

**Agenda**  
**Indiana University**  
**BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL**  
**September 16, 2008**  
**Indiana Memorial Union – State Room East**  
**3:30 P.M. - 4:30 P.M.**

**Attendance**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Eric Arnold, Randy Arnold, Jack Bielasiak, James Biles, Nate Birkhead, Leslie Blaha, Julianne Bobay, Purnima Bose, Bruce Burgun, Stephen Burns, Carolyn Calloway-Thomas, James Capshew, Andrea Ciccarelli, Nicholas Clark, Diane Dallis, Jon Dilts, Erika Dowell, James Drummond, Paul Eisenberg, Harold Evans, Christine Farris, Dennis Groth, Karen Hanson, Patrick Harbison, Robert Hatten, Amy Holtzworth-Munroe, Brian Horne, Michael Jolly, Lloyd Kolbe, Padraic Kenney, Paul Losensky, Valerie Markley, Bryan McCormick, Amanda Meglemre, Michael Morrone, Brian O'Donnell, Diane Reilly, Jeanne Sept, Richard Shockley, Daniel Sloat, Jerrold Stern, Richard Stryker, Herb Terry, Neil Theobald, Vasti Torres, David Waterman, Maxine Watson, James Wimbush.

**MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT:** Geoffrey Conrad (Sarita Soni), Elizabeth Johnson (Jennifer Riley).

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Carrie Donovan, Julia Fox, Luke Gillespie, Laura Ginger, Valerie Grim, Lokman Meho, Dan Ondrik, Lisa Pratt, Alex Tanford, Susan Whiston.

**GUESTS:** Barbara Bichelmeyer (Associate Dean of Faculties), Nicole Brooks (Herald-Times), Michael Hamburger (Geological Sciences), Russ Hanson (Political Science), Jonathan Plucker (Education), Sue Talbot (Trustee), Theresa Winge (AMID), Craig Dethloff (Faculty Council Office), Patricia Pierson (Faculty Council Office).

1. Approval of Minutes

March 4, 2008: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/minutes/07-08/03.04.08minutes.pdf>

April 1, 2008: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/minutes/07-08/04.01.08minutes.pdf>

April 15, 2008: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/minutes/07-08/04.15.08minutes.pdf>

2. Memorial Resolution for Irving Katz

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/08-09/B4-2009.pdf>

3. Agenda Committee Business (5 minutes)

(Professor Herb Terry)

Circular B1-2008: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/08-09/B1-2009.pdf>

Circular B2-2008: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/08-09/B2-2009.pdf>

Circular B3-2008: <http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/08-09/B3-2009.pdf>

4. Presiding Officer's Business (5 minutes)  
(Provost Karen Hanson)

5. Question / Comment Period\* (5 minutes)  
(Provost Hanson and Professor Terry)

6. Approval of Indiana University Bloomington General Education Policy (5 minutes)  
[ACTION ITEM]

(Professor Herb Terry)

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/08-09/B5-2009.pdf>

7. Non-Tenure Track Faculty Overview (10 minutes).

(Professor Jonathan Plucker, Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee)

[http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/08-09/auxiliary/NTT\\_Report.pdf](http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/08-09/auxiliary/NTT_Report.pdf)

8. Preliminary Report of the Research Affairs Committee (10 minutes).

(Professor Stephen Burns, Chair, Research Affairs Committee)

9. Report on Extended Sustainability Initiatives (15 minutes).

(Professor of Michael Hamburger, Associate Dean of the Faculties, and Paul Sullivan, Deputy Vice President for Administration, co-Chairs Sustainability Task Force)

[http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/08-09/auxiliary/Sustain\\_08.pdf](http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/08-09/auxiliary/Sustain_08.pdf)

10. Adjournment into Committee Meetings. (60 minutes)

Budgetary Affairs	Ballantine 347
Distributed Education	Woodburn Hall 205
Diversity and Affirmative Action	Woodburn Hall 202
Educational Policies	Woodburn Hall 009
Faculty Affairs	Woodburn Hall 204
Foundation Relations	Student Building 140
Fringe Benefits	Student Building 220
Library	Ballantine Hall 214
Research Affairs	Ballantine Hall 006
Student Academic Appointee Affairs	Woodburn Hall 006
Student Affairs	Ballantine Hall 144
Technology Policy	Ballantine Hall 205

\*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](mailto:bfcOFF@indiana.edu)

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

**HANSON:** Welcome back to another academic year. I'm delighted to see all the familiar faces and the new faces on the Faculty Council. We will get right into the business of the meeting, first with the approval of the minutes from the last three meetings of the spring semester. I assume you've all read them. Anyone want to move approval of the minutes? Let's get this.

**GROTH:** (Raises hand for motion).

**HANSON:** Second?

**BIELASIAK:** (Raises hand for second).

**HANSON:** All in favor? (Council: Aye). Thank you. Minutes are approved. We have a memorial resolution for our late colleague Professor Irving Katz and I believe Jeanne is here.

**AGENDA ITEM#2. MEMORIAL RESOLUTION FOR IRVING KATZ.**

**SEPT:** Yes, as always let me refer you to the complete memorial resolution that's provided you. I'm going to read selected excerpts from it, although quite a bit. When Irving Katz retired in 2002 after four decades of dedicated service as a professor of history and Jewish studies at Indiana University, the IDS described Katz as a living legend. His introductory courses, American History 1 and 2 were rites of passage for generations of IU freshmen and among the university's most popular classes. He enlivened lectures with his own personal and family history which spanned the twentieth century. The son of Yiddish-speaking immigrants from Poland, he grew up in New York City's Lower East Side during the Depression and after graduating from City College, he served in Korea. He said, "I was very grateful to the US Army for defeating the Nazis," he explained. Most members of his extended family had actually been killed in the Holocaust and experiences as an infantryman corporal made him a dedicated pedestrian. He eschewed cars, and encouraged students to walk with him and to tell him stories about their own histories.

After earning his bachelor's degree from City College in 1954, Irving went on to receive a master's and a Ph.D. from New York University and began his career at IU as an assistant professor of History in 1964. Although he had offers from Northwestern and the University of California-Berkeley, Irving chose Bloomington "because the offices were bigger." He authored two important books on US business history, *August Belmont: A Political Biography*, and *Investment Banking in America: A History*. These achievements

facilitated his promotion to associate professor of history in '68 and later promoted to full rank in 1981.

Professor Katz encouraged his family and his students to learn about and appreciate music. Indeed his daughter graduated from the IU School of Music and is now a musician with the New York City Ballet. For seventeen years, he dined weekly with students in Forest and Briscoe Quads leading them in discussions of politics, current events and culture. He arranged to take groups of students to dress rehearsals and performances at the MAC giving many of them their first experiences with opera. Opera, he explained, brought together all the fine arts: visual design, drama, orchestral, and vocal performance. "When it works," he said, "it's heaven." In recognition, he was made an honorary member of the IU Residence Halls Alumni Association in 1987.

He received awards for teaching excellence from the History Department, the Borns Jewish Studies program, he served as Vice President of the Indiana Jewish Historical Society and he received the Thomas Hart Benton Mural Medallion for distinguished contributions to Indiana University. He gave innumerable lectures to community audiences throughout the Midwest on aspects of American Jewish history and especially Israel. President Myles Brand ranked him among "the very best of Indiana's faculty," noting that, "this institution is a better place because of him."

Respectfully submitted by Nick Cullather.

**HANSON:** Thanks Jeanne. May I request a moment of silence for our colleague Dr. Irving Katz? (Silence) Thank you. Now are we prepared to return to agenda committee business?

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

**TERRY:** Thank you, Provost Hanson. First of all like the Provost, I want to welcome you in some cases back and in other instances this is the first time, welcome to this venerable institution. In case you don't realize it, we of BFC have been around since 1947, for 61 years. This is the start of my 35<sup>th</sup> year at IU, so I've been here for more than half of the history of the BFC, and I get to look out and see many people that I know and I'm glad you're all willing to serve. We are so long lasting because there have always been people on the faculty willing to take on this task. I would like to extend a special welcome to all of the people out there who are serving on the BFC for the first time; whether they're student members or others. I say would like to, because we have no comprehensive list of everyone who has ever served on the BFC so would everyone who is in their first trip through the BFC please sort of wave your hand for a moment and all of the veterans look around. That's a good pool! Please, if you're a veteran here say hi to these folks and be prepared to help them (laughter) and if you have questions of us, you know, please ask. We're very glad you're here. New blood is always welcome.

Among the new members out there are three representatives of non-tenure track faculty as those of you who are faculty know, because you voted for it last year, we amended the constitution and added for the first time non-tenure track faculty and so, is Pat Henderson of Optometry here? There's Pat, back there. Pat represents the clinical ranks. Michael Morone of Business, over there. Mike represents the lecturers. And Randy Arnold, there's Randy, representing research science. Welcome and thank you for representing your colleagues and joining the Faculty Council.

Over on our right here is somebody who I hope will be a visitor frequently, Trustee Sue Talbot. Trustee Talbot attended a number of our meetings last year and she's indicated to me that she will come to as many of these as she can this year, and I'm very grateful for the Trustee's interest in our business. And if any of you have anything to suggest to me as to what I should say to the Trustees Thursday, let me know because one of the duties of the BFC President is to speak to the Trustees and I'm formulating my remarks for them so you'll get them later. I want to briefly introduce the members of the Agenda Committee. You know, one of the things I've learned is that new members of the Council often don't know what we do. So let me explain what the Agenda Committee is. In a way it's the executive committee of the BFC. We set the agenda for these meetings, obviously, but we also guide the subcommittees, we meet regularly with the Provost, not just about the agenda but about other matters we have of interest to all of us. And that this is, in a way, the leadership of your Council. Would these folks sort of wave as they come by, Purnima Bose of the Department of English, James Capshew of the History and Philosophy of Science, Andrea Ciccarelli, oh you moved...? (laughter) okay, of French and Italian, Erika Dowell of the University Libraries, unfortunately Alex Tanford of the School of Law I think is not here today...okay...and I'm Herb Terry. I'm a faculty member from the department of telecommunications.

Another important person for you to know is at the end here, Craig Dethloff. Craig is in his second year as Chief of Staff of the Bloomington Faculty Council. Those of you who have business to do with the Council will often deal first with him. The Faculty Council Office, if you don't know it, is over on the ground floor of Ballantine Hall on the north end of the building. So if you're ever on the ground floor, just turn to your right opposite the large dining room there and you'll find the BFC office.

You have been given the traditional set of beginning of semester circulars. That's what we call our handouts, basically. And I should point out that there is an update on the version of circular B1-2009, the list of Bloomington Faculty Council members, that you have been given. You don't need to make that update here unless you want to. In fact, I'm not even going to read it all to you. There have been some changes in the GPSO representatives, the Graduate Student Professional Organization. Our website always has an up-to-date version of the committee, of the Council membership and is up-to-date now. So you can update this if you wish by going to the BFC website.

Over the summer, one of my tasks was to work with the Nominations Committee and the Agenda Committee to organize the various committees of the BFC. We've done that, and we've shared our thoughts a week or so, or a couple weeks ago with the heads of those committees about what we, the Agenda Committee, hope those committees will accomplish this year. I got the agreement this morning of the nominating committee and the Agenda Committee to at least look into something. I discovered that one of my biggest tasks this summer was assembling all these committees. And assembly of committees in the summer is a good deal more difficult than assembly of committees in the spring. So I'm going to try and see if we can conduct our elections a little earlier in the Spring than we have in the past, in hopes that by Spring Break or thereabouts, we'll know who the members of next year's BFC are, and once we know that with the exception of a few groups like student members and the sort which come in rather naturally, we'll be able to get the Council organized faster in a more expeditious fashion. I hope that will be helpful.

I've also asked each of the members of the Agenda Committee to sort of take responsibility for two, and in some instances three committees. They're kind of a liaison. They will work with the committee chairs, some of them, in many instances they are members of at least one of those committees anyway, and what I hope is that when the agenda, just prior to the Agenda Committee meeting, those liaisons will be in touch with the committee chairs, will find out what they're doing, when the Agenda Committee gets together we'll know how work is going in the committees.

I'm not unprepared at this point to give you a comprehensive preview of the issues likely to come before the Council this year, but I do want to give you warning about one that one way or another is going to occupy our attention. In the last couple years there's been a great deal of administrative reorganization of not only the campus, but the system. As a result, we have large numbers of policies that talk about or give responsibilities to administrative officers of the University that no longer exist. And we have other administrative officers who probably should take over some of those roles, but that's not clear in our policies. The most glaring example of that is sitting next to me here. We have adopted policies out the wazoo for the last, I don't know, several decades talking about the role of the campus Chancellors. And every campus has a Chancellor now, except us. We have a Provost. And now that Provost Hanson and President McRobbie have had a year to begin to define their offices, it seems to be time to work through our policies and figure out where we substitute "Provost" for "Chancellor," where we substitute "President," as Chief Executive Officer of the campus, for "Chancellor," maybe an "and / or," I don't know. But we've got to begin that process. Thus, I expect that during the year you may be brought, I think a list of changes may be brought to, many of these I think will be no-brainers, it will be pretty clear that you substitute "Provost" for "Chancellor" in many of these. We will bring you lists of things and say, "object now or forever hold your peace." You know, for those at least that we think are slam dunks. Then we will talk, we will work with the Provost and the President to gradually bring others of these to you in hopes that during this year,

hopefully not extending to next year at least when it comes to the “Provost”/“Chancellor” issue, we’ll get those things up to date.

I also intend to propose that an institutional mechanism be created for keeping our policies up to date as the administrative structure of the University changes. I’m not exactly sure how that will be done and I’ll work it through the Agenda Committee and other committees of the Council. But at some point, I expect to ask you to approve something that once approved, will mean that these changes won’t accumulate as they have in the past. We have other changes to make as well, not just the “Provost”/“Chancellor” issue. A good example of that emerged recently. Under our policies, we consult with the Vice President of Research when we name the chair of the Conflict of Interest Committee. We don’t have a Vice President of Research at the moment. It’s not an office that exists anymore. So we will be working with that with the President and with the Provost on an *ad hoc* basis through that one, but that’s an example of the kinds of changes we need to make.

We also, I hate to admit this, have conflicts in our policies. We didn’t always look back fully at what we did when we did something new. And I hope over the year to begin to identify some of those and to bring that to you for resolution. Ultimately, I don’t know that this will happen during my year as BFC chair, but maybe somebody will carry it on, it would be useful if we converted all of our policies into what lawyers would call a code, a comprehensive subject matter arrangement of policies. The process of doing that would flush out any contradictions that we’ve created. I hope maybe we’ll move down that path.

As far as the agenda goes, I want to stress to every person in this room be you a member of the BFC or not that our agenda is not set in stone. Some of you, I hope, ran for the office or ran for membership on the BFC in hopes that the BFC would do something that was important to you. Please bring issues that you think the BFC should address to me, to any member of the Agenda Committee or to Craig, and we’re anxious to be responsive to what you think we should be doing. You’ll notice at your tables, if you’re a member of the BFC that your little signs have changed a bit from last year. Your name hasn’t changed probably, but you do have an indication of the unit from which you were elected or which you represent by virtue of office. We added this with some trepidation, but I think it’s important. The trepidation is because, generally speaking, when people gather in these rooms over the years, they’ve acted in the best interest of Indiana University Bloomington even if sometimes that is not acting exactly as their unit might want them to do. On the other hand, you’re all representatives of some group even the At-Large people who represent everybody. And I want from time to time for you to reach out and at least try to get information from the people who elected you to this body. So I’ve decided to remind people of where you come from and Trustee Talbot can look out here and see how well we represent the Bloomington campus. But don’t lose sight of the fact that we hope that once you’re here you act in the common good.

In fact, I want to ask you to do a little reaching out to some extent between now and October 7<sup>th</sup>. Later today we'll have a report from Steve Burns on what the Research Affairs Committee is doing in response to the problems that have arisen in the campus over human subjects research. I will say a few things in a moment about what I've done over the summer. But we have scheduled, we have planned a more substantial discussion of the human subjects issue at our next meeting, October 7<sup>th</sup>. And in between I would hope that you would pay attention to your colleagues, to the people who elected you, and try to see if this, all the changes that are going on in human subjects, and Steve will review some of them, are working for your unit or not and don't stop doing that for the October 7<sup>th</sup> meeting, continue beyond. We can be a source of feedback to the campus administration, but we can only be that if we're attentive to our colleagues.

Let me make a few comments on things that have happened with human subjects this summer. The problem in human subjects became apparent, oh, two or three, four months ago and almost from the beginning I was involved with it to some extent. I think I first began to get involved in it when I got emails from faculty members who were encountering delays with approval of human subjects protocols. Over the summer it became very clear that the new Vice President for Research Administration, Dr. Ora Pescovitz of the School of Medicine was moving aggressively to try and deal with the problem. Stories ran in the Bloomington *Herald-Times* just before the semester resumed that while accurate in many respects gave some impressions that Bloomington's IRB was going to be permanently disbanded or things like that. That's not so as Steve will explain. What I can tell you from several talks with Dr. Pescovitz and with others on this campus who are dealing with the problem, presentations that she has made to the Board of Trustees and others is that while these are unfortunate circumstances that should not have occurred, they have certainly caused adverse effects for faculty and graduate students and staff. They are being addressed and they're being addressed well and with great commitment of university resources. And as Steve will explain, pretty soon we hope things will be back on track and in some ways better than they were before, and certainly in more compliance than they were before. So we have paid attention to that issue over the summer and as Steve will explain, we will continue to do so. That's it!

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

**HANSON:** Thanks, Herb. This is the meeting at which it's traditional for whoever, the Chancellor, Provost, somebody to give a report on the budgetary allocations from the previous year. So I think I'm elected to do that now. And that, I have here is a fairly formal report because it involves large figures and I don't want to get them wrong. Something I emphasized last year when I gave the campus address last spring is that our budget for this last biennium has been helped by strong support from the Indiana General Assembly. For this operating year, this fiscal year, on the operating side, the

state is providing a 4.3% increase in the funding which is nearly 9 million dollars. On the capital side, the campus is receiving substantial repair and rehabilitation funding and you know that was made available last year in tending to roofs pretty assiduously since then. It's used to repair and maintain our buildings and infrastructure and for quite a long time we weren't receiving it. We also received 18 million dollars in bonding authority for the cyber infrastructure building and state funds to repay bonds for previous construction projects.

State funds are combined with a 7.4% average undergraduate tuition increase to provide faculty and professional staff salary increases that together averaged about 4.9%. That counted both negotiated salaries and the amounts that the school has allocated for merit increases along with full funding for substantial increases in health care and other benefit costs. That last is particularly noteworthy. One-fourth of all new spending on campus this year will be used to fund inflation in our benefit costs, not for new benefits, but to cover the costs of maintaining current benefit packages.

Increased tuition funding was also used to cover 9 million dollars of the 11 million dollar increase in financial aid provided to our students this year. While state appropriation and net tuition revenue go directly to the schools, funds are available to meet campus priorities through a Provost Fund which last year was set at \$3.8 million dollars. Also from assessments (inaudible) responsibilities centers and they were also funds from reserves and other smaller sources. This total in base and cash approximately \$16 million dollars.

The campus was pleased to be able to provide the support staff with their largest salary increase in at least five years at a cost of \$6 million dollars. I think, in fact, that the campus would have been pleased to make even a larger increase in support staff salaries, but we (inaudible) to fall in line with things that were being done at other campuses that were not in quite as good financial shape as we were last year, but I think the support staff should know that the Deans in most of the schools were looking to make an even larger increase in support staff salaries but those weren't negotiated with the union.

Increasing graduate fellowship amounts and creating additional financial aid programs cost another \$2 million. In the past years, the state provided funding to pay utility and maintenance costs for new buildings, but it no longer does so. Thus for every new campus building that comes along, we pay the heating and maintenance costs. In particular, given what happened last year, it was \$1.8 million dollars to heat, cool, and clean Simon Hall and the new classroom building on 3<sup>rd</sup> Street. Student Academic Appointees received much needed dental coverage and the campus fully covered their premium increases in the existing SAA health insurance at a cost of \$1.2 million dollars. Fee courtesy for dependents of Bloomington faculty and staff required an additional \$1 million dollars this year and in addition \$800,000 dollars was provided to continue the

strategic hiring program that the BFC approved years ago to increase the number of senior women and underrepresented minorities on the faculty.

Finally, a number of charges were levied from the central administration with the largest being the university tax which increased \$1.2 million dollars. Thus, a very huge portion, most of the \$16 million dollars was used for unavoidable assessments. All of them of course, either absolutely necessary, such as heating, or very desirable, such as the incremented financial aid and graduate fellowships. I'd actually turn those around. I'd say that graduate fellowships were the absolutely necessary, the heating was desirable, but in any case it went for those assessments. Out of the \$3.8 million dollars left in the provost fund, the campus provided the College, Education, HPER, Business, and Informatics with over \$2 million dollars in previously agreed help. Those were commitments that had been made and were still on the books that came out of this year's Provost fund. So that really left only about \$1.8 million dollars to allocate.

In concurrence with recommendations from the Budgetary Affairs Committee, I provided nearly half a million dollars in additional funds to the College for student academic services, specifically to increase AI support and to increase salaries for academic advisors. There was something else here that wasn't requested by the Budgetary Affairs Committee, but I provided additional funds to other units where academic advisors were below average. The Academic Affairs Committee, I mean, the Budgetary Affairs Committee, mentioned that it would like to see a campus assessment overall of how those salaries were doing but I had in fact commissioned such a study by HR in the Fall of last year. And we had good data on where people were well below averages so some additional funds were supplied as well as to the College, to the University Division and the Hutton Honors College where most of the rest of the academic advisors are for undergraduates.

I also funded the BAC recommendation for a five year trial of the resident scholar performance program in the Jacobs School of Music. It's sort of like a post-doc program for performers. And I'm phasing that in with a \$300,000 dollar annual commitment over two years. They couldn't get the hiring in place that quickly, so that will be a commitment that's on the books for next year. I also provided \$116,000 that the Budgetary Affairs Committee recommended for the Dean of Students counseling program. All other Budgetary Affairs Committee recommendations were also funded, and those included \$87,500 to match a federal grant received by Radio-TV, \$59,000 to increase faculty salaries in the School of Nursing, \$56,000 for a case manager for the Dean of Students to move things more quickly through the forums of ethics and judicial review they have. \$30,000 dollars to Women's Affairs for a sexual assault program. The Office of Women's Affairs was also awarded, and this was endorsed by the Bloomington Budgetary Affairs Committee, \$39,000 to match an advance grant, a NSF grant, to increase women in science but that was on the assumption that we would get the grant. We didn't. This was a partnership that we had with some other institutions and we did

not get the NSF grant so that funding didn't go in that direction. And a small sum, but important, \$5,202, the graduate school for the office of post-doctorate support.

It's also worth noting that three schools made requests for assistance with diversity initiatives: The Kelley School for a minority summer institute, HPER for a center for minority health, and Informatics for an Assistant Dean for diversity education. All were given assistance. It's a high priority for this campus and it's good to see the schools thinking of various ways in which they are institutionalizing their commitment to diversifying the campus. Funding was also found for wage increases in the Library and for the collections.

The complete story of the finances of the campus should include mention of the tremendous progress IU-Bloomington has made in ensuring affordability for low income students in particular, low income Indiana residents. In partnership with the IU Foundation, the campus' Matching the Promise capital campaign has focused on creating four-year undergraduate scholarships as well as graduate fellowships. The effort has generated gifts and bequests totaling over \$128 million dollars for undergraduate scholarships which is helping Hoosiers from many different backgrounds, many different interests to obtain a first class education here at IU-Bloomington. A parallel initiative has raised almost \$65 million dollars for graduate fellowships which is allowing IU-Bloomington to compete with other outstanding research universities for the most sought after graduate students. We're also using our own revenues, however, not only for the matches on these gifts but also for other forms of financial aid.

How long we can continue to meet our fiscal challenges doing this and remain competitive is a serious question. It's a serious question for the council and for the entire campus to consider together as we think of our priorities for the next few years. This is the challenge we face. We have unavoidable costs: benefits, utilities, insurance, the heating, the cleaning. We have outside mandates and regulatory compliance and the report that Steve will give will talk a little bit about that, but perhaps not the costs associated with it except the costs of faculty time and anxiety. But there are huge financial costs as well. And of course we have increasing competition for the best faculty and the best students.

Our funding per student here is eleventh out of eleven of the CIC institutions. Thus, I remember being on the Faculty Council and hearing Ken Gros Louis say this year after year. The campus is significantly underfunded in relation to its peers. It's also underfunded in relation to its academic ambitions and its performance. We've done remarkably well. We've always done remarkably well relative to our better funded CIC peers and competitors. But for this to continue we must, at a minimum, continue to maintain the collegiality that's marked this campus for decades, clearly identify our shared values, and act in accordance with them and respect faculty governance. In this instance exemplified over many years by the Budgetary Affairs Committee which plays a major role in determining priorities, recommending allocations, and along with other

BFC committees works with the administration of the campus to achieve agreed upon goals. But we really do have to examine our goals together because the money is always tight for us and we need to figure out where we want it to go. Okay, that's the budgetary report. Any questions about that? The Budgetary Affairs Committee will have a complete list of all allocations from the Provost fund. Okay?

A couple of other, well more than a couple, other announcements. Just let me quickly say a couple of other things. We concluded as you probably know, successfully concluded, two Search and Screens from the end of last year. Matt Auer from SPEA was named Dean of the Hutton Honors College and that Yvette Alex-Assensoh of Political Science in the College of Arts and Sciences was named Dean of the Office of Women's Affairs. This year, we have many Search and Screen committees that are beginning to be formed and a number of reviews. And actually a number of coupled task forces that I also want to announce in connection with these Search and Screens. First of all, two Search and Screen committee formations are going out this week. One is for a new really a new position: Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education. The second is for the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs. And, again, this is something that we discussed at the last meeting in the Spring of the Faculty Council. These are kind of successor functions to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean of Faculties. We've been working on job descriptions through many iterations. We shared some of this with the chairs of last year's Educational Policies Committee, and Faculty Affairs Committee. Outlined descriptions have been shared with the Dean of Faculties' unit with all the Vice Provosts with all the school Deans and a number of committees. And we will keep working on those even as the committees get up and running and will also themselves I think, add to the job descriptions.

In connection with the creation of the, essentially, the kind of new post, the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, I'm also convening a task force on undergraduate education. Chaired by a faculty member but with broad representation from faculty, staff, and students to give advice to whoever the new incumbent is on what we're doing right, what we're doing that could be improved. For all of these committees and for the ones I'll mention in a minute, I'm using the fairly large committees and the suggestions have come from and have been taken from the Nomination Committee of this Council, from the Bloomington Professional Council, from CWA, IUSA, and the GPSO.

The second round of new Search and Screen and task force formation will probably take place next week. This is for the Vice Provost for Student Affairs and the Dean of Students. And we're very unhappily going to lose Dick McKaig to retirement at the end of this year and that will be very difficult to find someone to replace Dick and the dedication he's shown for I think 17 years in that position. He and the students had talked together about forming a task force on student life or student affairs and we're beginning to form that as well. Again, to talk about what we're doing right, what we might change, and to suggest ways in which whoever is named at the end of what will

be a national search in this case, might proceed to organize that office and pursue an agenda.

By the way, the first two, the Vice Provostial jobs are internal. Part of it is so that the people who are chosen are going to be up and running by January 1<sup>st</sup>. The other reason for that is that we want people who are well acquainted with the traditions of this campus.

Third general category: the search for the Dean of Libraries. Pat Steele is doing a wonderful job. She has been working for the last couple of years and is doing a number of innovative things and I think has lots of energy to continue, but we had promised that a new search would begin, and so it will begin this year. We have reviews on a number of the Deans. I mentioned it last Spring that these had stacked up a little. We'll get them back on track this year. The review of the Dean of the School of Law and the School of Education will be ongoing. The review of the Dean of the School of Music was undertaken last year, and concluded at the very end of the year. We'll have a report on that shortly. And it's already time for the new Dean of the School of Journalism to have the first part of the review that's mandated by Faculty Council rules, the survey. So those will get underway this year.

There are other things that might be mentioned but this is a short meeting, we need to move on. I mean, I wanted to say a word or two about the compliance issue as well. Steve will undoubtedly report on this in more detail, but I had asked to have a meeting with concerned faculty last Saturday with Dr. Pescovitz and Steve Martin and Peter Finn. I think it was a useful meeting where people spoke frankly and addressed a variety of concerns and I think it both allayed some anxiety and let us see where we had to go from here, but we'll talk about that in a little bit.

Other two features that are worth mentioning from the agenda right now: I just, I do want to add my endorsement to the Action Item #6, the General Education Policy. The committees have been working hard to figure out the implementation of the guidelines that this Council approved some time ago under the incredibly hard-working, diligent and able leadership of Barb Bichelmeyer and Russ Hanson. And they will be asking for approval of the implementation. And we had good news at the very end of the summer on the proposal to continue with the sustainability initiative and I hope Dave will have some more time to talk about that at the end as well. But, we'll move on. Are there questions or comments?

**TERRY:** For either of us?

**HANSON:** For either of us?

**AGENDA ITEM #5. QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD.**

**TERRY:** For either of us? This is the question / comment period.

**HANSON:** For one another?

**TERRY:** No.

**HANSON:** Okay. Well then let's move to the first action item, it's #6 on your agenda. The approval of the Indiana University Bloomington Gen Ed policy.

**AGENDA ITEM #6. APPROVAL OF INDIANA UNIVERSITY BLOOMINGTON GENERAL EDUCATION POLICY.**

**TERRY:** Thank you, Provost Hanson, and thank you for your endorsement of this item. Veterans of the Council may be surprised to see this thing on the first, as the first item of business on the first meeting of the Bloomington Faculty Council and may be especially surprised to see it allocated for five minutes of discussion. Let me hope that we can actually stick to that agenda and let me explain how it got here.

Over the summer, but especially in the last two or three weeks, it became apparent to me that it would be highly desirable for this Council to remove any ambiguity about the General Education Policy. Those who have been around the Council for a long time know that in various guises we have been talking about General Ed for decades. We began to seriously talk about it in about 2005-2006. In 2007, we were presented with the report of a General Education Committee, a General Education report that we'd asked to make the report. That report, presented to us near the end of the 2006-2007 Council year, included a policy for General Education, which is actually reproduced and attached to circular B5-2009 and it included some guidelines for the implementation of that. The guidelines by and large were stabs at interpreting some of the concepts and phrases that were used in the policy. We did not vote on that report at that time.

Rather, we said to the, well in fact we created the General Education Committee, and we said to that committee, 'Go forth and attempt to implement this and come back to us if you run into problems with the policy.' They went ahead and began to implement it and with great vigor and great faithfulness to the policy and the guidelines that we had given them. At the end of that 2007 meeting, Ted Miller expressed his hope that this would work out during the summer of 2007, getting organized so that very early in the Fall the Council could take action on this document. The Council did not take action on the document in the Fall of 2007. In fact, it did not hear again from the General Education Committee until the last meeting last year, April 15, 2008. At that time, Barb and Russ appeared, I unfortunately was out of town, but I read the minutes. Barb and Russ appeared and they discussed in great length what they had had to do to try and implement this policy and especially how they were interpreting the guidelines. What was significant was that they reported no difficulty in applying the policy itself. There were some things to be discussed about the guidelines. They were discussed at this

meeting at the end of last year and over the summer the General Education Committee continued to work under its understanding of the guidelines toward the implementation of the policy.

The point is that even at the end of the meeting last year, there were no serious concerns expressed by anybody not by members of the Council, not by Russ and Barb, and notably not by the Deans of the various schools all of which have consequences as a result of this and they had bought into this policy. So at the end of last year's meeting, Lisa Pratt noted that the BFC will meet in the Fall of 2008 and offer some sort of blanket support for the changes. She referred to the guidelines. We do not bring this intending an Action Item at this time. What this means is that this Council has never actually approved of the policy. And what I became convinced of this summer is that we need to do that.

First of all, the General Education Committee, the schools, even the departments are all proceeding now with the assumption that the policy is what they've been working under. Everybody has committed, Trustee Talbot will confirm this, to a 2011 implementation date for this. And if we're to meet that deadline, we need to fix the policy so that the schools can rely on it and so that the departments can do whatever they have to do to their curricula in response to whatever their schools do. The 2011 date is key to changes in the state that will require all students attending four-year secondary, well secondary institutions like IU to complete the Core 40 curriculum, the General Ed policy assumes that people will come into IU having that. And it was also linked to our own slightly upgraded mission standards. The schools and departments simply need to know that they can depend on the policy and they need to know what it says. We've already reached the stage where the policy needs to be given to university publications and documents if it's going to appear in the 2011. Hundreds of colleagues and administrators and students and others will now be involved in the process of amending school curricula and departmental curricula. They need to know that they can rely on what we have done.

I've been assured by Professors Bichelmeyer and Hanson that they have continued to work with the policy. They, representing the General Education Committee, continue to work the policy exactly as it was written and before this Council at the end of 2006-7 at the end of 2007-8. There are a still a few fuzzy matters regarding the guidelines, but the guidelines are not the policy and what we really need to adopt is the policy. I'm confident that working together of the General Education Committee can keep the education policies committee and perhaps this Council informed of what's going on with the guidelines. The important thing is approving the policy. This thing has had extensive edit before the BFC and its Educational Policy Committee over many years.

So I ask all of you who held up your hands at the beginning and are new to this Council to trust us. (laughter) We are much more like the Senate of the United States than the House of Representatives. The Senate is a continuously meeting body about a third of

whose members can turn over every each year, but it doesn't start anew every year. The House does, and that's why the House doesn't get anything done. (laughter) And we're more like the Senate. We have debated this at great length, and it is my hope that you will regard, even if you were not involved in that, that your colleagues have done the right thing and approve it. So we ask you to do that after a short discussion or perhaps no discussion at all. And to make final what has been before this Council twice with no serious amendments opposed to it at those times. We are proposing to change this grammar, this is going to be published all over, it should be good grammar. So we are proposing to substitute one 'is' for an 'are.' And one 'may' for a 'might.' And those are reflected in this document with italics and cross hatching and other than that, this is what the Council has seen twice before, and we hope that you will approve it now.

**HANSON:** Any questions or discussion?

**BIELASIAK:** Yes I want to clear up what we are approving.

**TERRY:** You are approving the policy that is attached to, at the last page of circular B5-2009. It is a straightforward description of what the General Education requirement is. Notably, its two component parts: The "Common Ground" which every school, every student here at the Bloomington campus beginning in 2011 must do and the "Shared Goals" which is more optional. It's sort of up to the schools and the (inaudible) programs to figure out what they can do there. It is mainly the "Common Ground" that the committee has been working on implementing in fine detail. It is to some extent the definitions of the "Shared Goals" of the second part of the policy that are still up for a little debate and discussion ...am I right on that? Okay. So this is what you're asked to vote on and this is, except for the grammatical corrections, what has been before the Council twice before.

**BIELASIAK:** This is like approving apple pie and motherhood. And, you know, the devil's in the details and I've had some problems with the details, particularly in my capacity as the Director of Undergraduate Studies in Political Science where application for course allocations among these there seems to be idiosyncratic. There is very little justification and rationale about why some courses are approved and others not. And I guess for that reason, I have been leery about approving a general policy without getting a sense of what stands behind it.

**HANSON:** Do you want to comment on that?

**R. HANSON:** I think Herb has made the distinction between the structure of the curriculum and how we actually fill out the course lists that meet the requirements that are part of that curriculum. And that process is governed by the process that the BFC established which is the appointment of the General Ed Committee. That's a work in progress, and those course lists are being refined even now and we are trying to approve the process we put in place, a better record keeping system, this past year so

that we can communicate more information to the people who propose courses. But what is important for us in terms of meeting the deadline for implementation is that the basic structure be assured. Because if that were to change, then much of the work that has been done would go out the window and it's not clear to us that we would be able to make up that by 2011. So we need some assurance on the basic structure of the curriculum itself.

**HORNE:** Two questions really, when this was formulated, and I've been on committees in the school of music where this came up tangentially but was certainly not involved in the development of this in any way, was this, do you feel that this is essentially codifying what is current practice in a way? Or is this, you know, that a committee came together and said that the ideal should be this and then everybody should just find a way to fit this?

**R. HANSON:** I don't think it codifies current practice. It's a set of common distribution requirements if you want to think about it that way and there has been no such thing on the campus in, I think, my lifetime is fair to say. So this is new in that sense.

**BICHELMAYER:** I would also add to that that the various academic units, this reflects current practice in various academic units to different degrees. And in that regard, Russ and I spent a good portion of last year meeting with the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs or the Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education in every academic unit to discuss with them how exactly the General Education curriculum would play out and the "Shared Goals" in each academic unit to get an understanding of where the potential difficulties would be and what basically is already in place. And on April 15<sup>th</sup>, I believe, was the date that we reported last spring, we provided about a 35-page document to the BFC that articulates, reports from every single academic unit about their response to how they would actually go about implementing each one of the "Common Ground" requirements and the "Shared Goals" recommendations.

**HORNE:** Thank you.

**TERRY:** As you can imply from Barb's answer, this does mean that there will be some changes in the schools. That's why we need to approve this so that they can know that this is what they need to make changes in response to. Never in my 35 years at this place has a policy been the result I think of such finely tuned attention to frankly the politics of this campus. Every school and the Deans are aboard with this. Although to some extent in every case it will change their life to some extent. The General Education Committee was rather carefully crafted to retain a balance among the schools and with the College of Arts and Sciences and others. It was a lot of negotiation went into that. Guess what! I've learned from them that the committee, which we thought wouldn't work, actually seems to work reasonably well. And they're on the verge of proposing some slight rebalancing of it, but that simply reflects changes in the numbers of tenure lines in various schools.

Sure, this is new. We have never had a common General Education core across all the schools of this campus. But a decision was made quite some time ago by this Council to have such a thing. We set up a committee that produced this. That was certainly the result of mainly faculty work with some input from administration. We told this group in good faith to go forward and see if you could implement this and we would step back in if you had trouble, but they have not had trouble implementing “motherhood and apple pie” here if you want to call it and that’s why the Agenda Committee is confident that now is the time to make it final. What I can say is that I expect a continuing dialogue between the General Education Committee, the Council, the Educational Policy Committee, and others over the details. And we’re not giving that up.

**HANSON:** Lloyd?

**KOLBE:** May I move to accept the Indiana University Bloomington General Education Policy that exists in Circular B5-2009.

**HANSON:** Second?

**UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER:** Second.

**HANSON:** Discussion? All in favor? (Aye) All opposed? Any abstentions? The policy is adopted.

#### **AGENDA ITEM #7. NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY OVERVIEW.**

**HANSON:** Next a report from the Faculty Affairs Committee, Jonathan Plucker on non-tenure track faculty.

**PLUCKER:** Good afternoon. I know our time is tight. Can everyone hear me? Okay, thank you. One of the last things in your packet today should be a report from the BFC Faculty Affairs Committee, Subcommittee on Research Faculty Appointments: Definition, Status, and Policies. I tried to make it longer, but that’s all I could fit on two lines. In the interest of time, I realize that we’re going a little bit over, I’m not going to walk everyone through this. I am going to talk briefly about why Faculty Affairs starting at the beginning of the last academic year started to look into really issues just dealing with research faculty, and it very quickly grew into just policy issues with non-tenure track faculty in general.

You know, why did we start looking at this? A lot of different reasons, probably the major reasons were that the campus spent a lot of time in the last few years, five years to ten years at least, really looking at clinical appointments and really refining those clinical policies. And there were starting to be some questions from people who work with research faculty and then also among the research faculty themselves about

whether their policies were following in lock-step. Our cursory examination last year pretty much showed that they probably haven't and we probably need to spruce those up a bit. And then we just started to hear anecdotes from various centers around campus where, probably not the majority of research faculty, but where many, many of them are. And just as a case in point, there's one center on campus that has over 35 research faculty, and when we talked about the director and the research faculty, none of them knew that there were ranks for research faculty or that they could be promoted. Some of them have very impressive vita that would rival that of our most distinguished full professors. People didn't even know that they were even on campus for the most part. So it's probably a situation of benign neglect.

So the first thing that we did, if you turn to the third page, the first figure, is just look to see how many of the different faculty ranks there were. And I should point out that Dean Sept and the Dean of Faculties office were extremely helpful in helping the Faculty Affairs Committee try to actually understand these. And I think the big number, the most important numbers here, over 1500 tenure-track faculty, that wouldn't really surprise anyone, 169 lecturers, (this is the fall 2006 count), 94 clinical, research faculty are at the bottom two rows, 446 research faculty. To say that number stunned the committee would probably be an understatement. We thought it would be 100, 120, we weren't expecting it to be by far the largest non-tenure track faculty group.

And in the interest of time, I really don't want to go too much farther into this, the last two pages, front and back. The first is our conclusions from our first exploration if you will. Sitting in the back of the room, I realize the table at the bottom is completely meaningless, percent increase, because Law went from, had a 100% increase, they went from 1 to 2. Not the most useful table that I've ever made. The observations are pretty straightforward I think. The recommendations, and these are really recommendations that are meant for the full Faculty Affairs Committee, to tackle this current academic year. And I think the first one is really the general conclusion is that debating on how the faculty are going to change, moving away from tenure track positions is pretty much a moot point. It has changed. It's changed significantly. We probably haven't noticed it that much, but we're talking, I mean, there's roughly half as many non-tenure track faculty on campus as there are tenure track faculty. The change has happened. The question is, do our policies and do our practice reflect that reality? And that's really what the Faculty Affairs Committee is going to be tackling this year. And I will stop there in the interest of time. How's that? Any questions?

**HANSON:** Jonathan, are there, you noted that these issues will be taken up by the Faculty Affairs Committee, but are there questions or observations that you want to pass on to Jonathan right now?

**BURNS:** Do you have any idea how many of these are classified, sort of as what we'd call "post-docs." Sort of within two, three years of...

**PLUCKER:** Uh, Jean is shaking her head. At the end of the year, we actually tried to determine this and there was a lot of confusion about that. Whether research out there is post-docs and if they are, what percentage are they? I actually had post-docs pulled out of the figures. I believe they're separate, other people say, 'Absolutely not, they're part of Research: Other.' So Jean, do you have any insight into that?

**SEPT:** I was going to say, were you working with Mike Wade on this? Because he's been working on this for the last year to actually review, particularly the salary rates for researchers on campus. And in collaboration with Julie Knost in terms of the Department of Labor was very curious about our salary assignments and as a campus we have no minimum salaries for researchers whereas we do for other faculty ranks. So we've actually done a fairly detailed analysis that teases apart the researchers, their salaries, and attributes such as terminal degree, years in rank, a discipline, age, a range of things like that which account for most of the variability in salaries and it's allowed us to identify outliers. So we've done a very careful study of that. They're actually reporting it to Julie tomorrow. I'm delighted if Mike could report to your committee or work with your committee on this and in the broad spirit as well, of course this last year we had our, I believe it was the first workshop for promotion, workshop for non-tenured faculty for non-tenure track faculty and so we got a great turn out for that. There were about 60 non-tenure track faculty who attended that. So we've been doing a lot to raise awareness just as you recommend.

**PLUCKER:** And I think it's worth noting that when we started to call around to peer institutions to ask them what their policies were, there was a lot of silence on the other end of the phone: 'Oh yeah, we have research faculty!' 'Well, can you share some policies?' 'Yeah, we have research faculty!' (laughter) Yeah, that's not really answering my question. And so there is also a leadership opportunity here I think, in that most of our peer institutions are just starting to tackle these same policy issues too. So we're actually a little bit ahead of the curve which is good.

**HANSON:** Maxine?

**WATSON:** Why don't you talk to the post-doctoral affairs office? We took data from the Dean of Faculties office. And what we seem to be finding is that classifications are pretty good because the large departments are sent back a list of people identified as post-docs and those identified as research associates. And it was the post-doc identified people who were truly post-docs. So I think that's pretty good information (inaudible) confirmation from the chairs. And I think we've gotten that 225 post-docs in place, which was more than I expected (inaudible).

**HANSON:** Thanks, Jon.

**PLUCKER:** Thank you.

**HANSON:** We're running a little bit late and we want to have the committee chairs meet with their groups, but before we do that, these last reports. So could we ask Steven to give a preliminary report on the Research Affairs Committee?

**AGENDA ITEM #8. PRELIMINARY REPORT OF THE RESEARCH AFFAIRS COMMITTEE.**

**BURNS:** Thank you. If you can hear me, I'll start talking as I walk. So as many of you know, and as Herb and Karen have mentioned, we ran into a number of problems as the human subjects office was reorganized at the beginning of the summer. As a result a lot of protocols sort of got held up and the review process got mixed up and in part, there was a lot of miscommunication going on. There were some problems with protocols. We were reported to the federal government. Most of the problems, I want to stress, are related to procedural issues. There's no evidence that anybody was put at risk. Any issues like that were not raised at any point. But there were procedural issues with how we did things. And some of it mattered to the extent of who signed what pieces of paper.

The Office for the Vice President of Research Administration instituted a very ambitious reengineering of the entire process. That was kicked off in the summer and a lot of the problems then that sort of cascaded came because in a sense I think they just weren't prepared for the diversity of research that exists on the Bloomington campus. We do research over such a wide range that they were counting on existing review boards in Indianapolis helping them out and those groups didn't necessarily have the expertise to handle what we do here on the Bloomington campus.

As indication in this meeting Karen mentioned of the seriousness with which the OVPRA is taking this, they've now got 16 individuals working full time trying to get us back up to speed and to get everybody back in business. In the last week, 53 protocols had been approved including ten over the weekend. So they're working weekends as well as weekdays. By the end of this week they expect to have our own board, Peter Finn is the chair of that, back fully in operation. They will have been trained according to a very ambitious accreditation schedule and they will be back in business by the 19<sup>th</sup> is what I've last heard. So they're taking it seriously, they are kicking it up. Hopefully we will be seeing a lot of these problems in halted protocols moving.

However, the Research Affairs Committee wants to stay on top of this and be aware of what's going on. And we want the Faculty Council also to be aware of what's going on. So our committee, rather than meeting right after this meeting, is going to meet next week. And we're going to have the Associate Deans for Research of all the schools as well as some of the department chairs that are deeply involved in this process, as well as Steve Martin and Peter Finn and we'll do some fact checking. We'll see how things are going. It's kind of a short term to give them to actually get things fixed, but we've got to work on a basis because typically there's several hundred protocols being reviewed per

month and if we don't get back going up that slope, it could just cascade again. So we will be having a meeting next week, we'll meet with all the interested parties. We will try to prepare a report that we will distribute to this council before the October 7<sup>th</sup> meeting and we've invited I think Steve Martin from the OVPRA office will be here as well and so we'll hopefully have more information for you at that meeting. We invite you all to let us know if you see problems and especially let your Associate Deans know because they will be at this September 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting, but both Herb and I would be happy to (and Karen probably as well) hear if there are issues that don't look like they're starting to sort of see the upswing. And I think at that point I'll stop because we're running late.

**HANSON:** Any questions or comments? Yeah...

**DRUMMOND:** I don't want to extend this discussion too much because we're way past time here, but I want to comment and maybe pose a question or two. I thought it was a need that we as researchers and scholars here at IU have to be certified in order to carry out research that involves human subjects. But the office that reviews our applications was not certified. And that said, I mean, I had two projects this summer. One with a grad student and one of my own that were delayed and I do thank Sara Brand at IUPUI who got them approved—late—but, anyway... The second comment here is what's the purpose of the IRB and whose interest does it serve? Does it serve our interests as scholars or does it serve the interests of the administrators to make sure that we cover our asses, excuse me. I think that this is the appropriate time for the faculty to be involved in the reconfiguration of the way the IRB operates here on the Bloomington campus. I don't think we should wait for a complete reconfiguration and then respond to it. I don't know if it's too late to do that given the changes that took place in the summer, I'm just putting that forward maybe for consideration.

**BURNS:** So let me give a partial answer as none of the above. The role of the IRB is to protect and enhance the communication between people who volunteer to be in research and the researcher. So it's to protect human studies. It's absolutely true what you're saying that often institutions try to shoehorn on extra stuff to cover their, their....

**DRUMMOND:** ...behinds...

**BURNS:** ...desires as well. But the real moral imperative is protection of the human studies. In terms of getting ahead, let me just finish. I'm actually hoping and I've approached OVPRA about this, to have the Research Affairs Committee start talking about a lot of the other issues they're going to be covering and reengineering going forward. So hopefully we can get ahead of some of these issues, get faculty feedback going, and get a communication going. For this one, I think we've got to get it moving and I wouldn't want to wait for faculty processes unless we can do them really expeditiously. Because as you say, a lot of students especially have been hurt in this process. Is that a good enough answer? We can talk afterwards.

**HANSON:** Other questions or comments now about this? This, obviously this is a huge issue for the campus and I think it's good that you're having this meeting again after checking in with OVPRA, but you'll come back to the Council.

**BURNS:** Yeah, we'll be back at the next meeting.

**HANSON:** Thanks Steve. I see that Paul Sullivan is here. Is Michael Hamburger? Yeah okay. Sorry, yeah, we are running late but the Council would like to hear at least some report on the sustainability initiatives.

#### **AGENDA ITEM #9. REPORT ON THE EXTENDED SUSTAINABILITY INITIATIVES.**

**HAMBURGER:** So I'm going to talk fast. Basically, you've got a one-page summary that's kind of put together in as small a font as we could fit in. Everything that's happened in the last year. Probably most of you are aware of the publication of this report last January. That was really the formal product of the task force on sustainability. We have been in something of a state of limbo since then. The task force has continued to meet informally. We've undertaken a number of pretty high profile and I think quite successful projects. Notably, a large number of student internships. There have been over 30 undergraduate and graduate students who have worked on projects related to sustainability. Some very strong partnerships between the academic side and the operational side of campus and some very exciting new academic initiatives that have taken form or are taking form over the course of this last year. That feed to the future development of a sustainability program. The big news as of a couple weeks ago is that we have gotten formal administrative approval to proceed with the program in some form yet to be determined with the goal of hiring at least an interim director of campus sustainability and to move forward on a number of projects that are listed at the bottom of this sheet some of the high priority issues that we see undertaking during the upcoming year.

**HANSON:** Anything to add Paul?

**SULLIVAN:** Questions?

**HANSON:** Any quick questions? Well, we're grateful to you for coming. And I do think we actually will have more to report probably by the next meeting when we all will have had a chance to meet and try to flesh out where we're going now that we have approval from the President. So, thank you for being here today. We have the adjournment into committee meetings a little bit late. If you turn to the list of committee meetings and the places they're meeting, if they're still waiting for you, it's on the back page of your agenda. Distributed Education isn't meeting nor is Student Affairs and Steve, are you saying that Research Affairs is meeting later? Right? So all the rest, please meet with your committees and we will see you at the next meeting. We're adjourned.

