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1. Approval of Minutes
March 27, 2007
http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/AY07/minutes/03.27.07.htm

2. Presiding Officer's Business (10 minutes)
(President Adam Herbert)

3. Agenda Committee Business (10 minutes)
(Professors Theodore Miller and Bart Ng)
AGENDA ITEM #1: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

HERBERT: I would like to call the meeting to order. I think we have everyone that’s going be here on our various sights outside of Indianapolis. Call the meeting to order and ask first if there are any corrections to the minutes of the March 27 meeting. If not I’ll assume that they are approved.

AGENDA ITEM #2: PRESIDING OFFICER’S BUSINESS

HERBERT: My comments are really very limited today. Let me just tell you that we last week as all of you know I did send an e-mail message to all members of the university community and specifically a letter to the president of Virginia Tech voicing the feelings of concerns that all of us and the Indiana University family have for the faculty, students, and staff at Virginia Tech. I’m just very pleased that on several of our campuses there have been vigils and other moments of silence out of respect for those who lost their lives.

Let me also tell you that we are now engaged in a process of reviewing all of our emergency preparedness plans and strategies on each of the campuses. I have asked each of the chancellors to send to me a comprehensive set of all of their plans, all the strategies. I’ve formed a special committee that is going through those. We’re going to try and get a sense as to whether there are
any void areas that we need to address. We’re looking also at new technologies that might help us to more rapidly disseminate information. I think the other part of this is that we do have an obligation to look at ways in which we handle situations in which concerns are raised about someone who is within the University community, obviously respecting there rights but if there are issues, concerns that are raised, we need to have very clear policies that are in place that guide us relative to how we are going to deal with may be problem situations at a personal level. So what we’re doing is reviewing our policies related to those matters as well and that will continue over the course of the next several weeks and then we will come back to the chancellors and talk with them and then broaden the discussion more formally or more extensively as we get into the fall.

As all of you are aware there are a whole host of technologies that are now available a reverse 9/11 and other technologies we need to take a look at to determine if they are appropriate for us on all of our campuses. We’ll keep you informed of that but I just want to give you a sense as to what we’re doing going forward to try to assure that we are where we need to be. We have posted all of the emergency plans on our IU website or at least with the links to those. One of the things that we discovered I got several e-mails indicating that we didn’t have the address or the website for our Columbus program so that was buried within the IUPUI documents so we pulled that out and that should be online now. That was the only unit that was not readily apparent in terms of being able to go to the website to take a look at emergency plans. My assumption is that they will be fleshed further, and I’m working with Michael McRobbie on this, we want to make sure that this summer we’re able to fine tune this to a much higher level of effectiveness so that when we come back in the fall we’ll be able to report on how we’ve fleshed this our further.

Other thing that I would share with you is that we’re now in the final hours of the legislative session and are monitoring very closely the budget process so they are in conference and we continue to be hopeful that the legislature will be supportive of the several initiatives that we’ve put forward. Again so far things do look very positive you just can’t tell obviously until the session is over. Thus far if things go as we hope they will, this will be a very good year for Indiana University overall. There were a couple at least one campus that had some problems and I think we’ve been able to fix that. We still are optimistic with regard to support for inflation, R&R money is obviously extremely important to us, and again members of the conference committee are holding things pretty close to the desk but we have, in terms we have heard, we have not been alarmed thus far. So again as soon as we get the final information and we will know something by the end of the month assuming that they don’t want to go into special session, and I haven’t heard anything up to this point that would suggest that that’s likely to happen. So we’ll know something very shortly, and we’ll have a presentation for the Board of Trustees at the meeting next month relative to how we have fared with regard to the request that has been made.

Let me also just tell you that we’re working now on the timing for the supplemental board meeting that will be held in the month of May. That will be for the purpose for establishing tuition rates for our campuses and programs. We’re going through that process right now, taking a look at needs. We have had all the deans involved in the conversations in the campuses and that information is now coming to us at the university level. We’ve had feedback prior to that but we’re trying to get everything wrapped up so that we’ll be in a position to have that hearing.
What we’re required to do, we can’t hold it before the 10th of May so it will be somewhere probably toward the middle or end of the month. What we’re required to do is to publish in advance the level of increase and also the purposes for which the money will be used. Then we have to hold a hearing relative to that report that we publish. I think it’s either 10 days or two weeks prior to the meeting. So that’s why we’re going through all this at this point and one of the things that obviously is critical is how we fair with regard to the ultimate amount allocated by the legislature; whether or not we get plant expansion money and those sorts of things. That’s a particular issue here at IUPUI so again we’re trying to develop some models that will enable us to deal with multiple issues. The major concern from the legislative perspective continues to be residential undergraduate tuition. Some of the trustees have also asked us to be prepared to talk about the amount of loans that students are taking out so that when we make the presentation the board will also include information about that so that the trustees will have a broader understanding of what the impact might be students. We also have been collecting data on peer campuses and academic units so that we have that as a context for the discussions as well. We’ve already dealt with some of the housing issues. We’re still waiting for IUPUI with regard to that. Bloomington we have dealt with. So pretty much I guess we still have some mandatory fees also that will be part of this. My assumption again is that sometime in May, we’re still trying get all the dates on the calendars for the trustees, it probably will be somewhere after the 18th or 20th in that time frame. It’s cutting close in terms of the units then being able to get budgets and so we’re sensitive to that, but we really have no choice but to do it in that context. So that concludes my report.

One last thing, I was really pleased that we were able to announce a few days ago here in Indianapolis a gift of 30 million dollars from Gene and Marilyn Glick to create an Eye Institute to the School of Medicine. That gift is broken up. 20 million dollars is for construction for a new facility and 10 million dollars for an endowment. They have been very generous to the University. They are very supportive of the School of Medicine. I was kind of joking a little bit, but when I made a start off with the announcement, it was a gift of 36 million, oh I’m sorry 30 million and he started laughing and I just wanted to make sure you were listening Gene. He said “well you ain’t seen nothing yet”. So I was very pleased to hear him say that. Both of them are just wonderful people. For any of you who may happen to see him in Indianapolis, I think continued expressions of our appreciation to him would be particularly appropriate. Now let me turn to Ted for a report from the agenda committee.

AGENDA ITEM #3: AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS

MILLER: Thank you very much, President Herbert. I really don’t have much to report to you of a substantive nature today. I really just want to take this opportunity to thank all of you who have served on the University Faculty Council this year and the preceding year. This is my last University Faculty Council meeting. I think it’s fair to say. Some of you know I am going to be retiring as a faculty member at Indiana University I think on May 31st is my official date of retirement. I will not ever again come and sit at a University Faculty Council meeting. I do want to thank all of you who have contributed your service to the University in this way. Just speaking personally, I have found tremendous satisfaction in working within the faculty council framework both on my campus and here at the university level. I am absolutely convinced, I’ve been a member of the Indiana University faculty now for 32 years, and I am absolutely convinced
that if this body did not exist that we would be looking today at a very, very different Indiana University from what we now experience and hopefully enjoy. It’s commonplace to wonder whether the UFC has any real effect on anything and on a day to day basis it’s sometimes kind of hard to sense that the UFC really does have an effect on anything. But over 30 years it is very, very clear to me that this University has been profoundly affected by the University Faculty Council and I think in almost all cases for the better. So I again thank you very, very much for your service to this Adam and I hope you find it and have found it as fulfilling as I have. (Clapping) You’ve never done that for me before.

Now the only other thing I want to say here today is that I know you’ve all received an invitation. President Herbert has graciously has invited us to a dinner this evening at the Lilly House. I think it starts at 6:30. Is that correct? 6:00. I just really encourage all of you to make an effort to attend that. I’m sure it’s going to be a very fine event and we’re very grateful to President Herbert for his invitation. Speaking again personally, maybe I’ll have a chance to say some more of this tonight, but I think I probably have seen as much of President Herbert as anybody over the course of these past four years. I’ve been a member of the UFC Agenda Committee through the entire period that Adam has been with us and I really appreciate a very long list of things he’s done for the University. I believe that he is leaving Indiana University in much, much better shape than it was when he arrived, and I think that is the mark of an administrator. I hope you have the same views Adam, and I hope take pride in it because I think you really should. I’m very appreciative of many of the things that you’ve done and I really applaud you, I think, because there was a point in time where it seemed like faculty was attacking you in a rather unsubtle way. Through all of that in the end, I think we now have a University that really is much better off than it was before you came and I really do appreciate this. This is a very sincere expression of thanks to you. (More Clapping) Well anyway so I encourage you all to attend tonight’s, well I’ll think of it as a gala.

HERBERT: Well actually I really do hope that as many of you as possible will join us. I wanted to use this as an occasion tonight to thank Ted and also welcome Bart back into a role that he’s very familiar with and finally to thank all of you for your service to the University. I know that some of you are not going to be able to join us because you’re in other places. This has been a wonderful experience for me. It’s been extremely rewarding. Ted and I really have had many conversations over the past couple of years in particular and the only thing I still haven’t adjusted to is how quite and shy he is and how unwilling to articulate some of his views, notwithstanding all of that, but there are so many matters on which we agree relative to what has to be done to strengthen the University. I told Ted that since he was going to be retiring, I’m going to step down as president also. (Laughter) I didn’t want to serve with anyone else. Ted I just want to tell you publicly as I have privately well say a little bit more tonight about how much I’ve enjoyed working with you as well and the University is really going to miss you. I have something for you, but I’ll wait and give it to you tonight. So those of you that aren’t going to be there you aren’t going to see what it is that he gets.

AGENDA ITEM #4: QUESTION/COMMENT PERIOD

HERBERT: Let me now see if there are any questions or comments that any one has. Marty.
SPECHLER: One of the nicer ceremonies we have at Indiana University and a chance that all of us will have to express our appreciation to President Herbert for all the things he’s done for us is the installation of the new president. My question is Adam whether a decision has been reached when that installation ceremony will take place.

HERBERT: That will be announced by, I refer to Michael McRobbie as 18 since he’s the 18th president, and I think they’re going to be announcing some of that shortly. It’s not appropriate for me to do it, but I think they will be making an announcement shortly.

SPECHLER: Probably in the fall some time?

HERBERT: Yes, that is correct.

MILLER: If I could just interject here. I just am recalling a conversation that Bart, President Herbert, and I had at the last trustee meeting I think we were just kind of standing there and talking. The President was making reference to this idea that Michael McRobbie is the 18th president, and he was referring to him as 18. Adam is the 17th president and he was talking about himself in terms of 17, and Bart reminded the President that 17 is a prime number. So the President now sees himself as being prime. (Laughter)

HERBERT: Being prime. I also must tell you that I really do feel fortunate. I’ve had the opportunity of working with David, Mary, Bart, and now Ted and all of them have just been wonderful colleagues to work with. So I just feel very fortunate to have had the privilege of working with outstanding co-chairs like them. Other questions or comments? Hearing none this is our last meeting.

MILLER: This is our final meeting yes. The final opportunity to question.

HERBERT: Okay Bart.

NG: I just want to actually make a rather sad announcement. I was reminded of this by some of my colleagues. Many of you know Henry Besch who has been a member of this body on many, many occasions for many, many years. Henry passed away rather suddenly approximately four weeks ago. I just want to share that with you. It is a really great loss to this party as well as to our campus. Thank you.

HERBERT: Thanks for sharing that with us.

AGENDA ITEM #5: ANNUAL DIVERSITY AND AFFIRMATIVE ACTION REPORT

HERBERT: Let me know turn to Julie Knost and ask her to provide her annual Diversity and Affirmative Action Report to the council. Julie.

KNOST: First of all I want to thank you for inviting me here and giving me time on the agenda to actually speak. I usually end up at the last meeting, the last item and I’m trying to rush through the report and I’ll try to be careful this time today too.
The second thing is I passed out a report that you can’t lose on your desk, because it’s one of the brightest colored documents. We have President Herbert to thank for that. I want to tell you today that what I’m doing is and this report includes breakdowns across the campus in regard to the current state of their faculty and in regard to the state of women and minorities. Let me start by talking about some of the data sources and that is, each year on October 1st we run a master file that ___ across the years and good for the entire university and across campuses. What I have done in this report is also provide additional information that comes from the ____ report. For those that aren’t familiar with that, it is from the US Department of Education and is the primary source that is used for data collection across universities.

In this report, I have tried to provide campus by campus information and then also peer institution comparators and national average comparators in this text. So I want to start out briefly today talking about the national trends. Women in the faculty across the nation have shown steady increases in both the total national profile and at almost all campuses and across almost all ranks. This is partly because, if you look at a pool of sources for recruits into the faculty you often see substantial increases at all degree levels both in PhD production and graduate enrollment in hiring, and in a number of years rank within the profession which regards to promotion and retention. That is really quite _____ because it has been steady for about 1% increase over a steady number of years now so that it looks like we are beginning to have some proportionality and tipping points going on. I would say that the same is true in certain subfields. I am just going to throw this out there and that is now what we are seeing in areas like law and medicine that for years have—I mean, when I graduated from law school, women still made up about 7% and they are up to about to 40% of law schools. Now that you are seeing substantial number of pools of women in particular in those fields, they are also minorities. So we are getting to a point that the pool of available people both joining the academe and also practicing professions is increasing.

Distribution is still a fairly serious concern especially in the stem areas. That is in biotechnology, engineering, and math. And one of the things that I think is quite interesting, there nationally is that engineering is pulling out ahead of the other areas. And that is engineering, both in terms of administrative appointments of women in the deans and administrative positions is showing substantial gains and in terms of degree production. But not math and not physics. I think it is interesting because I know that engineering, math, and physics are not the same, but to the extent that we argue that some of the fundamentals of math and science backgrounds, especially at high school levels, are feeding into professions and areas differently, it is kind of hard to explain the difference of why engineering is doing so well.

The negative side or the left, some progress but could look better side; I sent around a separate sheet that I produced out of the Chronicle for Higher Education is either the very last piece that came out or it might have been the one right before it, and in that is information on faculty salaries in general. In particular what I have passed around is the chart regarding men and women’s salaries and the salary gaps remain. There is also a very brief recent report that came out this week from American Association of University Women that looks at salary data. What is interesting about it is that there are very substantial statements in this and that is that even when you control for degree field, occupation, and institution you are still getting this gender gap in
fairly substantial size on salary. And finally that in regards to our students that the payoff for a woman receiving an education, there is still a large gap between the payoff for that degree long term in terms of their life, compared to men. There has been some progress, but those ____ data.

In terms of minorities, again sort of mixed but good information; nationally the number of full-time minority faculty nationally continues to rise. I would recommend that you look at the National Council on Education Report on Minorities in Higher Education. Rises begin at all levels; graduate, full participation, hiring, entrants of the profession. And minorities have steadily increased their presence as full-time faculty at all ranks. Most of the data I am looking at is only full-time tenure/tenured track faculty. There also have been increases amongst all racial and ethnic groups and so that’s again evening out in some positive news. But the despite the gains, that minorities share of all the professors remains low and the actual number of ____ remains low.

So now comparing it to IU, I would say that you are looking at a similar profile. IU has showed progress over a 10 year period, but the story of _____ and the last years have been uneven, showing some losses especially in minority faculty. In some cases, the numbers are very small for minority faculty, especially for African American faculty or females. Looking toward the total campus composition, this year in particular, if I look at the entire university as a whole, there was a slight decrease in the total faculty. However, it was very uneven this year and those of you on your campuses know that probably. To give you a profile, Bloomington’s slight increase basically offset loss at the smaller campuses. There were several campuses that had significant decreases in faculty. Some of them, as I have said, _____ have had a tough year so ____.

The other very important factor is that retention, resignation, and retirements are constantly undermining any gains. Across the board, we are doing turnover. It is interesting because the retirement is fairly predictable, the retention is less predictable, and the retention, at the Bloomington campus, those of you at the Bloomington campus that got the Bloomington report, I track every loss that we had in the faculty in the last year and went both to the faculty member and to the department, found out where they went, and I would highly recommend that you ask that on your campus that you do that because it is pretty revealing, on the Bloomington campus most people went to better institutions _____, about half of them left for spousal reasons, and most of them were resignations at the associate level. And that is that people seem to be more flexible and are being hired in and taking jobs that they think are their best choice, but once they have the security of tenure and have more flexibility, which is part of the market, they are both getting more offers but they are also looking at factors that they may have besides salary that become more salient to them in their decision to stay or not to stay. That has had a disproportional impact on minorities and senior women and that is where we are having large losses and we are also having substantial losses for minorities and senior women. Again I would recommend that you look at your campus reports there.

On the hiring level, the assistant rank is still the most common rank for hiring. One of the things that I want to say here is that especially on campuses that do a lot of hiring at the lecturer rank, I think you need to look—a couple years ago there was some change especially on some of the campuses of changing long-term adjunct appointments to lecturer rank. ____ One of the things
that I think you need to look at now is when hiring lecturers, whether it is possible that those will move into some sort of tenure track rank. On the Bloomington campus, the example that I can give is that we had hired two lecturers in Fine Arts and they were converted to tenure-track position this year. So the assumption, I know that the council talks about the non-tenure track faculty, is the assumption that you will always be in a non-tenure track position, I think is something that should be looked at again at in terms of opportunities for hiring.

Every place that in the last year I talked about the campuses that location was the problem and everyone said location. Bloomington said that location was their problem; Indianapolis said location was their problem, East said location was their problem in terms of hiring. I think that is interesting. I am not going to say anymore. Everyone thinks that location is the problem.

The faculty like issues of best hiring and affect hiring and retention as I said, so that spousal issues and other choices about why people stay or why people take a job have an effect. Another thing that I would put forward to you, is you have 10 days. Your family leave policies and other family related policies that you should probably be looking at seriously in terms of recruitment.

On promotion, there are still differences by number of years to promotion that is both longer for women and minorities. Campuses should be looking and developing a list of whoever who has been in rank 7 years plus, and I would recommend that you take that back to your campus again and within your department. The other thing that I would ask you to look at in terms of under representation of women and minorities are the distinguished ranks and nominations. I want to point out that Northwest has a banner year at Founders Day this year. That is, they had a lot of people that were nominated and received awards and I think it was really interesting because in talking to Northwest, one of the factors I think was because people were nominated and where this is going on, this is something you have control on and your campus has control over and where women and minorities are under represented is something that we need to look at. So look at your faculty and think putting people forth.

Administrative appointments; I want to talk about administrative appointments. Some campuses have not been very inclusive of women and minorities in their administrative frame. And they vary partly I believe because of how those appointments are made. It also depends on whether the appointment is sort of a long-term appointment, meaning I am hired in and I am there until it ends or whether they are brought in on a 4-year appointment. I would like to take the recommendation again that you ask yourself what is your process for administrative appointments. A norm that works is that if a …..and President Herbert has brought this up…that administrative appointments generally should be an appointment that is sort of aside from your faculty appointment and if we set them up on 3 and 4 year terms, then there is nothing says that is has to be a full national search. It can be an internal search and we should be mentoring and identifying people that can serve in those administrative positions. Someone once said to me, a faculty member once said to me, that when you are a faculty member you should always be willing to be a faculty member, a chair, a dean or division head, a chancellor, the head of the faculty council at some point in your life. That is what mentoring is about, to say what are the possibilities. And the administrative appointments are another one that I would like to highlight here today.
Couple things that I want to tell you about coming up; one is that President Herbert has asked and I think this is going forward, that there was a part of an assessment of all of your campuses on diversity plans and by the end of the year, each campus will be asked to put together a diversity plan and some of these things that I have mentioned here and I hope from the data that I have given you will help assist you in participating in your campuses and outlining where the real objectives and roles _______.

**HERBERT:** I might just note there Julie that Michael McRobbie and I will bring this up at the next board meeting. We will be asking each campus to have much more explicit plans with regard to faculty as well as students and staff and also plans relative to commitments relative to a greater utilization of minority women on businesses.

**KNOST:** The second thing I’ll have you bring up and I don’t know if you’ve talked about here, and that is the new HBCU initiative and while that was announced primarily I think for the Bloomington and IUPUI campus I know for example South Bend is now working on the graduate side as side as well if you want to talk a little bit about that.

**HERBERT:** What we’ve done is to announce the establishment of a major partnership with nine historically black colleges and universities and I think we may add a tenth one. The focus there is both at the faculty level and also student level and its primary emphasis is in the stem areas. This summer we’re going to have a summer institute for students, and they’ll be working with faculty members here in Indianapolis and in Bloomington. We also have established a fellowship program for students, and that will be open to students on all campuses. It will be run out of the graduate school. One of the good news aspects of this is that as a result of our facilitating greater collaboration among faculty on the various campuses this also affords opportunities for us to become eligible for some grant projects; federal programs that are currently set aside only for HBCU’s. But now what the feds are doing especially in defense, but other agencies as well is they’re saying the collaboration with majority research universities will also be very positively considered as they make award decisions. I attended a session a week ago in Atlanta. I gave a presentation and I had four different federal agencies indicate to me that they are interested in doing some work with us because of that partnership. So I think it offers a number of very significant possibilities over the long term and I kind of think the faculty collaboration is a very important of this. I think it also will lead to a significant increase over time and the number of minority graduate students that we’ll be able to attract particularly in the stem areas.

**KNOST:** On the graduate students side, ___ outlook that it should have a listing of the top producers of PhDs by discipline, again, ____. The other thing that I wanted to mention…I thought I brought it with me but I don’t, there are interesting sources where you can identify graduate students, ______ graduate recruitment across the board. Diverse magazine has the Arthur Ashe Award. It just came out last week I think. The Arthur Ashe Award is for outstanding athletes, minority athletes. These are all students. They are just incredible. They give the students, the person’s home institution, their GPA, their names, and pictures. You open this and we are talking about some 30 pages of some of the most outstanding students in this country. You can see Kinesiology, Social Work—as a recruitment source, I look at this and think this is amazing. It takes the initiative of individual departments to identify those people. It just doesn’t happen. We are too big of an institution. I cannot do it. The graduate people cannot do it. They
try to send out this information. It really is impressive and shows that there are all kinds of
students out there who have great caliber and we should be maximizing it. That’s all I have; I
have been talking forever, I’ll take questions. Bart.

NG: Mary has a question.

KNOST: I didn’t see Mary back there. Nursing, there is a bunch of people listed in nursing.

FISHER: My question is a recurring one and that is that it’s been quite a few years since we’ve
done any salary equity studies. I really believe that knowing that this is generally an issue
throughout the county it would be a good time for that to happen. My question to you is, how do
we make that happen?

KNOST: Well let me talk about something we have done and your right it’s been probably about
seven years since we’ve done _______. One is that, now I have to call ____ because I can’t
guarantee that ____, but there is quite a lot of progress that has been made in assuring that salary
review committees exist at least the school level or department level so that the opportunity to
report the salary can occur at that level and that part reflects that belief that peer review and
going through the ___ process of trying to cross that bridge and bumping it up into some
administrative process. The second thing is that pretty recently because our systems are better,
we are now doing comprehensive compensation review, meaning I run the data at the aggregate
level to look by department at ranges of salary by minority and women and then _______. But I’m
simply able to look at the ability to take that further hasn’t yet occurred. And I agree with you
that administratively, it’s been discussed every year and I think it will remain on the agenda.

HERBERT: Marty and then we’ll come over to you.

SPECHLER: First, Julie, with respect to the salary review I also feel that that would be
desirable but I object to the idea that you looked at average faculty salaries. I think that the
median and difference in medians will be far more revealing than the average considering that
we’re moving through history and I hope in the right direction. But none the less some of the
longest standing people are going to be predominately men and the average is going to distort
that because the distribution is undoubtedly skewed to the right. As you understand under those
circumstances the median is much more revealing and I think that the gap between the medians
is going to be less. That’s my conjecture, s a statistician here, as compared with the gap in the
averages. So that’s the first thing I urge you to do is look at medians and not at averages.

The second thing is of course the idea that we’re working all of us to get reasonable
representation of women and minorities in all fields I guess that means converging to 50% for
women across all fields is a desirable objective. Personally, I think that there’s nothing more
important than personally encouraging the most promising young people whether they’re men,
women, and of any race to pursue academic careers. There’s nothing more effective in my
opinion than putting your hand on a shoulder of a person and say you have the talent to work in
academics and research and I want to encourage that. There’s a lot of young people despite all
the little superficial encouragement they receive, really don’t believe that they have it but some
of our students do have it and they should be encouraged. Now Julie this with respect to
converging to 50% lets say with women, I notice the figures about librarians. In our two biggest library systems the number of women being hired at the assistant librarian rank is now 70%. 7 out of 10 of the new hires in Bloomington and IUPUI were women, and maybe it’s not surprising and maybe it’s not troubling but roughly 2 thirds of the senior women at the senior librarian full rank are also women and probably participate at about the same proportion in the hiring committees. Do you find that troubling that in that field there are no separate figures for education, nursing, and some other fields that might be interesting? Do you find that troubling too and what would you propose to do about that?

KNOST: Well I do find it troubling because I really think the explanation of some of the age gaps is about sex segregation by occupation and librarian, education, SLIS and all those are being showed. I think that you see some.

SPECHLER You mean there aren’t men who want these jobs.

KNOST: I think it has not been a profession that men have sought out. I think that gets back to your point and that is when you put your hands on [End of Tape 1, Side A… some comments may be lost. Side B is blank]

SPECHLER: Well that would be interesting to see

KNOST:

BALDWIN: I speak as a male librarian,

KNOST: I include Lecturers in the Affirmative Action plans

BALDWIN: But at IUPUI

KNOST:

BALDWIN: But one of our faculty concerns

SPECHLER: Actually, Jim, it’s not exactly true.

MILLER: Well, Marty, if I could

SPECHLER: Absolutely, Ted, and a lot of people

KNOST: I just want to say though, I mean, obviously

SPECHLER:

MILLER: If I could just make one
HERBERT:

FISHER:

KNOST: Yes, in prior years

HERBERT:

KNOST: No, if anybody wants more information they can contact me.

AGENDA ITEM #6: POLICY AND PROCEDURES ON RESEARCH MISCONDUCT

ATKINSON:

ALTER:

KINTZELE:

ATKINSON: One of the problems that we run into

KINTZELE: Because you say they are getting previously

ATKINSON: Right. They are informed at every stage

KINTZELE: Another one I would like to bring up

ATKINSON: I think it’s very important that anonymous information been permitted in this procedure. Very often

ALTER: Well, let me turn this over to Eric Swank

SWANK: Yes, when they restated the regulations a few years ago

ATKINSON: There is a, research misconduct can be a very serious issue

SCHNEIDER:

KINTZELE: Well, some of the comments that the IU Kokomo

ATKINSON: Right. And there has to be a university official

HERBERT: Herb?

TERRY: This is yet another comment
ATKINSON:

HERBERT: Other

BALDWIN:

ATKINSON: Right.

BALDWIN:

ATKINSON: I think that’s correct.

BALDWIN: The committee would not

ATKINSON: If they

BALDWIN:

ATKINSON: I think that would fall outside of the policy

BALDWIN: Because these days with email.

ATKINSON: The intent of the policy

MEISS: I think we’re making anonymous information

HERBERT: Other questions or comments?

ATKINSON: George, do you want to add anything?

HERBERT: Does this require a motion

AGENDA ITEM #7: CIC PROVOST’S STATEMENT ON PUBLISHING AGREEMENTS

HERBERT: The next item is the CIC Provost’s Statement on Publishing Agreements. Bart, do you or Ted, who’s going

MILLER:

CREWS: Thank you, Professor Miller.

HERBERT: Marty?

SPECHLER: My problem now stands behind the pronoun “you”.
HERBERT:

FRANTZ: What does

MILLER: I think

HERBERT:

MILLER:

SPECHLER: I personally

HERBERT: Herb?

TERRY: I’m prone to say that we should endorse it.

HERBERT: Well, one way

TERRY: I move that this Council endorse this policy

HERBERT:

FRANTZ: Second.

HERBERT:

KINTZELE: I think that the CIC should have gone to more of the big national university organizations

HERBERT:

CREWS: If I may reply to exactly that point

LAHIRI: I’m on the faculty in the School of Medicine

CREWS: That’s right. You touched your finger on exactly the contract.

HERBERT: Let me ask if either Bloomington or Northwest

COFFIN: Yes, I do. This is Don Coffin at Northwest

SPECHLER: Just listen more often, Don.

COFFIN: It seems to me if the purpose is to negotiate
HERBERT:

GROTH: We don’t have any comments.

HERBERT:

FRANTZ: I would vote against this if it

HERBERT:

TERRY: The most forceful word in this thing

HERBERT: Are there any additional comments

MILLER: I would just like to clarify one point. I would just like to say that the

FRANTZ: The legal staff

HERBERT: And some of those staff are also in Indianapolis

AGENDA ITEM #8: REPORT ON CORE CAMPUS AND SYSTEM SCHOOL OPERATIONS AND PRESIDENT HERBERT’S RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

HERBERT:

MILLER: Yes, we have also discussed this item [Tape 2, Side A begins in the middle of Ted speaking here] the university structure; academic structure really are matters that the faculty should be engaged in to an extent beyond which they are currently. The report that the President commissioned on this topic was done by administrators, ex-administrators of the university. There has been really very little consultation with the faculty and the units concerned. I’m not saying that there hasn’t been any but there really has not been much consultation. The faculty in the units are not really well versed in the underpinnings of this concept of system school and of core school. I’ve been a member of the faculty of a system school for 32 years, and really my sense is that the faculty just doesn’t think in these terms its just not sort of one of those things that kind of leaps into the faculty mind. We think about our campuses, we think about our schools and our colleagues on our campus. Core campus school system schools really are a subject I think that the faculty should talk more about and that really is the purpose of the resolution that we bring to you. We understand that the President is going to make some recommendations to the trustees at the next board meeting which will be in a week or so, a week and a half. Our hope is that to the extent that the discussion of this particular topic has energized some debate within the various schools about this matter. We are really hoping that that could continue and somehow we could find a way to encourage this discussion.

One of the things that occurred to me as I was thinking about what this resolution might say and I think at the end of the day is maybe the most important thing in my mind now is that-- and I
draw an analogy to a document that we saw here in the council not sure if it was this year or last year, it was a policy that had to do with the creation of new graduate programs on a campus. We had a specification of what the conditions were under which we would have new graduate programs; the potential to approve a new graduate program. We understand what it takes to deliver a new graduate program. We have ideas about this. To the extent that a core campus school for an example is different somehow from a regular school, it seems to that we ought to understand what those differences are particularly as we think about going forward and contemplating an era where core campus schools might be terminated. In other words we change them from being core campus school to just being a collection of schools on their respective campuses. When should that happen? What are the criteria that we use to evaluate the existence of these rather special units? I see this resolution as a resolution that calls for a continuation of the examination of this issue. I’m very hopeful that the Presidents recommendations to the Trustees will not foreclose that sort of thing.

HERBERT: Are there questions or comments?

G. HOYT: Yes, I agree. The many different comments that were collected, I want to thank the people that did this nice volume of comments, indicate that what Ted is saying is exactly the case. That there’s a lot of misunderstanding about what a core school is versus core campus systems versus the University with a capital U. I think within the schools across the campuses, how one understands oneself in Bloomington versus Indianapolis is truly different and these are comments by some of the leaders within the schools and when leaders are showing not just conflict but lack of a conception of what sort of structure they’re in, it was very disconcerting I must say. So I totally agree that we need much more discussion on this and involve more people so that there can be some sort of discursive resolution to this. Not everybody is ever going to agree on all these things of course but it has to be much more agreement than this. Our board of trustees can look at this and have seen things have calmed down but unless we have everybody or most people on board on what the dean recommended it clearly won’t have the function that one desires from it.

SPECHLER: I agree with Giles that there’s a great deal of difference in these reactions and not all the reactions have yet been published but one very disconcerting part of it is that some cases one of the usually smaller partners or one of the smaller members of the system school either want to divorce or haven’t been talking to the other partners for years. I mean this is a really sad situation in a few of our schools; journalism, in other schools to, music school. Some facts have been revealed by this that really should be taken into account. One of the issues is if we have either a system or a core campus school and one of the partners doesn’t like it, do they have the right to opt out? Is this a divorce on demand system? Well I don’t think that any civilized society can tolerate divorce completely on demand at a moment’s notice and I don’t think that we should have divorce on demand in a moment’s notice either but in some cases there isn’t even notice.

HERBERT: Other comments? Are there any comments from Bloomington?

GROTH: None.
HERBERT: Ok, Herb?

TERRY: I guess I’m wondering what the purpose of this resolution is, in the sense that I understand it is that President Herbert is to make recommendations or a report to the trustees. I am not sure if you know what the trustees are going to do once he makes his report. I guess I’m wondering at the very end of this resolution why the verb ‘concurs’ is in here? With whom are we concurring? Or are we simply concluding that the structure of multi-campus schools at Indiana University should be reconsidered? What I’m really wondering is if our intent is to influence President Herbert to make his recommendations to the board but also know that there has been this discussion at the UFC? There is some lack of faculty concurrence with these recommendations or if we’re trying to urge you to report to the trustees when make your report that this has passed?

MILLER: Well, I think, let me just go back to the question of concurring. We’re really concurring with the President. The President is the person who launched the study of the multi-campus units, the status of the multi-campus units. I think that what this says is that we concur that this is something that really does need to be done and we’re trying to give credit to the President for undertaking this initiative because I think we feel that it is something that should be done. I think that what we’re saying here is that we’re not quite sure that we’re ready to put this to bed for another 30 years right now, alright.

TERRY: Does the president concur that we should reconsider this, what’s happening?

VERMETTE: I’d like to propose this, that you keep concurrent with data that the University Faculty Council concurs with the President that the structure of the working campus units within Indiana University should be reconsidered, and then add “but in a process that must involve the faculty” and that’s our idea. But in a process that must involve the faculty units to an extent far greater than it has been to this date.

MILLER: I’ll take that as a friendly amendment.

VERMETTE: I don’t know how friendly it is though. [Laughter]

HERBERT: It’s regarded by being friendly by the person who made the amendment.

VERMETTE: We’ve been told that there’s no such thing as a friendly amendment.

HERBERT: From a parliamentary procedure it is a friendly amendment.

SPECHLER: I just want to point out that the report by former Dean Charles Bonser a very distinguished dean, a long time dean, and a very successful dean at this university was not really discussed in any detail in this Faculty Council. We are to some extent at fault here. We got this very thoughtful and detailed report and I think he spent 10 minutes on it so I believe that we should send that report to whatever committee of the UFC is going to reconsider this because after all he did a lot of work and he’s a real expert and has worked in this. He’s not the only expert but he knows more than almost any of us about how a system school works.
HERBERT: Bart?

NG: Marty, the only problem is that Dean Bonser’s report was a report to the President not to the UFC.

SPECHLER: Well, I’m sure the President is interested in having those facts known to everybody and it was put on our agenda. So why can’t, if it was on our agenda Bart, why don’t you send it to the committee that’s going to reexamine this?

SCHNEIDER: We kind of did. The President did bring it to us but we only have enough time to get these kinds of comments from the faculty and so rather than make this conclusion at the bottom of this presentation this is really asking for more time that certainly would be appropriate if the trustees choose to ask for further inquiry and discussion.

HERBERT: Herb?

TERRY: And I think our real point is though here is that this additional discussion really shouldn’t occur at a UFC committee. It should occur back at the Faculty Council Policy Committee, faculty groups back in the schools that are really subject to this. That’s what I think we’re trying to encourage is that we got the benefit of the Bonser report but it didn’t reach down to hear from the faculty involved and we know that. This is just a concurrence of the idea this needs reconsideration but recommendation and that reconsideration has got to start down at the bottom.

MILLER: I think that’s right. The basic thing here is not that we want the UFC to continue to discuss this. It really is a matter for the faculty in the various schools to engage in a serious way; just what is this all about and really what would be the best interests of our students of our colleagues going forward. I think the primary focus is on another audience here but on the other hand this notion that we really don’t have a clear idea about what are the conditions under which we actually would want to recognize something as a core campus school or as a system school. I mean that’s something for the University Faculty Council I think to discuss.

HERBERT: I should tell you that we did have extensive discussion of this in the Agenda Committee meeting. I did go into considerable detail to discuss my views on this, why I have responded the way I have. I’m trying to be respective of the fact that this now a place for the council to articulate your views and so I’m not going through discussing all that except to tell you that the Board of Trustees did ask me to take a very hard look at several organization structure issues. Included in that was a specific charge to look at core and system schools. I have done that and what I have put forward in my view does address a number of the issues that have been articulated. I have been given some different information with regard to the level of discussion at least from the dean’s and there discussions of these matters with their policy groups and others. I think all of this information is very helpful. I also want to make sure that everyone understands that the most significant change in the recommendations that I put forward relates to the system schools not the core schools. Essentially what I am saying is that it is my belief that with regard to the system schools that we should provide greater opportunity for all of the
campuses to make a determination as to whether or not the current model works for them. So that the campuses have an option of becoming free standing or maintaining relationships with the school; the primary school, whether it is in Bloomington or in Indianapolis. It seems to me that we’re at a point where that makes sense.

With regard to core schools the final analysis, I am making very few recommendations for changes there. I am saying that if we’re going to have core schools we need to make them work. That the current system actually is dysfunctional in terms of facilitating the prospects for success in those units and what we need to do is to address that issue head on. We do need to have a process where there’s periodic review of programs and so I’ll spell that out in more detail. I just want to make sure that everyone understands that the basic thrust of this, the most significant impact with regard to change is with regard to the system schools and giving all the campuses, as part of the mission differentiation process, greater flexibility to make a determination as to whether or not they want to continue with those relationships. The one exception clearly being social work because there are accreditations issues there and may be the second is medicine all those units will continue to operate under the School of Medicine. So just for clarification in terms of what the effect is.

VERMETTE: Based on what you just said President Herbert, do we have any idea why the Board of Trustees ought to take up this question of reviewing the system schools and core schools? Have they been getting complaints from, I don’t know, chancellors or something that caused them to think there might be problems?

HERBERT: What the Board asked me to do is to take a look at all aspects of university operations. So this is one of those. It has not been examined for thirty years and so it was time to look at that. Just as we looked at overall organization structure, I’ve made recommendations with regard to the structure of the Bloomington campus and changes there. So all of this is part of that comprehensive review of how the university is conducting its business. I think basically what their view has been is that we need to get all of these things in order so that the next president can focus more on academic issues and other matters that are going to be of priority importance to him. Marty.

SPECHLER: I’d like to make one other comment. It has to do with my experience on the graduate council a couple of terms some years ago. We were considering an advanced degree on a campus which I’ll not mention, I don’t even remember which one it was, and a proposal came in from this campus and it proposed this degree but it was thought unanimously by the committee in charge, the Curriculum Committee, that that campus did not have adequate personnel to mount a responsible program. Now I think it’s very natural on my campus on every campus to be ambitious about what they’re offering their public, that’s very natural and in fact praise worthy. On the other hand we’re offering an Indiana University degree, whether it’s from this school or that school, and we all have an interest in preserving the quality and integrity of the Indiana University degree. Whatever school and whatever location is offered, whatever they say on the degree it’s still an Indiana University degree and therefore, I think there is a role and from my experience that includes the role, although not a pleasant role, to tell people you’re ambitious, you are forward thinking, but your not ready to offer a degree in that field because you don’t have enough personnel, you don’t have enough background, facilities or what not.
That has happened in my experience. I think it might well happen. That’s why President Herbert
I am uneasy, uneasy with the idea that every campus can decide for itself which way it will go
with respect to this or that program.

HERBERT: I understand that viewpoint and I think that’s something that we will deal with as
those issues arise. We had a case on one campus where there was an interest in offering a
graduate program. The proposal came before the Board, and we deferred it until a more
appropriate arrangement was worked out to assure that those issues were addressed. So I think
that that is a natural part of the process as you go through this kind of effort. David.

FULTON: President Herbert, in response to Marty’s comment I think we still have that
Academic Leadership Council in place, which in fact carries that filter role, if you will Marty.
All of these proposals from all the campuses go to the Academic Leadership Council, which I
believe is chaired by Chancellor Bantz to review those programs and to raise the issues that
you’re expressing.

SPECHLER: David, I value that, but I think it’s very important for a program in a certain
field—I mean after all you people are generalists, wise and experienced yes, but still generalists.
To have review by people who are in the field and already know what’s required to do a
responsible job in that field and as long as the Academic Council or the Trustees refer it to the
best authorities throughout the university, then no problem.

HERBERT: Herb?

TERRY: I’m actually comfortable with this idea that the President has recommended for the
university schools, partly because I have never known a faculty group to for less autonomy and
fewer options. I’d rather look over this with a number of checks and balances to which they do.
The reason I think it should go back to further discussion when it comes to the core campus
issues is largely, I think, to get faculty buy-in to this process. If the faculty haven’t been involved
in this review the deans may try to make it work. But without faculty buy-in, it’s up to us I think
to throw most of the barriers in there ______ accomplished. The virtue I see in sending or
recommending this is that we continue in a fashion which gets more faculty involved. That’s the
way that I can see this ever getting a decision about which unit should function as core campuses
and which should not, but more importantly the commitment of the faculty to work with the
administration and to get that done.

HERBERT: Other comments?

MILLER: Well, let me just say that I think Herb makes a good point. One of the things that I
said to the President in the Agenda Committee meeting was that in my 30 year experience in a —
it’s actually a system school I guess at this point, in my 30 year experience of it as a system
school, there has been a tremendous change in the attitudes of the faculty about the systemness
of the school. In the mid-seventies, the feeling was very strong. There was a total faculty buy-in
to this idea of a system school but over 30 years, and I continue to think that the responsibility
center system had a great deal to do with this in terms of disentangling the systemness of a
school like SPEA, today, I think the typical faculty member in SPEA doesn’t have any buy-in to
this notion of a system school or even as a core campus school. I think there is very little buy-in. To turn that around I think it’s going to be extremely difficult and I don’t think it’s going to happen by the Board of Trustees decreeing that it is so.

HERBERT: Again, keep in mind, and this is the irony of all of this, that I have not said that we’re going to disband, well maybe with one exception, a core school. It seems to mean that what Ted is arguing is that I should go much further, or that this ought to go much further than what I’m putting of the table. What I’m saying is that as of right now what we need to do, if we’re going to have core schools, and I have seen nothing that would suggest at this point it is essential that we abolish all of them, which creates a whole host of other issues, but what we ought to do is to make sure that they work and to take a look at, be very pragmatic about this, take a look at the barriers that have made it difficult for these schools to function effectively. Let’s eliminate those. Lets be much more structured about this and then we have the opportunity to take a hard look and determine whether or not in the final analysis the model works or doesn’t work. We’ve gone for 30 years with this model and have never sat down and talked specifically about the role of the deans in the context of this, the roles of the chancellors or the deans ___ the chancellors.

There are number of other matters that relate to budget that have not been clarified. It is natural that you are going to have some problems in that kind of context. Perhaps this is just given my background in public administration, what I want to do is to make sure that we are much more precise with regard to how we’re operating, what the expectations are, and that we have a point in time, periodically, in which we come back and we conduct assessments of the effectiveness in what we’re doing. None of that is evident at the present time. It’s been 30 years and no one has ever dealt with it. So what I’m trying to do is deal with it in a methodical fashion. Let’s get these systems in place. Let’s run this in a fashion that’s much more efficient and if it doesn’t work then you have an opportunity to come back and fix it. I’m sorry I didn’t mean to get louder. (Laughter) I just want to make sure everyone understood.

MILLER: Well Adam, if I think, if your report says that at the end of the day, given that we try everything to make this work, if at the end of the day we conclude that it doesn’t work and we are then open to some restructuring then I think I would be perfectly content with such a report. I have a sense that, and I’ve told you this privately, I have a sense that there are a number of faculty around who really do not think your recommendations go far enough. It’s kind of the opposite of Marty. Marty is concerned that it might be going too far on the system school front. I think there are a number of faculty around who think that your recommendations may be don’t go far enough. I think if at the end of the day there is a chance to sought of look at—before we focus on the problems, we try to fix them, we try to make it work the way we think a core school should work and if we can’t make it work, if there are barriers that we just can’t get past, then we’re in a situation where we reconsider what we’re doing. I think that would be perfectly acceptable.

HERBERT: And I can tell you that that’s basically where I am and that’s the way I’m trying to approach this. I am going to indicate to Board that there ought to be a time period in which we, as a routine manner, take a look at these issues. Right now we’re in a scenario in which this just goes on forever. There’s never an opportunity to asses it. I happen to believe very strongly in the
concept of accountability and assessment of what you’re doing. We haven’t built that into anything; whether it is in the broader context of university operations where we now have that in place or here, we’ve got to do that. What I’m trying to do is to streamline this and make sure that it works. If it doesn’t work we have a point in time in which you can come back and assess and say these are the problems. Can they be fixed? Can they not? Have the nature of the field changed such that a new model is necessary? Frankly what I’m concerned about is, if we don’t have some kind of structure for this it’s just going to go on forever because no one is going to want to deal with it in a systematic kind of fashion. So what I’m trying to do is to provide some structure and a systematic approach to dealing with it rather than allowing this to go on for another 30 years.

TERRY: I’m very encouraged by that. My only concern at that point though would be that not only that the Trustees are aware that this is what we’re going to do; we’re going to go get out with a plan to try to make it work. There are reasons to suspect it will or also the reasons to suspect it won’t, we’re going to review it. The only thing I would hope to be added to that would be that that review at that time seeks out faculty input in a way that this process so far has not. So that in the course of your report to the trustees you we’re to say to them what we would provide to them at that time a lot of information not just from the deans but from the faculty and then I’d like to see us get all the time on this whole thing too.

NG: I just want to make one remark. I want to thank President Herbert, having raised these issues; I think they are all very important issues that will have a lot of great impact on the future of Indiana University. In fact, precisely, because of that I think that we have to approach this question in a very deliberate way to make sure that this will not be another missed opportunity. As we all sit around saying that things have been going on this way for 30 years, I think it will be a very good thing and now that we take stock of what we have and in fact look at the problems. Look at what core or system school, ultimately what structure you want. The question is does it encourage collaboration? Does it add value to the work of the faculty and the school? I think those are the issues that the faculty can contribute a great deal in that discussion to make sure that we will not miss this opportunity for the future.

HERBERT: I have already begun pulling together my notes and everything and I can tell you that I am going to suggest that every 5 years there be a review of the schools to look at those issues as well as others. I think in that context both external review and faculty participation would be appropriate and I’ll speak to some of that in the context to what I’ve put on the table. Some of these matters can be ones that the President takes action on. I think the Board will either, the ideal thing is for the Board to endorse that as opposed to formally approving some of these matters because what you don’t want to do is to establish the precedent that the Board is going to get into an even higher level of detail related to the academic enterprises. So there’s a balancing act there that we have to be sensitive to. But what I will do is articulate all of this in a fashion that is as binding as I can make it with regard to future presidents. Herb.

TERRY: I move to table the discussion.

HERBERT: Motion to table. Is there a second?
BOBAY: Second.

HERBERT: All those in favor of tabling please say “Aye” (AYE). Opposed “No” (NO). Okay to motion on the floor is to approve the recommendation, would you like to articulate. Has the motion been made? I’ve forgotten now.

MILLER: This document comes to us from the Agenda Committee so I think it’s legitimately on the floor. I would just say that given what President Herbert just said I think that if this resolution is read broadly it really is not in conflict with what the President has been suggesting. This basically says that this is an issue that needs consideration. The consideration is long overdue and what this resolution says is that the process of reconsideration whether it’s in the next week or whether it’s over the next five years if we have some process in place what this says is that we think the faculty needs to be more deeply involved in thinking about these matters than has been previously the case. So I don’t see a particular conflict between this and what the President has articulated.

SPECHLER: Point of order, we have an amendment that has been made by Professor Vermette and seconded and accepted by you Ted as a friendly amendment, whatever that means, so I think when we’re referring to the resolution that’s the resolution that’s on the floor.

HERBERT: Right, as amended.

FULTON: In light of what Ted just said I just think we need to recognize that on page five according to the report the said statement of the proposed action along the deadline which I took as meaning that this is what we will be doing if adopted by the Trustees. It says here, “This will require the deans and their faculties, the campus financial officers, the academic leadership of the campuses, and the President to work together towards these ends”. Then it gives us a year to get that done. That clearly includes the faculty of all of the core schools in terms of the collaboration in these reviews. I think you’re right we’re confirming the resolution based on what’s confirmed what’s in the President’s report.

FISHER: But the academic leadership is not synonymous with the faculty. I think our resolution is being distinctive in that we want actual faculty involvement not just academic leadership involved. That’s why I think I’m speaking in favor to the resolution and the importance of the resolution.

HERBERT: Ok, if there’s no further discussion of the resolution as amended all those who are in favor please say “Aye” (AYE). Those opposed “No” (No). The resolution as amended is adopted. Now we go into the executive session.

NG: I just want to say that before we go into executive session, I would like to take this opportunity to really express on behalf of this council our gratitude to Ted Miller who has provided us with magnificent leadership during this past year. We actually discussed how we should honor Ted, and Ted said to me to tell everybody that he really doesn’t want anything, but he wants to have something that during his retirement he could sit back and look at and enjoy.
For that reason we are going to present to him today on behalf of the Faculty Council a plaque that he doesn’t even have to hang it up, he can just hold it in front of him and hold and read and stare at. Would you like to read that Ted?

**MILLER:** Will it says, “Indiana University in appreciation for your leadership, your tireless support of faculty governance, and service to the University Faculty Council this award is presented to Theodore K. Miller Co-Secretary 1997-1999 and 2005-2007 for twice going into breach when you should have learned the first time. (Laughter) UFC Agenda Committee April 24, 2007. (Applause) Thank you very, very much, and Bart I think that what you’ve done is perfect.

**HERBERT:** That’s very well deserved.

**NG:** Very well deserved. Now despite the fact that Ted does not really want anything, but he did once tell me that one of his dreams after he retired was to set sail to Portugal and when he gets to Lisbon he’s going to sit on a sidewalk café and sip on whatever strikes his fancy at that time and listen to Fado, Portuguese folk music, and this is his dream. For that reason, I’m also going to present to him a couple CDs just to wet your appetite. You just will have to do for now until you get to Portugal and enjoy the sun. Again on behalf of the Faculty Council here’s a couple of CDs for you to enjoy while you’re staring at the plaque. (Applause)

**MILLER:** Thank you very much.

**NG:** Finally, I really want to say that I thoroughly enjoyed working with Ted in these past two years. I could not think of a more forceful and effective advocate of faculty rights for the involvement of faculty. I think we really have been fortunate to have Ted playing such a strong role with the University Faculty Council at this time. So Ted I wish you good health and great fun during your retirement, your well deserved retirement. Congratulations.

**MILLER:** Thank you, thank you very much. (Applause) I wish you all—well, thank you very much.

**HERBERT:** Bart I just want you to know that you got some of us very nervous when you talked about his going to Spain. I thought you were going to say he was going to be on the beaches and you had one of those skimpy swimsuits (Laughter) the thought of that just psyching all of us out.

**NG:** Awe you really give me an idea.

**HERBERT:** Okay, now we need to go into executive session for the purpose of dealing with honorary degrees.

**AGENDA ITEM #9: EXECUTIVE SESSION: HONORARY DEGREES**