

Minutes
Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
January 30, 2007
Ballantine 008
3:30 – 5:30 P.M.

Attendance

MEMBERS PRESENT: George Alter, Julie Bobay, Maria Bucur-Deckard, James Capshew, John Carini, Richard Carr, Angela Courtney, Les Coyne, Robert Eno, Alyce Fly, Dennis Groth, Barbara Hawkins, Amy Holtzworth- Munroe, Kevin Hunt, Laura M. Jezewski, Elizabeth Johnson, Owen V. Johnson, Christina Kuzmych, David MacKay, Eric MacPhail, Grant McFann, Murray McGibbon, Michael McRobbie, Theodore Miller, Theresa Ochoa, Lisa Pratt, Amy Reynolds, Paul Rohwer, Jeanne Sept, Robert Shakespeare, Sarita Soni, Jerrold Stern, Robert Terrill, Herbert Terry, Neil Theobald, Larry Thibos, David Waterman, William Wheeler

MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT: Bob Horne (Robert Hatten), Richard Shockley (Elyce Rotella)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Moya Andrews, Eric Arnold, Katy Borner, Keith Clay, Aurelian Craiutu, Luis Davila, Paul Elliott, Patrick Harbison, Betsy Henke, Andrew Lauck, Terrence Mason, Sara Pryor, John Scott, Alex Tanford, Maxine Watson, Cara Wellman, James Wimbush

GUESTS: Lloyd Kolbe (HPER), Kelly Kish (BFC)

Agenda

Agenda
Indiana University
January 30, 2007
Ballantine Hall 008
3:30 P.M. - 5:30 P.M.

1. Approval of Minutes
December 5, 2006
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY07/minutes/12.05.06.htm>
2. Agenda Committee Business (10 minutes)
(Professor Theodore Miller)
3. Presiding Officer's Business (10 minutes)
(Interim Provost Michael A. McRobbie)
4. Question / Comment Period* (10 minutes)
(Interim Provost Michael A. McRobbie and Professor Theodore Miller)

5. Updates from BFC Library Committee (20 minutes)
(Professor Maria Bucur-Deckard, chairperson, BFC Library Committee)
Committee Charge: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY07/circulars/B19-2007.htm>
Faculty Survey Report: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/librarysurvey.htm>
Digital Futures Report:
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY07/circulars/DigitalFuturesReport.doc>
6. Report from Interim University Dean of the University Libraries Pat Steele (20 minutes)
7. Discussion of Non-Tenure Track Faculty Appointments [DISCUSSION] (30 minutes)
(Professors Kevin Hunt and Theodore Miller, co-chairs, BFC Faculty Affairs Committee)
<http://www.iub.edu/~bfc/docs/AY07/circulars/B18-2007.xls>
<http://www.iub.edu/~bfc/docs/AY07/circulars/AcademicAppointments.pdf>
8. Report from Bloomington Campus General Education Committee (10 minutes)
(Professor Theodore Miller, co-chair, General Education Committee)
9. General Education Program Implementation [DISCUSSION] (10 minutes)
10. Standing Committee Reports
11. Old Business
12. New Business

*Faculty who are not members of the Faculty Council and who wish to address questions to Interim Provost McRobbie or Professor Miller should submit their questions to the Faculty Council Office. Our documents are available at: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/>. To send e-mail to the Faculty Council Office: bfcoff@indiana.edu

AGENDA ITEM #1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MCROBBIE: Ladies and gentleman, let us start with the motion to approve the minutes from the last meeting on December 5. Can I have someone to propose a motion and to second it?

REYNOLDS: So moved.

MCROBBIE: Seconded, all those in favor [aye]. Against? They are adopted unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM #2: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS

MCROBBIE: The second agenda item is the agenda committees business which is Ted.

MILLER: Thank you. I would like to make a report on a couple of items today, one being the labor studies program issue. Labor studies as many of you know is a program that is headquartered in Indianapolis. It is centered in Indianapolis. Indianapolis controls it. Although

there are faculty in the program that work on the Bloomington campus and on several of the other campuses of the university. The unit is under some distress I would say, and has been under some distress—and the Indianapolis campus has been reviewing the program and trying to decide what to do about it. I just wanted to say that the Indianapolis Faculty Council is going to act on a recommendation from its Agenda Committee in early February. And this recommendation is one that I believe is supported largely, at least, by the labor studies faculty. The main point that I am trying to make here today is that while that for a number of months it appeared though the end of this process might not be very pleasant. It now appears at least that there is a chance that it will be a pleasant outcome. At least I am hopefully that it will. It still depends on the Chancellor at IUPUI and the President of the University doing something but some of the aspects of the various proposals that have been floated have been set aside and at least the main recommendation from the Indianapolis faculty council is a very positive one from my point of view.

The second item has to do with general education. You will note that we have several items about Bloomington general education on our agenda here today. This item is about the university level gen. ed. situation. You may recall that the Trustees in their various pronouncements about things in the last year or so have included a focus on general education and have asked the President to give a report to them at their February meeting, which is going to occur two days from now. I am pleased to report to you that the President is going to tell the Trustees that he thinks that the approach that has been taken of general education across the campuses of the university is suitable approach that he supports it and I am very hopeful that by the end of the discussion by the Trustees on this issue that we will essentially have a clear path forward on the one that we have taken. I think the Trustees still have questions about what we are doing here in Bloomington. We will address some of those later on here in our meeting today. But as far as I can tell the President is going to support the approach that the faculty have taken to this and urge the Trustees to accept it. This is good news at least from my point of view. I don't see on Dick Carr's face that he necessarily believes it.

The third item has to do with the Presidential search. I am hoping to be able to say a little more about this at our next meeting, which in case you haven't focused on this yet, our next meeting is scheduled for exactly seven days from today. You can write that down in your calendars. I am hoping to say a little more about the Presidential search at that meeting. The search committee is meeting tomorrow and what I can say at this point is that the search is progressing, think in a normal fashion. Candidates have been interviewed. Some have been put forward to a second round of information gathering. My sense is that it's a strong pool of candidates and I think anyone looking at the list of names from the people sitting around the table here would probably think similar thoughts. People with strong academic backgrounds, experience kind of people that look like they might be Presidents of an institution like this. My sense is that the search is going well. I think I will stop there.

MCROBBIE: Thanks, Ted.

AGENDA ITEM #3: PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS

MCROBBIE: I've got two things to report on firstly with respect to the Deans searches. We are in the final stages of the search of a HPER dean. Two finalists are interviewing this week and we have just started on the first round of candidates for the Informatics deanship. The interviews have already started for the first of the Informatics Dean candidates. I think that would mean that we expect to have the HPER appointment made fairly soon are going well. And maybe by the end of next month or soon afterwards for the Informatics Dean and of course the committee is not started its labors for the position of Dean of University Libraries. That committee is well underway as well and has met a number of times.

The second thing that I want to report on is a very interesting ranking of research universities that came out. A number of you if you follow the Chronicle and a few short other things over Christmas might have read it just after the break. It was a new ranking the so called Faculty Scholarly Productivity Index. And now surprisingly this maybe hasn't gotten as much attention as it deserves. All rankings including this one of course can be criticized and along supplement about these rankings in the Chronicle included some of the criticisms of it for example it seems to maybe undervalue the interdisciplinary--multidisciplinary programs. But I think just a cursory glance at what's involved in this particular ranking would suggest that it certainly has more creditably than say the Princeton Reviews ranking of party schools and I think for that reason its results should be noted with some interest and taken reasonably seriously. It adopts applets type of methodology, that is it looks at productivity and looks in terms of books and journals published, also looks at journal citations of all its honors and so on. It's a lot closer in methodology to say the Shanghai Jiao Tong, which is now established to some extent internationally and is different to say reputation based index like US News and World Report.

What I think is just excellent news for Indiana University and for this campus in particular is that we have 14 programs that are ranked in the top 10. I want to read those aloud because I think they are programs of honor and if people haven't heard about this, they should here this and the School of Medicine has two programs as well so overall the University has 16 programs, 14 on this campus as well. This means that we rank 10th among the publics and 23rd among all American universities in terms of number of programs in the top 10. Having 14 out of 60 odd programs means we have roughly a quarter of our programs on the Bloomington campus and in the top 10. Again this is a little bit similar to the NIFC which will come out next year, which will probably provide a much more finer level of analysis. I think this maybe to some extent of what you might expect with that as well. It is interesting to that our colleagues at Purdue had 10 programs out of 57 ranked in the top 10. Meaning they were 16th ranked among the publics and 33 overall. So remember we are 10th and 23rd.

I think this is a really wonderful achievement and looking around the table there are people from some of these departments here and in fact at least one chair. I would like to read these out quickly to give you an idea of this particular ranking, as I said all rankings need to be taken with a pinch of salt, etc, etc, but according to this survey, here are the 14 for those of you who haven't got down into the detailed analysis. They taxonomy is somewhat eccentric here. Under the biological sciences, botany and plant biology ranked number #2 behind Berkley. Cognitive science, which I would not have put under this category, but anyway Cognitive science ranked #10, Carnegie Mellon is first. Ecology and Evolution of Biology #3, Wash U is #1. Business Administration ranked #7 behind Illinois – Chicago and Washington – Seattle. Educational

Leadership #8. Communication Sciences and Disorders #7. East Asian Languages and Cultures #7 behind University of Chicago at #1; French #1; Italian #4 NYU is #1. Music #2 behind Harvard this is the scholarly side of these matters. Near Middle Eastern Studies #10 behind Princeton at 1. Portuguese #6 Vanderbilt is #1. Spanish #7 behind Vanderbilt again at #1. Clinical Psychology at #2. So those are the 14 programs according to this ranking, this methodology who rank in the top 10 nationally. I think we should all convey our congratulations to all of our colleagues in all of those departments for that fine achievement which I think really reflects superbly on this campus as a great center of scholarship and research. Maybe you can join me in giving applause to those colleagues around the table.

Let me add that there is of course the issue here that is more on the negative side and that is many of the people who have made these great contributions and are responsible for building on whose reputations, the reputations of the campus is based. I noted this in a speech recently. If you look at the demographics of the campus about half of all the tenure faculty will retire in less than 10 years. However having said that I want to comment on our hiring for this academic year. Jean Sept's office did some analysis on this and according to Jean's office we hired exactly 100 tenured/tenure track faculty, which makes the percentages very easy to calculate. Of that 100 new faculty tenure/tenure track new hire for this academic year at that point, 52 come from AAU institutions and about 15 come from institutions of comparable quality mainly Europe and Australia, and a number of others come from non-higher education institutions but scientific and scholarly research institutions of considerable reputation as well. If you look at where the next generation of faculty coming for this university based on that snapshot alone the picture is I think a very strong and very positive one that bodes extremely well for the future. I think indicates that the kinds of people that have led us to such a strong position, 10th out of all the publics, will in turn be replaced by people of comparable quality. That was just the second thing that I wanted to comment on.

AGENDA ITEM #4: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

MCROBBIE: And now I think we move to questions and there is a question about the life sciences initiative and the response is a lengthy. I am not certain who asked this question. It was passed on to me, but let me try and if anyone would like to ask any more detailed questions about this, I can drill down.

MILLER: I can clarify where the question came from. The BFC has a committee called the External Relations Committee and that committee had a meeting with Vice President Healy and with J.T. Forbes and discussed this Life Science initiative and out of that meeting as I understand it grew a series of questions to the university campus administration.

MCROBBIE: So let me just respond to the questions.

1) Is the new money request outside the regular budget request?

YES. THIS LIFE SCIENCES REQUEST IS IN THE FORM OF A SPECIAL STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST THAT IS CONSIDERED SEPARATELY FROM THE OPERATING REQUEST.

2) What are the implications/commitments of the regular budget if this new money is granted? What are the estimated costs or fiscal impacts on current budgets?

COMPENSATION: STATE FUNDING IS INTENDED TO FULLY COVER COMPENSATION COSTS FOR THE NEW FACULTY.

START-UP PACKAGES: IU BLOOMINGTON HAS AGREED TO SHARE IN THE START-UP COSTS FOR THESE FACULTY MEMBERS. IF THE INITIATIVE IS FULLY FUNDED, IU BLOOMINGTON WILL PROVIDE \$20 MILLION IN ONE-TIME FUNDING OVER 10 YEARS.

FACILITIES: IU BLOOMINGTON WILL FUNDRAISE THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN STATE ALLOCATIONS FOR NEW BUILDINGS AND ACTUAL COST.

3) The Initiative talked about new jobs in Bloomington-what are the latest numbers of direct jobs being talked about and is there a breakdown of types of jobs?

460 DIRECT JOBS AT IU BLOOMINGTON

100 FACULTY
40 RESEARCH ASSOCIATES
140 POST DOCS
140 LAB TECHS
40 ADMIN/CLERICAL

4) As we understood from our discussion with JT Forbes and Tom Healy, there would be a three-year staged allocation to this funding and there would be evaluations of how the funds are used. Can you give more details about how the evaluation is to unfold (who is evaluating, how and where the reports will be submitted?)

THE FUNDING IS PLANNED OVER 3 BIENNIA (NOT 3 YEARS). I DO NOT BELIEVE THE EVALUATION PROCESS HAS BEEN DEVELOPED.

5) What is the latest dollar amount talked about to be earmarked for Bloomington and where will those funds go within the Bloomington campus?

BLOOMINGTON'S SHARE IS ONE-THIRD OF THE SPECIAL STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST. IF WE RECEIVE THE FULL \$100 MILLION, THEN IU BLOOMINGTON'S SHARE IS \$33.3 MILLION. 2/3 to go to the Indianapolis, principle to the medical school that was based the relative share of the research dollars that come into the two campuses if you look at what you can regard as being broadly speaking money that comes in from the NSF for Life Sciences its roughly between 2/3 and 1/3 between the two campuses so that is what that is based on. I can respond in a little more detail if people have anymore questions there or get information if I don't know the answer.

MCGIBBON: Michael, what is the university position on the current impasse between Bloomington hospital and Anthem.

MCROBBIE: I can confess I haven't really been involved in that at all. If you would like me to get a formal response on those who are, I would be happily do that and send it to Kelly to distribute.

MCGIBBON: I think some staff are very concerned about the situation.

MCROBBIE: I would happily get a response on that. I just haven't been involved in the latest. Yes, Luis?

DAVILA: This would be directed at Ted if I may. Being that you represent the faculty on both committees for this search for the presidency. I have taken the liberty of copying a report that had been announced when Sue Talbot was last here to address us on the subject. I think it is very important to us in particular in the humanities, I am in Spanish, and also the social sciences as to how the candidates for the presidency are conversant in what will in the future and already might be the familiarity with the Cyber Infrastructure of digital scholarship as well as well as helping us in the humanities recover the past centuries of the Commonwealth of the culture record. I think that you are probably already asking this of the candidates but I think it's important to put this burning bush before them. In it would be so helpful to at least it might induce and learn how conversant they might be with this document that appeared in July of the year 2006. I copied one copy for you and if you could give Sue Talbot another copy. If anything to have it before you, you who are serving on both committees and represent all of us of the faculty.

The National Science Foundation, three years ago did wonderfully well in structuring this side, at least giving recommendations of the needed cyber structure for the sciences and engineering and now in tandem we very much would like to be in on the future and the progress and there are other faculty members that have concurred with me. Of course it doesn't take much to concur. I will give you this to you after the meeting.

MILLER: Thank you, Luis. I would be happy to do what you ask. Actually there are two other items of question related. Maybe if I can just say what I have to say first and then we can go to Bill.

One of these you will recall, we had a question from Alice Robbin, December 5th. A question regarding email services, you will find in your materials a response from Brad Wheeler who is the acting Chief Informational Officer of the University. So that's for your information.

The Agenda Committee received this message, anonymously in campus mail. I will first read the question and then the response.

As you know, a few years ago the BFC enacted a cap or limit to the number of courses that can be taught by non-tenure-track faculty: no more than 3 courses per semester. Why then is the Kelley School running advertisements for Lecturers who will teach 3 - 4 courses per semester, which is the equivalent of the "18 - 24 hour teaching assignment", described in the ad? Any idea why this is permitted by the Dean of the Faculties, which approved the ad and which publishes the advertisement in its "Bulletin for Academic Appointees"?

This question was passed on to Jeanne Sept and this is the response that she offered and asked me to read. "Our office made a mistake in not noticing the "18-24" wording in this ad during our routine review. However, the wording in the ad does not alter the fact that the Kelly School of Business needs to seek a waiver each time they want to assign an overload of more than 6

courses per academic year to a non-tenure track faculty member. When a school petitions the DOF for an overload as "an exceptional case" we ask them to justify it, based on short term academic need. We have made such approvals on a case by case basis, but always remind the units that such cases need to be exceptions, not the rule. In cases where units are making repeated overload requests, we have asked for a description of their plan for avoiding such exceptional requests in the future."

Is this a follow-up question Bob?

ENO: Can we get some insurance that in cases where exceptions are granted, consideration is given in some form to the lecturer involved?

MILLER: Is Jeanne here? She couldn't be here today.

WHEELER: In following up on that and in anticipation of item number 7, I am wondering if I might please ask Provost McRobbie for his views on the fact that it appears that one school has a business plan that depends upon a systematic use of overloads of non-tenure track faculty contrary to the policy that was alluded to in that letter. And I was wondering if in part to discussion seven that Provost McRobbie might share his views on that situation.

MCROBBIE: Bill frankly I don't have any views at the moment simply because I don't understand all the facts. I haven't yet been briefed and gotten into all the facts of this yet. I intend to do so and will assess the matter appropriately. Probably you were at the same budget meeting that I was at when the comments arrived. But there are two sides to every story and one needs to drill down find out exactly what is going on, which is what I intend to do.

ROHWER: Could we get an explanation on the impact of the President's Fund for this campus, and specifically, does that mean that some of the tuition and fees the students pay, would that be used to help students on other campuses?

MCROBBIE: Neil probably can answer that if we put him on the spot.

THEOBALD: The President's Fund will begin this year or for the next budget year. It's 12.5% tax on all new revenue; it goes to the president. Given that he operates across campuses, is it theoretically possible that funds from one campus can end up at another campus? _____

MCROBBIE: I think that's probably less of a really burning question. I would like to cut it off there because there's other business to go through. Why don't we move on to agenda item 5 which is updates from the BFC Library Committee.

AGENDA ITEM #5: UPDATES FROM BFC LIBRARY COMMITTEE

MCROBBIE: Maria are you going to start for us?

BUCUR-DECKARD: This is going to be quick so we can move on. I'm going to speak to these out of order but they are in chronological order. The first thing that I want to mention is the

report that was presented on July 20th by the BFC Library Committee. The chair of that committee Harold Ogren could not be here today to speak to it all. Kelly was on it as well. Several other committee members from last year are still here and Pat is also here and she will hopefully address a little bit of this report to you in a few minutes. I don't really want to present it because basically it's here for everyone to read and there's a lot of information in it. I should say that a lot of effort went into it and it became extremely useful and the timing could not have been better, for the August Digital Futures Study Group that Michael McRobbie appointed. That is the second item that I wanted to simply present to you.

The Indiana University Digital Futures Study Group final report, which came out in September, was the work of several committee members appointed by Michael McRobbie. You have the list in front of you. One of the experts is here with us. Dick where are?

RUBINGER: I'm the non-expert on this.

BUCUR-DECKARD: Non-expert but still an expert on the committee. The report is fairly brief and I don't think there is any startling finding in it. It sort of confirmed the general wisdom of the faculty and librarians had come to believe, and to communicate that to the administration and especially obviously for the purposes of running the dean of libraries search, which is starting soon.

MCROBBIE: It has started.

BUCUR-DECKARD: It has started. We have a committee that is appointed, and in fact the last bit that I'm going to mention is this general charges list that we came up with at the end of last semester was to in a way respond to the final report of this Digital Futures Study Group in view of what we could do based on that report and based on the tradition of what the BFC Library Committee does in general to work with this search committee, to try to respond to the questions that they might have and to represent the concerns of the faculty and librarians ____ for those who are not on the committee itself.

We are meeting with David Zaret, who is the chair of that committee, and with other members that can make it next week. As a committee, we want to present these charges to them as basically a job definition for ourselves. We were not charged to come up with this. We sort of came up with it out of a series of discussions over the fall. Some of the committee members who had been on the Library Committee last year, and as a new member of the committee, we are sitting around scratching our heads very often thinking about what it means for us to be working on behalf of all the concerns and interests of faculty, librarians, the library, and all the different units that are involved in what we do. So this is what we came up with and it's a collective work of both faculty and librarians trying to represent everybody's views on the matters as best as we can.

So I guess the recommendation is to have this endorsed by the BFC so that we may when we meet with the search committee for the Dean of Libraries, present it as who we are and something for the candidates for job of the dean of libraries to have in front of them as they come through.

I don't know if there's any questions that I may answer.

MCROBBIE: Any questions for Maria?

MILLER: Could I just make a general statement about the Library Committee's charge list? I would like to really say that I appreciate the work that has been done over the last several years in the Library Committee a great deal. We're really seeing a substantial transition in the role of the Library Committee, I think. This was begun, I think, under the leadership of Harold Ogren and now continuing with Maria. I think it's been a very positive thing not only for the BFC but I think also for the libraries of the campus and the university. I really do appreciate very much the work that's been done and I also appreciate Pat Steele who I guess was the first dean recipient of the new Library Committee. I appreciate her forbearance in working through this transitional phase. I think that this really does set the stage for a very positive and promising future. So I really do appreciate what you've done Maria.

BUCUR-DECKARD: Thank you; the committee thanks you. So I don't know what follows, a vote?

MCROBBIE: Is this something to vote on?

MILLER: I think we generally have things like this for the other standing committees. We have endorsed their charges, so this is kind of an addition to the list.

MCROBBIE: So we should formally vote on this?

MILLER: Yes.

MCROBBIE: Ok. Let me first ask, are there anymore questions for Maria before may be moving to deal with this as a vote?

TERRY: I just have one; did you have a starting point for this document? Is this a change from any existing document?

BUCUR-DECKARD: There was nothing. It was me sitting down and reacting to the expert's report.

MCROBBIE: I guess the motion would be something about adopting this as a charge for the committee. Can I have a motion to that effect from somebody?

BUCUR-DECKARD: I guess I'm making the motion.

MCROBBIE: You're making the motion. Second?

ENO: Second.

MCROBBIE: Bob. Ok, any discussion on this or any words that people want to change or make amendments to?

BUCUR-DECKARD: I should say that we had some discussion inside the committee about the definition of information fluency and we decided that we're going to be standing by the gen. ed. formula and let it ride with some people abstaining, just so you know.

MCROBBIE: Any discussion, any comments for Maria, so we can move quickly if there is none? Okay, if there is no discussion let me ask for all those who are in favor of endorsing this as the charge, please say "aye", against, abstentions? There being none, it's carried unanimously. Thank you Maria.

BUCUR-DECKARD: Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM #6: REPORT FROM INTERIM UNIVERSITY DEAN OF THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES PAT STEELE

MCROBBIE: Pat, you're going to give a short report.

STEELE: Ted I do appreciate that; it did take a lot of forbearance to be part of this transition because it is actually quite wonderful for the library to have such an active group. Before the dean had to make up an agenda for the group and now I get to use their combined expertise and they are very active. I think it's good for all of us.

Last year when I met with you I told you how important your input was going to be in defining the library of the future in ways that were meaningful to your research, and to your teaching, and to student success and learning. I think you've heard from Maria; we've managed to get a lot of significant input this year from the BFC Library Committee Survey, the expert study report and then our own Live Call Survey that we did in the libraries, as well as a number of studies that we've conducted within the libraries.

So the first thing we found out is that, which was good to know, is that you still value the libraries. That the libraries still really are seen as an integral part of your success in doing your work at the university and also that individual librarians are very important to the success of the faculty.

We also heard some things that we thought we could work on right away and a few of those are that people were not very enamored with our web and we've made a couple of cosmetic changes. Now we're completely restructuring pages in our web environment and doing a lot of usability testing at all levels of that. So that is on going and will take several more months I'm sure.

People that use the Wells Library did not think that the stacks were the most inviting environment and so we established a position to supervise that stacks shifting that need to occur now that we are moving materials that need to be moved out to the ALF and just generally make things work a little better. I think if you've been over there lately, I hope you'll agree that things are starting to improve in the stacks even though we certainly haven't reduced the number of materials in there to the levels that we need to.

People complained about parking; of course we solved that problem immediately. They complained that they couldn't return books and so we put up book drops. We have three different book drops around and that has made a difference. Now, some of them are hidden by grass that I'm going to poison some evening. But we're going to put signs there to inform people. So that has helped people wanting to be empowered. We have now a self check unit so that if you don't want to stand at the desk and get things checked out, you can check it out on your own.

Building upon some of the advances we've made for delivery at ALF; there definitely were concerns about ALF and I won't spend time on that. I hope to leave time for questions and if there ALF questions I will try to answer those. But we did make a number of advances; last year six day delivery to 22 locations was something completely unique among these 50 or so storage facilities that exist out in library land. So we did that and this year we started electronic delivery to your desktops. So that has become so popular that 25% of our deliveries are electronic. So we felt that that was a good thing.

We started an alert service for you for new titles using RSS feeds. But some of the input was not on just these kinds of specific things that we could address rather quickly. It was on the broader issue of our collections and how we balance the digital future and digital collections. Digital collections are very popular; the number one thing for all users; not all users of all categories of users. I'm sure there are individuals who do not find digital resources their number one priority but we didn't find too many of them. Digital resources are important, traditional collections are important and how the libraries are balancing that is a big issue for people and all of this input from faculty particularly. I think we were very well served by the expert study group with that question because what they in essence said to us and to the university is that the libraries have to continue investing in the rich traditional collections that distinguish us from our peers and increasingly in special collections that in a digital world will make the difference between what we are and what other universities are. We can assume a ubiquitous approach and access to core materials in a digital world.

They cautioned us that we also had to continue to move in digital initiatives in ways that we haven't done as yet. They also said that this was going to take new money; new investment. Not only new investment from the university, us finding more grants, us raising more money, and us realigning our resources within the libraries. I've been taking that part of it to heart in this interim period, this two year period that I've had and I've been seeing myself as a person who is really preparing a way for the next dean and I'm going to borrow from Provost McRobbie on remarks he made on leadership. He felt that there were basically two kinds of leaders; practical leaders and transformational leaders. So what I'm seeing myself now—this really helped me talk about my interim, and that is, as a bridge between two transformational deans because I think the search is laid out to us a new transformational person. Certainly Suzanne Thorin was that. I'm a

very practical person. I'm helping work on the infrastructure of that bridge and making sure too that we keep traffic going on it now because we couldn't stop anything. That is my brief little picture for the day and I thank you Michael for that help in seeing that.

We've been concentrating in three areas; digital development, space, and the infrastructure, particularly repurposing staff positions and librarian positions, to move away from traditional kinds of activities into areas where we need to invest. Some of those are pretty simple like taking a new position and having someone oversee shelving and stacks shifting and so forth. It's not new age but it certainly is what we needed to do in our library. We've done a number of things, I'll give you a couple of examples.

One I'm very proud of is our head preservation left and took a job at another university and there was a position that needed to be filled and I asked one of our senior administrators if he would be interested in taking that on. So he took his administrative skills there and now we've investing in his training in the preservation aspects. So he's already been to Cornell for school for two or three weeks and he's involved in learning that and he loves it and he is making a big difference there and yet we were able to use an existing position and address a very important area within the libraries.

Because we have fewer journals to bind, we were able to eliminate a position in our bindery preparation, rely more on our vendor to do the work and use that position for something else. I think the story here is that we're not able to just eliminate positions and just save the money. We are able to reinvest in new areas and that is something we are going to have to continue to do.

We've expanded IU Scholar Works. I told you the last time I reported here that we were initiating it. I think we can expect that over that the next year under Judy's leadership, we can expect that the content in there expands dramatically.

We have gotten approval from the Capital Priorities Committee and we found a funding mechanism, I believe, for the second module of ALF. This was kind of a real goal of mine for the new dean. It couldn't be built and in place by the time a new person is here but I felt that we really had to get past the hurdles of talking about whether we need it or not, and I think we've gotten there because I think for the flexibility for the libraries over time for us to continue to bring in new special collections which are very space intensive and for the campus to have the flexibility to invest in the central core for academic reasons, we need ALF 2. So I'm very proud that we've moved it to that point. We've used some new software to evaluate our collections in the context of our peers. It's helped us define what are the actual strengths of our collections and the future for digitizing projects and for cooperative projects it will make a lot of difference that we have that kind of information about our collections.

We have been conducting a pilot digitizing project outside of the context of the digital library program to see what kind of workflows that we have; how can we bring other staff that haven't been involved in this into it; what would it cost; what are the issues involved, and we are using Indiana related materials for that. We also have one person who is working on a project with Google, the books that are digitized in Google, attaching their records to our IUCAT records so that if you find it within our catalog and it has been digitized by Google, presumably you would

be able to click and go to the digitized text. We have been working with an Oncourse Sakai project nationally to make sure that customized library resources will be available on your Oncourse pages in a very easy way. As I said we are continuing to review our branch libraries and we have closed one; the SLIS Library.

We have also spent some time-- since most of you are scholars here. I wanted to talk a little bit about the east tower. We've invested clearly over the years a great deal in the West Tower in the Information Commons and Information Commons 2. We are looking at a third floor that will take that to another level but the East Tower has not languished. We are working on the stacks and so forth and we did do some preliminary work in defining a research commons but this year we took the time to define, actually with Dick Rubinger who is hiding back there and says he is not an expert, he pointed out to us in the BFC Library Committee a year or two ago that there really were not fine reading spaces in the Wells Library. There was really no inspirational space and I think that most of the input that we got from users is that it's actually quite the opposite in many ways. So we have come up with a plan for refurbishing and completely restructuring the reference reading room, to where it would be a fine and we would hope inspirational space. So this next year we are going to try to find money to do that. But we see that as kind of the front piece of the whole development of the East Tower for scholars so that we would see that as our research tower in all ways; where you would come to get help in your digital initiatives, for working with traditional collections, for a whole array of support things that we can probably get to you. So we will be working on that this next year.

I also want to gather for the new Dean information about the potential impact of the minimum wage. We hire up to 800 students a year. So the raise, deserved or not, we can all argue that but it is going to have a big impact on the library's budget, probably ¼ of a million dollars. Also as I have been watching our national rankings for librarians' salaries have been going down in the wrong direction for a number of years and our PA equity issues are quite significant so I think that is information that we can pull together for our next dean.

We see preservation as an important part of our future. We have always been relied on upon to hold on to our paper products and make sure that they are there for a hundred of years for you. The question is out there on the digital product and whether someone is going to step up and do that. And this year we have joined three initiatives, national initiatives that are trying to address the issue of long term preservation of digital content over the long term. So we now belong to CLOCKSS. We are a founding member of CLOCKSS, Portico and the Open Content Alliance.

I guess the last thing that I want to tell you is I hope this just shows you the kinds of things that we are involved in; that's getting information from users, looking at our infrastructure to see what are the issues so that when the new dean does come we have moved as much as has made sense in this interim, we have pulled as much information together and we have put up mechanisms for input and I think the changes in the Library Committee this year are a good example of how that input is going to continue over the years. I hope that next year when the new dean addresses you that it will be in the context of a broad strategic planning process that will define, with your input, as we have been talking about the library of the future because it is very exciting and I am having a very good time preparing the way. I met with the college policy

committee the other day and I said “you know it is hard job being the Baptist and preparing the way.

Can I answer any questions?

THIBOS: I have a question. It’s my understanding the Graduate School still requires dissertations to be presented in print form. Is that correct and if so, is there a move to allow students to submit in electric format?

STEELE: I thought some years ago it was an option

ROHWER: It is an option. Actually, student that are doing a masters thesis currently have to print them out and in fact it is their complaint that it costs \$300 to have them bound currently at IU Print.

DAVILA: It is allowed.

ROHWER: Yes it is currently allowed for PhD Students but not for masters students who are doing the thesis.

STEELE: But clearly having thesis and dissertations available electronically really is something that—we can have a whole other show with Julie talking about the scholar works and digital publishing. That’s a big part. The reason I ended on the idea of the broad strategic planning process is that I really hope that at some akin to what happened with IT when that process went through, where you really could look at all issues on the table, where we can start defining relationships with the press, relationships with a variety of entities on the campus so that we start seeing the library as the partner in many many arenas.

TERRY: One or two years ago Harold got us to endorse joining or supporting a group that was trying to pressure _____and drive down journal costs. Has that had any effect?

STEELE: It didn’t work. No, I’m afraid that our journal costs have gone up. I should know this because we are preparing our budget, eight hundred percent over a period when the regular economy’s inflation rate was forty something or sixty percent. So it’s quite phenomenal and of course through each year there’s more and more of a combination of these publishers into fewer and fewer numbers, which presumably gives them more power.

MCROBBIE: Bob?

ENO: This is a comment rather than a question. Through the work of the Library Committee and through the work that you did in initiating the faculty survey, and through the way that the Digital Futures Study Group process played out, I know in the past 25 years that I’ve been here, there’s never been this much faculty interaction and trading of ideas as there has been over the last few years. I think it is quite a dramatic change. There are a raft of issues that I have filed in the issues to up whenever we talk about the library, both generally and for my colleagues from my departmental angle in EALC. But I don’t feel the need to bring them up in this context

because they have been put in play. We've got lots of responsiveness and when we are aware that all of the input that we have put into this process is something which is under constant review and we expect that it's something that hopefully the new dean will find that information whenever he or she arrives and that this will continue. I think it is something that has been really dramatic and I credit both the Library Committee but I also credit you for the way that you have interacted and approached the faculty and you have been very welcoming through this.

STEELE: Well, thank you, I appreciate it. But I think that really is a realization on my part and librarians' part that we are all in a very different world right now and I can't anymore define in twenty years what the library is going to be than probably any of you can. So the only way that we are all going to get there together with something continues to significant to you is for us to continue to talk to each other. That is why I asked for input last year and we got lots and I think we can never have too much. But that I appreciate it, thank you very much.

MCROBBIE: Any other questions? We'll take one more question just to keep us on the schedule. Any other questions?

STEELE: Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM #7: DISCUSSION OF NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY APPOINTMENTS

MCROBBIE: Thank you Pat, thank you very much. And remarkably we are on schedule. Agenda item 7; Ted are you going to start with this?

MILLER: Yes, I will start. It was approximately five years ago that the BFC and the UFC approved a new Academic Appointments Policy. One of the main features of that policy was the creation of a category—the lecturer category of appointments which has been used, which is a well used appointment category at Indiana University at this particular point in time. From one point of view this item on our agenda, this is a discussion item as you'll see. Basically the way I would like to have you approach this is looking over that five year history, whether we have some issues that we need to attend to, some unintended things that happened as a result of this appointment policy. Today, we mean for this to be for this to be a discussion item.

The Faculty Affairs Committee has been thinking about the non-tenure track appointments and it has come to some conclusion about things that perhaps are problematic and which perhaps should be addressed. Kevin and I, Lloyd Kolbe who is a member of the Faculty Affairs Committee is here with us today, we can get into what those ideas might be. But initially, just to kind of set the stage for this, you have before you a sheet on which the composition of the Bloomington campus faculty is sort of set out. This by the way is part of a report that we are probably going to have on our agenda next week. This is a campus level sheet showing how many tenure eligible people there are, how many non-tenure eligible people there are on various categories. We also have a document that is broken down at the school level and then I think we

also have a document that specifically for the College that is broken down at the departmental level, so that we have basically a full rather detailed report on what kinds of people are appointed, what kinds of academic appointments exist in the various units of the university and we will have that as a focal point of our agenda next time. Today this document is really there only to provide kind of a list of the sorts of appointments that actually are available on the Bloomington campus, actually within Indiana University. What kinds of appointments are there? What are the categories of appointment? And then you can see the numbers of people in each of those appointed categories.

You will note if you look at the second column from the right. You will see that some—I am now only looking at the full-time part of the table, which is the top 3rd of the table. If you look at the second column to the right, you will see that a couple of these categories have negative numbers in terms of changes from 2003 to 2006. This by enlarge is a reflection of the fact that these categories are basically what you might think of as old categories. They are not categories into which appointments, at least in principle, they are categories into which appointments are no longer being made. Although I will have to say, that the numbers there for the adjunct, the full-time adjunct faculty, I don't really quite understand the numbers because it was my understanding that we weren't making such appointments on the campus anymore. It appears that we perhaps are, but nonetheless there are some categories here that are old categories.

The ones that are of particular interest from the non-tenure track point of view of course are the lecturer category and the clinical faculty category. You can see that there are now 169; this is as of the fall of 2006, which is the last census date, if you will, for this kind of data. There are 169 lecturers on the Bloomington campus, full-time lecturers, and there are 94 clinical faculty appointments on the Bloomington campus. And in both of these categories we have seen growth over this 4 year period or 3 year period. You will also note that the tenure eligible faculty numbers are also increasing over this period of time. This strikes me as being from one point of view being a positive news of this particular document because earlier on before 2003 it appeared that the tenure numbers were going that way and the non-tenure numbers were going that way. So at least we have growth in the tenure eligible numbers here as well.

The Faculty Affairs Committee has been particularly interested in the clinical appointment category. Most of our discussion has focused on the clinical appointment category. You have another document which is from the Academic Handbook, 2005 version of the Academic Handbook. This is a statement of this academic appointment policy, at least it's the beginning part of the policy, and one of the things that this document focuses on is the so called classification of academic appointments. And there is a little bit of text describing what these appointments are for and you will see on the first page there is a section beginning Non-Tenure Track Faculty Appointments. There are clinical appointments, lecturer appointments, several categories of non-tenure track appointments. As I say, the Faculty Affairs Committee has been focused on the clinical appointment category. We are not sure that the clinical appointments that are being made on the campus at this point are really helpful, let's say, for the campus at large. Kelly put together a document that has some of the clinical appointment advertisements that have appeared over the last couple of years. None of these are current listings but from last year and the year before; some of the clinical appointment jobs that have been advertised. One of the

things that is clear from this document that there really is a substantial diversity in terms of what clinical appointment category is currently being used to accomplish.

I am not sure what side of the page that you are looking at. If you look at the page, where the top item is Clinical Assistant Professor, this is an audiology position in the department of Speech and Hearing Sciences. This position is, I think, a position that seems like a clinical position defined in what I would call a traditional way. If you look at the advertisement underneath it from the Kelly School of Business, it is not obvious at all to me why this particular position is a clinical position. I could see it being a lecturer position. I could also see it being quite appropriate for being a tenure track appointment position. It reads to me like a fairly typical faculty type, teaching oriented faculty type position. Why it is a clinical position, I do not know. There are a number of such advertisements here that from my point of view and I think the Faculty Affairs Committee agrees that there really is a diversity in this particular category that is not particularly useful. I don't know I have told some of you that I think the experience that I had – when was it, it would have been at the beginning of the last academic year. Ken Gros Luis was still in the Chancellors office. He invited me to come to his Dean and Directors meeting. That was at the beginning of the last academic year and he asked me to talk about what the Faculty Council was going to be trying to do that particular year. And at that point our main focus was on admissions so I talked a good bit about that. I then mentioned in sort of passing that we were also going to be focusing on some of these non-tenure track issues. I indicated that I thought there was some issues in the clinical appointment area. Both my dean, the SPEA Dean, and the Business School Dean, were there and they very emphatically made the point that they felt that their use of the clinical appointment category—well, let's put it this way, what they said was that they had appointment needs that without the clinical appointment category could not be met currently. That is essentially what they said. They needed to be able to use either the clinical appointment category or they needed something else that would substitute for what they could get out of the clinical category. At the same time the Dean of the Optometry school was there and when this discussion was almost over, he spoke up and said that he really hoped that the Faculty Council would take up the clinical appointment category because he felt that in his school. The clinical appointments were extremely important, very valuable to the school and he thought that the—I don't think that I am miss quoting him, well I am not sure that I am quoting him exactly, but I am not miss characterizing what he said that he felt that what some of the other schools were doing with clinical appointments was really devaluing his faculty. And he really hoped that the Faculty Council would do something about this.

So the Faculty Affairs Committee has been talking about this and we have several proposals that I think are of interest to us. One of them would be to try to make clear what exactly a clinical appointment is for and it is quite apparent to me that the current language that is used to describe what a clinical appointment is not doing the job because all kinds of people are reading it and interpreting it in ways that I don't think were—if you think about the intent of the faculty in creating this, this was not what the intent of the faculty was but the language doesn't appear to be clear at all. Kelly drew together some information about the clinical appointments, sort of historical record of what the clinical appointments were for. This was sort of before my time; I wasn't active in the Faculty Council at the time when this started. This goes back to 1987, not really all that far back. 1987 the Faculty Council approved the creation or the use of this clinical appointment category. This is what at that time the document said about the clinical

appointments. Clinical appointees, the prefix clinical is used for appointees with rank of lecturer through professor who may be appointed as full-time salaried physicians, dentists, nurses, optometrist, audiologists, and speech pathologists primarily providing patient related services, part-time salaried or volunteered faculty members in those units where clinical instruction is offered. That language to me is really very clear in terms of what the faculty had in mind in creating that particular category of appointment and basically what it does is it enumerates the units in which such appointments can be made.

In 1995, this particular definition was altered and I think the definition that is now in the Academic Handbook is essentially the one that was adopted in 1995 and this is what it now says. Clinical appointees, the prefix clinical is used for appointees of the rank of lecturer—well I don't think it says it quite this way right now but the key part of this phrase is still there; is used for appointees of rank of lecturer through professor who may be appointed as full-time salaried, part-time salaried, or volunteer members in positions where their primary duties are teaching students and resident fellows in the clinical setting and also responsibility in professional service. So this idea about primary duties teaching students and resident fellows in the clinical setting, that language is clearly much more general than the initial language. And I think it was changed, I am not actually positive about this but I think it was changed to allow the law school to hire legitimately people who would be clinical appointees working in the law clinic. The initial definition sort of excluded the law school and this more general language was used to allow for the law school to participate in this. The consequence of this change, I think, has been that now almost everyone is into the clinical game on the Bloomington campus. This is not true in Indianapolis, at least no where near to the extent that it is in Bloomington, nor is it true on the other campuses. Those campuses still have a more traditional view of what a clinical appointee is, but in Bloomington, I think it has just become a problematic feature of our academic appointments.

So one of the things that the Faculty Affairs Committee has discussed is to change this language, what is a clinical appointee to do and we have talked about going back to sort of the old style where we enumerate what kinds of people can be in these appointments. We have talked about other ways to revise the current language, but that clearly is something that the Faculty Affairs Committee is interested in doing. If we did that, this would preclude the Business school, the School of Public and Environmental Affairs, and other units from employing people in this appointment category. What I was told in the meeting that I attended that Ken invited me to attend with the Deans was that the real need from a professional school point of view, the real need was to have a category into which distinguished practitioners could be appointed. In other words, from a Business School point of view, there are x-CEOs who are out there who have incredible experience. The Business school wants to bring them to Bloomington to expose their students to these people. At least initially the clinical appointment category was used in Business for this purpose. I am not sure that it is still being used exactly in that way but I think that is still part of the deal. My dean has a similar feeling. Outstanding practitioners of public affairs want to bring them to Bloomington, it's something that probably exists in many of the professional schools and for various reasons the lecturer category does not appeal to these deans. They do not think they can hire the people that they want to hire if all they can call them is lecturer. They are looking for something of a professor label and also they do not feel that these people can be appointed as tenure track faculty because they don't have the qualifications. The school doesn't

want them to do research. They don't have a research expectation of these faculty. It's more a teaching oriented faculty.

The Faculty Affairs Committee as a result of this has talked some about creating, yet a new category of appointment. Adding a category to our lexicon, this category – I don't think we are hung up on what the title would be but – the title that is used in a number of different universities for this purpose is the category of Professor of Practice. I will just leave it at that. That is the title that is in use out there in the broader world of academia, professor of practice. And that is a title that the deans mentioned if they had access to a category like that they would be quite happy. In any event, this is kind of the background of this particular discussion item. I am bringing this here today just to get a sense of what a broader group of faculty might feel about these issues. The Faculty Affairs Committee is a rather small group. It does not represent every unit very effectively, I don't think. So I thought before we started dropping policy documents in front of you. It might be useful to have a general discussion and to get a sense of how you folks feel about these matters. They may well be other non-tenure track issues that are on your minds. One of them that is on our minds is the representation of non-tenure track faculty in the Bloomington Faculty Council. That is an issue that I think we want to try to deal with this year. We have talked some about that so with that as a preference. Please I invite your comments.

MCROBBIE: Bob?

ENO: Ted, I'm sure you'll remember when we drew up the new regulations for lecturer we blended them in with clinical faculty. One of the purposes of going to a full blown lecturer category and giving it types of robust dimensions that we did was to try to drain the flow of appointments from tenure track faculty to non-tenure track faculty under the cover of clinical faculty with the type of expansion that occurred after 1995, which you are talking about. The lecturer category was specifically framed in such a way that the title professor could not be used in there, lead way of how you title people under the classification of lecturer but you can't misrepresent the classification and call it professor. The reason was precisely because we did not want units to bring in people of a certain level of distinction such that they were really qualified for a tenure track position and represented a response to a need that would normally covered by a tenure track position. But that those sorts of appointments with a continuous slide away from tenure track to a non-tenure track base on the campus. It looks from your figures that we have done a pretty good job at least holding the line and perhaps maybe making some progress in keeping non-tenure track appointments under control.

I can understand what the deans of SPEA and the Business school are talking about with the need to find an appropriate title for distinguished people who simply are not part of the tenure track world and do serve a tremendously important role on campuses such as ours. Professor of Practice such as that title reads is a perfect cover for any type of appointment you want to smuggle into a non-tenure track line rather than a tenure track line. If we were to have an appointment title that was something on the line of distinguished or great or genius professor or whatever, but it was non-tenure track and that made quite clear that the unit was making a commitment to the type of individual that would be filling that sort of appointment. I think that we have something that would be much easier for the council to discuss. But if we are talking about trying to solve a particular type of problem with an implement that can be used for

purposes that we have been working very hard for a long time to try to put to bed, we probably should be careful before we spend on a lot of time in that.

MILLER: Yes, well, I agree with that Bob. One of the things that the committee has discussed and it goes somewhat in the direction that you are talking about. If you will notice, the document that you have that we are currently working with were we go through these appointment categories, one of the things that is in there is a listing of the possible titles that could be used within that category. With regards to this professor of practice idea, the committee I think would propose that there actually only be one title. That is to say that there wouldn't be assistant professors of practice; there wouldn't be associate professors of practice. Everybody would be a professor, which would imply a kind of distinction along the lines that you are talking about. But using different words to label the category may also be a way to make that, but I think the point you are making is exactly correct.

MCROBBIE: Okay, Bill?

WHEELER: So, when you first began this discussion I was inclined toward the medical view of the word clinical, the optometry clinic, speech and hearing clinic, and so forth. But as I thought about it seemed to me like there is an issue of clarifying the notion of the word clinic that is intrinsic to the notion of clinic that is a matter of practice. And one example that occurred to me Ted that I wanted to propose to you, consider for example the Math/Stats Center, you know there could be a case made that it be the Math/Stat Clinic and then we would it be appropriate for the Statistics Department to appoint a clinical faculty member that is a practitioner to be in charge of the Math/Stats Clinic which is primarily concerned with consultation types of matters. As I thought about that one it seemed to me that may be that does suggest a transition for the committee to think about and the notion of the word clinic.

MILLER: Well, it's pretty clear that the word clinic isn't a definitive word. I've heard all kinds of arguments about why wants being done in my school is perfectly consistent with the idea of clinical. Some people see clinical as a synonym for professional. I've heard that on a number of occasions. So the words are important and its pretty clear to me that we don't have them right at present.

MCROBBIE: yes?

WATERMAN: I'm sorry to leave you to repeat something but I am still a little bit unclear of what's really wrong with this label clinical. It seems like labels don't really matter that much and I have a hard time of understanding this idea that sort of trends from tenure track to non-tenure track can really that much influence just by the labels people have and I don't see the problem basically of calling people what they want to be called. If that develops problems, with people in the sciences who want to use these labels for particular purposes maybe they could come up with another label like clinical science professor or something like that. I guess it's partly a comment but I just don't quite understand this discussion really and all its ramifications.

MACKAY: Well, business schools go through pendulum swings from being theoretical to being practitioner oriented and I think right now that we are sort of putting practitioner into the

pendulum swing. It is not just the business school here. Its business schools nationwide and in talking with our deans about this last year, I think the feeling is that there are strong financial, recruiting, and competitive reasons as to why you really need to add some professorial rank to attract faculty that are most appropriate for teaching, particularly an MBA program, and I don't believe deans really care if its called professor of clinical or professor of practice but the ability to attract high quality people from the business world is greatly diminished if the only title is lecturer.

MILLER: Now that was the message that I heard last year.

ALTER: I just wanted to briefly respond to speaker before last. I think that the point is not that we can call things whatever we want. But rather that the people who we want, and the business school wants to get to fill these positions, do care what they are called. Is it good to have a set of titles that will attract the appropriate kind of people and it would seem to me that it must be a problem now for the business school and SPEA that if I read this advertisement correctly it doesn't seem to be really advertising for the kind of distinguished person that the deans want to hire and if over time if that continues the value of that title itself will be diminishing.

MILLER: Well, I mean, one of the facts is that we now are in a position where people can be hired as assistant clinical professor rank and the business school has done it, my school has hired assistant clinical professors. So they're using the appointments in a broader way than the statements about distinguished—it's a broader use today than that certainly.

Going back, if I can just make an attempt at outlining one thing that really does seem to me to be quite problematic about this. One of the things that is true about the clinical appointments is that there is a promotion process. The clinical appointments follow a very similar promotion process to that of the tenure-track faculty. There are campus level committees that evaluate the clinical promotions. Well, what is the criterion for promotion in a clinical category? Is it really excellence in providing clinical services, in teaching people how to deliver clinical services? Is that what a clinical promotion is all about? That I think is originally what the faculty had in mind for this. Well, if you take a person from the school of business who doesn't provide clinical services, who isn't teaching people about clinical services, what does the promotion committee do with a promotion in such a case. I can't help but think that—I have not served on this promotion committee, but I can't help but think that the committee really has no idea of what the standards or criteria are for promotion, and I can't help but that think that's not a good thing.

MCROBBIE: Maria was next.

BUCUR-DECKARD: I was just going to bring on the table what you mentioned before with regard to the discomfort on the part of the people at the School of Optometry who it is not just about the School of Business pursuing a particular cause of action; that people in Optometry feel like their own definition is getting devalued. So it's not just one professional school trying to improve and take care of its internal needs but it seems like it is affecting the ability of another school to recruit. Is that what you were referring to?

MILLER: Well, I'm not sure what the problems were that what the problems were that the Dean of Optometry was referring to but he basically said that he felt that the practices of the other schools were devaluing his most valuable faculty.

BUCUR-DECKARD: But that's a very fuzzy claim.

MILLER: Yes, it is.

MCROBBIE: Larry, and then Lloyd.

THIBOS: Yes, I'd like to answer your question at least from the point of view of the School of Optometry what promotion requirements are because I serve as the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee in the School of Optometry and I can say without any reservation that the qualifications are exactly the same as they are for tenure track, with one exception; and that is that we have no requirement for research activity. But scholarly activity, excellence and teaching and service are the same criteria as we have for tenure-track and we hold those criteria very dearly. My suspicion is that this was at the root of the complaint by Dean Lowther in the School of Optometry, and that we wouldn't want anyone to think that we had less scrutiny being played to promotion and tenure to clinical rank faculty than we do for tenure track.

WATERMAN: Well, one quick thing; I served on a College committee and they have exactly the same criteria, which is that research is not considered. It's considered teaching and services and it doesn't seem to me to be complicated.

MILLER: Lloyd?

KOLBE: I think Professor Miller was pressing and anticipating on the problem that is, in my opinion, very likely to grow or perhaps grow very quickly in that my understanding is that many schools are trying to do more research and one way to do more research is to give the tenured and tenure-track faculty less teaching responsibility and by doing that hiring more lecturers and clinical faculty and I think the numbers that show suggest that this might even be accelerating in the future.

The other thing the committee discussed, not to say that there's any conclusion about it, Ted identified it, but what is the process, if any, by which any the unit, the school and the university would have some control over quality, consistency and quality of people who would be brought in across the schools in these non-tenured positions. Lastly, if these positions grow like all the data suggest that they have, how will that affect the proportion that would be the correct proportion to assure that they are represented appropriately in faculty governance.

MCROBBIE: Barbara?

HAWKINS: I think that part of the problem is that there's a tension between the contingency, these being the contingent faculty and the process that many of them are going through in terms of the promotion, the tenure, the long term contracts, the sabbatical like leaves. You're giving them almost everything that a tenure faculty works for the tenure and promotion process but they

are truly contingent and they don't understand the difference, so that if they are there for a long time they longer feel like they are contingent, they think they are just like the tenured faculty. So there is this problem of national growth of contingent faculty. That's what these are. They are not promising, they are appointed as needed. But we have set this up in such a way that we are going to have grievances with people who have been a long time who all of a sudden think they have been here forever because they have gone through promotion and tenure, the probationary, the long term and the unlimited contract. I think there is a misuse in this category that's taking place. And that's my sense; is the tension between being contingent and how were implementing these particular appointments but not ranked in tenure.

MCROBBIE: Let me try to, in the interest of time as well, bearing in mind that if—unless we wind this up a minute we'll be behind schedule again, let me try to make a suggestion as one way to go here. It's difficult to get a sense of the meeting given that there have been big arguments in the pro and con of this issue. But one thing that would concern me is if the council was to move in a direction that's set up by some confrontation with the deans on this. I don't think anybody would want to see that happen. I wonder whether one way to move here, one might be if I were to approve a committee with four or five members of the council and four or five people at the level of the deans or associate deans or something like that, who can represent the point of view of the schools and a number of people from this group who can represent the point of view of not wanting to dilute the faculty base, to actually see if it's possible to come up with suggestion as to a resolution and come back to the council. I would say that there would probably be five of each with the School of Business, SPEA, Optometry and may be the College. I'm not certain who goes beyond that, and then see if it's possible to come up with a suggested way forward. Professor of Practice is certainly one way forward. That obviously has some issues; Bob suggested a genius level, but then you have the associate and the assistant geniuses and so on. I think some of us are mindful to the fact that some people who have the title of clinical professor actually make some significant contribution in this university.

I was going to suggest this as a way forward but Barbara you have something?

HAWKINS: I like that suggestion and I would also encourage us to think about seeing about locating people who have been through the CIC Academic Leadership Program because that's a very important issue that's discussed during that training; the whole role of increase in contingent faculty, the issues of privileges and rights, how it gets confused with tenure and so forth. So they study this through the CIC Program.

MCROBBIE: The Council I wish had gone a different direction but I'll put forward as may be an offer to try to make progress here, that if you like let's let points of view to argue and try to come to some kind of resolution that might be acceptable in the council.

MILLER: Well I think it would be useful to have a forum where the deans were involved because they certainly are the people who are making these appointments. They have demonstrated that they will make appointments in the face of some adversity even. So I think getting the deans on board will certainly be a positive thing. I'm not sure I want to see the authority of the faculty over the policy issues to the deans under our understanding of the role of the faculty. These really are the faculty's policies.

MCROBBIE: I wasn't suggesting that, it was more of getting those groups together.

ENO: It might take the Dean of Faculties off the hook because the Dean of Faculties is in a very awkward position of trying to enforce faculty policies in some of these circumstances.

MCROBBIE: Mindful that we have a quarter of an hour to go. Bill, really quickly.

WHEELER: I just want to suggest that this seems to be something for the presiding officer and the Agenda Committee to take care of for us, that we don't have a need to actually vote on this.

MCROBBIE: I wasn't suggesting that we vote unless anybody wanted one. Unless there was any violent disagreement, Ted and I can work this out. Alright, let us move in that direction and then item 9 which I guess which can sort of take together. We've got about 15 minutes to that discussion. Ted.

AGENDA ITEM #8: REPORT FROM BLOOMINGTON CAMPUS GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE

MILLER: Yes, well Item #8 is a fairly brief report. This is a report about activities of the Campus General Education Committee. The gen. ed. committee has met several times and the last time they met they approved new descriptions of the curriculum content of the new gen. ed. curriculum; a description of the social and historical area, a description of the world languages area etc. So there is some new language, sort of locally developed language that has been developed and approved by the committee.

The second task of the committee is to work on the list of courses in each of these areas. Basically what has happened since slightly before Christmas, there has been a lot of activity in the schools; identifying courses, sending courses forward for consideration and that process is about to be undertaken by the gen. ed. committee. I expect that this is going to take maybe a month or a month and a half of the process. There's a fairly long list of courses that have been proposed. 1141 courses initially, so the committees are going to try and work their way through these things and hopefully a somewhat smaller number than that. Who knows? We offer a lot of good courses on this campus. That's one thing that's clear.

MCROBBIE: As the ratings prove!

MILLER: So in any event, the main point of this was just to give you just a brief sense that the committee is in action and we are expecting at the end of this academic year, I think early April is our final meeting of the year, we are expecting that the gen. ed. proposal will be back on the floor here with the new descriptions, with the course list and ask the BFC to give another approval to this document.

So that's item number 8.

AGENDA ITEM #9: GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

MILLER: Now, Item #9 has to do with one of the issues surrounding this gen. ed. program that is still controversial in certain corridors anyway. It has to do with the implementation of the program. You will recall that the document that we approved indicated that the program would be implemented in 2011. That was a date that was selected primarily because that was when the new admissions standards would be implemented, and there is a clear connection between the admissions standards and the gen. ed. program. Now at the same time, there was not a great deal of thought and analysis given to this decision about when to implement the program. It just seemed sort of logical to everybody that 2011 would be the right time to do it. Some people think that it should be done earlier, and I have been telling these people that I think that there would be a number of problems created if we started earlier. First of all, it has been unclear to all of us I think involved in this, once this program is approved say in April. How much work really has to be done within the academic units on the existing degree programs to reformat them to take this new element into account? How much work is going to have to be done in the PeopleSoft environment to get these new degree audits up and running? This is all somewhat. This has all been very fuzzy to us. We have only had very general ideas about this and so it seems that putting this off to 2011 was a safe approach. The people that I am talking about of course you can imagine who the people are that are pressing on the implementation. It is a subset of the Board of Trustees. As I say, I have been trying to explain to them why we think it would be useful to wait until 2011. It is pretty clear to me they don't think my ideas about this in a very definitive way. What I have been talking to Michael about is having him and the administrative staff of the campus that is really responsible for administrating the academic programs: the Deans, the people in the Registrars office, the people in Enrollment Services, the people in University Division. There are a variety of people who will be affected when this program is undertaken. So I have been talking to Michael about him under take a more formal process of considering whether it would actually be feasible to begin this earlier, how much earlier would it be feasible to do it in, what would be the problems that would revolve around this. And I believe that Michael is willing to do this.

MCROBBIE: I told Ted there's nothing that I enjoyed doing more.

MILLER: And so really I am coming here to ask if there are any dissenting voices in this. I really think it would help us to sort of get to the point where we can all kind of understand what we are going to do and when we are going to do it and just try to settle the issues a bit.

CARINI: So we have until Thursday?

MILLER: Yes. Well no, you mean the evaluation.

CARINI: Yes.

MILLER: No, but I would like to tell the Trustees that we are going to do this or perhaps Michael could tell the Trustees that we are going to do this. But I would like to tell them that this is something that will be undertaken in Bloomington, and at the end, we will have a recommendation that has a little more substance to it. It's not based so much on speculation.

MCROBBIE: I think what Ted's asking is general sense from you, not a formal vote, but a sense that you are happy to proceed this way. Then I will have my office, which is going to mean Roger Thompson and Roland, who is sitting at the back looking inconspicuous or trying to look inconspicuous, and people in Jeanne Sept's office and others work on this and try to come up with some kind of plan as to time table for how this would actually really work with more detailed analysis of all the steps. I don't know how long that would take. I am assuming a couple months, 2 or 3 months to get that done. It may involve things like: Can we have phasing in of this. Is that realistic? It's been raised, maybe it makes sense, maybe it doesn't. Can there be early adopters? Can one school decide they want to do this early and can we move in that direction? Again that may not make sense after further analysis, but that's what has been purposed. I guess what I am looking for is a sense from you that you are agreeable to that.

MILLER: Let me just say one other thing. Ideally, when this proposal comes back before the council in April, you recall that the implementation date is part of the proposal. Ideally if we are going to change that implementation date that is something that we would like to know before the council takes action. And the council rightfully would want to understand what the issues are and what the potential complications would be.

MCROBBIE: Do you remember which April meeting?

MILLER: I believe that right now we have only one April meeting scheduled which is at the very beginning of April. I am not sure exactly the date, 4th, 3rd, 4th something like that

TERRY: It's the 3rd. Passover. I just want to make one comment. I am sure that you didn't intend to do it, Michael, but your list of people that you might contact are all in Bryan Hall and Franklin Hall. It's important, I think, that the Deans as Ted said come in on this.

MCROBBIE: Of course.

TERRY: Because I have heard from a couple of them on that. And sort of related to that, I hope that the plan is to find when we can implement this that we can look if we can do it earlier. If we conclude its 2011, we will tell the Trustees that we have looked at it hard and 2011 is really.

MCROBBIE: Yes, Ted will enjoy telling them that.

ENO: It would be nice if all the offices involved understood that the Faculty Council had not initiated this request for their additional services which would certainly [comments missing].

MCROBBIE: Indeed. Any other comments on this matter? I will take general sense that since the original movement that there hasn't been anyone violently opposing it. Is that agreed? Any other comments on this matter, generally? Ted, do you want to say anything else?

AGENDA ITEM #10, #11, & #12: Standing Committee Reports, Old Business, and New Business

MCROBBIE: Okay well, I have often wondered what all the new business is since we have never gotten to it before, but we have got two minutes. Is there any old or new business or any standing committee reports that can be done pretty rapidly?

STERN: For the committee that's going to look into the clinical professor issue. Maybe this committee would be doing this anyway, but it would be very helpful if they could give us a summary of the pros and cons.

MCROBBIE: Oh that would be the idea. If they can't agree, then we are back to square one. If they can agree it will be up to you this council to make a decision as to whether they want to endorse whatever they come up with.

THIBOS: I did have one question. We didn't have time for earlier for Ted in regards to the Presidential Search. Is it your understanding that when the final list of candidates is forwarded to the Trustees that it will all be made public.

MILLER: No.

THIBOS: It is not your understanding.

MILLER: It is not my understanding. There's been a good bit of talk about it. Various people have urged the Trustees to make it public but as far as I know they are not going to do that.

MCROBBIE: There being no other comments or burning issues. We are adjourned. Thank you very much.

Meeting adjourned at 5:26 pm.