

**Minutes**  
**Indiana University**  
**BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL**  
**March 4, 2008**  
**Indiana Memorial Union Georgian Room**  
**3:30 P.M. – 5:00 P.M.**

**Attendance**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Lisa Bingham, Julie Bobay, Stephen Burns, James Capshew, John Carini, Diane Dallis, , Paul Eisenberg, Robert Eno, Harold Evans, Christine Farris, Patricia Foster, Laura Ginger, Dennis Groth, Karen Hanson, Robert Hatten, Brian Horne, Kevin Hunt, Owen V. Johnson, DeWitt Kilgore, Lloyd Kolbe, Valerie Markley, Terrence Mason, Bryan McCormick, Ursula McTaggart, Amanda Meglemre, Brian O'Donnell, John Paolillo, James L. Perry, Lisa M. Pratt, Diane Reilly, Paul Rohwer, Jeanne Sept, Richard Shockley, Alex Tanford, Neil Theobald, Robert Terrill, Herbert Terry, Michael Tracy, James Wimbush

**MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT:** Todd Tinius (Eric Arnold), Elizabeth Johnson (Jennifer Riley), Ruth Stone (Sarita Soni),

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Moya Andrews, Jack Bielasiak, James Biles, Andrea Ciccarelli, Nicholas Clark, Angela Courtney, Aurelian Craiutu, Joseph DeJean, James Drummond, Luke Gillespie, Amy Holtzworth-Munroe, Matt Jarson, Christina Kuzmych, Eric MacPhail, Mike Robinson , Robert Shakespeare, David Waterman

**GUESTS:** James Boyd (Herald-Times), Amanda Ciccarelli (Office of the Provost), John Applegate (Office of the President), Brad Wheeler (VPIT) Craig Dethloff, Lebo Molefi, Trish Pierson (Faculty Council Office)

**Agenda**  
**Indiana University**  
**BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL**  
**March 4, 2008**  
**IMU Georgian Room**  
**3:30 P.M. - 5:00 P.M.**

1. Approval of Minutes  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY08/minutes/01.15.08.htm>  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY08/minutes/02.05.08.htm>
2. Memorial Resolution for Professor Emeritus Conrad Mueller  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY08/circulars/B21-2008.pdf>
3. Agenda Committee Business (10 minutes)  
(Professor Lisa Pratt)

4. Presiding Officer's Business (10 minutes)  
(Provost Karen Hanson)

5. Question / Comment Period\* (10 minutes)  
( Provost Karen Hanson and Professor Lisa Pratt)

6. Educational Policies Committee: Priority Registration for Student Athletes [ACTION ITEM]  
(30 minutes)  
(Professor John Carini)  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY08/circulars/B19-2008.pdf>

7. Student Academic Appointee Affairs Committee: SAA Grievance Procedure Revision  
[ACTION ITEM] (30 minutes)  
(Professor Robert Terrill)  
[http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY08/circulars/B18-2008\\_Revised.pdf](http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/AY08/circulars/B18-2008_Revised.pdf)

\*Faculty who are not members of the Faculty Council and who wish to address questions to Provost Hanson or Professor Pratt 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](mailto:bfcoff@indiana.edu)

#### **AGENDA ITEM #1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**HANSON:** Let's begin, even though some people may be wandering in, shaking off the rain. You all should have had a chance to look at the minutes of the meetings from January 15<sup>th</sup> and February 5<sup>th</sup>. Anyone move approval of the minutes?

**UNKNOWN MALE SPEAKER:** So moved.

**HANSON:** Thank you. Second?

**UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER:** Second:

**HANSON:** All in favor? [Aye]. We have a Memorial Resolution for Professor Conrad Mueller and Jeanne is here.

#### **AGENDA ITEM #2 MEMORIAL RESOLUTION FOR PROFESSOR EMERITUS CONRAD MUELLER**

**SEPT:** Professor Emeritus Conrad Mueller died at the age of 87. Connie received his PhD from Columbia University, where he remained on the faculty, becoming a full professor and chair of the department. Connie came to IU in 1965, where he also served as the chair of the department. He retired in 1987. Connie's research interests were in sensory systems in general and the visual system in particular. He co-authored one of the most influential books in visual sciences, *Vision and Visual Perception*. He also wrote *Light and Vision* and *Sensory Psychology*. The latter book

was a general work on sensory systems and was translated into five different languages. As a prominent visual scientist, Connie was asked to and served on a number of national organizations such as the Advisory Committee on Biological and Medical Sciences of the NSF, a Presidential Task Force on Education under President Lyndon Johnson, as well as the Executive Committee for the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Similarly he served as a consulting editor for many of the major journals in psychology. Connie was instrumental in the education of numerous graduate students. He felt that working with graduate students was one of the most rewarding aspects of academic life. He served on the dissertation committees of over 60 students at IU and he's remembered as one of the most perceptive but gentle reviewers. He had the ability to get to the heart of an issue and ask questions such that one's view shifted, sometimes of an entire line of research. Students fortunate to have Connie on their committees always came away with a much deeper understanding of their own work. Connie [break in recording apparent, some material lost]

### **AGENDA ITEM #3 AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

**HANSON:** The first business on the agenda is the Agenda Committee business.

**PRATT:** I'm going to start with a few announcements from the UFC meeting, which normally, of course, is offset from our meetings. But in response to a request from the President to reschedule to accommodate some important travel he had, we actually held the UFC meeting this morning in Indianapolis and many of us are a little wet and soggy from the drive and walk back down here. Two important things happened this morning at UFC. Number one, we passed the Policy on Transfer Credit that was previously approved here by the BFC. We also had a fairly long discussion, with the President chairing that discussion, on his expectation for the Resolution on Recent Changes in Tenure and Promotion. Some of you will know that both the Bloomington and Indianapolis members, as well as the members from the other campuses, of the UFC Committee on Faculty Affairs has been reviewing a document sent out by the Indianapolis Chancellor, by Chancellor Bantz, calling for a change in the way the summary dossiers are presented by the regional campuses. It caused a tremendous stir among the regional campuses because it was not a document or policy that was developed in consultation so there was a great deal of concern about why faculty governance was not closely involved in the development of a policy that impacted tenure dossiers. As a result of many, many discussions about that, the President has now asked the Faculty Affairs Committee to join with him in - he's not sure what he's going to call it, he thought perhaps a task force - to look specifically at the baseline for tenure and promotion policies for the regional campuses, but to also include enough members of the faculty from Bloomington and Indianapolis that some issues also dealing with tenure and promotion on the two larger campuses could be addressed by that committee. He will call that committee to begin meeting, hopefully, just within the next few weeks. And again, that will involve most, if not all, of the members of the UFC Faculty Affairs Committee, a few additional faculty members recommended through Nominations Committee, and then administrators as Michael, and I assume he'll touch base with Karen on this...

**HANSON:** What issues pertaining to Bloomington were...?

**PRATT:** He just felt that there might be issues that would come up in this discussion that might want to be discussed with regards to Bloomington and Indianapolis. He did, however, say, because we immediately said we felt that tenure and promotion issues were working quite well on these two campuses and that this was not a time to begin a major relook. But we agreed that certainly it was appropriate for Bloomington and Indianapolis faculty to be in the room if baseline for tenure and promotion for the university system as a whole was being discussed. So, you may...

**HANSON:** But that wasn't being discussed! The baseline was for the regional campuses.

**PRATT:** Well, unfortunately – and we also suggested that Bart and I would look very carefully at the charge, and might want to weigh in on the charge.

**HANSON:** I think our offices better weigh in on the charge, too.

**PRATT:** Yeah, I think so, too.

**HANSON:** We were not in the mix before, and the only thing that made a difference was that occasionally the regionals would say, 'Bloomington ought to be brought into it,' but our baselines were sort of higher than theirs to begin with and we looked like a thorn in the side.

**PRATT:** Well, we asked him about this, and he said he clearly expected the baseline for the regionals not to look like what was being done at Bloomington and Indianapolis, both in terms of not just the current burning fire, which is the number of external letters. That, many of you will know, is what started this whole discussion, the requirement - the so-called Ehrlich requirement for six external letters, which turned out to be a burden at many of the regional campuses. Most of their units simply couldn't get six external letters, depending, of course, on how you defined external – if it was external to the unit or external to the campus or whatever. At any rate, something is happening, and we're going to try to figure out what's happening. And again, that just happened about an hour and a half ago. So I don't have any more information for you than that right now. It's certainly something we all want to pay attention to. Those were the only – the Credit Transfer was the only action item this morning. The promotion and tenure review was the principal point of discussion.

Also, just in the past few days, Bart and I have received administrative findings on two important UFC documents, both of which have a long history of action in the BFC, those being the Family Leave and the Intellectual Property Policy. We've been waiting to hear the administrative response to both of those, and we now have the initial findings. Let me start by talking about the Family Leave. The Family Leave primarily was in the President's office – was stalled in the President's office – as they did a financial assessment. That was done by Neil Theobald's office. It seems that that was a very difficult financial assessment to undertake, simply because you have to make some assumptions about the ways in which the new policy might be utilized, and that makes it really difficult to thoroughly think about impact. What you can certainly say is that there is a major change when you go from a partial salary to a full salary family leave. So what Neil's office did is they looked at the offsetting revenue that units were allowed to utilize to handle replacement costs for instructors if, in fact, they had to pay for instructor replacement.

Just looking at the data for the Bloomington campus, because apparently - and John Applegate or Neil, correct me if I'm wrong here - that was the campus for which there was the most data available, and it looked like the loss of that offsetting revenue when you go from partial pay to full pay for the Bloomington campus was about a hundred thousand dollars per year. I, frankly, was surprised and happy to see that the figure was, what I felt, was modest. Of course, what we don't know, again, is how a change in policy, with a more clear and widely discussed policy, might change the ways in which it is utilized. Bart and I have made a recommendation to the President to continue to be supportive for the new Family Leave Policy, to bring it forward, but we've also asked him to think about which administrative office would bear the responsibility for capturing data on the actual costs incurred over the next couple of years so that if we need to do this financial assessment again, or we need to reconsider this at the next go round, the data for Neil's office or some other office to look at that will be easier data to collect. The President, in response to questions, said he was very supportive of the new Family Leave Policy and it was his expectation, now that they had Neil's financial assessment, he would bring it back one more time to the Deans, Chancellors, and Karen, the Provost, for discussion. He expected then to - he had every expectation that it would be supported, and that he would be bringing it to the Trustees. John, help me out here, did he say in May or June?

**APPLEGATE:** I think May, and it would be as an information item

**PRATT:** Right, so again, his feeling is that this can come as an action item from the president's office, and I heard nothing in the meeting today to suggest that he wasn't strongly supportive of the policy as passed by the BFC and the UFC. The one other thing for which there was some discussion in the Agenda Com meeting, but little or no discussion at the plenary session was with regard to Intellectual Property Policy. The administration has also done a very in-depth assessment of how that document differs from the previous policy. And of course, you know that we have been working long and hard this Fall with a consensus committee of administrative members as well as faculty members from Bloomington and Indianapolis to really refine that policy in terms of the language and both the utilization and the understanding of it. I think we all feel very good about that consensus document. But it is, of course, a document that has been passed by faculty governance. It now goes to the President who then, in turn, brings that to the Trustees, so that one does need to move for the Trustees. One thing that happened in an in-depth review by the administration after the consensus document was developed is that it became clear that the document did not spell out the difference between net revenue and gross revenue and it simply was not possible to make a clear reading of the document and understand how those terms were being used. And furthermore, in comparing the new document with equivalent documents at other institutions in the Big Ten, there was simply no other policy out there in which the recognition of the very substantial cost of legal fees and legal expenses were not paid first before there was revenue distributions. So, they are recommending that the specific definitions utilized in this policy would allow for those legal expenses being paid first and then revenue would begin to be distributed. One other major change from the previous policy here in Bloomington which involved a sliding scale of distribution with decreasing proportionate distribution to the creator with increasing revenue particularly as the revenue moved above 400,000. But many of you know that there have been very few discoveries or patentable inventions from Bloomington that have gone to those higher levels, so in general the relevant distributions to look at in the older policy were the distributions for zero to two hundred and two

hundred to four hundred. There is a major change in the policy that we've approved in that we now look at the distribution to both the creator and the distribution to the creator's laboratory. The number that is in the policy that we have passed is a flat proportion regardless of the ultimate revenue stream and that proportion is 50% for the combination of the creator and the creator's laboratory with the distribution between those two parts being 35% to creator and 15% to the laboratory so that maintains the 50% level distribution that we had in the previous document, but it is now required that 15% of that 50%, Dennis I hope you're nodding, correct me if I've got this all right, 15% of that goes by requirement back into the laboratory of the creator or inventor. So we are now working again with John Applegate to make sure that we agree on the distribution of the other 50%. So they had some thoughts about modifying the distribution in terms of – not at a major level, but at sort of playing with a 5% variation in the amount that goes to the campus unit that houses the laboratory and the creator, the amount that goes to the university and the amount that goes to IURTC. So again we're not quite ready to bring this back in final polished form, but we sincerely hope that we are within just a few days, a week at that most, of having that distribution proportionality settled. We will make a determination of whether or not it is close enough to what was voted on that we again do not need to re-vote this campus by campus. It is the President's hope that he can take this to the Trustees with very strong support from his office again at the May meeting. Is that right, John?

**APPLEGATE:** Yeah.

**PRATT:** That's his hope. So that is, I think, all of the information on what's happening with regard to documents and action items that we've been following. I have one other announcement that I want to make at this time. I have over the past month and a half been just every other week either on the East coast or the West coast with an increasing level of responsibility to NASA through meetings that they call Science Analysis Groups. As a result of the fact that there is now on the books a flagship mission to attempt to fly a rover to Mars, collect samples, contain those samples, and bring them back to Earth for study here and it is really a remarkable opportunity for me, as something I've dreamed about ever since I was a small child, to be involved in the possibility of Mars samples being in Earth laboratories for studies. And I simply find that I cannot maintain this level of travel, classroom teaching, and the responsibilities of the BFC presidency, not to mention husband and children, who think that they're the forgotten element at this point. So it really appears that for me personally and for the health of the BFC, the appropriate thing to do is to step down from the presidency at the end of this year which would also mean stepping down from responsibilities to be senior co-Secretary of the UFC next year. There is a clear set of policies that indicate how a president is replaced if they are unable to fill out their term. A recommendation needs to be made, Laura and Julie correct me if I've got this right, a recommendation from Nom Com and the Agenda Com...

**BOBAY:** The appointment.

**PRATT:** The appointment. Okay, so they actually do the election. It will be my very strong recommendation to them that Herb Terry will replace me. Herb over the last few weeks has, on more occasions than I'd like to admit, run meetings on my behalf and represented the BFC on behalf of faculty governance and again I will be making that recommendation to them and

hopefully we'll have an announcement about that or an indication how we'll move forward on that by next meeting. And I think that's everything from the BFC Agenda Com.

#### **AGENDA ITEM #4 PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS**

**HANSON:** And you personally. We are all very sorry but understand the pull of Mars. I didn't have any particular business that I wanted to bring to you but the talk of what happened at the UFC is fresh in my mind and I guess I would like to urge the Council to be careful about this. I'll talk to the President about it, too. But that issue arose about P and T because of the regionals and it was actually something seemingly more trivial than the number of letters that got added to it somewhere along the line, but it had to do with the form of the dossier initially; the form in which the Chancellor in Indianapolis wanted to receive the dossier. And it grew from there about issues of who had control of what, but this is not our issue. We do not have a dog in this fight and if any of you end up appointed to a committee, this is not our issue and we certainly do not want to have our procedures standardized by something that's rationalizing the relation between the regionals and Indianapolis, John?

**APPLEGATE:** Karen, I'd just say that that's not the idea at all. I mean the idea of having Bloomington and Indianapolis represented had to do with being a resource of practices on those other campuses. No thought that this would become a matter of setting standards for Bloomington or Indianapolis.

**HANSON:** Okay, were particular people suggested as Bloomington reps or...?

**APPLEGATE:** It's not at that point yet.

**HANSON:** Well, okay. This is something we'll...

**PRATT:** And I guess there was some discussion about, at one point the UFC Faculty Affairs was viewed as a sort of information body and at another point the President and Bart said they thought they would just wholesale appoint the UFC Faculty Affairs Committee to this joint committee, so I think there's some confusion right now about who exactly will be on the committee.

**HANSON:** Any questions or anything anyone wants to raise? Yes, Bob?

**ENO:** Yeah, I have a couple of things. Before I say them, I should say I'm very sorry to hear your announcement, Lisa. I'm sorry for you and I'm sorry for the Council.

**PRATT:** Thanks, Bob.

**ENO:** It's a very difficult decision, but it sounds very exciting. On the issue of the P and T question, it seems to me that the relationship between the faculty and administrations on the regional campuses is quite different from the relationship on other campuses and the balance of courses that faculty governance finds itself involved with are quite different. And if faculty governance on the regional campuses has recommended that Bloomington and IUPUI be

involved, Bloomington and IUPUI faculty governance be involved in this process, then I would strongly recommend that we be involved with this process as a resource to make sure that faculty governance as a principle is represented in these negotiations. The other thing I wanted to say had to do with the Intellectual Property Policy, which I have not looked at for about a year I suppose, so I don't remember it in detail. If there is going to be any change to the net/gross distinction in that the policy had at one time outlined, my recollection, my clearest recollections are of an iteration of that policy that is older than I am now, so I don't remember it clearly, but I do know that the divisions, the percentage allocations that were made including a very large hunk that was allocated to IURTC were made on the basis of gross revenues rather than on the basis of net revenues and part of that was designed to make IURTC self-sustaining and to encourage its efficiency in the way that it ran its operations as well. It's to provide a revenue stream and incentives for efficiency. If you have a change from gross to net, so then taking net out of that calculation, you'll have to make a pretty substantial change in the allocation of percentages. It would be necessary to go back and recall what the intent was behind making the original division so as to make sure if you make the one change you have a compensating change in the other direction so that the intent of the original, the intent that was passed by the faculty governance groups, is maintained. If that intent is changed, it may be an improvement for all I know, but then I would think that it would have to come back to faculty governance.

**PRATT:** I might also note, Bob, that one of the other things that was not clear in the previous policy or in the policy that we voted was how you handled marketing expenses and in what's been proposed now by the administration, it is quite clear that marketing expenses are a burden that IURTC must bear as part of their expenses bringing these products forward and in a way it should incentivize them to aggressively market because their revenues need to cover...

**ENO:** All of that was considered in coming up with the original division of percentage allocations.

**PRATT:** Well we have asked for this now to go back to the individuals who have been re-working this over the Fall semester to try to again ensure that any changes that are made are consistent with what was done previously and if it appears that we are deviating in a significant way then it will require bringing it back to the individual faculty councils.

**PERRY:** For those of us not having dealt with this as long as Bob has been around, could we say what IRT...what...?

**HANSON:** IU Research Transfer.

**PERRY:** Yeah, well it's changed names, but what does the acronym stand for now? Even those of us in Public Administration have four acronyms like that. What is it?

**ENO:** It's IU Research and Technology Corporation.

**PRATT:** Yeah, I think so. And again, John since you're in the room, would you like to just briefly comment on this as well?

**APPLEGATE:** Well, I mean the reason we looked at this is there were two problems. One is that the numbers that were the original allocation were not, as far as we know, based on a great deal of data. In fact, there is a surprising dearth of good data about this and we tried to find what we could and base it on a goal actually not as grand as making IURTC self-sustaining but really to keep it at its current level of support from the university. And the second one is that there really did seem to be some confusion about what gross and net meant to various people through the process and, which seems incredible to me, but I think it is actually true, and so getting that straightened out and making sure that our policy was really fiscally responsible is, I think, a lot of the objective of re-looking at those numbers.

**ENO:** The new numbers may be better numbers, the new arrangement may be better. If it changes from what the Faculty Council passed then, if you want to make this a Faculty Council document, it ought to go back them.

**APPLEGATE:** I mean, I think that's your call. We're just trying to get the most appropriate numbers that we can and also really try very hard to achieve the same goals that, as far as we can tell, that the choice percentages had in the first place; in other words, creating an incentive that you talked about on IURTC to do this, but on the other side protecting IURTC from not having to pursue un-economic inventions, basically. And you know there are obviously a whole bunch of other goals involved in the policy so that's what we were thinking, but I mean your point about the governance process – you know, I think that you collectively are the better judge of that.

**HANSON:** Other questions or comments? Yeah, Herb?

**TERRY:** I would just like to say one thing again echoing Bob's comments about my sadness that Lisa is stepping back. One of the joys of service on the Faculty Council is you get to meet people from throughout the campus regardless of their academic specialization. You get to know them as academics, you get to know them as faculty leaders, and you get to know them as individuals. It has been a pleasure to work with Lisa. I understand why she wants to give this up, because she has given this every bit of energy that she possibly could and I'm going to go a little further. The purpose of faculty governance or the BFC is to create an environment in which faculty and also students and staff can do their best, and in Lisa's case this means pursuing an absolutely unprecedented scientific opportunity. I may simplify it a bit, but basically Lisa has a choice between putting hours and hours into faculty governance or into playing a major role in discovering whether or not there's life on Mars. [laughter] If that were the choice I know where my priorities would lie, and if it turns out that I succeed her that's wonderful, but what I wanted to say is that it's been a pleasure to work with her this year, and we'll have an opportunity after the last Faculty Council meeting to thank her for her service.

**PRATT:** Thank you, Herb.

**HANSON:** Anything else? It's true, she's not going away now. Don't bid her farewell yet. Okay, let's move on to the first Action Item, the EPC Committee has a report on Priority Registration for Student Athletes.

## **AGENDA ITEM #5 EDUCATIONAL POLICIES COMMITTEE: PRIORITY REGISTRATION FOR STUDENT ATHLETES**

**CARINI:** Well what you see before you is essentially the same document that we had discussed about a month ago and in the intervening time we had reconsidered in light of some the comments that were made two meetings ago and we've also had an EPC meeting that was largely devoted to discussions with Associate Athletic Director Kimya Massey who is actually more in day to day contact with the advising of student athletes and so he educated us as to some of the benefits of the policy as it's currently being implemented and I think that the one big thing that we left out in our discussion last time was the fact that there are rather strict Big Ten and NCAA regulations on progress toward degree and what that means for student athletes is that progress is tracked every semester and it counts, you know, the actual requirements towards the degree, not just counting up credit hours. And so in the advising process there's a very high level of emphasis placed on athletes getting requirements taken care of as early as possible so that later on in their academic careers they can continue to make progress in their chosen major. That is probably the most important benefit of the priority registration policy. I'm sorry we left that out and I'm very glad we had the opportunity to hear from the advising side of the Athletic Department. As far as the impact on the non-student athletes, the policy allows student athletes to register before any other undergraduate student and so obviously that gives those student athletes a great degree of freedom to register for just about anything they want. However, because of these restrictions and because of the emphasis placed on getting requirements taken care of early, the students you would think would have the greatest negative impact on non-student athletes, the freshmen and sophomores, probably have the most pressure on them to get their requirements taken care of to get off to a good start academically as well as athletically, so the scheduled coursework that does not conflict with practice. For the older student athletes, they have more freedom obviously, that's assuming they've made progress toward their degree, having more freedom to electives, but of course then the impact on the non-student athletes is less, because they would naturally, you know, without the priority registration, have a greater ability to register for the classes that they want. And then finally I'll just remind you that even as it's currently implemented the impact on non-student athletes is rather limited. In other words, we're not keeping seniors out of courses, and a handful of juniors are kept out by younger student athletes and nobody's being kept from graduating. And then finally, if there are problems with particular courses, this is quite the – Roland Cote was there for our discussion, the Registrar, and he pointed out that departments have considerable freedom to impose restrictions on registration for their courses. They could, you know, set aside seats for students that they know will need to be registered for their course, for their own majors who are not student athletes. They can set different restrictions based on class standing, for instance, and really control, keep out, freshmen, sophomores from registering for courses. And they have other means, if they think that there's a problem in a particular course, that is a much more cost effective means of controlling registration than anything than anything that could be done at the campus level, either by the Registrar or even across the board by the Athletics Department, because I think that their advisors have their hands full as it is just keeping the students on track. And then finally, another benefit for that was that for parents of student athletes who are thinking of coming here, it's very important to them to know that their children be able to attend class. So if they can register the course so it won't conflict with practice, won't conflict with competition schedules, that is a significant benefit, an attractive benefit for bringing student athletes, and for

making parents more comfortable with sending their children to Indiana University. So that's all I have to say for now, any questions? Bryan?

**MCCORMICK:** Just a comment out of curiosity and I apologize if this was covered last time, I just couldn't recall. The impact on student non-athletes, how is that calculated?

**CARINI:** The Registrar did actually two studies, one in the fall, one in the spring semester so they looked at all of the courses where student athletes were registered, identified the ones that had closed and then actually looked at the class standings of the students that were in there, comparing student athletes with non-student athletes, and then looking at the students who were on the wait list. So the impact was considered to be negative on the non-student athlete if say, a sophomore student athlete was in the course and then there was say, a junior on the wait list.

**MCCORMICK:** So there's no way of telling who saw the class was closed and didn't bother waitlisting.

**CARINI:** That's correct, but there are always – no class only has student athletes in it and so there's always other...

**MCCORMICK:** No, I understand. I'm just saying by using waitlist as the measure, is that a full understanding of the impact on the student non-athletes?

**CARINI:** Well, it's hard to know. It's also hard to know what – I don't know if they actually looked at the time of these registration events took place either, maybe the junior actually had a chance to get in the course and so forth. I don't think that we will know. Bob?

**ENO:** I see you've got a paragraph at the beginning of the resolution that calls for a periodic review of this motion, that the registration procedures will allow for improvements in the future and I think that's a good thing. I made an objection or at least a suggestion last time that you brought this to the Council that we consider including very specifically that we support an attempt to configure the registration process so that the student athlete priority registration would be only for courses that were required for degree progress and not for electives, and I think what you've done in talking about the counseling patterns in the advising for athletes office has more or less been addressed to that issue and I understand that what you've said responds to those concerns and indicates that there may be less reason for them than otherwise. I think in principle priority registration for student athletes is not a good idea, but in practice it's a necessity, or recognized as a necessity on practically all campuses that run extensive athletics programs. We need to have something like this if we're going to have the type of athletic program that we decided to support as a campus. So in terms of the suggestions or reservations that I expressed last time, as far as I'm concerned, you've kind of brought the gap closer to the point where the practical needs outweigh any particular concerns. I'd rather we didn't have to have a policy like this. I think in principle it's not fair to students who are not athletes, but I don't have any further objections to it or anything I'd like to talk about.

**CARINI:** Thanks, well let me just point out that we want to continue having them do the reviews but what Roland was particularly emphatic about was putting the resources of his office

towards an improved system for everybody and so instead of aiming it at, kind of an ill defined group of students who might be impacted now, which is certainly a minority of students, probably a small minority, in any way. And so he pointed out, you know, to get an improved registration system is going to take a major effort not only on his part, but really on the part of the faculty and the students in trying to make the case to the Provost and the Vice President for – is Brad Wheeler here? –

**GINGER:** He left.

**CARINI:** He's hiding?

**PRATT:** He left.

**CARINI:** So in order to make it a high enough priority for those capabilities to be added to the new PeopleSoft system, so if there's a time to do it, that time would be now, because we're probably stuck with this system for another five years, and so I think, you know, there's enough time to make it worthwhile to develop a system that will benefit everyone. If there's time left on the Educational Policies Committee agenda to come up with a resolution, we'll try to bring that back by the end of the Spring, but I think it should be a high priority and it's got to start with the faculty, come from the students, and have the administration know that we put a very high value on the ability of other students to get the courses they need. Thank you. I'll get off my soapbox.

**HANSON:** Are there other questions or comments? Well, this comes as a motion made and seconded since it comes from the EPC, are you ready to vote? All in favor, aye? [Aye] All opposed? The "ayes" have it. [Resolution passes with none opposed and no abstentions] Actually, note that I've been in touch with Roland during this period, too. We've been looking at new scheduling patterns which might help a little bit on some of these things. They'll help on a variety of other things, too -- the classroom availability -- but that's ongoing. The next Agenda Item comes from the Student Academic Appointee Affairs Committee and it's a second, third reading of the SAA Grievance Procedure Revision [End of Side A]

#### **AGENDA ITEM #7 STUDENT ACADEMIC APPOINTEE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE: SAA GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE REVISION**

**TERRILL:** The document you have has been revised and changed slightly since the last time we talked about it and I'll talk about those changes in a minute. But just to refresh your memory, this a document that is intended to be inserted into the SAA Handbook to update and replace some outdated language there, so it represents no change in policy, but it's just sort of a summary and a guide towards underlying policy documents, specifically, three of them. There's a policy document recommending a set of grievance procedures be established at the departmental level, a policy document establishing a SAA Grievance Committee as a subcommittee of this organization system here and then there's policy document establishing the Board of Review. As to the changes that have been made, I want to thank Herb Terry for meeting with me and working out some of the language as we went to revise this document. Specifically, condensing some of the language in the opening paragraphs just to make it a little bit more accessible and get to the point a little bit quicker about what the document's about. You

may notice a section has been added there, a sentence has been added in there, kind of a pointer toward the OVPR. That's really about research misconduct. That's really kind of tangentially related to this document that Pat Foster suggested be added there and I think it makes good sense, because this document, the SAA Handbook, is widely distributed. It makes sense that a SAA might go to this document looking for help about how to handle a research misconduct issue and that would then point them in the right direction, so that's why that's been added there. Herb suggested sort of moving the footnotes which are the HTML pointers to the underlying policy documents, moving those up to the top of the individual three sections, rather than leaving them at the bottom and that may improve readability a little bit; added the Religious Bias Incidents Team to a list of a possible alternatives to use under the section on the SAA Committee and that's really substantially the changes since the last time the document was presented to you all. So that's it.

**HANSON:** Questions or comments? Actually I have a question, did you check to make sure that this language about the university Research Integrity Officer is up to date? Those organization charts are changing, Compliance and OVPR.

**TERRILL:** I believe so. That's cribbed from their website.

**HANSON:** I think you may want to check it again.

**TERRILL:** Does it need to be updated?

**STONE:** It should be Office of the Vice Provost for Research Administration.

**TERRILL:** Okay, thank you.

**TANFORD:** I'm not sure that it matters, but the paragraph that you referred to where you added one of the various incidence teams, that same paragraph appears in the Affirmative Action Complaint Procedure Guidelines, but it is longer. That is, it cross-references a greater number of alternative administrative offices that handle these things. I'm not sure that that matters.

**TERRILL:** Yeah, I don't know that it matters either, I don't think it would do any harm to extend the list. Are you suggesting that maybe it would be better to extend the list here?

**TANFORD:** No, if anything there are plenty of other offices, period, would be okay with me.

**TERRILL:** Okay.

**TANFORD:** I don't think, because we're looking at the same provision...

**TERRILL:** I see.

**TANFORD:** ...on the Affirmative Action Committee and I would point out that the paragraphs are slightly different so I would point out that the paragraphs are slightly different, but I don't think that matters.

**TERRILL:** Okay, fair enough.

**ENO:** I think I asked you the same question last time. This is going to go into a Handbook...

**TERRILL:** Yes.

**ENO:** ...and so what you're asking for is our approval of this procedure to put in the Handbook, basically the only question I have is whether or not the content of these descriptions are in fact accurate descriptions of the policies that we have adopted which are the reference lines. If they are accurate descriptions of the policies we've adopted, I don't even think we need a vote but it would certainly be a good thing to do. That's the only question I can see, since the policies are what we voted on.

**TERRILL:** Yeah, that's correct. It's not a change in policy. The Handbook as an entirety is under revision, actually I think the committee has a pretty good version of it which should come at this point, I don't know, probably not until the Fall and at that point this would be a part of that, but we wanted to bring this section forward as quickly as we could because we thought there was a need for that. But you're right, it doesn't represent a change in policy, just kind of a summary of policies.

**ENO:** The only other thing that I'd say which I said before so I'm going to say it again is I think that the Dean of Faculties or some other appropriate office should know which departments have policies at the department level and be in a position to inform students of which departments have policies and then collect them and have easy access for them, because right now we haven't tracked whether policies are complying with what we put in as a suggested policy for departments. Our policy is to suggest that departments have a policy.

**HANSON:** Other questions or comments? I've got to say I still remain slightly uneasy about that first paragraph, because I suspect the URL isn't right and some of those things are in flux. If you could seek approval pending checking that...?

**TERRILL:** Sure! I checked it a couple of weeks ago, I'd be happy to be sure that it is up to date and the t's are crossed and the i's are dotted. Absolutely, sure.

**HANSON:** Okay. Other questions or comments?

**TERRY:** I like to ask Provost Hanson a question, should we approve this with an understanding that whoever keeps track of the Handbook can also keep the URL's up to date?

**HANSON:** Umm...yes? [laughter]

**TERRY:** Okay, I'd then recommend that we do that. We're not approving the specific URL, we're giving the editors of the Handbook the responsibility and the authority to change the URL's as they change.

**TERRILL:** That's one of our assumptions, and it may be an incorrect one, but our assumption is that eventually the Handbook will migrate toward being a web-based document, and so that's why we wanted to put the links in there, but you're right they have to be updated.

**TANFORD:** And along the same lines, I assume it is our intent that if the names of the individual administrative offices for incident teams get changed administratively that whoever does the Handbook sort of understand that they have the authority to update the correct names of things for example if the various incident teams get merged into a single one that they'd be able to change that if the Office of Women's Affairs gets a new name, I think that's our last administrative office that has not been re-named...[laughter] Sorry, that they be allowed administratively to do that without having to come back to the Faculty Council and say do we approve a technical change like that.

**HANSON:** I think that's right, but actually this is a slightly larger issue than it might seem and Alex's remark underscores that. I mean part of it is that what you're now referring to is a university wide office, not a campus office, and so we could make various promises about what might happen in the information related to that, but it's not actually under the control of campus. The other thing is that the empowering of, I don't know, the people cleaning up the Handbooks to make various changes in names, I think, has actually within the year gotten us into some trouble and I think it would be wise sometimes for this governance body to look at some of those issues more closely. Some of these things aren't minor. They actually make a difference in what you unit you're talking about, but I don't think it's a huge issue here but you are now talking about a university-wide office.

**ENO:** On a procedural issue, it used to be the case that in things of this sort of nature, BFC committees were empowered to negotiate with units to approve and modify and so forth, and they would simply report to the Council what they'd done, rather than bringing things back to a plenary body of this Council. Because if we were to get into those sort of waters, every document which relates to BFC policies, posted on the web or in printed form and so forth, that is continually revised had to come back to the plenary, body we'd be doing this all the time. I think really this is a document that I really don't think requires Council action. I think it does require committee review and a report to the Council of what it did, but there's nothing wrong with having Council action today. But I think we want to make sure that we don't establish a precedent where we're looking over their shoulders, you know.

**HANSON:** That isn't what I'm suggesting. I'm suggesting actually that this body should have looked at its own governance documents in connection with the major re-organizations that have taken place in the university since 2006.

**ENO:** That's our institutional memory.

**HANSON:** You don't want to be governing according to memory, you want the governance documents that work!

**GINGER:** That's why we have to let Bob come, that's why Bob has to be here.

**HANSON:** Well do you want to vote on this now? Alright. All in favor of empowering this committee to insert this in the Handbook say “aye.” [Aye] Opposed? [Resolution passes with no opposition and no abstentions]. I think you have dispatched your business for today. Thank you.

**TERRILL:** Thank you.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm.