

**Agenda**  
**Indiana University**  
**BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL**  
**October 7, 2008**  
**IMU Georgian Room**  
**3:30 P.M. - 5:30 P.M.**

**Attendance**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Eric Arnold, Randy Arnold, Jack Bielasiak, James Biles, Leslie Blaha, Julianne Bobay, Stephen Burns, Carolyn Calloway-Thomas, James Capshew, Nicholas Clark, Diane Dallis, Jon Dilts, Carrie Donovan, Erika Dowell, James Drummond, Paul Eisenberg, Harold Evans, Christine Farris, Lucas Fields, Luke Gillespie, Dennis Groth, Karen Hanson, Patrick Harbison, Robert Hatten, Patricia Henderson, Brian Horne, Michael Jolly, Pdraic Kenney, Lloyd Kolbe, Paul Losensky, Valerie Markley, Amanda Meglemre, Michael Morrone, Brian O'Donnell, Lisa Pratt, Diane Reilly, Jennifer Riley, Jeanne Sept, Richard Shockley, Jerrold Stern, Herbert Terry, Vasti Torres, Maxine Watson, Susan Whiston, James Wimbush.

**MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT:** Geoff Conrad (Sarita Soni), Ann Gellis (Laura Ginger), Bryan Stuart (Daniel Sloat), Jeff Stake (Alex Tanford).

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Nate Birkhead, Purnima Bose, Bruce Burgun, Julia Fox, Valerie Grim, Amy Holtzworth-Munroe, Lloyd Kolbe, Bryan McCormick, Lokman Meho, Dan Ondrik, James Perry, Richard Stryker, Neil Theobald, David Waterman.

**GUESTS:** Nicole Brooks (Herald-Times), John Carini, Amanda Ciccarelli (Provost's Office), Roland Cote (Registrar), David Daleke, Bob Eno, Mary Gray, Steve Martin, Jonathan Plucker, Sue Talbot (Trustee), Michael Wade (Assoc. Dean of Faculties), Chuck Watson, David Zaret, Craig Dethloff (Faculty Council Office), Patricia Pierson (Faculty Council Office).

1. Memorial Resolution for Romane L. Clark  
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/08-09/B6-2009.pdf>
2. Agenda Committee Business (10 minutes)  
(Professor Herb Terry)
3. Presiding Officer's Business (10 minutes)  
(Provost Karen Hanson)
4. Question / Comment Period\* (10 minutes)  
(Provost Hanson and Professor Terry)
5. Update on Research Compliance at Bloomington (30 minutes)

(Professor Stephen Burns, Chair, Research Affairs Committee)

[http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/08-09/auxiliary/RAC\\_IRB\\_Report\\_Final.pdf](http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/08-09/auxiliary/RAC_IRB_Report_Final.pdf)

**Brief Recess.** (5 minutes)

6. Discussion of Proposed Changes to the Office of the Dean of Faculties (50 minutes)  
(Provost Hanson and Professor Terry with preliminary remarks by Professor Padraic Kenney, Chair, Educational Policies Committee and Professor Jonathan Plucker, Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee)

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/08-09/auxiliary/Vice%20Provost%20for%20Undergraduate%20Education.pdf>

<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/08-09/auxiliary/VP%20for%20Faculty%20Affairs%20and%20Academic%20Policies.pdf>

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

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

\*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: MEMORIAL RESOLUTION FOR ROMANE L. CLARK.**

**HANSON:** First business of the day is a memorial resolution for a dear colleague of mine, Romaine L. Clark, Jeanne?

**SEPT:** Yes, let me refer you to the extensive comments that Paul Eisenberg submitted [electronic noise]. There he is! So forgive me for taking excerpts from your lovely testimony.

Born and brought up in Iowa, Romaine L. Clark began his studies in the State University of Iowa after having served in the United States Army Air Corps from 1943 to 1945. He graduated Iowa and earned his masters' degree and doctorate degrees in record time and joined the faculty at Duke University. He came to Bloomington in 1970 as a full professor in the Department of Philosophy and the respect that his many colleagues had always had for him is well evidenced by the fact that although he was a relative newcomer to IU, he was nonetheless selected to be chair of the Department of Philosophy in 1972.

Bo was a person from whom I always expected high mindedness and good sense, and he never disappointed me. In addition to his term as chair, Bo served the department both as its undergraduate advisor and as the director of graduate studies. Indeed, Bo was much sought after by graduate students in particular who wanted him to direct their dissertations and serve on their doctoral committees. He was also known for the slightly unphilosophical analyses of Hoosier basketball which he shared with his colleagues. He had also served the College and the University with insight and commitment in a number of critical roles including chairing a search committee for a new dean of the College in 1980.

Bo's research interests led him to explore the philosophy of perception, the structured natural language, and the nature of common patterns of inference in every day reasoning. These interests led him to specific investigation of such topics as the relation of sensation to perception, the nature and logic of predicate modifiers and the formal and semantic characterization of reasoning from effects to sufficient explanations. His research was always well received and he won a number of prestigious grants and fellowships including two National Science Foundation grants to senior fellowship from the National Endowment of the Humanities. He was a senior Fulbright research fellow from 1981-1982 when he spent the year as a fellow at the Institute for Advanced Study at the Australian National University.

When he learned of Bo's death, Paul Spade a colleague and distinguished fellow of medieval philosophy read a tribute that was circulated to all members of the department. "He was an acute philosopher," Professor Spade wrote, "And one of the few philosophers I've known whose work every one who knew him respected him for. Even if they strongly disagreed with his own views, he was always asked the most penetrating questions in departmental colloquium papers, he asked questions that clarified issues for everyone and went right to the heart of the matter." Paul Spade adds, "He was also a perfect gentleman. A man of utmost honesty and just plain good sense. I can honestly say he was someone I admired and those of you who know your Kierkegaard will recognize there's a distinction here, someone I regard as worthy of imitation."

Submitted in gratitude for Bo Clark's remarkably steady and fertile thinking, writing, teaching, and service to IU.

**HANSON:** Thank you, Jeanne. Could we stand for a moment of silence? Thank you. Okay, Agenda Committee Business? Herb?

**AGENDA ITEM#2: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS.**

**TERRY:** A number of quick announcements and then a short comment on today's agenda.

First of all, as many of you know, the campus has been engaged in a master planning exercise for quite some time now. The master planners are going to present sort of an update on where they stand to the Indiana University Trustees, or actually to the Facilities Committee of the Trustees, at a special meeting in November. Simon Atkinson, the head of the Indianapolis Faculty Council and I asked President McRobbie if we might not host a meeting on each of our campuses for faculty to talk to the planners and get some insight into what they're saying and to provide some feedback. That is being arranged. At the moment, I don't have exact times and dates and locations for it, but the BFC will host such a meeting we hope you will come and encourage your colleagues to do so.

An announcement about, believe it or not, the election of the 2009-2010 BFC. The bylaws of this body say that we're supposed to complete that election by the end of January 2010, 2009, I'm sorry. That's not exactly the way elections have run in the last few years. Craig and I are trying hard to come up with a schedule that will meet the bylaws, not just for the sake of meeting the bylaws, but rather because if the Council's election is complete by the end of January, then it can select its officers, it can form its committees, and I can tell you it should be much easier to form the committees of this Council in the latter part of the spring semester than it is over the summer. So I hope that we'll pull that off; we're working hard to do it.

We talked last time, I said last time that the Agenda Committee would be bringing to you a review of policies that we've adopted over the years that talk about Chancellors, and trying to figure out how to update that given that we have a Provost and a President as the CEO of the campus. We're working on that, but I should tell you that the task perhaps has broadened a little bit. We realize that there are policies that are to some extent incongruent with each other. As we encounter those, as we apply them this year, we'll bring those to your attention. It may be the case that because of fundamental changes in the structure of the campus or the system, it's not clear that a particular policy is well written to meet current circumstances. We'll talk about that. And even more importantly, I think the Agenda Committee has realized in the last few weeks, partly growing out of our discussion of these proposed changes in the Dean of Faculties' office that the BFC itself as a kind of an institution of faculty governance is more or less in the form it existed under Herman Wells and the University has changed a lot in subsequent years, maybe it should be the case that the BFC changes. What's going to happen is the Agenda Committee is going to broadly look at that question. We're going to think about it some more. We probably will involve some or many of you in those discussions and we'll come back to you later with thoughts of how we might proceed there.

The UFC Agenda Committee met this afternoon. That committee is going to be, remember that's a committee of the UFC, is going to be taking a look, is going to assign, its Faculty Affairs Committee to take a look at the policies and procedures that we have in place for the appointment of system wide officers, in other words, for Vice

Presidents. We're going to take a look at how those offices are created, how they may be restructured, how search and screen works, and that sort of thing. I think it's likely that as a part of its work, the UFC committee may ask at least Indianapolis and Bloomington, maybe all the campuses, for comments on those policies related to system wide appointments.

As far as today's agenda goes, we have a short discussion to begin with, of the state of affairs with human subjects' research and the reconstitution of the IRB. Steve Martin is here, that's scheduled for thirty minutes. We'll take the time that's needed. Should we end early, we will take our break early and that will be followed by our discussion with Provost Hanson of the proposed changes in the office of Dean of Faculties.

It's been determined by the bylaws that that is more less the Provost's item and so I will chair the discussion of that item, Item 7 of the agenda. My hope is it will focus on the substance of her proposals. I know there's been debate about how this got to this Council and it should have been here in the spring and that sort of thing, and that is probably true, I think it would have been better had it been here in the spring, but it is here now and I'm very certain that the Provost will listen to whatever this Council wishes to say about this matter.

I'm going to begin by asking her to make a short statement. She knows what some of the concerns are on the campus. She may decide to address those. After that, we'll ask Jonathon Plucker and Padraic Kenny representing our Faculty Affairs Committee and Educational Policies Committee for a brief summary of their reports which you've seen on the agenda. We'll have the Provost comment on that, and then we'll open it for general discussion. Thank you.

### **AGENDA ITEM#3: PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS.**

**HANSON:** Thanks Herb. I didn't have other business today except that one question came in antecedently so, I guess this actually came to Herb...

### **AGENDA ITEM#4: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD.**

**TERRY:** And I forwarded it to you.

**HANSON:** And he forwarded it to me! Because nobody else wants to talk about smoking. It was in a question from a faculty member, but it's not as if we haven't gotten these questions from students and staff from a variety of quarters, because people are unhappy that there's little enforcement of the no-smoking policy and it's unclear how enforcement's supposed to work, supposed to be kind of informal where there are chains of reporting, but in any case, many people think that the smoking problem is worse on campus now than it was before. That 's particularly in certain places around the door to the library, Wells Library, between SPEA and Business, at some of the

dorms. I can tell you that as, and someone here suggests that if it's not working, we might as well just remove it. Well, we can't remove it because this actually is a Trustees' policy and we are fortunate enough again to have a Trustee with us today, but we do have to do something to make this more effective.

I should tell you as these things come in we've been in touch with the people who have responsibility for those buildings to do something. You know, as complaints have come in about the dormitories for example, we've gotten in touch with Pat Connor and said, 'Make sure your staff enforces the policy near the dormitories.' We've been in touch with the Union and people in these other offices have tried valiantly, the people, the building managers and various staff, in order to deal with the issue, but it's clear things still aren't working. I've talked with Vice President Clapacs about it, about whether or not signage will work, what we - I mean - those thirty foot signs seemed to work for a while even though they just appeared overnight and there wasn't any talk about them for a while. People did at least stay 30 feet away. Now those were larger signs. I mean, there are aesthetic issues here as well as the issues about the policy.

In any case, some new efforts are definitely going to be rolled out by the facilities side in order to make the ban more effective, but I think we may need more than that. And I'm going to use the usual administrative ploy of taking one of the people who wrote with a concern up at his word that he would like to help. (laughter) So constitute another committee, and actually it was a graduate student and I think that he actually had some interesting suggestions to make and I think if we form a committee that is largely composed of students but also staff and faculty it would be quite useful. The impetus for this originally was after all, a group of students. So I think it would be quite appropriate if they start thinking about how we might best enforce this since we are seeming to have some difficulties at the administrative level. But I think it would also draw some more attention to it among the student body. I don't know which category of folks people might be seeing, might be identifying as the biggest violators, but no matter what, it's true that we have new folks coming onto the campus, you know 7,500 of them at the least this fall, and I've seen myself in some instances around the dorms, people who don't look like they're trying to be scofflaws, they're just new freshmen. So we've got to do a little bit more and we will, and they'll start I think, we'll get a committee going soon. And if you want to be on that, let me know. So that was the only question ahead of time. Anything else? Okay, other questions? Yeah?

**DALLIS:** At the last meeting, you had mentioned that you were forming a search and screen committee for the Dean of Students and also a task force on student life. Could you tell us a little bit about the progress of that and possibly how you'd like either one of those committees to work with or not to work with the Student Affairs Committee which I chair?

**HANSON:** Actually we haven't had, we've begun asking, you know, we've solicited the names for those committees from all the relevant groups: the Nom Com, the IUSA, the

GPSO and the Professional Council and the Union, and we have the committees mostly fleshed out but they haven't had, and I do believe that the nominations from the Nom Com included people from the Student Affairs Committee, but we haven't had a first meeting. We've begun to write up a charge to each of them, but they haven't gotten going yet. Are there suggestions you want to make though about how we proceed aside from having representation from SAC? That's probably going to get going this next month.

**CALLOWAY-THOMAS:** Karen, I would like for you to comment on the extent to which Indiana University Bloomington has been affected or will be affected by the current economic crisis that we are experiencing?

**HANSON:** Probably badly. (laughter) Well actually, maybe not so badly. I mean, not so badly as some other institutions, I mean, this is something that those of us who, well you don't show it, but those who've been around here for a long time remember about the funding for Indiana University that we are often not in as bad a shape as some of our peers when the economy tanks though we often don't then you know do as well when the economy is bubbling. And that's a good thing right now. We're going to, we're looking as if we've got some good reserves going into these difficulties and the CFO was actually of the opinion that in fact it would be leading us to be in a particularly good competitive position because other institutions that might be depending much more heavily than we are on one source of funding, might be disadvantaged as they try to cope with drops in that source of funding where as we have basically three sources of funding: tuition, and the state, and our endowments. And the endowment income will presumably be going down.

We, because of the very large class size, have more cash reserves this fall than we might have expected to have, more than we budgeted for. I mean, that's the, that's a crucial thing to help us get past this patch. State funding is something that will remain to be seen throughout this year. Obviously there will be lots of claims on the state budget. It will be a difficult year. People will be feeling the pinch from a variety of directions and the other thing to remember is that as times are hard, the demands on the state budget increase rather than decreasing. So, our portion of that pie might go down because of that. So in a way, there's no, the good news is there's no reason to panic. We're going into this I think very well situated. And particularly well situated in comparison to some other schools, but there is every reason to think that we will have to do some belt tightening in the out years. It may actually come with a bit of a lag because of the revenues that we realized this fall through tuition.

**TERRY:** There was a report I think on NPR last night about the increasing interest rates that universities are encountering with selling bonds for construction. Have we talked about that impact on us yet?

**HANSON:** Yes, and the good news on that front is that some of the financing that we already have for some of the projects in which we're engaged was locked in. We don't have variable rates on it which some other institutions have, so we're actually, because of the good planning of the Treasurer's Office, are in pretty good shape about that too. But it is true as interest rates change we may have some other difficulties with financing. But again, comparatively, we're in pretty good shape, again because of the foresight of I think the Treasurer's Office.

**HORNE:** Excuse me, when you say comparatively, I'm sorry to belabor it, but do you mean compared to other institutions in the state or other you know Research I institutions?

**HANSON:** Other -Research I universities. I mean, take that with a grain of salt. We, compared to perhaps other CIC institutions and maybe compared to certain other private institutions that may depend very heavily on endowment income, but say compared to Harvard which has, you know, the endowment that rules the world, you know, we're in great shape. But even if their income goes down, they've still got a ton of income. The other thing to say about the unsettled economic climate though is that, you can think of how many things are in play this year that are slightly different. Often when there are bad economic times, you find more, you find an increase in college enrollments because people can't find jobs and they go to college. Since there are difficulties in the loan industry right now, that's going to make that difficult for some families who might otherwise not be able to afford college. On the other hand, you know, there have been various ways in which we've been addressing the affordability issue, so that might help.

We also, I think, very wisely moved to direct lending last year foreseeing that there would be some difficulties with private loans and that's helped and it's stabilized things for our students. But there are a lot of things in play right now that make it very hard to predict where we'll come out. But I do think the University has positioned itself quite well in all the things that we had some control over. The endowment though has fallen. I mean there are lots of, on the other hand, the IU Foundation works on a four year rolling average so again, those things won't be felt immediately and if there's more fund raising in the interim then the endowment, I mean, the income we realize may not fall absolutely. It may even continue to rise.

How is charitable giving affected by this sort of climate? It depends. I mean a lot of people will feel more pinched and won't feel in a position to give to the University. On the other hand, some people may be thinking about these charitable annuities so they can lock in some income for themselves while gifting some of their assets. So it's very hard to say, but it's you know.....again, I think the University has done a good job in protecting itself against some of the vagaries that we're bound to experience. Other questions or comments? Did I end on too depressing a note there? (laughter) That was sort of a good thing...

Okay, any questions on any other topic? Well then we'll move to Item 6, the Update on Research Compliance, and Steve...?

#### **AGENDA ITEM #5 UPDATE ON RESEARCH COMPLIANCE**

**BURNS:** The Research Affairs Committee met with a number of people on campus and also with Steve Martin who will speak in a bit. And the IRB chair to discuss the current status of things in relation to the Institutional Review Board. Now just to remind you this is the group and the office that is in charge of overseeing the compliance issues related to human studies research on the Bloomington campus. And there were a number of problems during the summer that led to very long delays and a great deal of sort of clogging up the works in terms of getting protocols approved during the summer. OVPRA has invested a lot of money and has put in a lot of work on getting that moving, and things are moving better.

One thing that did come out in the meeting and I'm not going to go over all the points, but we're a bit concerned that some of the good statistics are not reflecting the fact that a great number of faculty members and students are readjusting their research priorities and their submission procedures and so there may be another rush of protocols submitted once things get sorted out and so that's a concern of our committee and it's something that we really think we just have to keep watching. The impact is it's clear that groups have rethought their research goals. So this is going to have a, maybe not major, but a long term impact on the way people perform research on the campus. And so it's very important that as we go forward we think about how these reorganizations in research support are carried out. And that's one of our recommendations is to work more closely with the office of Vice President for Research Administration on future issues. In this case it wasn't practically possible to do so. But in the future we've agreed we're going to try to work more closely and try things out and try to get a feel for what the impact will be before the whole new system comes online.

And so basically we also encountered a lot of concerns on campus about the growing burden of the federal compliance on research especially student research, exempt research. And we're suggesting actually that the campus form a working committee to look at that. There's a lot of interactions and complexities that I, frankly, don't understand yet. And I don't think any of us do. But it's an area where we need to look at how best to implement and be compliant but to be flexible. The Bloomington campus has such a broad range of research that it doesn't fit into any of the classic niches like a biomedical research institution or a physical research institution or an educational research institution. We do it all. And so it's worth getting a group, a diverse group of faculty, together, I think, and look at that.

In terms of the forms and the procedures that were put in place in the summer, Peter Finn, the chair of the IRB has taken the approach and we support it, that what was put in place they need to go with for a little bit. They don't need to keep changing forms and adjusting things every week and confusing people even more. But he is urging people to make suggestions and they will then look at it, probably in January, and redesign the system somewhat to take the best of those suggestions. One point we wanted to make is that it's important that a broad range of people be involved. The tendency of these committees is to bring the heavy-duty researchers in to look at that forms, but people like me who've been dealing with IRB's for thirty years are so used to the forms we're actually not good at proofreading them or figuring out whether the students are going to just get buried in terminology. So we want a broad, diverse group involved in that re-working. And I think I'll stop there. We can address questions, but Steve Martin will bring us up to date on where they are now because it's been changing so fast and then we can open up to questions.

**MARTIN:** I want to thank the BFC for the opportunity to provide an update as well as Dr. Burns and the entire Research Affairs Committee for working with our office to identify issues and to work through how those issues could be addressed. Obviously this past summer marked an enormously difficult time in which significant changes were implemented and over a very short amount of time. And while these corrective actions were absolutely necessary, it nonetheless had a significant impact as Dr. Burns indicated, on several researchers in the forms of delays and just general uncertainty. And this was obviously of great concern to our office. The IRB staff and the IRB chair and vice-chair, the vice-chair is here today that's Dr. Kennedy, have worked very hard to institute these new procedures but also look at how best to improve review times.

Significant improvements have been achieved in the last few weeks, so currently deployed at Bloomington, we have 20 people who are working just on screening protocols. To give you an idea, this is about five times what normally existed in the office. So, this increase has been necessary in part because we're going back and reviewing the entire file from beginning to end to ensure that we've addressed any compliance issues that exist. And we have started to see an increase. There's no doubt, the summer was just basically dreadful in terms of the number of protocols that were being processed. And to give you an idea, and I looked at the period between July 4<sup>th</sup> and August 15<sup>th</sup>, on average, there were about four protocols approved per week. Over the next three weeks between August 16<sup>th</sup> and September 5<sup>th</sup>, there were about 10 approved per week and over the last four weeks, we've seen a big jump to averaging 40 protocols per week and just last week we had 50. In addition we have about 163 protocols that are currently being screened and should be ready for approval in the next two weeks. So we look at life, we could see that number jump up to 80. So we're just now reaching a point where we're getting ahead of things...but it has taken some time to get there. Turnaround times in terms of what someone should expect today if they submit on the new forms and the forms, you know, assuming that the information that the forms ask for is present, for continuing reviews turnaround time can be as little as

two weeks. For other types of submissions, the turnaround time should be approximately four weeks. Though in some cases where we know of special circumstances we may be able to make that happen a little bit faster.

For full board reviews, these are reviewed protocols that go to the IRB for approval. And really represent probably around 5 or 6% of the total number of protocols. If we get those two weeks in advance of the meeting, they should be heard at that next meeting. So while we have a number of priority criteria that we use in deciding which protocols to approve first, which include studies that may be expiring, studies with vulnerable populations. We've tried to be responsive to any kind of special requests that we may get in the office and based on a suggestion at the Research Affairs Committee, we've set up a triage network where we're working with departmental administrators and school administrators where we're going to give them a list of protocols that are in the queue that we have for any particular week and then they can help us prioritize that. And that certainly should help with identifying junior faculty that may be impacted, or any graduate students that have issues with theses or dissertations.

As far as communications, we were not communicating very well over the summer and I think we've taken a number of steps to try to improve that including several meetings with School of Education, PDS, Sociology, HPER, and meetings are planned with History as well as Optometry. In conclusion, I'd just like to say that the office is committed to doing whatever it takes to get things back on track. We understand that people have been impacted negatively as I said, that's of great concern to us and we appreciate working with Dr. Burns. Thank you.

**HANSON:** Any questions for Steve or Steve?

**KENNEY:** One, I realize that it may look very different from the perspective of research scientists, but the perspective from History and other humanities and social sciences that are so different that I think that even the prospect of a committee that would review things might cause some concern, in the sense that well if there's one historian and one anthropologist and a whole bunch of scientists, are we even, are our concerns about how research protocols are reviewed even going to be understood and properly discussed? I'm just wondering whether this, and maybe you can tell us, is this going to be an opportunity to re-think how proposals from social sciences are even addressed or is the best we can hope for return to the *status quo ante*?

**BURNS:** I think ultimately, I'd look to Provost Hanson for addressing this, but my personal view is, for those of us who are biomedical scientists, there actually aren't that many options. We have to do what the federal government...so mainly it would be aimed at looking how best to optimize the ethical treatment of human subjects in other fields like history, but maybe to back off on some of the burdens of compliance if it's, if it's allowed. And I'm being careful here because I actually don't know what's allowed or

not. But I think that's the area we should look at the most because in these other areas such as mine it's irrelevant. I mean, there's not that much flexibility.

**MARTIN:** The only thing I'd add to that is that we did meet with the chair of the History Department recently, myself and some of the IRB staff as well as the chair of the IRB to start talking about some of these issues. So what I can assure you is that we will have these discussions and we'll definitely want to work with you. We do understand that each area has its own unique needs and we really need to work together to make it fit as best we can.

**HANSON:** And that is something that's provoking a national conversation to the extent to which social scientists in particular are being held to standards that really don't make sense for the kind of inquiry in which they're engaged. And I do think it would be good if we provided a kind of institutional voice in that national conversation. And I know many social scientists and historians share your worries about that.

**KENNEY:** Well it's not so much a worry as I think we have an opportunity here in which we we're forced to pause, forced to look at what we do more directly than other universities have had to even though they probably need to as well. And so this could be an opportunity to join that conversation because of the crisis we've gone through.

**BURNS:** I support that.

**TERRY:** Steve, standing Steve, Martin.

**BURNS:** Standing Steve.

**TERRY:** You said that two weeks before the IRB meeting would be a good lead time to have it considered. How frequently is the IRB itself meeting?

**MARTIN:** The IRB is meeting monthly, but if there is a need to get protocols then we're available to meet more frequently. They did have a special meeting on the this 19<sup>th</sup>. We completed the educational plan that was outlined in our corrective actions on the 18<sup>th</sup>, and we scheduled a meeting on the 19<sup>th</sup> so that they could resume protocols as early as possible. So that actually happened a little bit earlier than was needed. But as I mentioned earlier, it's really only a small percentage of the protocols that actually go to the full committee.

**HANSON:** Other questions or comments?

**BLAHA:** Given that the IRB has limited actual meetings, and it's been raised that there have been negative impacts towards graduate students especially with their dissertations. There is a specific timeline that they have to have approval from the IRB prior to being able to graduate or bring up against the six-month to make graduation

deadline. With the limited meetings, what's being done to prevent students from failing to graduate simply because they're waiting on the IRB?

**MARTIN:** I think that goes to the triage network that I was talking about when we've set up an ability to work with each department. We give them a list of protocols that exist in their areas. In some cases, the schools if they're small enough, in some cases, departments. So they can help us prioritize and let us know if there are graduate students who are being impacted because those are things we may not know. So they're going to give weekly lists. And this week we started with PDS, School of Ed, and I think there was one other....Optometry. And we're going to add to that so that each week there is a list they can help us pull out those that need immediate attention so we can help them make that.

**BURNS:** It's worth noting also, a lot of graduate student protocols do not require a full board review. And so they're not necessarily going to be tied to that monthly schedule. So they can go more quickly.

**HANSON:** Other questions or comments? Okay, thanks Steves. Now, did you really want to take a break now?

#### **AGENDA ITEM #6 DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE OFFICE OF THE DEAN OF FACULTIES**

**TERRY:** Would you like to make your presentation first, then a break?

**HANSON:** Presentation? That...

**TERRY:** Whatever you want to say.

**HANSON:** ...that honors it too much. Yeah, I didn't prepare a presentation exactly. But I could say a few words about how this has come to you. I began to think about the restructuring of the restructuring of the office of the Dean of Faculties and a Vice Provost for Academic Affairs during the last academic year when Jeanne mentioned to me that she was scheduled to step down at the end of this calendar year. And it seemed to me that this would be a time at which it would make sense if a change were going to be made to begin to make it. And Jeanne, as you may or may not know, had stayed on past the time which she had originally agreed to, to work in that office because she stepped up to the plate to head up the reaccreditation efforts for the campus and that meant she kind of missed a sabbatical which she'd been promised when she'd been given the appointment and she had a project, has a project, that she's working on that is time sensitive and she wanted to move forward with that. So despite the impotence to stay on a little longer, she reasonably enough, wanted to step down.

In connection with that, I had been thinking about building up the support for the undergraduate education side of responsibilities that are lodged in that office in part because of various kinds of changes that had taken place since the last time that office was configured. Partly the Hutton Honors College was moved out of what used to be academic support and diversity but is now DEMA [Diversity, Equity, and Multicultural Affairs].

In addition, we've garnered a lot of scholarship dollars for particular scholarship programs that are connected with undergraduates and they're not just scholarship programs. They are educational programs. And those are scattered about in various places and I'm not sure we get the coordination that would be most useful for the campus by their being scattered about. In addition, we had been in a kind of holding pattern about University Division for a little while. For a while there had been a, for a number of years I think for those of us who are old timers, you remember that had had a director then for a significant period of time it had a Dean, and then it didn't have a Dean again. But in any case, University Division is a very important unit there from the undergraduate side and it has to articulate with some of these other programs that are now entry points for our undergraduates.

In the time period since the last Dean of the University Division, there's been a continued growth in direct admits to the schools. That's one of the issues that's there. And what we do with those direct admits and how we manage those direct admits when they want to get out of one school and transfer to another remains an issue. University Division always had that as an attractive feature for this campus, that it was a place for students who were still exploring a number of majors. There are other issues about how the University Division will function now that we have had growth in the community college system.

In addition, this Council of course passed the General Education proposal, and that has to be implemented coming down the line. And there has been a lot of work going forward that has been coming out of a joint committee, partly staffed by one of the Associate Deans in the Dean of Faculties' office, and there are co-chairs obviously, and partly staffed by other faculty members as it should be. But the attention that the campus will have to give to General Education won't end with 2011 and the official roll-out of that program. That program will need constant tending because courses will come in, courses will go out as people retire. There will be proposals for new things, it's going to require constant attention and monitoring. And there's going to have to be somebody who's doing record-keeping in connection with that.

We will in addition, I think, have certain challenges that are connected with state mandates that have changed in the environment for undergraduate programs in recent years. What, again, to an old-timer like me seem like recent years. Because we have mandated various forms of transferability from the state institutions and that includes the community colleges, we can have, we number one have to monitor what the

transfer and articulation agreements with respect to specific courses, we have a core library of courses that has to be tended. And more importantly I think in the long run, we have to see that the students who are coming in from these other institutions with what the preparation they've had in those other settings, really matches what will be going on in this campus.

Because the other feature that's been going on on this campus in the last few years is the increasing quality of the undergraduate class. So as we have been saying we've been ramping up the expectations for our undergraduates and have in response to the quality, increased quality, of our undergraduate classes been hoping to challenge them more. We are also dividing up populations of students going to Indiana institutions in such a way that some of the students who might not have been admissible here may nonetheless be coming back into our programs as juniors. Or sophomores; some after the freshman year. And we need to think a little bit more about how we're going to support them, what we're going to do to make sure that those students are ready to succeed in the programs that we have been developing for this set of terrific undergraduates we have.

It's partly because of some of those issues; external issues, internal issues, again connected with things like the growth of various new programs like the Cox Research Scholars and the Hutton Honors College that it seemed the time was right to focus on undergraduate education as a Vice Provostial office. One of the other features that is partly external, partly internal, partly state, partly national has to do with assessment of undergraduate education. Now I know that this is something that's talked about all the time in higher education, but it's quite true that the pressures for assessment from the state and in particular from the higher education commission are very real right now. And thinking about how we will do that for the campus, how we will do it productively, in a way that makes sense to us so that we're not wasting resources and we're actually getting information that's of value to us is an academic matter. But there are going to be benchmarks of some sort that are required by the higher education commission and that's another feature that the campus as a whole has to think about. It will be an issue that cuts across schools. So that was part of the reason for thinking about a grouping together a number of the units that are concerned with undergraduate education into a Vice Provostial office.

That leaves as it were, the other half of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean of Faculties office one connected very importantly with faculty development, promotion and tenure, grievances, mediation, celebration of the faculty and academic personnel policies. I mean, we maintained a separate sort of unit there that's apart from HR with respect to academic personnel policies and services. My thought on this is that basically there's a kind of division in two here of the office as it has existed. It, as you also probably know if you've been here a long time, the Dean of Faculties academic affairs' office has shifted its shape a lot over the decades depending upon the incumbent. And there have been some functions that have gone out, some that have come in, new

programs that have been started. And Jeanne has produced a very useful organization that basically does have those kind of two halves. On the one hand there are a lot of programs connected with undergraduate education and the support of undergraduate education. And that includes support to graduate students and faculty. It's things like the writing tutorial services and other instructional support services that are used as people try to improve their teaching to not just undergraduates, but graduate students. And graduate students use those for the classes they teach with undergraduates. In addition, there are units that are, you know they're not self-contained but they are certainly well oiled machines and working very well. And there's no intent in any way to break any of these up. They will just be part of an office that is now focused on faculty and academic affairs and that means the policies that are governing this campus that come out of the BFC, and elsewhere. It means faculty mediation, grievances, developments, P&T, some of the terrific programs that have been developed by the Dean of Faculties' office such as the scholarship of teaching and learning. The thought is that those will now be grouped together and there will be a focus there on faculty and faculty affairs.

That's the basic shape of it. What I've actually had distributed to your seats is a kind of a sort of organizational chart here that shows the functions that are in the current office and we can talk about you know kind of where they might, where each might go, though I think those are things you can discern from the descriptions of the two positions that you've been given. The second page of the stapled handout gives you some sense of the sort of flux there has been in that office. Over a period of time that includes at least three Vice Provosts or Vice Chancellors, Dean of Faculties, of programs that moved into that office and programs that have moved out. It is a very large and complex unit right now. And the third page will sort of give you a sense of that ,of the number of FTE connected with the office. So this is a, it is a, it's a large chore here thinking about untangling some of that and creating two offices, but again, the idea is to focus very specifically on the two kind of main core functions that that office really has.

On the one hand, the faculty and governance and personnel policies connected with academic affairs, and on the other hand, undergraduates and the undergraduate office would include some offices that weren't there before. Like the Hutton Honors College and probably the Research Scholars, the Cox Scholars, some other things that can be folded in there that are now distributed in other ways.

The only other thing I'd want to say at this point is that you know, in connection with the remarks that Herb made initially about when this was brought to the Council, I just want to add a little reminder, this was brought to the Council last spring at the April meeting. So this has been floating around for, publicly for at least six, seven months. And I've talked to a number of units about the proposed reorganization mainly to gather people's suggestions about how this might best be accomplished, what issues they thought were at stake, how these might be shaped to make sure that we don't lose anything in this transition and that we only gain things...It's been distributed to school

Deans, directors, a variety of other offices. It's been talked about with the University Division advisors, the whole advisors' Council for the campus and with the staff of the current Dean of Faculties, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs office. I've invited comments and a number of folks have written very helpful comments in with a number of suggestions which have shaped then these descriptions of the two positions which you've been given including a lot of comments from the people in the current office. And again, those have resulted in the descriptions which you've now been given. That is my way of background. I guess I mentioned it again at the last meeting we had but it, the AAUP of which I'm a chapter member suggested it would like to make sure it was on the agenda as well as being mentioned at the meetings so that people could stop and really make sure that everybody on this Council is thinking about this, and looking at it and examining it, and that's fine with me and that's why it's on the agenda this time. And I had promised last spring I consulted with the chairs of the Educational Policies Committee and the Faculty Affairs Committee as well as the Agenda Committee, first with the Agenda Committee actually, when I was contemplating this to see if they had reactions.

I also gathered some information about our peers. All the CIC institutions and then some others to see what their administrative structure looked like. They all had Provostial systems. That's part of what's at stake here too, that we have a Provostial system now and the issue is how does that work from the point of view of the campus. What's going to be most effective in providing a kind of advocacy and strength for the Bloomington campus? All of our peers in fact have that system, every institution of the CIC and the other ones I looked at, some aspirational peers like Harvard and Berkley, but also Oregon which is in some ways like us and Chapel Hill and Kentucky, they're all organized that way. I asked questions about the extent to which they had for example a separate ombudsmen to deal with faculty grievances and few have that but they lodge it in something like a Vice Provost for faculty affairs that function, which is where I propose to lodge it. That was useful.

After I did that I talked to the Agenda Committee, after the Agenda Committee, I made sure I talked to the staff of the Office of Academic Affairs and the Dean of Faculties, and then began talking about it much more broadly. When I talked with the EPC and the FAC last year, I suggested to them and that as the descriptions got shaped over the summer I'd share that with those committees and that's what happened last month. And so those committees as well have some reactions and we could move on to that or we could take the break. Which would you prefer?

**TERRY:** Let's take our break. Yes, there's drinks in the back. Please make it short. Come back, bring them to your table and we'll continue.

## **BRIEF RECESS**

**TERRY:** Let me explain that you should all have at your seats four pieces of white paper. Two of them are the current versions of the job descriptions for the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs and the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education. If you saw a version of this a week or so ago this is not quite identical. These are works in progress. But as I understand it it's the current version. There are also two reports, one October 2<sup>nd</sup>, one October 3<sup>rd</sup>. I am the nominal author of these. The reason is that that I got a relatively lengthy discussion of what these two committees had discussed about these proposals and tried to focus it and shorten it and make it a little pippier and the result is this as far as I understand both Jonathan and Padraic think this is a decent summary of what they, their committees, concluded. Before we ask them to comment, let me add one thing in response to Karen's summary.

You know, this has, this proposal has had a long gestation period. I was reminded today as a matter of fact that the Agenda Committee in 2005 recommended to the then Provost Michael McRobbie that some separation in the Dean of Faculties office between the undergraduate responsibilities that had accumulated in there over the years and the things that were more central to graduate to faculty interests might be desirable to think about. So we, the Agenda Committee at that time, just I remember telling Provost McRobbie, maybe you should think about this. And perhaps this is a legacy of that, although it's Karen's idea as well.

Second, as she said, she did bring this to the Agenda Committee last year and I think about in March and the committee discussed it, told her it was worth further consideration, we didn't throw cold water on it immediately and thereafter there were occasional updates on her part about how she was thinking and how things were going about the timing of the implementation of this, and so forth. It was mentioned as Karen pointed out at the last meeting of the Faculty Council last year. Unfortunately I was down in Florida, but I read the notes. I think the Provost and I will probably just continue to disagree about whether that's where, that had this issue not come up now whether that would have ended discussion. I think going forward what we will all do is listen very carefully to the Provost's comments in the future and if she says something that is provocative or interesting, ask questions and start a discussion and if there is time for that discussion at that BFC meeting, we'll do it. If not, we'll roll it over to a subsequent meeting. But nonetheless, here it is on the item.

I believe firmly from several conversations with Karen that she will pay attention to what comes out of this meeting. In addition, once the search committee begins to look at the job descriptions, they can make some changes in it in consultation with her so there is still an opportunity for whatever we talk about here today to have a great deal to do with, to shape the search and job descriptions. With that, I think Padraic was listed first, so let's hear from the Educational Policies Committee.

**KENNEY:** Well the last thing anyone wants me to do is to read a document that you have in front of you so I will try to give an executive summary of this summary. There were a few comments, not very many, from the EPC and they're reflected here. Basically our comments fall into two types. The first has to do with let's call it organizational or rhetorical positioning, and those will be points 1 and 3. As far as organizational positioning, there were questions raised about how the VPUE would relate to Deans of the various schools, the relationship to some of the tasks in the Dean of Faculties and also something that's not on here, but this came up in an email comment I got yesterday: what would the relationship be between the this position and graduate education? As far as rhetorical positioning, which that really has to do with a sense that there's much more emphasis in the description on, you might call them targeted tasks rather than core tasks. Not that this at all implies that core tasks would be lessened or ignored but that this might be a key to understanding whether this is more of a managerial position, an entrepreneurial position or something else.

The second type of questions that were raised has to do with specific tasks of the VPUE and I think there are three that are highlighted here in points 2, 4, and 5. First, what about assessment *per se* not research about assessment but actual assessment of learning outcomes, a position that I believe at other universities does fall precisely under an office like this one. Secondly what about distance learning?

And third, is this a point to talk about the future of the General Education committee and whether its tasks beginning in 2011 will fall under the curriculum committee, directly under the VPUE or somewhere else or will there be a need for something still called the General Education committee?

**TERRY:** Provost Hanson, do you have any comments on this?

**HANSON:** Yeah, to group 1 and 3 together, it's quite true that the course delivery, curriculum, degree requirements and so on are matters for the schools and the faculty of the schools but right now there is a role played by the Dean of Faculties' office at the campus level in connection with the curriculum committee and that task would fall here. There is also, the curriculum committee also of course has a role to play with respect to graduate programs and the expectation is that there would be a co-chair of the curriculum committee that would be representing the graduate side. It would be, the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education wouldn't be playing an intrusive role in the school core tasks if that's really the question you're asking with respect to number one. Obviously, faculty determine the curriculum and it's the faculty at the schools and schools determine their degrees. Though they have to go up through levels of approval which include campus approval if they have new degrees and to the Trustees and the Indiana Commission on Higher Education.

The assessment issue: that's, you know, I as a faculty member have always taken the line that we do tons of assessment. That's what happens every time we give a paper

assignment or have a quiz. But it's quite true that the state is very close to insisting we have campus assessment of undergraduate education. And that's something that would be a prime area of responsibility for this office; to figure out if that really is mandated, how we accomplish that. There are a number of programs that are connected with systems of assessment and accountability that our sister institutions in the state have signed on to right now. We have been resisting that for some very good reasons I think, though it's quite true we want information about the quality of undergraduate education out to the public. But we, I think this is a very difficult matter to figure out how to engage in campus-wide assessment that enhances what we do rather than absorbing resources to no good end. And that would be a very important task for this new Vice Provost to shepherd, I mean, this is not something that wouldn't be done in consultation with the schools and the faculty of the schools but it is a task in front of us.

The, as I mentioned I think in the initial statement before the break, I do expect that there will have to be continuing, continual monitoring of the General Education program by this office in a sort of, in perpetuity as long as this, as long as that program is in place and so I wouldn't think that you would think that the Faculty Council itself or a nominated group of faculty would forever be administering that. That is, getting in new courses, taking out old ones...that is just an administrative task and it requires some campus resources but I would think that would be lodged in this Vice Provostial office.

Distance learning: that's a complicated matter because some of the schools are interested in and have very successful, some schools have very successful programs of distance learning. Kelley Direct for example is sort of up and running. It's not an undergraduate program, but other schools are thinking about various other forms of distance learning and, insofar as they're doing that and thinking of that in connection with their own programs or with courses that they want to think about delivering in that way, that's a school matter. Right now, the division of Continuing Studies is part of the portfolio of that office. It has a complex relationship with the Dean of Continuing Studies, however. I mean, this is something that's (laughter) part of what you're asking suggests there are other organizational issues we might be concerned about. There is a Dean of Continuing Studies who is a University level administrator, seems to report to me on an org chart, but in fact is not part of this org chart, and doesn't actually have control over the Continuing Studies offices on all of the campuses. But seems to work in some other way with them. So it's very complicated and I don't know that this would particularly solve it. I do think that the distance learning component, the distance learning component that might be developed by a given school though wouldn't necessarily fall under this. Jeanne, did you want to say something?

**SEPT:** The (inaudible) rubric for that is the Dean of Continuing Studies is responsible for distance education. The local campus division of Continuing Studies is responsible for local courses extended programs, that sort of thing, mini-University, that sort of stuff. So it really is, the question really related to the Dean's responsibilities overall.

**HANSON:** And that's something that is in flux in some other ways too as Continuing Studies' distance education programs change. I mean, and it's getting rid of associate degrees. There was a move a number of years ago for Indiana University to get rid of associate degrees though we still have some and even this campus still has some for some good reasons. But right now there is a kind of mandate for Continuing Studies to get rid of its associate degree in Continuing Studies and cede that to Ivy Tech and have a bachelors of Continuing Studies. So that's complicated, but not, it's neither made more complicated nor less by this reorganization.

**KENNEY:** Plus it would hopefully, this would be an opportunity or this would be an office that could at least be maintaining or overseeing the quality of distance education.

**HANSON:** .... Maybe... (laughter) I mean part of what we have to see is that not all of that is under the control of this campus. Did that answer all of the questions you had to ask?

**KENNEY:** It spoke volumes.

**WIMBUSH:** To whom does the Dean of Continuing Studies report?

**HANSON:** (Provost shrugs ironically)

**TERRY:** Let the minutes reflect... (laughter)

**HANSON:** No! (laughter)

**TERRY:** Are there other questions about or pertaining to the proposal for the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education? Well let me suggest...

**KENNEY:** I do, I do. So I guess when you use the word proposal, that immediately raises questions, is this a formal proposal and what stage is it? What happens next?

**HANSON:** It's not just a proposal. I mean, I am dividing those offices unless I hear some really, really good argument against it today. And what I hoped for from the discussion is you know, any kind of clarification or sort of suggestions you might make about things you'd hoped could be accomplished or things you definitely don't think should be lodged there, any shaping of this that you'd like to do as this proceeds, but I do think we need a Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, and I intend to create one.

**FIELDS:** Just, Provost Hanson, as a member of the undergraduate community, I think on behalf of all of us, this is certainly a position that we support its creation, looking for someone to be specifically tasked with making certain our experience as undergraduates is as good a one as we can get.

**HANSON:** Thank you, Luke.

**TERRY:** Yes?

**GROTH:** I also would like to echo that. I think that I think that this proposal is splitting although certainly there are bound to be issues in any reorganization is going to end up in more clarity for undergraduate education which is going to actually help us achieve our mission. So I support it greatly.

**TERRY:** Lisa?

**PRATT:** Karen, you mentioned earlier how much the demographics of our incoming students are changing. Do you view this restructuring as a way in which the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education might be able to interact and coordinate more directly with admissions and decisions that are made in admissions and how we respond to the changing quality of the incoming students?

**HANSON:** Well, I hope so. I mean, right now after all admissions and enrollment management also report to the Provost. That's actually another Vice Provostial office. But it, I hope this will lead to more coordination there. There are issues that right now are of great moment for this campus, as well as for the rest of the University, about retention of all the subpopulations we have and some of those issues of retentions are, I think, exacerbated by some of the changes that we've made that are good for this campus, targeting a higher quality undergraduate body. I think it could be useful because those folks all kind of form a cabinet and they'll be looking at some of the issues from slightly different perspectives but there should be good coordination between the two. It's not, though, as if admissions would report to this office.

**PRATT:** And one other question: is this an office that would potentially address the issue of grade inflation or deflation on a sort of campus-wide basis because that's a topic that certainly the BFC has sort of touched on a number of times but we never really tackled it in a comprehensive way. And certainly many other schools are looking very carefully and I know there's universities that have aggressively adopted policies of grade deflation to mandate distribution to get grades back into some sort of, I don't know, order. Is this an office that might look at that?

**HANSON:** It certainly is. That isn't something that I had thought about as I was trying to basically look at the functions that are already out there and ones that I know are scattered around the campus that I wanted to draw together, but that's a perfect example of the kind of thing that someone who's tasked with thinking about undergraduate education first and foremost could be thinking about.

**SEPT:** I was just going to say that in terms of putting this in a broader context, one of the supporting rationales for creating a separate office like this comes out of our campus

wide reaccreditation effort. And you mentioned the notion of program assessment. And one of the comments on reaccreditation was 'Why don't we have a central office that tracks programmed accreditations and program assessments?' So that might also be something that could dovetail with the General Education assessment initiative as well.

**HANSON:** Obviously your office has been doing a great job on those as they've been coming in but I've been struck by that coming into the office. The number of accreditations that are hither and thither in the various schools and it's, it is something that would be useful to track.

**TERRY:** Kevin?

**HUNT:** I'm not a member of the Faculty Council this year. I want to thank Provost Hanson and President Terry for allowing me to come today. I wanted to ask, I wanted to sort of turn the questions that we've already asked so far a little bit around and talking about adding functions to what is now the Dean of Faculties' office and the importance of those and the fact that the Dean of Faculties' office as we add these further functions we need to add, the Dean of Faculties' office is becoming more cumbersome and so, so far, it seems to me that what we've talking about is creating this new structure will give a greater clarity of purpose to the undergraduate education side of things. So I want to turn that around a little bit and ask, can you talk about looking at the Dean of Faculties' office as it's now constructed, what barriers, what disadvantages are there in retaining the structure that we have now that this new structure will overcome?

**HANSON:** Well one of the things that I think is salient about the current structure is that one of the Associate Deans of Faculties is, has been, very overburdened. Not because of anything she has done, but because of the magnitude of the task that she's facing in dealing with the transfer and articulation climate and the General Education implementation. And allowing the grouping of resources and perhaps a few additional resources to be put into that function I think will be very helpful on that side. And it also is actually, it's the committee that was put together by this Council that actually came to me to say they needed more resources in order to achieve the task of implementing General Education. They needed some support resources. So that's one thing.

The other thing is a much more efficient use of the large number of dollars that have come in through Matching the Promise for scholarships. Right now, I know that we are not using that to, we're using it very well, but we're not using it to the best effect because we haven't coordinated that all of the gifts that have been made that are very specific to a particular program or a particular kind of program or a particular school with the rest of the financial aid that's going in through the Office of Enrollment Management and that's something that we need to do. It's a big task in front of us, a very big task. And I think it will be both useful in terms of conserving and marshalling our resources but also in terms of achieving some of these other goals that we've set for

ourselves that are mainly connected with mission differentiation and increasing the quality of the undergraduates on this campus and those are things that right now, nobody is quite in a position to deal with unless this gets centralized into one office. Did that help?

**TERRY:** Are there any other questions on the non-proposal, the decision to create a Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, the defined details of that. Okay.

**DOWELL:** In the back? Bob Eno.

**TERRY:** Somewhere back there? I can barely see you. Oh Bob!

**ENO:** I'm also not a member of the Council (inaudible) appreciate (inaudible). I just wanted to follow up Kevin's question, Karen, and ask you I understand why the addition of resources and the focusing of its efforts is important, but it still is not clear to me why having parallel Vice Provosts is the way to go for this sort of thing, and not increasing the portfolio of recent resources that is under the current Vice Provost (inaudible).

**HANSON:** Because these seem to me rather different functions. I mean, actually, obviously different functions. That undergraduate education is something that is not separate from us, none of our activities are separate, but quite different from faculty development and faculty affairs and faculty governance. They just seemed to be very different kinds of activities. And if we have two foci, I mean right now I think in some ways we do have kind of two foci, this is just making plain that we have those two foci and inserting a few additional resources where they need to go and then addressing some tasks that lie in front of us like the assessment and the coordination of scholarships that we haven't been in a position to do because of the, either because of lack of resources or because of the scattering of resources. I mean, why not grow one unit even bigger? It just looks like it's disparate parts. I don't see the rationale for doing that. It seems to me these are different kinds of activities in which that office is engaged and it's done very well in addressing those but they are different kinds of activities.

**TERRY:** Are there other questions about this position?

**BIELASIAK:** Yes I just want to follow up on the other two. Has any thought been given in this proposal, in this action I guess, with the structural issue of how this office will interact with other units on campus that bear on the function of undergraduate education? We've already heard about the Graduate School, the office of admissions, whatever other units and it seems to me there are currently some roadblocks in the relationship between those units and I guess my question is, how is this going to solve some of those larger structural issues that face the campus?

**HANSON:** Well, I guess I might need to hear more about what you're thinking of as the special roadblocks. I mean right now this, the Dean of Faculties' office does include things like University Division which involves advising the students who aren't directly admitted to the schools. Again, Bob, I'm not quite sure why that's a faculties office. That strikes me as an undergraduate function, and clearly an undergraduate function. Those, something like University Division, has to interact with the schools and the advisors do well at doing that. I don't know that there are particular roadblocks there but as an institution we have to think about how the changes we've made to have much more direct admission and less focus for entering freshman on University Division works. And whether or not some people are staying in University Division too long because they can't get into certain schools. What that means for the distribution of possibilities for students who come to this campus. There are a number of issues of that sort that need to be addressed from the campus level. I think this will enhance the ability of the campus to do that.

You know, the University Division right now can't look at the business school and say, 'You're going to have to reserve more spots for students who come as exploratory freshmen.' But something at the Vice Provostial level might be in a better position to do that or at least to, not that, not that anybody's doing that but those are the kinds of issues that might be there as direct admission goes forward. And that's one of the reasons I think there has to be something at the campus level. There certainly will be issues about how our undergraduate experience works for students who either aren't directly admitted to the school or come in as transfers from other schools and those issues are going to be increasingly pressing for us in the out years.

I don't think there are roadblocks between the affairs that are currently undergraduate affairs that are in the office of the Dean of Faculties and say, enrollment management. There's no direct supervisory line, but again that doesn't imply roadblocks and I actually again think that's another reason though for making these all part of a sort of a Provost cabinet. Because then they may be, it may be easier to coordinate their activities. But are there particular roadblocks you're thinking of?

**BIELASIAK:** Well, yeah, this may not relate to this particular office but I'm asking for example, one hears, and this is hearsay so maybe it's all wrong, that the admissions office is giving out scholarships that cannot be covered because of financial reasons by certain schools. That the number of scholarships offered sort of outweighs the capacity of schools to absorb. Now this is different units, but the question is again, will this hope to sort of coordinate, that's my question; is there some kind of mission of coordination that is envisaged in this office that may not exist at this point in time?

**HANSON:** Well, I think it's number one, that is not true that the office of admissions has given out scholarships that can't be covered by the schools. It's true that the schools pay assessments to cover the financial aid that the office of enrollment management by and large has been giving and some schools may be crabby about that because,

(laughter) yeah, well the money is the money and it can be used for one thing or it can be used for another thing, but...

**BIELASIAK:** They may not be counting on spending the funds this way, thus it could put some pressure.

**HANSON:** Right, well that is a complicated story but I don't think that the issue was that anybody had any money to count on that they didn't get. Still, I think it will be useful to have someone whose whole business is to think about undergraduate educational issues including how much it costs to get a class of a certain size, whether or not those costs are warranted given the other concerns we have about undergraduates including the academic support we offer them once they're here, or the quality of the advising the availability of the advising that we give them once they're here. There's, you know, it began when Carolyn asked the question earlier talking about the three legs of support we have financially for this University but in the end, there's one pot of money every year and the things that go into financial aid for example don't go into advising, adding more advisors. So it is important that we think about those things together. This office would not be directing enrollment management, but again, enrollment management does report to the Provost's office. So coordination of these two Vice Provostial offices I think would enhance our ability to achieve the ends that the faculty want and would be more inclined to I think be in touch with all the schools to see what their problems are with respect to undergraduate education than might be the case if these two units weren't sort of meeting together to coordinate undergraduate issues. Julie?

**BOBAY:** I might, it's possible I should know this already, but as you mentioned this cabinet that you're envisioning, I wonder can you just list the offices that would be part of that cabinet?

**HANSON:** Well, that is a loose term really. But right now I do meet regularly with the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean of the Faculties, the Vice Provost for Enrollment Management, the Vice Provost for Research, the Vice Provost for Student Affairs, and the budgetary officer for the campus....am I leaving anyone out? That's it, that's what we're thinking of the Vice Provostial offices. Precisely to share information and issues that might be relevant from one to another.

**BOBAY:** Are there other Vice Provost positions that exist?

**HANSON:** No. That's what I was thinking. That is, that's it. And all of those will continue.

**TERRY:** The BFC as you know has a fairly mandatory 5:30 adjournment. We would have to have unanimous consent to continue beyond 5:30, so I would like to move to the discussion of the other position. And move the wisdom of creating some Vice Provost

whose sole duty it is to worry about faculty and academic affairs. Can we start with the Faculty Affairs Committee?

**PLUCKER:** Thank you. I should note that when Herb asked me to chair faculty affairs he said it should be a pretty straight forward year, fairly easy except for splitting the Dean of Faculties office, system wide P&T issues, and tackling non-tenure track faculty issues. Indeed. Indeed. Thank you, thank you (laughter) for talking me into this.

You've all seen the memo. Faculty Affairs also had a meeting earlier this afternoon where we went over the memo again. And I was asked to emphasize a few points. I should note that the second point in the memo has already been addressed by the Provost's office, which we thank you. The addition of the second line in the draft that you have in the first paragraph was a result of the back and forth with Dave and Amanda and Karen. In general, I think sort of the last sentence of point 1 is really where the committee has been recently and where they certainly were this morning. I would change it, I worded it a little too carefully, I had said that the committee members have no deeply engrained objections to the idea. In general they thought it's a good idea, it makes sense. We talked through the various options like we've been talking through thus far this afternoon.

But the concerns that they had were really about preserving, specifically two aspects of the current Dean of Faculties' office that they find to be extremely valuable. And that is 1) the advocacy function and to a lesser extent concerned about the role of the new Vice Provost in the P&T system. And number 2) the first point has already been addressed I think partially by changing that line, but in terms of P&T, our understanding, Provost Hanson, is that you don't intend to change the role of the Dean of the Faculties and having a formal recommendation in the process. Is that correct?

**HANSON:** Right, the Vice Provost would.

**PLUCKER:** I'm sorry.

**HANSON:** There would still be a campus committee and there would still be another layer of review with that person making an advisor.

**PLUCKER:** We have heard talk that maybe it should be discussed about whether this new Vice Provost should maintain that formal role in terms of making a formal recommendation and the committee has debated it back and forth. I think for the most part people actually see the formal recommendation role as being an important advocacy function at the same time, which before we discussed it I wouldn't have actually seen it that way, but if you're being an advocate and you see things not going correctly or that there has been a mistake made the fact that you have a formal recommendation role does give you a formal way to get involved and makes it much

less advisory. So I think the, pretty much the consensus was keep that decision maker role formally.

And there is one other part that came up today that I think is worth thinking about and again, I hadn't really thought about it this way before. It relates to point number six. My institutional history only goes back about eleven and a half years. Some people on the committee, it goes back many, many, many more years than that, and I won't say how much to embarrass them, but a long time. And one of their concerns was that, back when it was a Chancellor system, they thought that there were plenty of examples, incidents if you will, where the Dean of the Faculties would try to enforce a specific policy or try to play a mediation role but that the Chancellor didn't necessarily back them up if the dispute became a dispute between the Dean of Faculties and the Dean of specific units. And that that's why there could be some inconsistency in policy enforcement and things like that. They talked about it mostly as a historical artifact. I certainly don't have any examples that I can share since I've been here, but it came up several times and it was certainly a very strong theme today.

And I guess I'll turn this into a question as opposed to a general statement, but well one of the questions was, I mean, you could just keep the name Dean of the Faculties and still split these offices and it was suggested that perhaps one of the reasons for changing it from a Dean of the Faculties to a Vice Provost position is that it would be a Vice Provost and a Dean trying to work these things out and from a Provost perspective, perhaps that would be different than two Deans sort of slugging it out. That was a bit too vernacular but I think you see what I mean. (laughter)

And then we also had a question about the how many Vice Provosts currently exist which you just answered...those were the major points.

**HANSON:** With respect to the "slugging it out" issue...(laughter)...one hopes it doesn't come to that, but if it does my thought here is that having this here as a Vice Provostial position actually makes it clearer where the lines of authority go because the Provost's office does have authority over the school Deans whereas the Dean of Faculties' office has, plays a different kind of role. I mean, there's budgetary authority over the schools, there's this position this office is one that appoints the Deans and reviews them, sets their salaries. The, and that to me, actually is one of the reasons that I think of this as strengthening the advocacy position for faculty, and in a way giving it a different set of teeth, to use another combative metaphor.

Where we've had some discussions and there's some disagreements among those who are experienced in both directions about the extent to which issues concerned with mediation and advocacy should be intertwined with the promotion and tenure decisions. And I know opinions differ on this. My own opinion is that the mediation, grievance, advocacy functions should be kept cleanly out of the P&T decisions. I actually think that say, aggrieved or worried junior faculty who want to bring problems to an

administrator and speak frankly, will be more inclined to feel comfortable about doing that if they know that that administrator will not next year be sitting on their tenure case and making a decision about it or even an advisory decision. That's a matter, you know, on which opinion might differ. I think that the issue about where mediation, grievances, and so on lies is actually not as, it's an issue of great importance to the campus, but I think it isn't an issue that's as cleanly cut right now as some folks might think. Grievances are brought all over. I mean, they're brought to the Office of the Vice Provost and Dean of Faculties, certainly in the first year I learned many are brought directly to me at the get go or simultaneously. They're brought all over and there's no stopping anyone from appropriately talking to other administrators who might be helpful when someone has a difficulty. I think that's likely to happen no matter what so that you can't make an absolutely clean separation no matter what. But my own sense is that, just thinking back to my own consciousness as a junior faculty person, I would have felt much more comfortable thinking that I was going to somebody whose sole business was to listen to my grievance or my worry or my concern who would not be sitting in judgment on me the next year.

Again, whoever is the first door that might be opened out of the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs if someone says, 'I have a grievance and I want to see somebody and I don't know whom I want to see,' whether that person is adequately informed about how P&T works, about how the policies of the campus govern everyone including all chairs and Deans and so on, is a matter for this office to ensure. I mean one of the things that Jeanne has insisted upon, and I think reasonably so, is that the Associate Deans who've been involved in mediation and hearing of grievances have been helped in that by their service on the promotion and tenure committees and I think that's right, but the important thing is they've got to make sure they know those features of how P&T works and how our policies govern, no matter how they acquire that knowledge. That's crucial. I don't think it's crucial though that the two functions be intertwined in that way and I'm actually this is a matter, you know we may want to talk about in more detail, I'm not so certain I see the point that the Faculty Affairs Committee might be making about thinking of this level of review as a particularly an advocacy matter. It is a matter of checking that things have gone right at earlier levels, but I think that it has to be understood as a fair review. I mean there's no decision that's more important for faculty affairs than tenuring. And I think this has to be a fair review of peers at the campus level. And that's how I'd expect it to continue with a campus committee and an administrator who sees the role as one of making sure that things have gone right up to that point and that things are getting a fair review at that stage.

**TERRY:** Moving along, do we have other comments? Questions? Ann?

**GELLIS:** Taking up on your comments and this is a major concern for, we've got one on the AAUP, of what we've presented today to the BFC and also in our report and that is this notion of separating promotion and tenure from the grievance activities. Because whether one accepts your premise that it's better that they be separated, I don't

understand, I still don't, and you and I have had conversations, I still don't understand how it is separated. That is, organizationally, how do you plan if you're going to have one Vice Provost for faculty affairs, where will the grievance and advocacy activities be located and to whom will that person report? I don't, I'm not sure I see this cut. One of the things I think the paper, that was the report that came out of the Faculty Affairs Committee, pretty much echoes what AAUP's concerns are in terms of these two very special functions of the Dean of Faculties' office. And I would like to know, I think it's important to know, where in the organizational chart, the person who's going to be handling grievances in the past it's been my experience, which does go back almost 30 years, that the Dean of Faculties was very actively the Dean, herself or himself, was very active, and that grievance activities were not pushed down very often below the Deans' level so that it would be Jeanne who would interact in my experience if a faculty member had a grievance they would go and talk with the current Dean of the Faculties and the Dean of Faculties would mediate between that faculty member and the chair or the Dean. From what you've said, that would no longer be the task of the Dean, the new Vice Provost. Who will have that task and wouldn't that person be reporting the Vice Provost and if that's the case, how do you maintain that they're separate? I just, I don't understand it, Karen.

**HANSON:** Well it seems to me that although, as I said, people bring grievances all over the place and sometimes simultaneously so that there's, in the end there's no way of keeping this utterly clean but then it's the person's choice if they want to go in every direction. But my sense is that the likely office for bringing grievances would be an Associate Vice Provost, but what I want to say is that over my thirty-some years that has often been the case that it's been the Associate Dean of Faculties who's been the first person to hear a grievance or the office to which a grievant has brought something for discussion.

**GELLIS:** Assuming that's true, I mean, assuming you reflect what has happened in the past, I still don't understand this notion of separation that then - that you're talking about because that I assume what you're saying is that under the new system you would have an Associate Vice Provost who would, I assume, report to the Vice Provost.

**HANSON:** Right, but they wouldn't also be the ones who are chairing the promotion and tenure committee.

**GELLIS:** So it's simply the question that they wouldn't be chairing the committee, but they would be talking to the Vice Provost about the issues and then...

**HANSON:** Well, who knows whether they'd be talking about them. They might be handling them completely. It depends upon what the issue is. As I say, there's no way in which you can say separation will always take place, but the idea is there'll be a designated office and it won't be one that handles both things.

**GELLIS:** I think there's a concern there that then the person who's charged with handling grievances and mediating is not of, and you talked about the person having more power because they're a Vice Provost versus a Dean, now we're talking about an Associate Dean mediating with a Dean or a chair.

**HANSON:** An Associate Vice Provost.

**GELLIS:** An Associate Vice Provost mediating with a Dean, and someone...I just, I'm not sure they're really of equal stature. I think the faculty loses some power, and admittedly, the Dean of - one of the major criticisms of the Dean of Faculties office - is that it has not had a lot of power, I think this system, at least as far as the grievance activities are concerned, loses power under your conception. And I have no problem, I want to make it clear, for myself, I am not speaking for AAUP, with whether you divide the offices or you don't divide the offices. It's this notion, once you've divided the office of where grievances are then handled and who's responsible and who reports to whom and who conducts those mediation activities.

Another question that I just raised, and then I'll let other people speak if they wish, is that I would like to have some more information about how the budgets are going to work. How are these offices going to be funded. Because I would assume right now and Jeanne, maybe you can talk to this, that there's some synergy that some people work in both areas. If you split the offices, you know, the budgets may not just split equally. You are going to lose some, you're going to probably need more money I would think, somewhere and it would be nice to have some more information about how if a number of people go to the undergraduate education side, will the Dean of Faculties office, or the Vice Provost for faculty, will they have enough personnel? Will they have enough funding? And I think that's a concern.

**HANSON:** Let me respond to both of those things. I don't, if you've been concerned about the power that the Dean of Faculties office has had in mediation and grievances, I do not see why you think that an Associate Dean of Faculties somehow is in a better position to address that issue than an Associate Vice Provost when after all, all of those units report into the Office of the Provost. There is budgetary authority over the schools and there is appointment authority over the schools of the Office of the Provost. There isn't out of the office of the Dean of Faculties. So one thinks in the end most of it is moral suasion or reminding people of the right thing to do, but in any case, there is line authority out of this office the way there isn't out of the Dean of Faculties' office. That's the first point.

The second point with respect to the budget is that, you know, it is a very large RC with a lot of resources right now and it will be a difficult and painstaking task to untangle those although many of these units are just sort of staying utterly intact. They're staying in the offices they're in, they're staying performing the same functions. It is the case that, you know, there may be ways in which people think about synergies, but I can

tell you that the budget for something like University Division which was a large part of this budget, there was in no way supporting the activities connected with faculty affairs and grievances. Let's be realistic about this. There may be some issues about resources, and indeed I think particularly I can see that some resources will have to go in to tend General Education, some new resources. But I actually am not, it's not huge amounts, we're not creating new positions that will have big budgets under them that aren't already there. The bulk of the budgets for both of these offices are already there. Insofar as any new resources will be added it's relatively small amounts to deal with issues that we currently have pressing on us from a variety of internal and external environmental causes connected with things like the transfer and articulation and Gen Ed.

**TERRY:** Steve?

**BURNS:** Just a question as to rationale going back to the grievance issue. It really does sound to me more like an ombudsperson role which answers to the Provost but mainly works through mediation across levels between departments and schools. And so what are the downsides of ombudsperson?

**HANSON:** Are you asking me? I'm not sure that I think there are downsides. I mean one of the issues that is crucial is that the Associate Deans who have done a lot of this over the decades have by virtue of being a part of the P&T process and by being part of an office that has as its, among its duties, keeping up with the developments in faculty governance and so on, has stayed on top of the governing documents, but that's to be expected of anybody who takes on this position. So, I mean you know, that's one issue but that's just a *sine qua non* of carrying out this kind of role appropriately. And no one should take on this job as Associate Vice Provost who isn't prepared to be fully prepared.

**TERRY:** Jeanne?

**SEPT:** I just wanted to add one point of clarification on the role of the Associate Deans of the promotion and tenure committees. They are liaisons to the committees but the committees are chaired by the faculty. The Associate Deans do not vote on these committees and in fact they don't express opinions or any valuation on those committees. They just serve as policy guides for the effective function and things.

**TERRY:** I can't see who Julie is pointing to, but...Oh, Bob again.

**ENO:** I've been listening very carefully Karen to what you've been saying. You've said some things that I find very encouraging. I'm actually completely neutral because I don't know whether it's better to split the offices or not to split the offices. But what's perturbing me in my mind are memories of the last time that we discussed restructuring the Dean of Faculties' office some years ago where it was to be turned into a Provost's

office under a Chancellor and there was to be a preservation of the Dean of Faculties role, and so on and so forth. Now what strikes me as very different about this time of course is that we don't have a Chancellor anymore, we have a Provost. And what I hear as encouraging in what you've been saying is that you believe that the Provost's office is going to be taking over the campus academic voice representing the faculty's concern about academic issues. Because, of course, the Provost is the chief academic officer.

And this was in fact much of the role that the Dean of Faculties traditionally played under a Chancellor. They sometimes played a Provostial role but didn't (inaudible) have it. My concern going down the lines thinking of the long term is that if you split an office like this, you naturally lose some of the political weight that goes along with an office in control of many different aspects of campus level life. The Dean of Faculties has been in the past the most obvious and most powerful representative of the campus point of view at a time when the schools after RCM gained an enormous amount of independent power. If the Provost's office is going to be engaged in the operational activities that are associated with these two offices, so the Provost is aware, engaged, is making sure that policies are properly enforced that grievance procedures and P&T are operating along the lines of those policies, then the problem, the political problem, of reducing the campus profile between the faculties and faculty standpoint would be reduced.

If the Provost still retains many of the functions that used to burden the Chancellor's office which would mean a Provost in the future that will not have the kind of resources available to have that kind of an operational meeting. Then it becomes a concern if there is no unified focus of the campus level academic voice. So I don't know which way is the right way to go, but this is why I've had a lot of trouble with myself, wrapping my head around these proposals and deciding how they might affect the University and (inaudible).

**HANSON:** I am dismayed that anyone would think that the Office of the Provost isn't concerned with academic affairs and the advocacy of the Bloomington campus. That is what the job is. This is the Chief Academic Officer for the campus. That's what the Provost was defined as. And of course the person in that office expects to be engaged in those matters. That is what the job is. And I'm not sure why one would think that there is a question about the loss of political weight. I mean, my concern is that without strengthening both of those functions and doing it by concentrating the activities that have been going on in those offices and the ones that need to go on in the future and connecting them immediately with the work of the Provost, IU Bloomington will be disadvantaged compared to other campuses in the IU system.

I mean, I don't know if I should be saying this for public consumption, but I think that is an important role of the Provost on this campus and I think that the resources, the administrative resources of the campus have to be organized in order to facilitate that advocacy position. And that, right now, those matters are concerned with academic affairs and faculty and the undergraduate mission. Both of those are things that are not

under pressure, but there are lots of changes that are going on with respect to undergraduate education and academic affairs and the position of the faculty. Some of them internal to the reorganizations that have been going on in recent years here, some of them related to the climate for higher education in the U.S. and in the world. And I think we need an organized office where all of these matters are kind of, not concentrated, but where there is very good communication among the offices that oversee these particular matters, and that's one of the things I hope this will accomplish.

**TERRY:** We have reached the adjournment time. We have people who depend on childcare and other sorts of things. Let me, if I may, close with a couple of comments or observations. Number one, I'm very certain that whoever holds these posts, especially the Dean of Faculty and Academic Affairs would be a tenured faculty member on this campus and then hopefully will take the values of faculty into the performance of the job and in the course of negotiating, seek the resources to do it. Second, we have faculty members on the search committee, there are at least two in this room. If you continue to have concerns, let them know what your concerns are. And three, let the Agenda Committee and the Provost know. This is a bit of a work in progress and if we haven't discussed your particular concern today, let us know.

**HANSON:** That is one last thing to be said. These are both internal searches for a reason so that people understand how these things have worked in the past and understand what the issues are that are facing us that can hit the ground running in January.

**TERRY:** Thank you all.

**HANSON:** So we're adjourned.

**Meeting adjourned: 5:32PM.**