

Agenda
Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
February 3, 2009
IMU Georgian Room
3:30 P.M. - 5:30 P.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Eric Arnold, Randy Arnold, Leslie Blaha, Julie Bobay, Purnima Bose, Stephen Burns, Carolyn Calloway-Thomas, James Capshew, Andrea Ciccarelli, Nicholas Clark, Diane Dallis, Jon Dilts, Carrie Donovan, Erika Dowell, Paul Eisenberg, Harold Evans, Christine Farris, Lucas Fields, Julia Fox, Thomas Gieryn, Luke Gillespie, Laura Ginger, Dennis Groth, Karen Hanson, Patricia Henderson, Amy Holtzworth-Munroe, Brian Horne, Michael Jolly, Padraic Kenney, Valerie Markley, Bryan McCormick, Amanda Meglemre, Michael Morrone, James Perry, Lisa Pratt, Jennifer Riley, Richard Shockley, Daniel Sloat, Sonya Stephens, Jerold Stern, Alex Tanford, Herbert Terry, James Wimbush

MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT: Ruth Stone (Sarita Soni)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Jack Bielasiak, James Biles, Nate Birkhead, Bruce Burgun, James Drummond, Valerie Grim, Patrick Harbison, Robert Hatten, Lloyd Kolbe, Paul Losensky, Lokman Meho, Brian O'Donnell, Dan Ondrik, Diane Reilly, Richard Stryker, Neil Theobald, Vasti Torres, David Waterman, Maxine Watson, Susan Whiston

GUESTS: Haley Adams (IDS), John Applegate (VPPP), Nicole Brooks (Herald-Times), Maria Bucur (Gender Studies), Amanda Ciccarelli (Provost's office), David Hummons (DEMA), Christoph Irmscher (English), Stan Jastrzebski (WFIU), Sue H. Talbot (IU Trustee), Brad Wheeler (OVPIT), Craig Dethloff (Faculty Council Office), Erin Rykken (Faculty Council Office)

1. Agenda Committee Business (5 minutes)
(Professor Herb Terry)
2. Presiding Officer's Business (5 minutes)
(Provost Karen Hanson)
3. Question / Comment Period* (10 minutes)
(Provost Hanson and Professor Terry)
4. Resolution from the Diversity and Affirmative Action Committee on General Peter Pace.
(30 minutes) (Professor Alex Tanford) [SECOND READING. VOTE SCHEDULED FOR FEB.
17]
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/08-09/B12-2009Rev.pdf>
5. BRIEF RECESS.

6. Reports of Chairs on Year to Date Committee Activities. (40 minutes)
7. Discussion of the Composition of the Search Committee for the Vice President for Research. (Provost Hanson and Professor Terry) (20 minutes)
<http://newsinfo.iu.edu/news/page/normal/9716.html>

*Faculty who are not members of the Faculty Council and who wish to address questions to Provost Hanson or Professor Terry 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

Minutes

HANSON: We should call ourselves to order because we are already a little bit late, and we have plenty of business today. I'll turn to the Agenda Committee business.

AGENDA ITEM #1: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS

TERRY: Okay, thank you. I'll keep this short because we do have a big agenda today. First of all, I've received a number of comments from faculty and staff and others about snow removal (laughter), and safety, and crosswalks and all kinds of things, but some of them are really very sharp, very useful observations I think, about areas of the campus that didn't get treated well or whatever. I'm going to compile that, and I will send that on to Vice President Clapacs. So if any of you have comments on snow removal, feel free to send them to me and I'll incorporate those.

I'm going to mention briefly something that the Provost is going to talk about in more detail and that is her open house with the master planners. You should have all received e-mails from her about that. What I would do, and she will do I think, is encourage you to take advantage of this opportunity. It's going to be a conversation with one of the main members of the master planning team, and frankly, I think one of the most significant members of the master planning team, in terms of really digging in and understanding IU Bloomington. There will be time to hear her presentation which I assume will be a kind of summary of what they will present to the Trustees, and then about 45 minutes for discussion.

I have received some comments that wish there had been more faculty opportunity to discuss the master plan and more faculty involvement in its creation. First of all, I think there was a substantial amount of involvement in its creation. The Provost created a series of task forces. Many faculty members as well as administrators and staff were on those task forces. They studied various aspects of what you might want to know in order to create a master plan, and I think the planners listened to those task forces. In addition we did have one meeting with the

master planners ourselves here that the BFC hosted. We weren't able to give you a lot of notice of that because we didn't actually get a lot of notice of the confirmation of the master planners' schedule with regard to that. You had more notice of the meeting that Karen has scheduled. What I want to stress is that the master plan is just a broad form planning document. You shouldn't imagine that everything that appears in this plan is going to be built out and constructed exactly as they proposed. This is a plan for up to fifty years. What will really be important will be faculty involvement in all the many steps that we'll have to follow with implementing the plan for many years to come, and it will be the responsibility of my successors and your successors to keep up faculty involvement in that.

I promised you at the beginning of the year that we would start through the process of identifying things in our policies that needed to be changed because of changing administrative structures. These are all the policies that mention the Dean of the Faculties. Okay? And we will be taking a look at those trying to figure out what to insert in lieu of Dean of Faculties. Many of these policies, it turns out, also mention other administrative officers like chancellors, that we no longer have. We'll move on this quickly as we can, and I would hope before the end of the year, bring you up to speed. [tape cuts out—some audio lost]. ...package of changes in various policies that I hope will clarify who steps in to do what in policies we've already adopted that deal with the Dean of Faculties Office and to some extent with the Chancellor/Provost.

Just a few things about three items on today's agenda. The first is this resolution from the Diversity and Affirmative Action Committee. You may have noticed that it says here "this will be scheduled for a vote on February 17th," the Diversity and Affirmative Action Committee did not approve this version of the resolution until late last week. We sent it out as soon as we had it, but obviously that didn't give you a great deal of time to consider it. It would not be fair for that reason alone, I think, to vote on it today. But in addition, it did not get to the Academic Council of the School of Business until the same time it got to us, basically. And they asked me for some kind of a postponement of a decision on the resolution. What I proposed back was that we start the discussion today, but we continue it at our next meeting. And that's acceptable to the Academic Council at the School of Business, whose reaction to it, I think, we need to hear.

Yesterday, you received, or you should have received, an email from a member of our group, Eric Rasmusen. Attached to it was a reaction to the resolution that it said was from the Academic Council of the School of Business. What I want to clarify is that what Eric sent was a draft reaction to the original proposal, the original resolution that was considered here late last semester. It was not the Academic Council's reaction to the revised proposal that is before you today. The Academic Council of the School of Business assures me that they will consider the resolution, they will consider some of the comments today, and they will have, probably, a written comment prior to the February 17th meeting.

Item 6 is something that I hope will become a regular and new activity for the BFC. The Agenda Committee decided that we would ask each committee chair to very quickly give us a kind of snapshot report of what they're working on and what they might bring to us in the rest of this

academic year, or for that matter, next year. I thought that a kind of mid-year check-up with the committees for all of you would be useful, both in terms of learning what they're thinking about and perhaps giving you the idea that maybe you should suggest something for their agenda. So we will have very quick oral reports from most of the committee chairs today. I think I know everyone who is reporting, but I might call a name and somebody might not be here, but I think I know all of those.

Finally, the last item is the discussion of the composition of the search committee for the Vice President for Research. I've obviously received a number of emails once the press release was out identifying the members of the search committee. Most of the emails have come from faculty in the humanities who believed that the committee's deliberations would be enhanced if a member of the committee who actually does mainstream, traditional, humanities research and seeks a lot of funding from the humanities funding agencies, were a member of the committee. I don't know what direction the discussion of the membership of the committee will actually take today. But I want to assume some responsibility for the composition of the committee as it stands. Along with my colleague, Simon Atkinson, at the Indianapolis Faculty Council, I was asked to submit names to the President of faculty members that might be appropriate members of this committee, and I did so. I consulted, but perhaps not as systematically as I should have. I gave the President names of people that I believed were very familiar with humanities research and that, in one way or another, I at least, thought of as doing that kind of research themselves. The President did pay attention to those recommendations. What I take away from the subsequent comments was something I was thinking about anyway—we don't have very many good policies on what should be done about searches for system-wide officers of the university. We've had some vice presidents appointed recently without searches. And that was a cause for some concern. What I think I've learned from this is that the University Faculty Council should take up the question of how to constitute search committees for university-level officers. And which officers should be included in that and so forth. Actually I think we might have a better and more systematic way of getting faculty members on those committees. So I will pay great attention to that. Actually, I will pay great attention to several things, including the master planners' meeting. One of the few perks of this office is that I get to speak to the Trustees at most of their meetings. If something significant comes out of the meeting with the master planners, I will probably say something about that because they will hear from the master planners before my comments, but they will actually respond to the master plan at a business meeting following my comments. And what's said about the search committee and the place of the humanities on the Bloomington campus is also something that I may take to the Trustees based on the comments today. Thank you very much.

AGENDA ITEM #2: PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS

HANSON: I don't have a lot of business today. I just wanted to remind you of that open house which is the 12th, which is next Thursday—4:30 to 6 and the location is Jordan 124. So everybody is encouraged to come and make sure that other people who might have an interest in it are aware of the meeting and that opportunity to see the plans and comment on them.

AGENDA ITEM #3: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

HANSON: Any questions or comments for either Herb or me? No? Alright, we'll move on to Item #4, the resolution from the Diversity and Affirmative Action Committee on General Peter Pace. Alex?

AGENDA ITEM #4: RESOLUTION FROM THE DIVERSITY AND AFFIRMATIVE ACTION COMMITTEE ON GENERAL PETER PACE.

TANFORD: Thank you. I'm Alex Tanford, I'm from the Law School, and I'm Chair of the Bloomington Faculty Council's Diversity and Affirmative Action Committee. For any of you who were not here at the December meeting, it was December when it was the first reading of this proposal. Very brief background—back in September of 2008, General Peter Pace, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, was invited to campus by the Kelley School and awarded the Poling Chair of Business and Government, which is an award connected to leadership. At the time that he was awarded that, he was already notorious, had national notoriety, for his statement made in his role as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs that the military's policy—the 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell' policy—the policy of discrimination, the official discrimination policy based on sexual orientation, was justified in his view because homosexual acts were immoral.

Because of this pre-existing public notoriety the decision to award him a distinguished university award was very upsetting and offensive to the gay and lesbian community. For that reason, the Diversity and Affirmative Action Committee got involved and we felt, that, indeed, this decision to award the chair was at best insensitive to the concerns and the plight of being a discriminated against minority on this campus. That's otherwise entitled to the protection of university policies promising equal opportunity and protection against discrimination—and basically our culture that this is a warm and welcoming place to faculty, staff, and students of all types. And therefore we brought to this group a resolution that discussed this, discussed the strengths—it was a complicated resolution that included the reasons why General Pace had been invited, a lot of detail about the 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell' policy, some discussion about the imbalance of viewpoints, the fact that the business school had closed his presentations to the public and the press. And it was discussed at length. And I would say based on, to summarize very briefly, I think, the concerns and because I'm going to try and summarize them in 45 seconds, I will undoubtedly to misstate them. We just took follow-up from people who had questions and what we did in response to them.

One question was whether we, before drafting this, had adequately consulted with the business school. The answer is that we had not. So we now have done so—we are now in a dialogue with the business school. As Herb pointed out, they have seen drafts of the proposal, they have been invited, though they have not attended any of our meetings, and they will

comment on it. The second question that was raised was whether or not the business school knew about General Pace's position at the time, and the answer to that is, yes, at the time they issued a press release, at the time that they announced him, distancing themselves from his views. So they clearly knew about it. Third question that was asked by a couple of people was what the role of the faculty of the Kelley School in the decision. I have asked but have been unable to get an answer. Neither the Kelley School nor the Academic Council has responded to my direct question, "what is the role of the faculty?" So I cannot answer that question.

There were concerns that the resolution was cast too broadly, in that it would sweep within it ordinary speakers and performers. There were concerns from the Music School, particularly about the variety of people who come here to perform and do we have to start screening their views. And in the new draft we have attempted to try to make clear that we are speaking very narrowly about the awarding of university honors to people who already have achieved national notoriety in some area, to try to avoid that problem of the casting of the resolution too broadly. There were questions raised about whether General Pace's views were religion-based. The original draft had language in it that his views about homosexuality were religion-based. We went back and researched that. It turns out General Pace's views were not religion-based; he explicitly denied that they were religion-based and said that they were based purely on his personal upbringing and his family. So we did not see that there was any religious issue there. There was a general concern about whether we had consulted more broadly with various constituencies on the campus that might be affected one way or another by this. We have now done so. And, indeed, if there is any constituency left un-consulted, I don't know about it. And, there was some concern that the original resolution was too strident in its wording, we have attempted to tone that down. There was a question raised whether this was an issue of campus concern at all, and if so that the reason this was of campus concern and not just a local incident needed to be articulated. It is now in the resolution.

In the last month, within and outside the committee, two other questions about this have been raised. One is the question of whether it is possible to draft this resolution without implicitly criticizing the Kelley School. The answer to that is; if so it is beyond my powers of drafting. You have to say that the Kelley School gave the award and therefore, I knew I could find no way and the committee could find no way of drafting this that avoided at least an implicit criticism of that decision. Second, and this was an issue that caused dissent on the part of the Committee-- meaning that we bring this recommendation to you not unanimously, but with a dissenting vote. And it was over the question, if I can phrase this properly, 'would we, by passing this resolution, ourselves engage in an act deeply offensive to religious conservatives and therefore engage in the very kind symbolic discriminatory behavior that we are criticizing the Kelley School for?' I thought that was a good question, and it was a question that caused one member of the Committee, because they thought that's exactly what we were doing, to dissent and it made our effort essentially, beyond saying let's all try to avoid offending people, which is not a resolution worth passing, made the effort sort of impossible to achieve in any fair sense. Let me just respond to that and then I think that will be the end to my introductory remarks. And that is this, in my view, both university policy and the mission of the Diversity and Affirmative Action Committee is to worry about members of minority groups who are traditional victims of

discrimination. And certainly there is no group in this country right now that is more the victims of discrimination than members of the gay and lesbian community. They have people running around passing constitutional amendments against their getting married. Whatever may be said about this being potentially offensive to religious conservatives, religious conservatives are not, under federal law or under university policy, a protected minority. Indeed, they may not even be a minority at all, at least in the population at large, and if they do constitute a minority of people on this campus, they do not constitute a minority group that is historically discriminated against. Therefore, even if in the passing of this resolution, that we offend some religious conservatives and their views, I suppose, ultimately, to me that seemed irrelevant because I'm going to side with the victims of discrimination, as opposed to those who are not.

Anyway, you have now the resolution before you, and Herb also mentioned you should have gotten an email from Eric Rasmusen, there also was an email sent around—mine is not actually, the one that I have—I printed it out. The email had a name on it, I printed it out, but there's no name on it—sort of raising the view from the military point of view. And I don't know whether people got that—that came in my email. Was that a green sheet what was circulated earlier? Yes, there's a green sheet, I guess, that was circulated at your place earlier. And again, that came into my email—I didn't circulate it—I don't know who the author of it is, I'm sorry I deleted that. Anyway, certainly there are other views, which you have in front of you. And with that, I throw it open to discussion.

HORNE: I was very bothered by the first resolution that was offered in December and spoke against that and whatever we decide to do today, this is a significant departure from that, and in my view, a huge improvement on that. So I'm personally grateful to you and the committee for just making that change. My feeling that day, was that I was bothered by it, but my feeling that day was this Council would have passed that resolution. So for you to take this step, I think, is something you didn't need to do, and I'm personally grateful for it. Having said that, to me, I'm personally bothered just at this moment for you to say that it doesn't bother you that you would offend another group of people because there's not historical discrimination in an atmosphere that is supposed to be not about anything really other than the freedom to express one's opinion. This is not about something Peter Pace did; it's about something he said and about something he believes—and the job has nothing to do with that. So for use to choose that it's okay to offend this group and this group and not that group—that, on its face, is bothersome to me. A man named Bill Maher, who's a comedian and a political commentator, produced a movie over the summer and fall called *Religulous* that made anybody of faith—not just didn't agree with them, but mocked them and used graphic imagery to do that. If someone in the university brought him here because he's a well known artist and allowed him to speak or even gave him some kind of honor, I think it would be the same kind of thing that we could pass a resolution, you know, kind of condemning that somebody did that and that he was offensive in doing that, and given what you've just said, it would be clear we couldn't come to your committee to get that resolution.

TANFORD: Then you've misinterpreted what I said. Indeed, I thought about your very question in advance, and the example that I came up with was suppose next year—well, it's too late, she's dead—suppose a few years ago, the Kelley School gave the Leadership Award, the Poling Chair, to Madalyn Murray O'Hair in honor of her 32 years of her exemplary leadership of the American Atheist Society. That decision to award a university honor would, again, strike me as the same thing that we have presented today. That is, it's a difference between protecting a group from being discriminated against and protecting a group's right to discriminate against others. And in this context, where religious conservatives are asking for their right to discriminate against the gay community, to be given the same weight as the gay community's right to be free from such discrimination, I do not balance those equally.

HORNE: But I don't know how the religious conservative vote even weighed in here. Nobody was asking anything. The man was employed in a position, they asked him about it because it was relevant to that position at the time, he took one step further and voiced a personal opinion rather than 'I'm doing this because it's the law of the land and I want to keep my job.' And now we want to punish him for that. The religious conservatives didn't weigh in, he just wanted to say this.

TANFORD: No, I was just saying there was a criticism made or a concern made about the resolution, that our resolution was going to be offensive to religious conservatives. I do not mean to suggest that there was anything about Poling's appearance that had anything to do with the religious conservatives. Indeed, we took out all references, some of those references had been in the first draft, and I agreed that the Poling thing had nothing to do with religion and it was not appropriate to bring religion into that in any way.

HORNE: Thank you. And again I'll just say one last thing, I appreciate this very much. I intend to support this resolution. My only concern would be if somebody, in a year from now, is bothered by something they could easily craft a resolution that said 'expresses its regret that so-and-so was brought to campus in a way that offended, you know, _____ community,' and I'm curious if we'll pass it at that time. But this one I support, and I'm very grateful that you and your committee took the time to make a vast departure from that first resolution to this.

TANFORD: Thank you.

HOLTZWORTH-MUNROE: In general, I don't know how I fall on this resolution because I'm very strongly in favor of freedom of speech, particularly on campus, but I think one of the reasons I'm very strongly in favor of that is because it opens up a dialogue that gets people talking about controversial issues in what's hopefully a constructive way that's well structured. So I apologize, I missed some of the discussion this December and I haven't followed this in detail, but my understanding is you said one of the concerns were that these were going to be closed meetings, was there a chance for dialogue about this, was there a chance for people to learn from that? And I'm wondering what you know now from the Kelley business school about how they're handling that? Are they continuing to ignore this? Or are they in fact doing some things to have this lead to a productive dialogue about these issues?

TANFORD: They had already begun to do some things to try to open up the dialogue a little bit. I know that Doug Bauder, who's the director of our GLBT center, had had conversations with General Pace. At the meeting last time, somebody from GPSO I think was also a business school student and had said that there was some dialogue within the business school about it. There has been a tepid response from the business school that the next time he comes to campus, although his schedule is very busy, if they could work something in they'll try to do something else. But one of the things that happened was in our discussion of this issue around campus with various people and thinking, as Professor Horne said, about what happens next time; that one of the things that became immediately clear was trying to create any kind of rule or policy or resolution addressed to how public appearances and speeches should be structured; and do you have to balance the panel, and how many people do you have, and how many hours; that that was a road that just could not be gone down. It was just infeasible to begin to think about, you know, worrying about that. There are too many speakers, too many performers, too many artists brought to campus under a whole variety of circumstances to start to cast this in terms of contribution to the ongoing university dialogue, so we just dropped that issue out of it all together. Paul?

HANSON: Paul?

EISENBERG: Yeah, in the final paragraph of the present resolution, you say the Council will be expressing its regret that General Pace was brought to campus in a way that was offensive. But you haven't indicated what that way was. Is it, as we are hearing now, that there wasn't an opportunity for dialogue between him and members of the gay and lesbian community or something else? All you say is that he was invited and received a significant honor, his views are offensive to members of the gay and lesbian community, and then suddenly this reference to a way that was offensive, which itself suggests that there might have been some other way which wouldn't have been offensive. And I was wondering if you could explain that.

TANFORD: Well I think that in this case, the way that he was brought involved at least three aspects. One is that although the Kelley School was aware of General Pace's position on this issue, they did not involve the gay and lesbian community, anyone from the GLBT Center, in the dialogue over the discussion of whether to bring him here at all. For example, his predecessor of the Joint Chief, two people before him, also a distinguished military leader and former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has recently written an editorial in the *New York Times* in which he says the 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell' policy is a failure and it's ill-advised and it's harming our military. So if that, for example, would have been known at the time to Doug Bauder, for example of the GLBT Center, had a broader constituency been involved in the decision of who to bring in the first place, it either might have resulted in a different choice, or at least, the minority community would have felt that their voices had been heard.

Secondly, was the point you raised, that when he came here, again despite the well-know notoriety of his views, the appearance was through the university press release and through the decision that the appearance was that they were isolating him, that they were sort-up

setting up barriers to prevent anyone from discussing this. There was no press interviews, no press conferences, all his presentations were closed to the public, so that there wasn't even an opportunity for anyone to raise any questions of what they wanted to hear or engage in the dialogue. So again that was a procedure that brought him here. The third was that, in addition to bringing him here, they gave him a university honor, the chair. So again, they didn't just bring him here, they brought him here with honor. So I think that there were a variety of factors involved in the way that he was brought here. Had almost any one of them been done differently, this might not [audio lost] ...litany of things that we thought went wrong, or should be done differently because, as many people noted last time, each speaker, not each speaker, each honor that is to be awarded by units around the campus is going to present its own unique set of procedural circumstances for deciding, awarding, announcing it to the campus and things like that. We were concerned not just—we didn't want to say that there was no way he should have been brought here. I don't think anybody on the Committee felt that—so that the language is a bit odd in some ways because it talks about the way that he was brought here, but we were trying to back off from saying that we thought he shouldn't come here at all.

KENNEY: So that actually brings a question. It seems to me that in a way it also ends up being so broad [tape fades out, audio lost] It's not clear what kind of remedy there could be. Seems to me of the three things you mentioned the most important, over and over again, is the question of honor. And I would urge the committee to think about restoring this in a way [inaudible]. Second, I have a question about the second paragraph, the line here seems rather vague—I'd like you to clarify it. You're discussing General Pace's statement in which he says that the military's policy was justified because homosexual acts are immoral. Now, there are two separate claims there, potentially two separate claims. One is that he was saying it was justified and two that he was offering his particular explanation for why it was justified.

TANFORD: He was speaking as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs. Up until he made that statement, the official explanation for the 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell' policy was related specifically to 'don't talk about it.' It was unit cohesion, fear that discussion of homosexuality out in the field with eight soldiers would cause dissension and interfere with unit cohesion and therefore fundamentally interfere with the military's mission. And when asked that, he said, no he didn't say 'no,' but the explanation, the justification that he gave for the policy was not unit cohesion, but was that homosexual acts are immoral.

KENNEY: Okay, so in other words, it was his explanation and not simply that he supported the policy.

TANFORD: That's right. That's right. Again, we do not—to the extent that he was a soldier just following orders and this was a congressional act requiring the military to follow the 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell' policy—that contributes to the symbolism of it, but is not central to the resolution.

MARKLEY: Thank you for letting me present another opinion. I'd like to suggest a redirection of efforts outlined in circular B12-2009. Concerning the conception of the circular; whatever the intent, it appears to me to be an attack on the military. Military organizations are easy to

criticize and they frequently do things that many of us don't agree with. Military organizations are though a reflection of the society of their origin. And today's military is not a conscript force, it's a professional force of individuals who choose to be in the military, and often for the opportunities that are not provided to them otherwise to advance their education. Our military represents only 1% of the population—it is a true minority with its own culture and values. The Bloomington Faculty Council certainly received a lot of attention as a result of this circular on talk shows and news networks. The consequences, unintended or otherwise, are that it increases the growing rift between academia and the military in the United States. Whether or not General Pace receives a Poling chair appears to be irrelevant. He has an extremely distinguished career and circular B12-2009 comes across to me as a harsh if not spiteful act that really doesn't benefit anyone. I feel that it did not reflect well on Indiana University or our uniformed services. Rather than endorse the circular, it appears to me it would be more in the University's role as an innovator to attempt to better understand the military culture of today's armed forces. Indiana University has a great deal of talent to offer an organization that is experiencing rapid, dramatic social and technological changes. It's much easier to facilitate change through positive rather than negative actions. It appears to me to be the tone of the Obama administration, as well. As a 21 year veteran from a military family, I strongly urge the members of the Bloomington Faculty Council to redirect their efforts, to reject the circular, and help the Department of Defense with meeting the demands of defending our nation. Thank you.

TANFORD: I would say that it is not our intent to attack the military. Indeed, the 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell' policy is a policy of Congress, not the military. I mean, it has to be enforced by the military, so if anything, we're attacking Congress in terms that we don't like that policy. I agree with much of what you say with one exception, which is that while the military is a professional force and provides education and extends rights to everyone, except people who are gay, of course. That would be our concern as a Diversity and Affirmative and Action Committee, and finally as your, sort of, conclusion that what the University ought to be doing is taking steps to close the gap between academia and the military, I agree with that a 100%, but I don't think that's mutually exclusive to what we're doing. I think we can do both things. We can say, 'on this campus we care and protect the rights of the gay community,' and we can at the same time 'we wish to have a greater dialogue with the military.' And I would endorse any proposal that suggested that.

SLOAT: First, I think it's worth noting, you touched on earlier about unit cohesion and how that's a priority, it does go both ways. Certainly, fraternization and any kind of engagement of a heterosexual kind, be it specific acts or even just speaking about it, there's no place for that in the military. It's very clear. There's a zero tolerance policy. Secondly, just a point of clarification, you mentioned earlier that the presentation was closed to the public. It was very clear that this was open to any member of the university community but it is true that each attendee had to submit their name in order to attend the presentation and this is largely just a security check. General Pace has a very stature, just want to make sure that everything goes as planned, that everything is safe in that environment, but again anyone was welcome to attend.

TANFORD: On that point, the University's official press release which is still on the University's website concerning his visit says explicitly all of his visits are closed to the public except outside of the Business school. So if that was the policy, it was not communicated and what you have said is different than the official press release. Since I have had limited response from the Kelley School about it, they have not claimed to me that these were in fact open to anyone and I was relying on the university press release, which says that they were closed. If they were in fact open, this was a well-kept secret.

SLOAT: I guess we'll need further clarification on that then. Lastly, I just wanted to note that you also mentioned that there was dialogue with the president of GLBT. The GLBT community on campus was invited for an open discussion with General Pace. I really wonder how many presenters that we bring would be willing to discuss their personal views in a public venue, and really how much more can we ask?

TANFORD: I don't know. We agreed as a committee last time that the Kelley School had made some steps to engage in the dialogue. We found that although selected members of the GLBT, representatives of the GLBT Center did engage in a dialogue there was still no open meeting, as far as we understood it, to members of the community at large. There are people who are concerned about the treatment of gays and lesbians who are not themselves gay and lesbian and they weren't included. We thought they could have done more. The Kelley School said that given his schedule, they really couldn't do any more, so that's one of the reasons why that issue about whether there was adequate dialogue dropped out of the resolution. They bring someone in, his schedule is crammed full of things, and they didn't have time for it. We thought that was not something that our resolution should address.

E. ARNOLD: Sir, I mean, you're correct, it's the law of the land and it's Congress' policy, but the motion or the resolution here reads that it's "the military's policy of discrimination." So I would just like to point that out. But secondly though, of course as an active duty officer, I have no personal, or, no professional opinion on the policy. (laughter) But I will tell you this. I'm not a native Hoosier. I came here from Virginia, and in the two and a half years I've been here, I do scholarship recruiting as many of you do, and I will tell you this; young, eighteen year old Hoosiers who want to serve their country as an officer, they choose Purdue over IU at a rate of 3 to 1. And there's a perception out there amongst the citizens of this state, that Bloomington and Indiana University is not a place where wearing a uniform – you know, you may be confronted. Now in two and a half years I've been confronted once. I mean that's the truth of it, but the perception is that it's not a very friendly place for soldiers, and as we move down this resolution, move forward with it, you know, perceptions can be reinforced. What's the point in seeing the value of a liberal arts education to officers [inaudible] to offer a young cadet as opposed to a mechanical, technical education that they will receive at Purdue? And what's the point of exchanging – now I'm competing with Purdue, I mean, there's no doubt – (laughter) but I'm just wondering how much damage this will do to our efforts to bring soldiers to the campus. To include veterans, I mean if you've seen the new G.I. Bill, it's quite generous. It's \$80,000, full tuition and fees. If I'm a young twenty-two year old veteran just back from the battlefields of Mesopotamia or the Hindu Kush and I look for where I'm going to spend my G.I.

Bill dollars, am I going to do it here, or I'm going to do it in West Lafayette? [Some remarks inaudible] That's all I have to say.

CLARK: I think that's a good point and something certainly this body should consider, but there's also an alternative to that, I think, which is that, you know, IU is clearly focused on recruiting as rich and diverse of a student body as possible, including having representatives from underrepresented minorities in the student body and on the faculty. And I think there probably could be an argument although I'm certainly not going to make it, and I don't have the evidence to present it, but there could be an argument that there is a perception in the gay and lesbian community that southern Indiana isn't particularly compatible for gays and lesbians and we might want to be conscious of that and the impression that's being delivered by both IU policies and who is invited and what this body's doing along with what, I think, you know, the consideration that you've brought forward as well.

HANSON: Any other comments or discussion today? This isn't up for a vote today, so the Business school will be responding next week.

BLAHA: I'm wondering if you can clarify at the end of the third paragraph, it says that the award "had an impact on the public image of the campus." It doesn't go on to say anything about positive, negative...

TANFORD: I'm sorry. In this version it's supposed to say "an adverse impact," and that word got omitted in the version that will come to you for a vote, that sentence—I'm sorry I meant to say that, thank you—will read that the award had an "adverse impact" – no, it didn't. Sorry, no, we took "adverse" out on purpose. Sorry, I got it backwards. It originally said "had an adverse impact on the public image of the campus," and then for exactly the reason just expressed it depends on what group you're in, as to whether it had a positive or an adverse impact. In other words, there are different perceptions about it, and so we what we can say is, 'is this an issue of campus concern?' And the answer is, yes, General Pace's invitation here and the award given to him had an impact. As several people have said, it was on the talk shows. It was noticed by the gay and lesbian community. It was noticed by many people in the university. It was noticed presumably by the military community here, and so it did have an impact on the public image of the campus, and this was designed not to cast that as one-sidedly negative or positive to make the case that this is indeed a issue of campus-wide concern and not just a local issue.

R. ARNOLD: I apologize for delaying our recess, but the one issue that I think hasn't really been brought up *per se*, at least today, is how a resolution like this might impact the potential to invite other speakers to campus. It would seem to me that there would be of the conservative religious community that would at least espouse, if not publicly say, the exact same thing that General Pace has said in the statement, and at what point would we be restricted from inviting someone like that? Could we invite them but not, you know, award them a University honor? I mean, it seems that while the intention of the resolution is good in protecting the rights of minorities on campus, I wonder if it's the right vehicle, because I wonder if it creates more

problems as a resolution than it solves in that sense and that you now are questioning every potential speaker...

TANFORD: No, no, I think you're engaging in reading too much into it and worrying about a hundred cases in the future. First of all, this isn't a policy. It doesn't set down any rules to guide future cases. It says nothing about future cases other than in the future we hope that all campus administrators will be sensitive to minority concerns, all kinds of minority concerns, you know, the gay community, the religious conservatives, the military, the Wiccans, I don't care. And it does not say, if you read this, it does not say, that our resolution is that General Pace should not have been invited here. Very explicitly it does not say that. It says that he was given an honor and that that was insensitive and offended a traditionally discriminated against group, the gay and lesbian community, and it was the way in which he was brought here, as I just said. Any one of a number of things might have ameliorated the negative impact of this on the gay and lesbian community; involving them in the decision, involving them in a dialogue, inviting a second speaker, but for exactly the reasons you express, we specifically want to avoid trying to set down any policies for any other future potential invitee, speaker, presenter or honoree. We're saying, 'this one, we thought, was not handled well.' And as result of not being handled well, it needlessly offended the gay and lesbian population on campus. In the future we hope these things will be handled in a way that is not that offensive and is sensitive to people. So I think in some senses, we're, you know, we've watered it down to the point where I don't see that the concerns that you raise are implicated in this. I mean, there may be sort of layers beyond this, which people may interpret this...

ARNOLD: I think that that may be the issue.

TANFORD: ...but they don't get – to me, you know, bringing Pace here, knowing his national notoriety and you got, yes, other speakers with national notoriety that are controversial, Ralph Nader, for example, you know Al Gore, any of those people. The people are aware of what they stand for and that they're controversial and so that's the circumstances under which this arose, not any other ordinary speaker with no known views...

HANSON: The Agenda Committee has determined that this will come again next time, so we really do have to bring this to a close, and Luke had his hand up. Let's have just one more comment and then take a brief recess.

FIELDS: Again just to reiterate, I think you've expressed concern for all kinds of minority concerns, and what I think is problematic with this resolution is it only addresses the concerns of the one minority. We're not addressing the concerns of the minority of students who are anti-war. Or what about the number of students who are from Iraq, or the number of students perhaps are adherents to the faith of Islam? This invitation could have been equally offensive to them, but it's not addressed in the resolution. Instead we're singling out one particular thing that he said. I think it could have gained just as much national notoriety for authorizing force in Iraq as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs and that's not being singled out in this. What kind of message does that send to the other minority groups on campus that aren't addresses here?

TANFORD: The University policy already defines what minority groups are entitled to the protection of the University policy and anti-war students aren't one. So we believe that our role as a committee in drafting this was limited to the list of groups protected under University policy. And those are groups that have defined immutable characteristics as a legal concept of a defined minority group that is historically discriminated against, and some of the groups you've mentioned are covered under the University's Non-Discrimination policy, some are not, and the committee would take equal action if we discovered something happened to discriminate against or offend any of the other groups that you mentioned. But it didn't. This happened to be one of tremendous symbolic importance to the gay and lesbian community so that's why we addressed their concerns.

HANSON: As I have said, the Agenda Committee has determined that this will come up again next time. Let's take a short break and return to the other topics on the agenda.

BRIEF RECESS

AGENDA ITEM #6: REPORTS OF CHAIRS ON YEAR TO DATE COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

HANSON: Could we reassemble, please? As Herb mentioned, he's asked the chairs of the standing committees to give a mid-year report. There's a list of standing committee chairs in front of you. I think Herb has briefed them all on the dimensions of the report. So I'll Herb to call on the people who will be the either be the chairs or the delegates of the chairs to report today.

TERRY: Yes, and we will keep this moving along because this discussion of item 7 is as important as the discussion of the General Pace resolution. Up first, Steve Burns.

BURNS: Do you want me to just stand here?

TERRY: Yes. If you have trouble recording any of these people wave at me, okay?

BURNS: I'm Chair of the Research Affairs Committee. We've had a fairly busy fall, we've been working on IRB related problems. We've brought some of our reports here to the BFC. We've had discussions about the IT Strategic Plan, we've had meetings to provide some input into the whole issue of the new Office of the Vice President, I guess it's not new, the Vice President for Research and whether the Graduate School should be within that office. And also concerns about going forward with issues related to research compliance and all within that office. We've had discussions with OVPR, the implementation of the FSRP program, mostly discussing things about how we could improve the review process and the communications process for the Research Support Program. We're starting to discuss the implementation of the new tech transfer distribution scheme. Primarily on identifying what units the unit income goes to, and we plan to bring forth a recommendation to the BFC probably in the next month or two. We started a discussion of the policy related to export control and publication relating to research

funds. Right now the university does not allow funding to restrict publication of the outcomes of research. The world's become more complex since that policy was first implemented back in the '60s, as far as anybody can tell, and there was actually task force on campus about a year and a half, two years ago, that came up with a fairly comprehensive proposal for restructuring that policy, but then it sort of died. And we were asked to look into the policies that Steve Martin brought back to this task force before it existed and we'll be coming back to that issue—perhaps bringing some recommendations or some policy itself back to the BFC this year. Herb has informed me that that has to go through a process with the UFC as well, and so that may take a while to work through all that. That is something we will be working on. We're going to be working with Steve Martin who's offered to bring the result of the satisfaction survey for the Office of the Vice President for Research Administration. They ran a survey; they'll bring that to us and discuss some the ramifications of that survey and its results. We hope to have discussions with the search for the Vice President for Research that'll probably be ongoing—and we've offered to be resource for that process as we [inaudible]. We're considering follow-up related to the IRB of the organization. And if people have issues related to research that are campus-wide that they'd like to bring to us, let me know. Thanks. Questions?

TERRY: Okay, I think we'll try to avoid taking questions. (Laughter.) But if you have comments on any of these reports please send them to these people. Jim Capshew, Constitution and Rules.

CAPSHAW: Yeah, me and Lisa are the members of this committee and we're working on the revisions of the constitution and the by-laws that you saw a first reading a couple weeks ago. We will probably get done with the final version in a couple weeks. So that's about what we've been doing. That's what we've been doing.

TERRY: Andrea Ciccarelli, Foundation Relations.

CICCARELLI: Yes, we met several times last semester and as a matter of fact some of our colleagues are meeting today and tomorrow in Indianapolis with the IU Foundation Board. Basically our concerns were to meet with Gene Temple, the new President of the IU Foundation, which we did. And it was a very long and productive meeting we thought. And we went over many aspects, which of course I will spare you now. There were many issues that were raised on how we would do different certain things that were done in the past about fundraising in particular. There were questions about paying attention to fundraising, not just to big donors which is also of course important, but also to small donations which for many units or many parts of the campus are actually not so small. We're talking about [inaudible] \$100,000, for instance, in the arts and humanities is a lot money, but is nothing for the sciences, for instance. We have a very good impression and just received an email yesterday from him, and some other people may have received the same email, saying that despite the financial situation throughout the world, actually so far Indiana University had not been suffering as much by the situation. We went to the Foundation Board of Directors—six people, six of us went to the meetings - And we were there as witnesses, but also to take our requests

as faculty members. We are going to send a report to the President of the BFC next week about the meeting with the IU Foundation Board.

TERRY: Alright, Diane Dallis, Student Affairs.

DALLIS: Our committee is responding to six charges that we received, and there was actually another thing that we did on our own. We are advising the procedures for the Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities. The code is a system-wide document, we have small changes we're making there, and they should go in front of the UFC on February 24th for an initial hearing and then there are some changes to the Bloomington procedures that we will bring here hopefully they'll receive their first reading on March 24th. Just a brief overview of what those are, they're fairly straightforward changes that reflect the current campus administrative structure, some modernization of some anti-harassment language, and clarification on records retention—some things like that. We were asked to prepare a list of concerns, or look into the impact of high student enrollment, or increasing student enrollment every semester and what effect that might have on the campus. And before we really even got started with that, we found a fantastic report from a task force from September 2001 called the IU Bloomington Capacity Report that pulled together excellent data and really discussed issues that are relevant today and made recommendations. We're actually just going to refer to that document in our annual report (laughter) because the work's already been done and we didn't think we needed to do it as well.

We were to review and consider the Board of Aeon's proposal for student representation on campus committees as well as review the Student VOICE recommendations and summarize those recommendations for the Council. We just received the Student VOICE Report and I'm not really sure how we will share that with the Council, or I'll actually take suggestions for that at some point, but we will at least respond to both of those reports in our annual report as well. We were to review the campus policies for the search and screen process for the Dean of Students and we did that as well. We were also to look at the portfolio of the Dean of Students' office and the way that it's structured. We've done that, we've compared the portfolio to other Big Ten universities to see what their Dean of Students or equivalent was responsible for and we have some recommendations that we'll make, again, in our annual report. Also in a similar note, we were supposed to look at career services and review at the variation of career services on campus throughout the different schools and just discuss those and make some recommendations or just share our findings—we'll put that in our annual report. And, also in late September, it's not a charge, but we had the opportunity to meet with Frank Acito to talk about the IT Strategic Plan. And the Student Affairs Committee made a formal response to the plan.

TERRY: Thank you, Diane. Harold Evans, Technology Policy.

EVANS: So our main interest this fall was obviously the IT Strategic Plan. We had in a variety of speakers from the IT community to tell us their views on what was going on there and how we could participate. And we were active participants in the review process and came up with

several structural recommendations from the committee on how to forward the plan. In spring we'll be participating in the implementation of the plan. We'll be advising Brad Wheeler and his team on faculty issues related to the implementation of some of the short-term goals of the plan. If people have questions or comments about the plan they're certainly welcome to get in touch with us—or concerns—we'd be happy to bring those up in our meetings.

TERRY: Brian Horne, Student Academic Appointee Affairs.

HORNE: The Student Academic Appointee Affairs Committee has dual membership of faculty members and also members of the GPSO, approximately of equal representation on that. We're kind of on two tracks this year. The first one is to take up several resolutions that have been offered by the GPSO. The first one was dealt with by Professor Burns' committee earlier the year. It's a resolution on the organizational structure of the graduate education. So that's already been dealt with by that committee and by this body. After that, we received a resolution on the Bursars' schedule of payments to the administration. We meet as a committee with the Bursar and the Registrar and Dean Wimbush actually as well about two weeks ago and the Bursar made a proposal for something that would essentially render this resolution mute. So the committee, we're going to meet again next week, but at this point we feel that we will not move ahead on that because it would really not be as necessary if the Bursar goes ahead with her plan that she announced. The third one is a resolution on establishing a committee under the Provost to periodically review and make recommendations on the salaries of student academic appointees. There's a meeting on this next week, and the feeling on the committee is that we'll meet shortly thereafter and allow time for the Agenda committee to move ahead on that.

By far what has taken the greatest amount of time though was a resolution on drop/add late fees for graduate students to the administration. And again that was the subject of the meeting primarily when we meet with the Bursar and Registrar and Dean Wimbush—and it is essentially a proposal to allow drop and add fees not to really kick in until after the second week instead of the first week, which would allow students more time to make their choices. And presented that way, it was a very positive thing and everybody was in favor of it. After the presentation of the Bursar and the Registrar, the committee was essentially split with faculty feeling one way and students, GPSO students, feeling another way. So my hope, subject to permission from the Agenda Committee, is to bring that resolution forward, though it is completely split from the committee, so that the faculty could consider it. It sounds like a wonderful thing, and in fact, it in some ways would be a wonderful thing, but there would be some serious implications and the faculty members of the committee were very concerned about it, as were the Dean and the Provost, excuse me (laughter) I mean the Bursar and the Registrar. So we will hopefully move that one forward. I'm not quite certain, I'm doubting that it would happen in two weeks, but perhaps in four weeks. So that we can deal with that. And I would speak and Nick Clark of the GPSO would speak and present essentially an opposing viewpoint, but you know the committee is split and it's important for us to deal with that. The other thing that that we, that has not come from GPSO it's just a charge from the Agenda Committee at the beginning of the year, and that is to supervise, or just get a feeling I guess, for

how graduate students, and student academic appointees essentially, when they come to campus, that they have an accurate feel for their financial responsibilities and for the commitment the campus is making to them. Based on my understanding of essentially anecdotal evidence, that some graduate students came to campus thinking that they had a certain deal that was rock solid as long as they kept their grades up and things like that, and then suddenly funding would dry up. Or they agreed to the position, and so they committed to the school, and before they finished their program, conditions changed. So I contacted first the officer in charge of that in my home school, the School of Music, and they were redoing the way they did it this year; the letters, the actual letters that went out. My hope is to get letters, copies of letters from various schools that go out this year, not specifically to certain students, but just to check the wording on it, to make sure that we are not making promises that we're not keeping. I don't think anybody is attempting to do that, but we want to be certain that we are not in fact. Thank you.

TERRY: I'm not sure that Christoph Irmscher was here.

IRMSCHER: I am.

TERRY: Oh, there you are!

IRMSCHER: I'm Christoph Irmscher, chair of the Library Committee. I don't have a list of glorious achievements, but what we basically did was look at IU (inaudible) charge that ITSP 2, with regard to the library, the library (inaudible), the library (inaudible), we drafted a response that we sent in and to which the intern had not received a response yet, but we do hope that we will be consulted when it comes to implementation issues. So a lot of our work went into reading through this and offering our response to it. A subgroup of us met with the Dean, the current Dean of Libraries, to talk about issues of assessment. And what she discussed in the committee as well and we were also charged with assisting the search for Dean of Libraries. I'm on the committee, and we will be reviewing the ad and hoping to assist with the search as it progresses in the spring. We are currently working, it's not one of our charges but it is an interest that the committee had, we are working on ways of finding some kind of integration, coming up with a plan for integrating library instruction and teaching in the College, how to make library instruction an integral part of teaching and (inaudible), and so we are drafting a letter that we would like to send to the faculty next week if possible. Any questions? Thank you.

TERRY: Padraic Kenney, Educational Policies?

KENNEY: The main concern of the Educational Policy Committee has been assessment. At the moment, as it relates to the General Education program which does not yet fully, or has not come into existence yet, but when it does, we'll need to assess it. This is an ongoing project. It will take us the rest of this year, and I'm sure into next year, because it also involves trying to figure out, or helping the General Education Committee figure out what Gen Ed's purpose is, educational purpose, and only then can we figure out what should be assessed. Along the way,

we're actually having a little bit of difficulty, I guess I could say, figuring out what are the lines that separate what the Educational Policy Committee does, and what the General Education Committee does. We are still working on this and again I think is to go on to next year. Last semester, one thing we did resolve, we had a request to look at priority registration for students other than athletes, and the committee declined to consider that possibility of the priority registration. Also in the fall we were engaged with the search for the new Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education. We have two new issues we are working on this semester, both of them ongoing. One, a question of excuses or accommodations made for students with religious observances, and possibly other reasons to be excused or accommodated from class, that mission still going on. Finally, we've been discussing the issue of credit for non-curricular or sometimes called co-curricular activities, independent study, internships, and so on, that discussion is also continuing.

TERRY: I don't think Lesa Lorenzen-Huber was here. We'll ask her to report at a subsequent meeting. You have before you a memorandum dated 1/30/09 from the Budgetary Affairs Committee. Brian?

MCCORMICK: Thanks, Herb. I'm chairing the Budgetary Affairs Committee with Jerry Stern, from the School of Business. The Budgetary Affairs Committee, during the fall spends a big bit of time simply trying to get a feel for budgetary issues, and what's going on on the campus as a result. We met with Vice President and CFO Theobald, as well as with Provost Hanson and her budgetary staff. At the present, we are in the midst of budget conferences. Budget conferences began on the 19th of December with Dean of Faculties and continue through about the 5th of March if I recall. We provided one, or at least one, if not two members at every budgetary conference, and then subsequently provide reports as well as discuss some of the issues subsequent to the budgetary conferences of the academic and non-academic RC's. We provide a summary and recommendation to the Provost's office, identifying priorities across campus. The memorandum before you is really part of our effort to try and engage faculty within the College and the schools, since our role really is at the campus level and that is the level at which we provide input and comment. Though we come from a variety of schools and colleges, we really focus on the campus.

The memorandum before you was circulated first to our membership and subsequently to budgetary and policy committees across campus to encourage faculty to be aware of the budget constraints under which we are right now, particularly for the upcoming fiscal year, but not limited to that. We are looking at an overall 1% reduction in state appropriation over the entire fiscal year, and since we're halfway through it, and it represents basically a 2% cut for the rest of this half of the fiscal year. We strongly encourage people to take active roles within their units to have faculty input on how we're going to deal with some of these really challenging restrictions that we're facing right now. We still don't know the end state of the state appropriation budget, but the governor has proposed a cut; the legislature may not go quite as deep, but we really don't know what the result is, and that's all we're really doing is providing input. At the campus level, we encourage our colleagues to be sure to be involved at their unit

levels in terms of how we make some of these cuts and how do they accommodate some of these reductions.

HANSON: Thanks very much Brian, and I just want to add that you people should look closely at this for all the reasons that Brian mentioned, but the other thing it doesn't include are the cuts that are being made in the support units. You'll notice these are basically the schools, but there will be similar cuts of a similar magnitude in all the support units, and that's in cash this year, but people are having to plan for austerity beyond that. So if you have thoughts about any of those matters, please do convey them. And the other thing is that, of course, the cuts are in some sense more significant than even this, what we've been estimating as kind of two-million dollar cut, but...

MCCORMICK: Just, as a point of clarification, the support units actually come under the budget of administration and planning, just under Physical Plant on the first page...

HANSON: Oh right, but they're broken out and actually they're, you know, trying to figure out how to allocate them to each support unit. The other thing is of course, that R&R money has been held back so that the cut for the campus has been much larger than that and more significant in a lot of ways than is reflected in this very accurate summary, so I just wanted to add that.

TERRY: Jim Perry? There he is. Fringe Benefits?

PERRY: The Fringe Benefits Committee met three times last semester, and we had a special meeting on retirement plans this semester; the University Human Resources reported the last week but our representatives were there, so we've been reasonably active this year. The work of the Fringe Benefits Committee really sort of falls into three areas from my perspective. One is focusing on enhancing and protecting benefits, particularly the benefits of the faculty, although some of those benefits are certainly shared around the campus. One of the sort of major issues that we encountered at the outset of the year was Herb's concern, which was passed on to the committee, and that was a concern the Trustees raised a year ago, or within the last twelve months about increasing costs of the healthcare program. I think last year it increased like 10 billion dollars, so the increases have been substantial, and although there was a period in the last ten years where we sort of (inaudible) the rate of increase, the rate of increase has been quite rapid, and that certainly, because it was raised by one of the members of the Trustees was sort of put into our lap. Now we haven't made great progress on that, but that is certainly one of the issues we'll be dealing with this semester, and that is, what sort of response, if any, do we put together to respond to possible efforts by the Trustees or something, or anyone to reduce the compensation for healthcare benefits or other benefits. The other sort of facet of the committee's work is also dealing with voluntary benefits; for instance, University Human Resources is looking at a new long term care policy, improved long term care policy, and that's going to be rolled out, we've talked to them about that policy, and a bike commuting policy for a tax saver benefit of some sort, and a variety of other programs.

And so one of our focuses has been on protecting and enhancement of benefits, the second area is communication. This is not only communication of the committee, for instance to the University Human Resources, but also the communication program of the university with staff or faculty, in particular, but with staff in general. One of the issues, for instance, that arose is the underutilization of the tax saver benefit program, underutilization of the tobacco program. There are a variety of benefits that help the faculty and help the staff and the university only if they're used and only if faculty and staff sign up for them, so one of the issues is trying to improve the quality of the communication and monitor that. We've also tried to sort of develop a strong relationship with the University Human Resources. They're really a force that has lots of influence, I think, with the Trustees, gives them good advice. I think, at least it convinced me as well as probably other members of the committee that we have a great program that is certainly a credit to the people that put it together, but also a great benefit of the faculty and staff.

So those are the three areas; protection and enhancement of benefits, communications, and developing a close working partnership with the administration. Probably this semester, we may be looking at a resolution regarding healthcare benefits. Another issue that we need to take up, probably either late in spring or more likely in the fall is the assessment of the new healthcare program, the high deductible on medical savings account. There are only three hundred people I think that signed up for the high deductible and medical savings account. The only way you get access to the medical savings account is by signing up for the high deductible. It was sort of cloudy what the program involved, when it was rolled out last fall. One reason I think it was a little bit cloudy was because Human Resources didn't want to press it or push it because it was a new program, and wasn't interested in moving people into it for the sake of moving people into it even though it may make good sense for a lot of folks, but I think we need to look at the people, or talk to the people who entered the program to get some feedback from them so we can again share that with faculty, in the next open enrollment period with the hope that we might be able to extend that to other individuals. For those of you not familiar with a medical savings account, University puts in 250 dollars and then you can contribute up to, I think it's 6500 dollars or so during the course of the year, that's tax free money that can be used anytime for healthcare. You don't have to use it like tax saver benefits in the same year, so that was a new program going on this last year, and like I said only about 300 faculty signed up for it, so the prospect is that it's one that more people will take advantage of in the future. We need to provide some feedback on that program.

TERRY: I know Jonathan Plucker is not here. He will speak at a subsequent meeting. And finally, Alex.

TANFORD: Well, you know one thing we've been doing—working on the General Pace resolution. Two things that we've considered that we did not bring to you; one was we considered getting involved in the Ora Wildermuth naming controversy, and then we decided that was a -- because it is located on our campus, but when that turned into a fight between McRobbie and the Board of Trustees, we thought we ought to keep our heads down and so we're keeping an eye on that but I'd say that's not on our immediate agenda. You know at the

very end of the summer, there was an article in the paper about the First Nations Center – is that right? - First People Center, First Nations Center, getting locked out of their offices, and it arose that - this is our sort of support center, like GLBT for Native American and indigenous peoples - and they argued that they weren't getting the support, they weren't getting the facilities, they were like second class among sort of this... And we were in some dialogue with Rebecca Riall, its [inaudible] director, about whether this was an issue in which faculty should get involved, and she said "no." They were in productive dialogue with the administration and they thought those things were being resolved. Lately they haven't been resolved as fast as she thought it would, we're sort of, when I say we I mean, me mostly and, well, the Committee teaches their classes, (laughter) are monitoring that. There may eventually be something in there about the status of that center that is worthy of faculty consideration, but it has not reached there yet. We kind of horned in on the Educational Policies' consideration of the religious observance policy. Padraic is being nice enough to keep me informed so that I know what's going on, just in case any issues in that arise about religious minorities on campus, and whether their religious observance holidays are getting the same sort of treatment; like Wiccans for example, I mean there are some on this campus, whether they're getting the same, whether they get the solstice off, like Jews get Yom Kippur and things like that, that's just floating around there in the background, nothing there that has arisen yet.

Two recent things; one is that there is, the Provost has appointed a diversity committee at the direction of the university, which has a different mission than we do. It is a broad-based committee designed to be proactive and find ways to advance the ideas and the values of diversity on this campus. They are planning a sort 'diversity week' in March, and there's one member of our committee who sits on that committee as well, and I'm sitting on that committee as *ex officio*, just so that the two committees concerned with sort of diversity and affirmative action issues, know what each other are doing, but there's nothing in there that is being brought to this body. The one thing that is on the horizon is the question about minority representation on search committees and review committees of administrators. Within the last couple of weeks, the issue has arisen about how the constituency, the makeup of the search for the Vice President for Research and we have several major academic, major Deans and administrative people on this campus that are on their five year review and there's something too about, that is just now coming to the Agenda Committee, to sort of look at the procedures that we have in place for recommending and appointing review and search committees and as a part of that, I think, that the next thing on our agenda as the Diversity and Affirmative Action Committee, is to look at ways to increase minority participation in those search and review committees, but that's something that's been put on our plate, that I am sort of putting on our plate within the last week or so.

TERRY: I want to thank all the chairs for their reports, most importantly I want to thank them for all of their work as chairs of these committees. The BFC is a lot like the congress of the United States. A great deal of its work is done in committees. A great deal of the work that the committees do doesn't result in things being brought here. They represent the faculty interests to many constituencies, and I hope if you have any comments on anything that's been said by any of these folks, you will contact them, or if you wish, contact the Agenda Committee.

AGENDA ITEM #7: DISCUSSION OF THE COMPOSITION OF THE SEARCH COMMITTEE FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH

HANSON: Thank you. Just with reference to the last thing Alex said. The next item is the discussion of the composition of the search committee for the Vice President for Research. I take it that Alex's committee is talking up both the composition of search committees and review committees, but the Faculty Council should be aware that there are clear stipulations about how administrative review committees are picked, and those are among your policies already, so you supply all the names for those. Let's move to the next item. The discussion of composition of the search committee. I notice John Applegate is here, and I believe you were part of the process connected with that. Would it be useful to begin with a discussion of the formation of the committee?

APPLEGATE: Sure, I mean, whatever. You're absolutely right, Provost Hanson, that there is a fairly detailed process for the establishment of search committees for positions that have a substantial impact on the academic program, which obviously the Vice President for Research is one of those, and the process which we follow is pretty straight forward.

In this case, it's a university-wide position, so the University Faculty Council is asked to provide a slate of names, I forget off hand whether it's twice or approximately twice, as are required to the committee, but that's been practice and in this case that's what we did. I think we really, more given the nature of the responsibilities the Vice President for Research, that is, primarily on Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses, we asked Herb and Simon Atkinson, for a list of names at some point in the fall, to see them toward the end of November. And proceeded to make, put together - the President proceeded to put together - a committee on the basis of the names presented, as the names that typically come from the Faculty Council, are of course, members of the faculty. So we put together a committee that was balanced, in this case, between campuses and disciplines, and very cognizant of trying to have as diverse a committee as we possibly could, and to then put together and then select a chair. That is the job of the President, and that's what he did. Subsequently, a couple of weeks ago I believe, at our usual meeting with the co-secretaries of the UFC, that is Herb and Simon, we went through that list of names, and as I recall there weren't any issues with it and at that point we went forward to make sure that everybody who was nominated or ought to be, agreed to serve, knew about it, and got the process started. So that's the process that we followed, and I believe it's the one that's required by the university policies.

FARRIS: In that humanities faculty are expected to conduct and publish research for tenure and promotion and for the maintenance of the academic quality of our programs, we're encouraged to seek outside funding. We need to manage that funding, if we get it. We need to use human subjects for review, if it's appropriate. I'd like to hear the rationale or the message that's being sent by not having the humanities representation on this search committee.

APPLEGATE: I think the message was at least intended to be, to the extent that there was a message there, was intended to be quite the reverse of that. At least two members come to mind; Jeff Conrad, who has been running the New Frontiers Program, which has been going for five years and has just been extended for another, very familiar with the arts and humanities program....

UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER: Not a humanist.

APPLEGATE: Pardon me?

UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER: Not a humanist.

FARRIS: He's an anthropologist.

APPLEGATE: I think one thing that's important to remember here, you know, I'm not going to get into the sort of disciplinary distinctions there, but from the perspective of what the Vice President for Research does, it seemed that, at least I would contend, that someone who is deeply familiar with the programs across the university, would be ideally suited to represent that view in the search committee. And I also suggest that someone like Russ Hanson, and again I don't know where exactly you want to draw the lines there, but is also someone who by virtue of the nature of this work, and I would also suggest, his deep involvement with General Education is something that crosses the spectrum of the disciplines on this campus certainly, would be someone who could bring that perspective. Certainly, the arts and humanities are something that are, I can tell you, are very important to President McRobbie. He feels very strongly about them. I think there is a lot of evidence that he's invested quite seriously in those and I can also certainly tell you that making sure that that aspect of what this campus and the Indianapolis campus do, was very much intended to be represented.

HANSON: Thanks, John. Andrea?

CICCARELLI: I just wanted to say that basically, I'm not going to get into the controversy who's in the humanities or not, because we'll be here until tomorrow, but I think that this problem could have been avoided, and this discussion could have been avoided, regardless of who would have been chosen by the President, by you or by the committee or the people who chose the people who served on the committee, if the President of the university communicates, when there is a search like this, a university wide search, which of course has to involve also other constituencies, communicates also to the Provost of the specific campus, the Provost of the Bloomington campus. And in that way, I think the Provost may have a better view of the various faculty members or whether or not they represent some disciplines or others, and above all if the President communicates to the President of the Bloomington Faculty Council, the Bloomington Faculty Council should actually convene to the proper constituencies. The Bloomington Faculty Council represented in any discipline, sciences, arts and humanities, whatever, it doesn't matter, and of course, I don't think it's your fault in other words, that's what I'm trying to say, because you worked with a pool of names, but we as

humanities scholars, in the Bloomington Faculty Council, were not consulted. I guarantee you that all the chairs, I checked with all the chairs of all the possible humanities departments, from history to the languages, to English, they had no idea about this committee and the composition of this committee, so it's that perception which is really what has, in a sense, created the problem. We could have given ten names and then President McRobbie or you or whoever could have chosen other people and we wouldn't be here complaining if that had been the case. Do you see? This is very different than...

APPLEGATE: I see your point. I mean I do have to say....

CICCARELLI: So regardless, Geoff Conrad is a very nice person, and he's a friend of mine. He's not a humanist, because coordinating a composition in arts and humanities for which 25 people serve in committees, who evaluates specific applications, doesn't make one an expert in the field. I just wanted to say that.

APPLEGATE: And just to respond on the procedural plan, I think that there is a process in which the University Faculty Council, or Bloomington, or Indianapolis Faculty Council are tasked with the responsibility for putting together that pool, and I would say that we rely on that and indeed expanded on it for some of those reasons, so...

CICCARELLI: That's why I say that you should be very clear that when these requests arrive, they are not personal requests to one person. And that's why I think they should go to the Provost, whoever the Provost is, of the Bloomington Campus because three years ago it went through all the situation with President Herbert because -- and we decided to have a Provost for the Bloomington Campus to have representation, all of us, in the law school as well as in the humanities, or in chemistry, it doesn't matter, or in the business school, it doesn't matter. So I think that could actually serve the purpose a little bit better for the humanities programs in Bloomington, and the President of the BFC should communicate to the proper constituencies.

TERRY: If I may follow up; that's what I spoke to at the very beginning of the meeting today. I think we can dramatically improve our description of how the campuses are supposed to submit, gather and submit, names to the President for these kinds of searches. The procedure is a little better spelled out at the campus level, if there is a Bloomington administrator being sought than it quite is at the university level, and I will hopefully work with the University Faculty Council so we can get something that accomplishes that more clearly in the future.

BOSE: I just wanted to say that I've gotten e-mails from lots of faculty in the humanities expressing disappointment about the announcement of a search committee, and most faculty agree that Professor Conrad brings extremely valuable experience to the search committee, not just as director other NF A&H program, but also in his capacity as Associate Dean of the Faculties, along with his stint as director of the Mathers Museum of World Cultures, and I think this experience really gives him important insights into recent trends in the arts and humanities. Nonetheless, he is not a humanities scholar, nor to my knowledge, does he have an extensive familiarity with external funding for humanities research, and while his inclusion

on the committee certainly represents a nod towards the humanities faculty, the humanities faculty do not have a direct voice on this committee, suggesting that our input is not crucial in terms of the position. And I just want to say that the title for this position is the Vice President for Research, it's not the Vice President for Research in the Sciences. But if you look at the news release for the search committee, there is no mention of the humanities specifically, and that is an object of concern. Most of us have few doubts that this position will go to a scientist in the end, and that is not the concern that I'm hearing from colleagues, the worry is that no one on the committee will represent our interest regarding the institution's commitment to IU's humanities departments, and no one will question potential candidates about their familiarity with grants and external funding for humanities.

APPLEGATE: If I could just respond to two points. One is kind of structural, which I think, I hope, will be helpful to you. The first is that it's important to understand that when you're talking about, I think, the areas that I would think would be most important in the humanities and the arts, which is the whole function of promotion of research, finding, supporting grant funding as opposed to the compliance issues, which clearly are dominant with the sciences. Though the function of research support and promotion will primarily remain on the campuses, that is, there will be an assistant Vice President or associate Vice President, I don't think that's been worked out, on each of the campuses for that function, that is basically the position that's held by currently the Vice Provost or the Vice Chancellor for those positions, so structurally, there will be someone who is deeply familiar with this campus, as well as with the Indianapolis campus, or two people who are and I would assume, and having a joint reporting relationship or shared reporting relationship with the Vice Chancellor as well as with this Vice Provost, the idea being of course, to make sure that the research programs of each campus, distinct as they are, will be well represented and I think that puts the Provost and then Chancellor at IUPUI in a good position to reflect that, so I hope that's one piece of it. And then, I've talked myself out of the second piece, or talked myself past the second piece, but I will come back to it, I'm sorry.

HANSON: We have a line up here. Who first?

FIELDS: I was really glad to see on the roster that we have today before the faculty that graduate students who were named, and I know at least in my relation with Dick, that I expect he'll do a fabulous job on behalf of the graduate students. We are just interested, and would hope, knowing that students could be added afterward, I was curious as to why there were no undergraduates named in the committee and interested to know if there was any reception to an undergraduate being added. I think that the undergraduates that do participate in research on this campus form a valuable part and I think that will continue to be a trend as undergraduate research becomes a more integral part of the undergraduate education.

APPLEGATE: I think it was mostly a matter of numbers. This is a very large committee already expected to do a lot of work in a short period of time, and research is primarily a matter with graduate students, so it was just, you have to make choices and I think that was the reason, certainly not an effort to dismiss or limit undergraduate research at all. We're certainly aware of that issue and thought about it a lot.

HANSON: Padraic?

KENNEY: So I am concerned that whoever fills this position, as well as others in the administration of this university will continue to be able to promote what humanities scholars do in research, but I take your point that that's not the main focus of this position, so let's talk about compliance in the humanities. One of the very important concerns for many scholars in the humanities is our relationship with human subjects board and areas around there, and the main problem there is that we perceive that scientists, who indeed are a dominate concern in those boards and those issues, don't really understand what the concerns are that historians, literary scholars, language scholars, have in their relation to the human subjects board, and that's been a continuing problem, not only of this university, but across the country. Given that, it would be extremely important for us to know that whoever is chosen understands why humanities research is different from what the scientists and the social scientists do, and here's where the concern with the two social scientists you mentioned really come to the fore, because the relationship of anthropologists or political scientists to human subjects research is very different from that of historians, literature scholars, language scholars, etc... So if we just restrict our concerns to that of compliance, then I see a very great problem that there is not a single humanities scholar on that committee who can be certain that the candidates understand those problems.

APPLEGATE: I certainly didn't mean to suggest that compliance was never an issue outside of the sciences. I can tell you from personal experiences that I know it's not, but that does bring me to the point that I spaced a moment ago, which is that it's also important to understand that the candidates, the final candidates, will be coming to campus and there will be an opportunity for a broad range of people to talk to them, and so a perfect opportunity for those issues to be addressed. And I think that there's no reason that, for example, we couldn't make some particular effort to make sure that the humanities are one of the groups that is, you know, well represented in that process.

KENNEY: And if the candidates who are then in the final pool, none of whom have any interest or understanding of that area because it's not been raised within the search committee, it's rather too late.

APPLEGATE: Well sure that's certainly possible. I also think I should also point out that Steve was mentioning this before standing ready to work with the committee. Perhaps that's a concern. I'm on the committee. I've certainly gotten this message very loud and clear, and we'll make every effort to make sure that's part of it. I'm sure I don't qualify as a humanist, but there is an art to law, sorry (laughter). But, obviously that's part of the initial outreach in a thorough search process, which is what we're doing, as well as part of the discussion.

HANSON: Now, we have actually reached a mandatory adjournment unless there is a consensus.

TERRY: If anyone objects to continuing, we will stop. There has to be unanimous consent to continue.

HANSON: There is at least one hand raised, is there unanimous consent? Any objections to continuing a little longer? Okay.

BUCUR: I'm a humanist, and I'm also somebody who's concerned about gender imbalance of the search committee. Now I would be curious actually to also hear what the proposal, what came from the BFC and the UFC in terms of the names that were put forth to President McRobbie, but in the way that this committee has ended up, as of the day that it was published in the paper, there were three women out of, at that point, I don't know, thirteen or fourteen or fifteen rather, and it was four women out of seventeen, and it seems to me that that is not a very progressive way to represent to perspective outstanding applicants for this job what would do best at IU. I think this sends a message that if you're a woman, or if you're a minority applying for the position, you have more of an uphill battle than if you're a white man, and that's personally not the way that I like to see IU represented, because I don't think that most of us stand for those values.

HANSON: Steve?

BURNS: I had another point on the issue of compliance. As important as this discussion goes forward with potential candidates and the search committee that there's different issues with students in all when you come to compliance, in terms of timeliness, responsiveness in all that transcend disciplines, so we need to be sensitive to creating a system of responsible (inaudible). It's a very different environment of an undergraduate research institution and a post-graduate.

TERRY: Since we are continuing I would like to take a minute to point out that there is a member of the committee over there with Nick, who is dutifully taking notes, and so I hope that like John, you've heard what the concerns are and will address them.

CLARK: Yeah, I'm not a humanist and I'm not a member of the faculty so I can't really speak to those concerns but I can raise the questions in each of the candidate interviews that have been raised here, and also I mean the, I know it doesn't really satisfy the concerns that are expressed, but my impression is that it's a very clear and conscious effort to make sure that anyone that is affected by this is involved in the process, and that came across to me in the search committee meeting more than in just about anything else, that one of the prerogatives of the committee isn't just to review the candidates and make a decision, but to reach out as far and wide as possible to the campus, and again I know that doesn't really satisfy the concerns that are expressed, but that is part of the mission of the committee to do that.

HANSON: A number of members of the Council have voted with their feet, so I am inclined to gavel us out unless there is any objection.....

Meeting adjourned: 5:35PM