," one such student wrote, and he suggested that if Peter ever left the academy, "you might well engage in nuclear reduction talks."

Outside the Department of English Peter worked hard in the Bloomington Faculty Council ("one of the four or five indispensable members of the BFC," one of its faculty presidents wrote); on the campus honors program ("the most valuable of any faculty member with whom I have worked as director of the Honors Division"); and on a series of committees whose members and chairs praised his "sheer energy and hard work," his "Puritan intensity," his capacity to "think clearly, argue cogently, and listen tactfully," his skill at playing the role, as one colleague put it, of a "gadfly with a memory." Peter did especially important work in the revision (twice) of the procedures by which faculty members lodged and prosecuted grievances. After the death of William Riley Parker, a distinguished Milton scholar, Peter almost singlehandedly arranged that part of his library be housed in the Department's conference room for use by colleagues. He helped to revive and reorganize the interdepartmental program in Renaissance studies, and before his retirement he was one of the founders of a still-active faculty-graduate student seminar in the history of the book.

Peter thought of himself as a demanding teacher, in part because he and his students read complicated literary texts, but mostly because he required a lot of writing and responded to it with characteristic thoroughness. He devised schedules of writing assignments which moved undergraduates through increasingly advanced modes of study and thinking so that they were not always replicating the habits of understanding that they had learned from his lectures or the tactics that had earned them good grades on previous essays. The teaching assistants who worked with him in undergraduate lecture courses consistently praised him. A piece of the lore of the department was his custom of asking one of his colleagues to dress in the costume of a bear, enter the hall while he was lecturing in the big undergraduate course in the plays of Shakespeare, and chase him from the podium, thus dramatizing a stage direction in *The Winter's Tale*, "Exit, pursued by a bear." He taught in the departmental honors program as well as all along the standard run of historical surveys of literature and courses in the writing of the English Renaissance. In addition to graduate seminars in the topics he was writing about, he sometimes collaborated with colleagues in seminars on the study of style, Milton and Wordsworth, and courses in Renaissance studies. In 1995 he was the first faculty member in English to teach in a summer program in London which enrolled undergraduates from Indiana

and several other universities, and the director of the program wrote that the strength of Peter's teaching had set the standard for the faculty members who followed him.

After Sheila Lindenbaum, Peter's wife, retired in 2005 from her fruitful career as a teacher and scholar of medieval literature in the Department of English, they spent most of their time in London, where they continued to write and lecture. Shortly before he retired Peter received a departmental award for excellence in teaching, and after his retirement he was awarded a Mellon fellowship to support research for his book on Milton and the profession of authorship. He received other recognition during his career: an NEH Younger Humanist Fellowship when he was just starting out, fellowships for study in the Folger Library and in Venice, an appointment as a visiting fellow of the Institute for English Studies in London, research grants from both the American and the British Bibliographical Societies. As his friend and a collaborator in some of his many enterprises, I often thought that he did not receive the recognition that he deserved. But he kept on patiently putting together the pieces of the work he cared about, and before he was done he had created institutional and intellectual structures that still stand, from the Parker Library and the seminar on the book to his essays on authorship. Mary Burgan, his colleague and department chair, wrote about him, "he has given consistently and ungrudgingly to our common enterprise." Those words, especially the last two, precisely honor Peter Lindenbaum's contributions to his profession, his discipline, and his academic community.

Be it resolved that this tribute to Peter Lindenbaum be presented to the members of the Bloomington Faculty Council, that a copies be sent to his widow, Sheila Lindenbaum, to the office of the University President, and to the Department of English.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Will the members of the Council please stand for a moment of silence in recognition of our esteemed colleague, Peter Lindenbaum? [Silence] Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM 3: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Today, I have a few updates to share with the Council. First, members of the BFC Executive Committee met on September 11th, and continued to focus on key things we might do to bolster the work of the Council, including providing a best practices document with specific recommendations that all of you should have. And, in a—let's get this done as efficiently and as effectively as possible—vein, members of the BFC Executive Committee, I have provided what we consider to be a sensible mechanism for doing this, and so this year, with a new moderator status, council members will be able to post messages to their constituents, hear from them, and provide direct feedback. And I want to congratulate members of the Council because I understand that some of you have already begun to implement some of the practices that I outlined in the document "BFC Procedures and Best Practices." So, I thank you, and we hope

that such encouraging and reinforcing efforts will be sustained throughout the year, and in years to come.

Second, please recall that in my remarks on September 4th, I noted that one of our major goals is to bolster the work of the BFC committees, and in that regard, members of the BFC Executive Committee have crafted a document that we're still pruning and varnishing, but it should be available pretty soon, and we think we will have some pretty lovely ideas to share with you with regard to that.

Third, with regard to an external-information-gathering-stay-informed-as-much-as-possible front, president-elect Herbert Terry and I attended the meeting of the Indiana Commission for Higher Education, which met at IUB last Friday, September 14th. At that meeting, President McRobbie addressed the group and talked a great deal about important topics such as elevated student enrollment numbers at IU, our comprehensive efforts to educate students about debt, online course initiatives, and academic transformations that are occurring on campus. For example, we talked a great deal about the transformations that occurred with regard to Informatics and SLIS, and the new schools of Global Studies and Public Health. I'm happy to report that President McRobbie emphasized, in a very clear, emphatic, and energetic way, his commitment to the IU faculty, "the core of the university," to use one of his favorite phrases. President McRobbie reiterated what I have heard him say again and again in both private and public meetings, and that is his fidelity to the proposition that faculty members are keys to a great university, and that we must do all things possible to attract and retain high quality faculty. He also talked about other matters such as monetizing parking, which you will hear more about in weeks to come.

Following the president's comments, higher education commissioners discussed parameters and procedures for on time completion of undergraduate degrees, student debt load, and financial aid reform. And it was very invigorating to hear the faculty representative, Professor Kent Scheller, who spoke before the Council on September 4th, remind commissioners that they had set the grade point average for successful completion of gateway courses too low, at a D. Yes! I was stunned as well. Commissioners pledged, however, to correct the matter, and will probably revise the grade point average for gateway courses up from a D to a C+ or maybe a C-, possibly a C.

So as a consequence of having attended that meeting, I was really just grateful that we have a faculty member on the Commission who is really in tune to what's going on, and looks out on our behalf.

Fourth, on Wednesday, September 12th, Provost Robel and I went over to the new School for Public Health, and had a lovely chat with members of that faculty. As you know, they are

grappling with the issue of whether to have an internal search for the new dean, or whether to have an external search for the new dean, and as a consequence of the meeting that we had, I have received some written as well as spoken comments from individuals indicating that the meeting was very productive. We will be having an internal search, and I understand that the search and screen committee will be formed as soon as possible.

Finally, this morning, I met with members of the parking operations committee, and we edited, for the last time we hope, the key contract terms to consider for Indiana University parking privatization document. That document will go to members of the Board of Trustees for their October 11th meeting, and after the members of the Board of Trustees have had an opportunity to vet that document sufficiently, we will know whether we will privatize parking at Indiana University. So I invite all of you to remain attentive to information with that regard. This concludes my report to the Council. The provost, as you can see, is not here today, but I should be happy and members of the BFC Executive Committee and Craig will be happy to answer any questions that you might have that we can answer. Yes?

AGENDA ITEM 4: QUESTION / COMMENT PERIOD

TERRY: As you—as you mentioned, Carolyn and I attended the Higher Education Commission in this room Friday, we didn't have the chance to coordinate. If I may, I'd like to expand just a little bit on some other things that emerged from the meeting because I was able to attend parts of it—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —That's right, I was able to—

TERRY: One thing that came up repeatedly [indistinct comment] IUSA is the Commission now administers much of the state of Indiana student financial aid. SSACI used to be independent; it's now been folded into the higher education commission, and it's become apparent that for many institutions, including IU Bloomington, the expectations last summer that we give a discount or something like that in hopes of substantial summer enrollment didn't pan out. It appears as if one of the major reasons for that is that many forms of federal and state financial aid cannot currently be used for summer. The feds can't—the state can't do much about the feds, but my impression was that the Commissioners came away thinking that they make a certain recommendations to the General Assembly, changes in the law, so that state forms of financial assistance may become available in the summer for Hoosier undergraduates at least, and I would assume that would be good if it happens, so I would then encourage maybe our student members here who could get on top of that issue a little bit, and lobby the Commission now because they seem to be pre-disposed to fixing a problem that was repeated several times that afternoon.

The second thing I hope that we all track relates to something I explored with Professor Scheller, the state's performance funding formulas. Basically, let me summarize how this works. Nobody, I think, is really assuming a major increase in financial support from the state in higher education in the coming biennium. The formula that the higher education commission proposes would essentially tax each higher educational budget—remember IU has nine higher educational budgets—tax each educational budget by a certain amount, take the money away, and then redistribute it to the higher educational institutions based on the Commission's assessment of performance. And as we learned last time, the Commission has a laser-sharp focus on rewarding progress to on-time degree completion and persistence for first-time Hoosier, not out of state, but Hoosier undergraduates. It has, as the moment, pretty much a one-size-fits-all formula for doing this. Last year, the IU Medical School did not fare especially well under that formula because, if you think about it, they don't graduate any first-time Hoosier undergraduates, and the Commission, recognizing that the health budget at IU didn't fit the formula, has taken it out and is going to be doing something else this year with regard to recommendations for the School of Medicine. At the moment, however, it continues to treat every other state institution and every subcomponent of that institution, in our case every IU campus, the same with the same formula. As I explored with Professor Scheller last time, we are different, so is Purdue. We have a research mission that occupies a lot of our attention and we think is important. We also offer a great deal of non-undergraduate degrees, and we teach a lot of non-Hoosiers, and so we tend not to do very well under these performance formulas.

We actually have two members of the Commission for Higher Education. We have faculty member Professor Scheller, and we have a newly appointed representative of the 9th Congressional District who was at the meeting some of the members are [indistinct comment] Congressional District [indistinct comment] IUB and IU Southeast. I explored with him, to some extent, the question of whether the Commission might make its formulae more mission-specific. In other words, look at the differences in the missions between Ivy Tech and IUB and Purdue West Lafayette, and see if it couldn't come up with something a little more finely grained, and reward institutions for performing their missions more broadly rather than for simply turning out more Hoosier undergraduates on time. And he indicated to me, although he's a very recent appointment to the Commission, they had had internal discussions about that, and it came up several times during the afternoon meetings. I would simply hope we continue to track what the Commission is doing there. I would second Carolyn's comments about President McRobbie's presentation. Another thing he forcefully did when asked by the Commission of what could it do better, was to say recognize that institutions like IUB have research missions and reward them for it, and so I would hope we would continue to pay attention to that, and, you know, encourage our two members who have some connection to us to pursue that information and see if there can't turn out to be a better formula for all of the state's institutions according to the state. That's the only thing I would add—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —Well, thank you. My counterpart, Jack Windsor, and I had a meeting with President McRobbie last Thursday, and I thought you might be interested to know that we should be hearing from the president in terms of Vice President Neil Theobald’s replacement, so we don’t know at this point whether there’s going to be an internal search or an external search, but we’ll keep you informed with regard to that. Are there any other comments or questions? Yes, Straub, I think I saw your hand first?

STRAUB: Sure, I was just wondering if you could elaborate a little bit more on kind of the evaluation process for privatizing parking. So what exactly were—what exactly was the process in deciding, you know, the pros and cons ultimately before concluding within the document that you’re presenting to the board.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Well, what the members of the parking operations did was to invite Ice Miller, an Indiana—Indianapolis law firm, to come up with a key contracts document. So no decision has been made—

STRAUB: —Right—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: In terms of whether we’re going to privatize parking or not, but rather we’ve just begun an investigative undertaking to see what are the parameters—

STRAUB: —Yeah—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —what are some of the potential consequences, and where would that lead. So, we should be a bit careful about saying that a decision has been made—

STRAUB: —Right—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —it has not been made, but I think it probably will be made if it’s in the best interest of Indiana University, and I think if there’s a big pile of money that—

UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER: —It’s nice—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —Members of the Board of Trustees will say, yes—

STRAUB: —Right—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —we’re going to do this because as I indicated the last time this body met, the university believes that some of that good faith money might be used to expand the faculty and do some marvelous things for the students. So we’ll have to wait until after October 7th, after the members of the Board of Trustees meet.

STRAUB: Right. I wanted to know—um—kind of looking forward, if there were any negative implications that ultimately privatizing parking would have on student life or faculty life. I know that there have been rumors of having potential increases in cost of parking passes, of parking tickets, just parking operations in general, and I wanted to know if there were any other implications that have come up?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: No, we were careful in the document to protect the interest of students in terms of where you might park for special events—

STRAUB: —Okay—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —for example. We were careful to protect the booth on Seventh Street—

STRAUB: —Okay—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —between HPER and the Student Union—

STRAUB: —Right—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —to ensure that we have a dynamic flow—

STRAUB: —Okay—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —and that students will be able to move in and out, and let folk run inside the Union and conduct kind of business that is required—

STRAUB: —Right—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —on short notice, so I think that that committee has been very thorough—

STRAUB: —Okay—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —I have been very impressed by how—how careful, how meticulous, and how dedicated members of that group are—

STRAUB: —Okay.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: So, I believe that you'll be pleased.

STRAUB: Thank you.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Yes, I'm sorry, Paul, you had your hand up? John, I'm sorry. John?

PAOLILLO: Thank you. Um—I was curious about parking as well. Whether there's some point at which there will be some discussion before this body regarding questions of privatizing parking or is that just going to be done without any connection to—to this group at all whatsoever. I'm concerned because a lot of the communication that has taken place so far has been either fairly minimal through this forum, or through the press, and there are a lot of things, you know—and the thing about the press, too, is that you have to go and find it—a lot of it. It is very difficult to—to—to know what you're getting as well in terms of the quality of information, and there are a number of things that were reported that raise concerns—concerns like about a fifty-year timespan, concerns about a—no adverse activity clause, and things of that nature. And I think those things would be very deeply concerning to the faculty at large.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: I'm pleased to say, on your behalf, that it's precisely the question that I put to Neil this morning, and he assured me that after members of the Board of Trustees have had an opportunity to talk about the document and to—turn the course of action that they will take, it will be at that point that the document will come to the various faculty, so we will all have an opportunity, from what I've been promised, to scrutinize that document as carefully as possible. And I—I must say that I came away from the two meetings that I attended feeling hopeful and confident that Neil and his—his committee members really did take their work very seriously, and they are trying to be as transparent as possible, but you're—you're right to keep our eyes on the prize here, so thank you. Yes?

JAFFEE: I have also a question that relates to process. In the meeting that you had last week with President McRobbie about Neil Theobald's replacement, did you advocate for a process that would have a true search process that would be dominated by faculty?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: I didn't put it in those terms, but we did encourage the president to have a search. We didn't push whether external or internal because we don't know what that search is going to be like.

JAFFEE: Well, given the history of senior positions under the current president that are made unilaterally, did you think that a position as the CFO of this campus should be a pure presidential selection?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: No, I do not.

JAFFEE: And was that made clear to the president?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: I did not make that as forcefully as I possibly could have, primarily because I—I don't know, at this point, whether he—what he's going to do.

JAFFEE: He probably does. [Laughter]

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: And—and perhaps he does, but—shall I put—say this? No, well—okay, I'll just leave it at that. I'll be diplomatic. Yes?

CLARK: I guess we're concerned that many of the inputs that faculty are supposed to have seem to come after the decision has been made, which is obviously not optimal.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: I agree with you, and so one of the things that you can do is to send a note to me, and that will give me some force, and some power—more power that I can use to say to the president, 'There is a groundswell for A, B, or C.' So, if you will take it upon yourselves to send me a note indicating what your wishes are with regard to that, and I will do my very best, and I know members of the Executive Committee will push as firmly and as vigorously as possible to acknowledge and carry out the wishes of—of the faculty because in every setting that I've attended, that has been the spirit of the representatives of—of the Council, but you make a very strong point, and that is there is a history here of top-down as opposed to bottom-up, in some cases, not in all instances, so thank you.

JAFFEE: Well, would you appreciate a—a vote in that regard here that—from this Council, if only just an advisory form rather than sending individual emails to you?

UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER: Yeah, that's right.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Yes, if you'd like to state it, yes. Put it on the table. On the floor.

JAFFEE: Well, that the sense of this Council is that whether it's internal or external, the search process for the new CFO of the Bloomington campus, or the university—whatever—should be open and have a committee that's dominated by faculty.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Is there a second?

UNKNOWN MALE SPEAKER: Second.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Okay. All those in—oh, we'll open it to discussion. Is there—yes?

WHEELER: I think the appropriate title is Chief Financial Officer of the University. [Indistinct comment] Neil is not just on the Bloomington campus—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —That's right. This is—which raises another very important strategic, tactical question, and that is whose jurisdiction is this? And we can take a vote, but it is also an issue that should come before the UFC as well as the BFC. So I just wanted to make that. Yes?

WIMBUSH: Carolyn, I think it's important to note that given the composition on the campus with regard to diversity that in order to ensure that we have an applicant pool that is diverse

that we need to often look outside the university, so to limit it to an internal search, I think deprives us an opportunity for increased diversity.

ALLOWAY-THOMAS: Thank you. Yes?

SIMPSON: I won't quibble over the word dominated by faculty, but I would like to add a friendly amendment that staff also have representation on this.

ALLOWAY-THOMAS: That is typically done when there is a search and screen committee, we normally have representatives from staff, representatives from faculty, and representatives from students. So, that's part of our constitutional authority, as members of the Council.

MILLER: Carolyn?

ALLOWAY-THOMAS: Yes?

MILLER: I just like to make a comment about this. Neil—Neil Theobald has been a rather unusual Chief Financial Officer for Indiana University in that he is a member of the faculty, and—now I'm not sure how the rest of you have felt about this—but I, personally, can say that I have slept much better over the period of time that Neil has been in that job, and I would really hope that the president would consider continuing on with a person of that type in that role. I think that has been of immense benefit to the faculty of this campus of the university, having somebody in that job that actually understands what we do and need.

ALLOWAY-THOMAS: Okay, thank you. Other points that—comments that should be made? Call the question? All those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye. [Aye] Those opposed, please signify by saying nay. [Silence] The ayes have it. The motion carries. I will take that groundswell to the president. And we'll keep you informed. Thank you. Yes?

TERRY: I'd also recommend that we share it with Jack.

ALLOWAY-THOMAS: With whom?

TERRY: Jack Windsor.

ALLOWAY-THOMAS: Oh yes, absolutely.

TERRY: And, just as BFC has adopted procedures that make it more nimble, the UFC has done so. I would hope we would urge the UFC to consider the matter, and if that means they do it through their Executive Committee, and don't do it through a meeting until we have one scheduled, that would be, I think, also an important thing to make to the president.

AGENDA ITEM 5: HEALTHCARE UPDATE

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Thank you. I believe we have exploited all the time that we should allocate to question and comment period, and we have in the room Associate Vice President Dan Rives. Dan, would you come forward please? Over the summer, members of the UFC Benefits Committee met regularly, and Dan kept us informed of changes and policies and programs that his office is implementing, and today we invited him to come and give us an update. Thank you for coming, Dan.

RIVES: Do I have to swear in or...? [Laughter]

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Yes, you have to say the oath. There's a password you must have.

RIVES: So, something we're passionate about in healthcare is parking. [Laughter] The—as—as Carolyn mentioned, the University Faculty Council Benefits Committee has met all summer long. I think you'd be quite impressed with our monthly meetings, and my update may be a little redundant for those of you participating in that group. We thought that today you'd like to have an update on the negotiations between Premier—and if I say IMA or Premier, they're the same—and Anthem, and so I can give you a little background, maybe talk a little about Premier and IMA, and then talk a little about Anthem, and see what questions you have. Can you hear me okay?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: And Dan, you might wish to put that mic just a bit closer.

RIVES: Thank you. This is not unexpected or unusual. Throughout the state, there are healthcare providers, sometimes whole systems, negotiating for different reimbursement rates. Last year up in Indianapolis, it was Saint Francis, so Saint Francis dropped out of several networks, and eventually came back in, and before that it was probably Saint V's, and if you go back far enough, you'll find Bloomington Hospital and SIRA in town, and the pedi—maybe not the ped's so much, but you'll find providers throughout the state going through a process of positioning and negotiating for a change in the reimbursement schedule.

It has gotten more different—difficult in Indiana because of our state laws. Indiana has a state law titled Any Willing Provider, and, I don't recall the actual date of inception and when it was passed, but essentially it says to all the managed care companies, you have to let all the providers into your networks as long as they agree to your fee schedule, and you can't discriminate for or against those providers.

So, that's a little bit of the backdrop in Indiana. Anthem is a company we use to access their provider contracts throughout the state, and Bloomington, Indiana—and some of them come down to Bloomington now—Bloomington we have three large provider groups. There's the IMA or Premier Healthcare, there's Monroe Hospital as a provider group, and a—another group is the IU Health Southern Indiana Physicians group. So in Bloomington, Indiana, we basically have

three provider groups, and currently they are all members of the networks we use for our healthcare plans, and we talk about Anthem—they all three get paid—the professional services are on the same schedule, as well as IU Health Indianapolis, and the primary care doctors in Fort Wayne, in Anderson, in Kokomo, you get the picture. So, essentially, because of the Any Willing Provider legislation, Anthem, as well as United and Cigna and so forth, they have a single fee schedule for physicians—not for hospitals; that law only applied to physicians, by the way.

In early 2012, Premier let Anthem know they wanted an increase in reimbursement, and Anthem duly said, 'We can't give you an increase in reimbursement; we can't discriminate in favor or against, and, by the way, any increase we give you is passed directly onto the employers, and the employers are asking us to keep the costs down.' In—on April 30th—excuse me, if I look at my notes to make sure I get my dates right—Premier then provided a letter to Anthem indicating they would drop out of the Anthem network. This is a very common process. Ask for something, you don't get it, so I'm going to drop the network and you begin negotiations. The letter that Premier provided to Anthem was such that they would terminate from the network effective November 30th. So effective December 1, if nothing else happens, Premier—IMA—would not be in the Anthem network.

Premier is looking for a very significant increase in reimbursements, and I only get this part second-hand, because technically I'm not supposed to be involved in the negotiations, and I'm not—and we're not—I mean, this is between a group of providers and a third party, but I believe that it's somewhere between, you know, like a fourteen, fifteen, sixteen percent increase per year over five years, and that's a lot. Anthem's response is, okay, first of all, the Any Willing Provider agreement, they are providing Monroe County physicians the same rate; they're providing IU Health Southern Indiana Physicians the same rate; and they can't give IMA a higher rate without giving everybody a higher rate. And, by the way, that fee schedule is not a fixed fee schedule. It's something that does adjust over time, and I'm not sure it goes up or down or sideways, but it does—it goes up a little bit. I will give you one other insight—and I'll say this loud enough so you can read it in your minutes—the reimbursements for physicians in Indiana is higher than our adjacent states. So, on average, if you take a look at the—the reimbursements, you know, there's like four, five, six office codes. If you take on average that reimbursement actual covered charges compared to Kentucky, as an example, maybe you don't want to do that, but, you know, it's like a twenty percent higher reimbursement rate, and it's higher than Ohio, and it's higher than a few other states that we're aware of so, you know, from a competitive posture prospective, as an employer, when I look at reimbursement rates, I'm not really anxious for Anthem to pay anybody more on a fee for service basis. And I will say this, that anything that gets paid to providers that's more, that's an—that's an expense to our employees, and—and I'm really guarded about that these days. The university, as you know,

has fixed the budget, and—and so everything above that six percent gets passed on to employees, and so I feel very sensitive to those increases.

So Premier has given notice to Anthem. They're going to drop out of the network, effective November 30th. They want a sizeable increase in reimbursement. Anthem is saying that's not really going to happen. And, for a while they weren't talking at all. As an employer, as a large employer in Indiana—or of this area—I went to both Anthem and to Premier, and said look, you should talk. At least spend time talking and seeing if you can figure this out. You know, I—I have a hard time saying, 'and pay Premier more.' That's—you can see how difficult that is when you get IU Health, Southern Indiana Physicians in the same town, and you can imagine who would be calling me if I did that, but anyway they are. So they are talking.

I suspect we will not hear much over the next month. And if this goes like the other negotiations across the state, we'll get to somewhere in November and hopefully they'll reach an agreement. Hopefully, my desire, is that IMA, Premier—who—a very large portion of their business comes from Anthem members, Indiana University is a huge portion of the population. The county government uses an Anthem-type plan. The school system uses an Anthem-type plan, and many small employers. And—and so you would—you would hope that the provider, at the risk of losing patients, would say, well, we want to really stay in the network and keep our patients, but I—I really don't expect we'll hear a lot more. I—I get disappointed that the positioning in negotiation takes place in the newspapers, and with you—and with our—with my family, too. So, you know, there's a lot of let's play on the emotions. Go talk to your employer and ask Anthem to pay us more, and you're smart enough, you know that that's not IU, that's you paying them more, and then—I think—and then timing this—though they missed the timing. I mean November 30th is after open enrollment. If you were really timing this right, you'd plan it in the maybe in October time frame when emotions were the highest around open enrollment, not after open enrollment closes. A lot of employers will, especially small employers, will do open enrollment very quickly toward the end of the year. So, that's the background, and for those of you on the Benefits Committee, it's the same report from the last time we met.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Do you want to say anything else?

RIVES: I'd be glad to, but—let me see if there's any questions regarding—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —Yes?

SHAPSHAY: Yes, the way you—you phrased the options, however, strikes me as—as—there's a—there's a kind of false dilemma involved. So, you said that either the IMA Premier folks back down, or that everyone is paid—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Could you speak—speak up a bit more—?

SHAPSHAY: —Or all the providers are paid more, and that cost is passed on to the employees or to IU, but there's another option, actually, which is that Anthem could actually absorb the extra costs as well. So, CEO compensation is astronomical at Anthem, it's possible that they could actually reduce that, and pay their providers more.

RIVES: So, the young lady's point is that, why can't Anthem pay more as opposed to charging the membership, in essence? Well, we are totally self-insured. So I don't even buy reinsurance from Anthem. I don't buy one dollar of insurance from Anthem or any third party. So, we reimburse Anthem for all the claims paid, and in a fee for service environment, any additional payment to any hospital, physician, prescription drugs, ancillary, comes right to us. Anthem is not a—it doesn't insure or guarantee or warranty or absorb anything. We do pay them an administrative charge to process claims, and—and customer service, and appeals and so forth, and it's a fixed rate or a capitated rate, but there's no mental—middle person of Anthem absorbing any claims here. This is all—every dollar my office wire transfers several millions of dollars to reimburse for claims every week to Anthem, and there's not—so Anthem doesn't play a role—as if it was insured though. Now, if it was insured, of course we'd be paying a lot more, but then Anthem maybe could make a business decision, but—and it's not just IU here. Remember, this is—this is a network that many members and employees are—are part of, and—but, I don't know, I'm probably getting a little long winded, but—but, you know, I hear that sometimes, why not cut the—Anthem is a—and those of you who know this better, please help me—is a public company, and they have shareholders. In fact, in the newspaper, when you read about their CEO recently resigned, evidently the shareholders were a little—they were displeased with the performance of that company, but—but, anyway, we are totally self-insured.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Sarita, please.

SONI: Dan, how much has the administrative charge—that Anthem charges us changed over the past five years.

RIVES: Oh, very good. So the question is, we pay a fixed dollar amount, and I'm trying to remember the number. It's somewhere in the thirty-five, thirty-seven dollar range for claims, customer service, network, utilization management, a whole continuum of services. Some years have been going up zero, and more recently like 1.2, 1.5%. So it's a very small rate of increase, which is pretty standard. That—I mean, the—the—that part of the business is getting more electronic, and the overhead expenses there are not increasing anywhere near the cost of the actual claims. So you wouldn't expect the overhead to go up that—that fast. And it doesn't.

COLE: So you mentioned that the probably not—the agreement is now going to be reached until the—sometime in November, which is probably after the open enrollment, so what does that mean for us, for what when we do the open enrollment then?

RIVES: Yeah, it's a very good question. One of the reasons I really almost despise—I don't know if that's a good word, but I really don't like the timing in issue. Your decisions about your healthcare plan choices will have to be based on what you know and we know. And—and we have to close the open enrollment process on November the 16th. I'm looking at a draft letter to go out, and we have seventeen thousand employees university-wide, and there's a lot of activity between healthcare plans, tax saver benefits, health savings accounts, non-smoking affidavits. So all that has to come together, and we really need to do that—close that before Thanksgiving, so we can get all the files prepared to the vendors, ID cards issued, and so forth. There's a lot of cleanup. There's several weeks of cleaning up the air on the reports and so forth. So we don't have any choice but to look at our open enrollment on a—on a window that—that right now we're scheduled to close November the 16th, and so I think we're going to have to make our open enrollment decisions based on—based on the healthcare plans as we know them. It is—in Bloomington, we have four healthcare plans; three of them use the Anthem PPO network. And the most popular plan is the High Deductible Plan with the health savings account. One healthcare plan, the IU Health Quality Partners Plan is non-Anthem, and, right now, Premier is part of that network.

There are some interesting things going on, and for those of you familiar with this field, you'll—I think you'll know what I'm talking about. St. Vincent now has taken over the management of Monroe Hospital, and so, all of a sudden in Bloomington we have two significant competitors. Now, Monroe Hospital before wasn't Monroe Hospital. Not—it's a good hospital, but IU Health Bloomington Hospital is a major hospital, and now that St. V's, who's a huge competitor of IU Health, comes into town, that sets up some interesting dynamics in the next couple months, if not couple years, and it'll be interesting to watch this marketplace.

So, I don't know if I really answered your question very well. I hope I gave you some insights. So, if I didn't, maybe you could ask me another one?

COLE: Well, but when is the open enrollment material going to be finalized that's going to be distributed to the faculty or, you know, staff?

RIVES: Good question. Open enrollment material, I'm actually looking at a draft of *The Informed Employee*, which we hope to go to the printer in a week's time. It takes about two weeks to get it out. So that would be very early October, and in the second or third week in October, the booklet, coming out to employees. And open enrollment's all done online, and the open enrollment period is from November the 5th to November the 16th.

COLE: So Premier Health is not included as one of the network—the network providers in this document?

RIVES: Well, Premier is included until—unless—if they don't make any change, they're still in the network until November 30th. I should say this, the contract that all the physicians have with Anthem have a clause for continuity of care, so there may be individuals who have—they're in a process of—I don't want to say of delivery, but of approaching delivery, but—and then there's care for neoplasms and cancers and so forth. So there's a—there are provisions in these contracts where, for certain care, and you want to keep that continuity, provider has to continue that relationship for the duration of so many months. So—so for some of our members who are being treated by a Premier physician, even if Premier drops out, there's some protection there.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Ter—Herb? No, I'm sorry, did you have your hand up—Ruta, did you have your hand up a moment ago? Alright, Herb?

TERRY: Don't we have any ability to turn to Anthem and say, 'Okay, here's the deadline by which we must tell our employees their choices, and you have to finalize that by that deadline. If you don't, IMA will not be a part of this?' Or whatever, it sounds to me like our deadlines don't mean anything to these parties.

RIVES: Let me repeat, it was Premier who gave a letter to Anthem and said, 'We are dropping the network on November 30th.'

TERRY: Which suggests that their contract with Anthem didn't bind them through the one-year period that our employees sign up for.

RIVES: Yeah, and as I said, I think that doctors plan it to—

TERRY: Well, can't we, as the person who purchases all of this, turn to these providers and say, 'Here's the deadline by which A) we must know who's in and who's out, and B) whoever's in, has to stay for a year absent some truly extraordinary circumstances.'

RIVES: Yeah, I'll think about what you're suggesting, and it might—in general, what you're suggesting, we don't manage the network of third parties the—and so United, Anthem, they're managing the network on behalf of many more lives than even IU. I mean, we're talking about millions of lives in Indiana, even though we have lots of lives, and lots of leverage, we're not the big dog in this game, and so— and so I can—I can push and prod and call and suggest, but I can't—I don't control the contracts. We don't control the contracts between and provider groups.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Are there other questions, comments for Associate Vice President Dan Rives? Thank you—

RIVES: —Thank you—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —for coming. Dan, there is a site, do you have that address readily available—the site, the benefits site, you know, where individuals can go and find information?

RIVES: Sure, yeah, the website, I think it's straight forward, it's, of course the w's, HR backlash e-d-u?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Craig has it. Yes, why didn't I ask Craig?

DETHLOFF: Yeah, it's <http://hr.iu.edu/UFCBC/index.html> [Laughter]

RIVES: So, you're talking about the Faculty Council?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Yes because we—

RIVES: —Yeah—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —because we—you've been posting information on there about, you know, decisions that have been made, policies that you've been implementing, and I just wanted to make sure that members of the Council know about that site and can consult it.

RIVES: So, a shortcut, if you don't mind, would be go to the University HR website. Look for the box that says "University Faculty Council Benefits Committee," and you'll find the material.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Thank you so much. Shall we break or shall we continue? Continue? The last item on the agenda is the Online Course Questionnaire, and I think Bill will be pleased today to know that we had a vote. Bill Wheeler, you're one of those individuals who says the Council must have a vote on something.

WHEELER: What...what...?—I'm not sure what we have a vote on though?

STEPHENS: We've had a vote.

WHEELER: Pardon?

STEPHENS: We had one already.

WHEELER: Oh, we had one.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: No, no, no. We're talking about the fact that—maybe that's an inside story, so go on.

WHEELER: Okay.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: We know that we've had a vote on the Online Course—

WHEELER: —last spring—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: --Evaluation—

WHEELER: —last spring—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —but Bill has said, just to clear the air, Bill's point is that a fully functioning Council should always vote on something.

AGENDA ITEM 6: UPDATE ON ONLINE COURSE QUESTIONNAIRES

WHEELER: My mantra is a meeting without a vote is a wasted opportunity. So, thank you. So, but I'm not here to talk about vote, I'm here to—from the EPC to lead a presentation to you—

GIERYN: Put the—Ted, maybe if you slid down, you could get closer to that mic. Thanks.

WHEELER: Is that better now?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Yes.

WHEELER: Thank you.

GIERYN: Move a little closer, Bill.

WHEELER: A little closer, yeah. How's that?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: That's fine.

WHEELER: Except I need to move the chair. So, as continuing members of—of this Council will recall, the Council had discussed procedures for online course evaluations at several meetings last year, and at the last of the meetings adopted a policy on online course questionnaires, which you have on the table in front of you. The BFC Executive Committee asked the Educational Policies Committee to provide this Council with an update as to what has happened since last April, and look ahead for this year. Now we have a plan for our presentation today. I'm supposed to do introductory remarks for two or three minutes, and then Alan Bender, a member of the EPC, is going to discuss another document you have before you, one that relates the campus common questions to published research on dimensions of instruction and student achievement. He has five to seven minutes for that. Ted Miller, who is also a member of the EPC and a former president of the Council, will then speak to the rationales and the importance of the rationales. Then one of our student—IUSA student representatives, Jarad Winget was

going to speak. He's ill today, so I'm going to say a few words on his behalf, and then during the response period, IUSA President Straub is going to fill in the details there. And then after the members of the EPC finish their presentations, the official respondents, Vice President Gieryn, Vice President Stephens, Judy Ouimet, and the IUSA president, will speak to fill in gaps, comments, suggestions, criticisms, and then they'll—all of us will be able then to respond to questions from you.

So again, then, more about my part, then, so developments since last spring include that a request for proposals for software to run the online course evaluation system has been published and distributed to relevant software companies. They're expected to submit their proposals by sometime in October. Dennis Groth, who couldn't be with us today, is going to chair a committee that evaluates these proposals and selects a software system to use. They expect to—that committee is expected to do its work during October and November, with the goal of having a system selected by the end of the semester. Now, of course, since it will only be selected at end of the semester, it will not yet—it will not, in fact, be available for use this semester.

Next, pilot testing of the campus common questions has continued through last spring and the summer, and Associate Vice Provost Ouimet has a questions committee. That committee has been in charge of these—of these pilot tests, and they will be submitting a report of their—of the pilot test and the results they've had from focus groups and things like that. A preliminary indication is that they found that all of the questions that were on the pilot test last year were to some—to a significant degree, independent of one another, each of them getting at a different dimension of teaching.

Now next, third, although the—the online questionnaire will not be available for use this semester by faculty, nevertheless, deans and chairpersons have been informed that, in accordance with provision one of the policy we adopted last year that says, "Online course questionnaires will be administered in all courses," that—that—that—that faculty instructors will be expected, this semester, all faculty and instructors will be expected to conduct student evaluations this fall. It's presumed on paper if they're not in the pilot test itself.

Next, let's see, implementation of the online course evaluations. Once the software becomes available, is going to be done gradually, beginning with a coalition of the willing. Complete implementation is expected to take several years, and we may not have the final thing implemented until the spring of 2015. Now, in accordance with item number six of the policy adopted last year, the EPC and FAC will be advising Vice President Gieryn—Vice Provost Gieryn and Vice Provost Stephens concerning the campus common questions that a consultation will go on later on this semester and the beginning of next semester we think. In accordance with item five, clause number five of the policy adopted last spring, this Council will have to vote to

approve the student return questions which are going to be put together by the—sembled and brought to first, presumably the Faculty Affairs Committee, the EPC, and then to this Council by the Vice Provost after receiving suggestions from IUSA and other sources, but this Council has to vote on the student return questions to approve them.

Now in anticipation of those last two items, namely the consultation on the campus common questions and the approval at some point in time of the student return questions, together with the possibility that the EPC may prepare a yellow paper, yes, a yellow paper like this—a yellow paper on the selection questions for use by—to advise departments and schools, and individual instructors on selection of their questions to put on it, the EPC has been considering various aspects of questions. And in particular, then, it's in that context that I want to turn first to Alan Bender, who's on my right, to discuss this chart that he has prepared relating the campus commo—the current proposed campus common questions to some research on teaching and student achievement, and then to Ted Miller to discuss the importance of the rationales that appear on this sheet. So I'd like to turn first to Alan. Alan, why don't you come over here?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: That cord won't go any further.

BENDER: Yes, so, it is written that to gain tenure and to be promoted, one must be judged an effective teacher. Okay, that is written. Also, it is written that departments and schools shall generate a teaching merit score for each of their faculty members every year. It is written. Okay, so enter center stage, the end of semester online course questionnaire. One of these handouts lists the rationale for the different items, and notice at the bottom of this page it says, "The information in this document is copied from an Executive Summary..." created last year, "by the OCQ Task Force Ad Hoc Item Subcommittee..." So that's where all the information on that form comes from.

The other form, this table, this is pretty much just copied out of—copied from a table from a book chapter written by Kenneth Feldman that was published in a book in 2007, and what Feldman was trying to address in this table, in the left column of the table is this question, how do different dimensions of instruction correlate with student achievement, and by student achievement, he's talking generally about using end of course exams. Okay? So that's what student achievement has to do with. And the dimensions of instruction, those are categories that Feldman came up with for classifying items that were on student ratings forms from different institutions, so he came up with various categories. Different—sorry, various dimensions of instruction. Alright, so—so the question is how do different dimensions of instruction correlate with student achievement? Feldman reviewed a bunch of published studies that had been conducted about that question, and then he calculated average

correlation coefficients that had been obtained and reported in all these various studies, and these studies were done mostly in the 1960's and '70's, I think.

Alright, so, you can see the right column of this table, it's an attempt to line up the online course questionnaire items with Feldman's dimensions of instruction, and I guess the last thing I want to say about this is that it's easy to poke holes in studies of this sort that try to correlate responses to items on student ratings forms with student learning. I mean, it's just, that's a hard thing to try to figure out. But, nevertheless, this table might help prod us to consider further how we might want to define effective teaching, and to then consider what roles the online course questionnaire is meant to play in judging whether or not teaching is effective. So should I open up to questions, or...?

WHEELER: Why don't turn to Ted?

MILLER: Oh, let's see now.

WHEELER: He's going to speak to the rationales themselves.

MILLER: Thank you very much. I appreciate the opportunity to be here today. I don't have—I don't have a great deal that I really want to say, I just want to emphasize the idea that underlying the questionnaire that is under discussion, is a document, and I'm not—I'm not sure, you know, how widely shared that document—you know, how widely shared it has been, but to me it's a very fundamental document in trying to develop a questionnaire of this sort. Essentially, it is a—it is a, and I think what we have here, Alan, if I'm—if I understand—I mean—

WHEELER: —This is a—

BENDER: —This copies that.

MILLER: Does it copy all the text in that?

BENDER: There was an introduction to this, but this has the rest of it.

MILLER: Yeah, I haven't really looked at it for a while now, but the effort in these rationales is—is basically to explain, you know, why it is that a particular question would be chosen to be put on the survey, okay? So there's a—there's a discussion of what, you know, what is a—well, what Alan refers to as the dimension of instruction. What are we talking about? A paragraph. Now, based on that paragraph, it—it seemed to me, as we talked about this a year or so ago, that there are any number of different questions that might have been chosen to represent that dimension, if you will. Clearly, particular choices have been made by the task force that's been involved in—in doing this. Whether those—whether those choices are the, you know, are the best possible choices that could be made, well, maybe—maybe not. The evidence of the,

you know, of the various test or trials that we're doing will answer those questions. But certainly over time it seems to me quite possible to envision a situation where the—where the particular questions could change. Indeed, it seems to me that overtime, you know, the—the dimensions of instruction that we focus on could change. Along, you know, and along with an accompanying rationale for whatever the new version might be. I don't necessarily see this as something that necessarily is going to be fixed in concrete, you know, this year, going forward. I hope it won't be, in fact. But—but I think—I think the rationales are extremely important because, you know, I've been around here for a long time.

I've been involved in lots of discussions of, you know, teaching evaluation, trying to formulate, you know—I mean, this used to be done in each school. Each school had its own approach to this. In SPEA, we used to have a little faculty committee that would get together every once and a while, and talk about, you know, what the—what survey questions should be, and my experience in that regard was always that, you know, that faculty members came to the table with a particular question that they thought was the best question, you know? They had favorites, right? There was never really any discussion of what the underlying stuff was. It was just that, you know, these are the questions we like. So, I'm, you know, I have been very enthusiastic about the idea of sort of focusing on this notion of dimensions of instruction, trying to explain what that is. What it is we think faculty members should be trying to do. As I say, I don't—I don't think we necessarily, you know, have, you know, have the final, the final answer here, but—but I think this is a very important sort of process that—that the faculty of the campus has really never engaged in. And this is clearly one of the really important activities on the campus, alright? And I—and I'm just very pleased that this is—this is kind of going—going the way it has gone.

Now, let me say one other thing about these rationales. Another—there's another reason why I think this is very important. It—it's very clear to me that there are faculty, in fact we've heard in the Educational Policies Committee, we've heard faculty who are members of the committee say, looking at the questions that are on the sheet, you know, 'I just don't think these questions really get at what I'm trying to do. I've got a different idea about teaching.' Well, and I'm sure—you know, I'm quite positive across this university there are perhaps a lot of—a lot of faculty members who, you know, who—who just have a different idea about this. My feeling is that—that if the Faculty Council will sort of put something like—we'll kind of adopt something like this—with a set of rationales, right?—this will provide a basis for faculty who really view their teaching in a different way, to be able to develop an argument about—about what it is they think they're trying to do as opposed to what this says that the typical faculty member perhaps should be doing. And I think that will be a very valuable thing for faculty going forward, trying to develop statements about what their—what their—what their teaching style is, what their—what their philosophy of teaching is. It'll give them a basis for saying, 'Well, look, you know, you

guys may think that this is what's important, but I think that this is what's important, and this is what I'm trying to do; this is the evidence that I've got that I'm doing it well,' and this essentially provide an alternate sort of argument for success in teaching—effective teaching, whatever it be.

So I—so I think that this document serves really two purposes. It really provides kind of the—maybe the typical, you know, what—you know, what the literature might suggest is the case, but it also gives a framework for people to really evaluate what they're doing, and maybe take—go down a different path, and have a—and have a basis for knowing that they're on a different path, and knowing that they've got to develop an alternate argument.

WHEELER: So at some point we—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: — May we mindful of time so we'll give the members of the Council an opportunity to talk.

WHEELER: Yes, so I was just going to say, you know, so the Council will be hearing more from us on those thoughts during the year. Jarad Winget couldn't be here. He has reported to the EPC that—that IUSA has been engaging with the items with Judith to—on what some of the student return questions might be, and that the IUSA wants to work closely with the Council and with the EPC, and with the administration to develop these questions. So with that I'd like to turn to our official respondents, and ask them if they have anything that they would like to add. So, at this time, Tom, do you have anything you want to add at this point in time?

GIERYN: I'd like to thank members of the EPC for working with us on this very important step. We value greatly your input. We are, at this juncture, proceeding with the plan that was outlined last spring. I think this is a useful update for the Faculty Council, but we're really *in medias res* right now both with the solicitation of a vendor, as well as the ultimate development of items, but we, again, are valuing the incredibly thoughtful suggestions from members of the committee.

STEPHENS: I'd like to just reinforce what Tom's saying by—by saying that the meeting that we had with the EPC recently was enormously helpful; the ongoing dialogue that will go on in the subcommittees looking at the items and in the selection of the software will be absolutely critical. We've had Faculty Affairs Committee input in this as well, and we really appreciate that. We—the next stage is to—just some of the questions, it was determined, should be in the hands of the schools and the programs and the departments and individual instructors. The next stage is to see to what extent these campus-wide questions meet the needs of the school and College tenure—schools and College tenure promotion and tenure committees, too, so that we can hopefully have some overlap between those requirements, and so to—reinforcing

what Tom has said, we're still in the process of seeking that feedback, and it'll us a little while, but of course we'll have meetings to do that.

WHEELER: Do you have any comments? Judith is chair of the Items—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —Tom wanted to—

GIERYN: —Footnote: the Council recommended last spring, when we considered this policy that we consult more carefully with the schools before proceeding. We're involved in that process.

WHEELER: Thank you. Judith is chair of the Items Taskforce. Judith, do you have anything to add?

OJIMET: Other than I really do appreciate everything that the EPC has been doing and Ted, your comments, they really strike home. We are spending a lot of time with these items we've done—researching them, providing rationales for why these items are important, and we plan on doing the exact same thing with the student return items, testing them through the focus groups, so the items are interpreted by the students in the way that the framers had intended. So, they're not just pulled out of the air. We have been doing a lot of research on them, so...

WHEELER: Now I'd like to ask IUSA President Straub if he would like to—if he has any comments he'd like to add.

STRAUB: I'd just like to say that on behalf of the student body, I'm super excited to have these—these questions actually go live, and have us be able to fill them out at the end of each semester. I think having them consistent across all of our classes will be invaluable. Having—having that information available to some of those questions online is also going to be incredibly helpful for students. You know, right now, many people—many students base some of their class decisions on just looking at grade distributions or going to ratemyprofessor.com, and, you know, they're just—they're not the best resources, and I feel like these questions are—are so unbelievably thorough, and, you know, they've done the due diligence in figuring out the purpose of each question, and I feel like they're really going to provide really, really great information for students. So I'm just—I'm very excited.

WHEELER: We'd be pleased to try and answer any questions you may have.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Jim? And then Walbridge? Yes, Jim, we're on?

SHERMAN: What I'm going to say is nothing new. It stems from the Feldman data on correlations, and I've seen other more recent data that verify, and it basically says if we could do the following experiment; take the same faculty person, keep the teaching constant from

semester to semester, but simply alter the grade distribution so that it varies up to a full grade point. The higher the grade point average, the better the evaluations. It's [indistinct comment]. No doubt about it. And this creates a lot of problems for people who tend to be hard-ass as I am and won't give in, it probably matters, but for me personally, at my stage at my age, it's not an issue, but if I were an untenured faculty member, it would certainly be an issue. I really like the law school approach, and that is that for most courses, as I understand it, faculty are constrained to meet a certain grade point average. I doubt that we could do it within the College or in other schools as easily, but I think it suggests that while questions like this can be useful, I think it's really important that we have other ways of judging faculty teaching, and not to replace, but certainly to supplement, and I hope that the committees will incorporate those, and look into serious ways to do such evaluation.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: John?

WALBRIDGE: My understanding is that where online evaluations had been tried at other universities, the response rate has dropped very substantially. So from, I suppose, the A+ range that I've generally seen here to 50-60% range, and that means in many or most cases, we're not dealing with results that are statistically significant, particularly since there is no reason to believe that the question of who responds is entirely random. What measures are being taken to ensure either that the response rates stay high, or that statistical significance is taken into account?

WHEELER: Let me say one word and then call on some others then. So, questions like this have of course come up before. It's my understanding with regards to the second part of your question about respondents, that the—the system—the request for proposals did include a clause that the system has to be able to make available the list of students who responded, not identifying any responses, but—assuming that you have enough—so you can't just say that, you know, if you have a handful, you don't want—you know, that would perhaps compromise things, but, you know, if there are a fair number of respondents that it would be possible to have a list of ones who responded. Now, it's also the case, though, that we have been told that, in fact, the response rates in the pilot test have held up, so Judith, do you want to speak to that on the response rates you've had in the pilot test?

OUIMET: Sure. I've done two pilot tests, and I had about 75—70% and 52%, and my 52%, if I took out a college that was capturing data from students twice, the response rate was up to close to 60, and I also did an analysis on a question that you both kind of mentioned with regard to who are responding, and the concern of having a bimodal distribution where the students who are A students, and the students who are not doing well are the groups that you're getting, and I have found that that's not the case. It's skewed towards the B to A+ range; we do have a few F's, but the C group is the smallest group of participants, but it's pretty

comparable to the grade distribution. So you're getting a good representation of students, now granted the smaller the class, the statistical significance with seven students, all you have are seven students in your class and five respond.... I mean, that's just the nature of the beast. You're not going to have the—um—you don't use statistics on those seven students.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Sonya wishes to respond, and then Peggy has a question.

STEPHENS: So, in the pilot studies we've done, we've found what they research at other institutions experiences is borne out, which is that although the number of returns may diminish slightly, the quality of the responses holds out and there's no significant difference in the data that you receive from a smaller sample, so it doesn't necessarily invalidate the online version. However, one of the things that we've been very concerned about from the beginning is that we put in place incentives for the students to complete the questionnaires, and, you know, some—some institutions have gone the route of saying, you know, they give you early registration if you fill out your course questionnaires or whatever. What we've talked about is the extent to which the student return items will be available to students may depend on their willingness to contribute to that bank of information, and, therefore, that is an incentive for the students who want to know about courses to participate in filling out their course questionnaires. So, we have had conversations about that. The evidence is that the quality of the data is not compromised by this, but it's something that we're continuing to work on, will be a critical part of the RFP and the software selection.

WALBRIDGE: Will the pilot—will the pilot study be reviewed in this way before the whole thing goes into effect?

STEPHENS: Will the pilot study be reviewed...?

WALBRIDGE: To see whether these problems exist or not.

STEPHENS: Absolutely. I mean, and we've been doing it consistently from the very beginning. We've been looking at that sort of data, and Judy, and I don't know if you want to say a little bit about that, too...

OUIMET: Well, I've also sent out for any faculty who participated in these previous two pilots, I have requested they fill out a survey about the reports that I have sent them asking them some—to give—give us some input, and many of the faculty have indicated that the open ended responses are much more informative in the electronic version versus the paper version.

STEPHENS: And—can I just add that a critical piece of this that both of you—I mean, you may be getting 85% in your paper questionnaires, but overall, that is absolutely not the case. Before we began this process, we looked at the—the validity of the data that we already receive,

which we, you know, have some belief in right now, and have a lot of store by and found that the—the rate of return was far inferior to that, particularly in large lecture classes, well below 50%. So...

OUIMET: And the other research I've seen is initially the response rates drop, but as students, in fact, did get accustomed to having these surveys, the response rates go back up, and the quality of the responses are—exceed what they were in the paper.

STEPHENS: A critical piece of this debate had been, just to remind the Council, a critical piece to the debate we had last spring, was that if—that if faculty wanted to do this in their classrooms, we would actually be mindful of that, and develop it along—on platforms that could be used by students, such as their cell phones, or—so, you know, it's possible that, you know, that you wouldn't have any difference in the way in which this questionnaire was taken. It would just be done on an electronic device rather than on paper and a desk.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Peggy? Yes, Peggy, it's been a while, and then Cassandra.

THOITS: I'm starting to get the sense of what a student return question is, but could somebody explain what a student return question is? Because I'm—I'm unfamiliar.

WHEELER: So the student return questions are questions where the—a statistical summary of the results would be accessible to members of the university community through a login-protected university site.

THOITS: I see.

WHEELER: So, in particular, students themselves would be able to see the results to those questions as well as academic advisors and instructors themselves. It would, you know—so, that was the—yes?

THOITS: And this is a subset of all the questions that are asked?

WHEELER: Yes.

THOITS: Okay.

BENDER: But it's none of these.

WHEELER: So the student return—

THOITS: [indistinct comment]

BENDER: —None of these are student return.

WHEELER: The campus common questions are intended for use for personnel decisions and perhaps university research, and—and, therefore, are not public—are, you know, they are not accessible even by the members of the university community in general. So those are the campus common questions. There will be some Gen Ed Committee questions. There will be school questions and instructor questions, which will be accessible only—and department questions—accessible only to the school or the department or the instructor himself. And so, the student return questions are a completely different set of questions that—where the results are—the intention is to make it available to the members of the university community. There are some—still some perhaps legal questions about how this going to work, and—and the Executive Committee and EPC and the FAC will be looking at some of those details later on as the semester goes on, but that’s the intention. And so, the IUSA has—has, you know, an initial list of ten—ten or eleven questions together with some other ideas. The EPC submitted six possible questions to the Vice Provost and to Judith. They may be receiving suggestions from other sources as well. So during the course of the semester the questions committee is going to work with all of this input to try and identify the student return questions, which are of most interest to the students, give the students the greatest benefit, and which are consistent with university policy.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Cassandra, and then Shu?

GUARINO: Thank you. I was just looking over these items, and I—I just—I was wondering about two different things. First of all, with regard to the items, I’m not sure we’re getting at the sort of notion of how much did you learn with these items. So I’m wondering if there’s any consideration to types of questions that might get at that. I mean because it might be that somebody doesn’t like somebody’s teaching style, but actually really learned a lot, and so it’s not maybe coming out on this too well. But that was just one minor point. The other thing I wanted to ask about is, is it appropriate for us to consider protections for faculty in vulnerable situations with regard to these—this type of feedback? For example, I’ve seen tenure cases come up with people having seven new preps in five years. Is there something that can be done where people who are teaching a class the first time, you know, are not—evaluations are not taken into consideration or something, you know, that helps faculty be more protected. And, you know, to the point being that we want to have—we want to improve teaching overall, I mean that’s the rationale behind all of this, but to do that, also, I think it means that faculty have to be given the ability to teach classes over and over again, and have certain protections in place.

WHEELER: So a first response to that. So, you know, those concerns or what lead to the differentiation between the campus common questions and the student return questions. You know, it’s supposed to be that the campus common questions are ones for which there are

privacy provisions and various protections there, and, of course, in tenure and promotion cases, you know, the—the candidate always has the ability to explain things. There’s also a provision here that, in the policies adopted last year, the instructor will have the opportunity to perhaps explain some of the results, if there’s some reason to be concerned about it. There’s also a provision that—that there will be no student—there will be no data provided for the student return questions during a—during the first year of an instructor’s teaching here. That is to say, that the student—answers to student [indistinct comment]—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —Bill, please use the mic.

WHEELER: [Indistinct comment] I’m trying to also look at her, I’m sorry. Okay, so—

GUARINO: That’s alright, I can hear—

WHEELER: —So the—to try and protect the instructors at the beginning of their career is this provision that the data for the student return questions would not be made available until after—until the third semester of teaching. So that would affect—protect new faculty and AI’s and things. There isn’t any protection for the first time you teach a new course, so I don’t think there’s any—been any discussion—

GUARINO: —that’s what I mean—

WHEELER: —So we appreciate that, and at least with regards to tenure and promotion, then, you know, then, you know, that of course the department, in fact the department and the instructor get to write material for the teaching assessment, you know, it gives them—it gives them an opportunity to bring to the attention of tenure and promotion committees that this is the first or second time the instructor has taught a course so—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —Tom wishes to address Sandy’s question as well.

WHEELER: —perhaps I should turn to Tom.

GIERYN: This is a very important question. Two points to make. First, is that online course questionnaires constitute a fairly small proportion of the overall documentation of teaching effectiveness. When we review promotion and tenure dossiers, we’re looking at an abundance of materials that gives a very rich picture of what faculty members are doing in the classroom, including the number of courses they’ve taught, the number of repeats, the number of new preps, peculiarity if there are certain sorts of courses, some in some departments particularly quantitative courses are reviewed and thought of differently by students than other types of classes, so we do have that additional information that I think is really important to have. Second is, we—we, the campus and various offices of the vice provosts, run enumerable workshops both for faculty at various stages in the tenure and promotion process, as well as for

department chairs and associate deans, emphasizing proper, let's say helpful, strategies in terms of assigning courses. It's not always possible for faculty members to get the course that they want to teach but, for example, one of the things that we both emphasize in terms of the VPUE and my own office, is that instructors need to be given an opportunity to repeat classes because only then can we see that they have the opportunity to learn from problems that may have arisen, make changes, and demonstrate some improvement. Without repeats like that, we can't understand that we've seen the faculty member not only willing to engage in improvements, but seeing that those improvements are effective. So I think we're working on that. It would be a sad case indeed if a faculty member were constantly asked to prepare a new class without any opportunity to repeat and show improvement.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Sonya, and then Shu.

STEPHENS: Just one more thing about—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —and then John—

STEPHENS: — this, which is really for one of the reasons, and I'm going to speak for Tom, and he—which has been motivating this all along is that precisely where you have those situations where a faculty member has multiple preps. You can actually compare data if you have common campus questions across the campus [indistinct comment], but it's much easier, then, to explain it, and to talk about it in a consistent way, and that's one of the motivating factors here.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Shu?

COLE: Well, I just need some clarification on these items, the one—the nine that's presented here. Are these the common—campus common questions?

WHEELER: Yes.

COLE: They are.

WHEELER: They are the—these were the campus common questions for the pilot test.

COLE: Right, oh okay. So in here the policy, online questionnaire policy number two, says that, "Aggregate data from campus common multiple-choice questions..." which is, "(no more than four) will be delivered to instructors," that we'll use. So which—were they going to be limited to four picked out—so what is?—I'm just trying to figure out what is what.

GIERYN: As I tried to indicate in my first remarks, we are in the middle of the game, and it is been very clear to me, and in consultation with the items committee and with the EPC that the decision by the Council to restrict the number of campus common items to four may not be in

the best interests of our ability to measure teaching effectiveness. When we sat down to try to cut from the seven fixed questions, and then we had the two open boxes at the bottom, we couldn't decide which ones to cut. They were, to use the language that both Ted and Alan presented, measuring different dimensions and we didn't see that we could rank order those dimensions. Remember where we started. Generally speaking, up until we've begun this process, the judgments for promotion and tenure purposes relied on two questions; the generic, how-good's-the-instructor and how-good's-the-course question in some wording. We didn't learn anything about what made the course good or what made the instructor good, so that what we tried to do with these campus common questions was begin to identify the dimensions that would feed into good course, good instructor. We got at seven, not because that's a magic number, we had, at times, longer lists. We pruned it down. We found we really could not prune it down any further without losing some insight into what made a teacher effective. When the Council passed the limitation on four, it was out of a concern that any more than four would, in effect, eat into those questions that could be developed by instructors, by departments, by schools. There's an obvious outer limit. We can't ask fifty questions. We might be able to ask twenty questions. As I say, we're still working on this, Shu, and I think if we could reduce the number without a loss of insight, we would. At this point, it's appearing very difficult, and that's something that we are consulting with the academic deans in the schools to see whether they agree. If they uniformly and consistently come back and say, "Let's toss number three or six," we'll give that strong consideration, of course.

COLE: But I don't think that I'm necessarily proposing that we should cut out these questions *per se*, but I'm just thinking about the other sets of questions that's going to be coming along with these because especially if we're going to have a set of student response—student return questions, and maybe school-wide, or departmental-wide, but I'm thinking about maybe when we're developing these, should we be cognizant of the other sets of questions we're going to be possibly thinking about. So that we know we won't be burdening students with fifty different questions about this particular class just because it's going serve for different purposes

STEPHENS: If I may—absolutely. And I think that this is a—this is a whole package, and so far we only have one of the parts that's even been tested. We're thinking about a very small number of student return items, and the critical piece here, I think, is that online course evaluations—questionnaires—are used for self-diagnosis. They are used often to help you think about your teaching and improve your teaching in ways that are meaningful for you as you reflect on it. We don't want to remove that, but we also want—in fact, what we want to do is to enhance it and we hope that any software package that we acquire, will enable faculty to develop mini questionnaires, mid-terms, that will—will give them absolute freedom to do that kind of diagnostic questionnaire with their students that would not then be part of the tenure

and promotion process, but would be absolutely about self-improvement and self-reflection. So it—it's part of a much broader package, which we haven't yet been able to discuss, so...

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: John, followed by Ruta.

PAOLILLO: I have a number of comments. I will try to be brief. I have tremendous—as we embark on this really large project, I have a tremendous amount of disquiet about this project and how we're approaching it. I have already spoken in this Council about my disquiet about the online dimension of it, and so I will refer people to past minutes for those comments. I will not repeat them here. Just taking the material that we have in front of us, the—the—starting with the rationales. This is very difficult for me to get through this. I haven't had a lot of time to spend on it. I get very, very stuck on the very first question, and the rationale that's given for the first question. As I read the question, "*How clearly were course learning goals and objective communicated to you?*" it is very different from what is stated in the rationale, where the rationale says, what we really want to know is did the course have a syllabus, and did the syllabus contain these things. You don't ask for somebody's opinion about that if that's the evidential piece of information that you're interested in. And so I'm not really sure that we've actually really thought through what it is we're doing when we state the rationales for these questions.

Second, the other piece of information that we have with the correlations on it, the statistician in me is just seething and writhing about this because it is just so patently evident that we don't have the first idea how it is that this data should really be analyzed. I know that—and I will acknowledge that I am not cognizant of the research in this area—but I can enumerate for you maybe half a dozen really important dimensions of variation. The grade spread being just one of them, but the instructor, yes the first time versus subsequent preps of a—of a course—the nature of the course, whether the course is required, cohort groups of students, okay, all of those things are important. If you actually manage to get these into a model to analyze this, it would be a tremendous achievement in the first place, okay? So the lack of a model—the lack of a real understanding about how this data will be used, we'll look at what? We'll look at correlations, we'll look at z-scores or something like that, and we'll make something up. We'll make up an interpretation, because that is what people do with these.

And the last thing has to do with Tom's comment regarding the documentation, and this is where I speak of the making things up that I have witnessed in promotion and tenure committees that I have sat on for cases that I have worked and in merit reviews that I have been a part of, and the experience—the overwhelming experience that I have—is that the documentation of teaching evaluations dominates! It absolutely dominates the presentation of teaching effectiveness, and anything else is small by comparison. Just in terms of sheer volume, we have computer printout after computer printout after computer printout of documentation

of teaching evaluations, and maybe somebody sits down and spends some time doing spot checking on some of those, but those other things that you mentioned—in my experience—no, they are not systematically or very well used in evaluations, and those things give me tremendous disquiet about this project.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Thank you, John. Tom will respond—after Tom, Ruta will make a comment or ask a question, and then Rebecca.

GIERYN: I feel the depth of your concern, John. On the first question, with respect to that item, remember, as you know well, that all promotion and tenure dossiers do include the syllabi, they're available so that all review committees and administrators can actually see whether the course is coherently constructed, that's why the wording of this question asks the student to say how clearly were course learning goals and objectives communicated to you. It's really a very active thing. We can see for ourselves whether or not the syllabi give evidence of coherence, but what we want is to know whether or not that was communicated to the student, which is why we have the wording there. Rationale is not going to be exactly the same as the item wording.

In terms of the other question, it's—it's easy to be drawn to the student course evaluation data, isn't it? Because it's a number and sometimes you can compare it to some group. It's easy to do that. I've looked at about a hundred a year promotion and tenure cases as they come through my office—all of them—and I see the reports from faculty committees such as the ones you were on, from administrators, from school committees, and so forth. In so far as somebody wants to identify any review committee or administrator a problem with teaching, and they hang the case for problems in teaching only on student course evaluations, it will fail because what that is to me anyway is an indicator that there is a reason to go into great depth and look at the rest of the dossier, in particular the rest of the teaching documentation, so that I think you're probably right. We have a tendency to glom onto these numbers in part because they're numbers, and because they seem to evince comparisons from one faculty member to another, but once we see a problem there, then it becomes vitally important that you turn and begin to look at things like the teaching statement or the syllabus or the peer evaluations of teaching or efforts to improve teaching or whatever other course development efforts are documented in the dossier. I agree with you. It's a concern that if—if we let it go and say, 'Yeah, it's all a matter of bad numbers on the student course evals,' we've got a serious problem. That's an indicator that needs to trigger a response by review committees and administrators.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Okay, Ruta has a question, and then Rebecca.

RUTA: Yeah, I guess I just have a couple comments. The first is about the actual questions and kind of the legitimacy, and then the second about the first time preps for teachers, or for, you

know, faculty, professors, sorry. But, so, I know obviously statistical viability of the—of the surveys is a huge concern. As a side note to kind of maybe, you know, quell some concerns, I think that what's—this is—it's difficult to quantify, but a lot of times in class, it's like I actually think through my—my evaluations when I fill them out, but I'm like the—always the last person in the room because about half of my peers literally just go down and will write D, D, D, C, D, D, and, I mean, is that any better than, you know—so, that actually—when that factors in, it—that skews the results in it of itself. So I think that that's a definite concern because, you know, if we don't have—if we're not getting like the bimodal distribution, if we're getting representative sample results, then they're probably actually a lot more well thought out if they're coming on online, rather than the kids who are just, you know, trying to get out of the classroom at the end of the semester.

And then the second point, in terms—regarding first time preps, so I'm coming into this obviously from a very different perspective as a student, but I just wanted to touch on it because I think it's an important issue. I guess I'd preface it by saying that, you know, I can speak from my experience, my four years in a university have been an intense period of growth, so you get that academics, extracurriculars, social. Obviously my classes are a huge way that I've, you know, been able to just develop as a person, and when—though it may be a professor's first time teaching a class, it's a student's—hopefully—only time taking the class. [Laughter] So, yes, it's important that we are aware that people have to have—professors have to undergo a learning curve, they have to learn how to improve based off of their past experiences, but from a student standpoint, I mean, I personally—I'm not going to sympathize if I have a bad experience, and that's—and that's really the—that's a huge component of the mission of the undergraduate experience. I mean, how well are our students now, at the beginning of the class, versus at the end of the class, beginning of university enrollment from when they hopefully graduate. And—and so I just think that that's a—I just think that's a major concern, so maybe we don't have to say you're not going to be really critiqued that hard, but there might be alternative measures. Maybe we could say here's how you, as a—this is the first time you've taught this class, here's how you stack up to other professors who this is the first time they've taught their class in a similar school, similar level of teaching. I think there's other metrics and other levers we can pull, but making sure that people are definitely being held accountable because, like I said, I just—I just think that every single class is too big of an opportunity to let it slide.

WHEELER: Well, they are being held accountable. It isn't saying that we aren't collecting data. It's that we're not making that data publicly available during the first—

RUTA: —Right—

WHEELER: —two semesters—

RUTA: —And—

WHEELER: —But—but, you know, to the university community, certainly the instructor sees that, you know, the department chair can see that, so you know, so—so, you know, so—so the issue of are they being held accountable, yes, they're being held accountable within the way that the university normally holds faculty accountable. It's just to say, you know, that we are not going to—the concern that led to this last spring was the fact that, you know, that—especially for a graduate student who is teaching for the first time, you know, that it's a new experience for them, and it may not be a great experience, and it may get negative recommendations, and then they may not be able to find a job later on. It could affect their entire career just because at the very first time they ever did it, they were inexperienced and it wasn't a good experience, and so this is designed to—it's not a matter of not holding the individuals accountable, but it's giving them a chance to grow without being, you know, penalized to the extent that—that a public release of the information [indistinct comment] could do. So they are—I assure you, they are held accountable.

RUTA: That was—and that's—I just wanted to clarify because I know obviously externally people who might not be able to see it, but from an internal standpoint, that's a little confused, so, thank you.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: We have eight minutes. Rebecca?

SPANG: Before I say what I was going to say, I feel I really, really must reply to Mr. Ruta, and say that what you're describing is a system in which there would be very, very, very few courses taught at this university. Everybody would teach the same thing over and over and over again because they knew it worked, and when faculty have new research interests and new topics they want to develop with students, it may be that one lecture isn't perfect, but it's still worth trying something new, so I think you need to be a little bit cautious in how hard you suggest that first-timers are somehow necessarily going to do something wrong.

Now, so that aside, I wanted to say that personally I am not anxious about OCQs. They can do it online, you can do it on paper, you can ask this question, you can ask that questions. It's fine. It's just part of the process. But, the anxieties that have been expressed by Professors Sherman and Walbridge and Guarino and Paolillo are exactly what I heard in my department when we talked about this last spring. I mean the level of anxiety in the History department and other departments is so high about this, and I think, and I've been trying to figure out because my colleagues are sensible people, I'm trying to figure out why there's so much anxiety, and it feels to me that partially there's a perception that if this material is collected digitally, it can then be used, and that it's going to be used by "them," as if tenure and promotion committees were not

made up by faculty. So somehow that message has got to be conveyed. And I think another part of conveying the message that this is not a plot, this is not a conspiracy—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —I hope not.—

SPANG: —might be in the language of some of the questions and the language of some of the discussion around this. I think my courses are pretty well organized, but I have to say when I hear the words “learning goals,” I’m tempted to reach for a revolver. [Laughter]

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Oh dear...

SPANG: You know to me, learning goals and objectives—okay, which one’s the goal, which one’s the objective? It’s just jargon. And so I think that jargonizing of talking about teaching is something that people find very off-putting, and frankly, I’m—my colleagues here question that student return questions—can we come up with another name for those because we aren’t giving the questions back to the students. It should be—um—somebody help me with this—

UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER: —student generated.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: We can tinker with that later.

SPANG: Yeah, but it seems to me that a different name for those would go somewhat...

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Bill, would you tell members of the Council where you’re going from here, as chair of the committee...

GJERDINGEN: —on this project. [Laughter]

UNKNOWN MALE SPEAKER: You can go anywhere you want...! [Laughter]

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Was that too rhetorical for him?

WHEELER: I’d like to move for adjournment. No, the—so—

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: —I’m sorry, that’s—

WHEELER: So the committee will be taking [microphone is handed to him]—thank you! Well, you know, certainly we’re going to study all of the responses we’ve received today. We will look at the minutes when they become available to make sure that we haven’t missed anything there. The committee is engaged with Tom’s office and with Sonya’s office. We have two members on the items taskforce. We have members on the evalua—group that’s going to select the software. As I indicated, you know, we are discussing these things. We’re concerned with the language of the questions. In our own discussions, we’ve said that we feel like the—that how questions are phrased are very important. We’d like to have—see the questions, to

some extent, be shaped by our norms of teaching, and our—our—our goals as teachers. Sometimes the language is—is, as you say, too much jargon. We'd like to see, perhaps, things about challenge, how much does this challenge you, how much does this inspire you, and we would like to see rationales that—that support those types of things, and so it—when I indicated that—that, you know, we might be preparing a yellow paper, you know, we do want to look at these concerns. We may also, in cooperation with the Faculty Affairs Committee, you know, look back again at the university policies on what—what our statements are about teachers, you know, if you look in the university Handbook, right now it says—there's this list of things, "A teacher will..." or "A teacher shall..." We have some ideas for, I think, better statements, better formulations, things that speak more to the mission of the campus, and our campus aspirations regarding teaching and learning. And we—we—we will work at that and—and bring that back to the Council at some point in time. So—and, as I said, the—for the student return questions those, of course, automatically come back to this Council for approval. And, again, we're going to be working with the IUSA and with the questions to these, to try and shape this to address some of those issues because we—we share those issues with regards to the phrasing of the questions, and to the statements of the rationales, so we're going to be developing policies, taking policy statements, taking all these things into account and bringing them back to you in due time.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: We'd like to thank members of the Council for a very productive discussion of this significant issue. Unless I hear a motion to the contrary, we are adjourned.

MEETING ADJOURNED: 5:28PM