

Minutes
Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
January 24, 2006
Ballantine Hall 008
3:30 - 5:30 P.M.

Attendance

Members Present: Lisa Bingham, Craig Bradley, John Carini, Richard Carr, Jorge Chapa, Les Coyne, Luis Davila, Romualdo De Souza, Erika Dowell, Paul Elliot, Emily Fairchild, Kenneth R. R. Gros Louis, Dennis Groth, Patrick Harbison, William Hetrick, Kevin Hunt, Robert Ivie, Cecile Jagodzinski, Gene Kintgen, Robert Kravchuk, Terrence Mason, Bryan McCormick, Murray McGibbon, Daniel Melamed, Alyce Miller, Theodore Miller, Theresa Ochoa, Harold Ogren, Isabel Piedmont, Sara Pryor, Amy Reynolds, Paul Rohwer, Richard Rubinger, Jeanne Sept, Jodi Shepherd, Alex Shortle, Jerrold Stern, Herbert Terry, Neil Theobald, Larry Thibos, David Waterman, Maxine Watson, Cara Wellman, William Wheeler, Gary Wiggins, Nicholas Williams

Members Absent with Alternates: Andrea Singer for Elizabeth Johnson, Michael Halla for Isabel Piedmont

Members Absent: LTC Lori Bass, Julie Bobay, Katy Borner, Bonnie Brownlee, Barbara Hawkins, Susan Jones, William Leckey, David MacKay, Gerald Marker, Dale McFadden, Lisa Pratt, Sarita Soni

Visitors Present: Michael McRobbie (Interim Provost and Vice President Academic Affairs), Roland Cote (Interim Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Services), Edwardo Rhodes (Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Support & Diversity) Julie Knost (Affirmative Action), Bradley Wheeler (Research & Information Technology), Bob Eno (East Asian Languages & Cultures), David Daleke (Medical Sciences Program), Jeff Wuslich (Provost & V. President Academic Affairs), Maynard Thompson (Senior Counselor to President), John Graves (Faculty Council)

Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes

December 6, 2005

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY06/minutes/12.06.05.htm>

2. Memorial Resolutions (5 minutes)

Librarian and Professor Emeritus Andrew Turchyn

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY06/circulars/B24-2006.htm>

Associate Professor Marcy I. Murphy

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY06/circulars/B25-2006.htm>

3. Agenda Committee Business (10 minutes)
(Professor Theodore Miller)
4. Presiding Officer's Business (10 minutes)
(Chancellor Ken Gros Louis)
5. Regular Question / Comment Period* (10 minutes)
(Chancellor Ken Gros Louis and Professor Theodore Miller)
6. Indiana University Policy and Template and Guidelines for Campus Admission Policies
(ACTION ITEM) (15 minutes)
(Professor William Wheeler, Co-Chair, University Faculty Council Educational Policies
Committee)
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/AY06/circulars/U9-2006.htm>
7. University Reorganization Question/Comment Period (60 minutes)
*The BFC Agenda Committee invites questions and comments about the upcoming university
reorganization to inform the Council's discussions of these matters throughout the semester.
Interim Provost Michael McRobbie will join the BFC for this discussion.*
8. Standing Committee Reports
9. Old Business
10. New Business

Minutes

AGENDA ITEM #1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

GROS LOUIS: December 6, 2005, Kelly are these the ones that you were talking about?

KISH: Yes, if anyone's uncomfortable with them, we don't have to approve them.

MILLER: There was a tape problem and it's not clear that it's still accurate.

GROS LOUIS: Okay, apparently there was a tape difficulty with the December 6 minutes and so if you've read them, there are large gaps that will be filled in creatively and imaginatively [laughter] by Kelly. So we'll pass that one.

AGENDA ITEM #2: MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS

GROS LOUIS: Next is the memorial resolution for Librarian and Professor Emeritus Andrew Turchyn and I call on Jeanne Sept.

SEPT: Thank you, Ken and as usual I'll be reading short excerpts from the extended resolutions which you have complete notes for.

Librarian Emeritus and Professor Emeritus Andrew Turchyn (Andriy Turchyn) died on October 4, 2004 in the house on Browncliff which he and his wife, Olha, had designed, and into which, following her death, he moved and raised his three sons, George, Nicholas, and Leo.

Dr. Turchyn was one of those pioneering librarians who, under very difficult circumstances, helped build the Slavic and East European collections in research libraries in the free world after World War II. Current Slavic Bibliographer, Murlin Croucher, said this of his efforts, "Andrew tried to maintain a real Slavic collection, that is, a collection that was comprehensive for not only the Soviet Union, but inclusive of all of Central and Eastern Europe. This added real depth to the I.U. collection while he was here." The nearly three decades during which Andrew Turchyn played key roles in the development of IU's Slavic and East European collection were a period of remarkable growth. In 1961, the collection had 10,000 volumes, but by 1980, it had grown to nearly 250,000 volumes.

Dr. Turchyn's original position in the IU Libraries in 1953 was as senior cataloger. He became Associate Head of the Catalog Department and Head of the Slavic Section in 1959. As Librarian of Slavic and East Asian Collections from 1966-69, he was responsible for the area studies reading room when it resided in Woodburn Hall before the materials were integrated into the newly constructed Main Library in 1969. At that time, Andrew was appointed Slavic Studies Area Librarian, a position he held from 1969-79. From 1969-80, students who were interested in Slavic librarianship profited from his "Slavic Library Materials" course in the School of Library and Information Science. Dr. Turchyn also served on the thesis committees of some of the students in the Russian and East European Institute who were interested in Ukrainian matters. In 1975, he was promoted to the rank of professor, and thus, upon his retirement in 1980, he was awarded the rank of both librarian emeritus and professor emeritus.

Andrew Turchyn also played a role in bringing about the teaching of Ukrainian language courses at IU. When Dr. Edward J. Brown became Chair of the Slavic Department in 1966, Andrew approached him with the idea of instituting such courses, and the first instructor of Ukrainian, Tatiana Sklanchenko, was soon hired to teach the courses until her retirement in 1979.

Professional affiliations of Andrew Turchyn included the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies (AAASS), the American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages (AATSEEL), both the American and the Ukrainian American Associations of University Professors (AAUP and UAAUP), the Ukrainian Library Association of America, the Ukrainian Historical Association, and the Indiana University Librarians Association. He was the initiator, co-founder, and Chair of the ALA Association of College and Research Libraries Slavic and East European Section and contributed his expertise to the Executive Committees of the IU Polish Studies Center, the IU Russian and East European Institute, and the Ukrainian Library Association of America.

Andrew Turchyn wrote scholarly articles on topics such as the cataloging and the classification of Slavic materials and the history of Slavic scholarship in the U.S. On the local scene, he was

the compiler of the 532-page *Slavic and East European Serials in the Indiana University Libraries*, a tool which helped generations of REEI faculty and students find appropriate source materials in the years before the IU Libraries online catalog became a reality.

Andrew Turchyn was born on July 17, 1912 in Chernytsia, Brody County, Ukraine, the son of Mykola and Maria (Chrzanowska) Turchyn. He attended the Polish State Gymnasium in Brody from 1925-1933 and the Greek Catholic Theological Academy in Lviv in 1933-38, where he received his diploma in 1938. From 1939-44 he worked as a teacher and social worker in the territory of present-day Poland and Ukraine. Andrew was very active in the Ukrainian Relief Committee, where his help to the prisoners of war in Brody resulted in a life-threatening bout with typhus in 1941-42. After World War II he studied at the Ukrainian Free University and at the Ludwig Maximilian University of Munich, where he received a Ph.D. degree (Philosophy, Psychology, and Journalism) on March 31, 1949 on the basis of his dissertation “*Metaphysischer Dualismus der Späteren Stoa als das ursprüngliche Zentraldogma der stoischen Philosophie*” (*Metaphysical Dualism of the Later Stoics as the Incipient Central Dogma of the Stoic Philosophy*). Afterwards he served as editor-at-large of the Ukrainian weekly *Khrystyians’kyi Holos* (*The Christian Voice*) in Munich, until his departure to the United States in March 1950.

Once he immigrated to America, Andrew continued his education, receiving the Master of Arts in Library Science (M.A.L.S.) from the University of Michigan in 1953 and an M.A. in Slavic Studies from Indiana University in 1960. Andrew Turchyn spoke German, Czech, Polish, and Ukrainian and had a working knowledge of many other Slavic and East European languages.

Andrew’s home village of Chernytsia was only 7 km from Pidkamin’, the village where his future wife Olha Salamacha grew up. Although Andrew and Olha were acquainted in Ukraine, their courtship did not begin until both were studying in Munich. Despite coming separately to the U.S., they were married in Buffalo, N.Y. on June 7, 1951 and began the life together that was cut short by her untimely death in November 1964. During his long life, Andrew Turchyn was a loving father, devoted to his family. His passion for librarianship was transmitted to son George, who is a librarian with the Monroe County Community School System. Golf and chess were two of Andrew’s hobbies.

We are grateful that Andrew Turchyn was a part of the IU Libraries family and the IU and Bloomington communities. As a graduate student in Russian literature in the 1960s, I made extensive use of the Slavic collection and had an opportunity to avail myself of Dr. Turchyn’s assistance. The scope of the collection at IU amazed me then, as it does now. It is to people such as Andrew Turchyn that we owe a great debt of gratitude for the painstaking efforts they made to build such a treasure in the IU Libraries. Although he is sadly missed, his legacy lives on in the IU Libraries.

Marcy Murphy, daughter of Mark and Irene (Crum) Murphy, was born in Ogden, Utah. Marcy lived in the Denver area from 1929 until 1974 and never forgot those roots. After earning a B.A. in English and French, cum laude, from Colorado College in 1948, she worked as a staff artist and librarian at the Library and Museum of Anthropology of the Denver Art Museums, Indian and Native Arts Department, then as a library assistant at Colorado College. She returned to school, at the University of Denver, to complete her M.A. from the Graduate School of Librarianship in 1959. She worked as reference and documents librarian at the University of

Denver, and then moved to Albuquerque, her second favorite place on earth, where she served as a reference librarian, then head of the Serials Department, at the University of New Mexico. She returned to Colorado as Head of Serials at the University of Colorado, Boulder; then served as the Head of Acquisitions and Serials at Colorado State University.

In 1967 Marcy re-introduced herself to student life as a post-master's fellow at the University of Minnesota. In 1968 she headed east, to the University of Pittsburgh, where she earned an advanced certificate in Library and Information Science. She returned to Colorado to care for her parents and took a position as Administrative Librarian for Systems and Planning at the U.S. Air Force Academy. Pittsburgh lured her back with HEA Title II funding and a position as a library network coordinator while she earned her Ph.D. in Library and Information Science.

Having been over and through the Midwest, her next stop was Western Michigan University, where she was appointed as an associate professor of librarianship in 1977. In 1981 she came to Indiana University as an associate professor of Library and Information Science. Bloomington friends and colleagues remember Marcy's enthusiasm for her courses on library management, public services, and special libraries. She worked extensively on projects related to library management, competencies for special librarians, library public services, and resource sharing through networking. Her articles in the *Journal of Library Administration* and *Special Libraries* focused on user evaluations of library services and how management practices such as goal setting can improve library effectiveness.

She collaborated with Sajjad ur Rehman in an analysis of book reviews in business management journals. Sajjad remained in contact with Marcy for the rest of her life. He commented, "The bond my family and I developed with Marcy Murphy during my doctoral studies lasted for more than two decades. She was a wonderful mentor whose keenness, affection and care helped me profoundly in my growth and advancement. She was instinctively humane and compassionate and had a passion for humanitarian causes."

Cecilia Siu-Wah Poon, one of Marcy's students and now Education Librarian at Western Washington University, said "Both my husband Craig and I were students of Marcy. Over the years we kept in touch. She was a wonderful librarian, educator, and friend. She will be missed very much. One of her beautiful pieces of art hangs in our living room, forever reminding us of her."

Thomas Izbicki, a former student and now librarian at Johns Hopkins University, described Marcy as "a good friend; her support during my transition to librarianship was very solid and much valued. She also opened to me a new perspective on libraries, as entities in need of sound management of people and resources, not just as places in which to do research. Being Marcy's assistant was an education in these issues, and I am the richer in my life for having learned from her."

After retiring from teaching, Marcy took classes on printmaking and art history in the IU School of Fine Arts. Friends there came to appreciate her critical eye and support for young artists – she purchased their work and contributed materials for the print shop. Edward Bernstein, Professor of Fine Arts, described Marcy as "the beloved 'grande dame' of the printmaking department for

over ten years. Her sunny presence and work in etching and woodcut was appreciated by both students and faculty. She will be sorely missed by us all.”

Janet Kennedy, Professor and Chair of the Department of the History of Art in the School of Fine Arts, described Marcy’s pursuit of her passion for art. “She became a familiar presence in the printmaking studios and art history classrooms of the School of Fine Arts and reveled in the opportunity for contact with students and faculty in this new setting. Always scrupulous, she sometimes brought her own folding lawn chair to crowded art history classes so as not to take a seat that might be wanted by a student; and she persevered in her new found discipline even when illness began to take its toll. Marcy’s slow, appreciative smile and her generosity to those around her remained constant throughout these years.”

Wendy Calman, Associate Professor of Fine Arts, described Marcy as “the consummate student: ever-learning, ever-changing, and an inspiration to everyone in the printmaking workshop. Her artwork was an expression of her daily life, consisting of personal genre scenes depicting her friends, cats, and surroundings in both intimate and universal ways. She contributed fully on every level, bringing her particular insights, thoughtful comments, and subtle humor to classes, critiques, and lectures; her presence was looked forward to and came to be expected, ‘as perennial as the grass.’ She had a true love of the arts, of printmaking, and of our students in particular. She has chosen to leave them a legacy by providing scholarships to support their striving for excellence in our field. Their future accomplishments will be a lasting tribute to Marcy and her achievements. We thank her, and continue to miss her.”

In recognition of Marcy Murphy’s contributions to the university and the profession, be it resolved that this resolution be part of the minutes of the Bloomington Faculty Council.

GROS LOUIS: Thank you Jeanne. I ask members of the Council and guests to stand for a moment of silence please. Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM #3: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS

GROS LOUIS: Now we turn to the Agenda Committee business and I’ll turn it over to Ted Miller.

T. MILLER: Thank you very much, Ken. The first item in my report is to indicate that item number six on our agenda, having to do with university policy regarding campus admission policies will not be discussed today. You may have noticed that it is not in your packet of materials. The UFC Educational Policies Committee, over the last couple of days has been sort of discussing how this particular document should be phrased and they’ve been going round and around about it and it’s not just quite ready for our discussion. It isn’t actually clear to me that this document will come to the BFC. We may try to do this just next week at the UFC and get it over with. There’s really not a whole lot to this. All this policy basically says is that the campuses have authority to implement their own admissions policies. So, it’s the policy of the university that the campuses can do this. And then secondly, it indicates that these admissions policies will comply with state law. And those are the two main planks in this university-level

policy. So there's really not much to it and there's certainly no controversy to it, and so as I said, we in all likelihood will not discuss it here. We are under some pressure to get that done so that we in fact can turn to the Bloomington campus admissions policy which will be one of the things we'll be working on in February.

So, with that out of the way, then we turn to the agenda for this particular meeting. Now, this is a rather unusual meeting following a rather unusual period. I've been a faculty member at Indiana University now for...hmmm...

KRAVCHUK: That long? [Laughter]

T. MILLER: Well I think its 30 years, it's 30 years and there's no doubt that what happened on January 14th is the most dramatic thing that has happened during my 30 years at Indiana University. The Trustees took action regarding the administrative structure of the Bloomington campus. You may be aware that my own personal view of this is that this was a very positive thing for the Bloomington campus. Although, I'm certainly willing to—I recognize that there are all kinds of questions yet to be answered that could make it maybe not be so positive. But still I think we have an opportunity to do something that is very positive for the Bloomington campus. And this meeting really represents a beginning of what the Agenda Committee had discussed, what we're going to try to do over the next—I think we have six meetings during this year following this one; six remaining meetings. What we're going to try to do and essentially we're going to—of course we do have some regular business t attend to. We have an Intellectual Property Policy that we need to deal with and so forth and so on. But we're going try to spend, at each meeting I think, some time discussing some of the major questions that have arisen in the face of this administrative reorganization and I'm hoping that in having these discussions here in the Council that this will be a way for the faculty voice to be heard. We're hopeful that the Agenda Committee of the Council is going to be quite active in discussions with the administration and these discussions will help the Agenda Committee in terms of the message that we want to take to the administration and to the Trustees as we deal with these questions.

So, we have certain materials that we are using today as sort of a starting point. The first one is this yellow sheet. Both sides and you'll see that this is titled Discussion 1.0. This is meant to be an evolving document where we try to frame what we think are the really essential questions that confront us, the faculty, as we move into this new era. So we have a few sample questions on the sheet right now. These may turn out not to be the essential questions, I don't know. Hopefully we're going to develop something that will basically shape the discussions that we have as we go forward. So that's document number one. Document number two is a green document and this document presents some organizational charts for peer institutions. You'll see the top one is for Purdue, then there's some stuff from the University of Michigan, two pages worth, then there's some stuff from Penn State, two pages worth. Purdue, Michigan and Penn State are institutions that have multiple campuses and where the main campus has an administrative structure like the one that the Trustees have put in place for Bloomington. The President as the head, the Chief Executive Officer of the campus, a Provost as the Chief Academic Officer. And so these organization charts on the green sheets basically show us how other universities have sort of put together something that seems to work for them and hopefully this will be a source of ideas for

us as we go along and think about what kind of structure we would like to have here in Bloomington and may be more broadly for Indiana University.

Then the third document is on the white pages and this document, well, let me give you the background for this. About a month ago, or two months ago, Kelly and I attended a CIC meeting on faculty governance. It's an annual thing. And one of the things that was done at this particular meeting is that the institutions were asked to bring their organization charts to the meeting and many of them arrived in huge billboard format, they were posted up around the room that we were meeting in. Of course, Kelly and I arrived with nothing because as many of you know Indiana University is such a complicated organization that it defies description in these charts. Well, this document was prepared by, essentially by Kelly, and by Kevin Hunt. There were a variety of people that contributed to it but Kevin and Kelly really worked hard over this weekend trying to put something together. Kevin I think, I'm not sure about this Kevin, but I have gotten the impression from talking to Kevin that he needs this kind of stuff to really help him think about this material. In the abstract it's kind of jumbled but when it's on paper, it makes a little more sense and well, this is fine. So we have something that's on paper.

HUNT: Actually, I've said that mostly I stood around cheering for Kelly. So, I merely provided a suggestion here and there. Kelly has intimate knowledge of this.

T. MILLER: Now, I want to make clear that this document does not represent a recommendation from the Agenda Committee about how the university should be structured. It is not a proposal about how the university should be structured. It is meant really to just sort of put something on paper that would be possible, whether it's the right thing or the wrong thing, who knows. It's meant to stimulate discussion but it's also meant, I think, to indicate that at the end of this process, that at least some of us feel that it really would be a good thing if the administrative structure of Indiana University could be described in terms of an organizational chart. I'm sure many of you have had experiences similar to mine; I have colleagues who have been faculty members at Indiana University for 10 or 15 years, they have no idea how this place works. None, they have no concept of it. I really think it would be helpful to us if we could all sought of come to understand what it is and what the structure is we're working in. Ken I believe is may be the only person alive, maybe Maynard as well, who actually understands all of this. [Laughter] So, please do not take this document as... it's meant to be something to talk about and I'm quite certain that at the end of the day when we do develop the organizational chart for Indiana University, it will look very different from this.

So that's kind of a guide to your materials. And as I said, we are hoping that over the span of these next six meetings to spend a fair amount of time talking about a variety of issues that—it's quite obvious, I think, that there are going to have to be some significant changes in the administration of the university to support this new structure that has been created for the Bloomington campus and I'm hoping that we can spend a good bit of time here talking about those things trying to come to some consensus about how we would like to proceed.

That is my report, thank you Ken.

AGENDA ITEM #4: PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS

GROS LOUIS: Thanks. Ted's been here just 30 years, he missed by two years, as some of you remember, which is the reorganization that created the core campus and the system schools and one that led a faculty council committee to recommend to the Faculty Council that President Ryan be condemned for insufficient consultation with the faculty before making his major changes, a committee that I chaired.

There is one—as Ted indicated, these are just conversations, but there is one important adjustment. If you look at the page with the schools and colleges, and I just sent an email out because I wanted to confirm with the President and with Craig Brater, which I did. The School of Medicine as you know will report directly to the President. However, all the other health science schools will continue to report to the IUPUI Chancellor, so they won't report to Craig. So in that middle column where it says Vice President of Life Sciences, then the School of Medicine reports to Craig and Medicine will report directly to the President. However, nursing, optometry, health and rehab sciences and dentistry will all continue to report to the IUPUI Chancellor which is why he's Vice President for Life Sciences and rather than Vice President for Health Sciences, which I'm sure that Kelly has found out that is the common title on other campuses on the Big Ten.

So, with that minor correction I would like to yield my time to...

T. MILLER: If I could just say, Ken. This document is really not meant to describe what we had as a structure nor what we now have as a structure. I think the point that you're talking about must mean that there's somebody walking around here on the campus that was close to Kelly who has an idea for some further restructuring. It's just kind of a possibility, it really is not meant to say that that's what it is or what it should be, it's just something for discussion.

GROS LOUIS: I'd like to yield my time to Michael McRobbie who's here. As you know as of a week from tomorrow he will become Interim Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs – Bloomington, and he will be, the President tells me and he has told Michael, he will be presiding over this body for these discussions the rest of the semester. Michael?

MCROBBIE: Bob Eno told me that I used to bankrupt the BFC with the cost of amplification because of the fact that I have a soft voice and you all have accents as well. So, forgive me if I have to use this amp. Let me first say that I'm very pleased to be here, obviously to be in this role the Trustees have asked me to take on. I will have been here exactly 9 years on Thursday, in the university. I arrived on what was in fact a national holiday in Australia, in the U.S. 9 years ago. And I've worked with, looking around the room, I've worked with many of you, I know some of you very well and hopefully worked productively with you over the years and very much hope to continue to do so. As I said, I know some of you quite well; one of my neighbors is down there, Dan Melamed lives beside me. Pat Harbison's band played at my wedding a few months ago. So there's quite a few personal connections here as well. I should say too, I've been really taken back with, my email exploded last week. I had two or three hundred messages, very positive messages from faculty and other people on this campus and elsewhere offering good wishes and so on to the future. I find that very rather moving and humbling that people have

expressed that level of confidence and I'll obviously do everything that I can to make sure that those expectations are met. I'm not going to say very much at all; I just wanted to say that obviously there are some immediate issues that I need to give attention to that the Trustees have asked me and will be asking others to give attention to, but I've already started, put the process of putting in place an agenda of consultation and meetings with people. I couldn't even finish putting it together; putting it together will take weeks and then executing it will take months. But I'm hoping over the next two to three months to meet pretty much exhaustively with all the appropriate groups and individuals on the campus, the deans and others as well. It will be helpful that the budget conferences will be going on as well because that will provide a nice snapshot of all the schools as well. So that will be my goal over the next few months will be to do that.

And then I will hope during that period to start bringing ideas and thoughts to you and to other bodies on the campus as well. Finally just let me say that I've known Ken for, actually, over 13 years and obviously well for 9 worked very closely with Ken and found him a superb colleague in every way, someone who's been a great supporter of things I've done and I've always supported him and I have learned an enormous amount from him and it is indeed an honor to, in some sense, follow him in the role that he's carried out with such excellence and distinction for such a long period of time. That's all I'm going to say and I gather that, I think, as of the next meeting or may be the one after that I will join you in a slightly more permanent fashion.

GROS LOUIS: Thanks Michael.

T. MILLER: Thank you very much, Michael. We look forward to your presiding over the meetings of the Council this year.

Just one other thing about the agenda, you'll note that item number 5 is called "the regular question and comment period" and item number seven is called "the university reorganization question and comment period". So try to separate the comments or questions that you wish to ask into those categories. We'll start with the regular ones.

AGENDA ITEM #5: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

GROS LOUIS: But I received so many regular questions that there's no time to answer them. [Laughter] I've received no questions in advance, did you?

T. MILLER: Did I receive any questions in advance?

GROS LOUIS: The regular questions?

T. MILLER: The regular questions in advance, no, I don't believe I did.

GROS LOUIS: Kevin?

HUNT: I'm glad that Ted started out by talking about all the drama that we've experienced now and our attention can focus on that. And I wanted to sort of talk a little bit about—ask you first Ken, about something I consider sort of unfinished business.

In particular, I think I can speak, I know I can speak for the AAUP, but I think I speak for my colleagues here as well in asking you to comment on some long-term consequences of some initiatives that you've overseen as Chancellor. This may not be as dramatic as our recent troubles but considering the extended time period involved, I think it's important enough that we should address it.

Ken, to your knowledge, has there ever been, in the history of this university, a Chancellor who has served IU with such distinction, who has served with such respect for shared faculty governance, who has demonstrated so profound a dedication to serving faculty needs, who has dealt so graciously with faculty in personal interactions, has worked as diligently to save guard the status of Indiana University, who has given so generously of his time, who has so successively acted behind the scenes to promote the interest of IU often giving credit to others, and who when presiding over the BFC has guided us with such forthrightness, such humor and such wit as Ken Gros Louis?

GROS LOUIS: Humility forces me to say I don't know. [Laughter]

HUNT: Despite that I would like to introduce a resolution and this resolution reads as follows: Whereas Kenneth R. R. Gros Louis has guided this body wisely, graciously and with wit and good humor and whereas he has worked tirelessly to maintain and improve the creative environment on the Bloomington campus, and whereas he has guided this campus with great respect for faculty members and for faculty governance, and whereas his affection for Indiana University and his 41 years of service establish him as a campus institution, and whereas he has presided over approximately 250 BFC meetings beginning September 16th, 1980...

GROS LOUIS: I remember them all [Laughter]

HUNT: ...and whereas he has presided over 24 separate discussion of general education with no resolution resulting and whereas he has worked with 17 BFC presidents, including Ted Miller twice, and whereas he has supervised stimulating discussions of the art of pornography, overseeing firearms and weapons altercations in this room and reflected on the advantages of double-sided printing, and whereas he has extended the mandatory adjournment time only once in twenty two and a half years of BFC service, Be it hereby resolved that the Bloomington Faculty Council expresses its gratitude and appreciation for his decades of service to the Council and to the University. [Applause]

GROS LOUIS: Thank you all very, very much and really it's been a great pleasure to do all this. There's been many occasions that even though I do get my check every month it's almost an embarrassment to get it because what I've done in the 41 years here, all those years have been such a pleasure that I shouldn't be getting paid for. Although I'm glad I am getting paid for it I need to add that too. Thank you Kevin and thank you all members of the Council.

HUNT: I'd like to make one more announcement that the AAUP has created an award that we will give on occasion, not every year that we will be calling Kenneth R. R. Gros Louis Award for Shared Governance. It's an award we'll give to faculty members and administrators that we honor as promoting shared faculty governance and issues that surround that. And we will also be—this is an award that's based on the Ralph S. Brown Award for Shared Governance with the national AAUP body and our AAUP chapter will be nominating you for the Ralph S. Brown National Award for Shared Governance.

GROS LOUIS: Thank you very much Kevin, thank you. That's very nice of the AAUP, thank you very much, I appreciate that. Other questions in the regular question period? Bob?

KRAVCHUK: Gee after that nice occasion Ken, I almost hasten to bring up business. But I wonder if those of you here, present, who are members of the RCM Review Committee would be able to provide us with an update as to where that committee's work stands and what the likely outcome of that review is going to?

MCROBBIE: Your timing is impeccable, Bob because there was a meeting held last night, the second meeting of that committee in Indianapolis. It started at 5:00 and finished at 8:30, so it was a fairly lengthy meeting. It had a presentation from one of the consultants, John Curry, who used to be the Executive Vice President for Administration and Finance and so on at MIT. And then there was a lengthy discussion that was basically about the kinds of questions that would be asked of the key players in the university, stakeholders and so on at the university. That was pretty much worked out and the details are being sorted out. I think a list was being put together, a fairly lengthy list, of the people to whom the committee will talk and those meetings will be scheduled in the next, I guess, over the next month or something like that to get input as well. So I think from memory, the goal is to try and get a report done by about the end of March. It will be pretty tight but I think that's probably achievable. I was trying to think if there was anything else—as well as talking to all the appropriate groups and so on, I think there's also a feeling that it might be useful to talk to the Trustees since they obviously have got to particular interest in RCM as well. So that's pretty much where we were last night.

KRAVCHUK: Follow up question? Is the scope of the review still as broad as it sounded like when it got started, considering the continuance of the system intact or has the focus narrowed somewhat to consider revision to RCM as opposed to perhaps its abandonment? I had some concerns when I saw the charge to the committee. It looked like it was very broad.

MCROBBIE: I think that, I might be speaking out of school here, I think the charge is as broad as you say but I don't think there's been any consideration of the abandonment of RCM. I certainly think there's been some discussion about refinements to it and so on but it's kind of premature because people are now waiting for the input to come in and then all those discussions will take place as well.

KRAVCHUK: Thank you.

GROS LOUIS: Other questions for the regular question period?

TERRY: I actually have a regular comment. In the last few weeks there have been several public statements made by Interim Provost-Designate McRobbie that research space is the highest space need on this campus. I read the report that you presented to the UFC last year. I know we have desperate research space needs but I would remind us that we also have desperate teaching needs as well. Not so long ago, one of the next buildings that was supposed to be constructed on this campus was the classroom building over in the library parking lot and recently the College of Arts and Sciences has adopted some teaching policies that some members of my departments faculty believe will have an adverse effect on their research. So I hope in the pursuit of research space that we don't lose sight of that. Not only to expand teaching space, but to equip classrooms that have no technology whatsoever with what is no longer cutting-edge teaching technology, it's just contemporary and I hope that doesn't get lost.

GROS LOUIS: Thank you Herb. Any other questions or comments of the regular period?

AGENDA ITEM #7: UNIVERSITY REORGANIZATION QUESTION / COMMENT PERIOD

GROS LOUIS: Okay, if not then we'll go to the irregular questions, item number 7. Ted do you want to say anything more than you did?

T. MILLER: No, I don't really want to say anymore, just that I see this as an opportunity for the faculty to engage the new environment that we are going to be working within and I think we all have some concerns about it and I'm hoping that, really, coming out of this discussion, we can have a refinement of the issues that we really want to focus on and the key issues from a faculty perspective that are really crucial as we go forward into this new environment.

GROS LOUIS: It goes over to Bill.

WHEELER: Thank you, I have a question both—it's unclear to me who will be the chief operating officer of the campus. Both from the comments at the Trustee meeting and also from the hypothetical charts provided for us. It isn't clear to me where that role lies. That the provost is viewed as being the chief academic officer of the campus and the president being the chief executive officer of the campus. But it seems unclear to me where the chief operating responsibility is and looking ahead at the budget conferences that our Provost-Designate McRobbie mentioned, who is going to be making the decisions or responding to requests? For example, in the charts you provided here it appears for example that Dean McKaig's office has shifted from reporting to what has been Ken's office to reporting to what appears to be Vice President Nelms' office—that budget in the past and requests from that office were decided by the Chancellor. But now it appears that since office is reporting to Vice President Nelms, that the budget request might be going up to the President before it ever came back down to the campus and so it's unclear to me where will budgetary responsibility and operating responsibility lie since the academic side, that is to say the faculty side, will be reporting to the provost. The student and auxiliary side will be reporting to Vice President Nelms and things are separated here in a way that has not been before.

GROS LOUIS: First of all remember that what you are looking at is simply suggestions. So, it's only been suggested that Dean McKaig will be reporting to Nelms. But to answer your question about who will make the budget decisions, in fact it's not clear to me. Michael is it clear to you?

MCROBBIE: My understanding is that for academic matters it will be the provost. I've heard nothing about any of these other changes but that doesn't mean that the President may not have ideas about it.

GROS LOUIS: I think at the moment it's just not clear.

T. MILLER: I think it would be useful Bill if you would express your view. You're an experienced member of the Budgetary Affairs Committee. So why don't you give us your view about how this should work? What would you like to see?

MCROBBIE: Can add to that Ted? That would be extremely helpful to hear views from all of you.

T. MILLER: Yes, I think that's really what we want. It's clear that there are lots of questions; I don't think there really are a lot of answers at this point. So what I think we really want to do here is to hear the views of the faculty on these matters that are not clear. What should we do?

WHEELER: I would defer to Herb and Bob, the co-chairs of the Budgetary Affairs Committee. Budgetary Affairs Committee has a long tradition of only speaking through its chairs. [Laughter]

GROS LOUIS: Bob?

TERRY: Bob?

KRAVCHUK: Herb and I haven't talked about this much Ken, as yet. But I can express a personal point of view and it seems to me that if the provost is going to be truly the chief academic officer of this campus then the provost must have authority and responsibility over all aspects of campus administration that could affect the academic mission. And to my mind, that's an inclusive undertaking that includes finance, physical plant, human resources and research. I believe that what the intent of Trustees was to give us was a strong provost and I would really prefer to see those roles combined into what is effectively a chief operating officer for the academic mission.

TERRY: Bob and I have not had a chance to coordinate our answers. Generally I agree with Bob's position but I would also note that the Trustees imagined a different role for President of Indiana University. They imagined that there was some problem, and I'm not really sure that there was, as to who was in charge of this campus; whether it was the chancellor or the president. And they decided that the president and he decided that he should be ultimately in charge of this campus. If he plays that role, I think it's to our advantage. I think it helps resolve the question of what the flagship campus of this system is. And so I don't know exactly how I would describe this because you can't certainly circumscribe in major ways, the budgetary responsibility I hope

would go to the provost but I would also hope that the president would be actively involved in the campus budget. As you know I've had debates with the President as to what we are taxed by the system. He calculates it one way and I calculate it his way and then add the extra charges that we get without notice, that's because he doesn't know about the campus budget. And if he is indeed the Chief Executive Officer of this campus, I would hope that there is an active interplay between the Provost and President over the budgetary matters of this campus.

GROS LOUIS: Other comments on this particular topic?

TERRY: Including some other folks who are on or have served on the Budgetary Affairs Committee.

GROS LOUIS: Bob?

KRAVCHUK: Just a little further elaboration. I see in the chart marked Indiana University Bloomington President, I think it's the third down. I see what is potentially a basic contradiction in that role, the financial component has been bifurcated. And as I understand it, it says vice presidents for Bloomington responsibilities "Finance" and yet we have an executive vice provost for budget under the provost and it just seems to me that neither of those roles are complementary, in which case they ought to be under a single person's responsibility or they are redundant in which case, one of them has to go.

T. MILLER: Are you looking at today's version of the chart, Bob?

KRAVCHUK: I think so, yep. Not the one on top but the third one down. It's the third one that's...

T. MILLER: There's the vice president for business and administration, is that the one you're talking about?

KRAVCHUK: No, it's under the right side, all the way over on the right, vice president Bloomington responsibilities, there's a vice president for finance and under the second box from the right marked provost and vice president for academic affairs Bloomington, the first box underneath there's an executive vice provost for budgetary planning and administration. Are they to walk around with a three foot string attached to each other and then how are they going to coordinate their activity?

T. MILLER: Well, it does seem to me, Bob, that one of the really basic questions that confronts us, given—first of all this is just my impression, but given that the Trustees have to a large extent separated the Bloomington campus from the rest of Indiana University. Given that that's happened, it seems to me that one of the really basic questions has to do with how this campus relates to the university administration. Which functions that are currently now being done by the university administration will continue to be done there? Which ones will be moved to the campus context? I think that in general you could go across the areas, whether it's the research area, whether it's the budget area, whether it's the human resources area, in all of them there are questions like that.

KRAVCHUK: I realize Ted, I'm being deliberately provocative here, but the point is that we have a chance with things in a state of flux to get some of this right and resource allocations decisions that are made should be made with due sensitivity to the needs of the academic mission and I would like to see more of that in the future than we've seen in the past.

T. MILLER: So what you're saying is that if you imagine the current situation now, where the university administration makes decisions more or less outside the frame of reference of the academic mission, without considering what the impact might be?

KRAVCHUK: Without a great deal of consultation, that's correct.

T. MILLER: You would like to see a shift so that more of the resources of the Bloomington campus or decisions regarding those are made in a context where the academic mission is part of the calculus.

KRAVCHUK: That's it.

GROS LOUIS: Yes?

MCCORMICK: If I could add as an example, our recent experiences with athletics provide just such a difficulty. If you look back athletics answers to the university-level but predominantly the impact of the structural deficit in athletics is worn by this campus.

TERRY: And that is simply another example of the president not considering the impact of his decisions on the campus budget.

GROS LOUIS: Bill?

WHEELER: So, again I have no answers to offer to any of the questions but that seemed appropriate for today. Another thought that occurred to me looking at this structure again, the one page 3, is the concern for the students because, again, by moving the dean of students from formerly the chancellor's office, soon to be provost's office, over to Vice President Nelms' office, then there become a separation between the student government and the student voice on the one hand and academic administration on the other hand. I think one of the strengths that all of us have benefited from on the current system, has been the fact that through Dean McKaig and through direct meetings with Chancellor Gros Louis, that the student voice has been heard in the administration. The Board of Aeons presumably will continue to advise Provost McRobbie but [End of Tape 1 Side A] ...Vice President Nelms' office and therefore again have at least an organizational structure, less direct communication with the provost's office than has been the case before. Heretofore it has been the case that anything that went forward to Dean McKaig would then come forward, I presume to your office in your staff meetings that you would be hearing the student perspective. But with Dean McKaig not being on the provost's staff that perspective then would be missing and so at this point what I just wish to express concern that I think the students need to be sensitive to as we move forward with this, that there is an

issue for the ways of continuity in the ways that the student voice is been heard on the academic administration side.

GROS LOUIS: Herb?

TERRY: I'd like to make a comment on the request. I disagree with Ted that you couldn't produce a model of how Indiana University is currently organized, I think you could. Certainly could in terms of the office of the vice chancellor, the chancellor for this campus. Vice president for whatever, Ken! [Laughter]. And I think it would be really helpful if your office, Ken, frankly before you step down would devote some resources to giving us an organizational chart for the way things are organized now. Okay?

GROS LOUIS: Done.

TERRY: Good, because I think those of us who serve on the Budgetary Affairs Committee or those who have been around 31 years in my case, we have some idea of how this place is organized and who reports to whom but it would be hard for general faculty members to see what changes are if it isn't in juxtaposition to something else.

The second thing that I think would be useful, probably something the Agenda Committee should do is, it's not only a matter of organization it is matter of function. I assume each of these offices have some statements as to what it is that they are responsible for and it would be helpful to create a comprehensive collection of those. I went looking at another university that doesn't seem to have an organization chart; the University of Wisconsin today. I wrote to the provost to see if she would send me one. Each of their offices has a paragraph or so that's a pretty good description of responsibilities and what we're looking at here is, I think, both a matter of organization and perhaps the shuffling and rearrangement of responsibilities and it would be useful to know where we're starting.

GROS LOUIS: This is something that I prepared for the new Trustee orientation. So this is the Bloomington Chancellor's chart, you can't see from all the way where you are sitting. But the green are the deans, the blue are the vice chancellors and the yellow are administrative deans and directors, from Radio and TV, art museums and things of that sort. And under the vice chancellors is listed, not in paragraph, but listed what their major responsibilities are. So for example, Jeanne is responsible for summer sessions, military science, faculty development, faculty records, academic support services, aerospace studies and university division. And then under Dean McKaig is student activities, student legal services etc. And then I also have a similar chart for my function as vice president. Many of these duties will be taken over by Charles Bantz. Anyway, what I'll do is give copies of this to the Agenda Committee and they'll distribute them.

T. MILLER: One of the things that I think creates a challenge for us in thinking about this is that Ken at present is both the Chief Executive Officer of the Bloomington campus and the Chief Academic Officer of the Bloomington campus. He is both of those things. What the Trustees have done, is to separate those roles and it seems to me fairly reasonable to believe that when those roles are separated some of the things that currently report to Ken will report the president.

And the student affairs area may well—could be one of them; it could be one of them. I think that's a fairly important question, just how are we going to deal with this? Our chief of staff here as many of you know is a student affairs expert. Her view of the situation, if I could just relay this Kelly you could fill in if you wanted to. But her view is that our current organization regarding student affairs is really way out of whack in terms of sort of contemporary practice in student affairs and our organization doesn't look much like any other university looks. This back page chart is in a sense kind of puts it together in a package that makes a little more sense I think from Kelly's point of view. Well, maybe, I won't put words in your mouth.

GROS LOUIS: I think a major question that Ted has touched on and many of you have touched on is what does the president and what did the Trustees have in mind when they made the president the president to the Bloomington campus. I think that is really a major issue and it's something that Michael and Adam will have to talk through in great detail.

MCROBBIE: Which is why hearing opinions like that is very helpful.

GROS LOUIS: Yes?

PRYOR: But given that we're going to have Bloomington Campus Admissions Policy and given that we're just worked on the new student code of conduct that pertains specifically to the Bloomington campus, it would seem to me that those mandate the fact that we have to have a dean of students who reports to the head of the Bloomington campus, not—I think given that student affairs is increasingly controlled at the campus level, surely it's a great fit for them to respond to somebody who has a focus on the Bloomington campus and not an overview of this at the entire system.

GROS LOUIS: As you think about these issues, there's one thing that Michael knows about and maybe some of you do too, there's something called an Academic Leadership Council. It used to be called the Academic Officer's Committee. I chair that. It's made up of the vice chancellors for academic affairs from all campuses. It's to that committee that all new degrees, undergraduate and graduate, go after they've been vetted by the appropriate committees on each campus, requests for new centers and institutes after they've been approved by the appropriate offices etc., name changes, academic policies go through that Council before any action is taken by the board, before it goes to the board agenda. So some of the comments about these charts were concerned that the Graduate School reports to Michael, undergraduate programs report to Charles Bantz in Indianapolis. But the link I think is that with Academic Leadership Council where both undergraduate and graduate programs would go and either that will be co-chaired by Michael or Charles or chaired by one of them. I think the co-chairing is the best of the two but I'm not going to have a final say in that. Anyway, it's something many people don't know about, it has a long history and it's had different names. There's always been a group like that which considers new degrees, centers and institutes, etc., name changes, academic policies before they go to the board and that will continue in some form.

T. MILLER: Another dimension of this I think that creates difficulties for us is that in our current structure, the term or the title vice president is a university level title. At the campus level we use the term chancellor and vice chancellor. So we can distinguish easily between who's a

campus official, who's a university official by these titles. If the president of the university is going to be the chief executive officer of the Bloomington campus, it is not beyond the realm of the possible that we could have campus officials that are vice presidents. So if you look at the fourth page of this white sheet or fifth page I guess it. This is the stuff the vice president for student development and diversity, that's what you were talking about Bill; you'll notice please that this is an Indiana University Bloomington chart. This vice president in this chart is viewed as a campus official, not a university official. So this vice president could be Dick McKaig, right, it could be Dick McKaig. So we're moving into an era where these titles, I think, are going to be a little less definitive in terms of just what they might mean, in terms of where people are positioned in the structure and so forth.

GROS LOUIS: We didn't have a chance to look at the charts at the other institutions to see if it's frequently the case that vice presidents report to the provost, as is true at Purdue for example. Yes Bob?

KRAVCHUK: That point is very, very well taken Ted and I want to return to something that you said a few minutes ago Ted and hard be it for me to disagree with you in a public forum but it just seems to me that the way you characterize Ken's role, it almost made it sound as though the change that was taking place is going to constitute a weakening of the chancellor's role and I see it going in the other way. I hope I'm not misinterpreting what you said but when I think of a chief administrative officer, a chief executive officer I normally think of somebody that has comprehensive responsibilities but human resources and physical plant and in fact many finance decisions are outside the chancellor's control. And so it just seemed to me that what we wanted to think of in terms of a model that resulted in a strong provost which by the way, this is not a contradiction in terms, would also strengthen the president. When I think of the Purdue model, you have a strong president backed by a strong provost each of them sort of sovereign in their respective spheres, the division of labor very well worked out but the president is freed up from the responsibilities for the day-to-day campus without advocating authority and ultimate responsibility. But the day-to-day management is the handled by the provost and permits the president then to turn his efforts to the external constituency where he has done an absolutely bang up job of promoting that university. More humorously Ken, correct me if I'm wrong but I understand that the one thing that you do have the authority in the finance side to approve on your own are locker fees, is that correct?

GROS LOUIS: That's right.

KRAVCHUK: I'd like to see your successor in that new role able to do more.

GROS LOUIS: Larry?

THIBOS: I'd like to make some comments about the organizational charts that are being discussed here. There are a number of bases along which you could use to make an organizational chart like this. The traditional way is through geography. We're all on the same campus together, we sort of work together in the administrative role and each of the different campuses has a mission of its own. The mission differentiation process is trying to identify a culture associated with each campus but also an administrative chart like this, lines connecting

boxes, typically represents pipe lines of money and so along with the administrative responsibility goes fiscal responsibility.

And then there is also the academic mission associated with each of the little sub-elements and sometimes these various ways of thinking about an organizational chart align with one another and sometimes they don't; they conflict and intercept rather than become collinear. And the School of Optometry I think represents the example, maybe the extreme example, of how some of these different ways of organizing the university can conflict with each other. It's conspicuous that the School of Optometry has been identified by the Trustees as one of the only schools on campus for which its budgetary responsibility might be shifted, they are proposing it be shifted, to the new life sciences president and maybe that was, I don't know the thinking behind that, maybe it was a done along the line of mission, academic mission—thinking well optometry is a life science profession, a professional school. So that way it lines up nicely in terms of its mission with the president for life sciences who happens to be located in Indianapolis of course. You might think the same thing might apply to the School of Health, Phys Ed and Recreation and that could be seen as a health science mission as well. But when you start thinking along those lines and maybe transferring budgets as well because of that mission also the geography issue starts to conflict and the culture issue starts to conflict with that kind of realignment. The School of Optometry is very closely aligned to the mission of this campus; it's a research school. We have a very strong program in basic science and clinical research. We depend strongly on Bloomington campus facilities and all that stuff the Office of the Vice President offers, faculty support programs, institutional review boards, grants and contracts, all these facilities are made available to us because we're on the Bloomington campus. It's part of that cultural milieu of this campus and we're part of that. We feel that we have collaborations, many of our faculty have collaborations with people around this table, different departments on campus.

So one wonders if there's a realignment of our budget and though we're geographically still here, problems are going to arise and we are pretty confused at this point as to what this all means for us and we're hoping that we'll be part of this dialogue with the new provost and sorting out what it all really means when you're thinking about realigning the school with the vice president for life sciences. We don't quite know what that really means and we hope we don't lose ground and ability to function well on this campus and in a research environment as a result of that kind of realignment.

GROS LOUIS: All your points are well taken. Remember the action taken by the Trustees was to move the budget to IUPUI chancellor, not to Craig Brater. But all your points are whole, I just wanted to clarify. Yes, Bill?

WHEELER: I'd like to respond to Larry because one of the things from the previous reorganization there in the 1970s was a strong endorsement of the principle of campus-specific tenure and the comments that Larry just made it may be appropriate for the faculty councils to reaffirm that principle because with the shift of the budget for the optometry from Bloomington to IUPUI chancellor it begins to suggest that—well could a question arise there. So I think it may be important for us to reaffirm the principle of campus-specific tenure.

GROS LOUIS: Yes, I think that—and Sarita made some very good points in the deans meeting this week and I'm hoping she's going to write those up along with her colleagues in optometry and point out some of these concerns that Larry has raised as well. Yes?

A. MILLER: We're having a hard time hearing you from back here. So we're missing a large chunk of the discussions so I was just wondering if people might be able to speak up a little bit.

GROS LOUIS: Okay thanks, thank you. If any of you make a comment, she can't hear it, so when you talk, talk up loud.

T. MILLER: Could I just say something about this as well. My own—I was quite alarmed when I read that part of the Trustee's, I'm not sure if it's the white paper that they distributed, where they were talking about shifting budget lines here and there. One of the things that we have, over now maybe seven or eight years, tried to work out for Indiana University, was how promotion and tenure was going to be administered in this really very complicated environment of multi-campus schools, system schools. Who reviews the dossiers? Where do they go from? So forth and so on. And many of you know this particular effort has failed to date. We have not been able to develop a policy that actually kind of indicates how we want this done. There are all kinds of conflicts. I shouldn't say that it's been going on for on only for 7 years, it really started back in 1970 with the reorganization. The Faculty Council spent a long time trying to work out how promotion and tenure should be handled in this new structure and it was never possible to come to any conclusions, anything that would be acceptable to the Council. So these questions are absolutely vital basic questions. If the budget for Optometry goes to the Indianapolis campus, there is no question but that the Indianapolis campus is going to feel that they are responsible for the appointments in Optometry, that the tenure in Optometry is going to be in Indianapolis. They're going to decide who gets tenure. There's no question about that.

Now at the same time Michael, in this white paper, the trustees are talking about the provost and the responsibility of the provost in this area. And basically they're saying well the provost is going to be responsible for all of the faculty in Bloomington with regard to promotion and tenure. Ken right now is not responsible for all of the faculty in Bloomington or the promotion and tenure because some of the system schools do get shipped off to Indianapolis. I believe that's still happening, is that not true? I think it's still happening, in SPEA I think it's happening.

GROS LOUIS: Well, they all come to me.

T. MILLER: Ultimately, but the chancellor at IUPUI has a role in the SPEA promotion and tenure cases that originate in Bloomington at this point. So this is a matter that just has to be worked out. The idea that the money can go here and there is not that simple by any stretch of the margin.

GROS LOUIS: Yes Craig?

BRADLEY: Well we've had a number of people who've expressed their concern about the current chancellor of the Bloomington campus not having control over matters that would seem to be critical of the Bloomington campus like human resources and buildings and grounds and

that sort of thing and athletics and I just want to add my voice to people who've referred to these very specific things that it seems to me the model we should be going for is the president as the chairman of the board and the provost as, in effect, whatever the trustees may have called it, as the chief executive officer of the Bloomington campus with control over everything—athletics, human resources etc, with the president of course having the final say over those things. But one of the things we've heard of about the difficulty of finding a new chancellor was that the chancellor's position lacks powers that you would ordinarily expect the chancellor to have over these matters. And of course ultimately the responsibility would be on the president. But we've seen now that if the president is not interested in those campus matters, things can just not get done. So to me it makes a lot of sense to have the provost have the first say on all of those matters that affect the campus so immediately as buildings and ground, human resources and athletics, subject then only to the approval of the president if the president is interested in it. Right now we have a president who doesn't seem to be very interested in some of these things and so they're just not getting done or they're getting done at the disadvantages of the Bloomington campus as in the case of athletics. So I would strongly urge that the incoming provost to try to draw those strands into his office to the extent that he can without in anyway detracting from the ultimate power of the president but in terms of day-to-day responsibilities.

GROS LOUIS: Herb?

TERRY: I agree with your comments but I'm kind of hopeful that we will not design an organizational system based on the interests of the current office-holders. My model for this university in the future would be a president who indeed functions as a chief executive officer of this campus and delegates much of the responsibility for the regional campuses and for IUPUI to a vice president, vice chancellor or whatever you want to call him or her.

But what I really wanted to say though is that I'm concerned that Trustee Ferguson has thrown a gauntlet down to us and I hope we are prepared to respond. He has said that he's interested in receiving faculty input; he has also indicated, to me at least, and through their actions, that the pace at which the trustees are prepared to move is rather fast. I don't know how to phrase this, I'm not even sure it should be a resolution, but what I would suggest is that while we may debate these issues in part or all of our next six meetings the trustees are going to be moving forward and the president is going to be moving forward and the interim provost is going to be moving forward. And from time to time they are going to want to know, I hope, what the faculty thinks about something. I don't think we have any structure other than to clearly empower our Agenda Committee to speak for us, at least in a reactive fashion, when asked what we think of something, I would like to say that we trust the Agenda Committee to represent us. Now from time to time that committee might say that the faculty is divided on that and we don't know. But at other times I think we need to make it clear to the trustees and to the president and the interim provost that there is a source that they can go to for answers to questions that they have and that that source is the Agenda Committee of this Council. I don't know if we should adopt a resolution affirming something that might already be true under our Constitution or not. But I wanted to lay on the table the proposition that they aren't going to wait six meetings for our input and I suggest less than six months and we need to be nimble enough to keep up with something we did. I mean we shook the president and the trustees out of lethargy. Good. I'm glad we did. And I think there are all kinds of prospects for things that have been covered and pasted over for

decades to be addressed but they won't come out well if they don't have faculty input from those of us who have had 31 years here and from others. And the only way to do that is to make it quite clear for those who want to know where to go that the place to go to find out what faculty on the Bloomington campus thinks is the Agenda Committee.

T. MILLER: Well I think the Agenda Committee is prepared to play that role, Herb. But at the same time my, you know, one of the advantages we have in the BFC is that we do meet fairly regularly, we meet every other week. And so what I'm hoping that we can do here is to come to some sense of what we think the big questions are and work with the administration to kind of come to some convergence on what the big questions are and start there and those are things that we can talk about. It's not that all of this is going to be settled in the next ten days. We do have some time to work on it but I think it is important that we get on the same page with the administration in terms of what decisions they really want to make now so that we can have a little, we can have a discussion and then go move down the list. At least that's the scheme that seems to me to be reasonable.

GROS LOUIS: I have no special knowledge when I make this statement but I share Herb's concern/belief statement that the trustees may well act very quickly.

OGREN: I agree with that notion that the big picture is very important and for me these box charts may be a little complex but I am drawn to the simple drawings on your Discussion 1.0 and I think that these questions need (inaudible). What bothers me about that is that we have at the top the one picture of the multiple campuses but immediately the next one down is a Ven diagram seems to put IU Med School sort of people to Bloomington. There's a funny distortion there that's going on that I don't really understand and I would have thought at least it might be, if we're going to make a statement about IU Bloomington being the flagship campus the first bubble drawing should be a series of little spokes going down to the regional campuses including IUPUI. But of course there's other options than this and I just wanted to know what led you to start the diagrams like this showing the IU Med School and IUPUI being as big as Bloomington in your charts.

T. MILLER: Well they actually aren't my charts but I will give you my response to this. If you go back two meetings of the trustees they almost kind of out of the hat created a new vice presidency in this university—Vice President for Life Sciences. And then on the 14th they created a vice president for academic affairs in Bloomington and provost and they created an executive vice president and named Charles Bantz to that position. So if you look at the structure of the university now it seems to me that it's not unreasonable to think that our current university really consists of three parts. There's the Bloomington part; there is the part that is headed by Craig Brater, the Vice President for Life Sciences—I'm not sure what the constituent elements of that part, what that is, I guess it's the School of Medicine at this point. These diagrams here suggest that it could be broader than that but I don't think that's really what the trustees are talking about at this point. And then there's the other part that has the other campuses. It's seems to me that that's not an unreasonable way to look at where we are right now. Now where we're going to go from here I think is somewhat uncertain. Whether those other campuses are going to remain as kind of a group headed by some university official or whether they are going to

devolve into more independent campuses I'm frankly not sure. But really it does seem to me that we now have a university that has these three main parts to it.

WATSON: It seems to me we're making a really substantive decision though if you like that three-part standing it recognizes the fiscal power of the Medical School and subsumes a lot of life science work done on this campus and implies that it's directed toward medical science. So I think in terms of growth of the sciences on this campus and the life sciences it has a very negative impact. Plus I think it releases, well I don't know how RCM works anymore, but it does isolate most of the Medical School overhead back into the Medical School by making it a separate reporting entity and line for that. Whereas I think even now the departments that bring in money through grants, some of that's going to fund other functions on campus, although I know it's channeled more directly back toward departments than it was years ago. But I think that could really (inaudible).

GROS LOUIS: My understanding, and Michael may be able to add to this too, that among other charges to Craig Brater is that he, as vice president for life sciences, he ensure that there's greater collaboration between the Medical School and appropriate departments on the Bloomington campus that are also life sciences.

WATSON: I missed what you said, there's appropriate...

GROS LOUIS: ...oh, whatever departments are appropriate, probably biology and chemistry would be the main ones...

MCROBBIE: You said coordination.

GROS LOUIS: Coordination, yes.

WATSON: But nonetheless, programs that are not medically or human oriented in those departments may suffer badly for that kind of reorganization because you've got a big gorilla there doing human-oriented work and yet some of your major strengths on this campus lie outside of medical.

MCROBBIE: There are no reporting changes on this campus and everything in the life sciences in this context could, in this context, continues to report as before. Craig Brater's role is one of coordination and his direct-report is the School of Medicine.

WATSON: Can you address whether the Medical School overhead stays in the Medical School?

MCROBBIE: I believe the indirects at the School of Medicine are basically, when they go to campus they go back to the Medical School, pretty much all of it goes back to the Medical School.

GROS LOUIS: Herb?

TERRY: I would like to propose a totally unnecessary resolution which won't be the first time

for the BFC. But I think the resolution does nothing more than restate the Constitution of the Faculty but unfortunately under the current circumstances I think it would be a good idea if we adopted it to clarify our understanding of the Constitution. Generally here is what I would say “The Bloomington Faculty Council expresses its expectation that the trustees and system and campus administrators will consult effectively with the Bloomington faculty on matters arising from the trustees actions and statements of January 14, 2006. For purposes of that consultation the BFC recognizes its Agenda Committee as its representative and authorizes it to speak for the Bloomington faculty when it feels comfortable doing so.”

GROS LOUIS: Is there a second to that resolution?

DAVILA: Second.

GROS LOUIS: Any discussion? If not, all those in favor of the resolution say ‘aye’ [AYE]. Opposed? Abstain? Good. You don’t have to leave Herb.

TERRY: I’m just giving this to Kelly.

GROS LOUIS: Bill?

WHEELER: To continue along with what Herb was referring to actually I felt that it was that what I heard from the trustees and the president were moving us more toward the bottom picture. Rather than the three circles, to two circles that the announced reorganization and having the Med School report directly to the president and having the president be the chief executive officer of Bloomington does in some sense bring the Med School back together with Bloomington the way it was before IUPUI, reuniting the Med School and the Bloomington campus under the president as the chief executive officer, while putting IUPUI excluding the Med School and the regional campuses under the new executive vice president so that it was almost beginning to separate Bloomington and the Med School on the one hand from all the other regional campuses which would have the executive vice president as their chief executive officer. So I read that as really in some sense separating, bringing the Med School back to Bloomington jointly reporting to the president, everyone else reporting to the executive vice president and looking down the road at some point in time and perhaps even spinning off. You know the Med School feels very strongly that it is the IU Med School, not the IUPUI Med School. And so I thought that responded to that that the Med School and the Bloomington campus are the traditional core of Indiana University and this reunites the traditional core under the direct leadership of the president and perhaps lays a foundation for perhaps moving the others off into a different organization at some distant point in time.

GROS LOUIS: And there are some significant implications of what Bill has just said and that is that I assume that the reporting of research income and members of academies, etc. will now combine the Medical School with Bloomington, as for example Cornell’s Medical School, as many of you know, is in New York City but when Cornell reports it includes the Medical School academy members and Medical School research dollars along with those that are in Ithaca.

MCROBBIE: So the implications of that for rankings and so on could be significant.

OGREN: Well that's interesting because in fact I hadn't thought about it that way but that bottom drawing in fact is just what I was suggesting that we might have seen as an evolution. That is this really bubble is really a number of bubbles which are regional campuses including IUPUI.

BRADLEY: It's like a tectonic shift; the continent of IUPUI has been separated from the Medical School.

OGREN: Well we don't know if the bubbles are coalescing or not.

GROS LOUIS: There are many at IUPUI who are very unhappy with the changes that were made January 14th and I don't know to what extent they will make that known to the Board or if they already have but obviously, it's an irony because if you know IUPUI as well as I do you for years the fact that they have been irritated that they are overshadowed by the Medical School. Now they are irritated that they're not going to be overshadowed by the Medical School! Bob?

IVIE: In one sense it's kind of hard to offer an opinion because there are some areas that are sort of difficult to figure out and one of them that at least I am not clear on is if, and I'm speaking now structurally I'm not talking about the people in the positions but just the structural dimension of this. If the president is going to become more closely identified with the operation of the Bloomington campus that would seem to suggest that the provost is going to be one of many reporting to a very active president and as this white sheet points it out it puts the provost along the line with nine, one of nine vice presidents reporting to the office of the president. And that's one of twenty lines reporting to the president across all of the university campuses. So if the president structurally is going to become a more Bloomington proactive agent, does that mean that the president's going to become less engaged with the rest of the campuses that are Indiana University? If it does not mean that then I think one of the resolutions that the faculty passed is not being responded to, which is that we need an executive officer for the Bloomington campus that will be in a position to advance very aggressively the Bloomington campus needs. We felt that we were slipping over a long period of time. And so it seems to me that what Professor Bradley was saying, and others have said, becomes really focused here in that should various vice-presidents filter through the provost if the provost is really going to be carrying the load because the president still has the same range of considerations for all of the different campuses as the president had before the trustees made these changes. And I can't figure that out. I can't figure out if the president is now going to become a super president, is going to do everything the president has been doing and also become fairly proactive on campus. Or if the provost is going to be the position that's going to give us what we have sensed we've been lacking structurally and that is a very strong voice for the academic programs and all of the budgetary implications to go with that. If you spread the money out all these other priorities, whether they're athletics or whether they're Medical School or whether they're something at IUPUI or some other kind of thing, because the structure reflects university-wide considerations first and Bloomington as a subset. So I get lost in the details but at the big level that seems to me to be one of the unanswered questions. What structurally is the president going to be vis-à-vis Bloomington and if it's just going to be more of the same then I think we have to think about organizing the provost's office so that it has more power rather than less power so that people

would be filtered through it rather than vice presidents, for example, filtered through it, rather than it being one across the line of nine folks reporting to the president.

GROS LOUIS: If you read the job description of the executive vice president that answers part of your question in that the executive vice president will be overseeing program reviews, accreditation, etc., etc. on all the other campuses. So the president, some of the things that the president would have done will now be in the hands of the executive vice president for all campuses except for Bloomington.

IVIE: Except that kind of reasons...that doesn't reason directly to the Bloomington situation.

GROS LOUIS: No, of course.

T. MILLER: If I could just say something in response to that, Bob. One of the things that is clear to me is that the trustees have taken this action primarily to improve the quality of the Bloomington campus. I think that that is their clear objective in this. And I know that they understand that one of the problems that has existed in Bloomington is that there is no person that actually has the kind of authority that you're talking about that can really make things happen that need to happen. And my sense is that they are intent on doing something about that.

GROS LOUIS: That may be Steve Ferguson calling.

T. MILLER: Yes. So I think there are a lot of unknowns about this but when it comes right down to it I think that what the trustees have in mind is to create a situation along the lines that you were describing where there is the authority in a place and I think that this is going to be in the provosts' office, that's my sense of what this is going to be. But when you look at what we've got now, you know all the vice presidents, all this stuff, right, it's clear there are going to be a number of changes to make that happen but I really do think that that is where they are coming from. And I think that keeping our eye on that big picture is going to be crucial because I think we want that too.

IVIE: Things going through the provost.

T. MILLER: Yes.

GROS LOUIS: Bill?

WHEELER: Well what I heard that Saturday was a little different from that because what I thought the president was saying is that one of the difficulties in talking to presidents at other institutions he mentioned that some other president had said that he would not consider taking a presidents' job if the president did not have much more direct authority and influence over the main campus. And I had the sense that the trustees were agreeing with that and that what they are putting in place is looking ahead to the next president. That it might be, for the reasons and observations that have been made, that the current occupants of the offices might not be active in the presidential role for the Bloomington campus but they might be laying the groundwork for a rather different type of person in 2008.

BRADLEY: But the problem is that the regional campuses have a big say politically, there is political power around the state and also within the university about who the president is, whereas this new structure removes the regional campuses from having a say about who our provost is. So it's difficult to get a president who has a lot of ambition for the Bloomington campus. But at least now we're free to choose a provost who has a lot of ambition for the Bloomington campus. It was really bad when we were interviewing the chancellor candidates because three people from IUPUI who were supposedly invited by accident showed up at the meeting and dominated the meeting with the candidates. It was very frustrating since we thought we were there to interview our chancellor and to hire our chancellor and they were the ones who did all the talking. At least next time we try to hire a provost and that won't happen because of the separation of powers but that's always going to be the case when you choose a president. So I'm less confident of getting a president who is really pro-Bloomington because I'm afraid unless he keeps quiet about it he won't get the job.

WHEELER: If that were the case then one could [End of Tape 1, Side B]...that if that was their intent then why replace the title 'chancellor' with the title 'provost' because if the objection there is not to the chancellor's aspect of the office but with regards to the senior vice president role. What they've done there is taken both of those parts away.

BRADLEY: I can't answer that question. I assume it's to make it clear that this is a new position with a new title.

IVIE: Just to spin off that, I think that helps clarify the point which is that we're not going to be able to have a president of the Bloomington campus per se. And what we really want is very strong leadership for the Bloomington campus which says to me that when somebody applies to the presidency of Indiana University they're applying for the presidency for all of those campuses. Structurally that's the way it's going to be. So that seems to me to argue for an organizational chart that empowers the provost more rather than less.

GROS LOUIS: Herb?

TERRY: For what it's worth I'm thinking of the career path of your predecessor, Bob O'Neil. Bob left the chancellor's position here to head the University of Wisconsin system. Maybe he didn't do due diligence but I think he got there and discovered the job wasn't what he expected in the sense that he had very little influence over what campuses did.

GROS LOUIS: Especially Madison.

TERRY: Especially Madison. And so he left and replaced Thomas Jefferson at Virginia which is good for him. But I kind of agree with Bill. I think that the trustees, I hope that the trustees, are looking ahead at the next president of this system and want to make that an attractive job. And I think we benefit if instead of giving in to political realities, as Craig put it, and the power of the little tiny regional campuses that we instead bite the bullet and I hope the trustees are willing to do it and we say this is a system with: one Research I institution of the first rank—Indiana University Bloomington; a very good and very distinctive urban university and other campuses

that perform both regional functions and feeder functions to the rest of the system. And we make the president's job of heading that including really safeguarding and promoting the interests of that Research I campus an attractive job to qualified individuals.

GROS LOUIS: Yes?

KRAVCHUK: I don't think it serves our interest to burden the presidency with too many day-to-day management functions with respect to this campus. It seems to me that we want someone who is going to be a forceful external presence—cheerleader and chief if you will. I might find somebody who is capable of bilocation who like Martin Jischke could be several places at once in the same time and it's like the scarlet pimpernel—he appears everywhere and no one can, you know, they don't catch his trail, they detect his presence and before they know it he's gone on to the speech or the next you know fundraiser. To get that kind of person...

CARR: Can you picture the job description? [LAUGHTER]

KRAVCHUK: ...you can't burden them with day-to-day management responsibilities. It seems to me the way that you can strip the presidency of administrative functions yet at the same time make it strong is to design the job around the kind of person that doesn't want to get their fingernails dirty with too many day-to-day details, that is happy to have a strong provost take care of that while they be presidential and do the sorts of things that presidents do. So I'm afraid I have to side in this case with Craig and with Bob Ivie in that we certainly want to see a clear delineation of functions between president and provost with respect to the Bloomington campus.

GROS LOUIS: Yes?

JAGODZINSKI: I have a question about process. If the trustees indeed are going to move rapidly, how far down these organizational charts are they going to move? What's going to be their process for doing this? And if we're going to have five more meetings worth of discussions on this what structure will we have for discussions? Will we just simply say in the end ok Agenda Committee go and represent whatever you heard at the BFC meetings or are we going to do something in writing that presents a cohesive position of this body if there is such a thing?

T. MILLER: Well it's a good question. First, I'm not really sure what's going to happen. But I am hoping that if the trustees are going to move rapidly that they are going to tell us roughly speaking which area they want to move rapidly in first, ok? And then I'm hoping that we can spend a little more focused time here in the Council. I'm not saying that we're going to spend all the next six meetings, two hours worth of just talk talk talk about this stuff, but to the extent that there is a focused question that we want the faculty's views to be known about I'm hoping we can identify those questions in coordination with the administration and with the trustees. We can have that discussion and the Agenda Committee can go and represent the faculty council in whatever way it can along those lines. That's the image that I have at this point.

MCROBBIE: If I could make a comment, Ted. Like Ken said before, I don't have any particular special knowledge, obviously I have some ideas and thoughts on these matters, but there is a trustees meeting next week and the next meeting of this Council is not until after that. There has

been a series of views that have been presented and if some of those represent some kind of consensus you may wish to think about expressing those in a more formal manner in a reasonably prompt way simply because things are moving pretty fast and I think are going to move pretty fast. If you want to have your views heard I suggest you might want to think about recording them and transmitting them fairly rapidly.

PRYOR: So are you proposing that this community should produce a flow chart that they find desirable or what product would you advise?

MCROBBIE: My own view is I would suggest you stay away from flow charts simply for the kinds of reasons that have been raised before when you get into intricacies about who reports to whom and why it's that way and not that way. It seems like the various principles and views being expressed, as opposed to the intricacies of a flow chart, and reporting those principles if there's a consensus on some of them would be I think the most important thing that you could do in helping those people who are going to be trying to pull this together and make these decisions in the next few weeks. Things could be going to move fairly quickly. The trustees have made no bones about that and there's a trustees meeting next week and there's a series of issues on the agenda there that might bear on some of these matters?

GROS LOUIS: Bill?

WHEELER: Do we know what those issues on the trustees agenda are?

MCROBBIE: They will, I think there might be some further refinement on some of these matters, but when you look at questions of search processes since they have indicated that they have concerns about the present nature of search processes. That I suspect will come up for discussion at the next meeting. I think the agenda, maybe it's already out and on the website, if not it will be out soon.

WHEELER: Can we ask the Agenda Committee to look at those things and see whether they think there's anything on the agenda for the trustees meeting on the 2nd and 3rd to which the Council should respond? And if the Agenda Committee feels that there are, either following the resolution we passed earlier the Agenda Committee can speak on our behalf, or if they wish they could survey us by email.

MCROBBIE: All I'm suggesting Bill is that you might want to think about being proactive rather than reactive.

CARINI: Be nimble, Ted.

T. MILLER: I've looked at the agenda for the trustees in the various committee meetings and I don't really see anything—I mean there is a discussion about search and screen procedures. They have, the trustees, appear to have this idea that the faculty is somehow unable to do search and screen processes in a timely way. And they have some ideas about how search and screen should be done. But quite frankly the document that has been produced by the trustees around this topic, frankly, doesn't strike me as being much different from the documents we have that describe our

search and screen policies. I mean it's not, I'm not sure that there's all that much to talk about. I think our problems in search and screening, these are problems in practice not so much problems in policy and procedure. We have committees, we appoint committees that have 25 people on them to do search and screen; our policy doesn't say we need 25 people. That's just something that we've done. So I'm not sure that there's all that much to this search and screen topic but that's one of the things that's on the agenda. I didn't see anything that really bears on this kind of structural, something coming to a head, in terms of these structural matters, I really didn't see anything like that on the agenda.

GROS LOUIS: Kevin?

HUNT: I'm not sure either what needs to be fixed with the search and screen process in policy but in practice it's another matter. And I think I made a few statements here about the search and screen issues and from what I've heard from other faculty members, I've not heard anyone that disagreed with me and I've heard from many people that agreed with me, and that is that one of the problems with the search and screen process is the level of secrecy that was expected in the chancellor's search. So not right off when there's a long list we expect it to be secret, and even when there's a long short list it can be secret, but the time where we're down to the last five let's say and we're discussing which of these people are going to make visits to campus I feel very strong and many of you have said to me as well that you feel very strongly, that those names should be public. And I think in the last search that one of the very strong contributing problems to that search failing was the level of secrecy that was sustained right until the very end. Had we known more about these candidates early on I think some of them would have been excluded from consideration and we could have chosen other strong candidates to take the place. And also I don't see anything that's positive about keeping the candidates' secret. By the time they are making visits to campus, by the time they are down to the last three, their names are inevitably going to be known anyway. And we find a situation where someone can ask a question about one of the candidates and the president can say that the candidates aren't public I don't feel I can make a comment about this particular candidate even when it might be the only candidate that's left standing. So I think, if I could make a change in practice, it would be to say that trying to sustain this level of secrecy at the time of the campus visits is ineffective and counter-productive.

GROS LOUIS: And I think you know, Kevin, certainly the tradition of the campus has been that the final three, or whatever the number is, see a lot of people—students, faculty, staff, and so what was done last December was not in keeping with the traditions.

HUNT: When we met with, when the AAUP met with Pat Shoulders late last week, one of the things that someone pointed out is something that I've heard other people say is that the thing that most of the faculty do is research and when these names are revealed the faculty can very quickly find out many things about these candidates that might not be apparent until a campus visit and that was the case in this last search that some of the things that were discovered about candidates late in the process would have been discovered within minutes of their names being revealed had they been revealed earlier.

T. MILLER: We have a document that came to us I think from the trustees a few days ago. It's a draft with their ideas about search and screen. We can send out a copy to the Council members.

One of the things you'll find in it, interestingly enough Kevin, is a very direct statement that says that the final group cannot be secret. I think the trustees have learned something from the experience that we've been through here recently. And on several points I think you'll find some ideas in there that I think are, from a practice point of view, quite positive, at least the way I look at it. But there will be some discussion surrounding those ideas I think.

GROS LOUIS: And those of you in the College, if you have seen your email in the last couple of hours, the first meeting of the Arts & Sciences search committee will be this Thursday and the President and Michael and I will be there. But that committee is only 10 people which is—our own procedures say that committees larger than 12 are unwieldy. So this has 10 with only one person from outside the College, Lauren Robel, who is chairing the committee. I'm sure, I hesitated sending the email to the whole College faculty, because the hour before I came over here I already had a lot of responses saying "how come this group is not represented?" Faculty in the College are 7 of them so there are some groups that are not represented. Bob did you have your hand up?

ENO: I just want to make a quick comment to follow-up on Vice President McRobbie's comment concerning the pace at which we want to respond to what's going on. The trustees have a feeling that faculty governance works very slowly and of course it does. The conversation that I've listened to since I came in, I was regrettably late today, was one of the most interesting I'd ever heard the BFC have. But it's not moving toward a quick conclusion and the trustees are putting their eyes on moving very quickly. I would strong advise this group to rely heavily on the Agenda Committee to have frequent interaction with the trustees and to give their best views of the, the views of the faculty on campus and the views of the BFC as they know them and as they have heard them at this meeting and they will continue to hear them, because the more supple the Agenda Committee can be and the more interactions they can have with the trustees as decision-making is going on, not just in trustees meetings, but in side conversations and so forth, the better they can make sure that faculty has the trustees ear in terms of the structure we want here in Bloomington, in terms of the Medical School, in terms of the entire university. So I really suggest that this group give the Agenda Committee a formal acknowledgement that they'll need to exercise unusual leeway in communicating faculty views.

GROS LOUIS: Bob right before you came in there was such a motion introduced and passed.

ENO: I'm sorry. I apologize.

TERRY: I'd like to build on Ted's comment. It sounds to me as if the trustees are doing what Trustee Ferguson said he would do. They sent us this document about what's on the agenda, or at least their thoughts on search and screen. We have been fortunate or unfortunate enough to have been elected by our colleagues as the representatives of the Bloomington Faculty at this time in the history of Indiana University. And just as the trustees are saying it's not business as usual I don't think it can be business as usual for us. Send us the trustees document, that's fine. But I think we have an obligation, each and every one of us, to look at that thing, to send our best thoughts about it back to the Agenda Committee, so that the Agenda Committee can in a timely fashion go to the trustees and say here's what the faculty things. I expect the trustees to continue to do that. That's an example of what you said, Ted, telling us in advance what they want input

on. And I hope that we will do what McRobbie suggested that we also find a way to be proactive in our own interests. But it sounds to me as if the trustees are fulfilling their end of this bargain and I think we have an obligation to not do business as usual so we can fulfill our end.

GROS LOUIS: And I think we have time for one more comment.

MCCORMICK: If possible, I would like to go back to some of the comments on the Ven diagrams because I think those are some areas where I think we can provide some input in terms of the structural, not in specifics, but in terms of the structural set-up of how the university is affected. I mean the creation of the Vice President for Medical Science (Life Sciences) sort of just as a created entity starts to begin to identify three institutions and at least from the limited discussion I've heard so far that's not been seen particularly favorably as it might impact this campus. I would ask whether or not it would be possible to just get some general feedback about how do we see this university in Bloomington. Are we simply one of a group? Or, should we have some fairly clear connections with what appears to be a medical sciences program—I realize it doesn't affect all units within the campus here but I for one am concerned about a three unit institution, particularly the way the life sciences initiative has been defined as basic sciences in Bloomington and applied sciences at the Medical School which eliminates a number of units that either do basic work and are not in the College or do applied work and are not in the School of Medicine.

GROS LOUIS: That's a very good point. We have reached the mandatory adjournment time unless somebody wants to...

T. MILLER: I have just a final comment, Ken. I'd just like to once again express my appreciation on behalf of the Council for your outstanding work for us over the years. This occasion I think is less bitter because of your appointment as university chancellor. I congratulate you on that and I think what it means, of course, at least what I think it means is that we're going to be seeing you around and we'll have the benefit of your counsel. And I think all of us are extremely pleased that that's the way it worked out.

GROS LOUIS: Thank you very much, Ted. That's very kind.

Meeting adjourned at 5:30 pm.