

Agenda
Indiana University
BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL
November 18, 2008
IMU Georgian Room
3:30 P.M. - 5:30 P.M.

Attendance

MEMBERS PRESENT: Eric Arnold, Randy Arnold, James Biles, Leslie Blaha, Purnima Bose, Stephen Burns, Carolyn Calloway-Thomas, James Capshew, Andrea Ciccarelli, Nicholas Clark, Diane Dallis, Jon Dilts, Carrie Donovan, Erika Dowell, James Drummond, Paul Eisenberg, Harold Evans, Christine Farris, Lucas Fields, Luke Gillespie, Laura Ginger, Karen Hanson, Patrick Harbison, Patricia Henderson, Brian Horne, Michael Jolly, Padraic Kenney, Valerie Markley, Bryan McCormick, Amanda Meglemre, Brian O'Donnell, Lisa Pratt, Jennifer Riley, Jeanne Sept, Richard Shockley, Daniel Sloat, Sarita Soni, Jerrold Stern, Herbert Terry, Vasti Torres, Susan Whiston, James Wimbush

MEMBERS ABSENT WITH ALTERNATES PRESENT: Angela Courtney (Julie Bobay), Julian Hook (Robert Hatten)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Jack Bielasiak, Nate Birkhead, Bruce Burgun, Julia Fox, Valerie Grim, Dennis Groth, Lloyd Kolbe, Paul Losensky, Lokman Meho, Michael Morrone, Dan Ondrik, James L. Perry, Diane Reilly, Richard Stryker, Neil Theobald, David Waterman, Maxine Watson

GUESTS: Nicole Brooks (Herald-Times), Amy Burke (IDS), Philip Eskew (IU Trustee), A.D. King (IU Student Trustee), Julie Knost (Office of Affirmative Action), Eric L. Richards (KSoB), Vicki Roberts (Office of the VP DEMA), Sue Talbot (IU Trustee), Monique Threatt (Libraries), Craig Dethloff (Faculty Council Office), Patricia Pierson (Faculty Council Office)

Agenda

1. Memorial Resolution for Robert Gross.
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/08-09/B11-2009.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. Resolution from the Diversity and Affirmative Action Committee on General Peter Pace. (30 minutes) (Professor Alex Tanford) [FIRST READING]
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/08-09/B12-2009.pdf>
7. Discussion of issues relating to the Bookstore. (20 minutes)
(Professor Herb Terry and Lucas Fields, President of the IUSA) [ACTION ITEM]
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/08-09/B13-2009.pdf>
8. Recommendation of the Faculty Affairs and Research Affairs Committees on the reporting line for the Dean of the University Graduate School and Relationship of the Graduate School to the Office of the Vice President for Research. (30 minutes)
(Professor Stephen Burns, Chair of the Research Affairs Committee and Professor Jonathan Plucker, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee) [ACTION ITEM]
<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/circulars/08-09/B14-2009.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

Minutes

HANSON: ...antecedently. I may have to leave just a few minutes before the end of the session because of another commitment. I tried to get them to delay it slightly, but they can't. So, we'll see what time we end but I absolutely have to be out of the room by no later than 5:30. So, we're called to order and the first business today is the memorial resolution for Robert Gross.

AGENDA ITEM #1: MEMORIAL RESOLUTION FOR ROBERT GROSS.

SEPT: Thank you, Karen I'm going to go ahead and read select excerpts from the complete memorial resolution which I recommend to you in the meeting minutes.

In the Brooklyn neighborhood in which Bob Gross grew up, it was generally understood that the purpose of going to college was to become a doctor or an engineer. But because no friend or anyone in his family was a college graduate, Bob decided to call a telephone operator and ask her, "Where do you go to become a doctor?" She suggested New York University and it turned out to be good advice. Although his ambition to be a doctor did not last very long, he majored in English at NYU and ultimately received his PhD in American Literature in 1960. He joined the Department of English at IU in 1957 and then moved quickly through the professorial ranks until he became a full professor in 1968.

Bob's studies were wide, deep and conducted with characteristic intensity. He wrote, taught, and directed dissertations on the fiction of Nathaniel Hawthorne, Herman Melville, William Faulkner and especially on American poetry from Whitman and Dickinson to T.S. Eliot and Sylvia Plath. The topic of the last dissertation he supervised was a study of poetry about jazz a project that has since eventuated in two anthologies of such poetry.

Right from the start of his time at Indiana, Bob Gross became known as an extraordinarily powerful teacher whether teaching freshman composition, undergraduate courses in literary history or topical graduate seminars. In 1965, Bob was awarded the University's Ulysses G. Weatherly prize for distinguished teaching and in subsequent years he won a Brown Derby in teaching award whose recipients are selected by the students themselves, and the Class of 1970 Distinguished Teaching Award. Bob also thought hard about the curricular and institutional structures in which learning happened and he worked effectively to improve them, leading several efforts in his department to reorganize the undergraduate curriculum and the honors program.

"What Gross brings to the classroom is passion," one of his students wrote. And throughout the four decades of his teaching, he maintained the intensity of his engagement with books and ideas. Students and colleagues consistently remarked his "unremitting intelligence, his finely controlled audacity, his vigor of mind and judgment, the curiosity and learning that make him a true scholar." His passion was to bring his students to understand and respond to literature, but he also used literature, one of his colleagues said of him, "to understand what was happening now and to emphasize that literature and literary study were not special provinces of life, but of a peace with its common pleasures and concerns." Indeed, Bob Gross found ways to take the energy of his teaching out of classrooms and beyond the campus, whether as a visiting professor of English and American Literature at the Universities of Zagreb and Sarajevo or in the special seminars he designed for steel workers. Bob went to the classroom and to books to participate in the pleasures of the text and to show students how to find these pleasures for themselves, to feel the excitement of discovering what can be learned in each encounter. "Most of my satisfactions as a professor are eroding as the years go by," he said in an interview in 1990, but he remembered, "those magical, wonderful moments when I feel that I'm helping young people acquire a sense of awareness and wonder that will help them on their road toward a life of happy aspiration." A wonderful phrase, 'happy aspiration,' and the colleagues who worked with, and the students who learned from Bob will also remember moments in which he opened for them new ways of understanding and feeling and an enlarged sense of possibility. Submitted by Donald Gray, Emeritus Professor.

HANSON: Please stand for a moment of silence. Thank you. Agenda Committee business to attend to?

AGENDA ITEM #2: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS.

TERRY: Okay, first of all, as you know we've been fortunate the last few meetings to have Trustee Sue Talbot with us. She is with us again, but hiding in the way back there is another trustee, Trustee Philip Eskew, and so I'm glad you both could be here, and I will see you tomorrow at Indianapolis for the meeting of the master planners.

A few announcements from the Agenda Committee. First of all, students have a role to play in this Council and they have a role to play today. Issue #7, the "Discussion of issues relating to the Bookstore" came about because Luke Fields approached the Agenda Committee and me and wanted to bring a resolution to the council. Because Luke's resolution, if adopted, might lead some faculty to make some textbook decisions in ways that would be financially advantageous to students yet this semester, the Agenda Committee decided to bring it directly to the floor rather than to put it through any of our committees. So that's here today.

Also at your desks is a resolution from GPSO pertaining to item 8, and when the time comes, we'll recognize Nick and GPSO and they can explain their position on that issue. A couple things that are upcoming, I think. One, all the ballots have been submitted for the nominee process of the election of the Bloomington Faculty Council. The next step in that process is to tabulate the ballots and then start working through the list of nominees to see which of them will actually agree to run. So we're making progress on that. We will still meet the deadline, I think of having the election completed in the time provided in the bylaws of the BFC.

We will have to begin soon developing a campus policy for the distribution of the 15% of revenues from Intellectual Property that is provided for the campus in the Intellectual Property Policy we and the Trustees adopted some time ago. So we will be referring that to an appropriate committee and as soon as possible we'll bring to this Council proposals for how the campus should treat that 15% of revenue.

I thought I would alert you that we're trying something a little different in the University Faculty Council and it's sort of related to issue 7 a bit. When Congress reauthorized the Higher Education Act, it created a laundry list of things that institutions of higher education had to do. And not just institutions of higher education but things like bookstores that are associated with higher education. The university has begun the process of figuring out all the things that it has to do as a result of the Higher Education Act reauthorization. Simon Atkinson, the Indianapolis Faculty Council President, and I, we decided that we would ask representatives of the administration that are in charge of that to come and talk to the UFC about what's on the laundry list and what the university has to do and so forth. What we then imagine is that based on that presentation, the representatives from the various campuses will go back to their to their campuses and talk about those that seem to them to be specific on which we might want to get the administrations advice. Obviously, Congress has adopted the law, we'll have to comply with it, but there may be different ways of doing things. The university is studying that. We will do that as well. And I think that's all my comments.

AGENDA ITEM #3: PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS.

HANSON: Thanks, Herb. I want to keep my business short today too, partly because I have to leave early, but just to add a couple of things to what Herb said. The master planners are presenting a preliminary picture of what they've done so far to the Trustees tomorrow in Indianapolis. And in connection with that as we think about moving to new buildings in a time of economic austerity, we again have to make sure that we're using the buildings we have here as well as we possibly can. You should know that the Deans of all the schools have been asked to provide a complete inventory of their own uses of the buildings we have on this campus. We're going to make sure that we're using everything as well as we can. We are also in the first phase of the implementation of some new scheduling guidelines to make sure that we use our space as efficiently as we possibly can and that raises something just to head into the question and comment period. I didn't receive any questions ahead of time, but I received an email from Michael Hamburger, Associate Dean of Faculties, worrying about the classroom attendance next week before Thanksgiving. And there was some email back and forth suggesting that it might be useful for us to talk about this again. The calendar does have us holding classes next week. Students are evidently telling various professors, 'Nobody else is holding class.' (laughter) But everybody I know is holding class, and this may be a trick that a lot of us with adolescent children know about. (laughter) Jeanne, I think, reiterates each year that the classes are held on those days, right? Nonetheless, some faculty and in particular Michael Hamburger would be interested in having a broader sense around the campus about whether or not you want to revisit any of those issues about how the campus calendar works. As you know, you asked for something like that in the Spring of 2007 and we had a relevant committee, that is a committee made up of the relevant administrators and representatives from the various units come back with a report that suggested all of the desiderata that were mentioned by the Faculty Council could not be simultaneously achieved. Whether or not you want to pick out some of those now and think those are our highest priority and we need the Calendar Committee to look at that is something that you could take up now if you want to. I just want to mention again, it's on the minds of some of your colleagues and so if you want to revisit that, I think you should charge the Calendar Committee to do that. But for now, remember we are holding classes next week and we want to use all the space we have as efficiently as we can. Is there any discussion of that or are there any other questions or comments people want to make? No? Okay, on to the next order of business which is item #5, the resolution from the Diversity and Affirmative Action Committee. Is Professor Tanford here? Yes, hi Alex! This is a first reading.

AGENDA ITEM #5: RESOLUTION FROM THE DIVERSITY AND AFFIRMATIVE ACTION COMMITTEE ON GENERAL PETER PACE.

TANFORD: I'd also point out, that the popcorn has arrived. (laughter) You have before you on a piece of yellow paper a proposed resolution of the Bloomington Faculty Council that was passed by the Diversity and Affirmative Action Committee and is brought to you with a recommendation that it be adopted by the Faculty Council. As some background, this semester, the Kelley School of Business awarded a university honor called the Poling Chair of

Business and Government to a man named General Peter Pace. This decision and its symbolism was deeply offensive to our gay and lesbian community. For those of you who do not know the background of General Pace, he served on the Joint Chiefs of Staff and as either Vice Chair or Chair of the Joint Chiefs from 2001-2007. He therefore had responsibility for enforcing the 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell,' policy which, if you've never actually looked at it prohibits anyone who demonstrates a propensity or intent to engage in homosexual acts from serving in the armed forces of the United States or from speaking about his or her homosexual relationships. During his tenure, more than 5,000 members of the US military were dishonorably discharged for violating the 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell,' policy. In March of 2007, and the core of why his appointment is so offensive to the gay and lesbian community, during the course of an interview with the *Chicago Tribune*, General Pace equated homosexual behavior with immorality and said, "I believe homosexual acts between two individuals are immoral and I don't believe that the United States is well served by a policy that says it is okay to be immoral in any way and I would not want any degree of acceptance of gay behavior to be our policy." When this hit the press and there was some concern about it, he issued a follow-up statement in which he said, "I shouldn't have spoken of my personal beliefs to the paper." But he did not apologize for, retract, or in any way back off from his position, nor has he since then, that he equates homosexuality with immorality. We considered this because General Pace was not invited here as an ordinary invitation to a controversial speaker. We make it clear in the resolution, not only do we have no objections to bringing in speakers with controversial views, we think that that is highly appropriate, exactly what a university should be doing. Rather our concern was first, that he was given a university honor, a distinguished chair, and that elevates. He wasn't just invited here, he was honored by the university and that that makes it an issue for us to talk about. Secondly, no counter speaker or no speaker with any alternative view about military leadership was invited, though plenty are available. If those of you who read the *New York Times* this morning for example saw that a letter has gone to Obama signed by 100 senior military officers asking him to repeal the 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell' policy because they think it has not, in fact, served the military well. No military officer with similar leadership ability who believed to the contrary was invited. Also, when he was invited, the Kelley School announced that there would be no interviews allowed of General Pace and that none of his presentations would be open to the university community. They would be closed and open only to the business school. Now, for balance, the committee does note in paragraph one, that General Pace has a unique an otherwise distinguished record of leadership, and was qualified by his leadership, of course, to appear as part of the business school's leadership program. He was Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff after all, and we notice and note in paragraph five that the business school issued at least some kind of statement distancing itself from his views saying that the business school did not endorse them. They didn't exactly disown them, but at least they distanced themselves. Nevertheless, despite those two matters, the committee felt that his appointment and the awarding of the university honor was deeply offensive and insensitive to gays and lesbians and that formed the basis of this resolution. In the discussion, and particularly at the suggestion of Doug Bauder, we wanted to focus the resolution to make it constructive as to what to do rather than simply a kind of a criticism of the policy. And therefore in the first place, we distinguish in the resolution between the ordinary invitation of a speaker with controversial views and hold only that we thought it was inappropriate to award

him a university honor. And to award him a university honor under these conditions where his interview, where his presence here, is not open to the community and there is no guarantee that he would participate in any kind of open and meaningful dialogue. The whole reason for inviting speakers of controversial views to this university is that it allows the community to engage in such a dialogue and the Kelley School prevented that, or has so far. We understand that his appointment is in fact a two-year appointment and that he will be making periodic visits to campus. For that reason, we urge in this resolution that the Kelley School, in the future on his visits here, make up for this closed door policy and facilitate opportunities for the university, the campus, the Bloomington community to engage in dialogue with him, pointing out that efforts to date, although they did invite a few representatives of the gay and lesbian community to meet privately with General Pace, we do not believe that those efforts are sufficient to this date. Hence the resolution and the background of it, and obviously as with any first reading we appreciate people's comments, suggestions, discussions to decide whether or not the committee needs to go back and reconsider this, withdraw it, present it as is or do what.

HANSON: Thank you, Alex. Any discussion?

HORNE: Personally I'm bothered by this. I mean there are many details, you know, with which I sympathize but at the heart of the matter it seems to me what we're doing is trying to punish somebody for something they believe. And we can say that it's because, you know, that they don't have to be interviewed by the press or there's many other reasons, but essentially that's what we're doing. I am against capital punishment, for instance, in all cases. Both parties for which I could vote, primarily mainstream parties, have moved away from that position so I have nowhere to go and I kind of have to think of other issues when it comes to voting. I'm against that all the time, but I would never want to say that I wouldn't allow somebody on the campus, or that I would want them to only be allowed on the campus if they would answer my questions about that issue when they're not hired about that issue. They're hired about another issue, and if we were to have, you know, Donald Trump, here awarding this, we wouldn't know his feelings on a variety of issues because he did not occupy a position where he was pressed in the press and in front of Congress about those issues. To me at the heart of the matter, I understand why people would be offended, but what we're saying is 'you have to believe what we believe or we're going to make it hard on you.' That's not what we should be doing, and we certainly shouldn't be saying 'we're a university, we're open to all, we're open to diversity, but if you don't believe what we believe we're going to make it hard on you to come here or to get an honor from us or to do anything else.'

HANSON: Colonel Arnold?

ARNOLD: Yes, ma'am. As an *ex officio* member I'm not sure I can propose an amendment to this resolution. I would just like to highlight that under the 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell' policy, they do not receive a dishonorable discharge. There are only seven very specific incidents and I cite Army regulations 635-200, paragraph 5-4 where someone would receive something other than an honorable discharge and each one of those instances would also incur something than an

honorable discharge should they take place between a heterosexual couple. So the fact remains that they don't receive a dishonorable discharge and that makes all the difference in the world...

TANFORD: Can I ask what kind of discharge they do receive?

ARNOLD: What's that?

TANFORD: Can I ask what kind of discharge— I mean, what language should go in there? What kind of discharge do they receive?

ARNOLD: Well, I would just strike "dishonorable." They are discharged from service. They receive an honorable discharge unless it involves use of force, coercion or intimidation with a person younger than 16 years of age. A heterosexual relationship in these instances would also receive an other than honorable discharge. So they receive an honorable discharge.

TANFORD: We will make the correction.

HANSON: Any other comment or question?

BILES: Could I ask a question? I'm assuming that this appointment was made after General Pace made his comments.

TANFORD: Yeah, we have someone who's on the Diversity committee from the business school and we don't know when Dean Smith made the mental decision. The actual appointment was made after the *Chicago Tribune* story.

BILES: Okay, and it was a Dean's decision, and it didn't go any further than the Dean of the college?

TANFORD: Apparently this was a decision vested in the discretion of the Dean of the business school in as far as we know.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: What is the position of the members of School of Business, do you know?

TANFORD: Well it's a huge faculty. I can't speak for the whole faculty. I can tell you that the member of our committee who's from the business school was the one who insisted on, well not insisted, but was the one that helped us draft this as a positive resolution seeking to make sure that General Pace's visit is open and is engaging in exactly the kind of dialogue that we're talking about rather than is merely a kind of criticism, and that there was no dissent on the committee on proposing this resolution. It comes unanimously from the committee. It was a compromise between people who wanted to go off and condemn the visit altogether and those who, you know, felt that it should not be condemned, but should be turned into a positive

experience. That's about the best answer I can give. There are members of the business school here who may be able to address if there is some broader view on the part of the business school that we didn't know about.

CICCARELLI: Is it fair to assume that when the Dean of the business school made the decision, or the business school made the decision, I mean, they didn't have to beg? There is no vetting process I suppose to hire visiting professors or maybe they didn't know about all this. I mean about General Pace as a private person, but more as – I mean I'm just asking because, of course, it seems to me that if I were going to invite somebody as visiting professor I wouldn't necessarily know what are his or her opinions about private...

TANFORD: It is my understanding that as soon as General Pace's name was circulated that this issue was brought to his attention. I do not know in what detail.

HANSON: Other questions or comments?

SONI: I would like to pose this question. Was the faculty involved in the invitation? Yes, he made the appointment...

TANFORD: No.

SONI: ...but was faculty consulted in any which way?

TANFORD: Not according to our committee member in the business school...

SONI: Well what committee member? Do we know for sure whether any other faculty members were involved?

TANFORD: He does not know that – like other units, the business school has a Dean's advisory or policy committee and the member of our committee is not on that, and he did not know whether there were any private consultations between the Dean and other members of the faculty.

SONI: Has the committee gone back to the school to find out about how this appointment was made and whether the faculty was involved?

TANFORD: No.

SONI: Was that important?

TANFORD: No, because our intent was to address it to the future, to say that we want this visit turned into something positive and we didn't see that his motives or decision process was relevant.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: Well what moral authority will you have, will we have, in the future should similar things occur?

TANFORD: What moral? I'm sorry I'm a lawyer and not a philosopher and I don't understand the concept of moral authority. (laughter)

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: What can we do other than what you have recommended here? Just use moral suasion, is that all you're suggesting that we do?

TANFORD: I suggest that we use moral suasion coupled with an appreciation for the idea that we want speakers representing diverse viewpoints to be invited here. In recognizing the first point made, it was difficult for us to try to draft something that would make clear that what we drew was a distinction between an invitation to a person and the awarding of that person a distinguished university honor. We think higher standards are applicable to the awarding of university honor, because that is an endorsement of the person's beliefs, we think, or will be potentially viewed that way.

BILES: It seems to me as if the resolution kind of floats somewhere between the responsibility being placed upon General Pace and the Kelley School, and from the discussion here it seems like it's the Kelley School that should be the primary focus, the Kelley School and other colleges in the future, right? I mean it's using it as an example and I would maybe recommend that in the revisions that we make that it be worded slightly to reflect that.

TANFORD: That was our intention and I wonder if you have any suggestions.

BILES: Well I think in the resolutions on the back, well actually starting on the bottom of the first page, the final "Whereas," you know, you mention the Kelley School, but it doesn't seem as if you're putting responsibility on the school. You seem to be reacting more to General Pace's views which are intolerant and I would make the case as well, too, in response to Professor Horne that we don't have any requirement or responsibility to tolerate intolerance. Yes, you know a diversity of views is appreciated, but I think morally and ethically, you know, there's no requirement to tolerate intolerance and these views are intolerant. Personally, I'd like to see him dishonorably discharged from his, you know, appointment, but I guess that's not going to happen.

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: It's intolerant.

BILES: Yes.

MCCORMICK: Let me ask, has this been vetted with the Kelley School policy committee?

TANFORD: No. I'm not sure what you mean by vetted by them.

MCCORMICK: Well, I'm just curious that this strikes me that we're making as a campus body a dictate to that unit without inclusion, discussion, you know. I would be concerned in my school if I learned from the BFC something that we are being told we had to do without even knowing it was coming.

TANFORD: All I can tell you is we have a member of the business school faculty on the committee and we assume that if there were any concerns, that those would be communicated and that was our avenue of communication.

HORNE: I'm sorry, one other question and I recognize this is stretching it quite a bit. Certainly in the School of Music we have people that are just world renowned musicians all the time some of which are given titles and some of whom just come and give masters classes, things like that. We don't know their views on this issue or any other, because they were never in such a prominent, you know, position, but why is it different that it just happens that we know this issue. This issue is not what drove his appointment or what gave him this honor. It just happened that his previous appointment called upon him to answer questions regarding this. If Leonard Slatkin, you know, the world famous conductor is coming to join our faculty, we don't know what he thinks about anything, and we don't need to know. It just happens that we know.

TANFORD: I don't really have a response to your point, but certainly there are people who are highly distinguished in the music field, now many of them very elderly, if they're still alive at all, who had an active association at one point with Nazi Germany, where their views would be clearly known. And I guess we saw this as the equivalent of giving one of them a distinguished honor which would be hugely offensive to the Jewish community or that was the way we saw this. It's not that we thought we should root out the beliefs of people. It was that the symbolism was already there. General Pace had already made this public, widely circulated statement. It had been reinforced by the Pentagon on their own website when they declined to retract it or apologize or distance themselves from it. And so it was this – it goes back to Carolyn's comment – it came to the university already covered in symbolism, an anti-gay symbolism. It wasn't just that he happened to be Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff at a time when the 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell' policy was in force through none of his control because it was passed by Congress and he may or may not have conservative views. That was not the situation. It was the situation that the university honor is itself a symbolic act, and therefore must be understood in the context of the symbolism that attaches to it. So I think we saw it as a fairly limited resolution, one of which is not likely to be a common situation for our ordinary speakers and honorees.

HANSON: Luke?

FIELDS: I actually had a chance to speak with the general, and one of the things I asked him about was his recommendation to authorize force in Iraq, which he also did as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, and I guess what I'm perhaps concerned about with this body is there a line that's being drawn, that there are certain things that the faculty are willing to be concerned about but

not others? Is his view on that war, which is controversial in a different light, something that should also be addressed? And are we singling something out versus a whole host of things I think could be found to be controversial on this campus?

TANFORD: We are singling this out. We are the Diversity and Affirmative Action Committee, concerned about protecting the rights of minorities who are historically and currently, presently discriminated against and the gay and lesbian community is number one on that list. And that's the reason. This is like race a generation ago.

HARBISON: Will the School of Music have to stop programming Wagner?

TANFORD: Only if – no. (laughter)

HARBISON: I mean you see what I'm saying!

TANFORD: Are you planning on giving Wagner a distinguished university honor?

HARBISON: No, but I would say that a performance at the MAC is a fairly distinguished honor.

TANFORD: But that's the essence of the distinction. A performance at the MAC is an ordinary participation in the university process. If it is accompanied by Gwyn Richards coming out and giving the person a distinguished award, then it moves into a different level of symbolism and it is that second level that we are concerned about, not the first.

HORNE: Well actually I concur with the IUSA President I believe, what other issues then would be eligible to bar the person from receiving an honor?

TANFORD: I would say Wagner. I would not give him an honor, because it would be offensive to the Jewish community.

HORNE: No, General Pace. What other issues would rise to the level of us saying...?

CALLOWAY-THOMAS: President of the Ku Klux Klan.

TANFORD: If he were head of the Ku Klux Klan, I wouldn't give him an award even if he had retired as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and accepted a job as director of the Ku Klux Klan I would say that that should disqualify him from getting an university honor, not from coming and speaking.

HANSON: Paul?

EISENBERG: I understand your concern with university honor and symbolic importance. Pretty clearly nothing can withdraw that honor, which has already been extended to General Pace. I think the burning concern should be that some other person of renown should be brought to

campus. As I read the penultimate paragraph, you're expecting the Kelley School to look around and seek that person. I think this motion with which I'm quite sympathetic would be better if you changed the wording so that it doesn't fall to the Kelley School to provide that counterweight, but that that be provided somehow or other on this campus, so that people who happened to know about the publicly expressed views of General Pace will also be able to hear from some distinguished person who has...

TANFORD: And to whom then do you suggest this be addressed? We address on the bottom to university administrators, generally...

EISENBERG: That's fine...

TANFORD: ...to be sensitive to...

EISENBERG: ...but in the penultimate paragraph it's that, "We therefore believe..." that "the Kelley school should facilitate opportunities...to be interviewed...and to invite a speaker..." That's the Kelley School, that's going to invite...

TANFORD: No.

EISENBERG: ...and I don't know that that's really important.

TANFORD: No, no. That was put in there because he will be back several times over the next two years...

EISENBERG: Yeah, I know, I know, but I'm not sure that that's...

TANFORD: ..and that's a chance for them to undo some of the symbolism.

EISENBERG: Okay, if you want it, fine. I think that's...

TANFORD: If there were different language you could suggest, I would certainly entertain it.

EISENBERG: Well, I think that since it's asking for a person "of equivalent stature," whoever that might be, would be invited not necessarily by the Kelley School.

TANFORD: I guess that we would think that that would not address the issue that this Poling Chair in Business and Government was a unique award awarded by the business school and I mean I suppose you know Dan Smith could call somebody in Arts and Sciences who could find a similar distinguished honor, you know, a chair in something else and maybe that would balance things out, but we just didn't consider it and I don't know how you would – send me some language and we'll talk about it, I guess.

EISENBERG: Okay, another thing that may seem really an attempt at wordsmithing, but it does disturb me is what is claimed in the next to last “Whereas” on the first page where it said concerning “the statement equating homosexuality with immorality,” you know, again perhaps I’m misreading that phrase but I take that to mean that homosexuality equals immorality in the way that $2 + 2 = 4$, where surely that can’t be General Pace’s view. To me it’s the case that he identifies all homosexuality as immoral, in other words there are other things under the heading of immorality that presumably even General Pace includes.

TANFORD: Point taken.

EISENBERG: Okay.

HANSON: Daniel?

SLOAT: I just wanted to say first as a Kelley student I felt that the school did a very good job in distancing themselves. I felt that they were in no way in the wrong. They made very clear that they did not support his personal beliefs, and most importantly to keep in mind he was invited to and subsequently awarded for his leadership experience. He was not brought as a controversial speaker, not as someone who has a certain view. If that had been the case, then it would certainly be encouraged and, I think, appropriate to bring someone with an alternative view. So being someone extensive leadership experience, I don’t think it’s fair to put him in the same kind of light that calls for ‘where’s the other viewpoint?’ because being brought as a person with leadership experience the other viewpoint would be someone without leadership experience.

TANFORD: No, but these were both statements made in his role, in the same leadership role as leader of the military that brought him here. That was why we saw the connection and that there were plenty of other, you know, maybe not obviously - no one else who was at that time the most immediate past Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, but there are certainly other senior military officers or other people who could have been invited. We are not suggesting that they necessarily should have been, we are saying it’s just the process by which he was invited that gave him a unique position in which there was, by the way it was structured, with no interviews, not open to the public and no counterspeaker, that it made the kind of dialogue that we want as essential to university community not possible. The question was how to say that, I mean you know obviously our statement of that has been imperfect. This is a document drafted by a committee.

KENNEY: I feel like things have gotten rather all muddled here, because at times we’re talking about his personal views, at times we’re talking about his professional conduct, and that part of the problem is that as a leader he has overseen a policy which has been injurious to a large number of people. And I can understand how when we start talking about his personal views, especially when you start throwing in Nazi musicians, it gets so muddy that we all imagine a million a different possibilities. People whose views we don’t know, and should we find out and

so on... I feel like we're on much stronger grounds on his professional views and how they have, you know, called into question his ability as a leader...

TANFORD: This is all - let me make this quite clear...

KENNEY: ...Yeah, I know, but I feel like some of your responses have really come down, you know, to his personal views...

TANFORD: No, no.

KENNEY: ... some rest more on professional and maybe clarifying the difference between the two...

TANFORD: There is no...

KENNEY: ...and taking a stand based on one or the other.

TANFORD: He was the one who attempts to characterize these as merely personal views, and that's why to try to put in his version of it and put some balance is why those statements are in there.

KENNEY: Well then let me draw attention to the last line in the fourth paragraph on the first page, "General Pace's beliefs regarding homosexuality, which are grounded in his religious faith, reveal an inherent bias against homosexuality." Why are we bringing in his religious faith? I'm looking at the quotes that are above there and while I don't doubt that elsewhere in that interview he talks about his religious faith, he doesn't in what has been quoted here. And so now we're saying 'well, actually this has to do with religious faith,' but maybe they're excusing, that, you know, you have to understand this is religious faith or it maybe a complicating or whatever factor, but I'm not quite sure, you know, how do you put that in there. That's essentially saying 'we are interested in his beliefs.'

TANFORD: I would say the committee was persuaded by an argument made by some members of the committee that one could make a case that holding fairly extreme anti-homosexual views based on a particularly narrow interpretation of religion is itself a minority viewpoint...

KENNEY: But how is that relevant here?

TANFORD: ...and therefore needed to be mentioned in terms of the balance since we're the Diversity and Affirmative Action Committee and that we are concerned about religious discrimination as much as we are about discrimination against homosexuality.

KENNEY: This subordinate clause – it just really muddies things up a lot. If you want to make that statement then, you know, that's a whole other argument to make.

BURNS: As I read the statement above it though, he says, “I do not believe the United States is well served by a policy that says it is okay to be immoral” so he is taking his personal beliefs to his interpretations of policy and leadership.

TANFORD: Yeah, he was Chairman of the Joint Chiefs when he conducted this interview and the statement that he made was in a question regarding military policy, about the ‘Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell’ policy. Maybe that should be in here. Again, this thing started out about six pages long and we kept trying to condense and condense.

KENNEY: (remarks inaudible)

TANFORD: It was our intent to limit anything we said about why this was inappropriate to positions that he took and indeed was in a position to act on in the very military leadership role for which he was being invited.

HANSON: Nick?

CLARK: My point is a little bit outside, I think, the realm of the resolution and some of the principles that are being discussed here, but I think it’s something worth considering and that’s there seems to be a pretty large discussion happening on this campus right now and I know it’s a discussion I’ve been a part of in several different committees on how to best recruit minorities to come here and increase the diversity of the campus and I have to think that this is relevant to that, in that if we include minorities that we want to recruit as gay and lesbian students, the fact that we bestow honors on someone that makes these statements, whether they’re right, whether they’re wrong, whether it’s the place of the Faculty Council or the university to take positions on it, but that we’re bestowing honors on it from a very pragmatic point of view I would think that that could deter certain gay and lesbian students from attending this university which is the exact opposite of what the campus seems to want to do in its recruiting initiatives. And I think that’s got to be at least, you know, minimally relevant to an issue like this.

HANSON: Sue?

WHISTON: I have two things about it. The first one is minor I think in wording. You say in the fourth paragraph down, you know about where General Pace’s beliefs come from. I don’t think we can say that, because I would imagine his beliefs are quite complex and it’s hard to say what another’s beliefs (tape ends, comments inaudible) of the paragraph which is really, you know, documenting what he has said publically. The second thing that I looked at, I think what you said, this is a document that we will use in the future. We’re talking about the future, and so when you’re talking about inviting a speaker of equivalent stature I was thinking about, ‘okay, so if we invite someone controversial, we’ll always then have to find someone of equal stature?’ I mean, I think to meet the main issue and the one that I agree with is that there was not any chance for him to participate in open and meaningful dialogues, and I think that’s what

we want in a university is when we bring people in for there to be that opportunity and that was not there in this case.

TANFORD: Well we talked about that in the committee and our concern was that we thought there were lots of instances around the campus where speakers are brought in and really their only meaningful dialogue is with a subset of the community, with a department or a school. I mean it is not uncommon for them to be brought in and speak under conditions where they don't get interviewed by the press or it's not open to the public for all sorts of reasons. We've had several such incidents over the past few years some of which have made the local paper, and therefore if the intent was to say that it was the combination of circumstances this was neither open to the public nor was a speaker of equivalent stature invited. My personal view is probably either one of those alternatives would have been adequate. I don't know that we didn't take a position, the committee, whether open to the public was more important than equivalent stature. For example, we tried very hard to get as I recall one of the Presidential debates here. That would not have been open to us to raise hands, but would have had opposing viewpoints in an atmosphere that was not otherwise open to open dialogue with the community and would have benefited us because there were people of equivalent stature expressing different viewpoints. So I guess that we saw it as an either/or. I can go back and make sure that it is expressed that way if there is any confusion, but that wasn't what we intended.

HANSON: I think actually we're kind of approaching the end of time for this, but Herb?

TERRY: Okay, I wasn't on the (inaudible) subcommittee, but I hope you will consult with the faculty governance body of the School of Business. When we take this up again I would like to know what role they played in it, if any, and what their recommendations to the Dean were, what they think of it. The second thing is borrowing from my own experience in telecommunications, the Federal Communications Commission for a long time tried to enforce a kind of a fairness doctrine requiring that opposing views on controversial issues be presented by broadcasters. It eventually concluded that that backfired. That it had a chilling effect, and at least as a university we ought to think about that. The third thing I think is I think your second paragraph in your resolution does accomplish what you have in mind, in the sense that the first sentence is a general admonition to the campus. In the second sentence you say, "In these circumstances..."

TANFORD: Wait, I think I was on the wrong page.

TERRY: "Now therefore be it resolved..." Next to last full paragraph of the resolution.

TANFORD: Okay, the first resolution paragraph.

TERRY: The first sentence is a general admonition to the campus. It does not talk about inviting another speaker. It's only when you in the second half of that paragraph address what you want the School of Business to do, do you say we think the School of Business should find a

speaker of equivalent stature. So I think as worded it doesn't require equal stature just because we invite someone who's controversial or it leaves options.

TANFORD: There, right. I see. Thank you.

HANSON: I guess the other thing that's sort of relevant about that is why it would be useful to talk to the Kelley School. I for one am not entirely certain how this Poling chair operates, if these people are coming in to, you know as it were, do a class, perhaps you know, in which case there are issues about what that openness means and I know that General Pace did meet the next day with Doug Bauder and some other folks. We've talked about this, but it wasn't an open meeting. There was some dialogue.

TANFORD: Doug was happy about that and we had the input of Doug on this. He also urged this to be a constructive one of dialogue rather than sort of just a criticism, but the bottom line is that the Diversity and Affirmative Action Committee felt very strongly that the symbolism of this was bad and we needed to say something as a faculty or we're parties to discrimination against the homosexual community.

HANSON: I think the...

STERN: I might mention that even though this is a two-year appointment, it's not the typical professorship-type two-year appointment where he's there as a tenured full professor. He's only here for a short number of days and even though he's halfway through his appointment he's only going to be on campus in Bloomington three more days as part of this appointment and he'll only be in Indianapolis one more day as part of this appointment then the appointment is over.

HANSON: Well, yeah, I think this is a first reading. I appreciate the discussion and Alex...

TANFORD: Again I appreciate this, I'm Tanford you can find me at tanford@indiana.edu, that's my email. If anybody can put some of these comments more specifically into proposed alternative language or anything like that, I will greatly appreciate it and we'll put them together and we'll put something back out to the committee expressing the concerns expressed here as well as I can and that process will be made better if those of you who had concerns put them in an email and send them to me rather than have me paraphrase them. So I welcome those and if you can get them in in a few days I will get this back out to the committee.

HANSON: Thanks, Alex. I see we've been joined by another Trustee, the Student Trustee, A.D. King, and he's presumably interested in the next item on the agenda particularly. Could we take just a two-minute break because the popcorn wasn't here antecedently (laughter) and get back to work.

BRIEF RECESS

AGENDA ITEM #6: DISCUSSION OF ISSUES RELATING TO THE BOOKSTORE

HANSON: Let's reconvene, and our next item of business is the Discussion of issues relating to the Bookstore. Luke, you want to begin?

FIELDS: Sure. Good afternoon, many thanks to Herb for all his help and the Agenda Committee for kind of expediting this through the process. I've been doing some work with the bookstore and Vice President Dan Sloat over in IUSA kind of making some assessments of the true costs of textbooks. One of our big projects this year is actually kind of assessing the feasibility of the statewide push for some tax freedoms for textbooks ultimately hoping to reduce the textbook cost to students, and that's a pretty big undertaking, one that we're coordinating throughout the university system and around the state. And then as we were kind of going through this in some meetings with the bookstore it came up that also a little bit more close to home cost of textbooks occurs when faculty make their adoptions for future semesters of what texts they're going to use. And I understand through some conversations with faculty that oftentimes this is a bit of an arduous process and that information in terms of when these texts should be turned in by, when these requests need to be made by, etc... are often challenging especially in light of 'I need to evaluate this text for the next semester, and they want to have these dates in by October 1st,' that sometimes the burden on the faculty is extremely high in terms of getting this information turned in. And so I was intrigued by how this was happening and Dan and I decided it would best to sit down with the bookstore and find out exactly what is this process of textbook adoption on the students' perspective. What happens to students as a result of textbooks being adopted? And ultimately what happens is, let's say the Provost is going to be giving a class this semester and next semester in philosophy and she's going to use the same text next semester that she's using this semester, the bookstore wants to know that as early as possible such that they can buy those books back and ultimately resell them to students for the next semester because they know the demand is going to be certain. And so when faculty go about making these requests, the bookstore knows that we need to buy back a hundred copies of Hume or what have you for this next course, (laughter) and then the students have a better opportunity to purchase used texts which are generally much cheaper than a new text. What I found out through some research with the bookstore is just at Barnes & Noble, the new operator of the University bookstore, is that in the spring semester of 2008 almost \$500,000 was not paid back to students in buy back simply because textbooks and their subsequent adoptions weren't completed before buy back began. Now let me break that down for you, because it's a lot of money and I think ultimately if the faculty chooses to support this, this is a measure that will really put more money in the students' pocket, and I think without increasing a burden on any particular party too greatly. So going into the week of finals, dead week, like the latter half of dead week and then the week of final examinations, the bookstores are buying books back for the next semester. When that begins, the bookstore has a list. These are the courses for next semester. These are the texts that the faculty members are going to be using for the courses that we know exist, and this is on hand from the Registrar and from what I understand pretty open communication. If the bookstore does not have a text adopted for a particular course, perhaps the Provost's philosophy course, not that she would ever not adopt a text on time (laughter) the bookstore knows that we can buy back a hundred of these texts for

the next semester because this book is going to be used again. So there's not a lot of risk to the bookstore of buying product that they won't be able to sell and the students get more money back selling a used book back when they know that it's going to be used. So if my text that cost me fifty dollars that I can sell back for twenty-five dollars, I will get that full twenty-five back knowing that it will be resold in the subsequent semester. However, if the bookstore does not know that that text is going to be used, they may buy it back, but they will do it at what is referred to as a "wholesale buy back" where they'll give you five dollars for the book that you maybe paid fifty or a hundred dollars for. And you can just see students, I've watched it, it's actually happened to me a couple of times; you hand this book that you paid a hundred dollars for and they say 'We'll give you ten dollars for that.' And you just kind of look at them and you want to take the book and just drop it in the trash and say, 'No thanks. How is this book suddenly worth nothing?' To a certain extent this can be alleviated simply by students and faculty working together to make these adoptions as early as the faculty can such that the students can sell back the maximum amount of books that they can to put more money back in their pockets. When students get a chance to buy used books they cost less and they get more money back for selling them back. So in one semester just at Barnes & Noble students were not paid back nearly \$500,000 in texts that were subsequently adopted, which means had they been adopted on time that money would have been put back in students' pockets. This isn't a case of courses that suddenly appear or that books were later added that we didn't know about, but that these were texts that could have been anticipated to have been used, books used from one semester to the next, that simply were not turned in on time this the week before final examinations. I've heard lots of confusion on behalf of the faculty that, "Well we think that the bookstore usually says October 1st, that's a very early date for such an adoption to be made," and I recognize that. I don't even know what I'm taking yet by October 1st and I can't imagine that the faculty are equally prepared for their instruction for the subsequent semester, but I believe that if faculty could have these adoption requests ready for the next semester by the time dead week rolls around that a substantial amount of money could be returned to the students in terms of putting more money in their pockets from buy back. As of last week 11/07, I guess maybe that was ten days ago, with five weeks to go in the semester, 43% of announced courses that were going to use a textbook or were anticipated to use a text had been adopted. At IUPUI that same number was 61%. I think that there's certainly, even within our own university system, a bit of a disparity in terms of – now, equally IUPUI has some 3,000 more courses than are offered here in Bloomington and I recognize that there's a course disparity – but 43% with much less than half of the semester remaining, knowing that with the week of Thanksgiving and approaching holiday break, that everyone's schedules are only getting crazier, it's concerning to me that on behalf of the student body that a substantial amount of money is going to not be returned to students that could be, equally recognizing that the cost of higher education is only getting higher and that in these, I would say, concerning economic times, on behalf of the students we would request any help that the faculty can offer us in terms of making an IU education as affordable as it can be. And so, somewhere meeting in the middle, this to me seems like a resolution that gives the faculty an opportunity to say 'we support and recognize the high cost of education to students,' and that my hope is that this is a request that all of you can view as, I think, genuine and reasonable in that my hope is that these are texts that the faculty know that they will be using in semesters to come and just on my

behalf a friendly reminder to please help us out where you can. I think that's really everything that I wanted to cover here. I do know that, assuming that this governing body would have an interest in adopting this resolution, I believe that this is an issue that the university faces across all eight of its campuses, and this is something that Dan and I think would be well suited to take to the All University Students Association, the Advisory Board, kind of to the Student Trustee. A.D. and I have had a handful of discussions on the matter and believe that this is something that could affect across the Indiana University system, and one that, bringing it to the Bloomington Faculty Council first, I believe this is an opportunity for this body to take some leadership on the subject and show a commitment to lowering the cost of higher education where we all can work together. So with that I'd be happy to answer any questions. Yes?

PRATT: Luke, I'm quite sympathetic about the cost of books. I have a daughter in college right now, but I also think that we need to put some pressure on the bookstore itself, because one of the reasons for outsourcing to a corporation that holds many of the largest bookstores in the nation was that we should in some way benefit from the fact that if they know that book's going to be adopted by a significant number of classes on other campuses, particularly for a class that we might not offer every semester but might be offered someplace else in the Barnes & Noble network, then there shouldn't be this policy necessarily that the book has to be reused on this campus for the student to get that buy back. I mean this should be negotiable and I think this is fine in terms of the sense of it, but I think we need to turn around and say one of the reasons we went with that particular company was that we were supposed to be somehow advantaged by their network and by their buying power. Great! They're using their network to get buying power, but they're not turning around and using they're network to give us buy back power. So I think we need to pursue that a little bit.

FIELDS: I think that makes a lot of sense. My concern and my hope in this resolution is, from what I understand and from the reading that I've done and lot of what I've heard from other campuses, is that faculty adoption rates are frequently problematic on lots of campuses and so I think equally that Barnes & Noble as the university bookstore I would hope would be sympathetic to leveraging that network. Equally, they need to know on any campus what texts are going to be used for that network to be valuable. And so I think that's just an opportunity for this faculty to take the lead and say, 'This isn't going to start, unless somebody does.'

PRATT: Yeah, I just think it's a little bit of a ruse for Barnes & Noble to say they don't know which books are the books that tend to be used for particular courses. They've got the statistics, they know full well and what they're doing is saying 'well great, we're going to get these books back. We're going to pay almost nothing to the IU students.' They know full well that that book's going to be used on one of the other campuses where they have one of their bookstores and they're going to make a monumental profit so I think it is not just the faculty who are the problem here. I think the bookstores themselves are part of the problem.

FIELDS: Yes?

ARNOLD: I have a question. My courses are only offered like once a year. I mean does the course have to be offered the very next semester? Many courses are only offered every third semester. I mean does it have to be offered the very next semester to get the full buy back value?

FIELDS: From what I've learned from Barnes & Noble, I think that is the framework that they operate under. That if it can't immediately be turned around here, that it will go back to the wholesale.

ARNOLD: I think that's another kind of ruse, but I'm sure they're going to keep that thing in storage for you know it's offered every third semester or every other semester, you know. They aren't going to throw that book away, I mean.

EISENBERG: Yeah.

HOOK: And in a similar vein, I believe the bookstore's deadline for fall semester's adoptions is sometimes in the summer which would be too late to be of use to someone selling at the end of the spring semester.

FIELDS: Yeah, can you say that again? I just want to make sure I heard that correctly.

HOOK: The bookstore's deadline for faculty to submit fall semester adoptions is sometime during the summer after the end of the spring semester so that would be of no help to a student selling textbooks at the end of the spring semester.

FIELDS: And so to that what I'm hoping for here is if faculty could submit that before we all go home for summer vacation.

HOOK: Which is long before they tell us.

FIELDS: Yes.

R. ARNOLD: I can only speak to the Chemistry department, hopefully other departments are a little more organized than us, but in many cases, we don't know who the instructor is prior to the textbook deadline. So I think it would be difficult to across the board implement a policy that would even just encourage faculty to do that, but I think what we do know is what textbooks will be used in the largest attended lectures, the largest lectures. So probably for 80% of our textbooks we know what those will be, you know, a year in advance. So I don't know, and your statement sort of says to maximize the efforts, but I think in terms of practically doing that, to let people know, and we know from our undergraduate office to order these textbooks, if you can get us to 80% capacity, not necessarily all the specialized, higher number courses, but the lower level courses where we have large enrollments, get those in on time, I think that is something would be much more easily doable than trying to do it across the board for all courses. But I encourage your efforts.

TERRY: Luke, I wonder if you can clarify something I think you told me earlier. I think your meetings with the bookstore suggest that if faculty even this semester got orders in by December 1, that the bookstore would pay higher rates...

FIELDS: Exactly.

TERRY: So the October deadlines are not really the ones the bookstore enforces, it's probably what they would prefer. Generally by the time you get that near the end of the semester you've figured out who's going to teach most of your classes for the following semester (laughter) so I hope we could do that. The second thing is that Professor Pratt is right. There are concerns about the bookstore all over this system. I got an email this morning from a faculty member at IU Southeast where the bookstore apparently means its October 1st deadline, and so I think the University Faculty Council and its groups will be taking a look at how the contract across the state has played out and we would welcome any observations that you have or other faculty have like Professor Pratt of things that we expected to get out of the contract and aren't getting.

HANSON: Paul?

EISENBERG: I want to make the point that (inaudible) it's not just that we should know that certain courses are offered, let's say, every third semester or only in the Fall, but we should make sure that people at the bookstore have that information so that again if we take an example from the Department of Philosophy, we know that with very rare exceptions a course in ancient Greek philosophy is going to be offered every Fall and not otherwise. The bookstore should know that, and it's highly probable that if not the same text will be used at least there will be a very large overlap in the choice of text so that confining this just to a semester is excessively narrow and may be playing to the business interests of Barnes & Noble, but to the disadvantage, clearly, of students and perhaps faculty alike.

HANSON: Professor Horne?

HORNE: I'm all in favor of this, but I would just like to see that the resolution part at the end of "Therefore" be strict, and I'm wondering if the deadlines are uniform, you know, for every semester, December 1st every Fall and, I don't know, April 1st every Spring or something like that so an actual date – I mean, I'm just trying to see myself as a faculty member not as a member of this Council reading, you know, the IDS that this resolution was passed and it just wouldn't stick with me at all. I mean frankly I would love to see the IUSA email us a week before April 1st and a week before December 1st every semester. (laughter)

FIELDS: We'll be happy to email you!

HORNE: Well, not for me! (laughter)

FIELDS: I was concerned about putting a hard date in there mostly because I know, in my personal experience, if a date passes I feel like it's already too late to do anything so I won't do it. (laughter) So I didn't want to put faculty back in a similar position where if October 1st is the Fall deadline and in November we're only at 43% I wonder how many faculty members knew they had missed it and 'okay it makes no difference now or January 1st, either way I'm late.' And so, ultimately what I've understood from the bookstore is they will make adoption requests during buy back, like the week of dead week and the week of exams if someone will just give them the information. And so I didn't want to put a hard date in there because I want to encourage this up until the very last. If we had to put a date I would want it to be the Friday of dead week, just so that there is as much possible time during the course of the semester that faculty can, because from what I understand the bookstore can juggle that, if they just get the information.

HORNE: Well the only concern I have is that, just speaking for myself, if I get an email from the bookstore or from, you know, frankly, no disrespect intended, but from, you know, those above me to do this. It goes on the list of the bazillion other emails that I get with instruction for that. If it comes from you and says I am in serious trouble and you could save me some money by just doing this little thing on your to-do list now as opposed to later I personally would be more prone to do it. Most of my friends would be more prone to do that, and the deadline, a date, I understand your point, but for me I really have to have that date.

FIELDS: If we included holiday greetings would that be fun, too? (laughter) Absolutely.

HANSON: I think that's right and that was the spirit of the resolution coming from IUSA, that they wanted the faculty to know there is this issue and I'm not sure all faculty do realize this, but it's not just a campus issue. It's a national issue, and we may have our various issues with the bookstore operations right now, but it is part of why part of the Higher Education Reauthorization Act had a stipulation that at the first time course schedules were published faculty had to include the ISBN number of the texts that would be used. And now it appears that that won't be written into the rules so that we actually are not going to have to comply with that, because it is very difficult to see how that could operate. But this is a matter of our students urging us to be mindful of what we could do to help them out and I just suspect that there is no one who doesn't want to do that.

PRATT: I really appreciate that you came up with that fact that we adopted books that would have resulted in a half a million-did I get that number right?

FIELDS: Yes, ma'am.

PRATT: Five hundred-thousand? I mean that's a staggeringly large number and I would never have guessed it that high, and I think that's what really gives me a gut level reaction. We have got a big problem here and we have got to figure out how to solve it, and this is a wonderful thing that you brought it to our attention in a way that we can react to it.

HANSON: If I may say so too, one of the things that the campus is always very careful about is sending out e-mails on various things to all the faculty. But, something that might be a helpful addition to this resolution is the authorization to send an e-mail to all the faculty that might be coming from IUSA. Just a thought.

CAPSHAW: Luke, I've got a question. What's the differential between the wholesale buy back and the, you know, full price buy back?

FIELDS: From what I've heard, and we spoke about generalized text, but Barnes and Noble, from what they told me, they can give up to half of the purchase price back on a used book or a new book that's now used. The wholesale buy back is something like a tenth of that.

HANSON: Any further discussion? Any, did you want to move this in the form it's in right now?

FIELDS: I guess I was equally interested in, if the faculty would support it, some kind of approval of IUSA's taking the leadership of this, of contacting the faculty once a semester as a reminder. My fear would be, or my hope would be that that wouldn't be one more e-mail that just gets deleted. I suspect that wouldn't be true but I know I frequently get e-mails that just are deleted. And I wouldn't want to create that burden, but if that's something the faculty would be receptive to, I would be more than receptive to adding that into the resolution.

HORNE: I would support that as long as it's completely narrowed to this one issue.

FIELDS: I concur.

HORNE: I don't need to know when a special event at Kilroy's is going on or something.

HANSON: Okay, is this in a form where you can vote on it now. So, the resolution is as stated here but with that addition that IUSA is authorized to send a very narrowly focused e-mail on this topic to faculty once a semester? Is that okay? Alright, all in favor? [Aye] All opposed? No abstentions. Unanimous. Alright, the last item of business today is the recommendation of the Faculty Affairs and Research Affairs Committees concerning the reporting line for the Dean of the University Graduate School, and the relationship of the Graduate School to the office of the Vice President for Research. Steve and Jonathan, do you want to make a statement?

AGENDA ITEM #8: RECOMMENDATION OF THE FACULTY AFFAIRS AND RESEARCH AFFAIRS COMMITTEES ON THE REPORTING LINE FOR THE DEAN OF THE UNIVERSITY GRADUATE SCHOOL AND RELATIONSHIP OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL TO THE OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT OF RESEARCH.

BURNS: Our two committees, in response to the President's State of the University Address held a joint meeting and invited Provost Hanson, Vice Provost for Research Soni, Dean Wimbush and Vice President Applegate to join us. And, basically we discussed the formation of this new office in two primary areas. One is sort of operational and the other was the relation

of the Graduate School to the Vice President for Research. In the past, the Graduate School had been a part of the Office of the Vice President for Research as I understand it. That was changed during the changing in the reporting lines and the creation of the Provost a few years ago, but never really permanently changed but meanwhile the Graduate School has been reporting to Executive Vice President Hanson in her administration role, not the provostial role. So we talked about this relation. Should the Graduate School be rolled back in under the Office of the Vice President for Research or should it remain in its current status? And, really, there wasn't a lot of dispute on the topic, even though the Graduate School is closely related to research, there was pretty much consensus that this new office has a lot to handle these days. It's got to handle all of the issues that have sort of caused some consternation on campus related to compliance and research compliance. It's got the broad university initiatives in research to deal with, and it's got the Life Science Initiative as part of that also being rolled in. Yet the Graduate School has sort of a different agenda and set of responsibilities. They are accepting responsibilities for the graduate education, curricular uniformity, ethical issues for training and graduate students, and they are separable enough that basically, in that role, there wasn't any strong feeling that it should return into the Vice President for Research. In that sense, we are bringing a recommendation of those two committees, that the BFC just recommend to the President, that the Graduate School remain in its current reporting role. We also discussed some of the issues related to the creation of the office, well it's not creation I guess, it's recreation of an office of Vice President for Research, and the general theme there was we wanted to just urge there that as that office is recreated and as it grows, that there really be good communication between campuses and between the research community and this office, because we feel there have been some lapses in communication that have created some of the problems like with human studies or with proper investment in animal facilities, things like that. And so it's important that that office exist and it exist in the milieu of the faculty and their needs. So what we're bringing for discussion here is that the Bloomington Faculty Council recommend that the Graduate School remain in its current reporting situation.

HANSON: Thanks, Steve. Any discussion of the recommendation? No?

TERRY: I thought I would add that Simon Atkinson of IUPUI and I meet monthly with the President, and we just met with him a couple hours ago, and we informed him that on both of our campuses actually, committees were recommending that the structure remain the way it is. They haven't had a discussion at IUPUI that we are having today yet. What I can tell you is I think the President is quite open to whatever it is that the faculty proposes, and will take it very seriously, and probably, will follow our recommendations if they are well supported. And John Applegate expects to hear from me soon after this meeting so I can pass our recommendations, if we have any, along.

HANSON: Any discussion? Lisa?

PRATT: James is in a meeting and is the current Dean. Would he perhaps comment on this, or can we invite him to comment?

WIMBUSH: Sure, my view is very much consistent with the resolution that came before the committee. I've had many discussions with various individuals including Karen. I've also talked to the President. Yesterday I had time to talk to Charles Bantz at Indianapolis and I don't know, oddly for some reason, I was thinking that Charles might have a different view, but the first thing he said to me was, "when I was at Arizona State, when I had the first opportunity to separate the Graduate School from research, I took that opportunity," and his point was, as the point that many of us have made, is that when the Graduate School is within research, it gets lost. In many institutions where there is the Graduate School and research, I often hear from my counterparts, that, quite frankly, I often see, at various professional meetings, the Associate Deans, I never see the actual Dean because he or she is often consumed with research types of obligations. I think that the relationship the Graduate School has to the Executive Vice President is one that has worked, is one that I think serves not only this campus but IUPUI, the other campus as well, and so I strongly endorse keeping the relationship as it is now.

HANSON: Other discussion?

CLARK: The GPSO passed a resolution, or the GPSO Assembly passed a resolution on Friday which is in front of you, and you know I think it basically makes several arguments that were made in the meeting of the two BFC committees that had been discussed before, but it was passed with near unanimity, and there is, I think, a lot of support for keeping it separate. The only thing I would note is the resolution itself goes maybe one step further in arguing that reflecting the recent reorganization of the Dean of Faculties, if we want to indicate the importance of graduate education on the IUB campus, it would be valuable not only to keep the UGS separate, but to maybe, in sort of a symbolic gesture, recognize it not only as a university Graduate School serving graduate education on all campuses, but also as an office for graduate education specifically on the IUB campus, and that Dean Wimbush, or whoever was serving in the capacity as Dean of the University Graduate School would sort of be recognized also as sort of a Vice Provost for Graduate Education; given that the recent reorganization is going to create those positions for undergraduate education and faculty affairs and several of the other functions performed on campus. But that is just sort of one step beyond, I think, what everyone else has sort of agreed on.

HANSON: But I haven't been in touch with James about that, so we'd have to have some kind of discussion. Is there additional discussion from the Faculty Council? Are you bringing this then, as an action item that you would like a vote on? Okay, it's moved and seconded from the two committees. If there is no further discussion; all in favor? [Aye] Opposed? Abstentions? Well, it passes unanimously then and we are adjourned.