

**Minutes of the  
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING  
September 6, 2005  
Ballantine Hall 008  
3:30 - 5:30 P.M.**

**Members Present:** LTC Lori Bass, Lisa Bingham, Julie Bobay, Bonnie Brownlee, John Carini, Richard Carr, Jorge Chapa, Luis Davila, Erika Dowell, Paul Elliot, Emily Fairchild, Kenneth R. R. Gros Louis, Dennis Groth, Patrick Harbison, Barbara Hawkins, William Hetrick, Kevin Hunt, Robert Ivie, Cecile Jagodzinski, Susan Jones, Robert Kravchuk, David Mackay, Gerald Marker, Joss Marsh, Terrence Mason, Bryan McCormick, Dale McFadden, Murray McGibbon, Daniel Melamed, Theodore Miller, Joseph Near, John Odland, Harold Ogren, Isabel Piedmont, Lisa Pratt, Sara Pryor, Aarti Ramaswami, Amy Reynolds, Richard Rubinger, Jeanne Sept, Jodi Shepherd, Alex Shortle, Jerrold Stern, Neil Theobald, Larry Thibos, David Waterman, Maxine Watson, Cara Wellman, William Wheeler, Gary Wiggins, Nicholas Williams, Eric Zeemering.

**Alternates Present:** Elyce Rotella for Elizabeth Johnson, David Daleke for John Slattery, Geoffrey Conrad for Sarita Soni

**Members Absent:** Katy Borner, Craig Bradley, Romualdo De Souza, Sandra Dolby, William Leckey, Theresa Ochoa

**Visitors Present:** John Graves (Faculty Council Office), Steve Hinnefeld (Herald-Times), Herb Terry (Telecommunications; Acting Parliamentarian)

## **Agenda Item #1: Approval of Minutes**

**GROS LOUIS:** The first item of business is the approval of two sets of minutes from April 5 and April 19 last spring. Are there any comments about those minutes? If not I will assume that they are approved as submitted. I'll turn to Ted Miller for the Agenda Committee business.

## **Agenda Item #2: Agenda Committee Business**

**MILLER:** Thank you very much, Ken. I would like begin by going through the documents that are in front of you. Just a few comments about them. Circular B1-2006 is the list of Faculty Council members. I'm not sure that it's exactly totally current as of this moment but there will be a replacement coming to you shortly that will have the final list in it. You'll note please that Bonnie Brownlee is serving this year as the Secretary of the Council and Craig Bradley is serving as the Parliamentarian. You'll note that Herb Terry is substituting for Craig today. Craig, some of you probably know was a clerk for Justice Rehnquist early on in his career and he is now in Washington for the funeral so he'll be back with us at our next meeting I'm sure.

Circular B2 is a list of the standing committees of the Council and the members. I just want to make a comment about the Agenda Committee. Some of you are aware that in electing the Agenda Committee for this year the final result was that a College faculty member was not elected. In the initial election there were no College faculty members elected to the Agenda Committee. As a result of that and conceding that the College is a very important unit of Indiana University, the Agenda Committee exercised its prerogative under the Bylaws of the Council and added to its membership a College faculty member that is Kevin Hunt from Anthropology. Kevin actually was a candidate for Agenda Committee election this year and was the next person in line in terms of the vote tally and so he agreed graciously to join the Agenda Committee this year. So we have an Agenda Committee of seven members rather than the traditional six members this year.

We also have in front of us Circular B3 which is a Summary of Actions Taken in the previous year. I thought that I might just give you an update on several of the items on this list. On Page 2, down two-thirds of the way down perhaps there is the item on Background Checks for Academic Appointees. That item was approved by the BFC, it was approved by the University Faculty Council and it is currently under discussion with the Trustees. The Trustees have had several meetings where they have had a bit of a focus on this issue and I would say at this point the Faculty Affairs Committee is sort of in negotiation with the Trustees over some points in our proposed policy. So we'll be hearing more about that as we go on this year. I think what's going to happen is that we're going to make a few modest revisions, hopefully people will view them as modest, but that document will be coming back to the Council for some discussion and then we'll kind of go on with it. So that's an item that's still under review. The Paid Family Leave Policy is in a similar status. The Trustees have been presented with the policy which was approved at the UFC level and they have some questions about it. These are primarily financial questions and there is sort of a discussion going on between the faculty and the Trustees over that issue as well. The Conflict of Commitment Policy is a document that was approved by the BFC at one of the final meetings of last year. It was taken to the University Faculty Council at

which time the UFC decided that it did not want to vote at the end of last year. That policy will come back to the UFC this year. There were a few last minute changes in that document and some of the campuses felt they wanted to think about those changes for a longer period of time than they had and so I'm expecting that will be back to the UFC very shortly. The Code of Student Conduct which was a major accomplishment of the Student Affairs Committee over a couple of years was indeed approved by the Trustees. There were a lot of people dancing in the aisles after that one was kind of out of the way. The Mission Statement for Bloomington will be in front of the Trustees at this upcoming meeting.

**GROS LOUIS:** First meeting. All the other campuses too.

**MILLER:** Yes. There will be a presentation of the Mission Differentiation materials to the Trustees at the September meeting and these mission statements are part of that. A couple of other comments about two items in this Circular B3. The Council has been spending a fair amount of time talking about things related to the Athletics Department and several of the items on this list fall into that category. I just want to call your attention on Page 2, I think it's Page 2, not quite halfway down, "Change in the reporting line of the Associate Athletic Director Student Athlete Services." The BFC approved a resolution to support this change in the reporting line. The final item on the third page pertains to a resolution on the Student Athletic Fee and student advising services. This has to do with the financing of this student athletic service issue and what this resolution did was basically to put the Council on record as not favoring the Student Athletic Fee and what it says here is calling for a reconsideration of the funding for student athletic services. This resolution was sort of an unusual resolution at the end of last year. It was done by an email vote. It was not something that was done in the Council. I'm making this statement to clarify where the BFC itself stands with regard to these issues. We did approve a resolution to change the reporting line; however, the campus funding of that activity was not endorsed by the BFC and we'll hear some more about that in the Budgetary Affairs Committee report later. I think there has been some confusion, there was some confusion in my mind over this particular issue, and I'm just trying to hopefully set the record straight.

All right then, the agenda for our upcoming meetings: September 20<sup>th</sup> is the next meeting of the Council and the general topic of that meeting is going to focus on admissions. Many of you I'm sure have seen the articles in the newspaper. We have some Trustees who are new to the Board of Trustees who are interested in the admissions policy regarding Bloomington. The faculty, the Educational Policies Committee over the last couple of years has been talking about admissions policies for Bloomington and we're going to have on September 20<sup>th</sup> a meeting primarily devoted to that topic. We will have a draft admissions policy that was crafted by the EPC last year. Well, actually starting in the preceding year, ending last year. That will be up for basically, a general discussion of the Council. The EPC is going to take that back under consideration and perhaps tweak a bit here and there. But we wanted early this year to get this admissions question onto the floor of the Council because it appears that this is going to be a big issue for us this year and we want to get started early. So there is a draft policy that we're going to review. The Chancellor's Enrollment Committee has produced a report about how the campus can reach its enrollment objectives. We're going to hear from Don Hessler and discuss that report. The Agenda Committee is working on a resolution. We have seen in the newspaper recently, we have seen some positions taken by members of the university administration regarding admissions.

We have seen some of the Trustees take positions regarding admissions. Our intent is to provide the Council with a resolution that will kind of put the faculty's position on record regarding Bloomington admission standards. We will have that resolution and that will be also part of the discussion and we'll ask the Council to approve that on September 20<sup>th</sup>.

The meeting following, October 4<sup>th</sup>, is a meeting that will be devoted to a discussion with President Herbert. He will be with us for the entire period that day and I imagine he'll have some things that he'll want to say and by that time we would have heard his state of union-- State of the University message and would just suggest for all of you, that questions you'll want to ask the President, you'll have a good opportunity to do that on October 4<sup>th</sup>.

Now my final item has to do with the hurricane relief efforts. We know that there are many things being done within the university, outside the university. The campus posted a statement of activities that it was undertaking. I believe we sent that to you folks yesterday by email. Some of you may have things you want to say about that and I would encourage you to-- when we have our questions and comments period, that will be an appropriate time to do that. At this point what I would like to say is that it seems reasonable and it has been suggested to me that it would be appropriate for the faculty of Indiana University to undertake some sort of, some set of activities that would support our colleagues who were affected by this hurricane in the institutions in and around New Orleans. Just what exactly those activities should be is not clear but what I would like to do at this point is simply to ask if there are three or four or five people in the BFC, or if you have colleagues in your units that you know are very interested in this, please contact Kelly. What I would like to do is form a small little working group that can act, can act and talk quickly and develop something that will be reasonable for us to do that would give some support to our faculty colleagues that are in self distress at this point. So please contact Kelly if you would be interested in participating in that.

Now, there's just one final thing. This is an announcement about the AI Affairs Committee. There was an intention that this committee would meet this afternoon but it will not meet this afternoon. AI Affairs will not meet. This actually is a hurricane related thing. Sandra Dolby who is the Chair of the committee has a daughter who was going to school in New Orleans and her family situation is sort of in turmoil right now and so the committee is not going to meet today but it will meet subsequently. Sandra will be in touch with you I'm sure about that. Thank you.

### **Agenda Item #3: Presiding Officer's Business**

**GROS LOUIS:** Thank you, Ted. Several items under the presiding officer's business. First, this is going to be a repeat of information if you got an email yesterday and if so stop me. But when it became apparent the students will not be returning to several colleges-- and Tulane by the way has announced that it's closed for the semester. New Orleans I believe is opening later this month. I don't know about Dillard and Xavier. In any case, we set up a hotline that was staffed 24 hours a day and we received about 600 calls from students from the institutions that I just mentioned as well as students who were from the affected states and who were at IU. The staff in particular, in the Admissions Office and the Registrar, University Division, Residence Halls, stayed open Saturday, Sunday and Monday. Residence Halls were open 24 hours a day to be able

to get housing lined up for students. Dean McKaig identified the students from the affected areas and sent a letter out to each of them offering assistance and any counseling that they might desire.

We've received a lot of positive feedback about our process. Apparently very few universities had a live hotline answered by a real person instead of a machine and I do want to thank all the staff who put in all those extra hours on Saturday, Sunday and Monday to be sure that all the students can be accommodated. And beginning this evening and tomorrow night and Thursday night at the Admissions Office, there's a welcome for new students. It's not a formal orientation but a welcome, but people will be there from appropriate offices to answer any questions students may have about financial aid and other issues. It's also the case that a number of faculty have offered help. Barbara Hawkins in particular, and her colleagues in the school of HPER have been in touch with the public health department in the affected states offering their support in a variety of areas appropriate to the school's missions and courses.

At the moment, and the number will probably change, we've admitted about 60 students. The Law School last I heard has admitted 19, primarily third-year students and the Law School is now filled. I've asked the academic deans on the campus when they recommend we stop admitting students and the response thus far has been mixed so in general people think we should stop admitting on Friday. Law school, which is going into its third week of classes, am I right about that, yes Lauren Robel says they really can't take anybody now, not because they don't have room but because being in the third week of classes is just too late. Some schools say they can take students early next week but certainly by midweek will be the deadline. We assume that these students have contacted other schools obviously as well. It was fascinating to me, in the Admissions Office on Sunday hearing students really shopping around asking what night life was like in Bloomington, whether the restaurants are good, whether apartments are close to campus, what the apartments look like and how expensive were they. But most of the students really just called and said, "I would like to come". The easiest students of course were those who had been admitted to IU but chose to go to Tulane, since we had all of their admissions papers here but were also admitted-- and I'll say that we've admitted without seeing transcripts as was recommended by the AAU after a conference call with the presidents of the affected institutions. Those transcripts will come later; we just have to take it on the students' word that they are in attendance at those institutions. How long they'll stay? Obviously Tulane students will stay at least through the semester. The Law School students-- is there anybody here from the Law School by the way? I don't know if the Law School students plan to finish their third year here or go back to Tulane for the second half of their third year, I don't know enough about the law curriculum and I don't know how awkward that would be to be halfway through your third year and then go back to another institution. In any case, the Law School will know that.

So at the moment we've admitted, as I've said, 60 and we expect the final number to be probably about 75 and then an additional 19 in the Law School. So, again, the staff in those offices that I mentioned really took a good chunk out of their weekend to devote time to these young people as they will from 5 to 7 tonight, tomorrow night and Thursday night in the Admissions Office.

I also wanted to welcome all of you who are new to the Council. I recognize a lot of familiar faces who have been on the Council before but a number of you are here for the first time and on

behalf of the Agenda Committee and myself I welcome you to the BFC. I think you'll find it a very interesting experience. The committees as you saw from the summary of last year do take up important issues and a number of the issues do go to the Board of Trustees for discussion and hopefully for the Board's approval.

I also wanted to mention last year there were four deans reviewed and there was a survey done of Gwyn Richards in the Music School as called for in your review policies. I prepared a summary of the four deans who are reviewed; they were Gerardo Gonzalez, Education; Dick McKaig, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs; Kumble Subbaswamy in Arts and Sciences; and Suzanne Thorin in the Libraries. And as called for in your policy, the summaries were shared with the affected dean, with the chair of the review committee and with the President of the faculty council, David Daleke, and they were all approved. So at the moment, a number of copies of the summaries are in the Dean of Faculties office and also a number of the copies are at the reference desk in the main library and if for some reason you can't get to one of those places, just contact my office and we'll be happy to send you the summaries by email. As I told the Agenda Committee, the summaries are fairly lengthy, longer than other summaries may have been in the past. But it seemed to me important to capture all of the important information in the reviews. I wouldn't say they're extremely long but they're probably in many cases about a third to a half the length of the actual review document itself, and when I shared it with the chairs of review committees, I asked them if this captured all of the main points and did it also accurately reflect the tone of their review. So those summaries are available in the Dean of Faculties office and at the reference desk in the Main Library.

In addition to the 24-hour hotline, individuals from Admissions, Residential Programs, University Division, Orientation programs, Dean of Students, had a cell phone number that they were told to give out anytime in the 24 hours if a student or parent wanted to speak to them immediately and so that was again a very generous gesture on their part.

And that's it for Presiding Officer's business. We'll go to the question and comment period.

#### **Agenda Item #4: Question and Comment Period**

**GROS LOUIS:** I had two questions in advance and then the floor will be open for your question or comments. First I heard Vice President Clapacs, here's the question: "I heard Vice President Clapacs on the radio last weekend announcing plans a major new parking garage across from the Law School. In the report he indicated that this plan was ready to be submitted to the Trustees very soon. I would like to hear what sort of campus level review this plan is taking place, both from the stand point of its impact on campus land use and its potential impact on transportation patterns. In addition, because this sort of proposal has significant implications for the city, has it received any sort of review by the town-gown committee or the city's planning department."

And here's the response I received from the architect's office. First of all, when I came back into office in January of '04, at that time, there had been discussions for about a year and a half before that about a parking garage some place near the new science building and I knew that residents in the Elm Heights area were concerned about where that was going to be. Rob

Fischman from the Law School was their spokesperson and was meeting with the architects as well as people in parking operations.

In any case, to respond, for approximately the last year, the university architect's office, parking operations and campus administration have been looking for the best location for a new parking garage on the south side of campus. Parking operations has identified this area of campus as currently the most underserved-- because the Poplars garage and the Atwater garage tend to be full and when MSB1 is completed and full, there obviously will be more need for parking in that part of campus and part of town. The Elm Heights neighborhood learned early on in the beginning of the process that we were looking at various locations and at the many meetings, telephone conversations with Rob Fischman, their representative.

In the last month we've narrowed the location to the side of the corner of Atwater and Henderson. It was determined that this site would be the least destructive to the existing residents on Third Street, the existing utilities in the alley and traffic circulation in the neighborhood. Smith Neubecker Engineers were consulted regarding access and impact on existing traffic patterns. At the August 12th meeting with Barb Ridgeway, the consultant hired by the city, the Third/ Atwater study, the process was described and preliminary drawings were given to the city of the garage. If there are additional questions, this by the way comes from Bob Meadows in the architect's office. So that's the, the short answer is that there was much discussion of this. Neighborhood residents have been involved; I'm sure not all of them are happy with the site chosen but that seemed to be the consensus site and the least disruptive and the city has been informed and know of the plans.

The second question I got in advance was: "I was surprised to see the installation of a hideous gigantic red clock,"...and the hideous has in parenthesis, "my interpretation," "on the lawn by Jordan River as I was last year to see the electronic sign in front of the union building. Do these sort of campus installations receive a sort of review through faculty or other campus committees? Perhaps some sought of ad hoc aesthetic review committee can be set in place to provide feedback for the campus before it moves forward with these installations."

You may have seen in the paper last week, and Alex if you want to add something to this, it wasn't Alex's idea but he knows the history of it as well. Some of you may remember when Meredith Suffron was president of IUSA. It was either last year before I retired or the year before that and one of her major campaign planks was to put large clocks around campus. Her point was, and I think you'll find this valid, that if you go from one building to another, all the clocks have different times, or even in the same building they have different times and so it will be helpful and also might be aesthetically pleasing, although not to the person asking the question obviously, to have the clocks.

So the response to that question is, first of all, a long history; Alex, do you know if Meredith was in 99-2000 or 2000-2001?

**SHORTLE:** '99.

**GROS LOUIS:** 99-2000. So this was first put on the table six years ago. This is again from Bob Meadows saying, “there was a discussion,” and he didn’t remember the date but I knew it was during Meredith’s time. She, by the way, is working for Proctor and Gamble now and is very happy about the clocks, contrary to the person asking the question. “There was a meeting in Terry Clapacs’ office with IUSA, Kurt Simic, Terry Clapacs and Bob Meadows. The idea of the clocks was IUSA’s. They had Dave Smith who was then the university landscape architect look at possible locations; there were seven or eight. David, Mike Crowe from campus grounds, and I presented them to Terry and four locations were selected to be presented to IUSA. A cost estimate was developed, funding was approved and the university architects office prepared drawings for constructions. The clocks were ordered through purchasing and the campus division constructed the plazas.”

Didn’t really answer the question, but it was a long process and it was handled primarily in the architect’s office. I do think it would be a good idea for something like this to go as it did not, to the Capital Priorities Committee, which, as you know, is represented by this Council and is chaired by Neil Theobald. So, in the future, as I’ll say now and I hope it goes on record, I think when things are planned in the architect’s office, even though we knew about them, we didn’t know the locations and the Capital Priorities Committee did not discuss the locations. So that’s the response and if the person asking the question wants more information, I’d be happy to get it for them. So with that, Alex, do want to add anything to that or not?

**SHORTLE:** Well, nothing but positive feedback. I don’t know if you guys have noticed but over the past week there’s been-- every time I’ve passed by the clocks-- about 10 people outside of Woodburn hanging out on the benches out there, which I thought was amazing. I know that was one of her big things that year.

**GROS LOUIS:** I’m sure there will be mixed reviews of these clocks. I remember when I was first chancellor the short wall that goes around campus, you know on Third Street, etc., was put in. And I received some letters of outrage about why we were walling ourselves in from the rest of the world. And I remember thinking: the wall? The wall’s only about this high. Not much protection if we’re trying to do that. Anyway, as with the wall, I’m sure there will be mixed reviews on the clocks as well. So the floor is open for your comments or questions on other issues. Bob?

**KRAVCHUK:** Ken, for the benefit of my Faculty Council colleagues and speaking as a member of the Chancellors’ Search Committee, I wanted to point out a factual inaccuracy in the story in today’s IDS where the author, Kristin Huett, on Page 7 indicates that the President created the committee two years ago to begin the process of searching for your successor. When in fact the committee was named about mid-fall last year...

**GROS LOUIS:** Actually, it wasn’t named Bob until the December Trustee meeting.

**KRAVCHUK:** Absolutely, yes you are right, formally, that is correct. But we weren’t really called together to have our first until late January. In fact, we’ve been at it for barely eight months. But even more than that, and speaking personally now, I take exception to the general thrust of the article which, seems to imply that any indecision or tardiness in decision-making on

the part of the university administration is owing to the faculty or somehow our faculty processes when in fact if you are diligent about it you can find a chancellor in much less than two years. And I would hate to think that the student reporter would have received this impression from anybody in the administration.

**GROS LOUIS:** Also, I should say, too, someone else may be commenting on this, that an email came to me about the report that Dan Smith had been interim from July 1, 2004, not January 1, 2004. So the impression in the article was that he was interim for 18 months but that wasn't the case. Other questions or comments on this or any other issues?

**SHORTLE:** In the article about, I guess last week, she stated that there were 23 faculty members when in fact there are two student representatives on the committee.

**GROS LOUIS:** Aren't there staff members too?

**SHORTLE:** And staff members also.

**GROS LOUIS:** And a Trustee, Pat.

**SHORTLE:** Yes.

**GROS LOUIS:** And a townsperson?

**SHORTLE:** Yes...

**KRAVCHUK:** The judge. Judge Taliaferro.

**GROS LOUIS:** She has a name, the judge! Luis?

**DAVILA:** I have two points that I'd actually like to make. First, alluding to what Ted Miller said earlier about the triangulation of how we might want to begin to address the politics of admission, that is, administration and faculty and then also how students might feel. I was very pleased again going to the newspapers, as accurate or inaccurate as they might be, a Will Rogers-type, that's all I know most of the time is what I read in the papers. But I was very pleased to see what you were quoted, or misquoted, that we don't wish to be an elitist institution. Whether we seek to raise our standards and do better research-wise and otherwise that's another matter; and I firmly believe in that. But I think, as we contemplate our future meeting about admission and all, we need to be a little concerned about our rhetoric in terms of being a flagship campus. I've been in the minority on that. And it's been something that's been important to I think the majority of people to establish IU Bloomington, as it has always been, as the central part of this university. But I think ultimately rhetoric does affect reality and we need to be a little careful, at least subconsciously or consciously, about how we perceive the whole, at least the rhetoric of admissions, and then what we ultimately want. We all want good students, we all want good faculty, we all want to be the best and the brightest. But I think that coming from a family where my parents had no more than a third grade education and fifth grade at most on the part of my

father, I know how important it is not to be believing too much in just how bright students want to be with other bright students and just based on SAT scores. Well, I'll leave it at that.

Then, and I don't want to be obstinate as the nemesis or voice crying in the wilderness but last year I suggested we should inquire as to some of the safety of the campus, not only as it's nowadays considered security and safety, as a result of the accident where Ashley Crouse was killed here coming out of the parking lot. We have a Transportation Committee; it's very miniscule, as I understand it. We're fortunate that Ted Miller, as President of Council, is part of that. And I think that the Agenda Committee ought to consider inviting the people from Transportation to explain to us, not just how we tend to the beauty of the campus and how much parking garages might if you like inconvenience us, but also how safe we are in terms of just the traffic that rushes through after 5 o'clock here and endangers some of the pedestrian students and otherwise in the darkness of that garage. Perhaps I'm overreacting but I think we should at least consider this also. And forgive me, I've said enough, but those two points I think are important to me at least and perhaps to others on Council.

**GROS LOUIS:** Thank you, Luis. Other comments or questions?

**ODLAND:** This is a question on another matter. When classes began last week, some number of sections were not assigned a meeting space at the time they were scheduled for their initial meeting. The question is, has the process of assigning classroom space to sections been completed? Have all classes that are scheduled to meet this week in fact have a place to meet?

**GROS LOUIS:** To my knowledge, yes. And you are quite right and there were significant problems. And the unfortunate thing is, and the unacceptable part, is that this is the second year in a row this has happened.

**ODLAND:** The other part of my question may be implied: is there any reason to think that this performance is going to improve in future semesters?

**GROS LOUIS:** I hope so. I've asked a group to get together at the end of this week under Roland Cote's leadership to address the issue and make sure it doesn't happen again. And the best we can do is get a report from that group. Yes, I agree with you. Other questions?

**SHORTLE:** I don't know if Ted wanted to talk about Katrina efforts?

**MILLER:** Why don't you go ahead and make your announcements.

**SHORTLE:** From the students' perspective, I know there are faculty and staff members involved in efforts related to Hurricane Katrina, but we met as student organizations last night we set up a meeting in the Union to talk about the student effort and what we wanted to do. IUSA personally, along with the Volunteer Student Bureau, would like to, we don't want to be running, we want to keep this very organic and we know each student organization does their own thing. But it needs to be coordinated. So we met last night and had a lot of great ideas thrown out. What we will be doing number one is performing the marketing, the outreach and whatnot and devising a list of what every student organization on campus will be doing and distributing

that both the newspaper and media outlets but also to the university and their Hurricane dedicated website. And also next Friday the 16<sup>th</sup> there will be a concert; it looks like a lot of people are getting behind this including the Union, for food distribution, the Greeks, and a lot of other student organizations will have a concert/festival something out in Dunn Meadow on Friday the 16<sup>th</sup>. So just a heads-up. I would like to somehow get faculty and staff involved and I know SPEA is doing a symposium seminar kind of thing in terms of education, but I'd like to have that awareness arm to all of these efforts that the student organizations are doing. So just to throw that out as something we'd like to get you guys involved in beyond what SPEA has done, has already set up for Wednesday.

**GROS LOUIS:** Thanks, Alex.

**ODLAND:** Something I'd like to add is that over the next few weeks the needs of people who are involved in this disaster are going to be changing. And my own sort of judgment from various networks that are already in place is that right now people at these universities-- students, faculty, and so on-- their most urgent need is some way of contacting one another, that is finding out where their colleagues are, where their students are, and so on. And there are some networks that are active in that way but anything that were available in the next few days would be extremely helpful. And then after a week or so that may be an old issue, that may be accomplished hopefully and something else is going to happen. I hope people don't lose interest over the next few weeks.

**SHORTLE:** Yeah.

**GROS LOUIS:** That's a good point, very good point. Any other comments?

**PIEDMONT:** I wanted to ask something, I'm sorry. Just along those lines I know the Modern Language Association on their web site has a, is trying to set up exactly what you're talking about, some way to network and get in touch with colleagues at the affected universities. So probably other professional organizations for other departments are doing something.

**GROS LOUIS:** Last week there was a phone conference for the presidents of AAU, NASALGC, ACE, with the President of Tulane and the presidents of other institutions and then instructions came to all the other AAU institutions about the best way to handle student transfers and now they are working on faculty and staff issues.

#### **Agenda Item #5: Report of the State of the Budget**

**GROS LOUIS:** OK, the next item on the agenda is the report on the budget and this I do, those of you who have been here before know I do this every year. And Steve, anyone else from the media, I have a copy for you here so you don't have to take notes.

As I have for many years, I always take the opportunity at the first Faculty Council meeting of the year to describe the processes and outcome of the current year's budget. Also, I will comment

briefly on the second round of the Commitment to Excellence program, even though the Trustees approved projects last December and these were well-covered in the local press.

Two factors made what is always a very difficult budget even more difficult for Bloomington this year. By the way I should tell you that these remarks will go out on email to all faculty and staff at 5pm today. Two factors made what is always a very difficult budget even more difficult for Bloomington this year. As many of you recall, there was a significant enrollment shortfall in the first semester of 2004 and that led academic and non-academic units on campus to reduce their budgets by \$6.6 million. And then, on top of that, the General Assembly reduced the state appropriation to Bloomington by \$4.5 million, which meant that in addition to all of our unavoidable expenses (and I will go through these in a moment), we were already significantly in a hole.

The Trustees last May approved an undergraduate tuition increase of 4.9%, that a combined figure of tuition and mandatory fees. This percentage applied to both resident and non-resident students. Graduate student rates were raised by 6% and the various professional schools had differences in their tuition increases based on their needs and their explanations to the campus and central administration as well as to the Board. This tuition revenue, of course, goes directly into the responsibility centers, based on their estimated enrollment for 2005-06.

The funds available to meet campus priorities included the Chancellor's Fund of \$3.9 million, assessments to the responsibility centers, funds from reserves, a commitment for strategic investment in science (a commitment made several years ago), the research incentive fund, and other smaller sources. This totaled, in base and cash, approximately \$15 million.

But then, consider that the campus needed to increase financial aid and graduate fellowships based on the tuition increase. This totaled \$1.6 million. The campus also provided a 1% salary increase to all support units, recurring fellowship commitments in the Graduate School, and a number of charges from the central administration, with the largest being the university tax, which increased \$846,000, and utilities, which increased by \$1.5 million.

Thus, a good portion of the \$15 million was used for unavoidable assessments -- some of them, of course, very worthy, such as the increment in financial aid and graduate fellowships.

Out of the \$3.9 million Chancellor's Fund, the campus provided the College with \$1 million to help it match outside offers. I'll talk about that more in a moment. I also agreed as part of the Informatics-Computer Science merger, as was reported by the Budgetary Affairs Committee at the last meeting in the spring, \$500,000 from the Chancellor's Fund. Informatics and the College also put up significant resources to effect this merger. The campus also had its share of the commitment for the strategic investment in science, made some years ago, and totaling for this year \$412,000. As many of you know, and as Ted alluded to, we also picked up two-thirds of the Student Athlete Advising costs, which totaled \$500,000. From the Chancellor's Fund, therefore, over \$2.4 million was expended even before the Budgetary Affairs Committee made its recommendations.

That committee made its recommendations in a memo to me on April 15. I'm pleased to say that the campus funded all of the requests except one and that one was taken care of from other sources. The major items funded from the Budgetary Affairs Committee recommendations included:

\$500,000 for collections support in the libraries

\$210,000 to Enrollment Services, in large part to ensure that we would not have another shortfall in freshman enrollment this year

\$100,000 to help Journalism remodel Ernie Pyle Hall auditorium

\$70,000 for an anti-alcohol psychologist in Student Affairs

\$125,000 to the Music School for several of its needs

\$100,000 to set up a Financial Services Center in the College of Arts and Sciences

\$98,500 to appoint a clinic director for optometry's rural/urban outreach programs.

Other amounts were smaller and the Budgetary Affairs can comment on them if it wishes to do so.

This accounts for a significant amount of the \$15 million that was available. In addition, \$800,000 was provided to continue the strategic hiring program that this Council approved years ago for senior women and minority faculty, \$430,000 for an increase in the SAA health insurance, other small increases, some of them passed on to us by university administration units.

The College and Schools did surprisingly well in being within the range of 1-3percent on faculty and staff salaries, plus benefits.

Nevertheless, because of the enrollment shortfall and the state appropriation reduction, both academic and non-academic units had to make significant reallocations. Such reallocations are not new to these units, but the size is increasing, and the time will come when any further reallocation becomes impossible without the elimination of something valuable and meaningful to the campus.

As a result of the five year review of RCM, it was agreed that the campus avoidable assessment would be held to 2.5percent. Also, the Chancellor's Fund was increased to \$4 million with allocations from both academic and non-academic units, with the understanding that their contributions to the fund would be returned, but not necessarily in precisely the same numbers with which they were received.

Let me turn now to the Commitment to Excellence program. The Trustees, I'm pleased to say, were enthusiastic about the items that were funded in the second round.

As some of you will recall, we used a different process in this round. To have a more focused effort in round two, as well as one that did not require large amounts of time that might lead to no funding and also one that did not have tight deadlines, Fred Cate's committee solicited what were called pre-proposals from academic units and others eligible to apply for funding. The committee received 30 such submissions.

In April of 2004, the Committee recommended to the President and me that we invite 11 of these proposals to be fleshed out and to be submitted for formal and detailed review by a subset of Fred's larger committee. Timelines were quite flexible.

Fred's review committee made its report on September 24, ranking the proposals in priority order. After reviewing the proposals themselves and after a significant series of questions from the President and from me (especially from the President), and responses to those questions from the Deans, we recommended to the Board that six of the committee's top seven priorities be funded.

You may ask why the back-and-forth series of questions? From the beginning, the President insisted that these investments needed to be highly focused and strategic. There are several reasons for this: the investments had to enhance the reputation of the campus; they had to attract national attention; they needed to demonstrate the ability to increase external support; and perhaps most importantly, they had to improve and expand opportunities for undergraduates and therefore broaden the undergraduate experience in Bloomington.

These were the proposals funded:

\$348,000 in base dollars and \$280,000 in one time funds were given to enhance Bloomington's excellence in cybersecurity teaching and research.

\$741,000 in base dollars and \$125,000 one time funds were given to the School of Education to add 8 faculty members in areas critical to the preparation of K-12 teachers. The faculty hired were built upon Education's current prominence: five of the school's nine programs are in the top ten in the country and faculty were added to these areas.

\$2.2 million in base dollars and \$405,000 one time funds to allow the College to renew leadership in the Arts & Humanities by hiring 15 senior faculty positions in four preeminent departments: English, Fine Arts, History and Philosophy.

In addition, the College committed to replacing all 18 faculty in these four departments who will retire in the next four years with 8 of these replacements hired at the senior level. Thus, these four departments will hire 23 senior and 10 junior faculty members in the next four to six years. I should digress here for a moment to say that if you read in the paper about faculty being eliminated in Education and Arts & Sciences that's not quite accurate. That is, there were a number of vacancies that were funded that were not filled so that the two schools could use those funds to get through this year but no lines were cut and the lines are still there and are funded.

The fourth, going back to Commitment to Excellence, \$1.2 million in base dollars for the College to substantially improve associate instructor salaries in eight top-ranked departments in the College. In most cases, these move the stipend, which had ranked from sixth to ninth in the Big Ten, to third in the Big Ten.

\$527,000 in base dollars and \$550,000 in one time funds was provided to create a new interdisciplinary undergraduate degree in American Studies.

Finally, \$700,000 base dollars and \$766,000 in one time funds was given to the College to establish a Department of Statistics. The overarching goals are to create a new undergraduate degree and better coordinate and consolidate statistical instruction across the campus, to enhance our competitive position for obtaining external funding for research, and to provide robust consulting services to researchers, industry, and state agencies.

As I said at the beginning, the Trustees responded with enthusiasm to these Commitment to Excellence plans because they understood that the investments were highly focused and strategic. It will take several years for the results of these funded proposals to fully blossom, but I believe they will significantly strengthen the campus and especially the undergraduate experience.

Once again, as I did last year, I want to praise Fred Cate's committee, and especially Fred Cate, for the extraordinary commitment of time, energy, and imagination in reviewing and discussing these proposals. We all owe Fred and his committee a major debt of gratitude.

How long can we continue to meet our fiscal challenges and remain competitive? This is a serious question, I believe, for this Council and my successor to consider.

Here in a nutshell is the challenge Bloomington faces. IU has been hit hard in recent years by cuts in non-targeted state funding. We face unavoidable costs (benefits, utilities, insurance), outside mandates and regulatory compliance, and increasing competition for faculty.

Other institutions want our best faculty and can pay more. Last year was an extraordinary one for faculty raids: 56, for example, in the College of Arts and Sciences alone-- and since I wrote this it's 58 in the College-- that compared with 15 the year before, 17 the year before that, and 15 the year before that. But there were also raids in other Schools as well and more than in any previous years.

Our funding per student is 11th of 11 in the Big Ten. If it were simply at the median in the Big Ten in undergraduate tuition and state appropriation, the Bloomington campus would have an additional \$98 million.

Thus, this campus is significantly underfunded in relation to its peers. It is also underfunded in relation to our academic performance and ambitions. My opinion is that we have done remarkably well relative to our better-funded Big Ten peers and competitors. That will continue, in my view, so long as we continue to maintain the collegiality that has marked this campus since I first arrived here 41 years ago, so long as we identify our shared values and enhance them, and

so long as faculty governance, in this instance exemplified over many years by the Budgetary Affairs Committee, plays a major role in determining priorities, recommending allocations, and along with other BFC committees, works with the leadership of the campus to achieve agreed upon goals.

And as I said this will be sent to all faculty by email sometime around 5 o'clock today.

#### **Agenda Item #6: Annual Report: 2004-2005 Budgetary Affairs Committee**

**GROS LOUIS:** The next item is the report of the Budgetary Affairs Committee.

**KRAVCHUK:** Herb Terry and I are going to do a little tag team here. We promise to be brief but sometimes talking about money that's difficult. For those of you who are new members of the Council and for those of you who are returning and have not previously served on the Budgetary Affairs Committee, haven't yet, we thought what we would do is to describe briefly our charge, our activities, and a little bit about our results for last year.

What the Budgetary Affairs Committee is charged with doing is to act on behalf of the Council and to give advice and to make certain decisions without necessarily consulting the Council in advance. And this is so that we can be nimble and move quickly in response to university administration initiatives. Rather than read the mission statement of the BAC I'll just direct you to Page 2 of the report that you have before you. We also are charged with recommending minimum salaries for tenure-track faculty and librarians, by rank, and to recommend a non-zero cost of living adjustment for them as well. We are a committee which is larger than most other BFC committees and we formally include one representative each from the Professional Staff Council, the IUSA, the Graduate and Professional Student Organization in order to represent as broadly as possible the various constituencies on campus. Historically the members on the committee have tended to serve for quite a few years; this is my sixth year on the committee. We have several members who have served for 15 and in some cases 20 years, including several former chairs of the Budgetary Affairs Committee, people who I and Herb can call upon when we need advice.

Each spring we really gear up for a lot of activity. We hold 28, now 28 budget conferences, which are hosted by the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor for Budget, Neil Theobald, to review the budget requests of various campus, academic and non-academic support units. Not every committee member goes to every budget conference obviously-- which is one reason why we are so large-- we divide and conquer. We like to get at least two members to each meeting. The attendees of these conferences in turn provide commentary; they write up what they have heard and report back to the full committee. The full committee then deliberates and then at the end of the process we'll make recommendations up to the amount agreed upon in advance with the Chancellor for allocation of Chancellor's Fund money, both for base increases and for one-time money allocations as well. I've already mentioned our role in setting the recommendations for salary minima and cost of living adjustments.

I want to say something about the Chancellor's Fund recommendations this year. The Fund was much larger than in previous years; however, you should know that we received requests for

some \$13.7 million dollars worth of funding. Obviously, we were able to cover less than, between the Chancellor's piece and ours, less than 25 percent of the total amount of requests. I want you to know that there were no frivolous requests; each and every one of them was meritorious and looked good and would stand on its own merits and so it was really a matter of allocating according to the campus priorities as best as we could discern them. In general, the Budgetary Affairs Committee will apply a general criterion of public good: which things will serve the public good the best, and what it means obviously is that somewhat more than three quarters of all the requests were disappointed and they did not receive funding.

Sometimes we're able to provide partial funding and at least take care of some of the needs and in other cases it's either all or, or nothing. And sometimes we see the same requests year after year. Once again they're all meritorious. This particular year the fund was larger than in previous years. The Chancellor has already mentioned the allocations from his piece of the fund as well as a good summary of our allocation as well. I will say that in general we supported the allocations that he made from his piece of the fund. However, the committee has and will continue, I suspect even given the current change in membership, to oppose any, that is without a great deal of analysis and rationale, anything that would continue to breach or increase the breach of the firewall separation between the academic and the athletic budget. These would have to be considered and scrutinized, very very carefully. I would like to turn it over to Herb now.

**TERRY:** Like Bob I'm going to truncate the remainder of our report but first I'm going to perhaps make a correction to what the Chancellor just called to my attention. He believes that in the table, Table 1 on Page 4, that the campus disciplinary base at \$25,000 was funded, he also says that Neil can confirm that, who is nodding his head. So apparently that was funded as well.

**GROS LOUIS:** It wasn't on your list Neil.

**TERRY:** First of all, as has been mentioned, this Council has charged the BAC with making recommendations related to minimum salary for tenure-track faculty and for academic appointees. We did that this year, we recommended a 1 percent increase in minimum salary for tenure-track faculty and librarians. You can see the results in the table at the middle of Page 5. We also recommended a minimum stipend for student academic appointees and for that a 2 percent rather than a 1 percent increase. That would raise the minimum stipend for associate instructors in the .50 FTE to \$7888.10. We are charged with making a recommendation of none zero cost of living adjustment and for that we recommended \$400 and we put in what has become a customary disclaimer in these recommendations that basically says to the schools, "If this is a big problem, try and work out something in consultation with your own faculty governance systems". I would point out that these requirements that we recommend minimum salaries were adopted by this Council at a time when we didn't have very many non tenure-track faculty. Now we have a substantial number of them and I rather anticipate that this committee, our committee, will ask you soon to expand our mandate and have a set minima for non tenure-track faculty as well.

A number of fairly consistent themes emerged through the budgeting process this year. They're not in any particular order on Page 6 but let me briefly highlight them. First is a continuing concern about perceived fairness of RCM, responsibility centered management, assessments.

Basically, to summarize what's going on here, the local control of assessments was pretty good. The Chancellor and Neil did a good job of getting control of that. This was mentioned by the Chancellor. The university tax, over which we don't have control, went up \$846,000. We were one of the earliest campuses in the country to adopt RCM. Other campuses adopted it later and the Budgetary Affairs Committee believes that there may be some merit in continuing to take a look at the experiences that those other schools on their versions of RCM and see if any adjustments, particularly perhaps the assessment system, need to be made. The committee remains concerned about the long-term impact of dwindling or non-existent R&R budgets. This is a long running concern in this campus; we just haven't received money from the legislature for R&R. We keep deferring maintenance expenses, at some point it's going to catch up with us badly and however difficult it is to do so, we believe it needs attention.

Third, what we hear from the people who present budget conferences, the information presented still tends to vary widely although I would have to say it was a little better this year than in past years. The more we know about what the academic and support units are doing and how efficiently they're operating, the better we can evaluate and rank the requests that they make.

And finally there's continuing concern that CTE tends to divert badly needed resources which are stretched thin at the moment away from the maintenance of core programs. The report here says that we were interested in making sure that second round proposals did more of shoring-up existing programs rather than going off on boutique projects. Frankly, it appears as if some of that was done but it will also matter in terms of how they are ultimately implemented.

Finally we have our observations on the athletics-academic relationships. Those of you who were members of the Council last year know that this was an ongoing theme here. The BAC has recommended against the use of academic resources to cover athletic department operations, resisted the imposition of the student athletics fees, over the summer after the Council adjourned, opposed the use of Matching the Promise money to fund the athletic scholarships, and expressed its concerns about its consequences for the campus budget, assuming the costs that are responsible for Student Athlete Academic advising. And basically we will continue to press for a firm separation between athletics and the academic side of the campus. On the other hand, as Ted noted, this Council adopted a resolution that basically says if the athletic department is going to continue to get these kinds of funds from the campus, it, like other units, ought to go through a budget conference.

Finally and perhaps more important, the last page contains our agenda for the coming year. I would note that that agenda can change. A couple of years ago we would not have put on it substantial discussion about athletics but athletics came up and we took it on. But we have nine items that we intend to pursue this year. The first relates to our relations to the university system. The UFC has a Finance Committee that is the closest parallel that exists at that level to the Budgetary Affairs Committee here. But our Budgetary Affairs Committee actually has much more involvement with the Chancellor and the local campus in the preparation and review of the budget than is true at the system level. So we are likely to work with the UFC and the UFC Agenda Committee to try and transform the UFC Finance Committee and get it into something that provides some of the services at the university level that we think we've provided over the years to the campus.

We intend to clarify the estimates of one time CTE money that will become available. That's an estimated approximately \$14 million that will become available during the next several years. As many of you know who've been here for a while, we have this wonderful but now lame-duck retirement plan 18/20. People are retiring and therefore 18/20 is rounding down but the money to fund it is built into the budget. So as 18/20 runs down there will be money available and we are going to project the availability of these funds and consider priorities for their reallocation.

Fourth, we had an agreement with Chancellor Gros Louis that basically the BAC is to be consulted on expenditures of greater than or equal to \$50,000. We hope to further discuss that with him and reduce it to writing before he retires and I think that's very much in line with the last paragraph of your--

**GROS LOUIS:** That was an agreement-- in 1975-1980 I chaired the Budgetary Affairs Committee. I made that agreement with my predecessor, Bob O'Neil, that, I didn't think I was going to become Chancellor, but when I did of course I thought who in the world put this here!

**TERRY:** Well, we hope you repeat that process, but may be the amount of money needs to be adjusted. \$50,000 is a lot of money than its less now. Number five, year after year, the Library comes to the Budgetary Affairs Committee and asks for a very large chunk of the Chancellor's fund money for acquisitions and serials. That really shouldn't happen under RCM. If those are essential operating costs of the Library, they should be in the base budget. So we intend to study and perhaps recommend.

**GROS LOUIS:** It will be part of the assessment this coming year.

**TERRY:** Very good. So that's apparently largely done. Very good. But you knew we were doing that.

**GROS LOUIS:** I knew.

**TERRY:** Ok, number six relates to the topic that's come up here a couple of times already today, basically the question of what the admission standards of the university should be, how should we respond to the Reilly report and so forth. It's in fancy language here projecting the fiscal impact of undergraduate population changes but it basically says we want to take a look at what the fiscal impact, financial impact would be of going down those paths of having fewer freshmen and having more financial aid to attract better ones and that sought of thing.

Number seven, Athletics Department participation we hope to implement, plan to implement, expect to implement the resolution was adopted here last year about having the athletics department in budget conferences.

Number eight, after the Council adjourned, a substantial amount of money was used to match private support for athletic scholarships that was raised by the Department of Athletics. That, according to the administration, was simply consistent with a Matching the Promise plan-- which basically said to contributors to the university, "you give us money for undergraduate financial

aid we'll match it." I question however, as whether anybody had contemplated that this would be used to match athletics department scholarships. We at least intend to determine the extent of academic subsidization through these scholarships.

And finally, as a condition really of getting its renewal of the Athletics Fee the Department of Athletics agreed that it would reform its finances and so forth and come back with a plan to the administration demonstrating how it was going to get its financial act in order I think by the end of this calendar year...

**GROS LOUIS:** Right.

**TERRY:** ...that would be taken into account in deciding whether or not to renew the Student Athletics Fee and we intend to play a role in reviewing this.

**GROS LOUIS:** It was a Trustee request.

**TERRY:** That they have it done. It was a Trustee request that they come back by December.

**GROS LOUIS:** Come back by the end of the year.

**TERRY:** So, in a truncated form, that is our plan. I'll close with one other thing. As Bob said, the BAC operates in some ways independent of you; the virtue of that is that we do develop I think a very good relationship and trust with the administration. I hope that continues under whoever succeeds Ken as well. Despite that we always look forward to hearing from you about budgetary priorities and budgetary consequences of things. One of the things that has surprised me over the years that I've served on the BAC is that we get relatively little input from you on budgetary matters and I hope in the coming year that we will hear from many of you. Thank you.

**GROS LOUIS:** Time is short but any urgent questions of Herb or Bob?

**PIEDMONT:** I just had a question on Page 3 in the use of the chancellor's discretionary fund is item number two SAA Student Athlete Advising? Is that correct?

**TERRY:** No.

**PIEDMONT:** It should be Student Academic Appointees right?

**KRAVCHUK:** Correct. We'll have an amended and corrected version of this sent to you.

**GROS LOUIS:** Are there other questions? Please send other questions to Herb and Bob and they'll respond. Now as you know from the agenda the various committees will meet and there are signs. Ted do you want to explain?

**MILLER:** We have the list of where the meetings will take place. If you aren't sure where your committee is supposed to meet we have the list here. Hopefully, we will have productive

meetings of our various standing committees today.

**GROS LOUIS:** We're adjourned.

**Agenda Item #6: Meeting of the Standing Committees**

[The BFC adjourned into standing committees.]